

**Official Minutes**  
CCSF Academic Senate Executive Council  
**Wednesday, May 16, 2012, 2:30 – 5:00 pm**  
Ocean Campus, Art 218

**2011-12 Council Members Present:** Jacques Arceneaux, Anna Asebedo, Thomas Blair, Monica Bosson, Steven Brown, Robert Clark, Venette Cook, Anthony Costa, Erin Cunningham, Beth Ericson, Lancelot Kao, Stephan Johnson, Benedict Lim, Suzanne Lo, Susan Lopez, Enrique Mireles, Kitty Moriwaki, Francine Podenski, Indiana Quadra, Maria Rosales-Uribe, Karen Saginor, Louis Schubert, Fred Teti, Diana Verdugo, Melinda Weil

**2011-12 Council Members Absent:** Madeline Mueller, Kovak Williamson, Kim Wise

**2012-13 Council Members Present:** Jacques Arceneaux, Anna Asebedo, Thomas Blair, Monica Bosson, Robert Clark, Venette Cook, Anthony Costa, Erin Cunningham, Beth Ericson, Vivian Ikeda, Lancelot Kao, Stephan Johnson, Benedict Lim, Suzanne Lo, Enrique Mireles, Kitty Moriwaki, Suzanne Pugh, Francine Podenski, Carol Reitan, Lisa Romano, Karen Saginor, Louis Schubert, Diana Verdugo, Maria del Rosario Villasana, Ellen Wall, Melinda Weil

**2012-13 Council Members Absent:** Madeline Mueller, Kovak Williamson

**Other Senate Members Present:** Alan D’Souza, Cynthia Dewar, Kimberly Keenan, William McGuire, Charles Metzler, Alexandra Nickliss, Andrea Niosi, Miné Ternar, Katryn Weise

**Guests:** Jeffrey Fang, Katie Gelardi

**I. Call to Order**

The Academic Senate Executive Council came to order at 2:36.

**II. Adoption of Agenda**

Council adopted the agenda.

**III. Approval of Minutes: May 4, 2012**

Council approved the minutes as corrected.

**IV. Public Comment**

- Council members reported that the May 12 conference “Keep the Community in Community College” had presented useful workshops and was well attended.
- Council members encouraged all faculty to attend the May 22 AFT/COPE–sponsored meeting at which Board of Trustees candidates would be available to answer questions.

**V. Officers’ Reports**

President Saginor reported that:

- She attended the Administration Oversight meeting on May 3<sup>rd</sup>. She expected an additional meeting to be scheduled in order to review three administrator's evaluations not presented at the May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.
- She spoke about issues concerning the Student "Success" Act of 2012 and repeatability on a radio show, Air Talk, on May 8<sup>th</sup>. She was presenting a counterpoint to Barry Russell from State Chancellor's Office.
- The Faculty Association Retirement event was wonderful. The Executive Council will send certificates to retirees, administrators and staff in the summer to thank them for their service.
- She announced and encouraged faculty to attend various upcoming and important meetings and end-of-the year events, including the May 24<sup>th</sup> Board of Trustees meeting, at which the preliminary 2012-13 budget would be presented.

1<sup>st</sup> VP Fred Teti reported that:

- Faculty members Trinh Tran, Simon Hansen, and Carolyn Toebe deserved commendation for organizing the Faculty Association Retirement event.
- He regretted stepping down from service as the 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President since he expected the incoming Executive Council would have a collegial and productive coming year.

2<sup>nd</sup> VP Steven Brown reported that:

- He felt pleased to have served as 2<sup>nd</sup> VP with the Executive Council, had positive expectations for the interim Chancellor, and concluded with high commendations for the work of President Karen Saginor.

**VI. Committee Appointments:** The Council discussed the need to clarify special assignments and resource appointments in the coming academic year.

**Resolution 2012.05.16.01 Limited and Unlimited Committee Appointments**

Resolved, that the Academic Senate Executive Council approve the appointments to the Shared Governance committees with limited and unlimited membership, as recommended by the Committee on Committees.

Moved: Blair; Seconded: Brown; MCU Appendix A

**VII. Unfinished Business**

- A. **Policy Blueprint: Faculty Recruitment and Selection:** Saginor presented a sixteen page memo which identified three areas of concern regarding the April 26<sup>th</sup> Resolution by Board of Trustees regarding the Policy Blueprint. Council members discussed the memo, which identifies for the interim Chancellor and the Board 1) Blueprint strategies that misrepresent current policies and procedures; 2) Blueprint strategies that conflict with current policies and practice; and 3) Blueprint strategies for changes that are consistent with current policies and procedures.

**Resolution 2012.05.16.02 Policy Blueprint: Faculty Recruitment and Selection:**

Resolved, that the Executive Council of the Academic Senate endorse the Memo, *Faculty Hiring Policies/Procedures and the Blueprint*, with changes.

Moved: Podenski; Seconded: Teti; MCU Appendix B

B. Report on Academic Senate Executive Council Work

**Resolution 2012.05.16.03 Report on Academic Senate Executive Council Work**

Resolved, that the Executive Council of the Academic Senate approve the Report on Academic Senate Executive Council Work of 2011-12 as written by Karen Saginor.

Moved: Blair; Seconded; Brown; MCU Appendix C

**VIII. New Business**

**A. Curriculum Issues:** Saginor reviewed the history of the relationship between the Curriculum Committee and the Council. Melinda Weil presented some details about the Curriculum Committee report and invited faculty to join the Curriculum Committee.

**Resolution 2012.05.16.04 Curriculum Issues**

Resolved, that the Executive Council of the Academic Senate approve the Curriculum Committee document, which approved 28 new courses, 4 new distance education addenda, and 10 new certificate programs.

Moved: Blair; Seconded: Brown; MCU Appendix D

**B. Student Learning Outcomes:** Committee members of the Ad Hoc SLO Committee presented information about their work on college-wide Student Learning Outcomes; they also presented suggestions for ways to share SLO information with faculty and students online. The committee will continue work in Fall 2012.

**Resolution 2012.05.16.05 Student Learning Outcome**

**Resolved**, that the Executive Council of the Academic Senate approve the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Student Learning Outcomes Committee that:

The SLO website be improved and turned into a single portal directing access to SLO work throughout the college; and that

Department student learning outcome information be made available on the college website and be updated periodically.

Moved; Brown; Seconded: Podenski; MC

**C. TLTR/Academic Policies Recommendation against Opt-Out policy for CCSF Gmail:** Cynthia Dewar described concerns about ineffective email communication with students. This confusion is largely due to unclear language that students read online about the opt-out option for CCSF gmail. Council members discussed concerns about successful gmail or other email communication with students who may have limited online access.

**Resolution 2012.05.16.06 Recommendation Against Opt-Out Option Policy for CCSF Gmail**

Whereas, The CCSF Board of Trustees contracted with Google to use Google applications for Higher Education as the host for all email services for CCSF students,

Whereas, two years into the use of Google mail, Faculty, Staff, and Administration continue to experience significant problems communicating effectively with students, and

Whereas, the College's opt-out policy for student CCSF mail underlies many of these problems, be it therefore

Resolved, that the Executive Council of the Academic Senate urge the District to revisit the decision that led to creating the opt-out policy for CCSF mail, and request a new, public, written legal opinion from District Counsel.

Moved: Teti; Seconded: Bosson; MCU

**D. Resolution of Support for Noncredit:** Lopez presented reasons for the Council to support Noncredit programs, faculty and students with a public endorsement. Council members presented concerns about the stated reasons and limited College resources. Lopez withdrew the resolution.

