Standard III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Accredited colleges in multi-college systems may be organized such that responsibility for resources, allocation of resources and planning rests with the system. In such cases, the system is responsible for meeting standards on behalf of the accredited colleges.

III.A. Human Resources

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

III.A.1.a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

III.A.1./III.A.1.a. Descriptive Summary. In July 2012, ACCJC recommended that “the college assess the adequacy of its current number of qualified classified staff and administrators and their appropriate preparation and experience necessary to support the institution’s mission and purpose.” In light of this Recommendation, a workgroup formed to review hiring and reassignment procedures; the response below includes the results of this review.

Replacement/New Positions Procedures. The Human Resources Department (HR) oversees the hiring processes for all District personnel to ensure that the District equitably and fairly administers established and published hiring procedures in accordance with the requirements of Title 5 California Code of Regulations, the California Education Code concerning equal employment opportunity, and the State Minimum Qualifications as outlined in the Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges.

For faculty, the hiring departments establish the hiring criteria, including job announcements, paper screening criteria, and interview questions in consultation with the Department Chair
or other unit manager, which the Dean, Vice Chancellor, and/or the Chancellor then review. Key personnel in HR and the Affirmative Action Office also review and approve these criteria, announcements, and interview questions to ensure the hiring of knowledgeable and qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness.

Pursuant to California Education Code §88137, the City and County of San Francisco’s merit system, overseen by the Civil Service Commission, governs the District’s employment of classified employees. All permanent and provisional positions, with the exception of positions exempted from the merit system process, have been classified by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR) according to their duties, responsibilities and authority. In order to add a new or additional classified position to a College department, the department must complete a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) or Express Classification form (EXP). The JAQ or EXP serves as the survey instrument designed to elicit complete and thorough information for a specific position, such as major functions, essential duties and responsibilities, and, if applicable, the level of authority.

The Human Resources Department drafts the criteria and job announcements for administrative positions in consultation with the Chancellor and the Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) Officer, with input from other senior administrators where appropriate. As a courtesy, the Academic Senate also reviews administrative job announcements.

Job announcements for each employee category list the required employment qualifications, the minimum qualifications, and the desirable qualifications established by the hiring department. Additionally, job announcements relate directly to the institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.

The formation of hiring search committees is an established participatory process outlined in District hiring procedures. Search Committee members for administrative hiring committees comprise representatives from the faculty, classified staff, administrative ranks, and students (if applicable). The Academic Senate selects faculty to serve on administrative hiring committees. For faculty hiring, search committee members are appointed by the department chair based on a democratic process that takes place at the department level. SEIU Local 2121 selects the classified staff search committee members. The Chancellor selects administrators to serve on search committees with input from the Administrators Association. The Executive Board of the Associated Students selects students representatives on hiring committees. The composition of Search Committees for all employee categories is consistent with federal and state guidelines on race and sex. Furthermore, in accordance with faculty hiring procedures, the background of search committee members should reflect the diversity, range of interests, philosophies, and programs in the department. The HR Academic Hiring unit and Dean, along with the Affirmative Action Office, ensure that search committee members are oriented on the hiring procedures, fair employment practices and procedures, equal opportunity and non-discrimination, and relevant sections of the collective bargaining agreement (Article 12).

To recruit large and diverse numbers of applicants, HR places job announcements in various local, state, and national mediums, including newspapers, publications, trade journals, employment websites, and internet job boards. HR contracts with Jobelephant, a recruitment advertising agency recognized globally as an authorized agent for employment advertising.

Prospective candidates for administrative and faculty positions must provide evidence of their qualifications and experience in their application materials and show their potential for contributing to the institution’s mission. Application materials include copies of transcripts verifying the degree required by the state-mandated minimum qualification, a letter of interest, a diversity statement, letters of recommendation, and, in some instances, a portfolio of work and additional department-specific questionnaires.

Hiring processes are rigorous and nearly all departments hiring faculty require a teaching demonstration and a portfolio of work as part of the interview process. Search committees paper screen the applicants and interview candidates based on stated criteria agreed upon by all committee members and certified by the HR department.

The Human Resources hiring units are responsible for ensuring that applicants meet the state-mandated minimum qualifications (academic positions) and the minimum qualifications (classified staff), including verification of degrees from accredited institutions and relevant work experience. Procedures are in place for determining equivalency through the Academic Senate Equivalency Committee and for evaluating foreign degrees where applicable.

These processes yield faculty and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The College employs over 800 full-time faculty and slightly more than 1,000 part-time faculty. Ninety-five percent of faculty and administrators hold master’s degrees and approximately 250 hold doctorates. They bring to the students extensive backgrounds gained through years of study, research, and extensive experience in business, industry, education, the arts, and government service.

In accordance with Education Code §87405, in September 2008, the Board of Trustees adopted Resolution No. 080926-S4 implementing a procedure whereby the District would consider job applicants with previous controlled substance convictions if the applicant successfully demonstrates five years of rehabilitation. This process includes the formation of a Committee on Rehabilitation composed of a classified employee, a faculty member, the District’s Chief of Police, HR staff, and a representative of the U.S. District Court Probation Office, the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department, or related associations. HR update the application forms, employee handbooks, and relevant materials to disclose the requirements and exceptions to Ed. Code § 87405, and, to ensure effective implementation of Resolution No. 080926-S4, the Dean of HR is required to provide a status report at each August and February Board meeting.

The institution serves a great diversity of students in a wide variety of programs, including credit, noncredit, contract education and continuing education. This variety requires placing greater emphasis on understanding and sensitivity of current issues pertaining to equity and diversity. For this reason, the District’s philosophy on hiring requires the College to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational
needs of students of diverse backgrounds. In addition to a required diversity statement as part of the application materials, job applications also include a question regarding diversity, and all interviews must include a question related to diversity.

District procedures call for an Equal Employment Opportunity monitor to attend every interview to ensure compliance with federal and state labor laws, rules, and regulations. Due to the lack of availability of trained monitors and funding to pay them, committees at times conduct interviews without monitors. All administrative hiring, however, includes a monitor.

**Reassignments.** Administrative reassignments—interim, acting, additional duties, and lateral transfers—have not always followed the District’s hiring policies and procedures. The Chancellor does have authority under Title 5 § 53021 to upgrade, reclassify, rename, or laterally transfer an administrator/administrative appointment. In recent years, significant numbers of retiring administrators during concentrated periods have largely driven the need for reassignments along with the lack of an overall staffing plan for filling positions.

