San Francisco
Community College District

Table of Contents

Introduction to Roles, Responsibilities, and Processes ... 2

Effective Participation Specifically Defined by Title 5 ... 3

Planning and Development Processes, Roles, and Responsibilities

D1. Development of Program Reviews ... 7

D2. Development of College Wide Plans Associated with Categorical Funding ... 10

D3. Development of College Wide Plans without Attached Funding ... 13

D4. Development of College Wide Initiatives, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures ... 15

D4a. … Unrelated to Either A&P or Student Matters (General) ... 18

D4b. … with Some Content Related to Academic & Professional (A&P/10+1) ("rely primarily") and Student Matters ... 21

D4c. … with Content Related to Academic & Professional (A&P/10+1) ("rely primarily") Matters (not requiring student input) ... 25

D4d. … Related to Student Matters Only ... 29

Resource Allocation Processes, Roles, and Responsibilities

R1. Resource Allocation of College Wide Supplemental General Funds ... 32

R2. Resources Allocation of College Wide Categorical Funds ... 34

Introduction to Roles, Responsibilities, and Processes

This guide codifies our decision making and resource allocation processes at the College and the roles and responsibilities within those processes. These processes are related to:

1. Program Review
2. Planning and development of college wide plans[1]
3. Planning and development of college wide initiatives,[2] Board policies, and administrative procedures
4. Resource allocation of supplemental General funds
5. Resource allocation of categorical funds

The purpose of these narratives and flowcharts is to ensure appropriate dialog and to clarify how all constituent groups participate in decision making.

The College recognizes that, in certain situations, we may need to expedite decision making when facing time-sensitive or otherwise urgent issues. In these cases, the College will maintain the general flow of decision making but may adjust the amount of time to ensure its ability to meet required deadlines.

As our processes change and improve, this document will also
A

Classified Staff Participation

Title 5 §51023.5 requires that "governing boards of a community college district shall adopt policies and procedures that provide district and college staff the opportunity to participate effectively in district and college governance."

In alignment with Title 5 §51023.5 (a)(4)-(a)(6):

- Staff will be asked to "participate in the formulation and development of district and college policies and procedures, and in those processes for jointly developing recommendations for action by the governing board, that the governing board reasonably determines, in consultation with staff, have or will have a significant effect on staff." At City College of San

Faculty Participation

Faculty participation takes place through the appointment of representatives by the Academic Senate and follows the processes outlined in AP 2.08.[3] Commonly known as the "Ten Plus One " or "10+1," (as articulated in Title 5 of the Administrative Code of California, Sections 53200) the following define "Academic and Professional matters."

1. curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines;
2. degree and certificate requirements;
3. grading policies;
4. educational program development;
5. standards or policies regarding student preparation and success;
6. district and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles;
7. faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports;
8. policies for faculty professional development activities;
9. processes for program review;
10. processes for institutional planning and budget development; and
11. other academic and professional matters as are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

Per City College of San Francisco Board Policy 2.08[4]:

> The Board of Trustees, and its official representative, the Chancellor, shall rely primarily upon and normally accept the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in the areas defined by Title 5, Sections 53200 and 53203.

The Chancellor effectuates this Board Policy through a process of "collegial consultation" involving regular meetings with the Academic Senate.

Administrator Participation

Administrator participation in governance takes place through the appointment of representatives to governance committees by the Chancellor, based on the recommendation of the Administrators Association Executive Council. Any responsibilities not specifically defined in other areas remain management responsibilities. The administration has the ultimate accountability and fiduciary responsibility to ensure that roles, responsibilities, and processes are carried out effectively and within regulatory requirements. This document references “senior administrators” in a number of places. Senior administrators include those with the following roles:

- wi3.54 (v)7 (:)13 MC /L4 tn/LBody <MCID 5 >De5 0.001 Tc -1 (s)2 (.h(wi)4.1 (v)h (p)-iTc 0.0035 Tc -8001 T-6h)-4 (i5 Tch

D1. Development of ProhfoAtt4 (p)2.2-l(R)-1θ (e)-1.8(v)-1tt4il

Phase 3: The College Planning Committee will evaluate the Program Review process, identify improvements to the process, and implement those improvements in the next Program Review cycle. As part of this process, the College Planning Committee will work collegially with the Academic Senate regarding A&P/10+1 processes related to Program Review and will "rely primarily" on the recommendation of the Academic Senate (see AP 2.08 for guidance).

