Accreditation Work Group #1 Mission -- Progress Form #2

Updated since the Aug. 16 progress report are highlighted in yellow below.

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Thursday, August 16.

Recommendation number and topic:
Recommendation #1 Mission Statement

Full recommendation text:

To improve effectiveness of Standard I.A Mission, the team recommends that the college establish a prescribed process and timeline to regularly review the mission statement and revise it as necessary. The college should use the mission statement as the benchmark to determine institutional priorities and goals that support and improve academic programs, student support services and student learning effectively linked to a realistic assessment of resources (I.A.3).

Related standards:

Financial & Academic Planning: #2 Planning, #10/11 Finances, #3 Program Review, #4,5,6 SLO
Resources: #7 Staffing, #8 Physical Resources, #9 Tech Res.
Decision Making: #12/13/14 Gov./Ldr./Board

Work group members:
Pamila Fisher; Jorge Bell, Steve Spurling, Ted Alfaro, Athena Steff, Pam Mery, Nancy Mackowsky, Karen Saginor, John Carrese, Greg Keech, Edgar Torres, Shannell Williams, Diamond Dave Whitaker, Anita Grier

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

July 27, 2012 – At the first meeting, the Chancellor who is the workgroup chair explained the role of the workgroup. The team reviewed the accrediting commission recommendation, reviewed the accreditation standard, reviewed other college mission statements, discussed shortcomings of our own mission statement, and assigned homework to the workgroup members. Homework assignments included gathering data, proposing revised language, conducting employee/student survey.

August 3, 2012 – At the second meeting, the workgroup reviewed proposed language for the mission statement which emphasized student learning, assessment, resource allocation; reviewed the survey for employees and students; and reviewed external/internal demographic data to help inform the mission statement. The group also discussed ways to help facilitate a board meeting on the mission statement.

August 9, 2012 – At the third meeting, the workgroup reviewed the results of the employee survey; determined that the student survey data was faulty and results would not be used during the board meeting; reviewed the California Education Code on the mission of community colleges; discussed how to prioritize the mission statement by including language indicating primary mission goals and when supplementary programs/services could be offered; talked further about ways to facilitate the board meeting.
August 15, 2012 – The fourth meeting of the workgroup took place after the board held a special meeting to review data and discuss the mission statement as part of its annual review process. Feedback from the board was incorporated in the final proposed mission statement which will be considered as a 1st policy reading during its August 23, 2012 regular board meeting. The final proposed statement includes the transitional studies as part of the primary mission, and highlights the importance of closing the achievement gap. Note that the student members were added to the workgroup and were able to participate in this last meeting only.

**Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.**

The purpose of the workgroup was to draft a proposed mission statement for the board’s review. The workgroup plans to address the recommendation are described below.

1. **Discuss shortcomings of the current mission statement** – The workgroup reviewed the accreditation standard and recommendation to better understand what changes were necessary. In its discussions, the workgroup conveyed the need to better focus on student learning, achievement, and assessment, link to planning and resource allocation, and explicitly state in policy that the board will review the mission statement on an annual basis. (Completed on 7/27/12)

2. **Draft new statement without priorities** – The workgroup focused its initial review of the statement by adding language in the introductory and concluding section to incorporate the concepts to meet the accreditation standard, e.g. focus on student achievement, learning, assessment, link to institutional planning and resource allocation. New language was added to explicitly state the board’s role in conducting a regular annual review of the mission statement. (Completed on 8/3/12)

3. **Collect and review internal and external data** – The workgroup reviewed internal and external data to inform and help facilitate the board discussions on the mission statement. This data included: San Francisco trends on population, ethnicity/race, age, foreign born populations, legal immigration, and educational attainment by age group. City College trends the work group reviewed included for both credit and noncredit students: headcount, age distribution, ethnic group distribution, educational goal, awards and certificates, Basic Skills English, Math and ESL enrollment. Credit and noncredit FTES was also considered. (Completed on 8/3/12)

4. **Collect input on priorities through online survey** – The college distributed a survey to all of its employees asking them to prioritize the nine areas explicitly bulleted in the current mission statement. In addition effort was made to reach out to the student body of spring, summer, and enrolled in fall. However technical difficulties did not allow for a complete survey to the students. Over 1200 employees responded (out of approximately 2500). Respondents included faculty, department chairs, administrators, classified, and students. The responses indicated the following top four priorities: Preparation for transfer; Achievement of Associate Degrees; Acquisition of career skills; English as a Second Language. (Completed 8/9/12)

5. **Plan a Board workshop to review the mission statement** – The workgroup discussed the various ways to conduct and facilitate a productive board workshop. It decided what kinds of documents and data would be presented, as well as brainstormed the agenda for the workshop. (Completed 8/9/12)

6. **Revise the mission statement** – Most important, the workgroup in its own review of the data and survey discussed how to consolidate the specific nine bullets and list them as primary mission items (e.g. basic skills includes ESL), and to specify other programs and services the college offers when resources allow. (Completed 8/9/12)
7. Conduct a Board workshop – On August 14, 2012 the Board held a special meeting to review the mission statement. Board members reviewed the workgroup matrix (workplan), California Education Code on the mission of the community colleges, reviewed the internal/external demographic data, FTES data, online survey data, and finally the proposed mission statement. They provided their input and feedback on the proposed survey, expressing the need to highlight the importance of transitional studies as part of the primary mission, and then need to highlight the importance of closing the achievement gap. (Completed 8/14/12)

8. 1st reading of board policy on the mission statement – The workgroup will make final revisions to the mission statement during its third meeting on 8/15/12. This final revision will be formatted as a board policy and the resolution will be discussed at the August regular board meeting. (Scheduled 8/23/12)

9. 2nd reading of board policy on mission statement – The board will review the mission statement as a second policy reading and hopefully adopt the mission statement. (Scheduled 9/11/12)

**Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable.**

If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

The attached material represents the agenda, data, and proposed mission statement that the board discussed at its August 14, 2012 special meeting. Resolutions and actions on the board policy on the mission statement will be included after the board meetings occur on August 23 and September 11.

**August 23, 2012** - At its August 23, 2012 meeting the Board reviewed the Mission Statement as a first reading of the new policy and approved the document. The statement included the changes noted during its August 14, 2012 Special Meeting. No additional changes or amendments were made.

**September 11, 2012** - At its September 11, 2012 meeting the Board reviewed the Mission Statement as a second reading of the new policy and approved the document.

**List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.**

The challenge will be in the implementation of looking to the mission to help with decision making at all levels (Board, Planning, Program Review, Resource Allocation). The activity of the workgroup were fast-tracked since the mission statement influences and guides many of the other recommendations, namely related to planning, program review, finances, and resources. The proposed mission statement does not significantly reduce the scope of activities. The proposed mission statement addresses the recommendation by establishing a prescribed process and timeline to regularly review the mission statement and revise it on an annual basis. The role of the mission statement is explicitly spelled out that it should be used as the benchmark to determine institutional priorities and improvement, and that is linked to planning and resource allocation. The mission statement delineates primary focus areas, specifically transfer, degrees, certificates/career skills, basic skills including ESL & transitional studies. These four major bullets (down from 9 bullets in original mission statement) are a general reflection of the California Education Code. Other programs and services will be offered only when resources allow, and/or in collaboration with community based organizations when possible. The merits of adding the word “only” was discussed at length. Some felt that it was unnecessarily prohibitive, others felt that it was absolutely necessary.
Accreditation Work Group Progress Form

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Friday, September 7.

Recommendation number and topic:
Recommendation #2 Effective Planning Process

Full recommendation text:
To fully meet Standard I.B Institutional Effectiveness, the team recommends the college to develop a strategy for fully implementing its existing planning process to look at each campus and site, examine revenues and expenses, and systematically address instructional program planning, staffing requirements, provision of student and library services, including facilities needs and competing priorities. The planning process should include clearly prescribed roles and scope of authority for all governance stakeholders involved in each component of the planning process (I.A.3, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.B.3.a, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a-b, III.C.1.a-c, III.C.2, III.D.1.a-c, III.D.2.a-c, III.2.g, III.3, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, and IV.2.a).

Related standards:
Effective planning relates to all Accreditation Standards (i.e. Standard I Institutional Mission and Effectiveness, Standard II Student Learning Programs and Services, Standard III Resources, and Standard IV Leadership and Governance).

In terms of the 14 recommendations, nearly all have implications for planning.

- Recommendation #1 Mission Statement is essential for informed and goal-directed planning.
- Recommendation #3 Assessing Institutional Effectiveness calls for the full implementation of program review (the college’s mechanism for unit-level planning) and completing assessments of SLOs (recommendations #4 and #5) in order to develop and report performance metrics to measure institutional effectiveness. On an annual basis, these measurements “close the loop” and inform the next cycle of planning.
- Several recommendations identify resource-related areas where integrated planning is needed (#7 human resources, #8 physical resources, and #9 technology resources).
- Since effective planning requires meaningful connection to budget process, recommendations #10 and #11 are also related.
- Finally, effective planning requires decision-making, thus the latter recommendations (#12, #13, #14) on leadership and governance have clear implications for planning.

Work group members:
Ari Aiken, Betty Inclan, Carl Jew, Chris Jackson, Diane Verdugo, E. Simon Hanson, Fred Chavaria, Jessica Brown, Jill Kersey, Kitty Moriwaki, Lindy McKnight, Pamela Mery, Peter Goldstein, Phyllis McGuire, Ray Gamba, Tim Ryan, William Walker
Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

July 19, 2012 – During the first half of the first meeting, participants for both recommendation #2 and recommendation #3 met together to review the recommendations and related accreditation standards and to identify characteristics exhibited by an institution with effective integrated planning processes. Given current exigencies, the initial focus of participants for recommendation #2 was on annual planning. The group discussed in detail an Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting timeline which would reflect these characteristics of effective planning: (a) directed by Board priorities and the College’s Mission Statement; (b) informed by data and assessments; (c) supported by unit-level planning that addresses Board priorities, references data trends, and is sufficiently timely so as to inform the following year’s annual plan and annual budget; (d) transparent and efficient in prioritizing allocation and resource decisions, including resource reductions when necessary, for the upcoming year; and (e) characterized by broad communication and dialogue at several critical junctures. The group also began to discuss the types of reports and metrics which might be most useful to inform planning.

July 25, 2012 – The group revisited the Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting timeline, particularly with regard to adjusting due dates to ensure that unit-level plans can inform a draft annual plan developed in conjunction with the preliminary budget. The group acknowledged that program review has historically been viewed as a mechanism for new allocations and must now be used to identify areas for reductions. The group discussed the need for a visual which could accompany the narrative for the annual process.

August 2, 2012 – The group briefly revisited the Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting (APB) timeline to acquaint new members. The group then spent some time reviewing and discussing the draft visual flowchart which reinforces the 12 month schedule and includes topical overlays making it easier to see where various items occur (e.g., where assessment occurs, where dialogue occurs, etc). In addition, the group discussed when and how the entire annual APB system would be evaluated to inform further refinements and adjustments. Then the group “shifted gears” to discuss longer-range plans. In particular, the group discussed when and how the College could complete a new Education Master Plan which would strengthen the process of continually connecting annual planning with enrollment, staffing, technology, facilities, and other resource-related plans.

August 21, 2012 – This meeting focused on a proposed timeline for developing a new Education Master Plan, as well as discussing how to display the connections between long-range planning and annual planning.

September 10, 2012 – Next Meeting

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

The workgroup developing the following plans to address the recommendations:

1. Develop a narrative that clearly outlines the Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting timeline which is characterized by the following: (a) directed by Board priorities and the College’s Mission Statement; (b) informed by data and assessments; (c) supported by unit-
level planning that addresses Board priorities, references data trends, and is sufficiently timely so as to inform the following year’s annual plan and annual budget; (d) transparent and efficient in prioritizing allocation and resource decisions, including resource reductions when necessary, for the upcoming year; and (e) characterized by broad communication and dialogue at several critical junctures. (Discussed 7/19 and 7/25. Final comments on 8/2 for distribution by 8/30 and Board review on 9/11.)

2. Develop visuals which reinforce the 12 month process for Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting (APB). These visuals would allow various components (e.g., assessment, communication) to be clearly identified in terms of their frequency and connection to the other components. Both the narrative and visuals will facilitate broader understanding of the APB process. (Discussed 7/25 and 8/2. To be revisited 8/21. Initial drafts can be shared by 8/30 and on 9/11.)