**Changes Addressing ACCJC Findings.** On September 27, 2012, the Board of Trustees took action to direct the Interim Chancellor to propose a new instructional administrative structure, congruent with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings, that has academic integrity and increases administrative oversight and accountability with the ultimate goal of being more effective and efficient. The proposal approved by the board on October 25 was presented prior to institution wide dialog or evaluation of data and activities for department chair reassignment time. A meeting was scheduled on December 7 by the administration to present the proposal to Department Chairs. Handouts were not available during the meeting and no details were presented about how the re-organization would be operationalized to ensure that students would not be negatively impacted. Many questions regarding how the proposal would be operationalized to ensure that students are not negatively impacted were posed. None were answered. Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman explained that the proposed organization represents statewide best practices, that details would be worked out later and committed to providing a list of California Community Colleges to the Academic Senate that are organized in the same fashion as the proposal suggests. In late January, the Administration had identified several California Community Colleges to serve as models and made arrangements for an in-person panel visit from one college and a video conference with personnel from a second college.

As a result of the October 24th Board of Trustees decision, the College has reduced the number of Vice Chancellors from five to three and has eliminated the Office of Governmental Affairs and the Office of Shared Governance. These changes also included moving the Research and Planning Office, Grants Office, and Development Office under the Chancellor’s direct supervision. Consequently, the Board of Trustees, at their October 25, 2012 Board Meeting, adopted the reorganized Office of the Chancellor and a proposed plan to reorganize the Academic Affairs administrative structure, including reducing the amount of non-instructional reassigned time for department chairs. The Board also approved a structural change within the Office of Student Services in December 2012 (see also the response to Standard II.B.). Twenty nine administrators have been given notice that they are terminated as of June 30 and job announcements are being prepared for newDean positions. These actions have been taken without a board discussion or vote and without institution-wide dialog and data assessment regarding impact on students enrolled in the effected programs.

---
During this time of transition, the individuals serving as Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor of Student Development are serving in an interim capacity. The College posted these Vice Chancellor on December 18, 2012, and they closed on February 7, 2013.

The College posted job announcements for XX School Dean and XX Center Dean positions on XX. In addition, the College posted job announcements for XX other administrative positions within Academic Affairs and Students Services in XX. Hiring committees will work throughout Spring 2013 to finalize the hiring of new administrators effective July 1, 2013.

In March 2011, the District and AFT 2121 agreed to revise a process for temporary faculty employee and substitute hiring. Included in this review was the implementation of an expedited upgrading procedure (above 67% of a load for part-time faculty) for short-term temporary or long-term temporary vacancies that would address unforeseen circumstances where the day-to-day substitute or the long-term-substitute hiring processes would not satisfy/fulfill the emergency situation, such as long-term illness or death. In theory this process should meet fair hiring processes that comply with Title 5 and the Education Code; however, in practice no safeguards are currently in place to ensure that a fair, equitable hiring process is followed at the departmental level. In fact, the HR department has no active role in this process.

The Chancellor and senior administration have also been meeting to address a much-needed classified staff reorganization that addresses the recommendations raised by the ACCJC and FCMAT; the College has already several individuals into high-need areas. Addressing classified staff reorganization is all the more critical now that the College laid off more than 30 classified staff members, some of whom had bumping rights into other College positions, and the administrative reorganizations will likely dictate additional changes.

III.A.1./III.A.1.a. Self Evaluation. City College of San Francisco employs faculty, classified staff, and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The overall search and hiring processes overseen by HR and the work of search committees ensure the hiring of knowledgeable and qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. However, job descriptions for administrative positions must emphasize clearly defined job roles, responsibilities, expectations, and authority.

Overall, the permanent hiring processes are rigorous, equitable and fairly administered in accordance with the requirements of Title 5 California Code of Regulations and the California Education Code. The practice of conducting some hiring processes without trained EEO monitors is a cause of concern that should be addressed. The established procedure for administrative hiring was overly cumbersome and lengthy. On November 15, 2013, the Board approved Policy Manual 3.04 that authorizes the Chancellor to make changes to this administrative hiring process. Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman has reviewed this procedure and has identified changes to better streamline the process.

The College needs to adopt a process for administrators to be reassigned or transferred and enforce the processes for reassigning personnel in all employee groups, which includes: administrative upgrades, lateral transfers, reclassifications, and additional temporary duties;
the faculty expedited upgrading process; and classified reassignments. Transparency in these transactions is necessary.

With respect to the administrative reorganization, there has been substantial opposition to a major reduction in the number of hours of leadership support to departments and the diminishment of opportunity for department chairs to contribute their expertise to the support of student learning. The proposal to alter the structure of departments and the role of chairs was made public only three days before the October 25th Board meeting. The authors of that proposal did not invite input from the Academic Senate, members of the faculty, nor from the academic deans. Although members of the Academic Senate were provided with an opportunity to speak about the proposal at 12:30 am when the Board considered it, the brief discussion of the Trustees before adopting the proposal did not acknowledge concerns raised by members of the Academic Senate. Members of the Academic Senate perceive this decision of great magnitude made in three days with insufficient evidence and no input from constituent groups as an action that is out of compliance with numerous accreditation standards, including I.B.3, I.B.4, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, and IV.A.3. Faculty are seeking participation in the decision making process (in accordance with Standard IV.A.2) and appropriate examination of impacts on student learning. The administrative changes taking place, largely focusing on concerns about the process of doing so, although many have questioned the reasons for doing so, and the process has not moved as quickly as planned. Individuals have raised concerns about the greatly increased authority workload of administrators as contained within the new draft administrative job announcements, and the district is engaged in negotiations with the bargaining unit that represent department chairs.

The College’s recent necessity to quickly lay off more than 30 classified staff members underscores the need to develop processes to ensure that planning for classified staffing needs is fully integrated with institutional planning, as recommended by ACCJC.

III.A.1/III.A.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement clear, consistent, and transparent processes for the appointment of reassignment positions for all employee groups Recognizing that the Chancellor has authority under Title 5 § 53021 to upgrade, escalate, reassign, or laterally transfer an administrative appointment, implementing clear, consistent, and transparent processes in the appointment of reassignment positions for all employee groups is strongly recommended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to ensure that future administrative job announcements clearly define roles, responsibilities, and expectations of management personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that trained EEO monitors are present for all hiring to permanent faculty and administrative positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop a process fully integrated with institutional planning to: Review the classified personnel structure to better assess the effective use of staffing resources.

