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I. Statement on Report Preparation

This report was prepared by the following staff of City College of San Francisco:

Chancellor                   Don Q. Griffin
Academic Senate President    Hal Huntsman
Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration  Peter Goldstein
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs & Accreditation Liaison Officer  Alice Murillo
Vice Chancellor for Student Development  Mark D. Robinson
Dean of Curriculum            Tom Boegel
Interim Dean of Student Activities  Elizabeth Rockstroh
Academic Senate Executive Council  Susan Lopez
Program Review Faculty Co-Chair  Loren Bell
Library Faculty Representative  Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer

Drafts of this progress report were discussed with the Planning and Budgeting Council, the College’s primary shared governance organization for planning and budgeting; the Chancellor’s Cabinet; the Academic Senate; the Classified Senate; and members of the Board of Trustees at their February Planning and Budgeting Subcommittee meeting. Additional groups providing feedback include the Program Review Committee and the Student Learning Outcomes Workgroup. The College Advisory Council approved this final report. The full Board will review this report at their March 25, 2010 Board meeting.

Dr. Don Q. Griffin, Chancellor
II. Background

City College completed its comprehensive self-study for re-accreditation in January, 2006, and submitted it to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. An appointed team of peers visited the campus, March 20-23 2006, and their recommendations were forwarded to WASC. Re-affirmation of accreditation was awarded at a meeting of WASC, June 7-9 2006, and the college was notified, on June 29, 2006, of the approval along with a set of formal recommendations by the Association. The WASC visiting team made ten recommendations to the College, and three of the recommendations were noted as having special emphasis.

A focused mid-term report was submitted on March 15, 2009 addressing all of the WASC recommendations with a special emphasis on Recommendations 2, 3 and 4 which are:

**Recommendation 2: Planning and Assessment**
The team recommends that the college build upon its continuing planning and assessment efforts and develop an integrated process of institutional planning and assessment that combines strategic planning, educational planning, facilities planning, technology planning, and personnel planning in a manner that links these planning processes to annual budgets. Planning should be based upon the findings of instructional and non-instructional program review, which should include clear criteria for resource reallocation and/or program and service development, expansion, or termination. (Standards I.B, II.A.2.e, and II.A.2.f).

**Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes**
The team recommends that the college ensure that student learning outcomes are fully institutionalized as a core element of college operations, with specific focus on curriculum and program development. (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.3, and II.A.6).

**Recommendation 4: Financial Planning and Stability**
The team recommends that the college develop a financial strategy that will: match ongoing expenditures with ongoing revenue; maintain the minimum prudent reserve level; reduce the percentage of its annual budget that is utilized for salaries and benefits; and address funding for retiree health benefits costs. (Standards III.D.1.b, III.D.2.c, and III.D.2.d).

The report also included College progress on the self-identified issues from the College self-study.

The Commission reviewed the report at its meeting June 9-11, 2009 and took action to accept the Focused Midterm Report with the requirement that the College complete a Follow-Up Report demonstrating status toward resolution of Recommendation 3 and resolution of Recommendation 4.
III. Response to Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes

The team recommends that the college ensure that student learning outcomes are fully institutionalized as a core element of college operations, with specific focus on curriculum and program development. (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.3, and II.A.6).

Since our Focused Midterm Report, CCSF has progressed demonstratively and substantially in the institutionalization of student learning outcomes as a core element of college operations. Implementation has broadened and accelerated. Facing extraordinary resource constraints, we have nonetheless identified several strategies for moving forward in a timely fashion.

The leadership at the College has demonstrated a strong commitment to advancing the dialogue on student learning outcomes. The administration, the Department Chair Council and the Academic Senate has each had a strong presence in guiding our discussions, designing our processes and providing staff development opportunities to support this institutional priority.

In the following section we will discuss the steps we have taken to institutionalize student learning outcomes as an element of program review and curriculum/program development, with our existing programs (including general education) and courses, with library and learning resources, and with student services.

Integration of student learning outcomes into program review

In 2008/2009 the College participated in a pilot program review process. A total of 105 departments and administrative units completed reports based on the template developed by the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the Office of Research and Planning. All reports were reviewed by the respective Deans, Vice Chancellors, and members of the PRC and the co-chairs of the PRC presented to the Planning & Budgeting Council (PBC). Given the nature of the strained 2009-10 budget projections, no recommendations or planning proposals were acted on at the May 2009 budget development meeting of the PBC.

Basic student learning outcome assessment reporting was incorporated into the pilot phase of our revised Program Review process for all departments. Revisions of course outlines, including those for distance learning, had begun to include major learning outcomes. In our Program Review pilot, a template was used to elicit description of the course or program SLOs, means of assessment, measurement criteria, analysis, and plans for improvement. Participation was voluntary and strongly encouraged in the pilot year; the goal was to collect at least 61 such reports, at least one for each department or unit. Student learning outcomes would be explicitly integrated into budgeting through the
integration of the new program review process into the CCSF system of planning, budgeting and evaluation. A workgroup of faculty and administration was convened and assigned the task---originally defined for a coordinator position---of coordinating SLO implementation.

Because of active participation by many departments who submitted reports for several courses, we received 78 reports, exceeding our goal of 61. Some of the SLO reports received were exemplary, showing a cycle of continuous improvement that was data-driven and included the use of student learning outcomes data. (Appendix # 1) Some of our courses, programs and departments may already be proficient in their implementation of SLOs. However, only 37 (62%) of the departments submitted reports. Our Program Review Committee reviewed the information submitted in the pilot year. While some reports were outstanding, others did not yield full information on the means of assessment, measurement criteria or plans for improvement. Some departments did not find that the timeline gave them sufficient time to make plans for improvement. Also, there were different interpretations of the terminology used in the templates. We now have a general sense of our baseline in terms of the departments which reported in the pilot year.

During the Spring 2009 semester, the evaluation of the pilot program review process began and continued through Fall 2009. A 12 question survey was developed by the Office of Research & Planning in consultation with the PRC and distributed to every College employee. (Appendix # 2) Seventy-one survey respondents provided feedback as well as the members of the Department Chair Council (DCC), PBC, and members of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Work Group. As of Fall 2009, in response to concerns raised in the Spring 2009 pilot implementation and the urgency of continued integration of current and upcoming demands of institutional planning, assessment, and student learning outcomes, the PRC met every two weeks.

The SLO Workgroup continued to convene during the Fall 09 semester to address implementation of the student learning outcomes process. The philosophy generated has been centralized coordination and decentralized (unit) implementation. Three of the Workgroup members have participated in Commission training and the DCC sponsored five Spring 2010 flex workshops related to the student learning outcomes process. (Appendix # 3) Additional workshops are scheduled for April 2010 and as part of Fall 2010 Flex.

In order to better guide and support the units with the SLO process, two questions in the pilot program review template were revised for clarity. (Appendix # 4) The first question (#6) now asks units to identify a six year plan for revising course and program curriculum outlines and a plan to develop, assess and utilize student learning outcomes in all of its courses and/or programs by 2014-2015. This expectation is being incorporated into our Curriculum Guide as well as our Program Review process.
These six year plans were submitted by the departments to their respective Deans on March 1, 2010 and the PRC and SLO Workgroup will use them to evaluate institutional progress in the SLO assessment process. (Appendix # 5) Departments have been encouraged to give early assessment priority to courses with high enrollments, courses that challenge students or serve as barriers to course progression, programs that capture courses across the curriculum, courses offered with greatest frequency and complete disciplines within a department to ensure broad programmatic review. Preliminary review of plans indicates that the majority of courses and programs will complete one cycle of their assessment process by 2013. Departments that seem to have more heavily scheduled their assessment for the latter part of the six year cycle will be provided with coaching from peer department chairs to ensure earlier assessment of their courses and programs.

The second question (#7) now asks respondents to provide a summary on progress to date on assessment plans introduced in last year’s program review report. Through a series of guided questions, units are also asked to provide examples of exemplary course and programs student learning outcomes assessment results. Respondents are also asked to identify their comfort level in managing their SLO processes and corresponding staff development needs. (Appendix # 4)

A primary objective for 2010-2011 is to greatly increase the number of departments and units involved in submitting SLO information as a required part of their program review for 2010-11. The active response from several departments last year has put us on target to receive SLO reports on the assessment of at least 130 courses and programs in the 2010-11 cycle, and to increase the number of departments responding to 62.

The Program Review Committee is looking at the question of whether program review could start earlier in the school year if we used a preliminary data set. This would allow departments more time to plan their SLO implementation, gather information for a thorough review, and report on improvements arising from their data dialogue.

Lastly, both the Program Review Committee and the SLO Workgroup members have discussed their roles in the SLO assessment process. At this juncture, it has been decided that the PRC members will have responsibility for reviewing the progress of units in the assessment of their SLOs, as described in their unit program review reports. The SLO Workgroup will have responsibility for monitoring the unit SLO course and program templates to ensure “closing of the loop” and for providing the staff development and coaching identified.
Integration of student learning outcomes into curriculum development

Our work on integrating student learning outcomes into curriculum development has had a two-pronged approach: working with developers of curriculum, and working with the Curriculum Committee.

Several years ago our template for our course outlines of record was adjusted so that our outlines now include student learning outcomes. On our template, they are referred to as “Major Learning Outcomes”. Chapter 2 of our Curriculum Handbook discusses the course outline of record, and talks about the integration of learning outcomes, content, and instructional methodology.

The Curriculum Committee chair and Dean of Curriculum hold regular workshops for faculty course developers; student learning outcomes is a large part of these meetings. We have seen that faculty developers have improved in their ability to write measurable, level-appropriate learning outcomes for their classes. Much of our current effort with faculty developers has been in more explicitly tying together the evaluation of learning outcomes into the instructional methodology section of the course outline of record.

The work that our Curriculum Committee has taken in integrating student learning outcomes has focused on changing the level of discussion at our Curriculum Committee meetings. Our Curriculum Committee is a quadripartite committee of faculty, administration, classified staff, and students. The Committee reviews and approves, on average, 30 new courses and/or course revisions per meeting, and meets approximately 8 times per year to review and approve curriculum. At our meetings, departments bringing forward proposals make a short presentation, and then the floor is opened for questions from the committee. The vast majority of proposals are approved pending the correction of stipulations.

A major recent shift at the Curriculum Committee has been to offload the handling of typographical and other minor changes so that they no longer take up time during the Curriculum Committee meeting. Members of the Curriculum Committee are charged with proofreading the course outlines, and these proofreading stipulations are given to the department without further comment. This has significantly changed the tenor of the conversation at the Curriculum Committee. The discussions at the meetings have been more focused on learning outcomes, content, instructional methodology, and the integration of those three areas.

Integration of student learning outcomes into program development

Our Curriculum Handbook guides departments in the entirety of our curriculum processes. Two chapters of the handbook work with program development: Chapter 4
discusses degree programs, and Chapter 5 discusses certificate programs. A recent revision of this handbook now guides departments to include a discussion of learning outcomes into the development process of certificate and degree programs. In addition to this guidance, departments who are proposing certificate and degree programs must now identify the learning outcomes as a part of the catalog text. (Attachment # 6)

In addition to this new requirement, we will include guidance about mapping program-level learning outcomes to individual courses.