**E. Letter by English Department faculty member Paolo Sapienza concerning Board meeting of April 26th, 2012.** Council members discussed their concerns about having more positive, effective Shared Governance dialog with Board members, especially when controversial issues are to be decided.

**Resolution 2012.05.16.07 Letter by English Department faculty member Paolo Sapienza concerning Board meeting of April 26th, 2012.**

Resolved that the Executive Council of the Academic Senate support Paolo Sapienza in his concerns as discussed in his letter to the Board of Trustees of City College of San Francisco.

Moved: Schubert; Seconded: Brown. MCU Appendix E

**F. Recognition of Executive Council members who are completing their service.** Outgoing and returning Council members were acknowledged for their service.

## **IX. Special Order of Business**

**A. Seating of 2012-2013 Executive Council Members** New Council members were seated.

**B. Election of Senate Officers** – The election officers were commended by the Executive Council. Antonio Trink, Academic Senate Administrative Assistant, was also acknowledged for his service. Senate Officers were elected by acclamation:

- President, Karen Saginor
- First Vice-President, Venette Cook
- Second Vice-President, Kitty Moriwaki
- Secretary, Jacques Arceneaux

## **X. New Business of the 2012-13 Executive Council**

**A. Approval of the Meeting Schedule on Academic Senate Executive Council Work 2011-2012.** The Council approved the meeting schedule for the coming year and approved that the Officers finalize meeting locations at different campuses.

**B. Approval of the Date for Fall Senate Retreat:** The Council approved August 29, 2012, 3:00-7:00 pm and suggested that Council call this meeting an Orientation.

## **XI. Committee Reports**

- Teti reported about Academic Policies decisions that will be presented to Council in the Fall 2012 semester.

## **XII. Open Forum**

- The Council commended Student Trustee Jeffrey Fang for his work.
- Katie Gelardi thanked the Council for supporting the event, “Keep the Community in Community Colleges.”
- Saginor thanked Katie Gelardi for photographing the Executive Council and many other CCSF events.

## **XIII. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:47

Venette Cook, Academic Senate Secretary

## Appendix A: Limited and Unlimited Committee Appointments – May 16, 2012

<b>Name of Committee</b>	<b>C/N</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Status</b>
College Planning and Budgeting Council	c	Kathleen White	Child Development/Family Services	New Application
Distance Learning Advisory	c	Cynthia Dewar (Resource)	Special Assignment	Reappointment
Facilities Projects	c	Katryn Wiese	Earth Sciences	Reappointment
Matriculation Advisory	c	John Watson	Counseling Services	Reappointment
Noncredit Issues	c	Maral Good	Disabled Students Program/Service	Reappointment
Noncredit Issues	c	Jeannie Spingola-Connolly	Counseling Services	Reappointment
Publications Advisory	c	Shannon Nixon	Biological Sciences	New Application
Scholarship	c	Matthew Holsten	English as a Second Language	Reappointment
Scholarship	c	Loan Huynh	Counseling Services (APASS)	Reappointment
Student Learning Outcomes	c	Mine Ternar	Art	New Application

## **Appendix B: Memo: Faculty Hiring Policies/Procedures and the Blueprint**

TO: Chancellor Fisher

CC: Gohar Momjian, Clara Starr, Leilani Battiste, members of the Faculty EEO Blueprint Workgroup (Lisa Daniels, Lynda Hirose, Lindy McKnight, Edgar Torres, Jessica Williams, Kovak Williamson), Veronica Hunnicutt, Lidia Jenkins, Monika Liu, Roland Montemayor, Lisa Romano, Samuel Santos, Minh Hoa Ta, Edgar Torres, members of the Academic Senate Executive Council, members of the Equivalency Committee, members of the Board of Trustees, members of the College Diversity Committee

FROM: Karen Saginor

DATE: May 17, 2012

SUBJECT: Faculty Hiring Policies/Procedures and the Blueprint

### **Purpose of this memo**

The Blueprint of College-Wide Policy and Implementation Strategy for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Hiring was published to the City College community in mid April. Unfortunately, the document contained errors in both data and other content, leading in some cases to inaccurate analysis. On April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2012, the Board of Trustees removed the word 'policy' from the title and designated it as a working document rather than a final draft. In adopting the document, the Board of Trustees directed the Chancellor and/or designees to begin implementation of its strategies without resolving which strategies included in the Blueprint would be subject to the California Education Code requirement that faculty hiring policy and procedures be developed and agreed upon jointly by the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. This memo provides guidance from the Academic Senate on:

- Blueprint strategies that misrepresent current policies and procedures.
- Blueprint strategies that conflict with current policies and procedures;
- Blueprint strategies for changes that are consistent with current policies and procedures;

The preparation of this memo is one step of several that are being undertaken by the Executive Council of the Academic Senate to improve equal opportunity in faculty recruitment and hiring. Further steps will include:

- Participation in both the Faculty EEO Blueprint Administrative Implementation Task Force Workgroup and in the Faculty EEO Blueprint Departments & Schools Implementation Task Force Workgroup

- Contribute towards improving the data and analysis sections of the Blueprint.
- Investigation into complaints of non-compliance with current policies
- Development of best practice recommendations for departments and for search committees
- Development of draft revisions to faculty hiring policies for joint consideration by Academic Senate Executive Council and the Board of Trustees
- Support for improvements in materials for orientation of participants in faculty search committees

Please find References for this memo online:

Excerpts from California Education Code concerning Faculty Hiring.

<http://tinyurl.com/6woplvb>

CCSF's Faculty Hiring document <http://tinyurl.com/7fd7pxn>

### **Blueprint strategies that misrepresent current policies and procedures.**

This section identifies two practices that the Blueprint alleges to be part of the current policies and/or common occurrences. Neither one is current practice or part of the current procedure. This section also identifies three practices that the Blueprint proposes as new practices although these are already part of standard procedures for faculty hiring.

**p. 18** within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Application and Documentation Process.

**Equivalency Committee Training.** The administration will work to ensure that within ten working days after the close of the application the Human Resources Office forwards to the Equivalency Committee and the committee responds to the files of those applicants who claim to have the equivalent of the minimum qualifications listed on the job announcement. ... The college will cease the existing practice which deems the CSU Master's degree the benchmark against which all equivalency applicants are considered.

**p. 24** within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Three: Equivalency

- *Adjustments to the Equivalency Committee* ... The College Equivalency Committee should ... change the current practice which makes a CSU Master's degree the bench mark against which all equivalency applicants are considered.

**Using the CSU Master's degree is not the bench mark against which equivalency applicants are considered. The applicant chooses the degree program to be used for comparison. The applicant may choose a program from any accredited institution in the United States.**



p. 19 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors.

**Diversity of Search Committees and Equal Opportunity.** Current college policy states that it is recommended that Selection Committees reflect the diversity of the student population, the work force, and the groups named in the non-discrimination statement. ... The commonly used practice of “double counting” will be eliminated, such that no one member of the search committee can be counted for more than one protected category.

**“Double counting” is not a commonly used practice. It is strictly forbidden under current policies and procedures. Human Resources personnel examine the composition of each search committee for compliance with current policy. Records are kept on the composition of each search committee. Any incidence of “double counting” or other non-compliance with policies for the composition of the search committee should be reported to the President of the Academic Senate for investigation.**

p. 4 within Policy Blueprint. Application and Documentation Process.