3. Draft process and timeline for evaluation and continuous improvement of APB processes (i.e. when and how the entire APB system will be reviewed). (Discussed 8/2. Final comments on 8/21 for distribution by 8/30 and Board review on 9/11.)

4. Draft process and timeline for creating a new Education Master Plan (EMP) in 2013-2014. The creation of a new EMP will be time-consuming and significant, thus it cannot be undertaken during the current semester. However, the College should begin pre-planning activities this year to lay a foundation for a robust EMP process proposed for 2013-2014. (Discussed 8/2. Final comments on 8/21 for distribution by 8/30 and Board review on 9/11.)

5. Draft a process and related visuals for other mid-range and long-range master planning, including technology, staffing, and facilities. The process and visuals will clarify the conceptual relationships between these plans, the EMP, and annual planning processes. In addition, sequencing and proposed frequency will be addressed. (Preliminary discussions occurred in August. To be discussed in detail during September.)

6. Assemble and draft materials which promote understanding of annual indicators and benchmarking. (Preliminary discussions occurred in August. To be discussed in detail during September. This activity is connected to recommendation #3, as well as recommendation #2.)

7. Identify data needs related to planning and program review. (To be discussed in detail during September. This activity is connected to recommendation #3, as well as recommendation #2.)

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

A draft Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting (APB) timeline has been discussed in detail, refined several times, and is ready for Board review. See appended item.

Several other items are in development, some of which will be ready for Board review by September 11. These include the APB visuals, the process and timeline for evaluation and
continuous improvement of APB processes, and the process and timeline for creating a new Education Master Plan.

**List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.**

A primary aspect of addressing this recommendation is not only outlining an annual process that connects assessments and planning to budgets, but also *implementing* that process this academic year. The first challenge will be sticking to the annual timeline, especially in this first year. The second challenge will be making difficult and perhaps unpopular budget-related decisions, particularly reductions. However, these challenges must be faced for the college to show a connection between planning and budgeting, including using assessments and data in the planning and budgeting processes. A related challenge is making sure all necessary data are available, widely discussed, and sufficiently accurate to support decision-making.
### Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Timeline

**Looking at last year to plan for next year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for FY 2013-2014</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2012 - Summer 2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual Performance Indicators and College-Wide Assessments for 2011-2012</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Chancellor leads discussions with the Board and College community on Annual Performance Indicators, End-of-Year Assessment, and Annual Program Review Summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>Board’s Annual Priorities and Planning Assumptions for Resource Allocation for 2013-2014</strong>&lt;br&gt;Using informed planning assumptions based on (a) internal and external trend data and (b) realistic budget scenarios for 2013-2014, the Board reviews the College’s Mission statement and delineates policy-level priorities consistent with the College’s Mission, as well as Board-adopted Policies and College Plans. The Chancellor communicates these Priorities and Planning Assumptions to the College community by mid-September (in future this will occur at August Flex).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unit-level Program Reviews for 2013-2014</strong>&lt;br&gt;Developed by all units during the fall semester in response to the Board’s Priorities and Planning Assumptions, Board-adopted College Plans, and any changes to the College’s Mission statement as well as unit-specific data such as historical trends, projected trends, industry board input, survey data, student achievement data, and learning outcomes assessments. Units should follow guidelines for completing reviews with attention to program effectiveness and student learning outcomes. Program reviews must be submitted to the immediate supervisor by the December deadline for consideration in the upcoming budget. Decisions for increasing or reducing resource allocations will be based on program review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2013 – February 2013</strong></td>
<td><strong>Administrative Recommendations for Increasing / Reducing Resource Allocations for 2013-2014</strong>&lt;br&gt;Completed program reviews are posted by immediate supervisors (e.g., School Deans) along with requests which are ranked based upon several factors per program review guidelines. Ranked requests are forwarded up the administrative chain until ultimately each Vice Chancellor identifies priorities for his or her area for that year. The Chancellor meets with the Vice Chancellors regarding the priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 2013 – April 2013</strong></td>
<td><strong>Governance Review for Increasing / Reducing Resource Allocations for 2013-2014</strong>&lt;br&gt;In February, the Chancellor convenes the Governance Council to determine overall prioritization. Final rankings are publicized via Program Review website. The highest ranked resource requests and identified reductions will be considered for inclusion in the upcoming Budget and reflected in the draft Annual Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Budget Preparation for 2013-2014</strong>&lt;br&gt;In February, copies of the current year’s unit-level budgets are forwarded to all units, reviewed, and corrected as necessary to form an initial basis for 2013-2014. Once the Chancellor’s Governance Council completes its work, the 2013-2014 draft budgets for each unit are adjusted to reflect allocation decisions and priorities while maintaining a balanced budget for the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 2013 – June 2013</strong></td>
<td><strong>Board Review and Approval of Tentative Budget and Annual Plan for 2013-2014</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Board reviews the draft Annual Plan and Tentative Budget no later than May. The Annual Plan and Tentative Budget are adopted in June. The Final Budget is adopted in September. All documents are posted online and shared with the College community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning for FY 2014-2015

|  | **Annual Performance Indicators and College-Wide Assessments for 2012-2013**<br>The Chancellor leads discussions with the Board and College community on Annual Performance Indicators, End-of-Year Assessment, and Annual Program Review Summary. |  |
|  |  |  |

**Notes:** An evaluation of 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.

Resources requests submitted via program review will be sorted into categories (e.g., staffing, facilities, supplies and equipment, including technology-related requests) to assist with systematic updates of longer-range plans. Schedule TBD.
Accreditation Work Group Progress Form

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Thursday, August 16.

Recommendation number and topic:
Group #3 - Institutional Effectiveness/Program Review

Full recommendation text:

Related standards:
- 1.B.5 and ACCJA Rubric for Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness

Work group members:
- Loren Bell
- Torrance Bynum
- Bill Goodyear
- Sue Homer
- Joanne Low
- Pam Mery
- Andrea Niosi
- Minh Hoa Ta
- Fabio Saniee
- Samuel Santos
- Katryn Wiese

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

Thursday, July 19  9:00 – 12:00 noon
The first meeting was a joint meeting with workgroup #2. The full group reviewed the agenda and the proposed charge and was given homework to review the recommendations, read the standards, read the relevant sections of the report, look at effective models, identify resources, list activities, and work on a timeline. We then broke into two groups where group #3 reviewed the matrix and started to develop the activities needed to meet the charge of the recommendation.

Monday July 23  3:00 – 4:30 pm
With new members joining the group, we reviewed the recommendation and the work from the first meeting. The group discussed and listed desired outcomes.

Monday, July 30  3:00 – 4:30 pm
With new members joining the group, we reviewed the work from previous meetings and divided out the tasks. Criteria for each of the major tasks were listed.

Monday, August 6 3:00 – 4:30
The group reviewed the steps and the annual timeline for program review. The template, guidelines, data, dean’s form and the website were discussed. Sub work groups were given the task of work in each area with a deadline of August 13.

Monday, August 20 3:00 – 5:30
Work Group #3 worked on the annual timeline for the program review process. It also worked on the template and guidelines. In addition, the group discussed the data elements to be included in the Program Review process and the elements to be included in the dean level review. The steps for the Fall 2012 Program Review cycle were listed.

Monday, August 27 3:00 – 4:30
Work Group #3 reviewed the Program Review deliverables: template, guidelines, rubric. Wording for the rubric was revised for consistency. Members of the Program Review Committee were also present. Goal was to bring everyone up to date and to solicit input before the August 31 roll out.

Monday, September ?? 3:00 – 5:00
This meeting was postponed to September 18. The roll out has also been delayed. A Special Board Meeting to discuss and approve the new mission statement will be held on September 11. The Program Review roll out will follow approval of the mission statement. In future cycles, the mission statement would be approved earlier in the year allowing other elements of planning and program review to maintain a synchronized calendar.

Tuesday, September 18 3:00 – 5:00
The agenda for this meeting will include final review of the template, guidelines and rubric. It will also include review of a recommendation from the technology group about linking Program Review to the Perkins Grant allocation process.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

Program Review Template – The PR tool will be updated to align the items with the planning process. The elements of the program review document are relevant, but language of the items have been tightened in order to bring clarity to the question being addressed. This was especially true on the SLO related items. The goal is also to put all the information in one place for easy reference of the writer and reader. In an effort to provide a stronger link to planning and budgeting, questions on maintenance of effort, growth and reduction have been included. Each unit will also be asked to rank their needs/goals as it relates to allocation of resources. Additional changes will be made as part of the annual review and evaluation of the Program Review process.

Criteria for Dean Level Comments - The open-ended template for the dean level comments has also been revised to provide more guidance and obtain standardized comments and recommendations.

Guidelines – A simple and easy to use set of guidelines will be developed to guide those completing the PR reports for their units. The goal is to obtain standardized responses. Work on the guidelines has been continuous in order to make the examples fit with the changes to the improved template.
Website – The website for PR will be developed with an eye to making PR an on-going process throughout the year. The website will be a resource. Location and format is under research at this time.

Timeline – Work in this area continues. The goal is to synchronize the PR timeline with other planning activities in the College. Group #3 and Group #2 continue to communicate and jointly develop this timeline. Research is scheduled to rollout data for PR after September 18. There has been a delay. All PR reports will be due before the end of the semester. A more detailed timeline should be in place as the data is rolled out. In addition, there is interest in developing a calendar showing the annual PR process over a three year cycle to eliminate confusion over the time period being addressed in the report.

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

Updated drafts of the Timeline, Guidelines, Template and Rubric will be distributed to the group on Wednesday, September 12. The group will be meeting on Tuesday, September 18 to review the latest templates and guidelines. Drafts have been updated several times since the start. This process has included a meeting with the Chancellor for her review and input. Meetings with other groups, such as the Enrollment Management Team, have resulted in agreed upon data sources and a better understanding of variances in reporting. This understanding will bring an improved process. This work to tighten the data should bring differences to less than 1%. For future years, a timeline of data runs will also reduce variances.

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.

A continuing challenge has been questions about the data provided in the PR template. Research gathers the information from our computer system, but the departments/units question the accuracy of the information. As stated above, meetings with Office of Instruction, Admissions and Records, and Research have resulted in agreed upon data sources and variances.

Another challenge is that we need different information/data for different types of units (i.e. instructional vs. student development vs. campuses vs. service). Research has continued to refine the data before the roll out.

As we move into a data driven decision making model, we may not be able to provide complete and accurate information to the PR units. Units with grants and contracts would benefit from data on revenue as well as expenditures. This would provide a more complete assessment.
Accreditation Work Group Progress Form

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Friday, September 7.

Recommendation number and topic:
4 – SLO/Instruction

Full recommendation text:
To fully meet Standard II Student Learning Programs and Services, the team recommends 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.

Related standards:
- I.B; II.A.1.a, c, II.A.2.a- c, f, g-i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2; III.A.1.c; IV.A.2.b, IV.B.2.b

Work group members:
- Joanne Low
- Tom Boegel (lead)
- Fabio Saniee
- Samuel Santos
- Andrea Niosi
- Charles Metzler
- Vivian Ikeda
- Nadine Rosenthal
- Jane Sneed
- Katryn Wiese
- Dennis Piontkowski
- Rebeca Chavez
- Chrissy Leuma

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

July 17: Initial meeting and orientation
**July 24:** Review of faculty and administrator roles; Initial discussion of roles, processes, and timelines/milestones for course, program, general education, and institutional SLO’s

**July 31:** Review of action plan for documenting course, program, and general education SLO’s; delegation of form creation.

**August 7:** Final approval of forms for course, program, and general education SLO’s. Reviewed data on course outline dates, with first review of timeline to get all course outlines to have approval dates within last six years.

**August 21:** Final endorsement of timeline for course outline updates. Review of SLO Proficiency rubric. Discussion of SLO Flex Day.

**August 30:** Continued discussion of SLO Flex Day. Review of SLO Proficiency rubric. Review of documentation and timeline for October 15 Progress report.

Our next meeting is scheduled for September 18, where we will assess the SLO Flex day and review the draft College Progress Report.

**Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.**

**Overall Plan.** The SLO/Instruction Accreditation Response Team Group has created plans based on the elements of the Proficiency Level of ACCJC’s “Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes.” The team reviewed these rubric elements, determining for each: (a) the College’s current status, (b) goals for the College, and (c) means of achieving those goals. The plans that follow in this section are organized by the elements of that rubric. There is some redundancy in this report, as some of the actions being taken cover different elements of the rubric (e.g., the integration of SLO’s into Program Review speaks to both decision-making and resource allocation).

