City College of San Francisco

Addressing the 14 ACCJC Recommendations:
Highlights & Accomplishments
Prior: Old Mission Statement; reviewed every six years

CCSF provides educational programs and services to meet the following needs of our diverse community:

- Preparation for transfer to baccalaureate institutions
- Active engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizenship preparation, and English as a Second Language
- Achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Science
- Completion of requirements for the Adult High School Diploma and GED
- Acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace
- Promotion of economic development and job growth
- Lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment

To enhance student success, the college provides an array of academic and student development services that support students' intellectual, cultural, and civic achievements. City College of San Francisco belongs to the community and continually strives to provide an accessible and affordable education as a part of its commitment to serve as a community resource.

Now: New Mission Statement, reviewed annually

Our primary mission is to provide programs and services leading to:

- Transfer to baccalaureate institutions;
- Achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Sciences;
- Acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace;
- Basic Skills, including learning English as a Second Language and Transitional Studies.

In addition, the college offers other programs and services consistent with our primary mission, only as resources allow and whenever possible in collaboration with partnering agencies and community-based organizations.

City College of San Francisco belongs to the community and continually strives to provide an accessible, affordable, and high quality education to all its students. The College is committed to providing an array of academic and student development services that support students' success in attaining their academic, cultural, and civic achievements. To enhance student success and close equity achievement gaps, the college identifies and regularly assesses student learning outcomes to improve institutional effectiveness. As a part of its commitment to serve as a sustainable community resource, our CCSF mission statement drives institutional planning, decision making and resource allocation.

The Vision and Mission statements are reviewed annually during the Board of Trustees summer planning retreat.
2: Effective Planning

Prior: weak ties to planning

- Less integrated, comprehensive planning process
- Planning not tied to central decision-making processes
- Work Group 15 formed to systematically analyze Center revenues and expenses

Now: Planning Timeline Established; Dashboard developed using State Scorecard
3: Institutional Assessment

Prior: Unintegrated program review and planning

• Before 2008—six year PR cycle
• 2008-09—annual cycle instituted
• 2010-11—program review suspended for the year

Now: Annual Integrated Planning and Budgeting Cycle

Research & Planning Office

Board of Trustees

Department & Units

Participatory Governance

Administrative Review
4: SLO Accountability

Prior: intradepartmental documentation

No SLO coordination college wide

Results:
- Excellent assessment unshared
- No required program mapping
- No Assessment Plan
- No program review SLO Report
- Little college wide dialogue

Now: comprehensive, transparent, accessible SLO reporting
4: SLO Accountability

**Course Student Learning Outcomes...**

- **Prior**: 0 units
- **Now**: 42 units

**Instructional Program Learning Outcomes...**

- **PROGRAM OUTCOMES**
- **Prior**: unknown
- **Now**: 22

**Admin Unit Outcomes**

- **Prior**: 0 units
- **Now**: 42 units

**Counseling Outcomes**

- **Prior**: unknown
- **Now**: 22
5: Student Services Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students unaware of services</td>
<td>• Awareness planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficult to access student data</td>
<td>• ARGOS implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Services inequitably distributed at locations</td>
<td>• Student Development Division reorganizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distance learners underserved</td>
<td>• Online counseling developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inaccessible evidence of counseling SLO work</td>
<td>• Coordinated, consistent, and sustained SLO work and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Counseling took place in silos</td>
<td>• One-stop counseling approach developing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty not evaluated for involvement in Student Learning Outcomes assessment

