



**Participatory Governance Council
April 21, 2022**

MINUTES

Meeting Called to Order at 3:37PM		
No	Item	Discussion/Outcome
1.	Land Acknowledgment (Procedural)	
2.	Roll Call (Procedural)	<p>Council Members present: Administrators: Jill Yee, John Halpin, and Wendy Miller Classified Staff: Maria Salazar-Colon Faculty: Fanny Law, Maria Del Rosario Villasana, and Simon Hanson Students: Angelica Campos, Orlando Galvez, Siwei Tang</p> <p>Council Alternates present: Classified Staff: Karl Gamarra, David Delgado, Linda Liu Faculty: Joseph Reyes, Mitra Sapienza Students: Heather Brandt</p>
3.	Approval of Agenda April 21, 2022 (Procedural)	Motion to approve April 21, 2022 agenda. Moved and seconded by Maria Del Rosario Villasana and Angelica Campos. Motion passed.
4.	Approval of Minutes April 7, 2022 (Procedural)	Motion to approve April 7, 2022 minutes. Moved and seconded by Wendy Miller and Simon Hanson. Motion passed.
5.	PGC Meeting – August 4, 2022 (Discussion and Possible Action)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simon Hanson stated that this item was put on the agenda due to the fact that the first PGC meeting after the summer break is scheduled for

Minutes by AD

		<p>August 4th, however, a new budget cycle starts at the end of June, and therefore PGC members must decide if they would like to meet earlier than the scheduled date to provide their input on the budget cycle before it is adopted. He added that the last two years the budget has been presented in the summer, which meant that there was no participatory input from the PGC. This situation is either an example of an exclusion by design, or if it's not, then accommodation should be made and discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wendy Miller stated that the PGC Budget Committee will be meeting on the following Tuesday, after which they might be able to provide further information.• Orlando Galvez stated that he would be able to attend the summer meeting if necessary.• Maria Salazar-Colon stated that it is important to get feedback from the student representatives before scheduling a new meeting date. She proposed to table the item until May.• Angelica Campos stated that she intends to be a part of the PGC until the new student leadership is able to take over her role in August and added that she will be able to participate in a PGC meeting during the summer break. She agreed with Salazar-Colon regarding moving the discussion item to May's agenda.• Heather Brandt asked for clarification on when the term for being a student representative on the PGC supposed to end.• Motion to table the item until the next meeting and to request more information regarding scheduling from the Administration.• Maria Del Rosario Villasana asked if there was a precedent for scheduling summer PGC meetings and stated that she will not be in support of summer meetings unless there is a crisis or a
--	--	--

		<p>special event. The issue of exclusion by design should be discussed during the next meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In response to Maria Del Rosario Villasana, John Halpin stated that no summer PGC meetings were held last year, however, there were some June meetings the year prior.
6.	Public Comments on Items not on the Agenda (Procedural)	No public comments.
7.	Chancellor's Report	Chancellor David Martin was not able to join the PGC meeting.
8.	Awards and Recognition (Information)	No information.
9.	Old Business	
	<p>a) Continue the Discussion of Public Comment Protocols and Procedures (Discussion/Possible Action)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue the Discussion of Roles and Responsibilities of PGC Members (Discussion) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wendy Miller stated that this item was discussed during the pre-agenda meeting, however, it was not decided at that time if there was a specific issue that PGC should focus on. Simon Hanson stated that PGC still doesn't have a policy on how to handle public comments. He agreed that professional development is needed so that facilitation is consistent, and added that the discussion was prompted by the inhibition of having to use Zoom and not being able to take public comments. He added that some questions were raised about equal composition of representation of various constituency groups in sub-committees vs the PGC. Future format must take into an account issue of representation for members of the public and expectations of behaviors from participants. He added that it is

		<p>difficult to come up with an action plan since it is still not clear what format PGC meetings will take in the Fall 2022. Possible recommendation from the PGC would be to ask the Board to take the lead on deciding what format should be used for the future meetings. Councilmember Hanson was concerned that the Board has not fully appreciated the feedback from some of the classified staff members about technical limitations of hybrid or online meetings. He stated that if PGC were to continue with the current format, the issues of participation from the members of the public will continue and suggested to table the discussion for the future meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Carl Gamarra stated that it is important for everyone to be included and asked if the Board should take the lead on deciding what the format for the future meetings should be. He added that one of the classified employees who were able to help with technological aspects of hosting remote meetings has been laid off, and that some of the impacts of employees being laid off have not been understood by the leadership who made these decisions. Currently there are not enough people to do the work.• Maria Salazar-Colón stated that due to the limited number of classified employees it is impossible to host meetings online and in-person at the same time and added that some of the equipment has been stolen from the Conlan Hall, which adds to the problem. She also mentioned that the decisions of PGC could have an impact on other employee groups, which should always be considered. Another problem has to do with receiving mixed messages about going back to meeting in-person. PGC should anticipate having meetings in-person starting in the fall, however.• Wendy Miller stated that we need to be respectful of the employees who will not be able
--	--	---