- *Simplifying Application Procedure – Letters of Recommendation & Transcripts* – Letters of Recommendation will no longer be required of applicants for faculty positions. CCSF will officially adopt a policy that unofficial transcripts and photocopies/scans of official transcripts may be accepted and official transcripts required only of those candidates who are offered the position.

p. 17 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Application and Documentation Process.

**Simplifying Application Procedure – Transcripts.** CCSF will officially adopt the administrative policy that unofficial transcripts and photocopies/scans of official transcripts may be accepted and official transcripts will be required only of those candidates who are offered the position.

p. 24 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Two: The Application

- *Simplify Transcript Requirement* – Many community college Human Resources departments do not request official transcripts at the time of application, but request unofficial transcripts be sent. Official transcripts are only requested later by those candidates who make it to final interviews. Such a rule change would help to avoid any candidates being disqualified because of Registrar’s Office delays at candidates’ alma maters.

**The Blueprint implies that the acceptance of unofficial transcripts with the initial application is not the current procedure and states that this would be a change in practice. As can be confirmed by Human Resources, it is already the practice that unofficial transcripts are accepted with the application. Official transcripts are required only at a later stage, before an applicant is hired.**

p. 4 within Policy Blueprint. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors

- *Augmentation of Faculty Hiring Orientation* - The hiring committee training shall be enhanced to include two new faculty diversity segments on the following topics: current state and national regulations and responsibilities regarding diversity in hiring; ...

p. 18 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors.

**Augmentation of Faculty Hiring Orientation.** The hiring committee training, which is currently mandatory for all hiring committees, shall be enhanced to include two new faculty diversity segments on the following topics: current state and national regulations and responsibilities regarding diversity in hiring; ...

p. 25 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Four: Selection Committees & Vice Chancellors

- *Enhance Selection Committee Training* – Enhance the Selection Committee Orientation to include information about Equal Employment Opportunity Law in California and US, similar to the presentation made by Sheila O'Rourke from UCOP. The Selection Manual should also be updated with this information.

**It is the current practice for training to include a segment on current state and national regulation. The Blueprint implies that this would be a change.**

p. 4 within Policy Blueprint. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors

- *Mandatory Scoring of the Diversity Statement* -The diversity statement, which is a mandatory component of every application for a faculty position, shall be a scored component of the paper screening process in all faculty hiring committees.

p. 19 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors.

**Mandatory Scoring of the Diversity Statement.** The diversity statement, which is a mandatory component of every application for a faculty position, shall be a scored component of the paper screening process in all faculty hiring committees.

p. 25 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Four: Selection Committees & Vice Chancellors

- *Scoring Diversity Statement* – The diversity statement, as a mandatory component of all applications for faculty positions, must be a scored component of the application.

**Human Resources can confirm that this is the current procedure. All components of paper screening must be assigned numerical scores. This will not be a change to current procedures.**

**Blueprint strategies that conflict with current policies and procedures;**

This section identifies recommendations that would require the concurrence of the Academic Senate because they would significantly alter current policies or procedures. The Academic Senate intends to follow up either with proposals for new policies that could receive mutual agreement with the Board or with administrative adjustments to address difficulties identified by the Blueprint.

p. 4 within Policy Blueprint. Outreach and Recruitment

- Outreach & Faculty Position Allocation Process - New requests submitted to the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) shall include a "Diversity Self-Study and Outreach Plan". In this plan, departments will submit detailed information on the department's diversity outreach and recruitment plan for the position requested, and (when applicable) an analysis of past outreach and outcomes (i.e. analyzing changing trends in the Screening Report data released by Human Resources).

p. 16 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Outreach and Recruitment.

**Outreach & Faculty Position Allocation Process.** New requests submitted to the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) shall include a "Diversity Self-Study and Outreach Plan". In this plan, departments will be requested to submit information to FPAC analyzing current data on diversity in the department (provided by Human Resources), detailed information on the department's diversity outreach and recruitment plan for the position requested, and (when applicable) an analysis of past outreach and outcomes (i.e. analyzing changing trends in the Screening Report data released by Human Resources). ... The quality of this plan will be considered, among other factors, in faculty position allocation. Departments will be given a model plan template that they may use to assist in developing their individual plans. Deans will be required to communicate the importance of outreach and recruitment to chairs, give feedback on the adequacy of departmental outreach plans, and report back to administration on the progress their departments have made on issues of faculty diversity.

p. 23 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage One: Position Allocation

- Adjustments in New Faculty Position Requests with FPAC -Adjust New Faculty Position Requests such that Departments should demonstrate they have determined a robust strategy for faculty diversity outreach and recruitment. Such outreach plan would be considered, along with other factors, in determining Faculty position allocation recommendations by FPAC to CPBC. Departments should be provided with a template or model plan in order to assist in ensuring outreach strategies are of a high quality, including a rubric for inserting the department's most recent HR data.

**Making this change would require mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. The current faculty hiring agreement calls for departments to “submit a request, accompanied by a justification, for any new or replacement positions needed...” (p.2). The current faculty hiring agreement specifies that these requests are considered by the committee (now called the Faculty Position Allocation Committee) which must agree to the request before it may be announced. In requiring material additional to the justification for the position, this strategy would significantly alter current policies and procedures.**

p. 16 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Outreach and Recruitment.

**Outreach & Faculty Position Allocation Process.** ... Furthermore, if the department seeks to limit recruiting by setting minimum qualifications higher than those set by the state, the department will be requested to justify this decision and analyze the affect this requirement could have on limiting potential candidates.

**Making this change would require mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. The current faculty hiring agreement states, “The Search Committee will develop the Job Announcement. Under the section titled “Minimum Qualifications: (required)”, the minimum qualifications agreed to by the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees will be listed ... The minimum qualifications adopted may be higher, but may not be lower, than those mandated by the State. When local academic qualifications exceed those of the State, only the local Minimum Qualifications shall be listed. Any specific qualifications that will be considered must be included in the job announcement. (p.3) This recommendation would significantly alter current policies and procedures.**

p. 4 within Policy Blueprint. Application and Documentation Process

- Simplifying Application Procedure – Letters of Recommendation & Transcripts – Letters of Recommendation will no longer be required of applicants for faculty positions. ...

p. 17 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Application and Documentation Process.

**Simplifying Application Procedure – Letters of Recommendation.** Letters of Recommendation will no longer be required of applicants for faculty positions.

p. 24 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Two: The Application

- Simplify Letter of Recommendation Requirement –the HR Department has reported that many applicants do not make it to Selection Committees because applicant recommenders fail to send in Letters of Recommendation on time. The College should implement a new rule such that no applicant with at least one Letter of Recommendation on file is disqualified from being sent to Selection Committees. ...

**Under current procedures and practices, the department and search committee determine whether letters of recommendation will be required and, if so, how many letters. The Blueprint has conflicting recommendations in this area. If no letters are required, they cannot be solicited as optional. Job announcements may not be used to solicit materials that will not be scored. Changing current practice to one that imposed the same requirement for letters of recommendation on all job searches would require mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. It is recommended instead that search committees be fully advised of their options for setting requirements, and that candidates be informed when letters are missing and of permissible alternatives, such as recommendations from students rather than colleagues.**

p. 18 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Application and Documentation Process.

**FPAC and Applicant Instructions.** The FPAC application for departments will include a section which asks departments to offer detailed instructions on what they are looking for on the paper application. Special attention will be given to clearing up any potential confusion about what is required of applicants in cover letters, teaching philosophies, model assignments, etc. The clarity of this explanation will be considered in the position allocation process.

