Standard 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 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 the 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.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco has a clear hiring policy and process that meets the requirements of Title 5 California Code of Regulations, and the California Education Code concerning equal employment opportunity and the State Minimum Qualifications. The District 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 the College’s programs and services. The Human Resources Department (HR) oversees the hiring processes for all District personnel, ensuring that the established hiring procedures are equitably and fairly administered. To ensure a large number of applicants, job announcements are advertised in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, at job fairs, on employment websites, and on the CCSF website.

HR also contracts with Jobelephant, a recruitment advertising agency which combines the placement of recruitment advertising with demonstrated customer support without additional costs. The company is recognized worldwide by newspapers, internet job boards, and trade journals as an authorized agent for employment advertising. They have placed College job ads in cccregistry.org, CSU East Bay JOBS4U, CSU Sacramento J.O.B., UC Berkeley’s CalJobs, Insidehighered.com, Higheredjobs.com, sfbay.craigslist.org, AsiansinHigherEd.com, IMDiversity.com, BlacksinHigherEd.com, and HispanicsinHigherEd.com.

The College has established and published inclusive procedures for administrative, faculty, and classified employee hiring [III A-1]. For each category of employee, hiring criteria, including job announcements, paper screening criteria, and interview questions, are established by the hiring departments, reviewed by key personnel, and approved by HR and the Affirmative Action Office to ensure results yield effective hiring of knowledgeable personnel. Job announcements list the required employment qualifications, the state-mandated minimum qualifications, and the desirable qualifications established by the hiring search committee.

Drafts of job announcements are reviewed by the Search Committee or Department Chair, Associate Dean of Affirmative Action, Academic Senate, and appropriate Dean, Vice Chancellor, or Chancellor. The Human Resources Academic Hiring Unit is responsible for ensuring that applicants meet the state-mandated minimum qualifications, 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.

To assure inclusive, expedient, and successful recruitment processes, the District utilizes when applicable, broad recruitment strategies, including advertising with local advertising agencies and using electronic media, such as Monster.com and Craigslist.org, as well as advertising in HigherEdJobs.com and Insidehighered.com.

Prospective candidates for faculty positions are required to provide evidence of effective teaching and show their potential for contributing to the institution’s mission by providing such evidence in their application materials, including letters of interest and the diversity statement, and during the interview and teaching demonstration. The hiring process is rigorous, and nearly all departments require a teaching demonstration and a portfolio of work as a part of the interview process. District procedures call for an Equal Employment Opportunity monitor to attend every hiring search committee meeting during the interviewing process to ensure compliance with all state and federal labor rules, regulations, and laws. Due to the lack of availability of trained monitors and funding to pay them, the administration sometimes directs a committee to conduct its work without a monitor.

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 that greater emphasis be placed on understanding current issues pertaining to equity and diversity when hiring. For this reason, CCSF’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 related to their ethnicity, culture, socioeconomic status, educational achievement, sexual orientation, or disability [III A-1 p. 17].

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 composition of each hiring committee is consistent with federal and state guidelines on race and sex. The Human Resources Academic Hiring Unit, along with the Affirmative Action Office, works to ensure that search committee members are oriented on the hiring procedures, employment regulations, and on the SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement (SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA) Article 12 – Upgrading provisions [III A-2 p. 51].

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. Many are prominent in a variety of communities. Others are officers and policy makers in professional organizations. Some are authors of nationally and internationally published texts in their fields, and a large number have done pioneer work in developing special courses and curricula [III A-3].

In 2010, 27 percent of the College’s administrators retired. CCSF hired interim administrators to fill the positions while the process to hire more than ten permanent administrators continues through the 2011-12 academic year [III A-4, p. ii].

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 and responsibilities. Exempt employees serve at the pleasure of the appointing officer and are exempted from the Civil Service process by the San Francisco Charter. All non-exempt District classified positions have been reviewed and classified by the DHR according to their duties and responsibilities. If a classified position is new or an additional position is to be added to a College department, a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) or Express Classification form (EXP) must be completed. 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 [III A-5].

In September 2008, the Board of Trustees adopted Resolution No. 080926-S4 requiring the College to consider certain job applicant finalists who have been convicted of a felony involving controlled substances. Under this resolution, finalists who submit evidence of at least five years of rehabilitation would be referred to a Committee on Rehabilitation. The Committee would then review the rehabilitation evidence and make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding whether or not the finalist is sufficiently rehabilitated. A Committee on Rehabilitation has been formed composed of faculty and administrators. Employee handbooks, employment applications, and employment websites have also been updated to reflect this new policy [III A-6, p. 2].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

City College of San Francisco employs faculty, staff, and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The overall search and hiring process instituted by Human Resources (HR) and the work of faculty and administrator search committees promote diverse and well qualified hires. The faculty hiring process is rigorous, and nearly all departments require a teaching demonstration and a portfolio of work as a part of the interview process. In light of the College commitment to having a diverse faculty and staff reflective of the communities the College serves, the HR department will continue to focus on strategies for increasing diversity in applicant pools and in hiring. Faculty hiring processes have sometimes proceeded without Equal Employment Opportunity monitors because of the shortage of trained monitors and funds to pay them. The College should recruit and provide training for more Equal Employment Opportunity monitors and identify funding for them.