**Rubric Element #1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.**

**Action #1.1. SLO’s Clearly Defined for All Courses.** We identified a need to develop a policy about the maximum age of a course outline for currently offered courses, and a timeline by which that policy can be put in place, so that we can ensure that SLO’s are clearly defined for all courses. We expect this policy and timeline to be published in Fall 2012.

**Action #1.2. SLO’s Defined for Programs.** By the end of Fall 2012, the College will identify SLO’s for all programs, including certificates, majors, and those disciplines that do not have a certificate or major. As the learning outcomes are developed and approved by the Curriculum Committee, they will be posted to the online catalog, and will be published in the printed 2013/14 College Catalog.

**Action #1.3. Documenting Course SLO Efforts.** We have established a new process by which faculty and departments submit information about course SLO assessment efforts. This information is submitted in two phases: a planning phase, which was due August 31, and an execution phase, where departments submit information as their plans are executed throughout
the semester. Results of both planning and execution phases are published online. School Deans
will monitor the planning and execution phases, and have standardized reports to submit to the
VCAA.

In addition to the standardized reporting, departments are publishing additional information via
departmental SLO web pages.

**Action #1.4. Documenting Program SLO Efforts.** We have established a mechanism where
departments can centrally submit information about program SLO work, and the results will be
published online. We plan to use the lessons learned from documenting course SLO efforts in
Fall 2012 to inform a more structured approach to the effort to document Program SLO efforts in
Spring 2013.

As with course SLO efforts, in addition to the standardized reporting, departments are publishing
additional information via departmental SLO web pages.

**Action #1.5. General Education SLO assessment.** By October 1, departments will submit
information to show alignment of course SLO’s to General Education SLO’s. Data gathered
about course SLO efforts will be compared against this alignment data to develop plans for
assessment to begin in Spring 2013. The mid-October meeting of the Bipartite Committee on
Graduation Requirements will focus on the review of this data and the development of
assessment plans.

**Rubric Element #2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.**

**Action #2.1. Fostering Dialogue through Online Resources.** Publishing information about the
assessment of learning outcomes online fosters widespread institutional dialogue. The College
has created a centralized web presence for SLO efforts, and information will continue to be
published there. Several sections of this report refer to the information being published online.

**Action #2.2. Discussion Embedded in Meetings; Special Meetings.** The College had already
been embedding discussion of the assessment of learning outcomes into several venues,
including Department Chairperson Council meetings and College Council meetings. This work
continues in activities held on the independent flex day on August 13 and on the SLO Flex Day
on September 12. We have also established a drop-in SLO Q&A lab where faculty and
department chairs can get questions answered about the assessment of learning outcomes and the
centralized reporting processes.

**Action #2.3. Completion of Comprehensive SLO Reports.** At the end of Fall 2012, the Office
of Instruction will complete a comprehensive report on that semester’s assessment efforts across
the College. Reports will be disseminated and shared with the college community. These reports
will be completed every semester afterwards.

**Action #2.4. Integration of SLO’s into Program Review.** Questions about SLO’s have been
part of Program Review for a number of years. In the Fall 2012 Program Review departments
will report on overall steps that they are taking as a result of the assessment of learning
outcomes. The information submitted in Program Review is the basis for the College’s annual
allocation process.
Rubric Element #3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.

Action #3.1. Integration of SLO’s into Program Review. As noted above, questions about SLO’s have been part of Program Review for a number of years. The Fall 2012 Program Review process includes a rubric, provided to all parties, and used by Deans and Vice Chancellors to prioritize requested resources and potential cuts. This rubric gives equal weight to a number of factors, one of which is how a change in resources contributes to and is supported by data on student learning outcomes.

Action #3.2. Development and Assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes. In Fall 2012, the College will develop and begin assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes. This will include examination of achievement data (e.g., transfer rate, job placement rate, certificate achievement numbers) and an integration of other assessments of learning. This assessment will be integrated into the College’s planning processes.

Rubric Element #4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.

Action #4.1. Identification of External Assessment Needs. As part of the alignment of courses to program SLO’s, we are also gathering information about external assessment needs (e.g., job placement rates, transfer rates). At the end of Fall 2012, this data will be aggregated to provide direction to the College about needed resources.

Action #4.2. Integration of SLO’s into Program Review. As noted above, the assessment of SLO’s is integrated into the College’s Program Review, Planning, and Budgeting processes.

Action #4.3. Online Resources and Training. Fostering institutional dialogue requires online resources, including centralized reporting and mechanisms by which individual departments can published more detailed information regarding their assessment of learning outcomes. As noted above, we have established a drop-in SLO Q&A lab where faculty and department chairs can get questions answered about the assessment of learning outcomes and the centralized reporting processes. The College will assess the current centralized reporting system at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and implement improvements in time for Spring 2013. The Office of Instruction’s Fall 2012 Program Review document will include requests for additional resources.

Rubric Element #5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.

Action #5.1. Completion of Comprehensive Assessment Report. At the end of the Fall 2012 semester, the Office of Instruction will complete a comprehensive assessment report on course and program SLO efforts based on the data submitted by departments. The College plans to continue these comprehensive reports every semester thereafter, collaborating with Student Services where applicable.
Action #5.2. Completion of ACCJC College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation. By March 15, the College is required to submit to ACCJC a report showing how we are at the Proficiency Level of ACCJC’S “Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes.” A draft version of this report will be completed in October 2012, using input from a variety of sources and data from planned course and program SLO activities in Fall 2012. A final version will be completed in February 2013.

Rubric Element #6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.

Action #6.1. Documenting Alignment of Course and Program SLO’s. In Fall 2012, departments are completing mapping documents showing the alignment of courses to Program SLO’s. This work will be complete by the end of the Fall 2012 semester.

Action #6.2 Documenting Alignment of Course SLO’s to General Education SLO’s. We have established a process by which departments will submit information to show alignment of course SLO’s to General Education SLO’s. Reports are due by October 1. It is anticipated that this process will generate discussion about the General Education SLO’s themselves, and the data submitted will be used to assess their applicability to courses. In addition, data gathered about course SLO efforts will be compared against this alignment data to inform future assessment plans. We expect to initiate some of this college-wide discussion at the mid-October meeting of the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.

Action #6.3. Updated Requirements for Curriculum Committee. We have created a new standard for Curriculum Committee submission where departments submitting new or revised certificate or degree programs now need to submit mapping documents showing the alignment of courses to program learning outcomes.

Rubric Element #7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.

Action #7.1. Publishing Program SLO’s. Program SLO’s are published in the printed and online College Catalogs. As noted above, in Fall 2012 the College is completing the process of defining program SLO’s for all programs, and will update the online catalog as they are approved by the Curriculum Committee.

Action #7.2. Piloting Means for Students to Demonstrate Awareness. Much of the work that has taken place on student awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs has focused on ensuring that students have access to these goals – inclusion in course syllabi, publishing in the Catalog. It is more difficult to determine means by which students can demonstrate awareness of these goals.
Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

**Action #1.1. SLO’s Clearly Defined for All Courses.** A draft policy and timeline has been developed and submitted to VCAA for approval and distribution. See attached memo.

**Action #1.2. SLO’s Defined for Programs.** By August 31, all departments were required to plan when they would submit program SLO’s to the Curriculum Committee for review and approval. These plans can be viewed online:


Evidence of execution of the plans will be on the Curriculum Committee web site, where meeting agendas and minutes are posted:

http://www.ccsf.edu/cc

Once defined and approved, program SLO’s will be listed in the online catalog:

http://www.ccsf.edu/catalog

**Action #1.3. Documenting Course SLO Efforts.** The planning phase is complete, and we are now in the execution phase. Plans and results are available online:


School dean reports are submitted to VCAA Low. She has this documentation in a binder.

Those departments publishing additional information about course SLO assessment are linked from the College’s SLO web site:


**Action #1.4. Documenting Program SLO Efforts.** As noted in the plan, in Fall 2012 we are focused on ensuring that program SLO’s are defined for all programs, and we will be establishing a more structured approach to documenting Program SLO efforts in Spring 2013. Results of any program SLO assessment occurring in Fall 2012 are published online:


Those departments publishing additional information about course SLO assessment are linked from the College’s SLO web site:


**Action #1.5. General Education SLO assessment.** Submission of alignment data is ongoing. Evidence of alignment data is available online:

Action #2.1. Fostering Dialogue through Online Resources. Information is being published online, and the efforts are ongoing. This item doesn’t really have a completion date per se; it’s the new normal.

The centralized SLO web site is here:
http://www.ccsf.edu/slo

Action #2.2. Discussion Embedded in Meetings; Special Meetings. This work will be ongoing. Copies of slides for the August 13 meeting are attached. We’ve also attached the SLO Faculty Handbook distributed on September 12th. Information about the help that’s available is shown on the right-hand column of:

Action #2.3. Completion of Comprehensive SLO Reports. As noted in the action plan, this report will be completed at the end of the Fall 2012 semester.

Action #2.4. Integration of SLO’s into Program Review. The questions about SLO’s are in the current Program Review Template, and that’s good evidence of this integration. Evidence of the integration will truly come through when we are able to show some resource allocation later in the school year.

Action #3.1. Integration of SLO’s into Program Review. See above. COPY OF RUBRIC?

Action #3.2. Development and Assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes. The Academic Senate has looked at several different models for Institutional Learning Outcomes, and the College has discussed various frameworks for looking at achievement data (e.g., VFA, ARCC reports). We expect to complete the development of ILO’s by October 2012, and complete an initial assessment in early Spring 2013.

Action #4.1. Identification of External Assessment Needs. This work will be completed by the end of Fall 2012. The templates used to map courses to program SLO’s shows evidence that we’re gathering this data:
http://instruction.ccsf.edu/ProgramSLO/

As they are submitted, the actual mapping documents are housed in the Office of Instruction.

Action #4.2. Integration of SLO’s into Program Review. See above.

Action #4.3. Online Resources and Training. The centralized reporting forms contain questions that will be used to assess the system and make improvements, so the data is currently being gathered. Information about the help that’s available is shown on the right-hand column of:

Action #5.1. Completion of Comprehensive Assessment Report. As noted in the action plan, this report will be completed at the end of the Fall 2012 semester.
Action #5.2. Completion of ACCJC College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation. This Progress Report you are reading is the framework for an initial report that will be completed in October 2012. A final report will be completed by February 2013.

Action #6.1. Documenting Alignment of Course and Program SLO’s. By August 31, all departments were required to plan when they would submit documents showing the alignment of courses to program SLO’s to the Curriculum Committee for review and approval. These plans can be viewed online:


Evidence of execution of the plans will be on the Curriculum Committee web site, where meeting agendas and minutes are posted:

http://www.ccsf.edu/cc

The alignment documents themselves will be in the Office of Instruction.

Action #6.2 Documenting Alignment of Course SLO’s to General Education SLO’s. Submission of this data is ongoing. Information submitted to date is available online:


Action #6.3. Updated Requirements for Curriculum Committee. Updated requirements are in the Curriculum Handbook, available online:

http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Curriculum_Committee/handbook.html

Action #7.1. Publishing Program SLO’s. Once defined and approved, program SLO’s will be listed in the online catalog:

http://www.ccsf.edu/catalog

Action #7.2. Piloting Means for Students to Demonstrate Awareness. Our group is still discussing this topic, and plans to have recommendations for implementation in Spring 2013.

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.

The SLO/Instruction Accreditation Response Team Group has identified several resource needs:

- While we have established an online centralized reporting system, the College will likely want to invest in something more robust, or devote existing resources to improving the current system.

- We continue to need professional development on a variety of topics, from SLO implementation to working with online resources. A college-wide SLO coordinator would greatly assist in maintaining momentum.
Attachments:

1. Memo regarding timeline for course outline updates
2. August 13 slides
3. SLO Handbook for September 12
MEMORANDUM

TO: Joanne Low, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

FROM: Tom Boegel, Dean of Curriculum, Instruction, Faculty Evaluation, and Tenure Review

RE: Proposed Policy and Timeline for Updating Course Outlines

DATE: September 7, 2012

As you know, current Curriculum Committee standards require that all course outlines list the Major Learning Outcomes (i.e., student learning outcomes) for courses. This policy was set in 2004. A significant number of the College’s course outlines have not been updated since 2004, and while what they have listed as “Course Objectives” may very well be learning outcomes, it is difficult to prove that we have learning outcomes established for all courses.