**Making this change would require mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. In the current procedure, the job announcement is not written until after the position has been approved by FPAC and funded by the College's Planning and Budgeting Council. This recommendation would require FPAC to approve the position a second time, based on the text of the job announcement. This recommendation would significantly alter current policies and procedures.**

p. 18 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Application and Documentation Process.

**Equivalency Committee Training.** ... The Equivalency Committee members will serve a maximum of two consecutive terms. The Equivalency Committee will receive annual training on interdisciplines and changing trends in graduate level courses, including deciphering transcripts. ...

p. 24 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Three: Equivalency

- Adjustments to the Equivalency Committee - As is college policy, the voting members of the Equivalency Committee must be changed every 2 years. The College should uphold this policy. The College Equivalency Committee should receive training on the importance of interdisciplines and the complexity of transcript reading in Master's and PhD level programs today, and should change the current practice which makes a CSU Master's degree the bench mark against which all equivalency applicants are considered.

**Making this change would require mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. It is not college policy that the members of this committee or of shared governance committees be changed every two years. The current faculty hiring agreement states, "The Equivalency Committee will have three (3) members chosen by the Academic Senate for three-year terms, with a maximum of two (2) consecutive terms. After a faculty member has served as an Academic Senate appointee on this committee, he/she may not serve as a standing member for six (6) years." (p.5) Further, the expertise of deciphering transcripts is supplied by "two (2) members of the department/discipline which is doing the hiring and an invited administrator ....The five (5) faculty members [three standing members and two discipline faculty] shall form the voting body of the committee."(p.5) Changing the composition or determination methods of the Equivalency Committee would significantly alter current policies and procedures. As is noted elsewhere, the current practice does not make "a CSU Master's degree the bench mark against which all equivalency applicants are considered."**

p. 20 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Administrative.

**Role of the Affirmative Action Officer & Monitors.** The role of the College's Affirmative Action Officer shall be reinvigorated ... especially ... as it relates to the rotation of faculty on hiring committees, especially in large departments. ....

p. 24 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Four: Selection Committees & Vice Chancellors

- *Role of the Affirmative Action Officer & Monitors* – Chancellor should revisit the role of the Affirmative Action Officer ... especially ... as it relates to the rotation of faculty on hiring committees, especially in large departments. ...

**Making this change would require mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. The current faculty hiring agreement states,** “Each department shall develop regular, democratic procedures for forming Search Committees. Upon notification of approval of a position the Department Chair will follow this established procedure to form a Search Committee (monitored by Academic Senate).” (p.2) **It is the responsibility of the Academic Senate and its officers to make inquiries into the rotation of faculty on hiring committees. This recommendation would significantly alter current policies and procedures.**

### **Blueprint strategies for changes that are consistent with current policies and procedures;**

This section identifies practices recommended by the Blueprint that can be implemented without changing current policies and procedures. The current faculty hiring agreement for faculty hiring is City College of San Francisco Faculty Hiring Procedures, jointly agreed to by representatives of the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees and adopted by the Board of Trustees in accordance with relevant sections of the California Code of Education and Title 5. It is available on the web at:

[http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic\\_senate/faculty\\_hiring.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/faculty_hiring.pdf)

The items in this section are arranged in the order in which they occur on pp. 16-21

p. 16 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Outreach and Recruitment.

**Human Resources Division Outreach.** The Human Resources (HR) Department will include a question in the paper application asking where candidates learned of the job announcement in order to provide analysis of current diversity recruiting practices. After collecting such data for 2-4 semesters HR will devise and implement a diversity outreach and recruitment plan for future positions.

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement. Human Resources can confirm that the online application already includes a question asking applicants how they heard**

**about employment opportunities with City College. Human Resources may need research support and resources to collate and analyze the data collected through the job applications.**

**p. 4** within Policy Blueprint. Outreach and Recruitment.

- Developing School Linkages for Diversity Recruiting - Schools will be requested to maintain lasting linkages with discipline-specific professional organizations and local (and national, if desired) colleges offering graduate level degrees in school disciplines.

**p. 17** within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Outreach and Recruitment.

**Developing School Linkages for Diversity Recruiting.** Schools will be requested to maintain lasting linkages with discipline-specific professional organizations and local (and national, if desired) colleges offering graduate level degrees in school disciplines. Schools will, at minimum, maintain an open line of communication with local departments and graduate diversity coordinators at local universities. Some examples of effective communication with local assets for faculty diversity include speaking with department chairs or graduate advisors at local universities and letting them know that the CCSF vision values a diverse professorate; passing on job announcements for positions to graduate advisors; speaking with local Masters and Doctoral candidates on campus about CCSF as a potential career choice; speaking with university-wide graduate diversity coordinators about faculty positions that become available at the college. Deans will be held accountable for their success in developing these linkages, and overall progress in faculty diversity in their respective departments, in their evaluations and in program review. .

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement, c.f. p. 4, “Departments are encouraged to recruit candidates and will receive copies of the job announcement for distribution.” Depending on the discipline, maintaining linkages with professional organizations and graduate schools might work better on a department level (i.e. Art), than at the level of the school (i.e. Liberal Arts). Falling outside the scope of the current faculty hiring agreement are questions that may arise concerning workload issues depending on whether such links are encouraged or required and on whether they are implemented at the School level or at the Department level, and the work it takes to establish and maintain links.**

**p. 17** within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Outreach and Recruitment.

**Faculty Diversity Web Site.** In order to assist departments and schools in their outreach and recruitment efforts, the Faculty Diversity Internships Coordinator will create a web site which focuses on faculty diversity. This web site would profile some of our diverse faculty and highlight some of the advantages of working at CCSF (i.e. the benefits of working with our diverse students, living in the multicultural Bay Area, advising student clubs). This web site would be a link from the HR web site and from the Faculty Diversity Internship Program web site (and other School and department sites, as well).

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement.**

p. 17 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Application and Documentation Process.

**Reminder Email out to Applicants.** Applicants to faculty positions at CCSF will be sent a reminder email 5-7 days before the application deadline reminding them that they can check the status of their application online and reminding them to look closely to see if their letter of recommendation is on file.

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement. This has been a practice of Human Resources when staff time is available. Human Resources is currently working towards an automated reminder that would not be dependent on staff time.**

p. 18 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Application and Documentation Process.

**Application Assistance Video on Human Resources Web Site.** CCSF will develop a You Tube video which is a step-by-step tutorial on how to apply for faculty positions. This video will be posted prominently on the Human Resources web site. This video will be updated anytime any changes are made to the application process.

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement. This has been a goal of Human Resources.**

p. 18 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Application and Documentation Process.

**Boilerplate Language.** The College will expand boilerplate language in job announcements to include new language that is more encouraging for diverse candidates.

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement.**

p. 18 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Application and Documentation Process.

**Equivalency Committee Training.** The administration will work to ensure that within ten working days after the close of the application the Human Resources Office forwards to the Equivalency Committee and the committee responds to the files of those applicants who claim to have the equivalent of the minimum qualifications listed on the job announcement...

**The current faculty hiring agreement states on p. 4** “Within five (5) working days after the close of application, the Personnel Office will forward to the Equivalency Committee the files of those applicants who claim to have the equivalent of the minimum qualifications listed on the job announcement. Within five (5) working days, the Equivalency Committee will decide on these claims and return all files to the Personnel Office with a report on each file indicating whether the applicant does or does not have qualifications equivalent to the minimum qualifications stated on the job announcement.” **It is challenging for the faculty from the department, the administrator and the faculty of the Equivalency Committee to coordinate their work together in such a**



**tight timeframe. Nonetheless, equivalency processes are completed expeditiously, most within the specified number of days.**

**p. 4** within Policy Blueprint. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors

- *Augmentation of Faculty Hiring Orientation* - The hiring committee training shall be enhanced to include two new faculty diversity segments on the following topics: ... evaluating diverse candidates and guarding against unconscious bias.