**Progress on general education student learning outcomes: Six year assessment plan**

In the last year we finalized our discussions on the identification of Student Learning Outcomes for our General Education program. These outcomes have been printed in the 2009-10 College Catalog.

In developing the learning outcomes for our General Education program, we have been mindful to link them directly to the inclusion criteria established in our Curriculum Handbook and used by our Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. We have also recently revised the paperwork that departments use to request inclusion in our General Education program. Our new forms require departments to provide clearer evidence of how the course meets the inclusion criteria. Departments must show how the course outline of record satisfies these inclusion criteria. With our learning outcomes tied directly to our inclusion criteria, we are now able to map the learning outcomes of our General Education program to specific aspects of the courses included in an area.

Preliminary discussions have begun on continuing the SLO process for our General Education program. This work will be challenging, as our General Education program is extensive. For example, the Social and Behavioral Sciences area can be met by taking one of 176 courses across 27 disciplines.

**Progress on academic program and course student learning outcomes: Six year assessment process**

Establishing a structure for SLO implementation in Academic Affairs has been an important first step for the College. The SLO Workgroup and Program Review Committee are among the groups leading the way. The SLO Workgroup helps to build consensus among leadership regarding SLO implementation. There is overlap of membership with these groups and the Academic Senate and Department Chairs Council, as well as the quadripartite Planning and Budgeting Council, to which the Program Review Committee reports regularly. All of these bodies, without exception, have been
engaged in SLO implementation dialogue since we submitted our Focused Midterm Report. The level of awareness of the SLOs model has increased significantly at the leadership level through these various discussions. During discussions surrounding the sometimes painful cuts planned for Spring and Summer terms, the need to maintain our core mission and learning outcomes was the key principle underlying every decision.

Since our Midterm Report, professional development has begun to significantly enhance our SLO implementation effort. CCSF has designated Student Learning Outcomes as the theme of Spring (Flex) Professional Development Day, raising the profile of learning outcomes throughout the institution, and providing training opportunities in the form of workshops on eight different SLO topics. All faculty and administrators were given the opportunity to participate in any of the workshops, with topics ranging from the development and assessment of course and program outcomes, to the SLO-based revision of a college success course and a general introduction to the process of continuous quality improvement (CQI). (Appendix # 3)

Faculty has begun to participate in external SLO-themed workshops as well as such onsite events. In Fall 2009, three members of the SLO Work Group—one representative of the DCC, one representative of the Academic Senate, and one administrator—attended the WASC conference in San Jose on student learning outcomes and subsequently reported back to major shared governance groups regarding what they had learned and the implications for extending the implementation of SLOs at CCSF.

Improvements in assessment have been undertaken. Many departments are exploring the use of more authentic and faculty driven assessment, often with the use of rubrics, to complement traditional forms of assessment of learning outcomes. Several departments are planning to apply together for a grant to purchase e-portfolio software to be used for authentic assessment.

Some of our largest departments, including English, Mathematics, and ESL, make some use of common assessment materials for multiple sections of the same course. Some other departments prefer to leave the manner of SLO assessment at the discretion of the individual instructor and our decentralized implementation allows for that flexibility. In many of the career technical, STEM, and basic skills-involved disciplines, implementation of SLOs seems to be particularly well developed. Since we are a very large institution, gathering information about the extent of existing SLO implementation in all of our courses and programs continues to represent an advance. We have much more information and evidence than before. Nonetheless, documentation is an on-going challenge, so we have discussed ways to continue to expand SLO reporting processes within existing resources.
Progress on library and learning resources student learning outcomes: Six year assessment process

Library and Learning Resources have developed student learning outcomes and begun assessment activities in fulfillment of its mission and two primary roles:

1) instructional role teaching information competency by means of a series of seven, non-credit research skills workshops or a one-credit course, LIS 10, “Use of Information Resources” that help prepare students to successfully satisfy CCSF’s information competency (IC) graduation requirement as well as Area B, Written Composition and Information Competency; and

2) academic support role of providing information resources and services to support student learning.

During 2007-08 and 2008-09, all of the course outlines, including SLOs, for the research skills/IC workshops were revised and submitted for College Curriculum Committee approval. The content and pedagogical changes were based on student feedback from surveys that indicated the need for more practical examples and engaging learning activities. Workshop outlines and instructional materials were revised and training sessions were offered for librarians that focused on the new workshop content and teaching techniques to involve students in their learning.

Similarly, when the College’s online course management software changed a year ago, the one-credit LIS 10 course was substantially revised with refined SLOs based on several years of results from student performance on pre- and post-assessments of learning, as well as student performance on course tests and graded assignments.

As part of the Spring 2009 new Program Review document, the Library submitted six SLOs for the Library Instructional Services/Information Competency Program. Progress to date is reported on the Spring 2010 Program Review document, but to briefly summarize, the Library’s Information Competency & Curriculum Development Committee has identified several assessment activities to be implemented during the Spring 2010 and Fall 2010 semesters that will provide data specific to each of the six SLOs.

To address the development of SLOs for the other Library and Learning Resources services/programs, a SLO Task Force was established in early Fall 2009. The outcome of their work is six SLOs that reflect ALL service/resource units of LLR. The SLOs have been shared with all staff and discussed at library faculty meeting and the Dean’s Library Advisory meeting. A SLO webpage is being created off the Library’s homepage that lists the six broad SLOs and connects assessment findings and plans for improvement.

Collecting student feedback using formal survey feedback forms about the research
skills/IC workshops has been a yearly or every-other-year activity for the past ten years. The findings have provided valuable information resulting in improvements to the workshop outline, instructional materials, design of workshop learning activities and teaching pedagogy. However, there was no organized attempt to formally assess what students had learned or could do as a result of attending these workshops until Spring 2008 when a multiple-methods assessment was administered that:

- collected data from students in three sections of ENG 1A about how they prepared for and conducted information research for their papers and
- evaluated the quality of their “Works Cited” page using a rubric.

As a result of this assessment a report was shared with English faculty and librarians (available at [http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/assess08.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/assess08.pdf)) and a recommendation was made to the English Department’s Curriculum Committee to revise the ENG 1A course outline to require five hours of research skills/IC workshops, thus increasing student preparation and experience using online information research tools.

The Alice Statler librarian has conducted surveys and other types of assessment with students in a Culinary Arts course that uses library research materials for assignments. As a result of her formative assessments, she has revised the assignment.

Following the work and recommendations of the Library’s SLO Task Force, a new Library Assessment Committee has been formed. Its charge includes developing an ongoing assessment plan that includes a timeline and suggested evaluation methods/strategies to assess the six program level SLOs above and to coordinate all assessment activities for LLR, which includes the Instructional Services/Information Competency program SLOs. Several different assessment activities are planned and/or underway for Spring and Fall 2010:

- approximately 600 students in Health Education courses will complete pre-instruction assessment before attending a research skill workshop and then post-instruction assessment three weeks after the workshop to ascertain their acquisition and retention of new research skills;
- three sections of students in Sociology 1 who attend research skills instruction with their class will complete a post-instruction assessment several weeks after the assignment is due to determine their understanding and application of concepts presented at the workshop;
- a random sample of about 200 students who complete two specific research skills/IC workshops will complete a pre and post-workshop assessment to determine what they’ve learned related to three specific SLOs;
- replicate the evaluation of research paper bibliographies/“Works Cited” pages using a broader sample in different disciplines;
- survey students using the Language Center about specific aspects of student learning;
- survey students using the Library’s group study rooms about the reason for use
and the importance of the group study rooms for their course assignments/academic success.

Once the Library Assessment Committee has completed its assessment plan with timeline and suggested assessment methods/strategies, a more comprehensive approach will become part of the Library’s annual operations, especially the Annual Plan and the Program Review document.

**Progress on student services student learning outcomes: Six year assessment process**

The Student Development Division has made substantial progress in the area of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) during the Summer 2008 and Fall 2009 semesters. Prior to the Summer 2008 semester, the Student Development Division had a SLO Workgroup that met regularly to discuss and brainstorm SLOs, initiated several SLO pilot studies, and began developing a timeline and mapping for SLOs within the Division.

Starting in the Summer of 2008, in an effort to move the Student Development Division closer to the WASC standards of sustainability in SLOs, the Division began a series of workshops for each unit within the Division. These workshops, facilitated by staff trained on SLOs, provided the following:

- a brief history and description of SLOs,
- a review of the Student Development Division’s involvement in SLOs thus far,
- an examination of individual unit goals and mission statements,
- the development of SLOs for each unit,
- the development of support activities for selected SLOs, and
- the development of assessments for selected SLOs.

After these meetings were conducted, a grid with all Divisional SLO information was created and monthly SLO Workgroup meetings, with at least one representative attending from each unit, were initiated. There were a total of four Workgroup meetings in the Fall 2008 semester. At the Workgroup meetings, unit SLOs were shared, goals of the group were brainstormed, and the opportunity for discussion and inquiries on Divisional SLOs was granted. In addition to the Workgroup meetings, individual unit meetings were scheduled on a one-on-one basis with the Student Development SLO Coordinator, and further presentations to departments within the major 10 units were conducted. In December 2008, each department was asked to provide a progress report for their respective areas, outlining what SLOs they worked on in the Fall 2008 semester, their development, and their future plans for each SLO.

The result of the diligent work of the many units within the Student Development Division was substantial. In seven months, the Division grew from only one to two units with SLO pilot projects, to each of the 10 major units, and many of their sub-units, with clearly identified SLOs. Although the units continued to move forward at different paces, and experience different levels of comfort with SLOs, the effort of the Division is unified.
in the collective approach to make significant impacts on student learning through the use of SLOs.

Goals for the Spring 2009 semester included:

• implementation and assessment of designated SLOs,
• development of SLOs for each department,
• integration of SLO mapping with institutional and Divisional SLOs, and
• progress towards Development and Proficiency in SLOs as outlined in WASC standards.

During the spring of 2009, the SLO Workgroup continued to meet, with two large group meetings including all departments and several small group meetings including 1-3 departments. This combination of large and small group meetings allowed the Division to move forward in terms of both individual department and unit goals and also in terms of larger planning for Divisional SLOs. At the end of the Spring semester, all departments were again asked to submit individual reports on the progress of their various SLOs.

The Student Development SLO Coordinator compiled a report that included each of the individual updates, which were substantial. During the Spring 2009 semester, the 10 units within the Student Development Division worked on 35 Student Learning Outcomes, most of which were in their second semester of progress. Many departments had moved beyond their initial data gathering phase and were now evaluating data and making plans for how to improve existing systems based on their findings. Further, across the division, a number of innovative assessment tools and formats were engaged. Examples include use of electronic tools such as Survey Monkey, in-person meetings with students, focus groups, evaluation of Banner data, and many other techniques.