III.A.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

III.A.1.b. Descriptive Summary. The institution has established systems for evaluating all personnel to ensure the effectiveness of its human resources. The SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement defines the criteria for evaluating faculty. District policies and procedures outline criteria for evaluating classified staff and administrators.

[evidence: SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement; PM 3.18; what about classified staff policy re. evaluation?]

The purpose of evaluation for all employee groups is to identify strengths and special qualities of the evaluatee and to define areas for improvement when needed. At all levels, the evaluations incorporate a criterion that effectively measures and evaluates an employee’s work performance. The evaluation process includes performance indicators that link to institutional effectiveness and improvement. At all levels, where employees receive a less than satisfactory rating, the District implements a remediation process.

Faculty Evaluation. The faculty evaluation process is administered by the Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, in accordance with the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA, Article 9. In general, the College evaluates classroom faculty every three years on the following: (1) professional qualities, including keeping current in their discipline; (2) performance – classroom instruction; and (3) classroom presentation, including demonstrating sensitivity to the learning difficulties of students. Student evaluations, conducted via an in-class survey, are a crucial component of every classroom instructor’s evaluation. Faculty evaluations carefully consider survey responses, which can reveal potential areas of concern or of exceptional performance.

The “job performance” component of an evaluation for classroom faculty consists of an in-depth evaluation of course content, subject knowledge, and classroom presentation. For librarians, job performance evaluation includes and examination of the extent to which librarians: communicate ideas effectively during workshops and instructional sessions at the reference desk; contribute to building, organizing, and maintaining library collections and resources; and strive to maintain an environment conducive to study, research, reading, and learning. Job performance evaluations for counselors consider how individual counselors help students define problems, support students in seeking solutions to problems, and provide opportunities for students to express concerns. For resource instructors, job performance evaluations focus on how effectively they develop instructional resources.
For full-time faculty under tenure review, are evaluated more frequently and they prepare additional self-evaluations. The process for gaining tenure also requires faculty to create and maintain a portfolio of their work.

To further improve the evaluation process and provide feedback for improvement to faculty members, the College added a category to the ratings component of the evaluation. The category of “Satisfactory but Needs Improvement” addresses issues prior to a faculty member falling into the “Unsatisfactory” category. The process also includes a provision that addresses the issues in question through an Improvement Plan. More specific evaluation components, which clearly describe the formal and timely processes that produce documented actions following evaluations, are outlined in the Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review Guidebook available from the Curriculum and Instruction webpage.

Faculty evaluations now include a component measuring their effectiveness in producing desired learning outcomes (see III.A.1.c.).

Department chair evaluations assess their supervisory performance in accordance with Article 8: Evaluation, of the SFCCD/Department Chairpersons Council CBA. This article specifies that each department chairperson should be evaluated by the academic and classified members of the department during February or March of each year of his or her term of office as department chair, except for the third or last year of the term. The department chairperson and the administrator to whom he or she reports examine and discuss the feedback submitted by faculty and staff in the Faculty and Classified Staff Review Form for Department Chairperson. The administrator then summarizes the review results files the results in the evaluatee’s personnel file.

Classified Staff Evaluation. The classified employee evaluation currently follows the Performance Appraisal System of the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR). The purpose of the performance plan and appraisal are to: (1) evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the employee’s work; (2) communicate these to the employee; and (3) set goals for performance, improvement, and career development. The College evaluates new permanent classified staff after three months and on the anniversary date of employment. The current appraisal/evaluation process does not provide for a specific rating on dedication to professional growth as made evident by an employee’s participation in District-wide committees, organizations, and projects (for example, Classified Senate or Accreditation workgroups).

Evaluations for classified employees working in positions directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes within library and learning support services (e.g., instructional lab aides) include a component for rating these employees’ effectiveness in this area. See also the response to Standard III.A.1.c.

The Classified Performance Appraisal serves as mechanism for dialogue between supervisor and evaluatee and as a way to create progressive work plans. To further improve the ease and timeliness of evaluations for classified staff, HR has made the forms available online. HR staff prompt the supervisor via an email notice about the need for an evaluation, and
sends reminders to the employee’s department head prior to evaluation due dates. HR also sends reminders if supervisors do not meet the deadline. The HR Classified Unit monitors this process. Prior to Fall 2010, supervisors only evaluated permanent classified employees, the College now requires evaluations for all classified employees.

**Administrator Evaluations.** The College evaluates administrators on their performance related to program planning, problem solving, professional relationships, job knowledge and application, human resource skills, communication skills, organizational leadership skills, personal leadership skills, and teamwork. The College first implemented the current Administrative Evaluation and Contract Renewal Procedures during fiscal year 2003-04. Since then, the College has updated this process to ensure a more direct relationship between the evaluatee and his/her direct supervisor. The Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee gave greater weight, 25 percent of the overall evaluation rating, to the supervisor’s review.

The procedures also require that early in the evaluation process, in addition to identifying responsibilities of the position, administrators set a minimum of five performance objectives that align with the Chancellor’s objectives and derive from the Strategic Plan and the College’s Annual Plan. The Chancellor’s Office oversees the administrative evaluation process, and the Oversight Committee reviews the evaluation process for fairness and consistency in the application of District-wide feedback and inclusion of this feedback in administrative evaluations.

**III.A.1.b. Self Evaluation.** Much discussion regarding the Administrative Evaluation process has taken place, specifically focusing on the role of the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee and the anonymous surveys that the Academic Senate and the Classified Senate administer. Although the College also evaluates faculty on the basis of anonymous surveys submitted by students, The College does not employ these additional evaluation mechanisms with other employee groups, and a number of individuals have questioned the value of this input and whether or not these additional mechanisms are equitable and fair. Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman has begun reviewing these procedures. Changes will include the elimination of the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee.

Although the Human Resources Department prompts supervisors annually to evaluate their classified staff, not all supervisors complete the evaluations in a timely manner. If a classified staff member does not receive an evaluation, the individual automatically gets a de facto satisfactory rating. SEIU 1021 has raised concerns about this.

**III.A.1.b. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revisit evaluation process for all employees Revamp the Administrative Evaluation Process to produce a more effective model guided by a review of best practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IIIA.1.c. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

IIIA.1.c. Descriptive Summary. In July 2012, ACCJC recommended “that the evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include a component that assesses the effectiveness in bringing about those learning outcomes (IIIA.1.c).” In response to this Recommendation, senior administration negotiated with employee labor groups to include SLO components in all applicable performance evaluation instruments for faculty, department chairs, classified staff, and administrators with direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes. Full implementation is occurring this Spring (2013).