Planning Agenda

None.

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.

Descriptive Summary

The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The criteria for evaluating faculty are defined in the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA [III A-2, p. 27-46]. District policies and procedures outline criteria for evaluating staff and administrators [III A-7; III A -8 p. 17-20].

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

The faculty evaluation process is administered by the Office of the Dean of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation, and Tenure Review in accordance with the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA Article 9 [III A-2, p. 27-46]. In general, classroom faculty are evaluated every three years on: 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, taken via an in-class survey, are a crucial component of every classroom instructor’s evaluation. Survey responses are weighed seriously, and may serve as a revealing indicator of potential areas of concern.

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 is evaluated in areas such as~~:~~ communicating ideas effectively during workshops and instructional sessions at the reference desk; contributing to building, organizing and maintaining library collections and resources; and striving to maintain an environment conducive to study, research, reading, and learning. For counselors, job performance is evaluated according to how they help students define problems, support students in seeking solutions to problems, and provide opportunities for students to express concerns. For resource instructors, job performance is evaluated on how effectively they develop instructional resources [III A-9, p. 3].

To further improve the evaluation process and provide feedback for improvement to faculty members, an additional category was added 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 matter 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 Office of the Dean of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review webpage [III A-10, III A-11].

Department chairs are evaluated with regard to the performance of their supervisory duties and responsibilities in accordance with Article 8: Evaluation, of the SFCCD/Department Chairpersons Council Collective Bargaining Agreement [III A-12, p. 11-16]. 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 [III A-12, p. 65-68]. The administrator then summarizes the review results, which are placed in the evaluatee’s personnel file.

The classified employee evaluation currently follows the Performance Appraisal System of the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources [III A-7]. The purposes 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. New permanent classified staff are evaluated 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).

During the previous Accreditation Self Study, HR reviewed and developed its own classified evaluation process for all classified employees. This new structure has served as a means of dialog 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 put the evaluation forms online [III A-13]. One of the staff from HR sends an email notice about the need for an evaluation, and then a reminder to the employee’s department head prior to the due date. The Department also sends a reminder after the due date if necessary. An HR staff member monitors the process. Prior to Fall 2010 only permanent classified employees were evaluated, but now all classified employees are evaluated.

Administrators are evaluated on their performance relating to program planning, problem solving, professional relationships, job knowledge and application, human resources skills, communication skills, organizational leadership skills, personal leadership skills, and teamwork. The current Administrative Evaluation and Contract Renewal Procedures were implemented during the fiscal year 2003-04 [III A-8, p. 17-20]. The Administrative Evaluation process was revamped to ensure a more direct relationship between the evaluatee and his or her direct supervisor.

To further improve and provide executive-level oversight of the administrator evaluation process, the program was moved from HR to the Office of the Chancellor in 2000. The current procedures require that early in the evaluation process, in addition to identifying their day-to-day activities, administrators set a minimum of five performance objectives that are in line with the Chancellor’s objectives. The Chancellor’s objectives are derived from key institutional planning documents, such as the Strategic Plan and the College’s Annual Plan. These administrators’ objectives are reviewed and approved by the Chancellor’s Office. The current process also identifies measurable outcomes for evaluation of the administrators’ objectives and an increase of the weight of the supervisor’s review, which is now 25 percent of the overall evaluation [III A-8 p. 17].

For information on how the College evaluates the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, please see Standard IV.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.

III.A.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. The evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student-learning outcomes does include effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

Descriptive Summary

All faculty who teach courses are evaluated regularly in accordance with Article 9 of the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA. During the evaluation of classroom faculty, evaluators review course materials to make sure that faculty are following the course outlines. The dialog that ensues between the evaluation committee and the evaluatee includes a review of his or her syllabus, teaching materials, teaching methodology, and grade books. All relevant findings are incorporated into the evaluation [III A-9]. Several components that contribute to the evaluation of the effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes are rated and discussed by the evaluation team, including the following areas that contribute to student learning outcomes:

* The course content is up to date and appropriate.
* The materials used are pertinent to the course outline.
* The class is taught at an appropriate level.
* Instructor establishes a student-instructor relationship conducive to learning.
* The pacing of the class is appropriate to the level and the material presented.
* Instructor stimulates students’ interest in the field and their desire to learn.
* Instructor demonstrates sensitivity to the learning difficulties of the student.

