Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that supports learning, enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

A. Instructional Programs

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this Standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

II.A.1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.

II.A./II.A.1. Descriptive Summary. As described in the response to Standard I, the Mission and Vision statements provide overall guidance to the College and its decision-making processes. To ensure that all offerings align with the College’s mission, the annual Program Reviews, which now serve as central decision-making mechanism, require units to explicitly state how their programs and services tie into the Mission Statement. At the same time, units must map their efforts and plans to the Strategic Plan and college priorities, both of which also stem from the Mission and Vision statements.

The institution ensures that its programs and services are of high quality and appropriate to an institution of higher education through a number of means, including review by the College’s Curriculum Committee, the Bipartite Committee, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s, and other means as described in the following paragraphs.

The review, approval, revision, and deletion of academic programs and courses fall largely under the purview of the College’s Curriculum Committee, a quadripartite shared governance organization of faculty, administrators, students, and classified staff that reports to the Academic Senate. Departments wishing to create, modify, or delete academic programs must, as a first step, get Curriculum Committee approval. Using the standards provided by Title 5, the Curriculum Committee approval process ensures that programs are appropriate to the mission of the institution and to higher education. Once Curriculum Committee approval is attained, the Board of Trustees provides the final District approval of programs and courses.

Another body involved in upholding the institution’s integrity is the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. This committee consists of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and five administrators. The Bipartite Committee’s purview is the various requirements of the associate degree. Much of the Bipartite Committee’s work is in approving courses for inclusion in the various General Education areas, although the Bipartite Committee
has also approved larger changes, including the major structural changes to its associate degree in 2007-08.

Many of our programs require approval by the State Chancellor’s Office. The application process for State Chancellor’s Office approval addresses five main areas: appropriateness to mission; need; curriculum standards; adequate resources; and compliance. [Chancellor’s Office Program and Course Approval Handbook, 3rd edition, p. 54-64]

Within Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, industry advisory boards regularly review these programs to ensure breadth, depth, and rigor. Certain CTE programs such as Nursing, Diagnostic Medical Imaging, Dental Assisting, Administration of Justice (police and fire training), and Emergency Medical Technician and paramedic training must meet additional industry-specific accreditation standards.

Departments report on the quality of their programs in Program Review using SLO data as evidence.

**Selecting Fields of Study.** With respect to choosing the fields of study in which it offers programs, the College has a decentralized approach. Departments review their course and program offerings continually, and make programmatic changes to reflect shifts in student interest and shifts within the discipline. Career and technical programs hold regular industry advisory meetings to get feedback about their curriculum. These departments make regular adjustments to course and program offerings to reflect current industry needs.

The student achievement outcomes of the institution’s programs are provided in the tables below.

- Insert table showing transfer information
- Insert table showing degree and certificate completions
- Insert table or examples of job placement data

**Assessing Currency, Teaching and Learning Strategies, and SLOs.** With respect to assessing currency, discipline faculty are largely responsible for assessing the College’s non-CTE programs. Occasionally, articulation maintenance, or the development of a major, require updates. For example, the Behavioral Sciences Department recently created a course to support their proposal for an AA-T in Sociology. The College’s new policy prohibiting the offering of courses when outlines are more than six years old will also assist in ensuring currency of courses. As noted above, industry advisory boards, and, in some cases, external accrediting agencies regularly review CTE programs for quality but also for currency and relevance.

The assessment of course SLOs serve as an evaluation of the teaching/learning strategies and embodied in SLO attainment. These assessments are conducted by each department in ways that are most appropriate to a particular discipline.

Departments use a variety of means to assess program SLOs. In the past, CTE programs were the primary programs to have completed assessments of program SLOs in the past. All programs now have assessment plans that are included on program/department websites. Program Review requires departments to report on how they have used the results of program SLO assessment in making curricular changes.
The institution ensures program currency by requiring departments to report on the assessment of learning outcomes in Program Review. In addition, course outlines cannot be more than six years old, and all departments must provide update plans in program review each cycle to show progress.

II.A./II.A.1. Self Evaluation. While the Mission and Vision statements provide overall guidance, we need to continue to make sure that we are making decisions based explicitly on the Mission and Vision. [Can we cite examples of how the recent revision of the mission statement has led to change as evidence?] In particular, given the recent development of Institutional Learning Outcomes, the College will need to ensure that the development of ILOs draws on the mission.

CTE programs have engaged in exemplary practices for ensuring that programs and services are high quality for some time. The College is currently working on extending those models to all programs, but this is a work in progress.

Although the decentralized approach to deciding fields of study works well, the linkage between the Annual Program Review system and planning and budgeting has been weak. As a result, the resources for developing new fields of study have typically been at the expense of other programs within a department. The College’s new, more tightly integrated Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting system should provide better results, but this remains to be assessed.

The current student achievement data is good; in particular, the number of certificates issued has been increasing. For purposes of better comparison, we need to be more systematic in the use of external assessment methods (e.g., transfer rates, job placement rates) in the assessment of programs.

As of Fall 2012, the College has instituted promising processes for assessing course SLOs, which will also assist in assessing teaching and learning strategies, with the promise of yielding data that will inform program improvements.

The institution could do better at ensuring programs and curricula are current for CTE programs by enhancing the questions asked in Program Review, and requiring programs to reflect on job availability, certificate/degree completion, and job placement rates.

Though processes are in place to require currency, the College needed more effective accountability measures. The new policy requiring periodic update of course outlines will help ensure this.

II.A./II.A.1. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We’ve now identified Program SLOs for all programs and mapped them to courses; need to work on broad-based Program SLO assessment that includes external assessment methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting General Education SLO assessment in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.A.1.a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

II.A.1.a. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco regularly conducts research to inform its practices leading to student success. Research in its broadest sense utilizes data from program reviews, assessment of success in meeting prior strategic plan objectives, and input from the College community. Information is also obtained through listening sessions, planning retreats, student equity forums, and individual feedback.

Other student learning needs assessment is based on City College of San Francisco’s Environmental Scans, both Internal and External Data Trends reports, which include data on student demographics, student performance indicators, and community and labor market information [II A-7, II A-8]. The Internal and External Scans inform the Strategic Plan and support the development of specific strategic priorities. They also inform the Educational Master Plan (currently out of date) and support the program planning priorities.

Over the last several years, ongoing research of educational needs by departmental faculty has led to joint efforts with local community and industry advisory committees. New courses meeting demands for educated workers in biomedical equipment technology, green economy, and health and safety include: Biomedical Instrumentation Maintenance; Solar Thermal Panel Installation; Green and Sustainable Organizational Practices; and Group Facilitation and Field Work in Health Education. These have led to new certificate programs in Biomedical Equipment Technician, Green and Sustainable Business, and Youth Worker.

Other avenues to investigate how College curriculum reflects industry employment needs are available through advisory meetings and DACUM (Developing A Curriculum) research groups.

In addition, Perkins has funded student focus groups in certain areas (Architecture, Computer Science) to assist in curriculum design for those areas.