The College has also begun incorporating SLOs as a topic of professional development whenever possible. The first effort in this regard was the provision of a FLEX Day dedicated to SLOs on September 12, 2012.

[Employee Handbooks]

Additionally, SLO language is added to relevant job announcements accordingly.

IIIA.1.c. Self Evaluation. The explicit inclusion of SLO components in evaluations of College personnel is new. The College will need time to effectively utilize this information to effect change when needed.

IIIA.1.c. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

IIIA.1.d. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.

IIIA.1.d. Descriptive Summary. In addition to Board Policy 3050: Institutional Code of Ethics [III A-15], expectations for ethical behavior by employees of the District are covered in various District policies, employee handbooks, and collective bargaining agreements. (See noted documentation reference.)

District policies concerning instructors' responsibilities in classrooms and laboratories are published in the Faculty Handbook [III A-16]. Additionally, Article 8 of the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA speaks to Academic Freedom, Duties, and Responsibilities; Article 8.D specifically addresses faculty-student relationships [III A-2].

The Classified Handbook outlines the requirements of classified employees at the time of hire, such as fingerprinting, misrepresentation of falsification of information, the arrest and conviction policy, and security clearance section 2.8 [III A-17]; District Policy 4.09 – Use of Slurs [III A-18] is included in both the Classified, Faculty, and Administrative Handbook on pages 12, 15, and 12 respectively.
All new employees are provided with a handbook at the time of their new-hire processing. The handbooks are updated regularly and are distributed via an interoffice mailing to all employees as well as made available on the HR website.

Other relevant policies and articles that define professional ethics expectations at CCSF include:

The SFCCD/SEIU 1021 Collective Bargaining Agreement (SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA) Article 9 – Discipline covers the discipline process for represented SEIU classified employees. Article 9.C – Causes for discipline outlines circumstances under which unit members may be disciplined for cause [III A-19].

The Board of Trustees adopted a Workplace Violence Policy on June 10, 2004 [III A-20]. A Workplace Violence Policy and Procedure Brochure for distribution to all employees was developed and reviewed through the formerly Shared Governance procedure (now Participatory Governance adopted by Board 10/25/12, Policy 2.07) during the Fall 2005 semester. The policy is included in the latest versions of the faculty and classified employee handbooks under section 2.6 B, and on page 32 of the Administrative Handbook. All new employees are provided with a handbook at the time of their new-hire processing.

The Affirmative Action Office disseminates information to all employees pertaining to the District’s Sexual Harassment and Unlawful Discrimination policies and procedures for filing complaints. This includes a review by the District’s Police Department to address any criminal violations. Additional information is available on their webpage [III A-21] The Classified and Faculty Handbooks also addresses the areas of Equal Opportunity Section 2.1, Unlawful Discrimination Section 2.2, and Americans with Disabilities protocols Section 2.4.

On July 29, 2010, The Board of Trustees passed Board Policy 3052 – Conflict of Interest [III A-22]. This policy stated that no trustee, officer, or employee of the District shall make, or in any way attempt to use, his or her official position to influence a District decision in which he or she has an economic interest. CCSF policy requires that all administrators complete the state Conflict of Interest Form 700 annually.

District policies and procedures may be found in the College Catalog, as well as the College website at http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy-Manuals.

III.A.1.d. Self Evaluation. CCSF has written policies and procedures pertaining to professional ethics intended to promote a supportive work environment that ensures healthy and collegial working conditions and fosters an environment of respect, trust, and collaboration. The College keeps all policies and procedures up to date with current law. However, since implementation of the changes resulting from ACCJC and FCMAT recommendations, members of the College community have felt that the environment currently does not reflect these positive intentions.


III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.
III.A.2. Descriptive Summary. ACCJC found that human resource planning is not fully integrated with institutional planning. Standard III.A.6 specifically addresses this concern. Moreover, the ACCJC evaluation team expressed concern that the College had insufficient classified and administrative staff with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the leadership, management or services necessary to support the institution’s mission and operations.

FCMAT, however, disagreed with the ACCJC’s finding that the College has too few academic managers; noting that the number of educational administrators (identified as 38 total administrators) employed by the College per 1,000 FTES is comparable with comparison districts. On the other hand, FCMAT agreed with ACCJC’s findings that the District’s administrative structure is lacking in stability given that at the time of their review, four out of its five vice chancellor positions were interim and the chancellor is also an interim assignment. FCMAT further found that the structure and responsibilities of department chairs differ significantly from typical California community colleges and that consequently the decision-making authority of the deans and vice chancellors has been marginalized.

FCMAT recommendations regarding the administrative structure include: (1) clearly defining and communicating the roles, responsibilities and expectations of management personnel and holding managers accountable for their performance; (2) implementing an administrative structure that will eliminate the redundancy of roles of the department chair and dean positions; (3) reducing the department chairs’ non-instructional reassigned time by collapsing and restructuring the assignment of disciplines and reducing the positions’ role in oversight of the instructional program; and (4) strengthen the roles and responsibilities of the deans, particularly in the administration of the instructional program. [FCMAT Report p. 49]

FCMAT also recommended that the college examine the report for accuracy in all areas. There has not been institution-wide dialog in this area. Some topics that need discussion: What exactly are the redundancies of roles between department chairs and school deans? What are the implications for students and department operations if department chair roles are diminished? Department Chairs have always been supervised by School Deans or the equivalent. Perhaps what is needed is professional development for the School Deans to familiarize them with the Department Chairperson’s contract along with support for the School Deans to act as supervisors in all areas as specified in the contract? What might be the operational considerations and impact on students if the Department Chair “oversight of instructional programs” is reduced? For decades senior administration have announced that the most cost efficient approach to CCSF operations is with the current Department Chair and School Dean system. What has suddenly changed? How much money will actually be saved with the proposed reduction of Department Chairs and their duties?

With regard to staffing and operational costs, FCMAT found that the College employs significantly more regular full-time equivalent (FTE) employees than comparison districts, both in total and per FTES and employs significantly more classified staff support at higher average salaries than comparison districts.

Under the direction of the Interim Chancellor and the Accreditation Liaison Officer, District employees began implementing plans to address the ACCJC’s show cause letter of July 3, 2012. Workgroup 7 was assigned to examine Recommendation 7, Human Resources. The workgroup examined and discussed was tasked with: (1) addressing possible options for
more effective and efficient organizational structure to determine logical reporting lines and structures that support timely decision making and accountability; (2) reviewing the appropriate number of administrators needed to support and manage the District’s instructional programs and services; (3) examining issues relating to the reassignment of personnel; and (4) proposing new practices designed to clarify and enhance the roles and authority of deans and department chairs.