CCSF course outlines identify student learning outcomes in relation to course content, teaching methodology, and student evaluation criteria. As a result, the assessment of these during a faculty evaluation demonstrates a link to the significant role faculty play in the integration of student learning outcomes into their curriculum and teaching practices. Dialog about student learning outcomes and teaching methodology begins at the departmental level, coordinated by the chairs. Faculty involved in course outline development engage in a technical review process, whose primary goal is to ensure that the learning outcomes, course content, instructional methodology, and student evaluation criteria reinforce and support one another. All proposed course outlines are subsequently subject to the review and approval of the College Curriculum Committee with these measures in mind.

The evaluation process also includes a student evaluation component for all classroom instructors, and, if applicable, for non-classroom faculty as well. Classroom and/or formal worksite visitations and observations are also conducted. Students are asked to evaluate instructors with a series of questions, including:

* Are the methods of testing (examinations, papers, etc.) a valid evaluation of the knowledge and or skills you have gained from this course?
* Are assignments relevant and helpful in understanding the subject area?
* Does the instructor try to interest you in the subject and encourage you to learn more about it?

The student evaluations are considered an important piece of evidence of faculty success during the evaluation process.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The faculty evaluation process is well documented in Article 9 of the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA. The process is designed to include dialog with and classroom observation by the department chair and/or the peer evaluation team, as well as findings from student evaluation forms. While the official evaluation forms used by students and peer evaluation team colleagues do not contain language that refers specifically to the student learning outcomes on the course outline, there are several components of these evaluation forms that do reflect teaching behaviors that directly contribute to student learning. Student evaluations across the curriculum typically range in the 4.4 to 4.8 range (where 5 equals “always”) for specific positive teaching behaviors, such as “Does the instructor try to interest you in the subject and encourage you to learn more about it?” [III A-14]. The dialog between evaluatee and evaluation team and/or department chair allows for a focused discussion of the effectiveness of the instructor’s performance in helping to produce these student learning outcomes.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

In addition to BP 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.

District policies concerning instructors’ responsibilities in classrooms and laboratories are published in the Faculty Handbook [III A-16, p. 16-24]. 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, p. 19-26]. The Classified Handbook outlines the requirements of classified employees at the time of hire, such as fingerprinting, misrepresentation or falsification of information, the arrest and conviction policy, and security clearance [III A-17, p. 16-17]. District Policy 4.09–Use of Slurs [III A-18]

is included in both the Faculty and Classified Handbook on pages 12 and 15 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 the 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 Shared Governance procedure during the Fall 2005 semester. The policy is included in the latest versions of the faculty and classified employee handbooks.

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. Additional information is available on their webpage [III A-21].

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.

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

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF promotes a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration and improved levels of communication, and policies and procedures are in place that ensure healthy working conditions and foster an environment of respect and trust.

Planning Agenda

None.

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.

Descriptive Summary

In normal budget years, the District has been able to maintain a sufficient number of qualified employees to maintain the integrity of its services and programs. In recent years, the College has suffered from the effects of budget reductions resulting from a major economic downturn that required the College to implement strategic spending reductions throughout the institution, including a severe restriction on hiring in the classified unit. Despite the economic downturn, the College exceeded its full-time faculty obligation for Fall 2009 by 127 FTE, the largest margin in the state (see Standard III.D.2.a).

Despite difficult setbacks, the reduction in spending has focused on ensuring the continuance of core educational programs and student services. Increased efforts by administrators, faculty, and classified staff have preserved the continued delivery of efficient and effective programs and services. This is a direct reflection of the quality of District employees. Additionally, the College, with respect to the “seventy-five percent rule,” has exceeded state requirements since 2005 [III A-23].

As noted in Section III.A.1.a, the faculty, classified staff, and administrators of City College of San Francisco are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. (Please refer to Section III.A.1.a for more details about the types of degrees held by faculty and administrators and their breadth of experience.) The Chancellor’s administrative structure is highly efficient, with one of the smallest administrator to employee ratios within the California Community College system. Approximately 43 administrators are responsible for overseeing the more than 2,700 employees (active adjunct faculty fluctuate from one semester to the next), and approximately 100,000 students served throughout the College’s campuses [III A-4].

Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. The College's Planning and Budgeting Council (College's PBC) reviews the Program Review reports and respective budget requests. As a component of planning, administrators and supervisory personnel are required to indicate resources needed for completion of their objectives, including staffing. Faculty and administrative position allocation is a Shared Governance process aligned with College goals, strategic priorities, and financial resources.

As an example, the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) plays the key role in setting the priorities for the hiring of new full-time faculty. FPAC was established as part of the process of creating the Faculty Hiring Procedures, which occurred prior to the development of the Shared Governance Agreement. It has subsequently been incorporated into the Shared Governance System [III A-1]. It is composed of three administrators and three faculty members.