Assessing Students’ Educational Preparedness for Program Planning. As part of the Matriculation process preceding enrollment in credit and noncredit courses, students

---

**Comment [TB1]:** We’ll want to follow up with this before the final report is determined.
participate in mathematics, English, or ESL placement assessment. Determination of the appropriate levels of courses to take is a “multiple measures” process, which is based on a number of factors, including the placement testing, standardized test scores (e.g. SAT, AP), other college coursework completed, and counselor assessment of relevant indicators during individual interviews. Student course placement data are also useful to basic skills departments in determining the schedule of classes for these departments.

Through the orientation and counseling components of the matriculation process, students receive valuable assistance in identifying their educational goals and the student services and academic resources available to them. Students are encouraged to meet regularly with a counselor to review their progress within their current courses as well as their progress towards certificate, graduation, transfer, and other educational goals.

Joint efforts with the San Francisco Unified School District enable the research office to prepare an annual high school report outlining the readiness of incoming students in the areas of English and mathematics [II A-9]. This report is shared with various SFUSD administrators, including principals at each of the high schools, and is distributed electronically to CCSF personnel. CCSF English and Mathematics departments use this report when making decisions regarding curriculum development, course design and revision, their basic skills programs, their accelerated course sequences, and the types of student support services needed. Additionally, the Gates Foundation recently funded a data-driven initiative to assess the preparedness of incoming high school graduates. The initiative convenes Mathematics and English faculty at CCSF with their respective counterparts in the San Francisco Unified School District to discuss any gaps in educational preparedness among high school graduates.

**Research on the Achievement of Student Learning Outcomes.** The assessment of learning outcomes is done by discipline faculty. While there has been some support from our Research office for faculty interested in assessing how well students achieve stated learning outcomes, the College has relied primarily on a decentralized approach to this assessment.

The College has not historically engaged in significant broader, multi-disciplinary approaches to assessing learning outcomes. However, as of Fall 2012, the approach to documenting SLOs, assessing SLOs, and utilizing SLO assessment results for program improvement has become more centralized, and an SLO coordinator now oversees these activities on an institutional level.

**II.A.1.a. Self Evaluation.** The College has good research practices in place to inform the College of broad student learning needs, through environmental scans and assessments of internal and external data. In addition, the College has good processes for assessing educational preparedness for English, mathematics, and ESL, particularly through the use of multiple measures.

With respect to program planning based on student needs, while there is some use of information derived from placement testing, the College could improve the incorporation of research into program planning.

For some time, the capacity of the Research Office to support faculty who wish to use research methods to determine if students are achieving stated learning outcomes has been
limited due to its staffing. This limited capacity inhibits the College’s ability to engage in broader, multi-disciplinary approaches to the assessment of learning outcomes.

**II.A.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to strengthen the Research and Planning staffing</td>
<td>Confirm appointment of Dean of Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire Director of Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire Research Analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment [k2]: Assumes appointment of current research analyst to dean position**

**II.A.1.b. The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.**

**II.A.1.b. Descriptive Summary.** Prior to offering a course, discipline faculty collaborate on the development of the Course Outline of Record, which is then reviewed and approved by the College’s Curriculum Committee. The standards for the Course outline of Record require faculty to define the following:

- Total number of hours of instruction
- Type of instruction (lecture, conference, laboratory, work experience)
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Instructional methodology, including in-class and out-of-class assignments and evaluation methods

While the College’s Curriculum Committee relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty in determining learning outcomes and the instructional methodology, Committee members are charged with examining the integration of these items as documented in the Course Outline of Record. As noted in Chapter 9 of the *Curriculum Handbook*, Curriculum Committee members examine a number of aspects of the course, including:

- Does the content justify the hours/units?
- Do assignments give students sufficient practice in achieving the learning outcomes of the course?

**Evaluation of Delivery Methods to Ensure Student Needs Are Met.** The College relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty to evaluate the delivery methods used. Faculty are engaged in the assessment of student learning outcomes for courses, and they update the Course Outline of Record as a means of adjusting the delivery methods to enhance student learning. In the case of distance education offerings, the Educational Technology Department routinely compares the effectiveness of these offerings against the effectiveness of traditional offerings of the same courses.

**Dialogue about Delivery Systems and Modes of Instruction.** The College’s Curriculum Committee routinely discusses modes of instruction. Departments proposing new courses, or
substantial revisions to courses, present their course outlines to the Curriculum Committee, and in the ensuing discussion, departments answer any questions that Curriculum Committee members raise. While department chairs are required to attend Curriculum Committee meetings to support their proposals, chairs will often bring lead faculty to the meetings as support, further enhancing college-wide dialogue.

Departments wishing to make distance education versions of courses must submit a Distance Education Addendum to the College’s Curriculum Committee for approval. Part of the Distance Education Addendum asks the department to justify how the learning outcomes of the course can be supported and/or enhanced in the distance education format. As with course outlines, there is ensuing discussion at the Curriculum Committee meeting.

The College also holds professional development days where faculty engage in workshops to learn about and discuss modes of instruction. For example, the January 2013 FLEX day included workshops on:

- Improving Student Retention, Success and Persistence with Contextualized Basic Skills Courses
- Finding Student Voices Through Pedagogy: College Student Development

In addition to professional development days, the College supports several special initiatives that lead workshops on modes of instruction. For example, the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) has held a number of workshops on varied topics, including the use of rubrics, ways of closing the digital divide, and the MIP Accelerated Practice and Pedagogy Project.

Effectiveness of Delivery Systems and Modes of Instruction in Facilitating Student Learning. Given the scope of our institution, it is difficult to provide a single answer to how effective any given delivery system or mode of instruction is at facilitating student learning. Effectiveness of any particular mode varies from course to course and instructor to instructor.

II.A.1.b. Self Evaluation. The College has a well-defined Curriculum Committee process that ensures that delivery methods will support the objectives and content of the courses. The Curriculum Committee is a quadripartite committee of faculty, administrators, classified staff, and students, ensuring that a perspective of views is used in examining the delivery methods for proposed courses.

The College relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of delivery methods, and this evaluation is well integrated into the assessment of learning outcomes.

While there is certainly discipline-specific and some limited college-wide dialogue on modes of instruction and delivery methods, the College could do more to promote more college-wide dialogue, especially since the challenges faculty members face will often be common across disciplines. Some dialogue will naturally occur as the College gets better at discussing the results of learning outcomes assessment.

II.A.1.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation II.A.1.b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II.A.1.c. Descriptive Summary. In July 2012, ACCJC recommended that “the college identify the intended student learning outcomes at the course, program, general education, certificate and degree levels, develop and implement assessments of student learning, and analyze the results of assessment to improve student learning. The results of ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes should foster robust dialogue and yield continuous improvement of courses, programs and services and the alignment of college practices for continuous improvement.”

In Fall 2012, the College responded by engaging in a massive effort to define SLOs for all disciplines, certificates, and majors. The current online catalog contains this information.

Identifying, Measuring, and Utilizing the Results of SLOs. The development of curricula is a faculty-initiated and controlled process, which includes the development of new courses, majors, programs, certificates, degrees, and the revision of existing ones. This can be an individual or collective activity. Course-level learning outcomes and strategies for attaining them are stated in the course outline; outcomes are in the Major Learning Outcomes section and strategies are in the Content and Instructional Methodology sections [II A-14 p. 40-54].