		<p>to come back in person and who will still need an option of participating remotely due to medical or religious exemptions.</p>
	<p>b) R2C Update (Report)</p>	<p>Alexis Litzky thanked the Councilmembers for having conversations about the return to campus and provided them with the following updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 of the Reopening Plan involved the reopening of the doors to the campus, which encountered some slight issues. Moving forward with the reopening plans includes getting signage up, which would indicate open hours and safety procedures which have been utilized inside. Better communication is still a top priority, and this includes providing important updates on the website. • Phase 2 should begin this summer, but it is contingent on health and safety orders. Starting next week, the work on developing a schedule of communication will begin with the hope that the frequency and clarity of communication will increase. • One of the issues that R2C group is working on is deciding on its purpose going forward, and whether it should be considered a committee, a taskforce, or a workgroup. Primary goal of R2C is to provide health and safety support during the transition to face-to-face instruction, but what kind of recommendations R2C can make in the future is still being discussed. • R2C is currently working on administrative procedure 2.23: Communicable Diseases. The Enrollment Management Committee recently had a conversation regarding vaccines, exemptions, and possible barriers for the registration process and enrollment, and discussed a possibility of adjusting the timeline

		<p>for submitting vaccination status so that it is not a barrier to enrollment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alexis Litzky asked the PGC members for their feedback on the future role of the R2C, and whether it should become one of the sub-committees attached to one of the existing participatory governance committees, such as Health and Safety, or become a floater PGC Committee, which reports back directly to the PGC. <p><i>Questions and Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simon Hanson stated that at least in the Academic Senate there is a recognized difference between a standing committee and a group that is formed for a specific purpose, and once a task group or a work group finishes its task, the purpose of having such a group disappears. Councilmember Hanson wanted to know if R2C sees its charge as permanent, and if the health crisis that it is tasked with overseeing is ongoing. He added that R2C group went through different incarnations throughout the past two years, but it is still unclear what the group’s task or the appointment processes are currently. Alexis Litzky responded by saying that she will relay the question back to the R2C, and that currently she does not see R2C as a committee per se, since the group is tasked only with reviewing the going back to campus procedures. The reason behind the question of purpose has to do with the definition of crisis, and whether the crisis is indeed ongoing.• Siwei Tang stated that students should have access to the R2C workgroup and mentioned that there was no student representation until this semester, and that it would help students to have access to the R2C meeting’s recordings and minutes. Alexis Litzky responded that there were 3 to 4 students who attended R2C meetings previously, and that it is important to note that
--	--	---

		<p>the R2C group, since it lives outside of the shared governance, does not have any recommending power beyond the immediate operational needs of the people in the meeting (i.e. distributing masks, updating signage). It is more of a conversation space where dialogue about returning to campus occurs.</p>
10.	New Business	
	<p>a.) Recommend that the District Delete Board Policy 6.11. (Action Item)</p>	<p>Frederick Teti provided a report on behalf of Tom Boegel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board Policy 6.11 asserts that the Chancellor would develop a code of conduct for students on campus, however, the code of conduct is already covered in Chapter 5 of the Policy Manual of Student Affairs Division. Since the item is already addressed, it is recommended that the Board delete Policy 6.11. <p>Motion to endorse the recommendation to delete the policy as recommended by the district. Moved and seconded by Wendy Miller and Simon Hanson. Motion passed.</p>
	<p>b.) Recommending Adoption of a Board Policy and Administrative Procedure on Multiple and Overlapping Enrollments AP BP (Action Item)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frederick Teti stated that having a policy on multiple and overlapping enrollments is strongly recommended by the Community College League. Such policy did not exist before, however catalogue language was developed with the leaderships of Dean Monica Liu in Admissions and Records to manage policies and procedures on dual enrollment in two or more credit courses where the meeting times overlap. The document was also shared with the Associated Students Council. Heather Brandt stated that the document was brought to the Associated Students Executive Council meeting, however the council didn't have an opportunity to weigh in on the document yet.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siwei Tang reiterated that Associated Students Counsel has not taken action on the document. • John Halpin added that this is the first read for this document and that it will be brought back to the next meeting after the constituency groups had a chance to look through it and provide their feedback.
	<p>c.) AP 1.00 - District Vision and Mission (first read) AP 1.00 recommended revision (tracked changes version)</p> <p>There is a suggested edit to BP 1.00 to make it congruent with the recommended revision to AP 1.00 – see BP 1.00 extraneous last sentence</p>	<p>Pam Mery presented the first read of AP 1.00:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document pertains to the District Vision and Mission statements and covers the procedure for the process of reviewing the statements. • Previously the document included some dated language and was not directly aligned with accreditation standard 1.a.(4). • The second page of the document provides the updated language on the procedure. Any updates to the Vision and Mission Statements require broad input and subject to Board approval since they are directly related to planning. The second paragraph states that the process for review relies on college-wide discussions since they involve fundamental statements for the college. The document also states that any adopted updates should be available on the website and in appropriate publications. and that the Chancellor will delegate the responsibility to carry out the process to the senior administrator. • In regard to BP 1.00, it is suggested that the last sentence should be removed to make it congruent with the recommended revision to AP 1.00. The Vision and Mission statements are being reviewed periodically rather than annually. Moreover, the last sentence is beyond the scope of the Vision and Mission statements. <p><i>Questions and Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simon Hanson asked if the document went to all constituency groups, and if all PGC members had the time to review it. Pam Mery responded by