**p. 18** within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors.

**Augmentation of Faculty Hiring Orientation.** The hiring committee training, which is currently mandatory for all hiring committees, shall be enhanced to include two new faculty diversity segments on the following topics: ... evaluating diverse candidates and guarding against unconscious bias. This training shall be adapted from trainings currently offered at Bay Area colleges and universities, especially the University of California at Berkeley and shall be delivered by faculty or other staff, as designated by the District. These additions shall be included in the Selection Committee Orientation handbook.

**This part is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement.** “All members [of search committees] must be provided training and orientation in: ... b) fair employment practices and procedures, c) equal opportunity and non-discrimination.” (p.1) **The current faculty hiring agreement anticipates that responsibility for this function shall be supplied by or monitored by the Affirmative Action Officer (now Title 5/EEO Compliance Officer).**

**p. 19** within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors.

**Infusing Diversity into Job Descriptions.** The district will develop a handout of best practices for infusing aptitude and acumen with diverse students and diverse curriculum throughout job announcements, and not relegate this issue to one isolated portion of the required skills for the job. This information should be given to all members of selection committee before finalizing job announcements.

**p. 24** within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Four: Selection Committees & Vice Chancellors

- *Infusing Diversity into Job Descriptions* – the CCSF Administration should develop a handout of best practices for infusing aptitude and acumen with diverse students and diverse curriculum throughout job announcements, and not relegate this issue to one isolated portion of the required skills for the job. This information should be given to all members of selection committees before finalizing job announcements.

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement. A convenient point for monitoring whether this has been appropriately done might be the review of the job announcement provided by the Academic Senate President before it is posted.**

p. 4 within Policy Blueprint. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors

- Mandatory Scoring of the Diversity Statement - ... The District shall provide a guide on best practices for evaluating the diversity statement to faculty screening committees.

p. 18 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors.

**Mandatory Scoring of the Diversity Statement.** ... The District shall provide a guide on best practices for evaluating the diversity statement to faculty screening committees.

p. 25 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Four: Selection Committees & Vice Chancellors

- Scoring Diversity Statement - ... Human Resources should provide departments a model scoring rubric.

**This part is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement.**

p. 19 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Policies and Practices of Selection Committees and Vice Chancellors.

**Training for Vice Chancellors.** Vice Chancellors who have selection designee capacity should be given a biannual administrative training by the Chancellor on hiring, which must include an analysis of the most recent Human Resources data report and a thorough discussion of the college's vision for faculty diversity.

p. 25 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Four: Selection Committees & Vice Chancellors

- Training for Vice Chancellors - Vice Chancellors who have selection designee capacity should be given an administrative training once every 4 to 6 semesters by the Chancellor on hiring, which must include a review of the most recent faculty hiring HR report and information on the college's vision and goals for faculty diversity.

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement. The two sections of the Blueprint show slight differences in whether the training should be once every two years or once every three years.**

p. 4 within Policy Blueprint. Internships and Mentoring

- Sustain & Increase Faculty Diversity Internships - The College should sustain the College's commitment to the Faculty Diversity Internship program, and increase the number of internships, which have a track record of being an extremely effective (and very low cost) method of increasing faculty diversity on campus.

p. 18 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Internships and Mentoring.

**Sustain & Increase Faculty Diversity Internships.** The College should sustain the College's commitment to the Faculty Diversity Internship program, and increase the number of internships, which have a track record of being an extremely effective (and very low cost) method of increasing faculty diversity on campus.

p. 25 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Five: Ongoing Commitment

- *Sustain & Increase Faculty Diversity Internships* – The College should sustain the College’s commitment to the Faculty Diversity Internship program, and increase the number of internships, which have a track record of being an extremely effective (and very low cost) method of increasing faculty diversity on campus.

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement. A report establishing the track record for the Faculty Diversity Internship program and the Grow Your Own program is needed.**

p. 19 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Internships and Mentoring.

**“Diversify the Discipline” Faculty-Student Mentoring Program.** City College of San Francisco, with its highly diverse student body, will take first steps towards helping to diversify the pools of qualified applicants for higher education faculty by instituting the "Diversify the Discipline" program. ... Mentor training, mentee networking and other professional development opportunities would be made available to faculty and students as part of this program.

**The proposed program falls outside the scope of the faculty hiring agreement. It is suggested that this promising proposal receive review through shared governance.**

p. 5 within Policy Blueprint. Administrative

- *Faculty Diversity Self-Study & Report on Initiatives (each semester)* - The Chancellor will begin issuing a report and analysis each semester on the status of faculty diversity at CCSF. This report will be comprehensive in nature and will include information on the following topics (across demographic groups such as race, sexual orientation, veteran status, gender, etc.).

p. 20 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Administrative.

**Faculty Diversity Self-Study & Report on Initiatives (each semester).** The Chancellor will begin issuing a report and analysis each semester on the status of faculty diversity at CCSF. This report will be comprehensive in nature and will include information on the following topics (across demographic groups such as race, sexual orientation, veteran status, gender, etc.): Full-time and part-time faculty hires across departments; ... Detailed evaluation of the impact that the blueprint initiatives have had in increasing faculty diversity at the college

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement. Currently Human Resources prepares such a report annually, although some of the information, such as veteran status, is not disaggregated by demographic groups. Since most full time faculty hiring occurs on a timetable for new faculty to start in the fall semester and very little hiring of any kind can be done under the current fiscal restraints, it is questionable whether the benefits of two reports per year would be worth the costs in staff time at this point. It is not clear whether the information collected would be sufficient to perform all the types of analysis desired.**

p. 20 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Administrative.

**Vision, Annual Plan and Strategic Plan.** The College will work to better incorporate a commitment to increasing faculty diversity in our vision and planning documents and place these issues as a central piece of the portfolio of the Office of the Chancellor.

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement.**

p. 20 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Administrative.

**Orientation for New Hires.** CCSF will offer an informal faculty diversity orientation for new hires so that diverse faculty may be able to break the ice in their new position with peers.

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement.**

p. 5 within Policy Blueprint. Administrative

- *Faculty Diversity Position* - Create a partial release faculty position or repurposed Human Resources position to coordinate the college's myriad faculty diversity efforts (i.e. outreach, recruitment, application assistance, etc.) and serve as a key contact person for candidates interested in a career at CCSF.

p. 20 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Administrative.

**Faculty Diversity Position.** Create a partial release faculty position or repurposed Human Resources position to coordinate the college's myriad faculty diversity efforts (i.e. outreach, recruitment, application assistance, etc.) and serve as a key contact person for candidates interested in a career at CCSF.

p. 25 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Five: Ongoing Commitment

- *Faculty Diversity Coordinator position* - CCSF should create a faculty diversity coordinator partial release position to coordinate the college's myriad faculty diversity efforts (i.e. outreach, recruitment, internships, etc.) and serve as a key contact person for candidates interested in a career at CCSF or has questions about the application process. . If funds are not currently available the administration should secure grant funding for the position.