Faculty write course outlines; in some cases, a department-specific curriculum group reviews course outlines. Further review occurs by the respective department chairs and school deans prior to submission to the Curriculum Committee. Majors, programs, certificates, and degrees also have learning outcomes identified on their respective documentation that is submitted to the Curriculum Committee. Accredited programs in the career and technical education area are mandated to hold industry advisory meetings. Programs that receive Perkins funding are also required to hold meetings with their advisory group to assure that curriculum reflects current industry needs.

Faculty involved in these processes are encouraged to submit the outlines for technical review by either the Curriculum Committee Chair or the Dean of Instruction. While many goals are associated with technical review, the primary goal is to ensure that learning outcomes reinforce and support one another within the appropriate level of courses, majors, programs, certificates, and degrees. After technical review is completed, there is another review by the Curriculum Committee Chair, Dean of Instruction, Matriculation Prerequisites Officer, and Articulation Officer who meet to discuss the proposals and schedule them for discussion at the Curriculum Committee. Assessment of learning outcomes also falls under faculty purview. The specific assessment methods for courses are selected by the respective faculty, often in consultation with their department chairs, and exhibit the entire range of assessment modalities.

Course and program SLOs are assessed in many ways, by discipline faculty. For courses, assessment methods are indicated in course outline and SLO-specific extra assessments are
described on department websites. Program SLO assessment methods are described on department websites. All program SLOs are mapped to component courses.

Results are used for course and program improvement: examples include changes in course instructional methodology, creation of new courses, changes in the structure of certificates and majors, and even the deletion of certificates/majors.

Evidence: examples from departmental web pages that serve as examples of how results are being used

Verification of the Appropriateness of SLOs. As noted above, SLOs are vetted by the Curriculum Committee, which ensures that the outcomes are appropriate to the level of the course (credit degree-applicable, credit nondegree-applicable, and noncredit).

Dialogue about SLOs. Department meetings held at FLEX events and scheduled throughout the semester include sessions devoted to SLO discussions. These are described on department websites. In Fall 2012, for example, faculty participated in three significant workshops on August 14, September 12, and November 21. [use agendas as evidence: http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city/college/slo/resources/professional_development.html]

Departments have begun using departmental web pages to facilitate dialogue among discipline faculty and across the college.

II.A.1.c. Self Evaluation. SLOs are now well defined for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. The College has good processes in place to define these SLOs and ensure they are at the collegiate level. Some course outlines are old, but we have established a process by which we will ensure that all outlines for currently-offered courses will be no more than six years old.

The College engaged in a major effort in Fall 2012 to develop program-level learning outcomes for all disciplines, certificates, and majors; the work now must focus now on carrying that energy forward into establishing routines of program learning outcome assessment. During that process, the College established a pilot reporting system for course and program SLO assessment activities but will [need to make refinements to this system].

The College has realized significant improvements within the last year in the understanding among faculty about the assessment of learning outcomes. As a result, the College has more broad-based participation among faculty who now share ideas online. Moreover, the College has appointed a College-wide SLO Coordinator (currently an interim appointment) and developed a docket of professional development workshops in Spring 2013 to fill in gaps.

II.A.1.c. Actionable Improvement Plans The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire a permanent SLO coordinator.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [k3]: Can we elaborate, perhaps with examples of refinements needed?
II.A.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.

II.A.2. Descriptive Summary. The College offers courses in all of the areas noted above: collegiate, developmental, pre-collegiate, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training, programs for international students, and contract education programs. Courses include developmental courses in noncredit ESL and transitional studies, pre-collegiate or basic skills courses in English, mathematics, and ESL, degree applicable and transfer level courses, short-term training in numerous career and technical fields, and contract education training/courses serving the need of local business and industry.

By what criteria and processes does the institution decide to offer developmental, pre-collegiate, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training, international student, or contract education programs?

Discipline faculty develop credit and noncredit courses and programs for review and recommendation by the Curriculum Committee to the Board of Trustees for final approval. 

Ensuring the High Quality of all Instructional Courses and Programs. The evaluation of courses and programs is largely completed at the departmental level. Individual departments have used Program Review to improve their courses and programs. A timely example is the recent curriculum work that the English and Mathematics departments have done to address the achievement gap. These departments have been revising the Course Outlines of Record for their developmental courses on an ongoing basis, ensuring that the expected learning outcomes are well defined and shared among departmental faculty. These departments are also experimenting with shorter sequences of developmental courses, and have established assessment methods that will allow them to determine the effectiveness of these sequences in achieving the desired learning outcomes [II A-27 Sections 1 and 2].

Courses offered for credit under contract education are also reviewed and approved through the Curriculum Committee process. These courses are normally taught by current faculty and if new faculty teach them, the faculty must meet state minimum qualifications. The first time a course is offered, the course is evaluated via a questionnaire distributed to students during the last class meeting. If the course is repeated, assessment information is gathered directly from the client. Informal assessments of courses offered not for credit are obtained through
email communications with the client who requested the course. Contract education delivers customized training so communications with clients are ongoing.

The Continuing Education program distributes a class evaluation at the end of the last session. Evaluations are reviewed by the Office of Contract and Continuing Education and if scores are weak, these are discussed with the faculty prior to offering the class again.

Instructional courses offered overseas are evaluated in a variety of ways, and may vary slightly from one program model to another. Students are surveyed at the end of each program. Survey results are read and discussed with departmental faculty, overseas academic directors and the Study Abroad Coordinator. Changes are made based on student and faculty input and requests.

For study abroad programs focused on foreign language acquisition, the College has recently started giving students in some locations an exam twice, once at the start and once at the end of the program. Pre and post assessment provides a way of measuring student learning outcomes and helps guide the College to areas needing improvement.

CCSF faculty make periodic site visits to overseas sites to observe and critique program courses. Their observations and recommendations are then reviewed by the Study Abroad Program and the academic director overseas. Suggested changes are then discussed with individual faculty and/or the head of the program where they teach (for example, the Academic Director at the Scuola Leonardo da Vinci in Florence, or the Director of the Cours de Civilisation française at the Sorbonne in Paris). If the evaluation indicates that the program itself is no longer well suited to its students, the College may seek another academic partner overseas.

Academic center directors overseas continually evaluate the academic courses they offer based on both student feedback and their own observations. Revised CCSF syllabi are forwarded to the overseas academic directors and faculty to review, discuss, and implement the curricular changes.

**Process for Establishing and Evaluating Each Type of Course and Program.** Before a department can offer a new course or program, it must be reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee and by the Board of Trustees. All new noncredit courses and some credit courses and programs must also be approved by the State Chancellor's Office. When departments wish to make changes to courses or programs, the Curriculum Committee also reviews those changes.

The Curriculum Committee ensures that all courses and programs meet the standards of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, for credit and noncredit courses and programs [II A-14 p. 55-58]. Curriculum Committee reviews of proposed Course Outlines of Record include careful consideration of the number and type of hours (lecture, lab, conference) and the instructional methodologies specified. In addition, courses that are to be taught via distance education require separate review and approval by the Curriculum Committee, which considers factors such as course suitability for distance education, student-instructor contact, and distance evaluation integrity [II A-14 p. 59-66].