The SLO/Instruction Accreditation Response Team Group has endorsed the following timeline so that a policy can be established whereby all course outlines for currently offered courses are no older than six years old. This timeline is based on the distribution of ages of current course outlines, and the relative workload to the Curriculum Committee in reviewing and approving course revisions. The SLO/Instruction Accreditation Response Team Group encourages you to adopt this policy and timeline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester(s)</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee focused on program SLO’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013/Fall 2013</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee focused on pre-2000 outlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>All courses must have outlines with dates 2000 or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014/Fall 2014</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee focused on outlines 2000-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>All courses must have outlines with dates 2008 or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee focused on outlines with 2008/2009 dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>All courses must have outlines with dates from 2009/10 academic year or later</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at my office (239-3360) or via email at tboegel@ccsf.edu.

Thank you.
Afternoon Session

Overview

- Enrollment management follow-up
- Planning and Program Review highlights
- Discussion of SLO elements common to instruction and student services
- Details of instructional SLO requirements

Enrollment Management
Planning and Program Review

Assessment, Planning and Budgeting Timeline
- Annual Performance Indicators and College-wide Assessments
- Board's Annual Priorities and Planning Assumptions
- Unit-level Program Reviews
- Decisions re: Resource Allocations
- Annual Plan and Tentative Budget

SLO's
Today’s Goals

- All: Discussion of Proficiency Rubric
- Instructional Departments: Clear picture of what must be done this semester

Proficiency Rubric

Proficiency Rubric: Seven Elements

1. Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, and degrees.
2. Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.
Proficiency Rubric: Seven Elements

3. There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.

4. Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.

5. Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned

6. Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis

7. Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled

Discuss

- For those elements of the rubric:
- What would that look like at CCSF?
- What barriers stand in our way?
- How can we overcome those barriers?
Break

Instructional Departments

Focus on Two Elements of Proficiency

- Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, and degrees
- Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes
Three Key Components

1. Conducting Assessments
2. Developing and Mapping Program SLO's
3. Mapping General Education SLO's

Structure

- Centralized, standardized reporting
- August 31: Submit plans
- Rest of semester: Follow-up reports
- www.ccsf.edu/slo

1. Course Assessments
Course Assessments

- Work with the Learning Outcomes you already have
- Use the results of assessment to aid in revising course outlines
- August 31: Submit plan for every course being offered
- Rest of semester: Progress updates

Plan Components

- For every course offered in Fall 2012, what are you doing?
- Implementing changes based on previous assessments
- Conducting assessments
- Focused on other courses

2. Program SLO's
YES

Yes, you have a Program!

- Certificate
- Major
- Discipline that does not have certificate/major

Examples

- Dental Assisting
- Two programs: certificate and major
- Music
- One program: discipline
- Behavioral Science
- Three programs: Anthro, Psych AA-T, Intro to Human Services Certificate
Mapping

- Course SLO's need to be aligned with Program SLO's
- Mapping is a process by which this alignment can be verified and documented

Develop and Map Program SLO's

- Need to get from 35% to 100% in Fall 2012
- Submissions through Curriculum Committee
- August 31: tell us when you will submit to Curriculum Committee

3. General Education SLO's
General Education

- Mapping of course SLO’s to GE SLO’s by October 1
- Every course applicable to a GE area
- Discussion at October Bipartite

Discuss

- What challenges do you foresee in getting this work done this semester?
- How will you overcome those challenges?
- What resources would help?

Help!

- Online forms: we will have some open sessions to assist in completing online forms
- Planning for possible extra flex on September 12
Other Considerations

- Focus of Curriculum Committee in Fall 2012 is going to be on processing Program SLO's (200+ programs in 6 meetings)
- Will also prioritize courses created for Title 5 repeatability changes

Three Key Components

- Conducting Assessments
- Developing and Mapping Program SLO's
- Mapping General Education SLO's
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Introduction

The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Mandate
The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the accreditation agency for California Community Colleges, requires student learning outcomes assessment as part of the accrediting process.

WASC 2002, Standard H: Section A 1 c., specifically requires community colleges to:

1. Identify student learning outcomes for courses, program, degrees, and certificates;
2. Assess progress toward achievement of the identified student learning outcomes;
3. Use assessment results to make improvements.

Definition of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
Student Learning Outcomes: Measurable cognitive, psychomotor, or affective skills or knowledge acquired which embody the overarching goals of a course, program or student service unit.

Both courses and programs have SLOs. Some course SLOs should be aligned with the program SLOs for the program that the course belongs to. Some course SLOs will be aligned with a degree or certificate program, some with an institutional-level program (like General Education), while still others may belong to both a degree or certificate and also an institutional-level program. Note: some course-level SLOs will be required for transfer agreements and articulation. It is not necessary for every course SLO to fit every course use.

Benefits to Students, Faculty, Departments, Programs, and the College of Implementing This Assessment Process
All people involved in higher education care about the results of the instruction they provide to students. The WASC standard formalizes this concern into a concrete process. It asks faculty, department chairs, and administrators to document the ways in which they are assessing the results of student learning and then use that knowledge to improve the instructional process.

Timeline for 2012/13 Academic Year
The goal of 2012/13 is to document evidence that CCSF is at the Proficient stage of SLO implementation (see Appendix A). During Fall 2012, the college has prioritized the following:

1. Assessing course level SLOs for all current courses
   The SLO rubric (Appendix A) requires assessments to be in place for course SLOs. While some departments may have course outlines with outcomes that need revision, the focus needs to be in ensuring that assessment activities are taking place in most of the courses being offered, and that plans exist for future assessment activities in the rest.
2. Establishing program level SLOs and mapping all relevant courses to those outcomes

The Proficiency rubric requires SLOs to be in place for all programs, and that there is alignment between course and program SLOs. While the focus for programs for Fall 2012 is on the development of program-level SLOs and mapping courses to those outcomes, if departments are engaged in assessment of program-level learning outcomes, they should report that as well. This information will be gathered using an online form.

3. Mapping of all SLOs from required General Education (GE) courses to GE SLOs

In addition to assessing the fit of our General Education outcomes to our courses, we will also use this mapping data to review reported course assessments that are relevant to General Education outcomes. This process will assist us in designing a model for the regular assessment of General Education outcomes.

Responsibility for the Process

Using the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning is a joint responsibility of faculty, administrators, and staff. All have a role to play.

At the course, program, and student service level, departments are responsible for identifying student learning outcomes, assessing the results, and making decisions about what actions to take once the results have been analyzed. Departments should decide if the best way to assess outcomes is through shared assessment tools or coordination of different assessment tools. Individual faculty members have a professional responsibility to contribute to the overall SLO efforts of the department.

Departments are aided in this process through two channels: the course outline approval process in Curriculum Committee and Program Review. When a proposal for a new course or program or for modification of an existing course or program comes before the Curriculum Committee, members will assist faculty in reviewing the SLOs and the proposed assessment tools. During Program Review, departments will summarize the results of SLO assessments and show how improvements are being made in teaching and learning throughout the department as a result of these assessments.

All departments and their faculty are responsible for maintaining documentation of the data they have collected showing the results of the outcomes, and the changes called for by their analysis of the data.

Administrators are responsible for supporting faculty and departments in their assessment efforts and ensuring compliance with accreditation expectations. This responsibility includes ensuring opportunities exist for faculty and departments to receive training in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes; creating structures where the results of assessment can be reported; and for fostering institutional dialogue.
Developing Student Learning Outcomes

“Student learning outcomes” do not represent a completely new direction in teaching and learning but rather a continuation of a trend that began with “learning objectives.”

That change was from a primary focus on the subject matter or body of knowledge to a concentration on the skills or application derived from the teaching of the subject matter. Verbs emphasizing what students would be able to do or know after the learning process was complete replaced the rather vague verbs “comprehend” and “learn.” Learning objectives had to be measurable tasks or skills. The purpose was to redirect the energies of the teaching and learning process towards its effects on the students. This makes education more responsive to the needs of students and to the sectors of society that depend upon the successful results of higher education.

This emphasis on results, which is sometimes reflected in the term “accountability,” has not been replaced by a new fad. Instead, the trend has continued in the same direction. Student learning outcomes are like learning objectives in their focus on the measurable results of student learning. They differ in scope, however. The main difference between student learning outcomes and learning objectives is that learning objectives are discrete, individual tasks or skills that must be accomplished before the larger, broader goals of the course can be achieved. The overarching goals of the course, however, are the student learning outcomes.

The other change between learning objectives and student learning outcomes is that the new accreditation standards now require colleges to collect data on the success of students meeting those overarching goals. Colleges are then charged with analyzing the data and making changes that will result in more effective student learning.

*SLOs are the measurable skills or accomplishments, which embody the overarching goals of a course. They represent the most important learning that takes place in a course. It may be helpful to think of them this way: when your students leave your course at the end of the semester, you want them to be in firm possession of certain abilities or knowledge, and you want them to retain those abilities or that knowledge. Those are the student learning outcomes.*

While many courses in the past have had upwards of 15 or more learning objectives (some science courses have over a hundred), student learning outcomes organize these skills into broader outcomes.

Because student learning outcomes need to be assessed in a more organized, concrete way than the old learning objectives, and because student learning outcomes are broader than learning objectives, it makes sense for a course to have a limited number of student learning outcomes. Ideally, most courses should have between five and seven SLOs. Currently, the number of SLOs
listed on the majority of course outlines is much greater. Through continued assessment, faculty will begin to identify which SLOs are actually learning objectives and can be combined with others to create broader overarching SLOs for the course.
Assessing Student Learning Outcomes

Setting goals for courses, programs, and student services is not a new idea to faculty; it is an integral part working in academic institutions. Faculty providing student service have a history of assessing their services, and soliciting feedback from students to make improvements. Assessing student learning also is not a new concept; most instructors know that they have to give grades, and to do that they have to assess students. Even those instructors who teach ungraded noncredit classes assess student learning. In the day-to-day flurry of teaching, however, it is possible for the connection between an instructor’s goals and the assessment of student learning to lose some clarity. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment mandate refocuses all of us on the strong links between statements of goals (SLOs) and their assessment. Here is a concise definition of assessment that explains those connections:

Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. It involves making our expectations explicit and public; setting appropriate criteria and high standards for learning quality; systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well performance matches those expectations and standards; and using the resulting information to document, explain, and improve performance. When it is embedded effectively within larger institutional systems, assessment can help us focus our collective attention, examine our assumptions, and create a shared academic culture dedicated to assuring and improving the quality of higher education (Thomas A. Angelo, AAHE Bulletin, November 1995, p. 7).

The WASC accreditation standard that has launched this project does not micromanage the assessment process. Instead, it leaves to faculty the decisions that will determine how useful the assessment process will be in improving teaching and learning. In other words, faculty members decide how they will assess the SLOs.

Any tool that measures the degree to which students have met a learning outcome qualifies as assessment. Such tools include skills performances or demonstrations, portfolios, productions (essay, oral presentation, visual artifact, speech), surveys, quizzes, and tests. Most outcomes can be measured in a variety of ways. See Appendix B for descriptions of various types of assessment tools and their uses.

It is also important, though, to differentiate between SLO assessment and grading. While the skills needed to attain the student learning outcome(s) for a course can and should inform the grade a student receives in a course, there are often more factors involved in a student’s grade than skill achievement. Often, missing or inconsistent work over the course of a term can significantly impact a student’s grade, even if he or she has reached the SLO for a course.
A student’s final grade in a course should not be the SLO assessment measure. Instead, an assignment in the course that effectively measures the achievement of the SLO should be the assessment tool. Rather than using a student’s grade on that assignment as the measure of success, criteria should be developed (either through a rubric or through setting a raw score as the threshold) for successfully meeting the SLO.

In order to help organize the assessment process, it is helpful to have a written plan (called an assessment plan) for how and when each SLO will be assessed. When developing an assessment plan, it is best to involve as many relevant faculty as possible, including full-time and part-time faculty. For assessment plan forms and sample assessment plans, please see Appendix C.
Developing Assessment Plans for Courses

Here are some steps that will help departments develop an assessment plan for a course:

1. **Review the SLOs as written on the official Course Outline of Record:**

   - How many are there? Are the SLOs overarching (“big picture” learning for the course) or are they smaller objectives (things learned in just one chapter, for instance)? A large number may indicate that they are being phrased as objectives rather than outcomes. Think about how your assessment plan can inform a future revision of the course outline.

   **Example of learning objective:** Recognize how human-built infrastructure impacts the coastal environment.
   **Example of SLO:** Articulate how human activities impact the environment.