Departments submit their FPAC requests on the FPAC request form as per the criteria and procedures established by the Committee [III A-24]. The Committee utilizes the same data from the Decision Support System (DSS) that inform the Program Review reports, such as data about supply and demand for courses or subjects, in order to assess faculty position requests, although some faculty believe that FPAC should consult the entire Program Review report in formulating its recommendations. After the data are analyzed, FPAC presents the list to the College’s PBC, which makes recommendations on the total number of full-time positions to be filled College wide. The College’s PBC recommendations are subject to the Chancellor’s approval.

As noted in Section III.A.1.a, in 2010 a significant percentage of the College’s administrators retired. CCSF hired interim administrators to fill the positions while the process to hire more than ten permanent administrators continues through to the 2011-12 academic year [III A-4].

The Chancellor has primary responsibility for the allocation of the Administrative structure. If it is determined that an administrative position is needed to ensure the effective operation of College services, top administration consults with the Academic Senate. If the position is new, HR will be called in to conduct a job analysis survey, determining in consultation with the Chancellor and the appropriate Vice Chancellor the accurate job duties and responsibilities, as well as the respective salary and benefits. After the availability of funds is determined, a request accompanied by a justification and a job description is sent to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate for review. The Executive Council is empowered to make its own recommendations on the request and job description. If the Senate and Administration cannot agree on the job description, the final determination falls to the Chancellor. Recommendations for amendments to the hiring procedures are made by the Chancellor in consultation with the Academic Senate and taken before the Board of Trustees for review and adoption.

The number of classified staff has fluctuated. With a slow state recovery and impending budget restrictions, the District has imposed severe restrictions on hiring in the classified unit and judiciously fills replacement positions of those who retire or leave for other reasons. The Vacancy Review Workgroup (VRW) became effective October 2004 through collective bargaining. The membership of the workgroup is specified in the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA, Article 2G, and Article 2H delineates information sharing [III A-19, p. 3].

In November 2009, approximately 34 classified staff laid off by other San Francisco Civil Service agencies “bumped” the College’s existing classified staff. This is this highest number of classified staff to get bumped out of their positions at one time in the past 20 years. This wide-scale bumping created anxiety and inefficiencies for those getting bumped and their supervisors. It also generated an atmosphere of uncertainty within the College community, which is not conducive to running high-functioning teams within departments and programs that rely on classified staff.

The classified bumping process is governed by the City and County of San Francisco Civil Service rules, not by the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA. Classified bumping and displacement are facilitated by the City’s Department of Human Resources (DHR) and are identified on a job seniority basis. While there is little that anyone at CCSF can do to control the bumping process, it has been a struggle, nonetheless, to manage during the ongoing economic crisis in San Francisco and California.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The number of full-time faculty is sufficient; however, the number of qualified administrators and classified staff has shown greater fluctuations. Given the current economic situation, the College is effectively using the planning and budgeting process to ensure that core staffing needs are addressed in most cases. The relationship between position allocations and the planning and budgeting process is integral to decision making about new and replacement positions. The Faculty Position Allocation Committee forwards its recommendations to the College’s PBC. The College has discussed reactivating and expanding the Classified Position Allocation Committee (CPAC) to review and make recommendations to the College’s PBC concerning positions for classified staff. CPAC is expected to be functioning by Spring, 2012.

Planning Agenda

None.

III.A.3. The institution systematically develops personnel polices and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

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

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.

Personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered and reviewed regularly through the Shared Governance process and, if appropriate, by the unions. Employee needs and concerns are voiced and addressed 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 is composed of the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, Legal Counsel, the Employee Relations Officer, the Director and Associate Director of Human Resources, the Affirmative Action Officer, and the Human Resources Supervisors. Recommendations for adoption of new and/or amended personnel policies are taken before the Board of Trustees. 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 1021 CBA [III A-19], contracts with other recognized bargaining units, and in the Faculty and Classified handbooks, 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, p. 51-52]. The process has been improved to include 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 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.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

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 Shared Governance process and by union staff, if appropriate. HR satisfactorily 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.

Planning Agenda

None.

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.

Descriptive Summary

The institution makes provisions 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 CBA. Classified employees may also view their personnel files upon written notice in accordance with the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA. 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 outlined 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, there must be only one official District personnel file for each academic and classified employee. 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. Medical records and investigative reports are not filed in an employee’s personnel file. Medical records are kept in a locked benefits cabinet with access restricted to designated HR staff only [III A-2, III A-19].

An online, password-protected database called Web4 allows employee 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.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Security and confidentiality of personnel records are diligently provided, primarily through locked files of paper-copy documents in HR with only authorized personnel allowed viewing rights. Employee access is provided by appointment, and some information is available online via passwords.

Planning Agenda

None.

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.

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.” Objectives are outlined to advance this priority, from the broader goal of fostering a supportive, positive, and productive environment for the College's diverse employees and students to specific implementation strategies, such as providing more access to educational technology, providing better support for and expanding the success of underrepresented students in meeting transfer goals, and improving the registration process to enable students to better access all pre-collegiate courses in a manner that promotes persistence [III A-27].