**Determination of the Appropriate Credit Type, Delivery Mode, and Location of Its Courses and Programs.** Departments propose the credit type and delivery modes for courses, which the Curriculum Committee then reviews, and the Board of Trustees ultimately
approves. Some courses, as noted above, require further approval by the State Chancellor’s Office.

Department chairs, school and center deans, and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs jointly determine the location of courses and programs. In some cases, the choices for locating courses and programs are limited by the available facilities (for example, new credit programs in construction trades are at the Evans campus because it houses the appropriate space and equipment for construction training). In other cases, center deans consult with counseling, Admissions and Records staff, and other student support staff to solicit input on student course demand. This information is given back to school deans and department chairs during the schedule preparation process.

II.A.2. Self Evaluation. The College has well-defined processes for deciding the various types of programs to offer and also uses well-defined processes for ensuring program quality. Although a number of departments have utilized the assessment of learning outcomes for program improvement, it wasn’t until Fall 2012 that the College embarked on a College-wide effort to do this and is improving. At this juncture it is too soon to know on an institutional level whether the College is using the evaluation of courses and programs effectively for improvement. The College will need to develop a way to evaluate this going forward.

The College has well-defined processes for determining the appropriate credit type and delivery mode of its courses and programs.

The process that the College has used for determining the location of programs that are not location-bound (e.g., not auto or HCT) is evolving. Part of the reorganization of the Academic Affairs division is to redefine the roles and enhance the authority of center deans. This reorganization is designed to provide more thoughtful approaches to program scheduling at the various locations.

II.A.2. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College needs to continue the momentum it has started in the use of learning outcomes assessment for program improvement, so that we can reach the sustainable continuous quality improvement level. While the focus of efforts has been on traditional academic courses and programs, we need to ensure that this continues on to non-traditional offerings, like study abroad and international student programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the intents of the Academic Affairs reorganization is to enhance the authority of the school and center deans, especially as it pertains to course and program offerings at the various College locations. The College needs to work to ensure that the reorganization meets this intent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.A.2.a. The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

II.A.2.a. Descriptive Summary. The College’s policies and institutional processes for the development of courses, programs, certificates, and degrees are explained in great detail in the Curriculum Committee’s Curriculum Handbook. The role of the faculty is paramount in the review and improvement of the quality of CCSF courses and programs. Faculty are involved at every level of the assessment process from the development of learning outcomes to their applications and evaluation. Faculty in each department are responsible for creating, reviewing, and assessing course and program outcomes within their offerings. Delivery and assessment are the responsibilities of classroom faculty, who are supervised by their department chair. Student learning outcomes are spelled out in the course outlines and program learning outcomes are published in the College Catalog (e.g., the Diagnostic Medical Imaging SLOs are on p. 366 of the 2011-12 Catalog).

Detailed guidelines in the Curriculum Committee Handbook relevant to the development process include recommendations for mapping courses to program outcomes [II A-14 p. 75-76, 82-83].

The Curriculum Committee conducts a rigorous peer-review process of every course and program proposed [II A-28]. The Committee consists of 18 faculty, six administrators, one classified staff, and two students. After a course and/or program has Curriculum Committee approval, it is referred via the Academic Senate to the Board of Trustees for its approval, and in certain cases, (programs with 18 or more units, noncredit courses, noncredit programs, etc.) the State Chancellor’s Office as well.

Assessment of Quality and Improvement. Due to the efforts of the SLO Workgroup and faculty departmental leadership, there is now a wide and shared understanding of how the assessment of SLOs can provide a framework for course and program creation and improvement. The College requires discipline faculty to use the assessment of learning outcomes to evaluate courses and programs. Beginning in Fall 2012, departments were required to report on the assessment activities for all courses that were being offered. The College extended this requirement to all programs in Spring 2013 and will continue to enforce this requirement beyond Spring 2013. Departments report on how the assessment of learning outcomes have led to course and program improvement as a part of the Annual Program Review system.

The frequency of evaluation varies from course to course and program to program, related to a variety of factors, including the frequency of course offering, the number of sections of a particular course, other priorities within the discipline, etc. The College has recently established a timeline so that course outlines for currently offered courses will be updated at least every six years. The results of evaluation vary and are hard to capture for an institution as large as City College of San Francisco.

Sample Improvements. There are a variety of improvements to courses and programs that have occurred as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes. For example:
The Mathematics Department has created a course (MATH 45X) designed as an alternative pathway to their statistics class, and is engaged in an assessment of this course, comparing the success of students who took this course vs. those that took the traditional prerequisite sequence.

Earth Sciences is increasing its use of the iClicker technology, especially in larger classes, to increase student interaction.

Cinema has created and/or updated course readers for a number of different courses. More examples of improvements can be found on individual department’s SLO web pages, available from the College’s SLO web site (www.ccsf.edu/slo).

II.A.2.a. Self Evaluation. The College has well-defined processes for the development of courses and programs. These processes rely primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty. The College’s requirement for centralized reporting of course and program assessment activities will be effective in ensuring that courses and programs are assessed regularly; however, this requirement is fairly new, and the College will need to work to maintain its momentum in this area. The College has not yet developed a way to evaluate whether these processes relating to assessing student learning outcomes effectively promote program improvement.

The College has not done well at ensuring that all course outlines are updated on a regular basis, however, a new timeline and policy have been put into place to resolve this.

The College’s required reporting on the assessment of learning outcomes in its Annual Program Review system is another helpful method in ensuring that programs and courses are routinely reviewed. The College needs to integrate more specific review requirements for CTE certificate and degree programs.

II.A.2.a. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College has put into place a policy for ensuring that course outlines are updated regularly. It needs to ensure that this new policy is followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College needs to integrate more specific review requirements for CTE certificate and degree programs into its Annual Program Review cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an evaluation of the processes relating to assessing student learning outcomes to determine whether these processes effectively promote program improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.

Comment [khc6]: True?

Comment [khc7]: True?
II.A.2.b. Descriptive Summary. Discipline faculty have the primary role in determining the competency levels and SLOs for courses and programs. New courses and programs are reviewed by the College’s Curriculum Committee, which reviews the SLOs for the course or program. CTE programs use advisory committees to perform regular review of their programs, including the learning outcomes.

The Curriculum Committee process for submitting certificates and majors for approval requires departments to map the learning outcomes of the program to the courses contained within that program. The mapping document asks departments to identify whether the course addresses the learning outcome at an introductory, developmental, or mastery level for program completion. (See Chapters 4 and 5 of the Curriculum Handbook). Curriculum Committee guidelines for approval require that students are able to obtain the mastery level of every program learning outcome regardless of elective course options.

Students have a clear path of achieving the SLOs required of courses and programs:

- All courses are taught in accordance with a course outline of record. The Curriculum Committee expectations for course outlines, as documented in the Curriculum Handbook, require integration between the learning outcomes of the course, the content, and the instructional methodology. This integration ensures students have a clear path to achieving the SLOs of the course.

- For certificate and degree programs, the Curriculum Committee expects an identification of the SLOs for the program and a mapping of SLOs to the required courses of the program. Curriculum Committee expectations state that students should be able to master the learning outcomes of the program regardless of any course options they may take.