   **Example of learning objective:** Able to format a MS Word document according to MLA guidelines including all document specifications (margins, headers, footers, use of styles, tab stops).
   **Example of SLO:** Demonstrate proficiency in the use of word processing, spreadsheet, database, and presentation applications.

2. **Decide on an appropriate assessment tool. Consider:**

   - What is the SLO asking the students to do?
     - Identify a fact?
     - Perform a skill?
     - Analyze a complex phenomenon?
     - Solve a problem?
     - Explain a concept?
     - Create a learning product?
     - Prepare a performance?
     - Apply skills or knowledge to real-world situations?
     - Evaluate options and select appropriate resources or tools
What types of assignments or activities will allow students to demonstrate the SLO (see Appendix B for more information about choosing an assessment tool)?

What tool will you select?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective exams</th>
<th>Out-of-class formal essays</th>
<th>Portfolios</th>
<th>Oral Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay exams</td>
<td>Skill demonstrations</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Performances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What criteria will be used to measure success or failure to meet the SLO?
  - Rubric (see Appendix D for tips on how to develop a rubric)?
  - Raw score?

- What are the expected results? (How many students are expected to successfully meet the SLO?)

3. Collaborate to determine how and when assessments will be conducted:

- How often will the course be assessed?
  - Will it be on a three-year cycle? A four-year cycle? Other?
  - Are there similar courses that could be grouped together?
  - Which semester will you begin assessing this course?
  - If changes are made to the course, when will it be reassessed to see the effects?

- Will you assess all students and sections or will you use sampling?
  - If you are sampling, how many students/sections will be involved?
  - How will you decide which students/sections to involve?

- What do you need to do to prepare?
  - Do you need to set up meetings for faculty teaching the course?
  - Do you need to create a departmental test or rubric?
  - How will you distribute materials?
  - Do you need any additional resources or training?
4. Think about how and when you will share the assessment results and use the results in decision-making about the course and/or program (“closing the loop”):

- **What needs to be done to gather and present the data?**
  - Do you need data from external sources?
  - What format will you use to share the data? PowerPoint? Handouts? Other?

- **When will be a meaningful time for involved faculty to reflect on the results?**
  - Department meetings? Retreats?
  - Organized meetings between faculty who teach in the same program
  - Online discussion forums and/or departmental email list
  - Posting of shared best practices on departmental SLO web pages
Developing Assessment Plans for Department-Level Programs

In addition to assessing the SLOs for courses, departments are also responsible for assessing the programs within that department.

In order to develop an assessment plan for instructional programs within your department, follow these steps (non-instructional programs – see Appendix E):

**Step 1: Create an inventory of your department’s programs.**

Title 5 defines a program as “an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education.”

All departments at City College of San Francisco have at least one program. Each certificate or major in a department constitutes a program. Departments may also have disciplines that do not have certificates or majors; those should be considered programs as well. Some departments may wish to expand a particular discipline into several programs (e.g., remedial, degree-applicable, and transfer-level Mathematics). Be sure to consider the following:

- Are there certain pathways that students take to achieve a particular goal? Certificate and degree programs are one type of “student pathway”, but you may have others – remedial to degree-applicable coursework; basic skills to academic and CTE programs, etc.
- Programs are often organized by academic disciplines and departments, but not always
- Many departments may have multiple programs – the number will vary by the number of degrees and certificates and also by student pathways through the department’s offerings
- Your department may have courses that are part of another department’s program

**Step 2: Consider the purpose/goals of each program.**

When trying to write a program SLO, it is often helpful to create a mission statement for the program.

- Program mission statements may or may not be different from the mission statement for your department. A department with a single program may have the same mission statement for department and program, while a department with multiple programs will likely have a broader department mission statement and more specific program mission
A mission statement will often begin with the program in question, then make a statement about what that program does or provides, and to whom or for whom it is provided.

You also might ask yourself questions:

- What will a student who completes this program be able to do?
- What concepts or skills run throughout all (or many) of your program’s courses?
- What skills or knowledge will students who complete the program have?
- What will students gain from completing this program?

Step 3: Decide how many SLOs your program needs.

Some programs may only need one or two SLOs

- Some programs consist of courses that all develop a single skill through various topics (for example, literary analysis is a single skill developed through practice with multiple literary traditions and genres)
- Some programs have a capstone course that ties together elements from all of the other courses – in this case, the capstone course SLO(s) can also be the program SLO(s) (for example, a paralegal studies capstone course that integrates concepts from previous courses and provides students the opportunity to practice them in a workplace setting)

Other programs may need several SLOs

- Some programs’ courses may develop two or more “strands” of knowledge or skills within the program (for example, a psychology program may include courses that fall into biological and social psychology or a modern language program may have goals in both linguistic and cultural competence)
- Some programs may have a split focus between content knowledge or theory and the application of that knowledge (for example, a science program that has lecture and lab components or a CTE program that focuses on both content area and workplace (or “soft”) skills)
- Some programs have external standards that course and program SLOs must align with regardless of the number (i.e. Culinary Arts is accredited by the American Culinary Federation).
Step 4: Draft your program SLOs.

Writing program SLOs is very similar to writing course-level SLOs. Keep the SLOs focused on the students (what will the student be able to do?) as opposed to the teacher (what will be taught?)

- Use critical thinking verbs appropriate to the level of the program (*Bloom’s Taxonomy* – see Appendix F)

- Avoid verbs that are not readily observable or assessable (such as “understand” or “know” or “feel”)

Step 5: Double check your SLO with assessment in mind.

Make sure that the program SLO is something that is readily observable and assessable – in other words, build in assessment from the beginning. Don’t create a program SLO that you can’t envision a way to observe or evaluate or that requires data that you won’t be able to access.

*For answers to Frequently Asked Questions about program SLO assessment, please see Appendix G.*
Scheduling Assessments

In order to organize the assessment process, it is important for each department to create a schedule of assessment to ensure that all courses and programs are assessed on a regular basis. While SLO assessment for courses and programs should be regular, it is not necessary to assess every course and program each semester.

First, consider how many courses and programs your department has. The number of courses and programs will likely affect how often each course or program is assessed. Aim to assess each course at least once every 2-4 years (maximum time 6 years).

Departments may consider grouping like courses together to assess in the same semester using a similar assessment tool. Or, if there aren’t clusters of like courses, departments may just split the courses evenly, assessing a similar number of courses each semester.

Once each course and program has been assessed at least once, a regular cycle of assessments for courses and programs should be developed.

Each department should create a written assessment schedule so that the timelines are clear. For assessment schedule forms and sample assessment schedules, please see Appendix H. Please remember that in Fall 2012, all courses being offered must have some kind of declared assessment plan.
Collecting/Analyzing Data and Fostering Dialogue

Once an assessment is complete, the next step is to collect and analyze the data. Since the goal of assessment is improvement at the course and program level, not evaluation of individual faculty members, it is recommended that assessment data be reported to the department at the course level (as opposed to the section level). If there is only one section of a course taught each semester, a department may want to collect several semesters’ worth of data before combining it at the course level for reflection and action planning.

Assessment data should lead to dialogue and affect decision-making for each department. After assessment data is available, departments should discuss improvements to the course and/or program suggested by the assessment data.

Just as departments should involve as many faculty as possible in planning the assessment (full-time and part-time), departments should plan time to discuss and analyze the results that will allow for maximum participation.

- Consider using department meeting or retreat time
- Use FLEX hours when possible
- Consider online collaboration options
- Communicate through email (or hard copies of handouts in mailboxes) with those not able to attend
- Use departmental SLO webpages for planning and sharing information

As your department considers the assessment data, you might ask yourself questions such as these:

- If the number of students meeting the SLO is not consistent with the expected results listed in the assessment plan, why do you think that might be?
  - Was the expected results number set at an appropriate level?
  - Would a different assessment tool be a better measure of student learning?
  - Should follow-up assessments try to target specific, smaller skills needed to achieve the SLO to help determine where students are having difficulty?
  - What could be changed about the course or program to improve student learning?
  - Should pacing or emphasis within a course or program be adjusted?
  - Should there be changes to student resources or services?
  - Are there additional resources that would help to improve student learning?
If the number meets or exceeds the expected result, what factors do you think contributed to student success in meeting the SLO?

- How might these factors be brought to positively impact other courses and programs?
- Are there relative weaknesses among specific, smaller skills needed to achieve the SLO? If so, how could learning be improved in those areas?
- Does the department want to consider a different assessment tool the next time the course is assessed to get a different kind of data about student learning?
- Should the expected result be set higher the next time the course is assessed?

Regardless of the results, how will these results inform other decisions for the department?

- How do the results of this assessment fit into the larger picture of the program or department?
- Is there a need for professional development on specific topics?
- Should budgeting priorities change?
- Should staffing or other resources be adjusted?
- Do the results inspire other ideas for improvements?

It is important to allow enough time for brainstorming and discussion – dialogue and inquiry are the most important parts of the SLO process, so this stage should not be rushed.

Keep in mind that accreditation standards do not suggest that if the assessment process reveals that some outcomes are not being met by a number of students, the institution or instructor will be punished. Rather, it requires that the information gained through the assessment process be used to improve teaching and learning.

This is how the loop is closed: faculty return to the student learning outcomes and reassess them and the teaching and learning process, making appropriate adjustments based on the specific knowledge of how well students are meeting the outcomes.
Documenting Progress

Departments should document both the assessment results and the analysis. Just as there are a variety of ways to assess student learning outcomes, there are many forms of documentation. If departments hold meetings to discuss the analysis of the data, minutes from those meetings can be used. Surveys from individual instructors can ask for suggestions for changes in curriculum and teaching practices. Department retreats can be focused on specific courses or programs.

The College has established mechanisms by which faculty and departments will report basic information on the assessment of learning outcomes. These reporting requirements are essential to ensuring that progress is being made and comprehensive reports can be developed.

Additionally, departmental SLO web pages are department-managed locations for providing additional information about the Department's SLO assessment process beyond the required reports.

Benefits of a departmental SLO web page include:

1. Facilitates department and intra-department dialogue
2. Facilitates tracking of progress and planning for the future
3. Provides virtual space to store assessment data and progress thus easing process of college reporting
4. Showcases department highlights

Individual course managers and faculty should maintain records of SLO activities including assessment data, dialogue, and planned changes to improve teaching and learning. These records will be essential in completing College reporting requirements and Program Review.

In Program Review, departments will be required to provide documentation of highlights of new directions spawned from assessment of SLOs within the department.

Moving Forward

As noted previously, setting goals for courses, programs, and student services is not a new idea to faculty; it is an integral part of academic institutions. Outcomes assessment is infused throughout our Accreditation Standards. These standards do not prescribe any particular outcome, assessment method, or mechanism by which this process should be done – it is up to us to define as a College.

The formalization of the assessment of learning outcomes required by these standards gives faculty an opportunity to ensure an appropriate focus on teaching and learning, promotes dialogue at the course, program, and college level, and forms a basis for future decision-making.
SLO Terminology Glossary · A Resource for Local Senates

Glossary – by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

The following glossary was developed from existing research and feedback from faculty and researchers from the California community colleges in response to Resolution S08 2.02 that asked the Academic Senate for California Community College to address the confusion in the field by researching and developing a glossary of common terms for student learning outcomes and assessment. The glossary does not dictate terminology nor does it seek to be comprehensive. Due to the increased collaboration between researchers and faculty, dialog about these terms increases our ability to serve our students and increase student success.

Affective Outcomes. Affective outcomes relate to the development of values, attitudes and behaviors.

Alignment. Alignment is the process of analyzing how explicit criteria line up or build upon one another within a particular learning pathway. When dealing with outcomes and assessment, it is important to determine that course outcomes align or match up with program outcomes; that institutional outcomes align with the college mission and vision. In student services, alignment of services includes things like aligning financial aid deadlines and instructional calendars.

Artifact. An assessment artifact is a student-produced product or performance used as evidence for assessment. An artifact in student services might be a realistic and achievable student educational plan (SEP).

Assessment Cycle. The assessment cycle refers to the process called closing the loop and is figuratively represented below.

![Closing the Assessment Loop Diagram]

- Develop, modify, or review a curriculum, course, program, or service
- Develop or modify Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
- Design and measure Student Learning as a result of Curriculum, Course or Program
- Collect, discuss and analyze data
- Determine refinements based on outcome data
Assessment of Learning. Learning assessment refers to a process where methods are used to generate and collect data for evaluation of courses and programs to improve educational quality and student learning. This term refers to any method used to gather evidence and evaluate quality and may include both quantitative and qualitative data in instruction or student services.

