

Meeting Called to Order at 3:37PM				
No	Item	Discussion/Outcome		
1.	Land Acknowledgment (Procedural)			

2. Roll Call (Procedural)

 $\label{thm:local_def} \mbox{Administrators: JII Yee, } \mbox{\it J} \mbox{\it bhn Halpin, and Wendy Miller}$ 

Classified Staff: Maria Salazar-Colon

Faculty: Fanny Law, Maria Del Rosario Villasana, and

Smon Hanson

Students: Angelica Campos, Orlando Galvez, Swei Tang

Classified Staff: Karl Gamarra, David Delgado, Linda Liu Faculty: Joseph Reyes

4.	Approval of Minutes April 7, 2022 (Procedural)	Motion to approve April 7, 2022 minutes. Moved and seconded by Wendy Miller and Smon Hanson. Motion passed.
5.	PGCMeeting August 4, 2022 (Discussion and Possible Action)	x Smon 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

		special event. The issue of exclusion by design should be discussed during the next meeting.  x 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 David Martin was not able to join the PGC meeting.
8.	Awards and Recognition (Information)	No information.

9. Old Business

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.

- x 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.
- x 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.
- x Wendy Miller stated that we need to be respectful of the employees who will not be able

for submitting vaccination status so that it is not Minutes by AD

10. N	a.) Recommend that the District	
	,	
	Delete Board Policy 6.11. (Action Item)	Frederick Teti provided a report on behalf of Tom Boegel:  x 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.  Motion to endorse the recommendation to delete the policy as recommended by the district. Moved and seconded by Wendy Miller and Smon Hanson. Motion passed.
	b.) Recommending Adoption of a Board Policy and Administrative Procedure on Multiple and Overlapping Enrollments APBP (Action Item)	<ul> <li>x 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.</li> <li>x Heather Brandt stated that the document was brought to the Associated Students Executive</li> </ul>

- x Swei Tang reiterated that Associated Students Counsel has not taken action on the document.
- x 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.
- c.) AP1.00 District Vision and Mission (first read) AP1.00 recommended revision (tracked changes version)

There is a suggested edit to BP1.00 to make it congruent with the recommended revision to AP1.00 see BP 1.00 extraneous last sentence

Pam Mery presented the first read of AP 1.00:

- x The document pertains to the District Vision and Mission statements and covers the procedure for the process of reviewing the statements.
- x Previously the document included some dated language and was not directly aligned with accreditation standard 1.a.(4).
- x 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.
- x 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.

**Ouestions and Comments:** 

x Smon 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

saying that the document was indeed shared with all constituency groups and Academic and Classified Senates chose to endorse it. x Wendy Miller supported taking this action. x 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 Vision. x Kristin Charles added that the recommendation from PGC will go to the Chancellor and then the Board of Trustees. 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. d.) Linking Board Policies and x Smon Hanson stated that this item has been Procedures on the Published recommended by the Academic Senate and that Website (Discussion/Possible the issue is that Board Policies and Procedures Action) 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. x 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. x Heather Brandt agreed that the website in its current state is not accessible, however,

		<ul> <li>x 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.</li> <li>x 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).</li> <li>x Input on the standards subsections is not mandatory, but welcome.</li> <li>x In the Fall 2022 the entire self-evaluation will be shared college-wide for broader input.</li> </ul>
12	Future Agenda Item	Continue the discussion about the possibility of meeting in the summer prior to August 4 <sup>th</sup> ; discussion of public comment protocols and procedures.
13	Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 5:12 PM