The College has established a centralized system by which the assessment of learning outcomes is reported. This centralized reporting system ensures that learning outcomes assessment is the institution’s way of monitoring the progress that faculty are making in using the assessment of learning outcomes to improve courses and programs.

II.A.2.b. Self Evaluation. The College has a well-developed mechanism for determining the competency levels and SLOs for courses and programs. The College relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty, and the College’s Curriculum Committee provides a sound means of ensuring quality.

The College also has a well-developed mechanism for integrating the learning outcomes expected at the course level with those expected of students completing certificate or degree programs.

Finally, the College has made great strides in establishing institutional ways of monitoring the assessment of learning outcomes work that is necessarily done at the faculty level. The centralized reporting system, begun in Fall 2012 and improved upon in Spring 2013, promotes dialogue among and across discipline faculty, and provides administration with means of ensuring that this work is being done. However, the College will need to maintain the momentum begun in Fall 2012 and continue to make improvements to the centralized reporting system. These improvements will assist faculty in their learning outcomes assessment work and will continue to provide the institution an ability to ensure that that work is taking place.
II.A.2.b. **Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to make improvements to the centralized reporting system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2.c. **High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.**

II.A.2.c. **Descriptive Summary.** The College has a well-developed process for the creation of new courses and programs. All certificate and degree programs are developed by faculty and presented by departments to the Curriculum Committee for approval using the Committee’s formal review process, as detailed in Standard II.A.2.a. Program proposals are prepared in accordance with the standards published in the Curriculum Handbook, which includes identification of the proposed program’s overall learning outcomes and an identification of whether the program is credit or noncredit [II.A-14 p. 5-58]. The Curriculum Committee reviews program proposals against these standards, ensuring that all instructional programs meet the standards of high-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The Office of Matriculation works closely with department faculty to ensure that all course and program prerequisites and corequisites are in compliance with applicable Title 5 requirements. These prerequisites and corequisites are then reviewed and are approved by the Curriculum Committee. Relevant student success data are provided by the Office of Research and Planning to assist in the identification of appropriate communication and computation prerequisites. Approved programs are forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final local approval.

External approval by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office is required of all of the College’s degree programs, all of its noncredit certificate programs, and many of its credit certificate programs. The California Community College Program and Course Approval Handbook establishes the criteria for State Chancellor’s Office approval of programs. To gain approval, the College must demonstrate that the proposed program meets curriculum standards that show the integration of courses in the program, so that students fulfilling program requirements will meet program goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Quality of Instruction</th>
<th>Content of Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [khc8]: Do we have a more recent survey?
There is some natural institutional dialogue that occurs between the Curriculum Committee, department chairs, and discipline faculty as courses and programs are brought to the Curriculum Committee for approval.

The College relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty to decide the breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, synthesis of learning breadth of each program it offers. Again, see previous descriptions of the Curriculum Committee process, and the criteria that the Curriculum Committee uses when reviewing courses and programs, as identified in Chapter 9 of the Curriculum Handbook.

The Curriculum Committee uses the requirements of Title 5 section 55002 when reviewing courses. This section sets different standards for different types of courses (and, by extension, programs), and provides several criteria to identify depth and rigor.

For degree-applicable courses, the Curriculum Committee uses the following:

- **Intensity.** The course treats subject matter with a scope and intensity that requires students to study independently outside of class time. 55002(a)(2)(C)
- **Difficulty.** The course work calls for critical thinking and the understanding and application of concepts determined by the curriculum committee to be at college level. 55002(a)(2)(F)
- **Level.** The course requires learning skills and a vocabulary that the curriculum committee deems appropriate for a college course. 55002(a)(2)(G)

For nondegree-applicable courses, the Curriculum Committee uses the following:

- **Intensity.** The course provides instruction in critical thinking and generally treats subject matter with a scope and intensity that prepares students to study independently outside of class time and includes reading and writing assignments and homework. In particular, the assignments will be sufficiently rigorous that students successfully completing each such course, or sequence of required courses, will have acquired the skills necessary to successfully complete degree-applicable work. 55002(b)(2)(C)

There is no parallel language for noncredit courses.

The Curriculum Committee review of programs involves a review of the courses in a particular program. Nearly all credit programs (certificates and degrees) consist solely of degree-applicable coursework.

The Curriculum Committee review of courses compares the learning outcomes, content, and methodology to the Title 5 requirements for courses, as noted above.

**II.A.2.c. Self Evaluation.** The College has a well-defined Curriculum review and approval process that ensures that all courses and programs are designed to have appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The criteria used by the Curriculum Committee are derived from various sources, including Title 5.

The College relies primarily on faculty to make specific determinations based on their subject matter expertise. The judgment of the faculty is balanced with the review of the College’s Curriculum Committee.
While the Curriculum Committee process is robust, there is limited evidence of institutional dialogue that has “occurred to enhance understanding and agreement about the quality and level of its programs.” The dialogue that occurs at Curriculum Committee meetings is good, but is focused on the matters at hand, and does not promote good cross-disciplinary dialogue.

II.A.2.c. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional opportunities for institutional dialogue to enhance understanding and agreement about program quality and level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2.d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

II.A.2.d. Descriptive Summary. Faculty are responsible for identifying the learning styles of their students and responding accordingly in the way they deliver and conduct classroom instruction and activities. The institution has not engaged in a centralized or systematic effort for identifying learning styles at regular intervals and thus does not capture information on an institutional level about the extent to which this preliminary assessment takes place.

With respect to acknowledging that learning needs vary and delivering instruction that meets these varied needs, certain initiatives have provided professional development workshops to faculty to develop their understanding of the diversity of students’ learning needs and responsive pedagogical approaches. For example, every year, the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) helps selected instructors modify their teaching methods to increase their focus on culturally relevant pedagogy. They share these concepts within their departments to encourage other faculty to do the same. To date, 165 faculty have been trained and 24 faculty have received mini grants to implement project ideas [II A-44].

In addition, start-of-semester FLEX workshops include sessions on multiple learning styles and diverse pedagogical approaches. Various departments have hosted other periodic workshops that are open to all faculty for sharing of best practices and new pedagogies. For example, the science departments have led workshops on using iClickers, mouse tablets, and reaching D and F students. Web pages for these workshops have allowed for dissemination to those who couldn’t attend.

With respect to online and hybrid courses, the Education Technology Department offers workshops on the use of Moodle as well as workshops on the use of Google apps for improved student learning.

Determination of Delivery Modes for Instruction. The College relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty to determine the delivery modes that are appropriate for students. Basic delivery modes (lecture, lab, conference) are documented in the Course Outline of Record, which is approved by the College’s Curriculum Committee.

In addition, when a department wishes to explore a Distance Education delivery mode, it is subject to separate review and approval by the Curriculum Committee via the Distance Education Addendum. This addendum (a) requires the department to justify why the
Distance Education mode is appropriate for the course, (b) has the department detail the changes in the instructional methodology including the frequency and mechanisms of student-instructor contact, and (c) has the department detail how evaluation integrity will be maintained.