Assessment for Accountability. The primary drivers of assessment for accountability are external, such as legislators or the public, and usually entail indirect or secondary data. Application of accountability data for educational improvement requires careful analysis of the alignment of the data and the ramifications of the actions.

Assessment for Placement. Assessment for placement is the process of gathering information about individual students, such as a standardized test or process to determine a student’s skill level, in order to place the student in a course sequence, such as math, English, ESL, or reading to facilitate student success. This process involves the validation of the content of the standardized test by the appropriate faculty content experts and analysis of the cut scores to determine the effectiveness of the placement and the development of multiple measures. Title 5 §55502 defines assessment for placement and the requirements for this kind of assessment.

Authentic Assessment. Traditional assessment sometimes relies on indirect or proxy items such as multiple choice questions focusing on content or facts. In contrast, authentic assessment simulates a real world experience by evaluating the student’s ability to apply critical thinking and knowledge or to perform tasks that may approximate those found in the work place or other venues outside of the classroom setting.

Bloom’s Taxonomy. Bloom’s Taxonomy is an example of one of several classification methodologies used to describe increasing complexity or intellectual sophistication:

Knowledge: Recalling or remembering information without necessarily understanding it. Includes behaviors such as describing, listing, identifying, and labeling.

Comprehension: Understanding learned material and includes behaviors such as explaining, discussing, and interpreting.

Application: The ability to put ideas and concepts to work in solving problems. It includes behaviors such as demonstrating, showing, and making use of information.

Analysis: Breaking down information into its component parts to see interrelationships and ideas. Related behaviors include differentiating, comparing, and categorizing.

Synthesis: The ability to put parts together to form something original. It involves using creativity to compose or design something new.
**Evaluation**: Judging the value of evidence based on definite criteria. Behaviors related to evaluation include: concluding, criticizing, prioritizing, and recommending.iii (Bloom, 1956)

**Classroom assessment techniques.** Classroom assessment techniques (CATs) are “simple tools for collecting data on student learning in order to improve it” (Angelo & Cross, 1993, p. 26).iv CATs are short, flexible, classroom techniques that provide rapid, informative feedback to improve classroom dynamics by monitoring learning, from the student’s perspective, throughout the semester. Data from CATs are evaluated and used to facilitate continuous modifications and improvement in the classroom.

**Classroom-based assessment.** Classroom-based assessment is the formative and summative evaluation of student learning within a classroom, in contrast to institutional assessment that looks across courses and classrooms at student populations.

**Closing the Loop.** Closing the loop refers to the use of assessment results to improve student learning through collegial dialog informed by the results of student service or instructional learning outcome assessment. It is part of the continuous cycle of collecting assessment results, evaluating them, using the evaluations to identify actions that will improve student learning, implementing those actions, and then cycling back to collecting assessment results, etc.

**Competencies.** See Student Learning Outcomes.

**Continuous Improvement.** Continuous improvement reflects an on-going, cyclical process to identify evidence and implement incremental changes to improve student learning.

**Core Competencies.** Core competencies are the integration of knowledge, skills, and attitudes in complex ways that require multiple elements of learning which are acquired during a student’s course of study at an institution. Statements regarding core competencies speak to the intended results of student learning experiences across courses, programs, and degrees. Core competencies describe critical, measurable life abilities and provide unifying, overarching purpose for a broad spectrum of individual learning experiences. Descriptions of core competencies should include dialog about instructional and student service competencies. See also Institutional Learning Outcomes.

**Course Assessment.** This assessment evaluates the curriculum as designed, taught, and learned. It involves the collection of data aimed at measuring successful learning in the individual course and improving instruction with the ultimate goal towards improving learning and pedagogical practice.

**Criterion-based assessments.** Criterion-based assessment evaluates or scores student learning or performance based on explicit criteria developed by student services or instruction which measures proficiency at a specific point in time.
Culture of evidence. The phrase “culture of evidence” refers to an institutional culture that supports and integrates research, data analysis, evaluation, and planned change as a result of assessment to inform decision-making (Pacheco, 1999). A culture of evidence is characterized by the generation, analysis and valuing of quantitative and qualitative data in decision making.

Direct data. Direct data provide evidence of student knowledge, skills, or attitudes for the specific domain in question and actually measuring student learning, not perceptions of learning or secondary evidence of learning, such as a degree or certificate. For instance, a math test directly measures a student’s proficiency in math. In contrast, an employer’s report about student abilities in math or a report on the number of math degrees awarded would be indirect data.

Embedded assessment. Embedded assessment occurs within the regular class or curricular activity. Class assignments linked to student learning outcomes through primary trait analysis serve as grading and assessment instruments (i.e., common test questions, CATs, projects or writing assignments). Specific questions can be embedded on exams in classes across courses, departments, programs, or the institution. Embedded assessment can provide formative information for pedagogical improvement and student learning needs.

Evidence. Evidence is artifacts or objects produced that demonstrate and support conclusions, including data, portfolios showing growth, as opposed to intuition, belief, or anecdotes. “Good evidence, then, is obviously related to the questions the college has investigated and it can be replicated, making it reliable. Good evidence is representative of what is, not just an isolated case, and it is information upon which an institution can take action to improve. It is, in short, relevant, verifiable, representative, and actionable.”

Evidence of program and institutional performance. Program or institutional evidence includes quantitative or qualitative, direct or indirect data that provide information concerning the extent to which an institution meets the goals it has established and publicized to its stakeholders.

Formative assessment. Formative assessment is a diagnostic tool implemented during the instructional process that generates useful feedback for student development and improvement. The purpose is to provide an opportunity to perform and receive guidance (such as in class assignments, quizzes, discussion, lab activities, etc.) that will improve or shape a final performance. This stands in contrast to summative assessment where the final result is a verdict and the participant may never receive feedback for improvement such as on a standardized test or licensing exam or a final exam.

General Education Student Learning Outcomes. GE SLOs are the knowledge, skills, and abilities a student is expected to be able to demonstrate following a program of courses designed to provide the student with a common core of knowledge consistent with a liberally educated or literate citizen. Some colleges refer to these as core competencies, while others consider general education a program.
Grades. Grades are the faculty evaluation of a student’s performance in a class as a whole. Grades represent an overall assessment of student class work, which sometimes involves factors unrelated to specific outcomes or student knowledge, values or abilities. For this reason equating grades to SLO assessment must be done carefully. Successful course completion is indicated by a C or better in California Community College data, such as that reported in the Accountability Report for Community Colleges (ARCC).

Homegrown or Local assessment. This type of assessment is developed and validated by a local college for a specific purpose, course, or function and is usually criterion-referenced to promote validity. This is in contrast to standardized state or nationally developed assessment. In student services homegrown student satisfaction surveys can be used to gain local evidence, in contrast to commercially developed surveys which provide national comparability.

Indirect data. Indirect data are sometimes called secondary data because they indirectly measure student performance. For instance, certificate or degree completion data provide indirect evidence of student learning but do not directly indicate what a student actually learned.

Information competency. Information competency reflects the ability to access, analyze, and determine the validity of information on a given topic, including the use of information technologies to access information.

Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO). Institutional Learning Outcomes are the knowledge, skills, and abilities a student is expected to leave an institution with as a result of a student’s total experience. Because GE Outcomes represent a common core of outcomes for the majority of students transferring or receiving degrees, some but not all, institutions equate these with ILO’s. ILOs may differ from GE SLOs in that institutional outcomes may include outcomes relating to institutional effectiveness (degrees, transfers, productivity) in addition to learning outcomes. Descriptions of ILOs should include dialog about instructional and student service outcomes.

Likert scale. The Likert scale assigns a numerical value to responses in order to quantify subjective data. The responses are usually along a continuum such as responses of strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree and are assigned values such as 1 to 4.

Metacognition. Metacognition is the act of thinking about one’s own thinking and regulating one’s own learning. It involves critical analysis of how decisions are made and vital material is consciously learned and acted upon.

Norm-referenced assessment. In norm-referenced assessment, an individual’s performance is compared to another individual. Individuals are commonly ranked to determine a median or average. This technique addresses overall mastery to an expected level of competency, but provides little detail about specific skills.

Objectives. Objectives are small steps that lead toward a goal, for instance the discrete course content that faculty cover within a discipline. Objectives are usually more numerous and create a
framework for the overarching student learning outcomes which address synthesizing, evaluating and analyzing many of the objectives.

**Pedagogy.** Pedagogy is the art and science of how something is taught and how students learn it. Pedagogy includes how the teaching occurs, the approach to teaching and learning, how content is delivered, and what the students learn as a result of the process. In some cases pedagogy is applied to children and andragogy to adults; but pedagogy is commonly used in reference to any aspect of teaching and learning in any classroom.

**Primary Trait Analysis (PTA).** Primary trait analysis is the process of identifying major characteristics that are expected in student work. After the primary traits are identified, specific criteria with performance standards are defined for each trait. This process is often used in the development of rubrics. PTA is a way to evaluate and provide reliable feedback on important components of student work thereby providing more information than a single, holistic grade.

**Program.** In Title 5 §55000(g), a “Program” is defined as a cohesive set of courses that result in a certificate or degree. However, in Program Review, colleges often define programs to include specific disciplines. A program may refer to student service programs and administrative units, as well.

**Qualitative data.** Qualitative data are descriptive information, such as narratives or portfolios. These data are often collected using open-ended questions, feedback surveys, or summary reports, and may be difficult to compare, reproduce, and generalize. Qualitative data provide depth and can be time and labor intensive. Nonetheless, qualitative data often pinpoint areas for interventions and potential solutions which are not evident in quantitative data.

**Quantitative data.** Quantitative data are numerical or statistical values. These data use actual numbers (scores, rates, etc) to express quantities of a variable. Qualitative data, such as opinions, can be displayed as numerical data by using Likert scaled responses which assign a numerical value to each response (e.g., 4 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree). These data are easy to store and manage providing a breadth of information. Quantitative data can be generalized and reproduced, but must be carefully constructed to be valid.

**Reliability.** Reliability refers to the reproducibility of results over time or a measure of the consistency when an assessment tool is used multiple times. In other words, if the same person took the test five times, the scores should be similar. This refers not only to reproducible results from the same participant, but also to repeated scoring by the same or multiple evaluators. While the student learning outcomes process should be reliable, it does not suggest statistical reliability analysis for every item and aspect of classroom and program assessment, but rather indicates that assessments should be a consistent tool for testing the student’s knowledge, skills or ability.

**Rigor.** California community college faculty use the term rigor relating to courses in the context of Title 5 §55002, such as referring to course standards of grading policies, units, intensity, prerequisites level, etc. Researchers often refer to rigor as statistical rigor or compliance with good statistical practices.
**Rubric.** A rubric is a set of criteria used to determine scoring for an assignment, performance, or product. Rubrics may be holistic, not based upon strict numerical values which provide general guidance. Other rubrics are analytical, assigning specific scoring point values for each criterion often as a matrix of primary traits on one axis and rating scales of performance on the other axis. A rubric can improve the consistency and accuracy of assessments conducted across multiple settings.

**Sampling.** Sampling is a research method that selects representative units such as groups of students from a specific population of students being studied, so that by examining the sample, the results can be generalized to the population from which they were selected when everyone in the population has an equal chance of being selected (i.e. random). Sampling is especially important when dealing with student service data.

**Standardized assessment.** Standardized assessments are those created, tested, validated, and usually sold by an educational testing company (e.g., GRE’s, SAT, ACT, ACCUPLACER) for broad public usage and data comparison, usually scored normatively. There are numerous standardized assessment instruments available for student service programs which provide national comparisons.

**Student Learning Outcomes (SLO).** Student learning outcomes (SLOs) are the specific observable or measurable results that are expected subsequent to a learning experience. These outcomes may involve knowledge (cognitive), skills (behavioral), or attitudes (affective) that provide evidence that learning has occurred as a result of a specified course, program activity, or process. An SLO refers to an overarching outcome for a course, program, degree or certificate, or student services area (such as the library). SLOs describe a student’s ability to synthesize many discreet skills using higher level thinking skills and to produce something that asks them to apply what they’ve learned. SLOs usually encompass a gathering together of smaller discrete objectives (see definition on previous page) through analysis, evaluation and synthesis into more sophisticated skills and abilities.

