

1 [Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report - Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a
2 Living Wage]

3 **Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings**
4 **and recommendations contained in the 2020-2021 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled**
5 **“Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage;” and urging the Mayor to**
6 **cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through her**
7 **department heads and through the development of the annual budget.**

8
9 WHEREAS, Under California Penal Code, Section 933 et seq., the Board of
10 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
11 Court on the findings and recommendations contained in Civil Grand Jury Reports; and

12 WHEREAS, In accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), if a finding or
13 recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a
14 county agency or a department headed by an elected officer, the agency or department head
15 and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Civil Grand Jury, but the
16 response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only budgetary or personnel matters over
17 which it has some decision making authority; and

18 WHEREAS, Under San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(a), the Board of
19 Supervisors must conduct a public hearing by a committee to consider a final report of the
20 findings and recommendations submitted, and notify the current foreperson and immediate
21 past foreperson of the civil grand jury when such hearing is scheduled; and

22 WHEREAS, In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(b),
23 the Controller must report to the Board of Supervisors on the implementation of
24 recommendations that pertain to fiscal matters that were considered at a public hearing held
25 by a Board of Supervisors Committee; and

1 WHEREAS, The 2020-2021 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled “Strategic Alignment:
2 Breaking Through to a Living Wage” (“Report”) is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
3 Supervisors in File No. 210706, which is hereby declared to be a part of this Resolution as if
4 set forth fully herein; and

5 WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond
6 to Finding Nos. F1, F3, F4, F5, F6, and F7, as well as Recommendation Nos. R1, R3, R4, R5,
7 R6, and R7 contained in the subject Report; and

8 WHEREAS, Finding No. F1 states: “City College did not have a formal role on the
9 City’s Workforce Alignment Committee while it was active and does not have a role on the
10 current ad hoc committee, and this inhibits effective programmatic coordination between
11 OEWD and City College;” and

12 WHEREAS, Finding No. F3 states: “OEWD’s lack of a concerted effort to enroll groups
13 in Eligible Training Provider List programs at City College hurts its ability to maximize limited
14 funds;” and

15 WHEREAS, Finding No. F4 states: “Limited availability of technical courses during City
16 College’s summer semester is a contributing factor to OEWD participants pursuing their
17 studies at alternative educational institutions, thereby incurring additional costs;” and

18 WHEREAS, Finding No. F5 states: “Demand for some City College courses and the
19 lack of priority registration for OEWD participants results in their being denied enrollment for
20 courses needed for their training programs;” and

21 WHEREAS, Finding No. F6 states: “Inaccuracies on the Eligible Training Provider List
22 unnecessarily deter OEWD job seekers from taking needed courses;” and

23 WHEREAS, Finding No. F7 states: “The lack of synchronization and outreach among
24 OEWD, City College, and community-based organizations in promoting Eligible Training
25

1 Provider List certificate programs at City College results in the underutilization of these
2 programs;” and

3 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R1 states: “The Board of Supervisors should
4 reinstate the Committee on City Workforce Alignment to Chapter 30 of the Administrative
5 Code and add City College as a member. The reinstatement should be completed no later
6 than February 2022;” and

7 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R3 states: “OEWD should convene a joint working
8 group to review current Career Technical Education course offerings at City College and
9 make recommendations to develop content that aligns with the needs of the OEWD
10 participants by December 2021. The joint working group should include City College’s Dean
11 for Workforce Development, the City’s Director of Sector and Workforce Development, and
12 the Eligible Training Provider List Coordinator for Workforce Development Comprehensive
13 Job Centers;” and

14 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R4 states: “City College should enhance its number
15 of short-term certificate training programs by February 2022, and these courses should be
16 developed in collaboration with businesses or community-based organizations receiving
17 OEWD funding. This should include an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during
18 City College’s summer semester to at least six;” and

19 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R5 states: “City College should allow priority
20 registration for OEWD participants enrolling in certificate program courses on the Eligible
21 Training Provider List. Priority registration should begin with the Fall 2022 semester;” and