		<p>saying that the document was indeed shared with all constituency groups and Academic and Classified Senates chose to endorse it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wendy Miller supported taking this action. • Maria Del Rosario Villasana asked what happens to the Board policy when the Mission gets updated and whether it has to be brought back every time for review. Pam Mery responded that AP 1.00 is in fact the procedure for reviewing the statements themselves, and that it is not changing either the district’s Mission or the Vision. • Kristin Charles added that the recommendation from PGC will go to the Chancellor and then the Board of Trustees. <p>The motion to approve the revision of AP 1.00 and delete the last sentence of BP 1.00 is moved and seconded by Wendy Miller and Angelica Campos. Motion passed.</p>
	<p>d.) Linking Board Policies and Procedures on the Published Website (Discussion/Possible Action)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simon Hanson stated that this item has been recommended by the Academic Senate and that the issue is that Board Policies and Procedures exist on the website in an uncomplete state. As CCSF is preparing for the accreditation visit, it is important to take action on this item. The Academic Senate passed a recommendation urging the district to migrate the Board Policies and Administrative Procedures to the public website with live links and use it as a functioning repository of policies and procedures. • Angelica Campos agreed with Councilmember Hanson that it is currently difficult to navigate the website or see which policies have been updated. She added that the College cannot wait for another platform to solve this problem. • Heather Brandt agreed that the website in its current state is not accessible, however,

		<p>transparency and accessibility are important. She added that students will support this action. The motion for PGC to endorse the recommendation brought forth by the Academic Senate is moved by Heather Brandt and seconded by Angelica Campos. Motion passed.</p>
	e.) Does the college need a Document Retention and Disposal Policy? (Discussion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wendy Miller stated that this item concerns AP and BP 8.16 under the business processes, which can be located in the archive website. It's a very comprehensive policy, which divides all college records into 3 classifications. The bulk of the documents belong to the third classification, which means that they can be disposed of after a certain period of time, dictated by what type of document it is. Although the policy provides very comprehensive instructions on labeling, disposal, storage, etc., these instructions are not being consistently followed. John Halpin encouraged the Councilmembers to read and follow the disposal policy and procedure.
11	Standing Committee Reports	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation Steering Committee Standards Subsections (Standard IVA.1 - IVA.3, IVA.5 – IVA.7) 	<p>Kristin Charles wanted to provide an opportunity for the PGC members to review the standards for the participatory governance committees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After accreditation was reaffirmed in 2017, one of the tasks was to map the standards for the participatory governance committees, as well as various entities, and to identify those entities that are responsible for particular standards. Accreditation Steering Committee came up with both primary entities, which are responsible for the standards, as well as secondary entities. PGC itself is related to the standard 4A, which is connected to the decision-making roles and processes, which is within a larger umbrella of standard 4 of leadership and governance.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the institutional self-evaluation report for accreditation, Accreditation Steering Committee created teams which have been focusing on collecting and analyzing different standards. • Team 44A includes members of PGC. The Committee is at the point where they have drafts of the standards. Both the standards and the feedback are now circulating through relevant committees. The standards which relate to the PGC are 4A1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 (one document per subsection). • Input on the standards subsections is not mandatory, but welcome. • In the Fall 2022 the entire self-evaluation will be shared college-wide for broader input.
12	Future Agenda Item	Continue the discussion about the possibility of meeting in the summer prior to August 4 th ; discussion of public comment protocols and procedures.
13	Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 5:12 PM

**PGC Meeting
Summary of Actions Taken on April 21, 2022**

Committee Updates:

Agenda Item	Action Taken
R2C Update	Information item only
Recommendation to delete Board Policy 6.11.	PGC recommended to delete the Board Policy 6.11.
Recommendation to adopt a Board Policy and Administrative Procedure on Multiple and Overlapping Enrollments AP BP	First read of the document, no action taken.
AP 1.00 - District Vision and Mission revision, edit to BP 1.00 to make it congruent with the recommended revision to AP 1.00.	PGC approved the revision of AP 1.00 and recommended the deletion of the last sentence of BP 1.00. Motion to approve AP 1.00 by Wendy Miller, seconded by Angelica Campos. This recommendation will go to the Chancellor and then BOT.
Linking Board Policies and Procedures on the published website	PGC endorsed the recommendation made by the Academic Senate, seconded by Angelica Campos. This item will be sent to the Chancellor for recommendation.
Document Retention and Disposal Policy (BP and AP 8.16)	Information item only
Accreditation Steering Committee Standards Subsections	PGC members will be providing feedback on an individual basis.

Unfinished Business:

Agenda Item	Action Taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To continue discussion on public comments • To continue discussion about the PGC August 4 meeting 	

Minutes by AD