At the same time, as noted in the response to Standard III.A.1., the Board of Trustees directed the Interim Chancellor to propose a new instructional structure, congruent with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings. The reorganization is currently in progress with a goal for completion by July 1, 2013.

Staffing needs and allocation are identified at the departmental level, whereby deans with recommendations from department chairs prioritize staffing needs within their programs, departments, and division by connecting staffing levels and adequacy to District planning priorities. In assessing the adequacy of staffing example of factors that are considered may be: (1) support needed to provide a specific function/service/course and the quality of that service; (2) the health and safety of students, faculty, staff, and District assets; (3) staffing required by law and/or to provide critical support of tasks required of regulatory bodies; (4) support needed to perform critical technology services; and (5) support needed to maintain facilities and physical operations. As stated above, the yearly Program Review process is the tool used by department to address staffing needs.

III.A.2. Self Evaluation. The number of faculty is sufficient; however, the number of administrators and classified staff has fluctuated greatly due to budgetary restrictions.

The District needs to ensure that its fully implement a new instructional administrative structure that includes supports academic integrity and increased administrative oversight and accountability, while at the same time aligning with budget restrictions. This is a time of significant transformation that the College will have to re-evaluate once firm changes have taken place.

To support the College’s ability to fully evaluate its level of staffing, staffing plans are not sufficiently well-linked to institutional planning. Better linkage will help assess more effectively need to be linked to institutional planning to more effectively assess the adequacy of staffing and how the institution’s personnel work to support its programs and services.

Writing new job announcements for every administrative position and hiring all administrative personnel through open hiring processes is likely to further exacerbate the lack of administrative stability identified as a serious concern by both ACCJC and FCMAT.

III.A.2. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans are underway to implement a new instructional administrative structure, congruent with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings. The new structure includes academic integrity and increased administrative oversight and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.A. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

III.A.3. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

III.A.3.a. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

III.A.3./III.A.3.a. Descriptive Summary. Personnel policies are governed by District policy and procedures, the California Education Code and Title 5, union contracts, and state, federal, and local labor laws. For example, Education Code § 87359 and Title 5 § 53430 regulations specify minimum qualifications for faculty and administrative hiring. The employment of classified employees is governed by the City and County of San Francisco Civil Service Commission. The College equitably and consistently administers and regularly reviews personnel policies and procedures. Through the collective bargaining process, the District and Employee Labor groups work collaboratively to find common ground regarding policies affecting their respective members. Employees voice needs and concerns via the Joint Labor Management Council, the College Diversity Committee, The Chancellor’s Cabinet, the Academic Senate, and the unions. AFT 2121 has a Grievance Committee that meets on a regular basis with the head of Employee Relations to work out any perceived problems between the District and faculty. Additionally, the Human Resources Committee meets every other week to address pertinent personnel issues, employee concerns, new and updated employment laws, and personnel policies. The Human Resources Committee comprises the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, Legal Counsel, the Employee Relations Officer, the Dean and Associate Dean of Human Resources, the Affirmative Action Officer, and the Human Resources Supervisors. The Board of Trustees considers and approves recommendations for adopting new and/or amending personnel policies. All policy manual amendments and additions go through two readings before the Board of Trustees prior to adoption.

HR communicates updates and new personnel policies, procedures, and/or laws by disseminating the information to employees through institutional mailings and making the information available via the Department website. Moreover, employment policies and procedures are stated in the Policy Manual [III A-25], the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA [III A-2], the SFCCD/SEIU J021 CBA [III A-19], contracts with other recognized bargaining units, and in the Faculty and Classified handbooks under sections 2.1 Equal Opportunity Statement, in the Administrative Handbook under Section Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment Policy, Section 3 SF City and County Charter, Section 4 District Employment & Requirements 4.1-4.7, Section 6 Leaves 6.1-6-14, and Section 7 Professional Development 7.1-7.2, as well as posted on job announcements and on the Department website. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies that ensure informational brochures pertaining to unlawful discrimination are distributed to all employees. Employee handbooks contain as an appendix the San Francisco Community College District Policy and Procedures.
for Handling Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination under Title 5 § 59300 et. Seq.  [III A-16, III A-17]

It is the responsibility of HR and the Affirmative Action Office to orient faculty and administrative hiring committees on the hiring procedures, employment regulations, and the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA Article 12-Upgrading provisions  [III A-2]. The College has improved this process by including samples and forms on paper screening criteria, interview questions, and teaching demonstrations.

HR and the Office of Instruction hold new employee orientations once yearly to educate all incoming employees on the District’s policies and to inform employees about their rights and responsibilities. The Employee Relations Officer is responsible for ensuring that College constituents are educated on new contract language.

HR is responsible for developing and distributing employee handbooks that inform employees of the principal rules, regulations, practices, and procedures essential to their role in the District. The handbooks are updated every two years. Current handbooks for Classified, Faculty, and Administrators can be found on the HR website.

III.A.3./III.A.3.a. Self Evaluation. The institution successfully ensures that all state, federal, local, and other relevant personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered and reviewed regularly. Through the collective bargaining process, the District and Employee Labor groups work collaboratively to find common ground regarding policies affecting their respective members. However, given the magnitude of the changes currently taking place, many would not at this time describe the process as collaborative.

HR satisfactorily communicates updates and new personnel policies, procedures, and/or laws by disseminating the information to employees through institutional mailings, employee handbooks, and making the information available via the Department website.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

III.A.3.b. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

III.A.3.b. Descriptive Summary. The institution provides for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Classified and academic files are kept in secure and locked areas in HR. Personnel records are confidential and may only be viewed by authorized personnel. Academic employees may view their personnel files during regular business hours by appointment with authorized Human Resources personnel as described in the provisions of the SFCCD/AFT 2121 DBA. Classified employees may also view their personnel files upon written notice in accordance with the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 DBA. Additionally, an employee may authorize/designate a union or other representative to review the file upon written authorization as described by both AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021 collective
bargaining agreements [III A-2, III A-19]. Administrators and classified employees not represented by SEIU 1021 have equivalent rights to inspect their personnel files, as outlines in their respective employee handbooks. For all employees, Education Code and Labor Code provisions are assured.