**Depending on the specific duties attached to this position, it appears to consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement. Although the faculty hiring agreement anticipates that functions such as outreach and recruitment will be handled by the Personnel Office (now Human Resources) and the Affirmative Action Office (now Title 5/EEO Compliance), the administration has responsibility for assigning such duties.**

p. 20 within Blueprint for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection. Administrative.

**Role of the Affirmative Action Officer & Monitors.** The role of the College's Affirmative Action Officer shall be reinvigorated in order to ensure faculty diversity on selection committees, especially as it relates to racial, ethnic, gender, LGBT, Disabled and Veteran diversity ... The Affirmative Action Office shall revamp Affirmative Action Monitor trainings to include more information on our vision and mission for faculty diversity and hold new trainings for college community members to become certified as monitors.

p. 24 within Memo from Chancellor Griffin. Stage Four: Selection Committees & Vice Chancellors

- *Role of the Affirmative Action Officer & Monitors - Chancellor should revisit the role of the Affirmative Action Officer in ensuring faculty diversity on selection committees, especially as it relates to racial, ethnic, gender, LGBT, Disabled and Veteran diversity ... The Affirmative Action Office should also revamp Affirmative Action Monitor trainings to include more information on our vision and mission for faculty diversity and hold new trainings for college community members to become certified as monitors.*

**This is consistent with the current faculty hiring agreement. The Affirmative Action Officer, now called the Title 5/EEO Compliance Officer, is an administrator and as such, receives direction from the administration. The Officers of the Academic Senate have been requesting that the Chancellor provide additional EEO Compliance monitors for more than a year. New monitors have been trained recently.**

## Appendix C: Report on Academic Senate Executive Council Work 2011-12

### Academic Senate Executive Council - Report on the Year 2011-12 - May 16th, 2012 -

As the academic year 2011-12 draws towards a close, it seems suitable to take a moment to celebrate the productivity and dedication of the members of the Academic Senate Executive Council. Since August, Council members have reviewed and edited essential documents, researched the implications of many issues, written and debated resolutions, attentively participated in arduous meetings, and provided City College with well-considered recommendations on numerous academic and professional matters in fulfillment of the responsibilities enjoined upon community college academic senates by Title 5. Because the year is not quite over and there are still many tasks to be finished, this report will be brief, providing only summary lists and notes without explanatory detail.

#### **By the numbers:** -

**21 meetings** as follows: 2 Plenary meetings, 1 Retreat, 2 Bipartite meetings, 16 regular Council meetings, and 1 special meeting -- approximately 48 hours of meetings.

**60 resolutions** approved through May 2nd

**212 appointments and reappointments of faculty** to serve as voting or resource members to Shared Governance Councils, Committees, and Subcommittees through May 2nd

#### **Review of and revisions suggested for college-wide documents**

- 2011-12 Annual Plan
- 2012-13 Annual Plan
- Annual Program Review templates
- Institutional Self Study Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation.
- Educational Master Plan (preliminary input only)
- Program Discontinuance Policy
- Shared Governance Evaluation Report
- Strategic Plan, 2011-16

#### **Recommendations regarding policies and academic matters**

Building on the work of the Academic Policies Committee, the Student Preparation and Success Committees, and the Curriculum Committee, the Executive Council made recommendations in the following areas:

- Registration priorities changes for Puente program students and Gateway program students,
- Courses to meet General Education area requirements (in collaboration with administrators on the Bipartite Committee) -
- Approval of new courses, course options and instructional programs
- Appeals process for taking courses out of sequence.
- Placement testing and assessment policies

### **Recommendations provided to the Board of Trustees concerning Board Resolutions: -**

- BoT Resolution No. 110825-P1 “Amend the SFCCD Policy Manual by Adding PM 1.17, Audit Committee Charter”
- BoT Resolution No. 120426-P1: “Amend the SFCCD Policy Manual by Adding Board Policy BP 7001 – Adoption of Annual Budget – Requirements
- BoT Resolution No. 120426-S6: Adopting Blueprint of College-Wide Policy and Implementation Strategy for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection
- BoT Resolution No. 120426-S10: “Recommendation to adopt revised Matriculation, Assessment and Placement Policy”
- Draft BoT Resolution: “Safe Neighborhoods / Effective Police Training.”
- Draft BoT Resolution: “Notice to Amend the SFCCD Policy Manual by Amending Board Policy BP 6620 (PM 7.16) Memorials and Naming Buildings”
- Draft BoT Resolution: Revision of “Guidelines for City College of San Francisco Named Gift and Other Giving Opportunities”
- Draft BoT Resolution: “Notice of Intention to Amend the SFCCD Policy Manual by Adding Board Policy BP 3151 – Disclosure of Campaign Contributions by Affected Administrator”
- Draft BoT Resolution: "Notice of Intention to Amend the SFCCD Policy Manual by Adding Board Policy BP 3152 – Resolutions Appointing Administrators, Single Administrator Rule.

### **Administrator job descriptions and position announcements.**

Reviewed by the Council, revisions recommended to the administration:

- ✓ Vice Chancellor of Matriculation, Assessment and Enrollment Services.
- ✓ Dean, Financial Aid
- ✓ Vice Chancellor, Campuses & Enrollment Services
- ✓ Vice Chancellor, Research & Policy
- ✓ Vice Chancellor, Student Development

### **Other Major Issues and Projects**

- **Academic Senate By Laws.** Article VI was amended to provide a process for Executive Council members to take a temporary leave from the Council if they are ill, on sabbatical or have other reasons.
- **Academic Senate Executive Council Election.** The Council appointed Election commissioners and directed them to offer paper ballots on request with electronic voting as the default. The Council approved the elections calendar and other election materials as needed.
- **CCC Student Success Task Force, draft and final recommendations -- Responses from CCSF.** Members of the Executive Council researched issues, shared information with all CCSF constituent groups, responded to surveys, wrote letters, spoke at meetings in Sacramento and Oakland, spoke with and provided information to the media, organized opportunities for students to advocate for themselves, and wrote resolutions to be considered by the ASCCC (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges)

- **Innovative Instruction.** In collaboration with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Executive Council drafted a procedure for courses to receive innovation funds. The procedure included draft application, instructions, rubric for scoring applications, instructions for follow-up report. The Executive Council created an Ad Hoc committee for the process and appointed faculty to serve.
- **Outside the Classroom / Non Instructional Assignments.** The Executive Council developed a proposal for minimum criteria for the approval of outside the classroom assignments and categories for tracking data on such assignments, along with examples and explanations showing placement within the categories of various outside the classroom assignments.
- **Professional Development Flex Policies.** Members of the Council met with Human Resources and AFT leadership to assist in clarifying policies
- **“Short Form” Evaluations of Administrators.** The Council revised and approved the forms for Faculty to request and submit anonymous evaluation surveys on administrators. The Council directed the Academic Senate Office to administer the surveys securely and confidentially.
- **Student Learning Outcomes.** Council discussed major issues and created an Ad Hoc Student Learning Outcomes Committee reporting directly to the Council, charged with coordinating SLO efforts, promoting dialogue throughout the college community, and structuring documentation related to SLOs at CCSF.
- **Wireless network and network security issues.** The Council advocated for the needs of City College students, faculty, and staff for functional networking access free of censorship or burdensome, unnecessary obstacles.



## Appendix D: Curriculum Committee Report

### Overview

At meetings in Spring 2012, the College Curriculum Committee approved 28 new courses, 4 new distance education addenda, and 10 new certificate programs. A list of approved courses and programs is below. Academic Senate Executive Council recommendation is sought so that these courses and programs may be brought to the Board of Trustees for approval, and so that the college may offer these courses and instructional programs at various college campuses beginning in Fall 2012.