Other groundwork for promoting equity and supporting diversity is reflected in an April 2009 Board of Trustees “Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution,” which acknowledged that the College is committed to ensuring equal opportunity treatment for all students. This resolution, crafted by the Board and the College community, originated with students’ concerns about the number of students, especially students of color, who do not successfully complete the basic skills course sequences or move into transfer-level courses and beyond to graduate and transfer. It called for the Chancellor, in collaboration with the Office of Research and Planning, to produce an annual report regarding educational equity, which would discuss the College’s progress toward equity for all students [III A-28].

In October 2009, the Chancellor published the “Preliminary Report on the Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution.” As the report was reviewed through the Shared Governance process, it helped drive discussions in all constituencies of the College regarding what could be done by faculty, classified staff, and administration to better serve the College’s diverse student body. The College has sponsored Student Equity Hearings, which began in early 2010 and are continuing through 2011. These hearings have brought together the community of faculty, students, and administrators to discuss salient issues and solutions concerning equity, diversity, and student success. In these hearings, the College community identified programmatic changes that would benefit students and faculty. Examples include: increasing the number of sections of mathematics courses to accommodate more students and to relieve faculty teaching in crowded mathematics classes; and the identification of professional development needs such as mandatory two-day retreats for English Department faculty to focus on pedagogy, student learning, assessment, and learning outcomes [III A-29].

Although the Chancellor initially planned to provide a revised Equity Resolution for the Board’s consideration in April 2010, he instead decided to create a special Task Force to work strategically on the planning and assessment of CCSF intervention efforts, and to assist in the implementation of those plans with the various College divisions and departments. This Task Force has been providing regular reports to Board committees and the full Board since June 2010; reports are made available to the College community on the Taskforce on Student Equity and Achievement Gap webpage [III A-30]. The College is also planning a review and update to the College’s State Equity Plan, which was last submitted in March 2005.

In the past two years, CCSF has made great progress in implementing changes towards increasing equity for students. These changes include: a streamlined hiring process for student workers; the opportunity to retake placement tests; accelerated mathematics and English sequences; AB540 student employment opportunities; AB 540 Student Center; worker’s rights presentations for ESL students; priority registration for recent SFUSD graduates; FRISCO Welcome Day for SFUSD students; and expanded access to financial aid [III A-31].

Multiple data measures from many of these groups demonstrate the impact of these changes. For example, retention was significantly higher in the accelerated English and mathematics courses; more than 50 percent of those who retook placement tests in ESL and English passed the second time; and 1,096 SFUSD students received early registration dates [III A-31].

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 those are currently interns; one is applying to graduate school [III A-32].

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.

Faculty and staff who work in the retention and success programs and centers throughout the College bring special expertise and knowledge that they share with their colleagues through interactions related to student learning in specific courses, curriculum development, and other academic governance issues that support diversity and equity. These programs/centers include the African American Scholastic Programs, the Disabled Students Programs and Services, the Extended Opportunity Programs, the Second Chance Program, the Latino Services Network, the Writing Success Project, the Asian Pacific Islander Student Success program, TULAY: Filipino American Success Program, Puente Program, Math Bridge, Bridge to Biotech and MESA/STEM Center (Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement/Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics). The programs, which are open to students regardless of ethnicity, reach out to the students who are at the highest risk of not succeeding in the college environment and provide them with supplementary instruction, academic counseling, mentoring, and scholarship and career counseling. Overall employee perception of these programs is rated as good, with the program scoring a three rating on a four-point scale in the 2011 Employee Survey [III A-33].

The College also has an active College Diversity Committee. This Shared Governance committee meets regularly to ensure that diversity remains an important topic of the College’s agenda for discussion. Its members have been very effective in recommending and facilitating the adoption of practices to increase knowledge and understanding of diversity [III A-34]. Examples of areas the Committee has focused on include:

* strengthening the retention programs, such as the newest TULAY: Filipino American Success Program, part of the Asian Pacific American Student Success Center, which is a learning community that integrates Filipino curriculum, counseling services, basic English and mathematics skills support, and peer mentoring for Filipino American students;
* working with the Office of Research and Planning staff to disaggregate data by race, ethnicity, gender, etc., to track student success and progress;
* taking a leadership role in the Achievement Gap/Equity dialogs;
* promoting wireless access for students;
* discussing the feasibility of a local parcel tax;
* identifying the need for a higher registration priority for recent high school graduates;
* advocating for community colleges at the state and local level.

Another very important program for faculty that promotes the understanding of equity and diversity issues is the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP), a professional development program that provides selected faculty with incentives, time, and resources to revamp their curricula and teaching methods to increase their focus on multicultural issues. MIP focuses on helping the selected faculty not only to infuse multicultural content and perspectives into the curriculum, but also to expand teaching strategies to meet the needs of a diverse student population. MIP supports the expansion of strategies that seek to meet the needs of the College’s diverse student population and increase equity throughout the College. MIP has been developing a group of “resource” faculty to assist faculty at-large who are interested in increasing multicultural awareness through theory and practice. MIP also provides professional development activities throughout the year, as well as a Summer Institute to help address current issues in teaching and learning [III A-35].