In accordance with the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA, the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA, and District policy, each academic and classified employee can only have one official District personnel file. Each personnel file consists of District employment records, educational advancement records, and other work experience that relates to employee service. The following items are considered part of a classified and academic personnel file but are maintained separately: time rolls, attendance records, payroll records, work orders, TB records, history cards, salary cards, credential records, schedule files, and assignment files.

The District may add similar categories of routine personnel recordkeeping as long as both AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021 are notified respectively as described in the contracts. The College secures and files medical records and investigative reports separately in the same manner as previously noted records.

An online, password-protected database called Web4 allows employees access to certain types of information. Employees are able to access and update some of their personal information, such as payroll information, benefits and deductions; sick days credited and used, and tax withholding, via their online account on Web4.

Additionally, the ITS Department takes great measures within its technical infrastructure to secure employment records in the CCSF Banner information system. Each user has a unique Oracle logon and password. Within CCSF Banner, each user is given limited permissions to view or update only specific areas appropriate for his or her job duties. Moreover, only select staff members in the administrative area of the College are granted access to the CCSF Banner information system.

The College implemented an exit interview process in Spring 2011 including an exit interview and employee exiting checklist, supervisory and/or key departmental sign-offs, and an employee acknowledgement. The next stage, scheduled for implementation in Spring 2012, is automation of the exit checklist, including electronic routing and electronic sign-offs.

III.A.3.b. Self Evaluation. Security and confidentiality of personal records is diligently provided, primarily through locked files of paper-copy documents in HR with only authorized personnel allowed viewing right. Employee access is provided by appointment, and limited information is available online via password protection. The College has implemented a clearly documented exit interview procedure for resignations and retirements, including an exit interview and an automated employee exiting checklist and employee acknowledgment. For classified employee lay-offs, the College follows civil service guidelines and the SEIU 1021 collective bargaining agreement.

III.A.3.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automation of the exit interview is scheduled for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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III.A.4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.

III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.

III.A.4/a. Descriptive Summary. CCSF demonstrates through major planning documents, policies, and daily practice, an understanding that equity and diversity are key to the success of the institution. The Vision Statement summarizes CCSF’s perspective on diversity as: “In our community, respect and trust are common virtues, and all people are enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding. We will maintain a supportive, positive, and productive working environment for our diverse faculty and staff, as well as a responsive environment in which student needs are met in a friendly, timely, and caring manner” [III A-26].

In the 2011-16 Strategic Plan one of the six identified strategic priorities is dedicated to diversity and inclusiveness. The goal of this priority is to “Promote diversity and inclusiveness at all levels of the College.” Included in the objectives is a focus on fostering a supportive, positive, and productive environment for the College’s diverse employees.

The College includes diversity as a component of all new employee orientations as well as in FLEX Day workshops.

The College also has a standing College Diversity Committee, which has been on hold during the transition of the Participatory Governance system. With respect to supporting diverse personnel, its revised purpose is to: XXX.

CCSF has offered a variety of diversity-related programs and services that support its personnel. The “Grow Your Own Program” was designed to encourage and help prepare City College of San Francisco graduates to return as teaching, counseling, or library faculty at CCSF after they have completed their upper division and graduate education. The students participate in a special support program, receive scholarships to pursue advanced degrees, and serve as teaching interns at the College. This initiative was intended to increase the extent to which faculty are representative of the College’s student populations. There was one incoming class of Grow Your Own students/faculty in 2007, and there are four more students/faculty in the pipeline. Three of these are currently interns; one is applying to graduate school [III A-32]. NEED UPDATE FROM Jessica Williams — GYO new applicants discontinued due to lack of funding.

The Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP) was established at CCSF in 1990 in response to a recognized need for the College to better represent California’s increasing cultural diversity. The purpose of the program is to identify and assist members of underrepresented groups who are in graduate degree programs, have no experience in a community college classroom, and are interested in community college faculty careers. Interns learn and practice teaching and interaction techniques appropriate for community college students from a veteran CCSF faculty member, which helps to make them more competitive when applying for regular community college faculty positions. The program was on hiatus from 2007 to 2011 and welcomed its first incoming class in years during the
Fall 2011 semester. There are currently four interns working as FDIP interns. NEED UPDATE FROM Jessica Williams

III.A.4/III.A.4.a. Self Evaluation. The College has been focused on making dramatic changes with fewer staff and has not been able to focus on supporting the diversity of its current personnel as much as it has in the past. With the new Participatory Governance system now in place, the Diversity Committee will be active once again, and can serve as venue for reinstating this focus throughout the College.

III.A.4/III.A.4.a. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue work in this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

III.A.4.b. Descriptive Summary. In compliance with Title 5 and at the request of the Board of Trustees, HR prepares an annual Employee and Hiring Data Report (see also Section III.A.2). This document provides an extensive summary of the institution’s hiring record and is used as a reference and educational tool for the institution’s hiring needs and goals. The historical data in these reports show that the institution is committed to hiring people with varied backgrounds and experiences. This is reflected across the District as indicated in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administered (Fall 2011)</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty (Fall 2011)</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty (Fall 2011)</th>
<th>Full-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2011)</th>
<th>Part-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21 53%</td>
<td>473 60%</td>
<td>542 54%</td>
<td>370 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19 48%</td>
<td>311 40%</td>
<td>459 46%</td>
<td>280 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6 15%</td>
<td>57 7%</td>
<td>73 7%</td>
<td>72 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7 18%</td>
<td>139 18%</td>
<td>180 18%</td>
<td>245 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>15 38%</td>
<td>431 55%</td>
<td>571 57%</td>
<td>129 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>27 3%</td>
<td>33 3%</td>
<td>70 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9 23%</td>
<td>89 11%</td>
<td>85 8%</td>
<td>105 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>3 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>3 8%</td>
<td>38 5%</td>
<td>59 6%</td>
<td>29 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>4 10%</td>
<td>71 9%</td>
<td>52 5%</td>
<td>9 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>24 3%</td>
<td>44 4%</td>
<td>19 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>42 5%</td>
<td>28 3%</td>
<td>31 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty and staff are also diverse with respect to their age [III A-4].

HR, in conjunction with appropriate College groups, has made a concerted effort through hiring procedures to maintain the highest level of commitment to academic excellence as well as to diversity and equity. HR actively recruits underrepresented populations and participates in the California Community College Affirmative Action Job Fairs.