### Administration of Justice and Fire Science

Criminal and Constitutional Law

New Certificate of Achievement

### Architecture

INTD 102 "Interior Design Studio I"

New Distance Education Addendum

### Automotive/Motorcycle, Construction, and Building Maintenance

Residential Plumbing

New Certificate of Accomplishment

AUTO 203 "Painting and Refinishing" (2 units)

New Permanent Course

AUTO 204 "Body/Frame Straightening and Repair" (2 units)

New Permanent Course

AUTO 205 "Auto Body Welding" (2 units)

New Permanent Course

AUTO 206 "Plastic Repair and Refinishing" (2 units)

New Permanent Course

CNST 112 "Carpentry - Advanced Framing" (4 units)

New Permanent Course

CNST 1012 "Carpentry - Advanced Framing" (105 hours)

New Permanent Course

CNST 113 "Finish Carpentry" (4 units)

New Permanent Course

CNST 1013 "Finish Carpentry" (105 hours)

New Permanent Course

CNST 116 "Furniture Making & Woodworking" (3 units)

New Permanent Course

CNST 1016 "Furniture Making & Woodworking" (105 hours)

New Permanent Course

CNST 117 "Advanced Furniture Making" (3 units)

New Permanent Course

CNST 1017 "Advanced Furniture Making" (105 hours)

New Permanent Course

Auto Body Non-structural Analysis and Damage Repair

New Certificate of Accomplishment

Auto Body Structural Analysis and Damage Repair

New Certificate of Accomplishment

Auto Body Damage Analysis and Estimating

New Certificate of Accomplishment

Auto Body Painting and Refinishing

New Certificate of Accomplishment

Carpentry

New Certificate of Accomplishment

CNST A "Industrial Truck Training" (0.5 units)

New Permanent Course

CNST 107A "Blueprint Reading (City Build)" (1 units)

New Permanent Course

### Behavioral Sciences

PSYC 4 "Forensic Psychology"

New Distance Education Addendum

### Business

MABS 90 "iPad for Business" (1 units)

New Permanent Course

### Child Development and Family Studies

CDEV 53 "Child Growth and Development"

New Distance Education Addendum

### Computer Networking and Information Technology

CNIT 133M "Mobile Web Using Intermediate HTML, CSS, and Javascript" (3 units)

New Permanent Course

CNIT 352 "Microsoft Exchange Email Administration" (3 units)

New Permanent Course

### Culinary Arts and Hospitality Services

CAHS 60 "Selected Topic in Culinary Arts (1-2-3)" (1, 2, or 3 units)	New Permanent Course
CAHS 60A "Sous Vide Cooking" (1 units)	New Permanent Course
CAHS 60B "Classic and Modern Sauces" (1 units)	New Permanent Course
CAHS 60C "Molecular Gastronomy" (1 units)	New Permanent Course
CAHS 60D "Pantry and Cold Kitchen" (1 units)	New Permanent Course
CAHS 60E "Charcuterie, Force-meats, and Pates" (1 units)	New Permanent Course
CAHS 60F "Carving" (1 units)	New Permanent Course

**Engineering and Technology**

ENGN 10B "Introduction to Engineering: Software Tools and Design"	New Distance Education Addendum
---	---------------------------------

**English**

ENGL 30A "American Literature, Beginnings to Civil War" (3 units)	New Permanent Course
---	----------------------

**English as a Second Language**

ESLV 3806 "ESL for Housekeeping" (105 hours)	New Permanent Course
--	----------------------

**Graphic Communications**

Digital Illustration	New Certificate of Achievement
----------------------	--------------------------------

**Health Education**

HLTH 91G "Health, Education and Equity" (1 units)	New Permanent Course
---	----------------------

**Interdisciplinary Studies**

Diversity and Social Justice	New Certificate of Accomplishment
------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**Physical Education and Dance**

PE 21 "Teaching Movement" (3 units)	New Permanent Course
Yoga Instruction	New Certificate of Accomplishment

**Appendix E: Letter by English Department faculty member Paolo Sapienza concerning Board meeting of April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

To the Board of Trustees of City College of San Francisco:

I was at the CCSF Board of Trustees meeting of April 26 and I was shocked by what I witnessed. I had heard that Trustee Steve Ngo was at times rude and abusive but that in no way prepared me for the reality. For brevity's sake, I will highlight only the worst of what I saw and heard. Resolution S10 (the English Department's proposal to pilot an amendment to the existing multiple measures we use to place students into the composition sequence) was introduced by Board President Rizzo with equanimity: he stated that all sides seemed to agree that the proposal should be implemented; the issue at stake was when to implement. President Rizzo further asked that discussion of the issue be civil and fair-minded, echoing the sentiment voiced only minutes earlier by just-retired Chancellor Don Griffin. Public comment ensued with debate aligning on two sides: to implement immediately, or to take the time to run the proposal as a pilot in order to set up the necessary structure for the proposal to work successfully.

When public comment ended, it was announced that the Board would now discuss among themselves. Instead, Trustee Ngo turned to the audience and directly addressed the English Department as "You." In no uncertain terms, Trustee Ngo lectured the English Department, characterizing them as petty, selfish obstructionists pursuing their own agenda at the expense of students. Rather than addressing the merits of the competing proposals in a professional manner, Trustee Ngo divisively framed the debate into a contest of good versus evil: my side is on the side of justice, while your side is for selfish reasons standing in the way of justice. Why did he frame it this way? Because we were pursuing the implementation of our own proposal, a proposal he largely agreed with; the major points of contention were the status of the proposal as a pilot and that we did not agree to the timeline he desired. On that basis, was his a justified response or even an appropriate one? No, it was polarizing and divisive. It was an insulting distortion aimed at members of the City College community; it was false and slanderous. By framing the debate this way, Trustee Ngo failed to "Treat staff employees with courtesy, and respect and civility." He failed to "Ensure an atmosphere in which controversial issues can be presented fairly and in which the dignity of each individual is maintained." These quotes are taken from the Board of Trustees' own Code of Ethics and Responsibilities.

I value differences in opinion and respect the role of heartfelt emotion in human discourse. What Trustee Ngo provided was something quite different: a divisive diatribe, a personal attack. It was meanspirited, spiteful, and full of venomous distortions. He believes his proposal will lead to justice. The English Department believes its proposal will best achieve justice. If Trustee Ngo were a responsible professional following the Code that should determine his behavior, he would not have so blatantly altered the amended and approved document submitted by the Academic Senate Executive Council, and he would have debated the merits of each proposal. Instead, Trustee Ngo attacked the morals and integrity of the entire English Department. Repeatedly, he addressed us with a forceful "You," so there can be no doubt that his words were a direct attack. Some examples: Again and again he claims "it's easy" for us to lengthen the timeline, a false characterization. How would he even know? In fact, on multiple levels it is very difficult, psychologically, logistically, tactically. His attacks on us make it even harder, since being insulted and bullied takes an emotional toll as well. But really, it is not primarily about us anyway, despite Trustee Ngo's combative attempts to push some kind of moral blame onto the English Department. The issue is to enact the proposal correctly and responsibly, for students, for counselors, for other departments and programs that will be impacted. This is the morally and professionally responsible route. As the Reverend Amos Brown enjoined earlier that evening, "make change and do it right." Our moral and professional responsibility is to do it right, and as we strive to do just that, we should not be insulted for our efforts. Trustee Ngo goes on to claim, again repeatedly, as if by saying it more than once he can make his statement true, that Resolution S10 is meant to remedy a "policy you know is failing. You know it's failing." If the policy were failing why would we be extending it? Trustee Ngo's blatant and argumentative distortion willfully ignores the fact that Resolution S10 actually strengthens existing policy, indicating that the policy itself is not the primary issue at all, but rather that we intend to work on improving its implementation. These examples show clearly that Trustee Ngo has replaced reasonable debate with empty rhetoric that distorts facts and attacks faculty. Once the factual distortions, empty rhetoric and emotional appeals are stripped away, nothing of substance remains in Trustee Ngo's initial rant, only his ill will.