Of the four main goals set at the end of the Fall 2008 semester, three were more than adequately addressed. The fourth goal – integration of SLO mapping with institutional and Divisional SLOs – is the goal that most needs to be addressed in upcoming semesters. Although the Workgroup can engage in more serious discussions related to Divisional SLOs, true conversations and collaboration with the Academic Affairs Division will need to take place. A new goal stemming from the Spring 2009 semester is to work more closely with the few units that did not provide updates or who are not making as substantial progress as other units.

The Student Development Division continued to make progress towards sustainability of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) during the fall 2009 semester. The 11 main units progressed through the SLO cycle at various stages, including the following:

1) Several Student Development units progressed on their SLOs by continuing data gathering. The Student Health, Outreach & Recruitment, Financial Aid, and Counseling units all continued work on existing SLOs by gathering data in order to enhance student learning in their respective areas.
2) Several Student Development units progressed on their SLOs by analyzing gathered data. Units in the analysis phase include Student Affairs working with data on graduation, Enrollment and Matriculation reviewing data on GED testing, and Counseling’s data on English as a Second Language orientation.

3) The Student Activities Office created a new SLO to evaluate student learning related to students organizing events, and Student Health, Counseling, and other departments continued to plan and develop new SLOs as well.

**Future Planning and Levels of Implementation:**
Since the summer of 2008, the Student Development Division has made significant progress related to Student Learning Outcomes. In terms of the four levels of implementation listed on the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges’ (ACCJC) *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness*, the Division began at the Awareness stage, but has quickly moved to the Development and Proficiency stages over the past three semesters. As SLOs continue to become an on-going and integrated part of the Division’s annual planning and reporting, as well as part of an on-going conversation related to the Division and institution’s overall quality and effectiveness, their stability and growth can and will be clearly seen and evaluated at the Proficiency level and beyond.

By the year 2012 it is anticipated that the Student Development Division, and all of its corresponding departments and units, will have reached the Proficiency level. Of the seven Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes listed under the Proficiency level that is applicable to Student Development, only the characteristic of: “appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned” is a concern for completion by 2012. With the devastating budget cuts facing all community colleges in California, adequate resources and funding may not be able to be distributed as readily as in the past. The Student Development Division anticipates reaching the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level by the year 2015.

**Next Steps**
CCSF has identified the need to make SLO resources available online. As a first step, Program Review Committee minutes have now been made available online. Later this year, the College expects to develop an SLO website for sharing resources, such as examples of SLO processes and results.

Lack of familiarity with the terminology of data-driven decision making and SLOs is still a barrier to be addressed at the college, even among faculty who may be engaged in a
continuous quality improvement cycle as a matter of course. Professional development, therefore, will be a significant strategy within our resource constraints. Moving forward, we plan to continue to ensure that not only the leadership, but all faculty and staff have multiple opportunities to learn about the student learning outcomes model and its potential for the improvement of learning.

We plan to continue to increase awareness of students about CCSF’s student learning outcomes and to continue the process of involving classified staff in SLO discussions. The topic is now discussed at meetings where these groups are present—meetings of the Planning and Budgeting Council, the College Advisory Council and the Board of Trustees. Informally, the President of Associated Students has discussed with faculty basic introductory information about SLOs at the College.

Student learning outcomes have been explicitly integrated into budgeting through the incorporation of the new program review process into the CCSF system of planning, budgeting and evaluation. That has taken place formally and the agendas of the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) are reflecting that change. It is our goal to ensure that decisions on budget allocations include dialogue about the results of assessment and of the program improvement plans. Although the College lacks funds at present to achieve many of our desired improvements, we intend that any new resources be purposefully directed towards evidence-based plans to improve student learning. Subsequently, resources will be fine-tuned as appropriate, based both on demonstrated need and effectiveness. These will be among the goals of the PBC with regard to operationalizing student learning outcomes.

SLO timelines will apply to distance learning as well as campus-based courses, programs, degrees and services. They will provide information to be incorporated into the Spring 2010 revision of the Educational Master Plan. Similarly, the revised CCSF Strategic Plan, currently under development, will include plans for enhancing SLO implementation and ensuring continuous quality improvement. A timeline, through 2015, for our SLO process implementation in courses and programs is included. (Attachment # 6)

IV. Response to Recommendation 4: Financial Planning and Stability

The team recommends that the college develop a financial strategy that will: match ongoing expenditures with ongoing revenue; maintain the minimum prudent reserve level; reduce the percentage of its annual budget that is utilized for salaries and benefits; and address funding for retiree health benefits costs. (Standards III.D.1.b, III.D.2.c, and III.D.2.d)

The college provided an update on progress made in this area in March 2009. This report provides a second update on progress made during the period between
April 2009 and January 2010, including the ongoing financial challenges for the college generated by our nation’s severe economic recession.

The budget review and recommendations process will be employed during the Spring 2010 semester as part of an effort to identify the cost reductions needed to address the increasingly challenging financial parameters facing all of California’s providers of higher education.

Finally, it should be noted that the College’s independent financial audits for fiscal years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 have all resulted in unqualified opinions reflecting the accuracy of the college’s financial statements.

The following is a summary of what the college has achieved in the four areas specified: matching on-going expenditures to on-going revenues, maintaining prudent reserve levels, reducing the percentage of the annual budget utilized for salaries/benefits, and addressing retiree health benefits.

**Match On-Going Expenditures to On-Going Revenue**

The ending balance in the College’s unrestricted general fund on June 30, 2009 was approximately $2.5 million, an amount relatively unchanged from the previous year. The fact that this was achieved without the use of any significant one-time sources of funding, demonstrated that the College had successfully matched on-going spending with ongoing revenue during fiscal year 2008-09.

Fiscal year 2009-10 began with a state budget that imposed dramatic reductions in funding on the community college system, including severe cuts to both apportionment and categorical programs. The cooperation of all parts of the college community was required to develop a balanced budget under these circumstances. The college’s final adopted budget included several items specifically designed to maintain financial stability, including leaving vacant positions vacant, freezing all salaries, cutting the salaries of the college’s highest paid administrators, and asking the college’s employees to share the burden of increasing health insurance premiums. To ensure adequate funds were available to support student services, an area targeted by the state for dramatic reductions, the final budget included authorization to use up to $2 million of the Board Designated Reserve if necessary. This decision was granted in recognition of the importance of these programs for student success. However, the College’s fiscal strategy was to spend as little of the $2 million as possible by carefully monitoring all spending and maximizing savings during the course of the year.

Enrollment for fiscal year 2008-09 was exceptionally strong; witness the fact that without adding class sections the college’s enrollment grew substantially, generating an additional $2.5 million in apportionment funding. Because the College earned enrollment
growth funds in 2008-09 it was able to reduce the number of class sections offered during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 semesters by an average of six per cent without any risk of losing apportionment funding during fiscal year 2009-10. This strategy of using the one-year “hold harmless” provision for community colleges also enabled the college to achieve an additional $4 million in savings by eliminating almost the entire the 2010 summer term. The college has already included in its budget model for 2010-11 a substantial restoration of summer classes to prevent a loss of apportionment funds during that year.

Because the College was conservative in estimating total revenue in its final budget for fiscal year 2009-10, positive mid-year corrections for final 2008-09 growth funds have resulted in a net increase in revenue as compared with the assumptions the 2009-10 budget was built on. On the expenditure side the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration and the Chief Financial Officer now review all budget accounts at the district level including categorical programs every pay period. Revenue estimates are also reviewed on a continuing basis and adjusted if data supports such a change. Any such changes are brought to the immediate attention of the Chancellor, and to the Board of Trustees at their regularly scheduled meetings. The combined impact of positive revenue adjustments and regular monitoring of all accounts has produced a situation in which the College may not need to spend any of its Board Designated Reserve during fiscal year 2009-10, thereby keeping the reserve relatively intact heading into fiscal year 2010-11.

While the college has made a sustained and concerted effort to maintain financial stability, the state continues to experience historic budget shortfalls. As the Governor and the Legislature try to agree on a plan to erase a $20 billion deficit covering the remainder of fiscal year 2009-10 and 2010-11, it appears that the best the college can hope for is a flat level of funding from the state during the next eighteen months, with a chance that some funding for enrollment growth may be available. In addition, there is the possibility of additional cash deferrals. While the actual amount of state funding the college will receive will not be known until at least June, the administration will develop a tentative budget for fiscal year 2010-11 that will once again be based upon conservative assumptions. Projected cash shortages will be managed with participation in the Community College League’s pool for Tax Revenue Anticipation notes.

**Maintain Minimum Prudent Reserve Level**

The Community Colleges System Office recommends that College’s maintain a prudent reserve equal to at least five per cent of unrestricted general fund expenditures. In a memo issued in October 2005, the State Chancellor’s Office stated that the “Primary Criteria” for the overall assessment of a district’s financial condition would be:

“... General Fund Analysis that will include a review of the current, historical and projected fund balance. The main criteria for assessment will be the percentage of unrestricted general fund balance to all expenditures and other...”
outgo of [the] unrestricted general fund. For purposes of this assessment, all unrestricted expenditures and other outgo will include all uses of unrestricted general funds under expenditure object codes 1000 thru [sic] 7000.

The minimum prudent unrestricted general fund balance is 5 percent. This minimum prudent level is considered necessary to ease cash flow problems, to deal with unexpected cost increases, and other fiscal uncertainties. If a district falls below this minimum prudent level, further review will be performed to determine if any fiscal problems exist. Such review shall take into account identified one-time revenues and expenditures as designated by the affected district.”

As reported in the Annual Financial Budget Reports (CCFS-311) the College’s percentages for this measure have consistently exceeded the recommended minimum amount, totaling more than 10 per cent in fiscal years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09. Based on current estimates, the College expects to exceed the 10 per cent level once again at the end of fiscal year 2009-10.

An important component of a college’s fund balance is the Board Designated Reserve. On June 30, 2009, City College’s Board designated Reserve remained at $6.65 million, the largest amount in the history of the College. In addition to the designated reserve, the fund balance included another $2.6 million in the form of a closeout in the unrestricted general fund. These two components totaled more than $9.3 million or about 4.5 per cent of annual unrestricted general fund spending. The College’s independent external auditors have advised the College that an additional $1 million in restricted funds should be added to the $9.3 million figure which would create a revised total of $10.3 million or more than 5% of annual unrestricted general fund spending. This means that even under the narrowest measure of fiscal reserves, the College exceeded the five per cent minimum amount recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office.

Reasonable thinking would suggest that reserve funds should be used for the purpose they were intended, for example to cushion the worst general economic downturn since the Great Depression. However, as previously stated, while it once seemed that the college’s 2009-10 budget might require the use up to $2 million of designated reserve, revised estimates now indicate that it may be possible to avoid using the designated reserve at all during fiscal year 2009-10.