On February 23, 2012, the Board of Trustees adopted Resolution No. 120223-S5, “Strategy for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection.” The resolution called for the Chancellor’s Office to develop a comprehensive College-wide policy and implementation strategy for improving equal opportunity in faculty recruitment and selection. The Chancellor formed task force workgroups who met and reviewed the hiring data and diversity statistics contained in the Human Resources Hiring Data and Employee Data Reports. Without any prior review by the Academic Senate nor the Affirmative Action Officer, the taskforce provided their findings to the Board of Trustees in April 2012 as a document entitled, “Blueprint of College-Wide Policy and Implementation Strategy for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection.” Because serious inaccuracies in the document were a source of concern, a “Diversity Blueprint Workgroup,” including the Dean of Human Resources and representatives from the DCC and the Academic Senate, reviewed this document. This group came together on April 23, 2012, and a summary of their findings, corrections, and timeline for implementation was presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators (Fall 2012)</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty (Fall 2012)</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty (Fall 2012)</th>
<th>Full-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2012)</th>
<th>Part-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number:</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by the Academic Senate to the Interim Chancellor Fisher in May 2012. Many of the groups’ recommendations regarding the hiring process are already in place (i.e., copies of transcripts versus original transcripts), and those recommendations were stated as areas of concern regarding recruitment that are reasonable (i.e., letters of recommendation) and can be accommodated and adapted into the current hiring process.

The recruitment of classified employees for the San Francisco Community College District is governed by the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA and the City and County of San Francisco Civil Service System.

III.A.4.b. Self Evaluation. The College publishes the annual Employee and Hiring Data Report and uses this information to assess how effective recruiting and hiring practices are related to increasing the diversity of its staff. The data in the chart are evidence of the diversity of the College’s employees.

Because of other work required by the Show Cause status, an annual Employee and Hiring Data report was not published in Fall 2012.

While the Blueprint document generated much dialogue, members of the College community raised concerns about the process leading to the development of the document. These concerns have not yet been addressed. See also the response to Standard IV.B.2.c.

[evidence: Blueprint document and email communications regarding concerns about the process]

III.A.4.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update Employee &amp; Hiring Data</td>
<td>HR prepares a report</td>
<td>March 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.4.c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.

III.A.4.c. Descriptive Summary. CCSF subscribes to and advocates for integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff, and students by adhering to a number of regulatory policies and laws, including union contracts, the State Education Code and Title 5, the City and County of San Francisco’s Civil Service Charter, District personnel policies and practices, and federal, state, and local labor laws. The institution has also established procedures and guidelines to enable it to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds, sexual orientation, or disability.

In addition, the institution has an Equal Opportunity Statement that addresses CCSF’s policy on equal employment and educational opportunities [III A-37]. The compliance officer for this policy is the Title 5/EEO/ADA Compliance Officer. The Title 5/EEO/ADA Compliance Officer is also responsible for disseminating informational brochures to all students and employees regarding District policies and procedures pertaining to sexual harassment and unlawful discrimination. This information may also be found on the Office’s webpage and in
employee handbooks. As required by law, sexual harassment training for employees serving in management and supervisory ranks has been ongoing since 2005.

The District has identified the Title 5/EOO/ADA Compliance Officer to the State Chancellor’s Office and to the public as the single District officer responsible for receiving all unlawful discrimination complaints filed pursuant to Title 5 § 59328, and for coordinating any investigation [III A-38]. The Title 5/EOO/ADA Compliance Officer is leading the update of the District’s EEO Plan in accord with the State Board of Governors’ proposed Title 5 EEO regulations.

The Office of the Director of Student Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities is responsible for student conduct and complaints. College Rules and Regulations pertaining to conduct are also contained in the College Catalog, in the Faculty Handbook, and on the CCSF website.

As stated in Section III.A.4.a, FLEX Day events have served as a forum for presenting informational workshops and trainings about the institution’s policies and practices related to respectful treatment of employees and students.

III.A.4.c. Self Evaluation. Based on its policies and procedures, the College does strive to demonstrate integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff, and students. However, given the large and rapid nature of changes taking place within the institution at this time to define roles, responsibilities, and accountability, members of the College community have not felt that the College has consistently upheld this intention.

III.A.4.c. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013 – comply with the State Board of Governors’ proposed Title 5 EEO Regulations by updating the District’s EEO Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.

III.A.5./III.A.5.a Descriptive Summary. The College’s Faculty Handbook, the Office of Professional Development’s webpage, and FLEX Day programs outline professional development requirements for faculty. The Office of Professional Development plans annual FLEX Day activity programs for faculty and staff. The FLEX Day programs respond to the teaching and learning needs that faculty and staff have identified and are consistent with the institutional mission. Examples of such programs include teaching with technology, methods to motivate and aid student learning, diversity, and multicultural topics [III A-36].

The discontinuation of AB 1725 resulted in the elimination of travel funds. This has directly affected the quality of FLEX Day events, as funding is not currently available for guest
keynote speakers, diversity workshop presenters, and informational seminars from outside agencies. However, the College has continued to offer a limited program.

Another issue related to offering an extensive array of FLEX Day programs is the reduction in the number of days devoted to FLEX. Prior to 2003, the Fall semester FLEX event took place over three days, and the Spring semester events were two days. This allowed for a varied and quality offering of workshops. Negotiations between the College and Collective Bargaining Units have reduced the programmed FLEX Days down to one day each semester. Faculty received the other four days as independent FLEX Days to attend conferences or pursue individual developmental activities. However, due to severely limited travel budgets, it is increasingly difficult for faculty to attend conferences or off-site workshops.

These changes have directly affected the Flex Day events by reducing overall attendance, constraining the College’s ability to solicit and contract with outside presenters, and limiting the number of quality workshops that could be offered. Negotiations are underway to restore one of the programmed FLEX Days to the fall semester.

Other outlets available for faculty professional development include the Basic Skills Faculty Colloquia, the Technology Learning Center’s (TLC) technology training sessions (see also the response to Standard III.C.1.b.), the Department Chairpersons Council-sponsored Student Learning Outcomes Workshops, the Multicultural Infusion Project activities, and individual department workshops.

[evidence: agendas/outlines, handouts, etc. for these initiatives/activities]

An additional professional development option offered through contractual agreement with AFT 2121 is sabbatical leave (SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA Article 17.N), which allows 4 percent of the faculty, including department chairs, to take sabbatical leave during an academic year. The Sabbatical Committee makes decisions about those who are awarded sabbaticals [III A-2, p. 92-97].