22 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R6 states: “City College should convene a
23 workgroup to identify and correct inaccuracies in the course descriptions, schedules, and
24 costs included on the Eligible Training Provider List by January 2022;” and

25

1 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R7 states: “OEWD should work with stakeholders
2 who coordinate the Eligible Training Provider List to develop an outreach program that
3 encourages clientele to pursue City College certificate programs. The outreach plan should be
4 approved by the Director of Workforce Development and implemented by April 2022;” and

5 WHEREAS, In accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), the Board of
6 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
7 Court on Finding Nos. F1, F3, F4, F5, F6, and F7, as well as Recommendation Nos. R1, R3,
8 R4, R5, R6, and R7 contained in the subject Report; now, therefore, be it

9 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the
10 Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F1 for reason as follows: City
11 College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee but
12 collaborates with OEWD in several other spaces, including the Workforce Investment San
13 Francisco (WISF) Board and meetings convened by OEWD for programs such as CityBuild,
14 TechSF, and the HealthCare Academy; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge
16 of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F3 for reason as follows:
17 This finding requires clarification. OEWD does not directly enroll groups into programs. CCSF
18 and OEWD should collaborate to provide guidance to community based organizations that will
19 assist with job placement and increase enrollment; however the Board of Supervisors
20 understands that WIOA funding requirements place strict requirements for OEWD regarding
21 adherence to outcomes that are specific to job placement and not inclusive of enrollment in
22 CCSF ETPL programs; and, be it

23 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge
24 of the Superior Court that they agree with Finding No. F4; and, be it

25

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge
2 of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F5 for reason as follows:
3 Priority registration is regulated by the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 58108
4 as a condition of claiming state apportionment for enrollment in the class; however, CCSF
5 when able, should prioritize OEWD students to the greatest extent feasible; and, be it

6 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge
7 of the Superior Court that they agree with Finding No. F6; and, be it

8 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge
9 of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F7 for reason as follows:
10 there appear to be some efforts by OEWD and community based organizations to promote
11 City College of San Francisco EPTL programs; however, the Board acknowledges that the
12 process should be refined; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
14 No. R1 has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future by February 2022;
15 and, be it

16 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
17 No. R3 will not be implemented because it is unwarranted or unreasonable for the following
18 reason: While the Board agrees that OEWD and City College of San Francisco should
19 collaborate on building Career Technical Education course offerings that aligns with the needs
20 of OEWD participants, OEWD and City College of San Francisco should be allowed to utilize
21 their existing meeting frameworks to perform this work; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
23 No. R4 will not be implemented because it is unwarranted or unreasonable for the following
24 reason: while the Board of Supervisors agrees that City College of San Francisco should
25 increase the number of short-term training opportunities, it is unclear whether it has sufficient

1 budget allocations to do so at the requested scale, or within the suggested timeline, as of this
2 Board's response; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
4 No. R5 will not be implemented because it is unwarranted or unreasonable for the following
5 reason: the recommendation regards policies internal to City College of San Francisco and
6 falls outside of the Board's purview; and, be it

7 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
8 No. R6 will not be implemented because it is unwarranted or unreasonable for the following
9 reason: the recommendation asks City College of San Francisco to convene an internal
10 workgroup, which falls outside of the Board's purview. The Board of Supervisors concur with
11 the recommendation that any inaccuracies are promptly corrected, but defers to CCSF as to
12 the process for achieving that result; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
14 No. R7 will not be implemented because it is unwarranted or unreasonable for the following
15 reason: while San Franciscans would benefit from encouraging OEWD clientele to enroll in
16 City College of San Francisco, the proposed outreach plan is not aligned with current OEWD
17 funding outcomes. However, OEWD and City College of San Francisco should continue to
18 collaborate and coordinate outreach to the greatest extent feasible; and, be it

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the
20 implementation of the accepted findings and recommendations through her department heads
21 and through the development of the annual budget.

22
23
24
25