Reduce Percentage of Annual Budget Utilized for Salaries/Benefits

The College is located in one of the highest cost areas in the country and this is reflected in the cost of the current salary and benefits structure. The ratio of personnel to non-personnel costs remains at a high level with more than 90 per cent of unrestricted general fund expenditures going towards employee compensation. Additional funding would be needed to provide increased support for non-personnel items that would change this ratio.

In addition, under historically difficult fiscal conditions, the College has made strategic decisions to maintain as many class sections and student services as possible in the face of significant state cuts in workload funding and severe state cuts to categorical
Under current circumstances, these efforts to protect students will contribute to the percentage of the budget going to personnel costs.

**Retiree Health Benefits**

An independent actuary has determined that the College has an unfunded liability of approximately $158 million for the cost of retiree health benefits. This unfunded liability is now included in the College’s financial statements as documented by the annual independent audit report. The College did join the investment consortium sponsored by the Community College League for this issue but has not deposited any money into the fund. Recently San Francisco voters enacted a measure that modifies post retirement health benefits for new hires, lengthening the number of years needed to qualify for the benefit and allowing the college to negotiate with its representative labor unions to charge new hires a percentage of their salary to prefund the future liability. The College cannot implement the charges to new employees without union approval. The College continues to discuss all aspects of post retirement health benefits with its collective bargaining units in an attempt to address this financial challenge.

**Next Steps**

During the past eighteen months, all parts of the college community have demonstrated the highest possible level of cooperation in a unified effort to protect the college from unprecedented budget gaps. To continue its current level of financial stability during fiscal year 2010-11, the same high level of cooperation will be needed. While the budget will need to restore a significant portion of the summer term during 2011 to ensure base funding, other forms of sacrifice will need to continue.

During the next several weeks, the college’s Board of Trustees and the shared governance Planning and Budget Council will be evaluating and offering changes for the administration’s recommended plan for addressing a projected budget shortfall during fiscal year 2010-2011. As was the case with the development of the 2009-10 budget, during the spring the Board’s Budget Committee will conduct several public hearings on the college’s budget for fiscal year 2010-11. The administration will incorporate the ideas and direction it receives from the Board of Trustees and the shared governance committee to develop a preliminary budget no later than April 2010. It is anticipated that the Board of Trustees will adopt a preliminary budget in June 2010, and a final budget shortly after the state legislature and the Governor agree upon a final state budget.

Include the future costs of operating and maintaining new and existing facilities in its planning models and allocate funds in a timely manner to ensure the effective operation of these facilities.

The college has opened four new facilities as a result of its bond program, Student Health Services, the Mission Campus, the Child Development Center and the Health and
Wellness Center. While these openings have increased operating costs, two of them, the Mission Campus and the Wellness Center have also increased revenue by growing enrollment. While a true “total cost of ownership” methodology was not used during the initial planning stage for these facilities, the college was able to set aside adequate funding to operate each facility upon opening.

The next facility to open will be the Joint Use Facility, which will add to total space inventory but will not generate significantly higher operating costs. The facility, which will open in August 2010, will be LEED certified, thereby minimizing utility costs, and required additional staffing will only be for a few positions for building engineer and custodial functions. In time, this facility, which replaces older classrooms, may also lead to increased funding from enrollment growth.

The college will open its Chinatown/North Beach Campus in January 2012. This facility will require a significant amount of operating support. The cost of operating this facility will be significantly offset by the College’s ability to cease paying approximately $700,000 per year in rent and utilities for the existing Chinatown/North Beach Campus currently leased from the SFUSD. To ensure a smooth transition, the College has already incorporated the net increased cost of opening the Chinatown/North Beach Campus into the three-year running model of the college’s operating budget.

Construction of the Performing Arts Center on the Ocean Campus has been delayed because the state portion of the funding for this facility will not become available until voters enact the next statewide educational facilities bond, the date of which has not yet been set. When the expected completion date for this facility can be determined, the expected additional costs will also be incorporated into the three-year running model for the college’s operating budget. In time, this facility, which replaces older classrooms, may also lead to increased funding from enrollment growth.

The College is committed to incorporating total cost of ownership into plans at the initial stage for any new facilities that may be built as a result of future bond issues.

Ensure the development of adequate contingency plans, which should be implemented in a timely manner in order to reduce potential exposure to losses.

Beginning with fiscal year 2007-08, and continuing through the present, the college made significant progress in its efforts to prepare for emergencies. More than one hundred employees are now trained in basic emergency preparedness. The college has also conducted two mock emergency drills and one evacuation drill at all campuses. In addition 139 employees have also completed advanced emergency preparedness training sponsored by FEMA. The college is planning to conduct a second evacuation drill during Spring 2010. In addition, the college has completed extensive physical improvements to meet the needs of the disabled community with respect to areas of refuge assistance and
path of travel. The college’s Chief of Public and the Director of Student Health Services have led this effort and the college’s shared governance Health and Safety Committee is monitoring the continuing progress.
### Expected Student Learning Outcome:
Students completing the course should be able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Student Learning Outcome: Students completing the course should be able to:</th>
<th>Methods of Assessment: Students completing the course will be assessed by these assessment methods:</th>
<th>Measurement Criteria: Students completing the course will be measured based on these measurement criteria:</th>
<th>Summary &amp; Analysis of Data: (Specify date completed.)</th>
<th>Plan of Action: Use of results and modifications. (Specify start date.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate the ability to write and revise in- and out-of-class essays relying on text-based and argumentative strategies that show competence with essay structure.</td>
<td>The Department of English will assign an out-of-class analytical/argumentative essay to a sample of English 93 sections. The essays will be the first or second out-of-class project and are part of a multi-week essay unit. The writing assignment will be accompanied by contextualized instruction that address aspects of essay structure.</td>
<td>Instructors will score the essays according to two multipoint analytical rubrics, one that measures competence in aspects of essay structure and one that assesses language use, sentence structure, syntax, and grammar.</td>
<td>Student essays are read by a group of English instructors who identify major strengths and weaknesses in a variety of categories, including essay structure, use of textual support, sentence skills, and grammar. The summary and analysis of the data will be complete by Week 12 of the semester.</td>
<td>The top three perceived student weaknesses (e.g. paragraph development, sentence focus, quality of textual support) will inform 93 instructors’ plans for teaching these items. Lesson plans that address these weaknesses will be prepared and shared on the English 93 course web site: <a href="http://fog.cest.cc.ca.us/~jnaasl/eng93/93home.htm">http://fog.cest.cc.ca.us/~jnaasl/eng93/93home.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Show ability to comprehend shorter critical essays and articles as well as longer, more sustained nonfiction works (Advanced Degrees of Reading Power (ADRP) readability score of 58 or above).</td>
<td>The assessment instrument will utilize at least one level-appropriate text of 1000 words or more that scores 58 or above on the ADRP scale.</td>
<td>Reading comprehension and the strength of textual support in written work will be assessed as a part of the analytical rubric used on the products of the assessment (essays). We will also have ADRP scores for all students who participated in the assessment (the assessment will be given in Weeks 1 and 2).</td>
<td>Analysis of the scores for textual support, which may be cross-referenced with ADRP scores, will occur in Week 13 of the semester.</td>
<td>Reading training, via workshops based on Reading Apprenticeship program, will be offered to English 93 instructors between Weeks 14 and 16 of the semester, beginning in Spring 2009. A lesson plan designed to address weaknesses in annotation, understanding of text structure, and reading comprehension will be prepared in Spring 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Recognize and show, through discussion and writing, that argumentation requires a logical framework and credible evidence. | The assessment instrument will require students to use logical reasoning, analytical skill, and textual evidence as they produce a written response to the assessment prompt. | Competence in logical argumentation, analytical thinking, and use of textual evidence will be assessed as a part of the analytical rubric used on the products of the assessment (essays). | Instructors and the department’s assessment coordinator discuss student performance in each category in a scoring session and at subsequent meetings, during the remainder of the assessment semester and in the semester following the assessment. | Lesson plans that address weaknesses in this particular area will be prepared and shared on the English 93 course web site: http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaasleng93/jhome.htm
The prepared lesson plans will be available for use by the beginning of the semester following the assessment cycle. |

| 4. Summarize and demonstrate comprehension of increasingly longer and more complex texts, both verbally and in writing. | The assessment instrument will require students to work with a level-appropriate text that scores 58 or above on the ADRP scale as they produce a written response to the assessment prompt. | Use of short summary and understanding of significant textual claims will be assessed as a part of the analytical rubric used on the products of the assessment (essays). | Instructors and the department’s assessment coordinator discuss student performance in each category in a scoring session and at subsequent meetings, during the remainder of the assessment semester and in the semester following the assessment. | Lesson plans that address weaknesses in this particular area will be prepared and shared on the English 93 course web site: http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaasleng93/jhome.htm
The prepared lesson plans will be available for use by the beginning of the semester following the assessment cycle. Because this particular issue involves reading skill, the assessment committee will recommend reading training, via workshops based on Reading Apprenticeship program, and offer them to English 93 instructors between Weeks 14 and 16 of the semester, beginning in Spring 2009. A lesson plan designed to address weaknesses in annotation, understanding of text structure, and reading comprehension will be prepared in Spring 2009. |