Other faculty professional development activities include the Basic Skills Faculty Colloquia, the Department Chairpersons Council-sponsored Student Learning Outcomes Workshops, ESL Colloquia, and Flex programs. Flex Day continues to be an integral part of the institution’s support of faculty. While funding for staff development programs has been discontinued on a state level, the institution, in consultation with HR, continues to fund this effort. Classified Flex Day was established in 2001-02 for all classified employees to ensure that the more specific needs of support staff, which may be significantly different from academic staff, are addressed (see also Section III.A.5.a). The programs provide a very effective forum to invite outstanding speakers and lecturers on campus to address current institutional needs, such as diversity training [III A-36].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The institution demonstrates through its Mission and Vision statements, Strategic Plan, policies, and daily practices, that equity and diversity for all College constituents are key to the success of the institution. There are many opportunities for faculty and staff to increase their understanding and awareness of diversity and equity issues. Although the understanding of and concern for diversity at CCSF have been at the forefront of instructional and student services for many years, recent discussions at the campus, state, and federal levels about the challenges of student academic achievement and completion rates have helped drive deliberations about additional solutions to meet local challenges. While actions taken thus far are certainly appropriate, annual review and analysis of data are also important to both continuing the dialog and implementing effective changes to increase completion rates. Given that student achievement gaps exist nationally, statewide, and locally, CCSF should continue to find new ways to address the issue while maintaining the successful methods in which the institution is already engaged.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

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. The Classified staff is 76 percent ethnically diverse (full-time) and 72 percent ethnically diverse (part-time); the Faculty is 39 percent ethnically diverse (full-time) and 36 percent ethnically diverse (part-time); and the administrators are 56 percent ethnically diverse. In addition, the percentage of Gay/Lesbian, Veteran, and Disabled employees in each category can also be seen on the chart [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.

The Human Resources Employee and Hiring Data Report Fall 2010-Spring 2011 shows the demographic make up of administrators, faculty, and classified staff as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Admini-strators**  **(Fall 2010)** | | **Full-Time Faculty**  **(Fall 2010)** | | **Part-Time Faculty**  **(Fall 2010)** | | **Full-Time Classified**  **Staff**  **(Fall 2010)** | | **Part-Time Classified**  **Staff**  **(Fall 2010)** | |
| Female | 23 | 53% | 481 | 61% | 566 | 55% | 383 | 58% | 112 | 58% |
| Male | 20 | 47% | 314 | 39% | 468 | 45% | 280 | 42% | 56 | 42% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 7 | 16% | 58 | 7% | 72 | 7% | 75 | 11% | 16 | 11% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 8 | 19% | 135 | 17% | 186 | 17% | 252 | 38% | 63 | 38% |
| White/Non-Hispanic | 16 | 37% | 444 | 56% | 593 | 57% | 131 | 20% | 39 | 20% |
| Filipino | 0 | 0% | 24 | 3% | 31 | 3% | 70 | 11% | 17 | 11% |
| Hispanic | 9 | 21% | 88 | 11% | 91 | 9% | 105 | 16% | 24 | 16% |
| Native American | 0 | 0% | 4 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% |
| Other/Unknown | 3 | 7% | 42 | 5% | 61 | 6% | 30 | 5% | 8 | 5% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gay/Lesbian | 3 | 7% | 73 | 9% | 54 | 5% | 10 | 2% | 2 | 2% |
| Veteran | 2 | 5% | 26 | 3% | 47 | 5% | 20 | 3% | 3 | 3% |
| Disabled | 1 | 2% | 42 | 5% | 35 | 3% | 34 | 5% | 10 | 5% |
| Total number: | 43 |  | 795 |  | 1034 |  | 663 |  | 168 |  |

Faculty and staff are also diverse with respect to their age [III A-4].

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.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

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.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

CCSF maintains 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 polices 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 District Affirmative Action Officer. The Affirmative Action 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 Affirmative Action 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 Associate Dean of the Office of Affirmative Action 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 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.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has demonstrated integrity in the treatment of its staff and students through policies, programs, and appeal processes.

Planning Agenda

None.

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.

Descriptive Summary

Faculty, classified staff, and administrators are provided varied opportunities for professional development through Flex Day activities and workshops, conferences and conventions (funding permitting), sabbatical leave awards, and individual professional development opportunities.

Professional development requirements for faculty are outlined in the Faculty Handbook, p. 16, on the Office of Professional Development’s webpage and in the Flex Day programs. The Office of Professional Development plans annual Flex Day activity programs for faculty and staff. The Flex Day programs are based on teaching and learning needs identified by faculty and staff, and are consistent with the institutional mission. Examples of such programs offered include teaching with technology, methods to motivate and aid student learning, diversity, and multicultural topics [III A-36].