Figure 1: D1. Development of Program Review

D2. Development of College Wide Plans Associated with Categorical Funding

Currently, college wide plans associated with categorical funding (student support plans) include the following:[8]

- Student Equity Plan (supporting the Student Equity and Achievement, SEA, Program)
- Strong Workforce Program (SWP)
- Adult Education Program (AEP)[9]

For more information and the most current set of plans, see ccsf.edu/plans. The process outlined here is for both existing categorical funding and for any new categorical funding that becomes available from the state.

If the College has a college wide participatory governance or Academic Senate committee related to the funding area, the Chancellor will assign the development of the Plan to that existing committee. For a list of participatory governance committees, see ccsf.edu/pgc; for Academic Senate committees, see ccsf.edu/acsenate.

If the College does not have a college wide participatory governance or Academic Senate committee or taskforce related to the funding area, the Chancellor, in consultation with related constituencies, will create a committee or temporary taskforce with constituent representation and designate a chair (or chairs). The number of members can vary. Constituencies appoint representatives to the taskforce/committee through their respective processes.

The taskforce/committee works collaboratively to develop the Plan. In doing so:

- A Lead Manager assigned to the taskforce/committee keeps the appropriate senior administrator informed of progress and solicits input from the senior administrator as needed. Lead Managers are typically deans assigned to the taskforce/committee and with ongoing management responsibility for the plan/allocation.
- If the plan contains Academic and Professional (A&P)/10+1 content, the Faculty Coordinator/Liaison[10] keeps the Academic Senate informed of progress and solicits input from the Academic Senate. In A&P/10+1 issues, the committee will “rely primarily” on the recommendation of the Academic Senate (see AP 2.08 for guidance).

To ensure that the Plan under development coordinates with other College Plans, the “Fan5” reviews drafts of the Plan and provides feedback through the Faculty Coordinators and Lead Managers. Fan5 is a workgroup composed of the Lead

[8] Note: the categorical funding sources listed are already attached to specific committees. The College recognizes that these plans involve A&P/10+1 issues and the Chancellor and Academic Senate will work collegially on revisions moving forward.

[9] Note: some categorical plans may require outside agreements/partnerships with community groups, city agencies, and/or San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). These typically have

D3. Development of College Wide Plans without Attached Funding

Examples of college wide plans without attached funding include the following:

- Education Master Plan (Planning Committee)
- Facilities Master Plan (Facilities Committee)
- Technology Plan (Technology Committee)

For more information and the most current set of plans, see ccsf.edu/plans.

If the College does not have a college wide participatory governance committee or taskforce related to the planning area, the Chancellor, in consultation with related constituencies, will create a committee or temporary taskforce with constituent representation and designate a chair (or chairs). The number of members can vary. Constituencies appoint representatives to the taskforce/committee through their respective processes.

If the College has a college wide participatory governance committee related to the planning area, the committee will lead the planning process. Depending on the scope and magnitude of the Plan, the Committee:

- may call on external planning support as needed; if planning support is from outside the college and requires entering into a contract, the Committee will serve as the RFP review and selection group
- should seek additional, supplemental constituent input as needed (includes individuals with relevant exot envs0.90 (he)3 ( )]TJ

D4. Development of College Wide Initiatives, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures

In general, **College policies and procedures** should be prepared by the administrator responsible for shepherding the policy review cycle (hereafter "policy review facilitator") to ensure compliance with Title 5 requirements.[11] Board policies should be global statements with details of implementation contained within administrative procedures. If the policy/procedures amends existing documents, then the policy review facilitator tracks the changes to show how the new version differs from the existing version.

College-wide initiatives[12] may be originated by students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators. Proposed initiatives may be in the form of an initial draft or may simply outline the focus and the components to be included in the item under consideration. The originator needs to seek and obtain the support of their constituency leadership via the following bodies before proceeding, consistent with the originator's constituency group and proposal focus:[13]

- Associated Students Executive Council
- Academic Senate Committees[14]
- Classified Senate
- Administrators Association and/or Cabinet
- Participatory Governance Standing Committees[15]

Most often, proposals are reviewed by the appropriate Standing Committee, regardless of source. Areas of concern, if any, are worked out in consultation between the Standing Committee, the forwarding body, and the originator. The Standing Committee then recommends the proposal for consideration by the PGC Agenda Review Group.