Prior

Now

• Resolution 2012.09.19.03 Faculty Evaluation to Include SLO Activities
• Whereas, in accordance with Education Code sections 87610.1(A) and 87663(f), AFT 2121 consulted with the President of the Academic Senate prior to engaging in collective bargaining regarding a substantive change to the evaluation criteria for faculty, including faculty under tenure review; and
• Whereas, the proposed change will bring City College of San Francisco into compliance with recommendations from ACCJC in regards to meeting accreditation standards;
• Be it resolved that the Executive Council commend AFT 2121 for bargaining for the addition of a criterion concerning engagement in Student Learning Outcomes and assessment activities, using language such as:
• “Effectively assesses the SLOs as stated in the approved course outline and demonstrates the use of data to improve instruction and/or program.”
• Board of Trustees Resolution No. 120927-S1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Vice Chancellors</td>
<td>3 Vice Chancellors;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Planning under Vice Chancellor supervision</td>
<td>Research &amp; Planning moved under Chancellor’s supervision; Dean of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness &amp; Director of Research appointed 3/21/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 College Deans</td>
<td>Academic Reorganization approved by Board; Hiring 3 Associate Vice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellors of Instruction; hiring 7 College Deans, 5 Center Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More accountability; authority; and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8: Effective Physical Resource Planning

Prior
Costs of operation for sites and centers less concrete

• Program review not tied to resource allocation

Now
Total Cost of Ownership Model identified:

• Total cost of ownership data gathered
  • Castro and Presidio sites no longer maintained
• Expenditures tracked and tied to each site and center
• 10-Year Facilities Master Plan being reworked
• Program Review Resource Requests are ranked by rubric, reviewed by deans and Vice Chancellors, prioritized and posted publicly, and used to allocate resources
## 9: Technology Planning

### Prior
- Technology Plan 2009-2012
  - Lab equipment not well coordinated
  - College has not planned for and acquired new and replacement equipment in a centralized, institution-wide manner

### Now
- Technology Plan 2013-2015
  - Plan tied to Strategic Priorities
  - Improved data collection procedures
  - College’s General Fund includes $1.5 million technology upgrade (ongoing):
    - 5-year desktop replacement strategy
    - Install more classroom projectors
    - Improved Security with newer, faster anti-virus software
    - Improve use of technology for delivery of student services
Prior

• Institution at “financial breaking point”
• Fiscal Planning not clearly tied to Planning, Program Review, or College Mission

Now

• Financial Crisis and Management Assistance Team Report issued
• 8-year plan for fiscal stability adopted, including increasing reserves
  • Board Priorities adopted
  • Program Review requests tied to Mission, College Plans & Priorities
12: Institutional Role Clarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Roles and responsibilities of constituent leadership unclear</td>
<td>• Training for Board, Senate, and Administration conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student participation in governance low</td>
<td>• Students have equal representation on Participatory Governance Council Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avenues of participation unclear</td>
<td>• Board Policy 2.07 and 2.08, now entitled “City College of San Francisco District Policy on Participatory Governance,” describes how the four constituent groups (faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students) can participate in the decision-making processes of the College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementing Professional Development Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13: Governance Structures

Prior: Shared Governance

Now: Participatory Governance

Participatory Governance Council
(meets on 3rd Thursday each month)

Standing Committees
Enrollment Management
(meets on 2nd Thursday each month)
Accreditation
(meets on 1st Tuesday each month)
Planning
(meets on 1st Thursday each month)
Diversity
(meets on 2nd Tuesday each month)

Sub-Committees
Steering Committee Workgroups

- Annual Plan / Budget / Program Review
- Educational Master Plan
- Human Resources Plan
- Technology Plan
- Facilities Plan
- Sustainability
- Program Review
13: Collegial Governance restructured
14: Effective Board Organization

Prior

Board members in disagreement about roles and conduct

Now

Training and Self-study results in Board goals for 2012-13:
1. responded to the recommendations of the Accrediting Commission.
3. Support the acquisition of a stable, highly qualified senior leadership team.
4. Conduct a comprehensive review of Board policies related to Board organization and operation, administrative authority, and Participatory Governance.
5. Implement a professional development plan for the Board of Trustees that leads to increased Board effectiveness and a cohesive and collegial team.
6. Do whatever it takes to save City College and best serve our students and community!