

## **How was the visit?**

An informal composite summary culled from informal faculty notes about the accreditation visit on April 4-5.  
compiled ksaginor

*Our accreditation visiting team came April 4-5<sup>th</sup>. We can't provide a true overview, because they came to ask questions of us, not to provide information to us. Unlike the comprehensive visit last year, there was no oral exit report from the visitors. We will not see the report written by the visiting team or get any official feedback until we receive the Commission's ruling in early July. However, the meetings were in discussion format, and the visitors expressed perspectives and responses.*

### **We heard the following positives from the visiting team members:**

- CCSF employees are dedicated to the college and to the students.
- Our college is strongly connected to our community
- A huge amount of work has been done
- Major changes have occurred in a number of places
- Praise for our SLO effort underway going so far as to suggesting that we'd be a model other colleges would want to learn from.
- In regards to SLO's "You have created a miracle!"
- Recognition of our efforts to be honest about what we were doing well and where we were behind or still need a lot of work

### **We heard the following questions and concerns from the visiting team members.**

- Sustainability -- will be able to continue all our efforts -- meet deadlines -- continue momentum?
- Are we really committed to continuing SLO work or have we only done it under duress?
- Resources -- are sufficient resources available to continue SLO efforts, to fund our technology plan, etc.
- We will be receiving funds from Prop A for 8 years. What happens in year 9?
- How will things move forward with all the position and leadership changes coming?
- Participatory governance -- what ARE the roles of different committees and leaders and how is this new system participatory?

## Questions and Answers

- In discussions about resources, some of the visitors, asked how the district will live within the budget allocated by that state, appearing to discount our additional revenues such as the parcel tax. Seeking clarification in a budget related meeting, we asked whether ACCJC expected colleges to live within the state funding, as opposed to living within their overall income. The visitor's response was, "No." ACCJC expects us to live within our total income, including property taxes, the parcel tax, etc.
- "Is restructuring of the sort that has been imposed at CCSF a requirement of the ACCJC???" Visiting team member's response was no, it is not required. However, we must meet the standards in all areas. How the standards are met is up to each institution.
- Dr. John Nixon, former President of Mt. Sac and current Associate Vice President of the Commission, asked, "It is the policy of City College to rely primarily on the Academic Senate for processes for institutional planning and budget development. How does the Participatory Governance Council facilitate that?" Most found the discussion the followed the question indicative of visitor's concern that the ACCJC standards regarding participation of faculty and of other employees (in standard IV-A) needs to be seriously followed. However at least one person present read it as proving for clarity of role – with no concern that governance may be too top-down.

### **These notes drew on sessions with the following groups or topics:**

Academic Senate Executive Council  
Accreditation Steering Committee  
Career Tech/General ED  
Curriculum Committee  
Department Chair Council  
Ed Tech Committee  
Information Technology Advisory Committee  
Media Services  
Planning Committee  
Participatory Governance Council  
Program Review workgroup  
SLO  
Technology Planning group  
Workgroup #7