

Report on the Resolution from the Academic Senate Special Meeting of March 25th, 2010.

Prepared for College Council on April 22nd, 2010

by Karen Saginor, facilitator of the Academic Senate Special Meeting.

Good Afternoon Chancellor Griffin and members of the College Council.

Before we look together at the wording of the resolution, I'm going to explain briefly how it came to pass.

On February 25th a draft Board of Trustees' resolution was presented to the public with an announcement that it would be considered on March 25th. The wording of the draft indicated that shared governance was expected to review it within one month. That document is on the web at http://math.ccsf.edu/pdf/CCSF_Board_Draft_Resolution_Feb_2010.pdf

Many, indeed most, resolutions coming from the Academic Senate receive their votes at Executive Council meetings, and many people use the term "Academic Senate" when talking about the elected representatives of the Executive Council. However, as you know well, the Academic Senate is the body composed of ALL faculty, full time, part time, non credit, credit -- all faculty.

As stated in the Academic Senate's Constitution:

"Special meetings of the Senate or Council may be called in the following ways:

(a) by the President;

(b) on petition of a majority of the Council;

(c) on petition of 100 members of the Senate." [Article VII of the Constitution of the Academic Senate, on the web at

http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/constitution.pdf]

You may notice that method 'c' does not specify who should count the number of members petitioning.

Such a petition calling for a meeting specifically to address the draft Board of Trustees' resolution started circulating on Monday or Tuesday, March 8th or 9th. That petition named me as the facilitator of the meeting and named Fred Teti to serve as parliamentarian. By Monday, March 15th, I had been given petitions with well over 100 signatures. (I did not have all the petitions. I believe the total number of signatures surpassed 200.) I was asked not to show the names to President Hal Huntsman. I counted them myself, and I asked a few others to count them.

On March 15th, Fred Teti and I went to the Academic Senate office in the early afternoon and spoke with Hal. He expressed a desire to see the signatures, and said that he had no doubt that there were more than 100. He suggested Attila Gabor, Shared Governance Coordinator and Classified Senate President, as a relevant but uninvolved third party whose counting would be acceptable to him. Fred and I accompanied Attila to his office.

When Attila had counted the signatures, Fred and I returned to the Academic Senate office. Hal was no longer there, but we noticed the paper announcement for the Academic Senate Special Meeting on the bulletin board. That same afternoon, I emailed the electronic document to Hal, the other officers and Antonio Trink (Academic Senate Office Secretary). The next day, I got a message from Hal saying that he had changed his mind about posting the announcement on the bulletin board and the Senate web page.

The announcement of the meeting was publicized on the College home page and in City Currents. It was also emailed to all Academic Senate members.

The Academic Senate Special Meeting was held on Tuesday, March 23rd, at which point we knew that the draft resolution was not on the Board's agenda. However, the issues it addressed are of great importance to all of us. There is every reason to believe that the Board still seeks urgent action concerning the Achievement Gap and Student Equity.

Faced with the assignment of enabling faculty to make decisions in one afternoon on long and complex documents, (the Board's draft resolution was 13 pages long), I made three procedural decisions. I asked all interested parties to submit resolutions in advance. I invited a slate of speakers to introduce the topics. In accordance with Roberts Rules, I announced at the meeting that we would be giving members priority to speak over non-members.

I received no complaints about the submission of resolutions in advance or the order in which we considered them.

The introductory speakers included one student (Ryan Vanderpol, the Associated Student President of the Ocean campus), one administrator (the Chancellor), and one classified staff member (the President of the Classified Senate) and several faculty members. I did not invite any members of the Board to speak.

At every opportunity for persons to speak from the floor, there were many members wishing to address the meeting, with the unfortunate consequence that opportunities for guests to speak did not arise. Trustee Joshua Nielsen came to the microphone several times during the meeting, and on one of those occasions a motion was made to overrule the priority for members to speak before guests. That motion did not pass. At the end of the meeting, I invited guests to address the Senate. Student Trustee Nielsen and two other students spoke. I had ten requests to speak from Senate members left in my hands.

Three resolutions were brought to the floor. The first one, which you have been sent, was brought by Francine Podenski and it passed by a vote of 69 to 25 with one abstention. The second proposed resolution, which had previously passed at an Executive Council meeting, was brought to the Special Meeting by Academic Senate President Hal Huntsman. It failed by a vote of 17 to 83 with one abstention. The third proposed resolution was withdrawn before a vote.

I delivered the successful resolution and reported the results of the meeting to the Board of Trustees on March 25th. Last week, an audio recording of the meeting became available and copies have been placed on Reserve at the Rosenberg Library.

Monica Bosson, who took minutes at the Special Meeting, sent draft minutes to all Academic Senate members on April 16th. Corrections were received and the revised draft sent out yesterday. The revised draft minutes have been forwarded to the Executive Council for approval, following the practice for approval of minutes from Plenary meetings.

Having reviewed the context, let's look together at the Academic Senate's resolution, on the web at http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/College_Council/PDFs/ApprovedReso.pdf. You were sent a copy of it, and I'm sure you've read it. I believe it speaks for itself, but I will bring a few points to your attention.

- Notice that the first two whereas clauses “recognize the continued existence of an achievement gap” and recognize that “faculty, administration, and classified staff ... have worked diligently .. and continue” to work for the success of all our students.
- The next three whereas clauses establish that the faculty have, for good reason, primary responsibility in academic and professional matters.
- Starting on line 27 of page1, it is pointed out that Board’s draft resolution “addresses academic and professional matters and/or matters appropriately considered in established shared governance committees.”
- Because the Board’s draft resolution relied heavily on an earlier document, the “Preliminary Achievement Gap and Social Equity Report,” the Academic Senate’s resolution observes that this earlier document “was submitted to the Board of Trustees in October 2009 without [the] shared governance review ... required by the *April 2009 Student Achievement Gap Resolution*. (page1, lines 33-37)

Now let’s turn to the remedies, starting on page 2:

- “The Academic Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees permanently remove all references” to academic and professional matters, and it lists them, a-q. Please notice that the Senate is not opposed to improvements in these issues. On the contrary, cast your eyes down page 2 to lines 38-42, where you will find the Academic Senate places “the highest priority for shared governance review” of these items “with timely reports and recommendations presented to the Academic Senate Executive Council.” The Senate is taking responsibility for this work.
- In the paragraph that I just skipped, (page 2, lines 24-36) “the Academic Senate recommends that the Board work with the Chancellor to develop the administrative portions of the Draft Board Resolution... ,” and it names them.
- At the bottom of page 2 (lines 45-48), please notice another item that the Academic Senate undertakes to accomplish, and that is “timely and collegial shared governance review of the *“Preliminary Achievement Gap and Social Equity Report.”*”
- Lastly, on page 3, the Academic Senate supports and encourages other work towards the elimination of achievement gaps.

Now, I’d love to go on to talk about some of that work and share my observations about these issues, but I was asked to address this body on the Academic Senate Special Meeting and the resolution that was passed there, so I’ll stop here. The Chancellor will update you on some of these activities. This concludes my report.