With the discontinuation of state funding, AB1725 travel funds were eliminated. 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, through the efforts of the Chancellor, the Office of Professional Development, and the Staff Development Committee, 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 was held 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. The other four days are given as independent Flex Days for the faculty 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, the Department Chairpersons Council-sponsored Student Learning Outcomes Workshops, the Multicultural Infusion Project activities, and individual department workshops.

The TLC, an office within the Education Technology Office, provides technology training programs to faculty and staff through regularly scheduled and Flex workshops. Training is delivered in a variety of modes that meet employee needs. The TLC offers workshops, online training, tutorials, and sessions created specifically for a department’s needs. Additionally, the TLC website contains information on accessing CCSF networks, email, and web accounts, and information on current projects and educational technology resources [III A-39].

An additional professional development option offered through contractual agreement with AFT 2121 is sabbatical leave (SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA Article 17.N), which allows four 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].

Administrative sabbatical awards are granted at the Chancellor’s discretion. 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 be granted 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, as noted in Section III.A.4.a. 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].

Results of the 2011 Employee Survey indicate dissatisfaction among employees with Professional Development (Travel, Conferences) at CCSF, and a near good rating for Professional Development (Flex). The 305 employees who responded to the question about Professional Development (Travel, Conferences) rated the services with a score of 1.98 out of 5, with 2 being below average and 1 being poor. This low rating can be attributed to the lack of funding for any type of travel or conference, as a result of budget constraints. The 522 employees who rated Professional Development (Flex) rated it with a score of 2.89, with 3 being good [III A-33].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Negotiations reduced the number of Flex Days down to one day each semester. After this change was made, it became clear that having only one Flex Day creates scheduling conflicts that directly affect Flex events by reducing attendance, constraining the ability of the College to solicit and contract with presenters, and limiting the number of quality workshops that can be offered. Given that student achievement and completion rates are important issues of concern, the College would benefit from directing more attention to improving professional development opportunities for all levels of staff. Working within current budget constraints, the institution should focus on improving Flex Day policies, particularly those devoted to improving student achievement and success.

Identifying and securing sources of income, such as the Basic Skills Initiative and Communities Learning in Partnership funding, will assist the College in achieving student success goals without taxing the already stretched budget.

Planning Agenda

None.

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.

Descriptive Summary

The Flex Workshop Evaluation form is distributed to participants during Flex Day seminars. While attendance at Flex Day is mandatory, faculty may select which events they attend and participate in. The event is limited to one day per semester, some of which is devoted to departmental meetings. The reduced schedule makes it difficult to schedule a wide range of varied offerings of workshops.

The primary ways that Flex Day sessions and other professional development opportunities are evaluated 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. In addition, the TMI staff work with faculty who have the benefit of online and hybrid course evaluation findings, so that based on student feedback, course improvements can be made. 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. The 522 employees who rated Professional Development (Flex) rated it with a score of 2.89, with 3 being good; of the 361 who rated the TLC’s training sessions, the mean score was 3.12 [III A-33].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

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 wide range of varied offerings 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. Staff in the Professional Development Office, in partnership with the Staff Development Committee, should consider publishing on their webpage results from semester Flex Day workshops with an online “Suggestion” mechanism for faculty and classified staff to suggest needed or desired training sessions.

The Professional Development Office should also inventory the types of evaluation practices currently being used across all College professional development venues to determine how the findings are utilized and the potential need for coordination or revision. They could then use the results of this inventory to publicize and promote how training is benefiting student learning and faculty and classified staff performance.

Planning Agenda

None.

III.A.6. Human resources 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.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco includes human resources planning in institutional planning. Results from recent long-term assessment and planning activities demonstrate how human resources planning has been included in these institutional dialogs.

In the first example, the 2011-16 Strategic Plan’s Objective Six describes goals of Human Resources and Staffing. The overall objective is to “Support workforce practices that are economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable for the College and its employees.” The ten goals in this section help define priorities during the next cycle, which include such objectives as “expanding the recruitment and hiring of a diverse faculty, staff, and administration and ensuring that professional development opportunities are available to all CCSF employees” [III A-27].

Another example can be found in the 2010-11 Annual Plan, where Section 8.1 outlines the need to “Improve efforts to recruit and hire a diverse faculty and staff, and continue to evaluate processes to ensure that the College workforce reflects the diverse communities the College serves, all as permitted by applicable law” [III A-40].