| 5. Identify and use key structural elements of an essay or longer work, including the thesis, topic sentences, and supporting details. | The ability to use key structural elements of an essay or longer work, including the thesis, topic sentences, and supporting details are critical to producing a successful written response to the assessment prompt. | Use of these elements will be assessed as a part of the analytical rubric used on the products of the assessment (essays). | Instructors and the department’s assessment coordinator discuss student performance in each category in a scoring session and at subsequent meetings, during the remainder of the assessment semester and in the semester following the assessment. | Lesson plans that address weaknesses in this particular area will be prepared and shared on the English 93 course web site: http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaasleng93/jhome.htm
Because this particular issue involves reading skill, the assessment committee will recommend reading training, via workshops based on Reading Apprenticeship program, and offer them to English 93 instructors between Weeks 14 and 16 of the semester, beginning in Spring 2009. A lesson plan designed to aid reading instruction will be prepared in Spring 2009. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Distinguish between and accurately interpret major textual inferences and implied information.</th>
<th>The assessment instrument will require students to identify and interpret textual inferences and implied information as they produce a written response to the assessment prompt.</th>
<th>Use of these elements will be assessed as a part of the analytical rubric used on the products of the assessment (essays).</th>
<th>Instructors and the department's assessment coordinator discuss student performance in each category in a scoring session and at subsequent meetings, during the remainder of the assessment semester and in the semester following the assessment.</th>
<th>Because this particular issue involves reading skill, the assessment committee will recommend reading training, via workshops based on Reading Apprenticeship program, and offer them to English 93 instructors between Weeks 14 and 16 of the semester, beginning in Spring 2009. A lesson plan designed to aid reading instruction will be prepared in Spring 2009. It will be available in fully editable electronic form on the English 93 course web site: <a href="http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaas/eng93/93home.htm">http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaas/eng93/93home.htm</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Demonstrate the ability to consistently write complete sentences using a variety of strategies, including coordination and subordination.</td>
<td>The assessment, which takes the form of an out-of-class essay, will require students to demonstrate their ability to produce complete sentences that show a variety of logical combining strategies, including coordination and subordination.</td>
<td>Sentence combining strategies, especially the appropriate use of coordinators and subordinators, will be assessed as a part of the analytical rubric used on the products of the assessment (essays).</td>
<td>Instructors and the department's assessment coordinator discuss student performance in each category in a scoring session and at subsequent meetings, during the remainder of the assessment semester and in the semester following the assessment.</td>
<td>Based on student weaknesses as identified in assessment results, English 93 instructors choose and prioritize sentence-level issues and plan more effective ways to teach sentence strategies. At weekly or biweekly meetings during Spring 2008, Fall 2008, and Spring 2009, instructors will discuss ways to improve sentence variety and sentence focus. As a result, a lesson plan that addresses sentence core errors and sentence focus was prepared and is available in fully editable electronic form on the English 93 course web site: <a href="http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaas/eng93/93home.htm">http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaas/eng93/93home.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Demonstrate control, a majority of the time, over the conventions of Standard Written English.</td>
<td>The assessment instrument will require students to demonstrate control over the conventions of Standard Written English as they produce a written response to the assessment prompt.</td>
<td>The students' mastery of the conventions of Standard Written English will be assessed according to the analytical rubric designed for this assessment project.</td>
<td>Instructors and the department's assessment coordinator discuss student performance in each category in a scoring session and at subsequent meetings, during the remainder of the assessment semester and in the semester following the assessment.</td>
<td>Based on student weaknesses as identified in assessment results, English 93 instructors choose and prioritize errors in SWE. Errors that impede meaning will be given high priority. At weekly or biweekly meetings during Spring 2008, Fall 2008, and Spring 2009, instructors will discuss ways to improve student performance in this area if the assessment shows that it is a problem for students at this level. Lesson plans or other course materials designed to address weaknesses in SWE, if deemed necessary by the committee, will be available in fully editable electronic form on the English 93 course web site: <a href="http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaas/eng93/93home.htm">http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaas/eng93/93home.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Demonstrate an ability to recognize grammatical patterns of error and revise accordingly. The assessment instrument will require students to recognize error and revise in order to produce a successful written response to the assessment prompt. It was for this reason, among others, that the committee originally chose to make the assessment an out-of-class essay; revision and drafting were deemed to be an essential part of the writing process. These skills are not assessed to any significant degree when students at this level write in a timed, in-class situation.

10. Demonstrate an ability to integrate sources as evidence and use parenthetical citations. The assessment will demonstrate the degree to which students can integrate sources and correctly format parenthetical citations in their written response to the assessment prompt.

Instructors discuss student performance in each category in a scoring session and at subsequent meetings, during the remainder of the assessment semester and in the semester following the assessment. At weekly or biweekly meetings during Spring 2008, Fall 2008, and Spring 2009, instructors will discuss ways to improve student performance in this area if the assessment shows that it is a problem for students in English 93.

Lesson plans or other course materials designed to address weaknesses in this area, if deemed necessary by the committee, will be available in fully editable electronic form on the English 93 course web site: 
http://fog.ccsf.cc.ca.us/~jnaas/eng93/93home.htm

A proofreading sheet designed to help students recognize patterns of error is currently available on this site.
**CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME PLANS**

**DIVISION:** CCSF / Instructional  
**DEPARTMENT:** Health Care Technology  
**PROGRAM/COURSE:** Phlebotomy Technician  
**CONTACT:** Peggy Guichard, Department Chair  
Kate Charlton, RN, BSN, PBT (ASCP)  
**EXTENSION:** (415) 561-1968  

**PROGRAM/COURSE GOAL STATEMENT:** Students will be in compliance with the California Code of Regulations (Sec 1035.1, 1242, 1246 and Sec 120580 of the Health & Safety Code) to prepare for and successfully pass the certification examination as a Certified Phlebotomy Technician.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Methods of Assessment</th>
<th>Measurement Criteria</th>
<th>Summary and Analysis of Data</th>
<th>Plan of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will master the knowledge necessary for an entry level position.</td>
<td>Tests on the reading from chapters in the assigned textbook on the roles and responsibilities of this entry level position; students will complete the Clinical Handbook and provide documentation of compliance with skills competencies.</td>
<td>70% pass rate on tests from textbook chapters and student clinical handbook.</td>
<td>Fall 2008 – all students passed exams and submitted the Clinical Handbook.</td>
<td>Keep course content up-to-date and linked to entry level employment requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate understanding of the didactic portion of the class.</td>
<td>Tests on chapter reading assignments and current articles on blood borne health related topics.</td>
<td>70% pass rate on chapter tests and article quizzes.</td>
<td>Fall 2008 – all students passed.</td>
<td>Continue to up-date the course content to meet accreditation requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate the in-</td>
<td>Students will properly set up their blood draw lab station.</td>
<td>100% pass on evaluation of set-up of</td>
<td>Fall 2008 – all students passed.</td>
<td>Continue with the same and keep blood draw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class skills competencies required to be placed in a clinical setting.</td>
<td>Lab station and appropriate equipment.</td>
<td>Supplies and equipment current with professional standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate understanding and practice of universal precautions.</td>
<td>Students will be required to demonstrate, in a laboratory environment, compliance with universal precautions.</td>
<td>Fall 2008 – all students passed. Continue; no plans to change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will successfully, safely and professionally complete required blood draws.</td>
<td>Students will draw at least 50 venipunctures, 10 skin punctures and observe and arterial draw.</td>
<td>Fall 2008 – all students passed. Continue; no plans to change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will successfully, safely and professionally complete a 40 hours clinical assignment in a laboratory setting.</td>
<td>Written instructor and clinical supervisor evaluation of clinical site draws.</td>
<td>Fall 2008 – all students completed the clinical site externship and received satisfactory evaluations from the instructor and clinical lab supervisor. Continue and add additional clinical sites, as needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will apply to the California Department of Public Health/Lab Field Services for a CPT1 certification.</td>
<td>All students will take the national certification examination.</td>
<td>Fall 2008 – 92% of students passed the national certification examination; some students send a copy of their certificate to the instructor. Continue; all students sit for the certification examination/develop a survey form to follow-up on student placement/satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2008 – all students passed. Continue; no plans to change.
1. Which learning outcome did you decide to examine?
By the end of the semester tutors will be able to:
   - Demonstrate their ability to use effective student-centered techniques in their tutoring sessions.
   - Evaluate their successes and challenges in tutoring.

2. To which courses in this program does this learning outcome apply?
   - LERN 10 – Tutor Training
   - LERN 1000 – Supervised Tutoring

3. How did the faculty who teach this course assess this outcome?
   - Developed an SLO rubric for LERN 10 tutoring topics.
   - Developed a list of topics for “Best Practices” for training tutors.
   - Developed two 12-question online assessment surveys, one for tutors and the other for students who received tutoring. The questions in each survey compliment each other.
   - Administered the two surveys towards the end of the semester.

   We chose to use a new assessment method to assess this outcome. Details:
   - Analyze data separately from each survey using the following criteria:
     - Most frequently used tutoring strategies
     - Least frequently used tutoring strategies
     - Compare the data from both surveys to determine the largest discrepancies between tutor responses and student responses.

4. In doing this assessment, what results have you found?
   - Highest frequency: Tutors are friendly, respectful, engaged, enthusiastic, active listeners, knowledgeable, and good explainers.
   - Least frequency: Tutors rarely apply awareness of cultural differences or incorporate study strategies and learning styles in sessions.
   - Largest discrepancies, with students responding higher than tutors: Tutors ask probing questions, help students find own answers, use praise and motivation techniques.
   - As a result of the above evaluation, instructors of the Tutor Training Course, LERN 10, have adapted their teaching to highlight and reinforce the importance of the areas noted as “Lowest Frequency” tutoring techniques.

5. In light of these results, what are your next steps?
   - These two online assessment surveys will be administrated each spring semester, and new responses will be added to older ones. As samples enlarge, new data will be assessed and evaluated, and the instructors will continue to adapt their teaching for increased student learning.
Appendix # 1 d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO #1 Pilot Study NSCD Summary Report: Cohort Group</th>
<th>Study Period Sp’09-F’09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students in Cohort Group sent e-mail and phone calls</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students successfully scheduled appt via e-mail</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students successfully scheduled appt via phone call</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Cohort Students who received Counseling</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 09 Term GPA for all cohort students</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 09 Term GPA: Students that received Counseling from our cohort</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 09 Term GPA: Students that did not received Counseling from our cohort</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate that counseling intervention by any counselor had a positive impact on student academic success. Specifically, the findings revealed that students that saw a counselor had higher grade point averages in comparison to those students that did not see a counselor.

**Challenges**

- Midterm grades are not GPA measurable
- Time consuming – At least 30 hours of time invested per counselor in data retrieval, data entry, and phone calls and emails for 20 students per counselor
- Identification of currently enrolled basics skills students in the filtering process was a problem
- Excel capabilities differ by counselor and impacts the time needed to complete tasks
- Reporting of utilization of support services solely relies on self-reporting
- Due to current structure of our Counseling Division, students in our caseload are often not in our caseload in following semesters.
  
  Example 1 – Students who earned 24 units or more moved to another counselor’s caseload in CSCD.

  Example 2 – Based on 3 Counselor reports, 47 out of 60 Cohort group students are no longer on their F’09 NSCD Counselor Caseload; 42 out of 60 Control group students are no longer on their F’09 NSCD Counselor Caseload.

- Due to demands of counseling appointments and other tasks, it was a challenge to obtain data retrieval of persistence rates.
Counseling Division SLO Statement #1: NSCD Pilot Study Counselor Report

- Many activities completed for SLO pilot project were extremely time consuming and not congruent with job description of counseling faculty as data collection & entry and GPA calculations should be the primary duty of the Research & Planning Department.

Recommendations

Revision of student learning outcome #1 – Student persistence rates and GPA’s of students on academic probation and students enrolled in basic skills will increase as result of regular meetings with any counselor and utilization of recommended support services.

- Caseload in future should be done with the appropriate number of Counselors and should solely be with currently enrolled basic skills and probation students as opposed to the entire 2,000+ students each counselor receives.

- Create measurable midterm GPA calculation tool in Banner for accessibility of midterm and term GPA retrieval and for it to be placed as a counseling tool on Spurling’s excel file.

- Data retrieval of midterm and final grades need to be further examined as it is too time consuming for each counselor to retrieve data for entire caseload.

  For example – counseling tool that makes easily accessible to view midterm grades on Steve Spurling’s excel files

- If we are to continue this particular study, time constraints need to be reexamined due to the extreme time consuming activities to retrieve midterm, final grades, email and phone contacts, GPA re-calculation total by term, and overall caseload management activities.

- Highly recommend a closer look at Banner’s SHATERM “Earned hours” as a filtering counseling tool to transition students to CSCD Caseload after completion of 24 units.