**Teaching Methodologies.** Courses vary in their main delivery mechanism, including lecture, laboratory, practicals, field work, internships, work experience, and conference. Within the general category of lecture or conference there is latitude for the use of in-class discussions and small group work. There are a small number of internship/work experience courses as well. Teaching methodologies vary by department and instructor and include a range of techniques from 100% lecture to 100% hands-on projects and activities. Faculty share practices at FLEX events and in informal brown bag lunch discussions, such as this past semester’s start of the “Teaching Sustainability across the Curriculum” brown bag series.

Discipline faculty select the methodologies they deem appropriate for the content of the courses they are teaching, and they document these methodologies in the Course Outline of Record, which the Curriculum Committee reviews and approves.

While there have been some efforts made by discipline faculty to match methodologies to the particular needs of students’ learning styles, the College’s di

**Assessing Student Learning.** Faculty use a variety of ways to assess the level of student learning that takes place as a result of instruction, as documented in the Instructional Methodology section of the official Course Outlines of Record.

Learning assessment methods include:

- Quizzes, tests, and exams
- Essays and papers
- Projects
- Oral presentations
- Assessment of in-class discussions

[Course Outlines provide examples; guidance for this section is included in Section 2.3.8 of the College’s Curriculum Handbook]

**Effectiveness of Delivery Modes and Instructional Methodologies.** Although there has been no College-wide collaborative effort to investigate the effectiveness of delivery modes or instructional methodologies generally, faculty conversations about student learning outcomes resulting from particular delivery modes or instructional methodologies have, in some cases, ignited a desire among faculty to try new strategies.

Moreover, a number of faculty attend national meetings on new teaching delivery modes identified elsewhere as effective, which they have embedded in their classrooms. An example of this is “flipping” classes, a delivery method that engages students in learning content outside of the classroom through videos and other online or print resources and then focuses classroom time on applying that learning. This method has been in existence for some time and employed in a number of classes across the College. Faculty currently using this process offered a January 2012 FLEX workshop on this topic.
The College has, however, paid particular attention to the effectiveness of its distance education delivery mode. The Educational Technology Department routinely compares retention rates and success rates of the College’s online offerings to more traditional offerings, and also compares with other community colleges. The College also participates in the State Chancellor’s Office assessments of students who withdraw from online courses to gather additional information.

II.A.2.d. Self Evaluation. The College has conducted limited assessments of student learning styles. In addition, while there have been some discussions of matching methodologies to learning styles, these discussions have not been broad-based. Any assessments that have taken place are those that individual faculty members or small groups of discipline faculty have performed, and College-wide discussion has not occurred.

The College uses a well-developed process to determine delivery modes for courses, including Distance Education. Although the College has diverse ways of assessing student learning, and while faculty increasingly use the results of those assessments to improve teaching, the College has not systematically investigated the effectiveness of delivery modes or instructional methodologies using assessment results institution-wide. An exception, however, is in the realm of Distance Education, on which the educational Technology Department does perform ongoing assessment.

The College has relied primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty to develop instructional methodologies that are appropriate to students. In many cases faculty successfully link their content expertise to pedagogical methods; it is assumed, however, that faculty all possess this “pedagogical content knowledge,” yet the College has never verified that this is true.

II.A.2.d. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We should have a regular survey of our students to ask about learning styles they find to be effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the College’s commitment to the assessment of learning outcomes, the effectiveness of new teaching methodologies will be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden our SLO assessment efforts to include discussion of and professional development opportunities for sharing new teaching techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create professional development opportunities on a more regular basis (in Spring we plan to have one every week at a variety of time and campuses and across a variety of topics).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage our in-house talent to share best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.A.2.e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

II.A.2.e. Descriptive Summary. The responsibility for course and program assessment lies with discipline faculty, who determine appropriate learning outcomes, develop assessment methods and criteria, administer assessments and evaluate the results, and plan and implement curricular changes.

Course assessment methods include assessments that are part of the instructional methodology of the course and used for student evaluation (e.g., exams, papers, quizzes) and other in-class assessments used solely for learning outcomes assessment (e.g., pre- and post-tests, student surveys). Faculty also use external assessments, such as licensure examination pass rates, job placement data, and transfer data.

Plans for outcome assessment and overall results are now posted on departmental web pages. The use of departmental web pages also helps promote dialogue among discipline faculty, across disciplines, and college-wide. The College monitors outcomes assessment through the use of a centralized reporting system, which the College first piloted in Fall 2012, and has implemented an updated system for Spring 2013. The updated system requires faculty to report on plans for assessment activities for courses and programs in the coming semester, and to report on the results of outcomes assessment for the previous semester. Reporting is required for all courses offered in a given semester and for all programs. Prior to this, there was no centralized requirement for documentation. As such, the faculty focus on assessing SLOs to evaluate courses and programs with an eye toward program improvement varied. With the new centralized, online reporting system, the institution as a whole will have a more comprehensive sense of effectiveness.

Moreover, the College’s Annual Unit-level Program Review, followed by all units at the College, requires units to:

- Reflect on data trends (Program Review form, Question #2). For units that offer courses and programs, those data trends include program award data.
- Reflect on internal and external trends (Program Review form, Question #3). Units can use this section to discuss the relevancy, appropriateness, and currency of their program and external needs to update courses and programs.
- Summarize overall directions taken as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes (Program Review form, Question #4).
- Set planning objectives for the coming year (Program Review form, Question #6).

To respond to Program Review prompts, units with courses are provided with the following data:
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- Student success data, including grade point average and percentage of units passed. This data is reported for departments as a whole, and is also disaggregated by age, ethnicity, BOGG waiver status, and gender.
- Program Award data (number of certificates and degrees issued by the College).
- Demographic Data, again by age, ethnicity, BOGG waiver status, and gender.
- Enrollment data, including the demand for courses and sections.

Note: while the data on student success noted above is reported for the department as a whole, the data noted here allows departments to drill down on the same data to subjects and courses. In addition, the student success data is available for drill down via the College’s Decision Support System, which will soon be replaced by ARGOS which will modernize this process. For example, departments have been able to investigate course success overall and by various student demographics including age, gender, ethnicity, basic skills level, new first time status, returning student, educational goal, etcetera. With ARGOS, departments will have easier access to this information.


With respect to the appropriateness of program offerings as part of the overall college curriculum, the annual program review requires units to provide a description of the program services and locations (Program Review form, Question #1). In the guidelines for this question, units are directed to identify how the unit’s services align with the College’s Mission. In addition, the question about resource allocation requires units to tie requests to the Board’s priorities and/or to overall College plans (Program Review form, Question #8).

Program Relevance and Learning Outcomes. The responsibility for determining program relevancy lies primarily with discipline faculty. Faculty have identified SLOs for all certificate programs, degree programs, and the General Education program. Work on identifying program-level learning outcomes was largely concluded in Fall 2012. Assessment of program-level learning outcomes has been in progress for some of the programs at the College for a number of years. As noted above, the College has set an expectation of reporting every semester on assessment plans for all programs. The achievement of learning outcomes varies from program to program; the SLO website documents learning outcomes by program.

www.ccsf.edu/slo

The Link Between Program Evaluation Results and Institutional Planning. As noted above, the annual program review system is directly connected to institutional planning, particularly through the revised Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting timeline and process.