Individual professional development targeted to specific faculty teaching/learning needs has been enhanced by the Union-District program to reward ongoing education and training with salary column movement. Since Fall 1999, AFT 2121 and the District have agreed to grant salary column movement to faculty who do not possess a Ph.D. Faculty wishing to take college courses to accumulate units for salary column movement may: (1) take undergraduate courses, which require prior approval from their respective School Dean and Vice Chancellor; (2) take graduate courses; or (3) develop a long-term professional development plan (SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA – Professional Development Plan). HR administers the evaluation of faculty coursework [III A-2].

The Chancellor grants administrative sabbaticals. In accord with the Sabbatical Leave Policy for Administrators, up to two sabbatical leaves may be granted per academic year and the award may be for one semester, one year, or a split (two non-consecutive semesters). Approval is based on seniority, benefit to the institution, and benefit to the individual, and consideration is given to the timing of the leave and its consistency with institutional priorities. Administrators may also receive a short-term paid or unpaid leave for professional development. Due to the reduction in the number of administrators, no administrator has received a sabbatical in recent years [III A-8 p. 28].
In cooperation with the leadership of the classified employees (SEIU 1021 and the Classified Senate), the Office of Professional Development and the Chancellor’s Office sponsor a classified employee FLEX Day once a year. The District provides release time for training and/or presenting during Flex Days. The Classified Senate established the Joan McClain (founding member of the Classified Senate) scholarship to aid classified employees pursuing academic goals.

The following educational opportunities are also available to classified SEIU 1021 members: (1) enrollment fee waiver program; (2) Book Loan Program; and (3) the SEIU 1021 Enrollment Fee Reimbursement Grant. Specific information about each of the aforementioned programs is available in the Classified Handbook and in Article 13–“Staff Development” of the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA [III A-17, III A-19].

III.A.5./III.A.5.a Self Evaluation. The College can only offer limited professional development opportunities given fiscal constraints. However, to response to ACCJC’s Recommendation relating to administrative capacity, Senior Administration has agreed to allocate $150,000 for employee professional development. The workgroup addressing this issue also recommended exploring low- or no-cost options for professional development, including participation on accreditation site visit teams, establishing a mentoring program, and the possibility of providing professional development, in some cases through existing CCSF classes.

In addition, the workgroup addressing administrative capacity recommended that the College restore orientations and training for deans, department chairs, program coordinators, classified staff and expand to others as applicable.

Interim Chancellor Fisher instituted a series of Leadership Training activities for the management team with a $100,000 donation for this purpose. Topics to date have included accreditation, enrollment management, Banner usage, SLOs, Shared Governance, and leadership strengths. The accreditation workgroup reviewing professional development has recommended that these activities continue and that the College develop a formal annual schedule.

III.A.5./III.A.5.a Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to work to fully implement and fund a professional development program that promotes training and professional growth opportunities for all employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for staffing of the Professional Development Office including a faculty on 40 percent release, to handle the increased workload resulting from tracking of faculty professional development credits and grants processing due to $150,000 allocation for employee professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

III.A.5.b. Descriptive Summary. The primary ways that the College evaluates FLEX Day sessions and other professional development opportunities is through the Employee Survey, administered at regular intervals, the FLEX workshop evaluation forms, and evaluation forms completed by faculty and staff related to the TLC and online course training sessions offered by staff in the Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) area.

Professional Development staff use the suggestions made on the FLEX evaluation forms to plan future FLEX Day sessions and share the evaluations with the presenters so that any comments can be addressed by the presenter before offering that training session in the future. They also use informal feedback and suggestions from faculty to plan future professional development sessions.

The results of the 2011 Employee Survey show a near good rating for Flex workshops, and a slightly higher than good rating for the TMI training programs and the TLC’s distance learning training and support.

[evidence: 2011 Employee Survey; other surveys?]

III.A.5.b. Self Evaluation. The FLEX sessions are limited to one day per semester, some of which is devoted to departmental meetings. The reduced schedule makes it difficult to schedule a sufficient variety of workshops. Because of this, the value of assessing workshops and using the findings for improvement are limited. Nonetheless, FLEX workshops and the evaluations thereof will continue.

When staffing allows, the College will examine the feasibility of including an online “suggestion box” for professional development on their website. In addition, the College will investigate a way to systematically and centrally measure the extent to which professional development activities effect changes in practice.

III.A.5.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to work to fully implement and fund a professional development program that promotes training and professional growth opportunities for all employees. Increase staffing resources to better implement evaluation practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.6. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

III.A.6. Descriptive Summary. In the previous Shared Governance system, hiring requests were reviewed by the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) and the Vacancy
Review Group (for classified staff). The Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) played the key role in setting the criteria and procedures for departments requesting full-time faculty replacements, using Decision Support System (DSS) data to assess faculty position requests. Although FPAC still exists on paper (it is created by the faculty Hiring Procedures Agreement) it does not at this time have a "box" in the Participatory Governance structure. In the new Participatory Governance system, these entities no longer exist. The College plans for future Units now submit staffing requests to be submitted through the Program Review process as part of the integrated planning and budgeting system. These requests make their way through several levels of prioritization by the administrators responsible for the area in question. The Chancellor has the ultimate decision-making authority.

In assessing the adequacy of staffing, managers consider the following factors: (1) support needed to provide a specific function/service/course and the quality of that service; (2) the health and safety of students, faculty, staff, and District assets; (3) staffing required by law and/or to provide critical support of tasks required of regulatory bodies; (4) support needed to perform critical technology services; and (5) support needed to maintain facilities and physical operations.

The Chancellor has primary responsibility for the allocation of the Administrative structure. If a new administrative position is needed to ensure the effective operations of the District, top administration work with the Human Resources Department to conduct a job analysis survey to determine the administrative level, i.e., dean, associate dean, director, etc., and related job duties and responsibilities. The Chancellor and top administration work with the budget unit to determine funding and as a courtesy the draft job description is shared with the Academic Senate Executive Council for their feedback.

III.A.6. Self Evaluation. Until recently, human resource planning has not been integrated with institutional planning, but plans are in place for this integration to occur in the future. Staffing requests did not follow a streamlined, transparent process. The primary reliance for the future now on Program Review as the mechanism for making staffing decisions will help integrate human resource planning with institutional planning. To fully integrate human resource needs with planning, the College must develop a separate staffing plan that feeds into the resource allocation process through Program Review.

III.A.6. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a staffing plan that includes assessing the appropriate levels of personnel to support workforce practices that put students first and that are economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable for the College and its employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue integrating planning with resource allocation/redirection by considering budget constraints and enrollment and aligned with the college mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Establish transparent and consistent practices for determining how replacement positions are prioritized.