Part of Trustee Ngo's ill will is his insinuation that faculty are out of touch with students' lives and situations, that his own life and that of his wife give him special knowledge and insight. I have immigrant grandparents. I, too, know what it is like to grow up poor in the American south. As my single mother raised three children, she worked as a receptionist and hostess at an Italian restaurant. Eventually, she took college courses at night, part-time. She finally earned her degree the year before I embarked upon earning my own. I, too, know very well the hardships of financial woes, absent parents, and dysfunctional family environments, as well as the enormous rewards of gaining an education. I have lived that experience. My wife, also English Department faculty, is an immigrant herself. We know our students very well, not only from our backgrounds but from years of experience in the classroom as well. And, along with our

colleagues, we bring that professional expertise to the table. Trustee Ngo's assumption that he knows better is condescending; his insinuation that we do not know our students' lives is an insult made out of ill-willed ignorance.

Clearly, Trustee Ngo sees the English Department as antagonists, not members of a shared community working toward a common goal. And in fact the goal was largely a common one, you must remember. The major point of debate was a timeline for implementation. Yet, Trustee Ngo's discourse focused on none of the particulars of that timeline. And in focusing only on speed, he completely avoided the issues of what would be needed to make the proposal work. He started the debate by creating two opposing camps and by vilifying the English Department. Simply because we disagreed with him, he claimed we were standing in the way of justice for selfish reasons. For example, he said we could afford to wait because we have jobs, as if this were a telling point. It was not a telling point at all; it was an insult, a distortion, and in no way engaged with the reasoned arguments we had put forward. In doing so, to again quote the Board's Code, Trustee Ngo contravened the injunction that "Board members are expected to maintain the highest standards of conduct and ethical behavior." Instead, Trustee Ngo employed the rhetoric of a demagogue, designed to demonize an opponent. It was not a discourse of fairness and respect. It was not the language of a responsible Trustee working to serve all the members of his community.

At the outset of his diatribe, Trustee Ngo acknowledged that the debate had become polarized. He even stated that he was somewhat responsible for this and that it was not a desirable state of affairs. That said, he immediately launched into the most polarizing section of his rant. We have all seen this rhetorical move before. A speaker begins by saying "I'm not a sexist, but..." or "I'm not a racist, but..." and then proceeds to say something sexist or racist. That speaker seems to believe that acknowledging awareness of bad behavior somehow absolves the speaker of responsibility for that behavior. Trustee Ngo is not absolved of responsibility. Declaring himself a fighter for justice does not entitle him to treat others in such an offensive manner. Everyone in the room on that night believes him or herself a fighter for justice. Trustee Ngo must respect differences of opinion. This is the very foundation of academic freedom and ethical discourse. He was the most polarizing figure at that meeting, and in that role he stepped outside the bounds of acceptable professional behavior.

Trustee Ngo's behavior was shockingly unprofessional and shamefully abusive. Speaking out of turn, I told him (and the entire room) just that. I apologize for my outburst and the disruption it caused. I went outside the proper process of the meeting, as Trustee Ngo was quick to point out. He then used that idea to take a swipe at the CCSF Academic Senate, claiming they had departed from due process on a past, unrelated matter. Why did Trustee Ngo make this point? To move the debate at hand toward justice? To effectively address the resolution on the table? No and no. Once again, instead of responsibly debating the resolution, Trustee Ngo chose to use the rhetoric of insult and attack. In fact, while I take some of the responsibility for my brief verbal outburst—and again I apologize—I would suggest Trustee Ngo must share the blame. By addressing the English Department directly rather than his fellow Board members, as well as through his insulting tone and offensive rhetoric, Trustee Ngo was the first to depart from the formal process. I merely followed his lead.

With all due respect, the other members of the Board are also complicit. The Board did not, and has not, held Trustee Ngo to proper conduct. I have now watched videos of past Board meetings. I see that his conduct at the meeting of April 26 was no anomaly, no one time slip. I understand the difficulty of maintaining civility in a large setting among disparate personalities; I've been managing classrooms for 23 years. I also understand that you may have become inured through constant exposure to Trustee Ngo's antics. But as a first time witness on the night of April 26, I will attest that Trustee Ngo's behavior goes beyond a mild straying from the Board's Code of Ethics and Responsibility: it falls into the category of workplace harassment.

In the aftermath, many of my colleagues were stunned, hurt and demoralized by Trustee Ngo's words. At that time I learned that some of my colleagues have already communicated to AFT 2121 that they feel Trustee Ngo has on previous occasions created a toxic and stressful workplace environment through his bullying words and actions. After the events of the April 26 Board of Trustees meeting this has become even truer. This needs to change. Now that I have seen the reality of what occurs at meetings of the Board, I cannot stand aside and thereby sanction with silence this abuse of professional ethics.

Why must Trustee Ngo change his behavior? First, it is his duty as a member of the Board to follow the Code of Ethics and Responsibilities. If he will not or cannot do so, he is not fulfilling his professional duties and should step down. Second, at the end of the Board meeting of April 26, no one in the room appeared happy with the compromise. But if the Board, Trustee Ngo in particular, had, first of all, not significantly altered the Executive Council's amendment and had begun discussion of Resolution S10 with an attitude of "hey, we all want the same goal here, what resources do you need to make it happen faster?" we could have reached the exact same compromise conclusion to the debate, but it would have taken half of the time, been achieved in a spirit of collaboration and unity, and everyone would have left the room feeling good work had been achieved that evening. Instead, by beginning discussion with a highly personal attack on the English Department—well, instead we got a highly polarized discussion which left everyone, on both sides of the debate, dispirited and demoralized. If Trustee Ngo had restrained himself from initiating the discourse by trumpeting on self-righteously about justice, and had instead taken the time to find out, from a position of goodwill, exactly how the proposal would logistically be implemented, a harmonious compromise could have been reached. Sadly, a real opportunity for amicable collaboration was missed. I am a mild-mannered person, but I become obstinate when aroused by an abuse of power and position. Trustee Ngo, while wrapping himself in the robes of moral righteousness, uses his position as Board Trustee to bully the community he is meant to lead. No one in the English Department wants to go in front of the Board because we know we will not be treated "with courtesy, and respect and civility." This is because of one man, Trustee Ngo. By its own Code, the Board must "Ensure an atmosphere in which controversial issues can be presented fairly and in which the dignity of each individual is maintained." The Board can only achieve this goal, one shared by myself and the English Department, if Trustee Ngo ceases his bullying and harassing.

To quote the Board's code one final time: "The Governing Board will be prepared to investigate the factual basis behind any charge or complaint of Board member misconduct." I respectfully await your response,

Paolo Sapienza  
Faculty, English Department  
English Eligibility Coordinator

Note: this letter has been written by one person but represents the views of many in the English Department. A broader petition, supported by the City College community at large, will follow.