When the timeline is too short or there is not an appropriate Standing Committee, a proposal may be brought directly to the PGC Agenda Review Group.

D4a. Development of College Wide Initiatives, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures *Unrelated to* Either Academic & Professional (A&P/10+1) or Student Matters (General)

Phase 1 below begins after the steps outlined in Section D4.

Phase 1: The Participatory Governance Council (PGC) Agenda Review Group generally receives proposed initiatives, policies, and procedures from the policy review fac2.001 Tc 4pe /Hur8m

D4b. Development of College Wide Initiatives, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures with Some Content Related to Academic & Professional (A&P/10+1) ("rely primarily") and Student Matters

Phase 1 below begins after the originator has followed the steps outlined in Section D4.

Phase 1: The individual shepherding the item submits the draft item simultaneously to the Associated Students Executive Council and the administrator with oversight of student activities, copying their senior administrator. The portion of the item that relates to A&P and student matters will be highlighted.

The administrator with oversight of student activities will work with the Associated Students Executive Council to review the draft agenda item and provide written feedback on those items related to student matters. The administrator with oversight of student activities will then forward the written comments to the individual shepherding the item, who will share the written feedback with the Academic Senate.

The Academic Senate considers the feedback from the Associated Students Executive Council. In addition, Academic Senate Committees have seats for student representatives to participate in the development of A&P/10+1, as appropriate.[18]

- to ensure that appropriate background information and sufficient content is included (if sufficient content is not included, the initiative/policy/procedure will be returned to the developer with feedback so that they can provide a more comprehensive draft) and
- to determine that the originator has solicited and incorporated input as appropriate (recognizing the purview related to A&P/10+1 and student matters)[20]

Phase 4: [illegible]

Phase5: [illegible]

College Catalog via the Office of Instruction. If the item is an initiative, implementation begins.

If the Chancellor does not accept the Academic Senate recommendation in the A&P/10+1 portions of the procedures/initiative or recommend the A&P/10+1 portions of the policies to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor must submit a rationale in writing to the Academic Senate that describes the exceptional circumstances under which they are not relying primarily on the Academic Senate. In cases where the Chancellor does not accept the Academic Senate recommendation regarding a policy, the Academic Senate may then submit their recommendation directly to the Board (see AP 2.08 for guidance).

If the Board of Trustees does not agree with the Academic Senate recommendation in A&P/10+1 matters, the Board must explain their determination to the Academic Senate per Title 5.

D4c. Development of College Wide Initiatives, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures with Content Related to Academic & Professional (A&P/10+1) ("rely primarily") Matters (not requiring student input)

Phase 1 below begins after the originator has followed the steps outlined in Section D4.

Phase 1: The individual shepherding the item, in consultation with the Academic Senate and the responsible administrator for the policy/procedures in question, or the initiative originator (If applicable), highlights the portion of the item that relates to A&P/10+1 matters and then submits the draft item to the Academic Senate.

The Academic Senate then reviews or amends the portion of the initiative/policy/procedures related to A&P/10+1 matters in consultation with the appropriate senior administrator to ensure Title 5 compliance.[21]

The Academic Senate engages in collegial consultation with the Chancellor regarding the resulting draft (see AP 2.08 for guidance).

Phase 2: During this phase, the individual shepherding the item finalizes the draft policy/procedures and incorporates the recommendation received from collegial consultation.

This is considered a "constituency-informed draft."

21

D4d. Development of College Wide Initiatives, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures Related to Student Matters Only

Phase 1 below begins after the originator has followed the steps outlined in Section D4.