- Collaboration with research office for accessibility of previous cumulative GPA, term GPA, units attempted & grade points total by term, midterm grades, final grades, use of support services, and persistence rates which would dramatically reduce time consuming activities allowing counselors to focus on counseling interventions.

- The focus of counselors should be to emphasize efforts on Counseling intervention for retention and persistence, as opposed to data collection.

Possible Solutions Discussed:

- Examine the phone text capabilities of the college to be able to enhance communication with students
Counseling Division SLO Statement #1: NSCD Pilot Study Counselor Report

- Continue e-mail contact from caseload throughout the semester for basic skills students

- Examine basic skills grant fund programs in which counselors are assigned to basic skills classes to monitor progress of students in collaboration with instructors

- As part of the Back on Track Initiative, we recommend the deficiency point be put to Banner (SHATERM) screen as a Counseling intervention tool to show how many units of “B” grade is needed for a student to be in good academic standing. (see attached sample).

- Examine electronic tracking through Technology Department to enhance inclusion of Counseling intervention such as tracking of referrals for utilization of student support services, adding deficiency point to Banner (SHATTERM) screen and electronic text messaging.

Challenges to Implementing Solutions:

Some of the solutions above could be implemented without The New Student Counseling Department (NSCD). However, the proposed solutions, that would require NSCD’s actions, will have to be delayed. The NSCD has suffered a devastating loss of counseling hours and must use the remaining hours to maintain core services to students. When the needed funding has been restored to NSCD the department can consider implementing the solutions proposed in this document. Numerous factors have caused the loss of counseling hours, some of these follow:

- Classes that had been taught out of load are now taught in load requiring additional counseling hours:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Hours Per Semester Lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDST 101</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPS 100</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPS 101</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lern 52A</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guid R</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPS 1111</td>
<td>30 (Non-Credit, Starting Spring)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compensation hours for the above in-load hours used in class for the counselors/instructors.

- One counselor was transferred to the Gateway Program and another is on maternity leave for Spring 2010.

- A counselor’s 9 hours of release time, for the academic senate, was not funded and is thus done in load.

- There is ongoing training for tenure track counselors involving 4 trainers and 9 learners.
Counseling Division SLO Statement #1: NSCD Pilot Study Counselor Report

- One full time counselor, meant to replace faculty retirement has been postponed and one consolidated position from reduced part-time hours was approved by FPAC and PBC. One was slated for delayed hire and one was vetoed by the Vice-Chancellor of Student Development.

- An LTS position was approved by FPAC, but was not approved by PBC.

- Coordinators do not have overload and impacts Counseling
Appendix # 1 e  

(SLO Excerpt from Program Review—CSCD)

For our upcoming accreditation, it would be helpful if we could provide examples of the good SLO work that we know is being done in the departments. Please complete the following for at least one course and at least one program in your department. As the assessment methods and SLO process methods vary from discipline to discipline, the Program Review Committee will not evaluate the substance of what you indicate here. However, in addition to assisting with accreditation, what you share will be helpful to your colleagues in other departments.

In addition to reporting on your course and program SLO work, there are a few questions that will help the college examine needs for additional SLO training and other assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program SLO: Case loading—Continuing Student Counseling Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Number:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Title:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Which learning outcome did you decide to examine? Copy this outcome from your course outline of record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the BANNER caseload program (beyond BSI) for better monitoring of student success and for improved communication with CCSF students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How did the faculty who teach this course assess this outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X We chose to use a new assessment method to assess this outcome. Details:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCD selected case loading for conducting research. Two different pilots were conducted to examine the value of case-loading. One pilot focused on case-loading students in CSCD who had placed into at least one basic skills-level class, and were also on probation. The other pilot focused on a collaboration project between English 91 instructors and five of the CSCD counselors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first pilot involved a small group of CSCD counselors creating caseloads with basic skill-level students who are also on probation, and making efforts to contact them and invite them to come to see a counselor for educational planning and general check-in. The second pilot involved counselors working with English instructors closely, performing outreach into the English classrooms and working with students in groups (sometimes in the English lab area) and then individually, giving important information about resources, education planning and the overall value of working with a CSCD counselor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In doing this assessment, what results have you found?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first pilot (case-loading BSI student who are on probation) was not successful. Very few students responded. We learned that a much more effective method of reaching potentially “high risk” students is to “go to them directly” by working in the academic classroom and labs linked to these classes. This appeared to “break the ice” and led to a much higher number of students following up with individual counselor appointments for educational planning, information and questions about resources.

4. In light of these results, what are your next steps?

[X] We plan on making the following changes:

We plan on examining other ways to effectively utilize case-loading with basic-skills-level students. We also plan to expand the English 91 collaboration pilot, inviting other instructional departments to participate in the program.
Course Number: ENG 1A
Course Title: University -Parallel Reading and Composition

SLOs Assessed

A. Compose research-based essays incorporating and engaging with multiple sources
AND
I. Integrate sources using MLA style documentation

Methodology
With the cooperation of selected English Dept. faculty, the coordinator of the Library’s Information Competency/Research Skills program designed a product evaluation during the Spring 2008 semester. Using the final research papers of three sections of ENG 1A, photocopies were made and the “Works Cited” pages were assessed using a rubric developed by librarians. Students in two of the three sections had completed preparatory research skills/IC workshops and one section had not. The scored “Works Cited” pages were compared for those sections who had the instructional intervention to the one which did not.

Analysis of Findings
Sources used – 94% used Google or another search engine and those students in the section that did not complete a workshop used fewer information tools, seemingly relying heavier on a Web search engine since significantly fewer of them used a library catalog, periodical databases, or a librarian for research assistance. Students in this section described more “other sources” used than those in the sections where all students completed at least one research skills workshop. These other information sources include textbooks, reading newspapers, viewing news programs/films and talking with the instructor.

Do the research skills workshops make a positive difference? Based on this preliminary, small sample the findings indicate that the research skills workshop do make a difference, although it is not clear which specific workshops and how many are necessary. The findings document that for the two criteria relating to the completeness and format of the in-text and full MLA citations, students in Section 1 scored significantly higher than students in the other section who did not complete the workshops.

See full assessment report at: http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/assess08.pdf (Section 3. ENG 1A Research Paper Sample, p. 5+)

Next Steps
We plan on making the following changes:

The Library’s Information Competency & Curriculum Development Committee made a recommendation to the English Department’s Curriculum Committee that the ENG 1A course outline, section VI Instructional methodology “Research and documentation assignments be revised to require 5 hours of library research/information competency skills workshops. This change went into effect Fall 2009. Another plan is to develop a new workshop focusing on citing sources responsibly and better understanding how to avoid plagiarizing.
Dear CCSF Community Members,

During the Spring 2009 semester nearly every unit in the College participated in a pilot of the Annual Program Review process. Congratulations on a job well done! Over 100 reviews were completed. The Program Review Committee (PRC) read all the reviews and is preparing a preliminary report on the process for the Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC).

To assist with this report, the PRC would like to hear your thoughts about the process so far, as well as any suggestions you may have for changes. The PRC will aggregate these responses with the informal feedback already collected. Please share your perceptions by completing the survey at the link below. The survey contains only twelve questions and should take five to ten minutes to complete. Please respond by Thursday, May 14.

http://research.ccsf.edu/Survey/PRSsurvey.asp

Best Regards,

Pamela Mery
Research & Planning
City College of San Francisco
Evaluate the 2008-09 Pilot Annual Program Review Process

Please help the College evaluate the pilot annual program review process by responding to the questions below. In addition, collective responses will be gathered via debriefings with constituent groups.

1. Please indicate your overall level participation in the program review process during Spring 2009 (using a five-point scale where one is barely involved, and five is highly involved).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Barely Involved</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 - Highly Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the following scale to answer the questions below:
1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Excellent.

2. Rate the overall usefulness of the numeric data provided by Research & Planning in the program review forms.

3. Rate the ease of use of the program review forms.

4. Rate the usefulness of the process, particularly with regard to eliciting unit-level reflection.

5. Rate the quality of results of the process, particularly with regard to facilitating transparent and rational planning at the unit level.

6. Rate the quality of results of the process, particularly with regard to facilitating transparent and rational planning at the division and college-wide levels (since the planning and budgeting process is not yet complete, please indicate your perception to date).

Please respond to the following three questions so we can understand whether perceptions of the pilot annual program review process differ by role, division, or affiliation. Your responses are anonymous.

7. Please indicate your role at the college:
   - Administrator
   - Department Chair
   - Faculty
   - Classified Staff
   - Other

8. Please indicate your division:
   - Academic Affairs
   - Student Development
   - Finance and Administration
   - Chancellor's Direct Report

9. Please check one or both of the following if you are a member of (or resource to) the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) or Program Review Committee (PRC):
   - PBC
   - PRC

   Please write your comments about the pilot annual program review process below:

10. What aspect(s) of the pilot worked best and why?

11. What aspect(s) of the pilot were the most challenging or problematic, and what do you think could be done to improve in these areas?

12. Please use this text box to provide any other comments about the pilot.

Submit Survey

If you have problems with the survey, please contact research@ccsf.edu

http://research.ccsf.edu/Survey/PRSurvey.asp
## STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME FOCUSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRN</th>
<th>WORKSHOP TITLE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302SLO</td>
<td>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes: Sharing Our Perilous Journey</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Health Center 207</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308SLO</td>
<td>How Research on Retention, Resilience &amp; Underachievement Can Help Us with Student Success</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Rosenberg 304</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314SLO</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes for Library &amp; Learning Resources: How They Support Every Student's Academic Success</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Rosenberg 414</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321SLO</td>
<td>Introduction to CQI Process (DCC Sponsored SLO Workshop)</td>
<td>2:15pm</td>
<td>Science 133</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322SLO</td>
<td>LERN 50: College Success Course</td>
<td>2:15pm</td>
<td>Rosenberg 304</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329SLO</td>
<td>An Example of a Course Based SLO (for a credit lab class) (DCC Sponsored SLO Workshop)</td>
<td>3:15pm</td>
<td>Science 133</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330SLO</td>
<td>An Example of a Course Based SLO (for a non-credit class) (DCC Sponsored SLO Workshop)</td>
<td>3:15pm</td>
<td>Science 9 (basement)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331SLO</td>
<td>An Example of a Program Based SLO (DCC Sponsored SLO Workshop)</td>
<td>3:15pm</td>
<td>Science 56 (Basement)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332SLO</td>
<td>Examples of Course Based SLO by a Panel (for credit lecture classes) (DCC Sponsored SLO workshops)</td>
<td>3:15pm</td>
<td>Science 30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

Instructional Departments, Support Units, and Campuses
Annual Program Review Form

Please review the following tables and fill out the text boxes that follow the tables. This form should be submitted to the School Dean. The completion of this form is part of the institutional program review process. In addition to this review, departments will be scheduled for a review of curriculum, teaching, and student learning every six years.