Some notable examples of changes/improvements made as a result of the program review system are [insert items that we can collect by the end of January when we have departments report extensively on program-level SLO assessment results].

Examples of program changes made as a result of outcomes assessment are shown on departmental web pages.
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II.A.2.e. Self Evaluation. The College has well-developed processes for course and program assessment, and has recently developed ways in which the institution ensures that these processes are done across the College. Reporting on the processes for course and program assessment (i.e. program review) are included in the College’s Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting cycle. The criteria used in the annual program review system is evenly applied across the College and includes relevancy, appropriateness, achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, and planning for the future. Although the annual program review system includes a wealth of data, challenges continue in the interpretation and use of this data.

The College should more obviously tie the evaluation of CTE program relevance into the annual program review system, by including labor market information and asking CTE programs to comment specifically on the trends in the labor market, on the number of program completers, and the impact of the program on completers.

The College recently received data from the RP Group’s completer/leaver survey. The annual program review process should include these data to assist in evaluating program relevance.

II.A.2.e. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College needs to continue integrating the annual program review system into planning and budgeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to enhance the data used in examining the relevance of CTE programs to include labor market data and the RP Group’s Completer/Leaver survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College is going to transition to using Argos reporting to allow better use of data during Program Review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2.f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

II.A.2.f. Descriptive Summary. The College has an integrated annual cycle of evaluation and planning that includes Unit-Level Program Review. The Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Cycle is part of a larger process of Planning, derived from Strategic Planning and the Board’s periodic review of the College’s Mission and Vision statements.

Assuring Course and Program Currency through Integrated Planning. The unit-level program review process asks units to reflect on overall department directions that have occurred as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes. While reporting on major directions taken as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes has been included in the
annual program review process since 2008-09, and while the assessment of learning outcomes has taken place since before then, the College has more recently (Fall 2012) embarked on a more thorough centralized system of planning and reporting on SLO assessment work. The College uses the SLO web site to centralize information about this process, to collect data, and to report on the results.

The Fall 2012 centralized reporting system asked departments to report on learning outcomes assessment efforts for every course being offered. The Spring 2013 system is more widespread, and requires reporting on both efforts that occurred in Fall 2012 and plans for efforts in Spring 2013:

- Academic Departments report on every course being offered and every program, including certificates, majors, and disciplines that do not have a major or certificate.
- In General Education, we are embarking on a more widespread pilot for CCSF General Education Area C.
- The expanded system also involves student development and other services. It is truly the College’s one central system.

Improving Outcomes and Making Results Available. The College systematically strives to improve outcomes by requiring reporting on assessment work, both in a macro sense through the annual program review system, and on a more micro sense through the every-semester reporting and planning system. Much of the work for improvement is done at the unit level, and does not require additional resources. For those improvements that require additional resources, the integration of the reporting on major directions taken into the annual Program Review process affords units the opportunity to tie resource requests to those improvement efforts. The SLO web site and the departmental web sites are the central locations for making the results of learning outcomes assessment available to appropriate constituencies.

II.A.2.f. Self Evaluation. The College has a well-developed system of integrated assessment, planning, and budgeting. The annual Program Review process is the centerpiece of the annual cycle, and has been going on in its current form since 2008-09. Throughout Summer and Fall 2012, the College has further refined the planning and budgeting system along with the Program Review template to ensure that it is a fully integrated system.

While the College has asked about learning outcomes assessment in the annual Program Review system since 2008-09, it was not an effective way of ensuring that learning outcomes assessment was widespread. The College has made great strides in the last year in creating a separate centralized reporting system. In addition to ensuring that outcomes assessment is widespread, this system has been very effective in making outcomes assessment work visible and promoting intra- and inter-departmental dialogue.

The annual Program Review system is the main vehicle by which departments can make resource requests. While this system provides the framework by which outcomes improvement efforts that require additional resources can be funded, it is too early to determine how effective this will be.

II.A.2.f. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:
An evaluation of the entire Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting process will be conducted in Fall 2013 via program review. Changes will be determined in Spring 2014 for implementation in Fall 2014.

As the College continues its efforts to improve its centralized reporting system on learning outcomes assessment work, it must also ensure that any efforts that require additional resources are effectively integrated into the Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting process.

## II.A.2.g

If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.

### II.A.2.g. Descriptive Summary.

During Fall 2010, all instructional departments were surveyed to assess which departments were using common examinations and assessments. The following courses were reported to have common exams or common assessments:

- Broadcasting 119, 120
- Chemistry 101A, 101B
- Fire Science 111
- English 90, 91, 93, 95X, 96, 961A
- English as a Second Language 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, 160, 170; Noncredit Levels 2, 4, 6
- Spanish 1, 1A and French 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 2B

Departments making use of cross-section assessments were asked how the validity of these measures had been established, and how cultural and linguistic biases were avoided in the creation and administration of the tests.

Departments have approached these questions in different ways. Fire Science, for example, uses a common test bank for Fire Science 111, with computerized randomization of questions from a database. Broadcast Electronic Media Arts uses common midterm and final exams in addition to common lab projects. Examination questions are continually vetted and refined during faculty meetings, and lab projects are all graded using a common rubric [II A-56 p. 2, 4].

The CCSF ESL Department maintains a promotion test program that is administered to noncredit students in Levels 2, 4, and 6 (matching the California State Department of Education’s Model Standards levels) to determine readiness for advancement. The exams utilized in the program were developed by CCSF faculty and are both valid and reliable. Testing is standardized and carefully monitored, and records kept of student results.
In credit ESL courses, students take common final examinations at each level assessing reading, grammar, and writing [II A-57 p. 8]. Predictive validity for reading and grammar questions was demonstrated through significant correlations between test scores and subsequent success in general courses. The writing components, graded holistically, are grounded by the use of rubrics and anchor papers. All questions are panel-written by diverse faculty to avoid cultural and linguistic biases, and revised during a final editing process.

The English Department uses a variety of common assessments in its courses. English 90 and 91 require a common portfolio for promotion into subsequent courses. These portfolios, based on essays, annotated readings, and a cover letter, make use of one essay and one reading common to all sections. The English faculty use a common rubric for grading and grade portfolios as a group, using two raters to minimize differences between instructors and a third reader in the event of discrepancies. English 92, 93, 96, 1A, 1B, and 1C go through cycles of evaluation for assessment purposes and to guide the three-year course revision process. These may be common summaries, common essays, specific targeted strategies, reading, testing, et cetera. The new accelerated/intensive courses, English 95X and English 961A, will be going through a three-year assessment process from Spring 2011 to Spring 2013, using many of the above-mentioned practices [II A-23 p. 6, 13-14].

In French and Spanish courses, instructors make use of a common bank of test sections to minimize differences in assessment between instructors, and work is currently underway in Foreign Languages courses to incorporate common elements into final examinations. Chemistry 101A sections use common, team-written questions for the midterm examination, and all students in these courses take the same final examination. Chemistry 101B sections share common portions of the final examination. These common materials have been developed by faculty consensus over time, and faculty conduct regular revision, looking for flawed or biased items and taking into account how different student populations are performing.