Phase 1: The individual shepherding the item submits the draft item to the administrator overseeing student activities to share with A91OiT oprn (1 (t y (t (r)3 (c)18 i)14 (d3)]TJ Di)4 w1c1)12u havn(S0 2 (r)14 (Tc 0 Tw 12.9 0 T11 ( )Tj /.005 Tc -0.001 Tw 0.23 0 3d [(1)-3 v

Phase 5: PGC conducts its first reading of the initiative/policy/procedures. If there are no comments or concerns raised during the first reading, the PGC makes a recommendation to the Chancellor. Otherwise, the individual shepherding the item, in consultation with the responsible administrator for the policy/procedures in question, or the initiative originator, incorporates feedback as appropriate into the draft prior to the second reading.

Phase 6: The PGC conducts its second reading of the initiative/policy/procedures. If no further review is required, the PGC makes a recommendation to Chancellor. If further review is required, a third reading takes place at the next PGC meeting and then the PGC makes a recommendation to the Chancellor. In the case of a third reading, the individual shepherding the item, in consultation with the responsible administrator for the policy/procedures in question, or the initiative originator, makes necessary changes in the draft based on any recommendations.

Phase 7: The Chancellor receives the recommendation from the PGC. The Chancellor **adopts initiatives and procedures** and **recommends policies** to the Board of Trustees.

- If the Chancellor is in agreement with the PGC recommendation, they will forward the recommendation to the Board as either informational or for Board approval.
- If the Chancellor disagrees with the PGC recommendation, they will inform the PGC as to the reasons why and forward the Chancellor's recommendation to the Board as either informational or for Board approval.
- If the Chancellor receives two recommendations from the PGC or a recommendation that they feel needs further discussion and clarification by the PGC, the Chancellor can return the item to the PGC for additional discussion and resolution.

The Board of Trustees **approves policies** and **receives initiatives and procedures as information items.**

The policy review coordinator posts policies and procedures on the Board of Trustees website, and, if applicable, in the College Catalog via the Office of Instruction. If the item is an initiative, implementation begins.

R1. Resource Allocation of College Wide Supplemental General Funds

Phase 1: Once Program Reviews/Annual Plans have been submitted, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness separates resource requests into the various categories. Categories of resource requests include, for example, the following:

- Staffing
- Information Technology/Equipment
- Facilities

See ccsf.edu/programreview for current category list.

When Program Reviews/Annual Plans are submitted, resource requests are reflected in ranked order.

Program Reviews/Annual Plans, including resource requests, are publicly available (see https://ccsf.curricunet.com/PublicSearch).

Phase 2: Senior administrators have the opportunity to rank the resource requests at the Division level. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness coordinates with senior administrators in providing requests, with unit supervisor and Division rankings where available, to the appropriate committees (see below) for review and prioritization. These committees review the resource requests and make college wide prioritization recommendations.

Committees that consider staffing include:

- Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) for full-time faculty positions
- Vacancy Review Group (VRG) for classified staff positions
- Chancellor's Cabinet for administrative positions

VRG, FPAC, and Cabinet make staffing recommendations directl(r)10 (1 (c) (t)-4 (e)]TJ-0 0 Td ( )Tj)Tj 0 (e)-1 [(V)-2 -2 (s)3n)-4 8ffive (fi)5 T

f

f

46-2 (R)4 (G)2 (,)1 (FP)-1

R2. Resource Allocation of College Wide Categorical Funds

1. Categorical allocations with State Plans (for Portions Based on Program Review Requests)

Phase 1: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness organizes Program Review/Annual Plan resource requests into a comprehensive list and provides the list to the internal resource allocation workgroup known as Fan5.[26] The Fan5 .
Lead Managers and Faculty Coordinators/Liaisons review the resource requests to identify those requests potentially eligible for funding by the respective college wide categorical funds. Mss8 (ho)2d [(Ms)3denstit4 (rc)4.pTj 0.002 Tc 4 (atTw [(c)4 (o)-2 (ll)10 (e)-0.9(d9)-6 (n5)-8 (6.87r5)]TJ4ol7)4 (h)]TJ0.002 Tc 0.002 1.97 0 .5 (a)0

The Lead Managers and Faculty Coordinators/Liaisons inform their respective committee/taskforce of the Fan5 discussions.

The committee/taskforce develops funding recommendations that take into account the Fan5 discussions, where relevant, and forwards the recommendations to the appropriate senior administrator.

Phase 3: Fan5 facilitates a joint presentation of all member committee/taskforce recommendations to the Academic Senate for endorsement.