**Summative assessment.** A summative assessment is a final determination of knowledge, skills, and abilities. This could be exemplified by exit or licensing exams, senior recitals, capstone projects or any final evaluation which is not created to provide feedback for improvement, but is used for final judgments.

**Validity.** An indication that an assessment method accurately measures what it is designed to measure with limited effect from extraneous data or variables. To some extent this must also relate to the integrity of inferences made from the data.

**Content Validity.** Validity indicates that the assessment is consistent with the outcome and measures the content we have set out to measure. For instance, you go to take your driver’s license exam, the test does not have questions about how to make sushi.

**Variable.** A variable is a discrete factor that affects an outcome.

---

i Section 55502 of Title 5 contains the following definitions related to assessment:
(b) “assessment” means the process of gathering information about individual students to facilitate student success. Assessment may include, but is not limited to, information regarding the student’s study skills, English language proficiency, computational skills, aptitudes, goals, learning skills, career aspirations, academic performance, and need for special services. Assessment involves the collection of such information at any time, before or after enrollment, except that the process of assigning a grade by an instructor shall not be considered part of the assessment process. Once a grade has been assigned and recorded in a student’s transcript it can be used in the assessment process.

(c) “assessment instruments, methods or procedures” means one or more assessment instruments, assessment methods, or assessment procedures, or any combination thereof. These include, but are not limited to, interviews, standardized tests, holistic scoring processes, attitude surveys, vocational or career aptitude and interest inventories, high school or college transcripts, specialized certificates or licenses, educational histories and other measures of performance. The term “assessment instruments, methods or procedures” also includes assessment procedures such as the identification of test scores which measure particular skill levels, the administrative process by which students are referred for assessment, the manner in which assessment sessions are conducted, the manner in which assessment results are made available, and the length of time required before such results are available.

Furthermore, Section 55202 states that the use of assessment as a prerequisite for placement into a course requires the use of multiple measures:

(c) The determination of whether a student meets a prerequisite shall be based on successful completion of an appropriate course or on an assessment using multiple measures. Any assessment instrument used shall be selected and used in accordance with the provisions of Subchapter 6 (commending with §55500) of Chapter 6 of this Division.


### Appendix A: ACCJC SLO Rubric

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools & Colleges

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Implementation</th>
<th>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Awareness**            | • There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.  
                          |   • There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student (learning outcomes).  
                          |   • There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.  
                          |   • Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.  
                          |   • The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses (or programs or degrees; where to begin). |
| **Development**          | • College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.  
                          |   • College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.  
                          |   • Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.  
                          |   • Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.  
                          |   • Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.  
                          |   • Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development. |
| **Proficiency**          | • Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.  
                          |   • There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.  
                          |   • Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.  
                          |   • Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.  
                          |   • Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.  
                          |   • Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.  
                          |   • Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled. |
| **Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement** | • Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.  
                          |   • Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.  
                          |   • Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.  
                          |   • Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.  
                          |   • Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.  
                          |   • Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews. |
### Appendix B: Choosing an Assessment Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Often Helpful When Assessing . . . .</th>
<th>You Will Need . . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills Demonstration</strong></td>
<td>• Learning that results in a tangible product&lt;br&gt;• Learning that results in the ability to correctly perform a process or procedure</td>
<td>• A project or demonstration that has been discussed by discipline faculty and will allow students to demonstrate the skill or process in the SLO&lt;br&gt;• A faculty-developed rubric to evaluate the success of the skills demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Essays (out-of-class or essay exams)</strong></td>
<td>• Identification of content-area knowledge&lt;br&gt;• Application of content-area knowledge&lt;br&gt;• Ability to explain concepts&lt;br&gt;• Ability to evaluate and select&lt;br&gt;• Analysis of complex phenomena&lt;br&gt;• Writing skills</td>
<td>• A writing prompt that has been discussed by discipline faculty and addresses the learning in the SLO&lt;br&gt;• A faculty-developed rubric to evaluate the learning or skill level demonstrated by the essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performances</strong></td>
<td>• Application of content-area knowledge&lt;br&gt;• Performing arts skills</td>
<td>• A performance opportunity that has been discussed by the discipline faculty and addresses the learning in the SLO&lt;br&gt;• A faculty-developed rubric to evaluate the learning or skill level demonstrated by the performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolios</strong></td>
<td>• Creation of a body of work&lt;br&gt;• Visual or media arts skills&lt;br&gt;• Writing skills</td>
<td>• A collection of student work that has been discussed by discipline faculty and addresses the learning in the SLO&lt;br&gt;• A faculty-developed rubric to evaluate the learning or skill level demonstrated in the portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentations</strong></td>
<td>• Identification of content-area knowledge&lt;br&gt;• Application of content-area knowledge&lt;br&gt;• Ability to explain concepts&lt;br&gt;• Ability to evaluate and select&lt;br&gt;• Analysis of complex phenomena&lt;br&gt;• Oral communication skills</td>
<td>• A presentation prompt that has been discussed by discipline faculty and addresses the learning in the SLO&lt;br&gt;• A faculty-developed rubric to evaluate the learning or skill level demonstrated by the presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective Tests</strong></td>
<td>• Identification of content-area knowledge&lt;br&gt;• Application of content-area knowledge&lt;br&gt;• Ability to evaluate and select&lt;br&gt;• Mathematical skills</td>
<td>• A test that has been discussed by discipline faculty and addresses the learning in the SLO&lt;br&gt;• An answer key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveys</strong></td>
<td>• Student satisfaction&lt;br&gt;• Student self-assessment of SLO mastery</td>
<td>• A faculty-developed list of questions that asks students to reflect on their satisfaction and/or learning&lt;br&gt;• A process for survey administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Assessment Plan Form / Sample Assessment Plan

#### Department:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>SLOs</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Criteria for Success</th>
<th>Next Assessment Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Department: ENGL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>SLOs</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Criteria for Success</th>
<th>Next Assessment Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 92</td>
<td>Students will be able to compose thoughtful, well-organized, grammatically correct short essays, using properly documented outside sources and personal observations and experiences to develop a unified thesis.</td>
<td>Portfolio scored with rubric</td>
<td>80% or more of students will meet Pass standard on the rubric</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Developing a Rubric

Developing a rubric can be very helpful when assessing SLOs. Rubrics allow faculty and students to more easily assess complex SLOs by:

- Clarifying the key elements of the SLO
- Documenting the standards that will be used to determine success
- Allowing for clear communication across multiple sections regarding the SLO and its assessment

To develop a rubric:

1. Work with others teaching the course – this can take place during in-person meetings, through online collaboration, or a combination of both
2. Break down the SLO and look for key features. These will become the Primary Traits and will go down the side of the rubric
3. Decide if you want a “yes/no” measure or one that includes levels. These will become the Levels of Mastery and will go across the top of the rubric
4. Describe the observable behaviors that lead to the levels in #2 for each of the Primary Traits. These go in the spaces between the Primary Traits and the Levels of Mastery.

Example:

English 92 SLO: *Students will be able to compose thoughtful, well-organized, grammatically correct short essays, using properly documented outside sources and personal observations and experiences to develop a unified thesis.*

- Primary Traits = Thesis (thoughtfulness, unity), Organization (well-organized), Evidence (outside sources, personal observations and experiences), Essay Length (short essays), Grammar (grammatically correct), MLA Style (properly documented)
- Levels of Mastery = Pass or No Credit
- See rubric on following page

Developing a good rubric will take some time and conversation, but it will also make SLO assessment much easier once it is developed.

Resources for developing rubrics:

- http://rubistar.4teachers.org/index.php
- http://edtech.kennesaw.edu/intech/rubrics.htm#why
## English IA Portfolio Student Learning Outcome Assessment Rubric

**Student Learning Outcomes:** Students will be able to compose thoughtful, well-organized, grammatically correct short essays, using documented outside sources and personal observations and experiences to develop a unified thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass Standard</th>
<th>No Credit Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio demonstrates clear thesis statements which assert a unified focus. There may be some awkward or mechanical sentence structure.</td>
<td>• Portfolio fails to demonstrate a consistent understanding and inclusion of thesis statements. Thesis statements are often statements of facts, not arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio demonstrates consistent use of transitions and sense of logical essay structures.</td>
<td>• Portfolio fails to demonstrate logically organized well-structured arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main points are found in topic sentences and are related to thesis.</td>
<td>• Topic sentences and main points do not relate to the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio contains sufficient source materials used as evidence in support of points. Sources are applicable, detailed and explained.</td>
<td>• Portfolio consistently fails to use outside sources to support main points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio contains writings that follow rules of Standard Written English. There may be some errors, but these are not distracting.</td>
<td>• Portfolio consistently fails to use detailed, applicable evidence to support main points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Essay Length</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio meets prescriptive page lengths.</td>
<td>• Portfolio fails to meets prescriptive page lengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Written English/Grammar/Syntax</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio demonstrates consistent correct modes of expression. There are some vague or awkward phrases, but these do not inhibit meaning or readability.</td>
<td>• Portfolio is extremely difficult to read and understand. Word choice is inappropriate or incorrect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio contains writings that follow rules of Standard Written English. There may be some errors, but these are not distracting.</td>
<td>• Portfolio contains numerous and distracting grammar and sentence boundary errors. Meaning is inhibited by errors in grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of MLA Citation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio demonstrates consistent MLA style. Sources are parenthetically cited and essays possess Work Cited pages. Minor errors in punctuation might exist.</td>
<td>• Portfolio fails to demonstrate any understanding of MLA style and format. No parenthetical or Works Cited pages present OR completely random/creative citation used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Portfolio Assessment (circle one)**  
- Pass  
- No Credit
Appendix E: Non-Instructional Program Assessment

Developing Student Learning Outcomes for Non-Instructional Programs

The overarching goals of a non-instructional program, beyond service to the student, are the student learning outcomes. An emphasis, therefore, is on results which are sometimes reflected in the term “accountability.”

The other change between learning objectives and student learning outcomes is that the new accreditation standards now require colleges to collect data on the success of students meeting those overarching goals. Colleges are then charged with analyzing the data and making changes that will result in more effective student learning.

Student learning outcomes are the measurable skills or accomplishments which embody the overarching goals of a non-instructional program or instructional course. They represent the most important learning that takes place through interaction with a program or participation in a course. It may be helpful to think of them this way: when students complete their interaction with your program, you want them to be in firm possession of certain abilities or knowledge, and you want them to retain those abilities or that knowledge. Those are the student learning outcomes.

Because there are numerous ways in which a student may interact and gain knowledge from a non-instructional program, managers directing those programs may choose to have more than one student learning outcome for which they assess student learning.

Getting started – preliminary discussion

In order to begin formulating your programs student learning outcomes, ask yourself the following questions:

- Who is the typical student or client to utilize your services?
- What are the attributes, skills, and values that are supported and nurtured by the student’s experience when in contact with your services?
- What does this student know as a result of using your services?
- What can this student do as a result of using your services?
- What does this student care about as a result of using your services?
- What are the services provided by your unit that contribute to the development of the ideal student?

To create the SLOs

1. Develop criteria (3 domains – see the tables below)
2. Brainstorm
3. Prioritize
4. Select

Writing SLOs

- Focus on what the student will be able to know, do, and feel (3 domains)
- Use verbs appropriate to learning based on Bloom’s Taxonomy.

Checklist for writing Student Learning Outcomes

- Consistency: Is it consistent and supportive of the Mission Statement?
- Reasonableness: Is it appropriate for the ability of the students?
- Measurability: Can it be observed and tested?
- Appropriateness: Is it important to the non-instruction service unit?
- Currency: Is it a current service?
- Clarity: Is it clear, precise, and simple?

**Double check your SLO with assessment in mind.**

Make sure that the program SLO is something that is readily observable and measurable – in other words, build in assessment from the beginning. Don’t create a program SLO that you can’t envision a way to observe or evaluate or that requires data that you won’t be able to access.

**Learning outcomes related to the three domains in Bloom’s Taxonomy**

According to Bloom’s Taxonomy, students experience several levels of learning from the acquisition of facts to the ability to think critically and solve problems.

**Student learning takes place in three domains**

1. Cognitive domain – recall or recognition of specific facts, procedural patterns, and concepts that serve in the development of defining knowledge classification
2. Psychomotor domain – performance defining physical skills
3. Affective domain – defining behaviors that correspond to values, appreciation, and attitudes.