Many departments responding to the survey indicated some reliance upon nationally-vetted textbook question banks written by experts in the respective fields, or norming to criteria of professional organizations, as ways to help minimize bias in tests. There is, however, recognition that these materials, though they minimize differences between college instructors, have inherent biases. Departments therefore take full advantage of CCSF’s diverse faculty to attenuate these problems. Faculty indicate that when an exam item is deemed to demonstrate bias, it is removed from examinations through faculty consensus.

Although not linked to exiting a course, placement testing is worthy of mention since it is an assessment of knowledge of skills prerequisite to courses in the College’s Mathematics, English, ESL, and Chemistry curricula. The purpose of course placement testing is to determine the correct level course in which a student should begin his/her studies in order to increase the likelihood of success.

All College placement testing in these subjects has been validated by the Matriculation Office and the Office of Research and Planning for predictive validity, reliability, and bias as stipulated by Title 5 placement assessment standards. Furthermore, these tests are continually reviewed and refined in order to maintain content and cut-score validity and to watch for disproportionate impact. During the assessment process multiple measures are used to produce initial placement in the Mathematics, English and ESL curricula. Counselors and Mathematics, ESL and English department faculty use placement test results to
recommend appropriate course enrollment. Other tests and student assessments given by instructional departments advise students of curricula and course sequences in their respective departments.

**II.A.2.g. Self Evaluation.** Some academic programs, such as credit and noncredit ESL, which move large numbers of the College’s students through well-defined sequences, are making use of common examinations that are statistically validated. Many more departments and academic units are moving toward common examinations, when appropriate, as a way to help gauge attainment of student learning outcomes. In these cases, effort is made to minimize biases and increase the validity of the results.

**II.A.2.g. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II.A.2.h. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.**

**II.A.2.h. Descriptive Summary.** Each course has a set of learning outcomes identified on the official Course Outline of Record. The Course Outline of Record also specifies the hours and units associated with the course. In its review of course outlines, the Curriculum Committee examines the content, hours, and units, and ensures that they are justified (see Curriculum Handbook, Chapter 9, Table 9-2).

The College awards credit in accordance with Title 5 Section 55002.5 and Title 5 Section 55256.5. This definition is in accordance with the Federal definition of a credit hour as stated in 34 CFR 600.2. The ratios of hours to units are specified in the Curriculum Handbook, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.4.

**II.A.2.h. Self Evaluation.** The College awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes and awards units of credit in a manner consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

**II.A.2.h. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.

II.A.2.i. Descriptive Summary. The institution ensures that achievement of stated programmatic learning outcomes are the basis for awarding certificates and degrees. Specifically, in the case of certificates:

- All certificates have an identified set of learning outcomes, as required by Chapter 5 of the Curriculum Handbook, and as shown in the College Catalog.
- The Curriculum Committee requires that departments show how the learning outcomes for the certificate map to the required courses, and requires that students are able to show mastery of the stated learning outcomes through this coursework (measured at the classroom level via assignments, surveys, exams and so on as specified in Standard II.A.2.e.) regardless of any course options the student may have in satisfying certificate requirements. Details are in the Curriculum Handbook.

In the case of degrees:

- Students getting an Associate Degree must satisfy a set of requirements, as outlined in the “Associate Degree Graduation Requirements” section of the College Catalog. These requirements include General Education requirements and Major requirements.
- For General Education:
  - Students completing the AA or AS degrees meet local CCSF GE requirements, which have a set of learning outcomes determined by the College. Each of the courses that meet CCSF local GE requirements has been mapped to those outcomes.
  - Students completing the AA-T or AS-T degrees meet the GE requirements by satisfying the CSU GE or IGETC patterns. While learning outcomes have not been identified in the College for these patterns, the inclusion of courses into these areas is determined by the UC and CSU systems, using the courses’ SLOs as noted in the course outlines.
- For majors:
  - Regardless of the type of degree pursued (AA/AS vs. AA-T/AS-T), students must also satisfy the major requirement.
  - For majors specified by a department or for the Areas of Emphasis of the Liberal Arts and Sciences Degree, learning outcomes have been identified and mapped to the required courses, in accord with Chapter 4 of the Curriculum Handbook.
  - As with certificates, students must show mastery of the stated program learning outcomes regardless of course options used in satisfying the major requirements.

In Fall 2012 the College reviewed all of its certificates and majors, and departments were required to show how the courses required for these programs mapped to the program learning outcomes. The College’s Curriculum Committee reviewed the mapping documents. In its review, the Curriculum Committee developed an initial set of institutional expectations for the learning expected of students completing certificate or major requirements.
The College first established the learning outcomes for its local General Education pattern in 2008. In Fall 2012, the College reviewed all of the courses applicable to the General Education areas, mapping them to the learning outcomes. This process generated significant discussion about the learning outcomes, some updates to the outcomes themselves, and updated processes regarding the inclusion of courses in the General Education areas (see minutes of October 2012 Bipartite Committee meeting).

[Evidence: Minutes of the October 2012 Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.]

Identification of Learning Outcomes. For certificates and majors, the College relies on discipline faculty to determine the learning outcomes. These learning outcomes are presented along with the required courses when a certificate or major is presented to the Curriculum Committee for approval.

The learning outcomes for the College’s local General Education pattern were developed by faculty from the relevant GE areas and approved by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements in 2008. These learning outcomes were assessed in Fall 2012 via a process of mapping individual courses to those learning outcomes and a self-assessment of the alignment between these courses and the learning outcomes.

II.A.2.i. Self Evaluation. The College’s Curriculum Committee has well-defined processes for ensuring that learning outcomes are identified for certificates and majors and for ensuring that students have opportunities to master each one of these learning outcomes regardless of course options used in satisfying major or certificate requirements. The College’s process for identifying student learning outcomes relies on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty, and, where relevant, industry input through advisory groups.

The process undertaken in Fall 2012 of mapping courses to the learning outcomes of the local General Education pattern generated robust dialogue about these outcomes, as shown in the minutes of the October 2012 Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. This dialogue included updates to the General Education outcomes themselves and some updated processes for inclusion of courses into the GE areas.

[Evidence: Minutes of the October 2012 Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.]

The College has been required to offer Associate Degrees for Transfer, which has different General Education course requirements. Legislation mandates the General Education pattern used in Associate Degrees for Transfer, and the decision on the inclusion of courses into the CSU GE and IGETC patterns is largely outside of the control of local faculty. The College has not identified SLOs for this GE pattern since changes to this pattern are enacted externally.

The College also allows students to satisfy the major requirement of the Associate Degree by taking 18 units in a field of study when a major has not been specified by the department. In these cases, learning outcomes have not been identified for the set of courses a student might take in satisfying the major requirement. However, learning outcomes have been identified for these disciplines, those learning outcomes have been mapped to discipline coursework, and that mapping has been reviewed by the Curriculum Committee.

II.A.2.i. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College needs to examine its practice of allowing students to satisfy the major requirement by taking 18 units in a particular field of study when no major has been specified by the department. While learning outcomes have been identified for those disciplines, there is no assurance that a student taking 18 or more units in a particular field of study will master those learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>