Department: <DEPARTMENT NAME>
Contact Person: <CHAIR or COORDINATOR NAME>
Date: <DISTRIBUTION DATE>

1. Description of Programs and Services and their Locations

< Description from Spring 2009 will be inserted by Research & Planning by January 29th. >

2. Data regarding Personnel, Student Contacts, Expenditures, and Productivity

< Data will be inserted by Research & Planning by January 29th. A glossary will also be provided. >

3. Data regarding Student/Employee Satisfaction—As Available

< Satisfaction data is not available for instructional departments. >

4. Use this text box to provide reflections on the data trends represented above. If you have additional data which you would like to provide, please also include that here.

5. Write an update on any internal or external developments affecting your department during the past year.

6. In last year’s program review, many departments identified a six-year plan for reviewing all of their courses and programs. Summarize your progress to date on the plans made in your department. Also, please fill out Attachment A detailing updated plans to review all courses and programs in your department. Please also use Attachment A to indicate your timeline for assessing and examining learning outcomes for your courses and programs.
7. In last year’s program review, many departments identified plans for improvement in courses and programs based on the assessment of learning outcomes. Summarize your progress to date on the plans made in your department. Also, please fill out Attachment B on work your department is doing this year regarding the assessment of learning outcomes.

8. Summarize progress to date on prior year’s planning objectives (excluding progress already cited in #6 and #7).

9. Please review the 2006 Education Master Plan. Using explicit references to the Plan (e.g., “Section IV.1. first bullet”), please provide a brief progress report for those items related to your department or unit. The plan is located at this link: [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/edplan06.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/edplan06.pdf)

10. What are the department’s major planning objectives for the next fiscal year? Please cite linkages, where applicable, to the College Strategic Plan, the College Annual Plan or other collegewide plans, including the Education Master Plan, the Technology Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, etc. You may also cite linkages to the department’s review of courses, programs and assessment of student learning. College plans are available at this link: [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_college.htm](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_college.htm)

11. After reviewing the 2006 Education Master Plan, the 2009 Environmental Scan, and based on information from Advisory Boards, field activities, and other appropriate sources, please briefly indicate where your department would like to be five or six years from now. Please also indicate what environmental factors prompt these changes. This information will be used to inform the Strategic Planning process in March 2010. **Note, a link to the Environmental Scan will be provided to you on or before January 29th.**

12. Please check this box to certify that faculty and staff in your unit discussed the major planning objectives: ☐
13. New Resources Needed
Briefly describe each project. Include specific links, where applicable, to the College Strategic Plan, the College Annual Plan or other collegewide plans (e.g., the Education Master Plan, the Technology Plan, the Facilities Master Plan) to support your request. You may also include specific links to the department’s review of courses, programs and assessment of student learning. Put your projects in order of priority. Add additional items as necessary.

Please remember to include any costs associated with staffing, equipment, supply, facilities, or unit requests. If exact costs are unknown, please approximate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1 Project Title:</th>
<th>Brief Project Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to Plans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Needs (e.g., classified, reassigned, non-instructional, lab aides):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Additional Units:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2 Project Title:</th>
<th>Brief Project Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to Plans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Needs (e.g., classified, reassigned, non-instructional, lab aides):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Additional Units:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#3 Project Title:</th>
<th>Brief Project Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to Plans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Needs (e.g., classified, reassigned, non-instructional, lab aides):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Additional Units:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT A

Please reference question 6 in the annual program review form for instructional departments.

Use the following chart to indicate your plans for SLO processes and Curriculum Committee updates for each of your courses and programs. Use the following key when completing this chart:

- A  We plan to conduct our assessments this year
- E  We plan to examine the results of assessments, and make plans for improvement
- A+E  We plan to conduct the entire SLO process for this course/program
- CC  We plan to update course/program through college's Curriculum Committee

SAMPLE SPREADSHEET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAG 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAG 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, a spreadsheet with your department's courses and programs will be provided to you by January 29th.
ATTACHMENT B

Please reference question 7 in the annual program review form for instructional departments.

For our upcoming accreditation, it would be helpful if we could provide examples of the good SLO work that we know is being done in the departments. Please complete the following for at least one course and at least one program in your department. As the assessment methods and SLO process methods vary from discipline to discipline, the Program Review Committee will not evaluate the substance of what you indicate here. However, in addition to assisting with accreditation, what you share will be helpful to your colleagues in other departments.

In addition to reporting on your course and program SLO work, there are a few questions that will help the college examine needs for additional SLO training and other assistance.

Course SLO
Course Number: 
Course Title:

1. Which learning outcome did you decide to examine? Copy this outcome from your course outline of record.

2. How did the faculty who teach this course assess this outcome?
   ☐ We chose to use existing assignments or evaluations to assess this outcome. Details:

   ☐ We chose to use a new assessment method to assess this outcome. Details:

3. In doing this assessment, what results have you found?

4. In light of these results, what are your next steps?
   ☐ We feel our students are doing well. Our keys to success with this outcome are:

   ☐ We plan on making the following changes:
Program SLO
Program Title:

1. Which learning outcome did you decide to examine?

2. To which courses in this program does this learning outcome apply?

3. How did the faculty who teach this course assess this outcome?
   ❑ We chose to use existing assignments or evaluations to assess this outcome. Details:
   
   ❑ We chose to use a new assessment method to assess this outcome. Details:

4. In doing this assessment, what results have you found?

5. In light of these results, what are your next steps?
   ❑ We feel our students are doing well. Our keys to success with this outcome are:
   
   ❑ We plan on making the following changes:

Process Questions - Does your department feel comfortable with managing the SLO processes that you have started, or do you need help? Please indicate your response below.
   ❑ We feel comfortable managing our own processes
   ❑ We need help in the following areas:
     ❑ We need faculty training on implementing the SLO process for courses
     ❑ We need faculty training on implementing the SLO process for programs
     ❑ We need good models for assessing outcomes in the following disciplines:

   ❑ We need help with workload in the following areas:
Appendix # 6

Chapter 4. Majors

4.1 Overview

Students pursuing an Associate’s Degree must satisfy several requirements for the degree. One requirement is the major requirement, which can be satisfied in several ways. One way this requirement can be satisfied is to take the courses identified as a major in the catalog. Students who pursue this option will have the name of the major appear on their City College transcripts.

Traditionally, City College of San Francisco did not create majors that would appear on student transcripts. Departments created Awards of Achievement to give students an opportunity to take an identified set of courses while pursuing the Associate’s degree and have the name of the Award of Achievement appear on the student transcript. We have now shifted to using majors, and almost all departments have converted their Awards of Achievement into a major. The process of converting an Award of Achievement to a major is fairly straightforward – see 4.4 Converting an Award of Achievement for details.

4.2 Creating a New Major

Considerations

Learning Outcomes

An important initial step in creating a new major is to identify the student learning outcomes for that major. The student learning outcomes should be broad and should drive the decision as to which courses to include in the major. Learning outcomes should be measurable, since as a part of the student learning outcome process you will need to assess these learning outcomes, evaluate the results, and plan and implement changes to the program as a result of this assessment.

Once you have developed the overall learning outcomes for the major, the next step is to map the individual learning outcomes into the courses that are included in the program. It may be helpful for you to develop a chart such as this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart can be filled in simply, putting X’s for the courses in which the various learning outcomes are covered, or can be filled in with more complete information, such
as the course in which a particular learning outcome is initially addressed and another course in which the same learning outcome is more fully discussed.

As you do this mapping process you may find that certain learning outcomes you think are important are not directly covered in any of your courses or are only covered in an optional elective. You may decide that it is necessary to adjust the outlines of some of your courses so that the proposed courses fully address your desired learning outcomes.

Finally, remember that the assessment of program-level learning outcomes will be an ongoing effort in your department. Once you have created the program, gotten approval, had students enroll and complete the program, assessed your learning outcomes, and analyzed the results, you may find that changes to the courses in your program, or changes to the structure of the program itself, are necessary.

Levels of Approval

Creating a new major requires approval at several levels. Departments should be aware of the entire process before starting, to minimize the complexity of this process.

The final level of approval of a major is at the State Chancellor’s Office. The paperwork required varies based on whether a department already has a similar approved program. Departments creating career technical majors will also need to get approval from our regional consortium. Departments are encouraged to meet with the Dean of Curriculum early in the process to review the applicable paperwork. Completed applications that have been accepted at the State Chancellor’s office are available in the Curriculum Office for reference.

The first step in approaching this paperwork is deciding whether the program is transfer or career technical in nature. Table 1 Elements of New Major Applications identifies some of the items departments will need to identify in the application for approval of a new major.

Table 1 Elements of New Major Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Transfer Program</th>
<th>New Occupational Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identify the four-year institutions the program will transfer to, including articulation agreements between the campuses.</td>
<td>• Identify relevant labor market information, such as the number of projected job openings and its relation to the number of projected program completers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the program is based on a model curriculum, identify that model curriculum.</td>
<td>• Survey of prospective employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If there’s an advisory committee, the names of members and minutes of key meetings with the committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departments pursuing a new transfer program can research articulation agreements online at www.assist.org. Contact the Articulation Officer early in the process of developing your major.
Curriculum Committee

Once the relevant courses totaling 18 or more units for a major have been identified, the next step in the process is for departments to bring the major to the Curriculum Committee for approval. Departments should prepare a document with the following information:

- Name of the Major
- Description of the Major, including Learning Outcomes
- Required and optional courses, with units
- Total number of units

In general, the format of this document should mirror how the major is to be printed in the Catalog. See Figure 1 Sample Major Text for one example; review the current Catalog for more examples.

### Major in Photography

The major in Photography is designed to prepare students to transfer to a four-year school. Upon completion of this program students will be able to:

- Create photographic images using traditional tools and techniques of photography
- Apply digital technologies to the creation and editing of photographic images
- Evaluate photographic images based on design aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHOT 50A History &amp; Aesthetics of Photography</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOT 51 Beginning Photography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSGN 101 Design Fundamentals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOT 55 Color Theory of Photography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOT 83 View Camera Angles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOT 60A Beginning Photoshop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOT 95A Beginning Color Printing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Units 21

**Figure 1 Sample Major Text**

Consider the following when preparing this document:

- The Description should include general information about the program of study and information about the transfer and/or occupational prospects of students who
complete the program. The description should also enumerate the learning outcomes for the major.

- Clearly define the required and optional courses for the major. Do not use phrases like “or equivalent course.” Instead, list any course equivalencies explicitly.

- Departments have flexibility in the way courses are listed. Some departments choose to identify courses based on semesters (first semester, second semester, etc.). Others choose to list a set of core courses and then a set of optional courses. Still others create a set of core courses and then sets of courses in different tracks. All of these approaches are valid and appropriate. See the Catalog for examples.

- In general, the courses listed in a major must include any prerequisite courses. In some instances it is possible to create program prerequisites for a major. Departments considering program prerequisites should consult with the Matriculation Office before proceeding.

- If a proposed major includes coursework from another department or could overlap the programmatic offerings of another department, departments should seek signoff from that department, using the spaces on the Program Actions cover sheet.