In addition to the long-term plans, the yearly Program Review process integrates human resources needs into long-term planning. As discussed earlier (Section III.A.2), Program Review reports and respective budget requests are reviewed by the College’s PBC. As a component of planning, departments, administrators, and supervisory personnel are required to indicate resources needed for completion of their objectives. Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. The relationship between the planning and budgeting process and position allocations is integral to decision making about new and replacement positions. For a new or replacement administrative position, the administration consults with the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and Classified representatives [III A-8]. The Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) reviews all requests for new or replacement faculty positions and makes recommendations for funding to the College’s PBC. For classified positions, decisions are recommended by the Vacancy Review Workgroup composed of District and SEIU 1021 representatives. In the end, position allocation for faculty, classified staff, and administrators is aligned with College goals, strategic priorities, and financial resources.

Reduced state funding has forced the District to be cautious about hiring new faculty and classified staff. However, departments and programs are still requesting staff through either the FPAC or the VRW.

In Fall 2010, a plan to temporarily upgrade part-time, temporary faculty to full-time status was negotiated in order to fill emergency vacancies and most effectively use the expertise of current, experienced part-time, temporary faculty, allowing them opportunities to more fully develop their professional skills.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has integrated human resource planning with institutional planning from the Strategic Plan to the Annual Plans and the Program Review process.

Planning Agenda

None.

Standard III.A Evidence

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Title** | **Web Address** |
| III A-1 | District Hiring Procedures | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/DistrictHiringProcedures.pdf> |
| III A-2 | SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement 2009-12 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Employee_Relations/PDF/2009-2012AFT_CBA-DRAFT-Amended-7-28-11.pdf> |
| III A-3 | City College Fact Sheet-2011 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/marketing\_publications/fact\_sheet/\_jcr\_content/left-col-parsys/documentlink/file.res/College Fact Sheet (Front) April 2011.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/marketing_publications/fact_sheet/_jcr_content/left-col-parsys/documentlink/file.res/College%20Fact%20Sheet%20(Front)%20April%202011.pdf) |
| III A-4 | Employee and Hiring Data Report 2010-11 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Human_Resources/cmsforms/employee-hiring-data-report.pdf> |
| III A-5 | Express Classification Form | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/ExpressClassFormRevJAQ.pdf> |
| III A-6 | Board Resolution No. 080926-S4 Rehabilitation and Hiring, Sept. 25, 2008 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/minutes PDF/2008/September\_25\_2008\_minutes.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/minutes%20PDF/2008/September_25_2008_minutes.pdf) |
| III A-7 | San Francisco City & County Human Resources Dept., Performance & Planning Appraisal | <http://www.sfdhr.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=2207> |
| III A-8 | Administrative Handbook, 2006 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Human_Resources/handbookpdf/ADMIN-HB.pdf> |
| III A-9 | Exhibit D: Peer to Peer Management Evaluation Form for Academic Employees | <http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/OfficeOfInstruction/EvaluationForms/Exhibit_D_Peerf2011.pdf> |
| III A-10 | Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review Guidebook, Aug. 2011 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/OfficeOfInstruction/EvaluationForms/EvaluationGuide.pdf> |
| III A-11 | Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review | <http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/employee-services/office-of-instruction/tenure-review-new.html> |
| III A-12 | SFCCD/DCC Collective Bargaining Agreement 2009-13 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Employee_Relations/PDF/2009-2013-CBA_Amended6-24-10.pdf> |
| III A-13 | Classified Performance Evaluation & Plan | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/pdf/Classified PerformancEvaluation.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/Classified%20PerformancEvaluation.pdf) |
| III A-14 | 2009-10 Summary of Faculty Evaluation – Credit, Noncredit, ESL & Library | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/pdf/200910Faculty EvaluationSummary.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/200910Faculty%20EvaluationSummary.pdf) |
| III A-15 | Policy Manual BP 3050 Institutional Code of Ethics | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/bp3050.doc> |
| III A-16 | Faculty Handbook, 2010 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Human_Resources/handbookpdf/FHandbook.pdf> |
| III A-17 | Classified Handbook, Spring 2011 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Human_Resources/handbookpdf/CLEAN-CLASBK.pdf> |
| III A-18 | Policy Manual, PM 4.09 - Use of Slurs | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/4/pm4_09.doc> |
| III A-19 | SFCCD/SEIU 1021 Collective Bargaining Agreement | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Employee_Relations/PDF/07-11_CBA-AMENDED_6-30-10.pdf> |
| III A-20 | Policy Manual 1.16 - Prohibiting Workplace Violence | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/pm1_16.doc> |
| III A-21 | Office of Affirmative Action Equal Opportunity Compliance, Sexual Harassment policies | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Affirmative_Action/> |
| III A-22 | Board Policy 3052 Conflict of Interest, July 29, 2010 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/bp3052.doc> |
| III A-23 | 75-25 Calculation, 2010 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/75_25full_time_obligation_summary.pdf> |
| III A-24 | FPAC Request for Replacement Positions forms | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/IIIA22_FPAC.pdf> |
| III A-25 | District Policy Manual, 2000-2010 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/NEW.shtml> |
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