Once this document is complete, the department should attach the Program Actions cover sheet (available from the Curriculum Committee web site), obtain department chair and dean signatures, and submit the required number of copies to the Curriculum Office.

Post-Curriculum Committee

Once the Curriculum Committee has approved the major, the department needs to finish the appropriate paperwork for submission to the State Chancellor’s Office. The Dean of Curriculum is available for assistance with this process.

Publication in the Catalog

Once a major has been approved by the Curriculum Committee, the name of the major will appear in the online catalog, and in the next printed version of the catalog, with a notation that the major is pending state approval. When the State Chancellor’s Office has approved the major, the Dean of Curriculum will make appropriate announcements to the department, counselors, and Admissions and Records staff, indicating the date of acceptance and the date which students will be able to petition for the major. Full details of the major will be published in the next print catalog and online.

4.3 Revising a Major

Once a major has been approved, revisions of the major generally require much less paperwork. If the revisions are keeping within the original scope of the major, departments can submit a revised document describing the new requirements of the major, along with the Program Actions cover sheet. Follow the directions on the cover sheet when submitting copies to the Curriculum Office.
Please note that if a department revises the course number or title of one or more courses in a major, that these changes will propagate automatically to the text in the major. No separate Curriculum Committee action is required for these changes to take place.

Departments should take care when deleting courses that are included in a major. The deleted course will be removed from the set of required courses for the major. Adding a replacement course requires submission of a revised copy of the major.

Departments wishing to make significant changes to a major – adding a new option, changing the focus of the major, etc. – should consult with the Dean of Curriculum before proceeding.

Departments wishing to delete a major can do so by submitting one copy of the Program Actions cover sheet, with appropriate signatures. Deletion of a major will be handled as an informational agenda item by the Curriculum Committee.

### 4.4 Converting an Award of Achievement to a Major

If a department has an established Award of Achievement, they can convert this Award of Achievement to a Major. Departments should prepare the catalog listing as described above and submit it to the Curriculum Office, following the directions on the Program Actions cover sheet.

When converting an Award of Achievement into a Major, departments have some latitude to change the required courses. If the changes in required courses are significant, additional State Chancellor Office paperwork may be required. Contact the Dean of Curriculum before proceeding.

Departments who want to create a Certificate of Achievement from an existing Award of Achievement will need to prepare additional paperwork to be submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office. In most cases, the paperwork is less significant than the paperwork required to create a new program. Contact the Dean of Curriculum before proceeding.
Chapter 5. Certificates

5.1 Overview

Certificates are a way to recognize student achievement for students who are not pursuing an Associate Degree or who are taking noncredit coursework. Credit certificate programs can be oriented towards either career or general education. Noncredit certificate programs generally can be designed to prepare students to progress in a career path or to prepare for degree-applicable or nondegree-applicable coursework.

5.1.1 Types of Credit Certificates

A Certificate of Achievement is a sequence of courses consisting of 18 or more units of degree-applicable coursework. Certificates of Achievement must be approved by the Curriculum Committee and the State Chancellor’s Office. Students who successfully petition for a Certificate of Achievement will have the name of the certificate appear on their transcript.

A Certificate of Accomplishment is a sequence of courses consisting of fewer than 18 units of degree-applicable coursework. Certificates of Accomplishment must be approved by the Curriculum Committee but do not need State Chancellor Office’s approval. Students who successfully petition for a Certificate of Accomplishment will not have the name of the certificate appear on their transcript.

Note: it is possible to submit certificates of 12-18 units to the State Chancellor’s Office for approval as a Certificate of Achievement. Contact the Dean of Curriculum for details.

5.1.2 Types of Noncredit Certificates

A Certificate of Completion is a sequence of courses designed to prepare students to progress in a career path or to undertake degree-applicable or non-degree applicable credit courses.

A Certificate of Competency is a sequence of courses preparing students to demonstrate achievement in a set of competencies that prepares the student to progress in a career path or to undertake degree-applicable or non-degree applicable credit courses.

Both types of noncredit certificates require approval by the Curriculum Committee and the State Chancellor’s Office. Contact the Dean of Curriculum for details.

5.1.3 Financial Aid Implications

Students pursuing a credit certificate of 16 or more units, or a noncredit certificate of 600 or more total hours, may be able to receive financial aid while they are pursuing the certificate. Contact the Dean of Financial Aid and Dean of Curriculum for details.

5.2 Creating a New Certificate

Considerations

Learning Outcomes

An important initial step in creating a new certificate is to identify the student learning outcomes for that certificate. The student learning outcomes should be broad and should
drive the decision as to which courses to include in the major. Learning outcomes should be measurable, since as a part of the student learning outcome process you will need to assess these learning outcomes, evaluate the results, and plan and implement changes to the program as a result of this assessment.

Once you have developed the overall learning outcomes for the certificate, the next step is to map the individual learning outcomes into the courses that are included in the program. It may be helpful for you to develop a chart such as this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart can be filled in simply, putting X’s for the courses in which the various learning outcomes are covered, or can be filled in with more complete information, such as the course in which a particular learning outcome is initially addressed and another course in which the same learning outcome is more fully discussed.

As you do this mapping process you may find that certain learning outcomes you think are important are not directly covered in any of your courses or are only covered in an optional elective. You may decide that it is necessary to adjust the outlines of some of your courses so that the proposed courses fully address your desired learning outcomes.

Finally, remember that the assessment of program-level learning outcomes will be an ongoing effort in your department. Once you have created the program, gotten approval, had students enroll and complete the program, assessed your learning outcomes, and analyzed the results, you may find that changes to the courses in your program, or changes to the structure of the program itself, are necessary.

**Process**

As noted above, creating a new certificate may require approval at several levels. Departments should be aware of the entire process before starting to minimize the complexity of this process.

For Certificates of Achievement, the final level of approval is at the State Chancellor’s Office. The paperwork required varies based on whether a department already has a similar approved program, and also on the size of the program. Departments creating career technical majors will also need to get approval from our regional consortium. Departments are encouraged to meet with the Dean of Curriculum early in the process to review the components of this application. Completed applications that have been accepted at the State Chancellor’s office are available in the Curriculum Office for reference.
Credit certificates under 18 units can be approved locally as Certificates of Accomplishment, without approval by the State Chancellor's Office. Optional state approval is available for credit certificates between 12-18 units. Certificates between 12-18 units that are state approved are then designated as Certificates of Achievement and can be posted on transcripts. The approval for low-unit certificates is generally less involved than the process for higher-unit certificates. Contact the Dean of Curriculum for more information about this process.

For Certificates of Completion or Competency, the final level of approval is at the State Chancellor’s Office. Unlike credit certificates, the application for approval of noncredit certificates is much less complex and can typically be done by Curriculum Office staff in consultation with the originating department.

**Curriculum Committee**

Once the relevant courses for a certificate have been identified, the next step in the process is for departments to bring the certificate to the Curriculum Committee for approval. Departments should prepare a document with the following information:

- Name of the Certificate
- Description of the Certificate, including Learning Outcomes
- Required and optional courses, with units (credit courses) or hours (noncredit courses)
- Total number of units (credit courses) or hours (noncredit courses)

In general, the format of this document should mirror how the certificate is to be printed in the Catalog. See Figure 2 Sample Certificate Text for one example; review the current Catalog for more examples.
Certificate of Achievement in Marketing

The Certificate of Achievement in Accounting offers specialized training for students interested in careers in advertising, professional sales, marketing research, business management, business promotion, and other marketing jobs. Upon completion of the certificate students will be able to:

- Analyze the components of a marketing plan
- Evaluate the effectiveness of a marketing campaign for a variety of businesses in both domestic and international arenas
- Synthesize a marketing strategy that includes an understanding of the managerial and financial components

**Course Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 140 Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 122 Salesmanship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 1 Accounting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 148 Marketing Management and Supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMBS 135 Small Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR 163 International Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Units** 18

---

**Figure 2 Sample Certificate Text**

Consider the following when preparing this document:

- The description should include general information about the program of study and the transfer and/or occupational prospects of students who complete the program. The description should also enumerate the learning outcomes for the program.
- Clearly define the required and optional courses for the major. Do not use phrases like “or equivalent course.” Instead, list any course equivalencies explicitly.
- Departments have flexibility in the way courses are listed. Some departments choose to identify courses based on semesters (first semester, second semester, etc.). Others choose to list a set of core courses and then a set of optional courses. Still others create a set of core courses and then sets of courses in different tracks. All of these approaches are valid and appropriate. See the Catalog for examples.
In general, the courses listed in a certificate must include any prerequisite courses. In some instances it is possible to create program prerequisites. Departments considering program prerequisites should consult with the Matriculation Office before proceeding.

If a proposed certificate includes coursework from another department, or could overlap the programmatic offerings of another department, departments should seek signoff from that department, using the spaces on the Program Actions cover sheet.

Once this document is complete, the department should attach the Program Actions cover sheet (available from the Curriculum Committee web site), obtain department chair and dean signatures, and submit the required number of copies to the Curriculum Office.

**Post-Curriculum Committee**

For Certificates of Achievement, once Curriculum Committee approval has been obtained, the department needs to finish the paperwork for submission to the State Chancellor’s Office. Career technical programs also require approval of our regional consortium. The Dean of Curriculum is available for assistance with this process.

Noncredit Certificates also require approval by the State Chancellor’s Office. Paperwork for this approval is typically prepared by Office of Instruction staff, but may also require input from the department. Contact the Dean of Curriculum for details.

**Publication in the Catalog**

Credit Certificates of Accomplishment submitted before the printed catalog deadline date will be published in the next version of the printed catalog.

Certificates requiring approval by the State Chancellor’s Office will initially have only their name published in the online catalog, and in the next printed version of the catalog, with a notation that the certificate is pending state approval. When the State Chancellor’s Office approval has been obtained, the Dean of Curriculum will make appropriate announcements to the department, counselors, and Registration and Records staff, indicating the date of acceptance and the date which students will be able to petition for the certificate. Full details of the certificate will be published in the next print catalog and online.

**5.3 Revising or Deleting a Certificate**

Once a certificate has been approved, revisions generally require much less paperwork. If the revisions are keeping within the original scope of the certificate, departments can submit a revised document describing the new requirements of the certificate, along with the Program Actions cover sheet. Follow the directions on the cover sheet when submitting copies to the Curriculum Office.

Please note that if a department revises the course number or title of one or more courses in a certificate, that these changes will propagate automatically to the text in the certificate. No separate Curriculum Committee action is required for these changes to take place.
Departments should take care when deleting courses that are included in a certificate. The deleted course will be removed from the set of required courses. Adding a replacement course requires submission of a revised copy of the certificate.

Departments wishing to make significant changes to a certificate – adding a new option, changing the focus of the certificate, etc. – should consult with the Dean of Curriculum before proceeding. If the certificate had required State Chancellor Office’s approval, additional paperwork may be required.

Departments wishing to delete a certificate can do so by submitting one copy of the Program Actions cover sheet with appropriate signatures. Deletion of a certificate will be handled as an informational agenda item by the Curriculum Committee.