### The Cognitive Domain (related to knowledge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Synthesis</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student remembers or recognizes information or specifics as communicated with little personal assimilation</td>
<td>Student grasps the meaning behind the information and interprets, translates, or comprehends the information</td>
<td>Student uses information to relate and apply it or to a new situation with minimal instructor input</td>
<td>Student discriminates, organizes, and scrutinizes assumptions in an attempt to identify evidence for a conclusion</td>
<td>Student creatively applies knowledge and analysis to integrate concepts or construct an overall theory</td>
<td>Student judges or evaluates information based upon standards and criteria, values, and opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite</td>
<td>Convert</td>
<td>Apply</td>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>Assemble</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Define</td>
<td>Chart</td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td>Create</td>
<td>Appraise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Conclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumerate</td>
<td>Discuss</td>
<td>Demonstrate</td>
<td>Correlate</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Determine</td>
<td>Diagram</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Decide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitate</td>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Dramatize</td>
<td>Dissect</td>
<td>Formulate</td>
<td>Defend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>Generalize</td>
<td>Establish</td>
<td>Differentiate</td>
<td>Generate</td>
<td>Diagnose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Make</td>
<td>Distinguish</td>
<td>Hypothesize</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Illustrate</td>
<td>Manipulate</td>
<td>Infer</td>
<td>Initiate</td>
<td>Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>Locate</td>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Invent</td>
<td>Justify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduce</td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Limit</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Restate</td>
<td>Solve</td>
<td>Outline</td>
<td>Reframe</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>Summarize</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>Synthesize</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Psychomotor Domain (related to skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observe</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Recognize Standards</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Apply</th>
<th>Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student translates sensory input into physical tasks or activities</td>
<td>Student is able to replicate a fundamental skill or task</td>
<td>Student recognizes standards or criteria important to perform a skill or task correctly</td>
<td>Student uses standards to evaluate own performance and make corrections</td>
<td>Student applies skill to real life situation</td>
<td>Student is able to instruct or train others to perform this skill in other situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hear</th>
<th>Identify</th>
<th>Observe</th>
<th>See</th>
<th>Smell</th>
<th>Taste</th>
<th>Touch</th>
<th>Watch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attempt</td>
<td>Copy</td>
<td>Follow</td>
<td>Imitate</td>
<td>Mimic</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Reenact</td>
<td>Repeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt</td>
<td>Adjust</td>
<td>Alter</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Customize</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
<td>Illustrate</td>
<td>Instruct</td>
<td>Teach</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Affective Domain (related to attitudes, behaviors, and values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Valuing</th>
<th>Organizing</th>
<th>Characterizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student becomes aware of an attitude, behavior, or value</td>
<td>Student exhibits a reaction or change as a result of exposure to an attitude, behavior, or value</td>
<td>Student recognizes value and display this through involvement or commitment</td>
<td>Student determines a new value or behavior as important or a priority</td>
<td>Student integrates consistent behavior as a naturalized value in spite of discomfort or cost. The value is recognized as a part of the person’s character</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Accept | Attend | Describe | Explain | Locate | Observe | Realize | Receive | Recognize | Behave | Comply | Cooperate | Discuss | Examine | Follow | Model | Present | Respond | Show | Studies | Accept | Adapt | Adapt | Adjust | Alter | Change | Customize | Develop | Improve | Manipulate | Modify | Practice | Revise | Authenticate | Characterize | Defend | Display | Embody | Habitate | Internalize | Produce | Represent | Validate | Verify |
|--------|--------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|--------|--------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
**Write a Student Learning Outcome for the Department/Unit (Template)**

*Department, non-instructional service unit: ________________________________*

*Mission statement for the department, non-instructional service unit:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(knowledge or concepts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychomotor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(skills or performance abilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Attitudes or values)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing Student Learning Outcomes for Non-Instructional Programs

Setting goals for their departments or programs is not a new idea to managers and supervisors; it is an integral part of planning and directing the work flow of a program or department. Assessing student’s knowledge about services received or processes learned, on the other hand, may be a new concept.

The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment mandate focuses all of us on the strong links between statements of goals (SLOs) and their assessment. Here is a concise definition of assessment that explains those connections:

Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. It involves making our expectations explicit and public; setting appropriate criteria and high standards for learning quality; systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well performance matches those expectations and standards; and using the resulting information to document, explain, and improve performance. When it is embedded effectively within larger institutional systems, assessment can help us focus our collective attention, examine our assumptions, and create a shared academic culture dedicated to assuring and improving the quality of higher education (Thomas A. Angelo, AAHE Bulletin, November 1995, p. 7).

The WASC accreditation standard for student learning outcomes does not micromanage the assessment process. Instead, it leaves to managers and supervisors the decisions that will determine how useful the assessment process will be in improving teaching and learning. In other words, managers and supervisors decide how they will assess the student learning outcomes.

Any tool that measures the degree to which students have met a learning outcome qualifies as assessment. Such tools include surveys and pre and post-tests. Most outcomes can be measured in a variety of ways.

Some of the principles of assessment to keep in mind when developing an assessment plan include:

- Assessment is an integral part of teaching and learning.
- Assessment is based on measurable criteria.
- Assessment is accomplished with a variety of methods.
- Assessment involves processes as well as outcomes.
- Assessment improves teaching and learning.
- Assessment informs planning and decision-making.

Some questions to ask:

- What assessment instruments and methods may be used in the department or service unit?
- Will they provide useful information?
- What purpose will the assessments serve?
- How will the assessment results used?
- Will the data collected from the assessment inform the unit’s decision-making?

Criteria for selection of assessment methods and implementation:

- The learning outcomes selected for assessment are important.
- The assessment methods measure student achievement.
The assessment methods are varied.
The criteria for determining success is established
The time frame for assessing student learning is doable.
The time and person responsible for the administration of the assessment is clear
The time and person(s) responsible to collect and analyze the data is clear.

Here are some steps that will help you develop an assessment plan:

First, check your SLOs:

- How many are there? If there are more than three, they likely aren’t true SLOs – they may be objectives that were just moved into the SLO area. You should revise them into SLOs before creating an assessment plan.
- Are the SLOs overarching (“big picture” learning for the department or program) or are they smaller objectives (things leaned in just one interaction with the department, for instance)? If they are not overarching, you should revise the SLOs before creating an assessment plan.
- Is the student learning described in the SLO observable and measurable? If not, you should revise the SLOs to make them observable and measureable before creating an assessment plan.

Next, decide on an appropriate assessment tool. Consider:

- What is the SLO asking the students to do?
  - Identify a fact?
  - Perform a skill?
  - Analyze a complex phenomenon?
  - Solve a problem?
  - Explain a concept?
  - Apply skills or knowledge to real-world situations?
  - Evaluate options and select appropriate resources or tools

- What types of activities will allow students to demonstrate the SLO?
  - Pre and post-tests
  - Skill Demonstrations?
  - Surveys

- What criteria will you use to measure success or failure to meet the SLO?
  - Rubrics
  - Raw Score
Then, decide how and when you will do the assessment:

- **How often will you assess?**
  - Will it be on a semester cycle? An annual cycle? Other?
  - Are there similar services that could be grouped together?
  - Which semester will you begin assessing this service?
  - If you make changes, when will you reassess to see the effects?

- **Will you assess all students or will you use sampling?**
  - If you are sampling, how many students will be involved?
  - How will you decide which students to involve?

- **What do you need to do to prepare?**
  - Do you need to set up meetings with staff?
  - Do you need to create a test, survey, or rubric?
  - How will you distribute materials?
  - Do you need any additional resources or training?

Finally, think about how and when you will share the assessment results and use the results in decision-making about the service and/or program (“closing the loop”):

- **What needs to be done to gather and present the data?**
  - Do you need data from Institutional Research?
  - What format will you use to share the data? PowerPoint? Handouts? Other?

- **When will be a meaningful time for your department to reflect on the results?**
  - Department retreats?
  - Department meetings?
  - Discussions via departmental email lists
  - What other departments could be involved in a robust dialogue about the results and what they mean?

- **What changes might be made to the service or program based on the results?**
  - Changes to the assessment tool or method?
  - Changes to the service, program or department?
  - Changes to the service delivery methods?
• Changes to student resources or services?

➢ How will these results inform other decisions for the department or program?

• How do the results of this assessment fit into the larger picture of the program or department?
• Is there a need for professional development on specific topics?
• Should budgeting priorities change?
• Should staffing or other resources be adjusted?
• Other

**Types of Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>numeric scores</td>
<td>narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Types of Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Use of tools/technology Tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role-play Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Student portfolio Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Essay Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral presentation Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of student satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of student services accessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre and post surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td>Informal evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Placement test Pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing a Student Learning Outcome (Template)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe the tool or strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When will you assess and how often?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources needed (staff, equipment, materials)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the criteria for success?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Bloom’s Taxonomy/Critical Thinking Verbs

Helpful Hints for Writing Student Learning Outcomes

Course Outlines form requests that the student learning outcomes state in specific behavioral terms the minimum skills students should be able to demonstrate at the conclusion of the course. The purpose of the following is to assist instructors when writing instructional outcomes for new courses.

- The format typically begins with the phrase "Upon completion of this course the student will be able to:" with a list of those expectations following.
- The challenge herein lies in distilling the hundreds of specific learning outcomes down to a reasonable number.
- The key is grouping individual items into sets that share commonalities. For example, a sociology course might have many detailed items for students to learn in the area of cross-cultural comparison, but the collective statement in the outcomes might be "Compare and contrast traditions and behaviors in a variety of cultures."
- Degree applicable credit courses are required to demonstrate critical thinking. The incorporation of critical thinking must be evident throughout the course outline but particularly in the outcomes, Methods of Instruction, and Methods of Evaluation.
- The manner in which the Learning Outcomes section reflects critical thinking is in the higher cognitive expectations expressed in this section. Basically, critical thinking involves active higher cognitive processes that analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate information. This contrasts the more passive activities such as recognizing, describing, or understanding information.
- Note that not ALL outcomes need to reflect critical thinking. However, it should be clear that higher thinking skills are an essential component of the course. The course outline must demonstrate that students are taught how to acquire these skills and must master them to pass the class.

Critical Thinking

Note: UC/CSU schools require a majority of the outcomes demonstrate critical thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Synthesis</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>distinguish</td>
<td>compose</td>
<td>judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyze</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>appraise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differentiate</td>
<td>propose</td>
<td>evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appraise</td>
<td>design</td>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calculate</td>
<td>formulate</td>
<td>compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiment</td>
<td>arrange</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>test</td>
<td>collect</td>
<td>revise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare/contrast</td>
<td>assemble</td>
<td>score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examine</td>
<td>construct</td>
<td>select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criticize</td>
<td>create</td>
<td>choose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagram</td>
<td>set up</td>
<td>assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspect</td>
<td>organize</td>
<td>estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debate</td>
<td>develop</td>
<td>measure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbs Requiring Cognitive Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>translate</td>
<td>interpret</td>
<td>define</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restate</td>
<td>apply</td>
<td>repeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describe</td>
<td>employ</td>
<td>record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize</td>
<td>demonstrate</td>
<td>list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explain</td>
<td>dramatize</td>
<td>recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify</td>
<td>practice</td>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locate</td>
<td>illustrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td>operate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review</td>
<td>schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sketch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many existing course outlines have outcomes that do not reflect the "active verbs" conveying critical thinking. It is usually the case that the course itself is taught in a way that incorporates critical thinking, but the course outline itself does not reflect those outcomes and methodologies. Bringing the outcomes into line is primarily a matter of reflection on the part of the faculty who teach the course upon those outcomes that require analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Some "before and after" examples are shown below.

**BEFORE:** Know the significant art achievements of Renaissance through Modern Europe.

**AFTER:** Compare and contrast the art works in the same historical period with art works from other historical periods to ascertain their stylistic aesthetic and historical relationships.

**BEFORE:** Have learned skills in performing and in working with others to create a theatrical event for children.

**AFTER:** Analyze a text in preparation for rehearsals, including the choice of style, language, and pace. Critique their own performances and rehearsals using a collectively decided upon matrix. Share these critiques with members of the ensemble in appropriate, culturally sensitive ways.
Appendix G: Program Assessment FAQs:

Q: My department doesn’t have any degrees or certificates – does that mean it is not a program?

All departments should have a program. If you do not have any degrees or certificates, you will be required to create a “discipline” program, which will naturally be more encompassing than a major or certificate and should cover a broader spectrum of what you teach.

There may also be clusters of courses in your department that are not degrees or certificates but that do form student pathways. You should consider these as programs and create program SLOs for them.

Q: My department has 12 different degrees and certificates. Do I really need a program SLO for each one? Why?

Yes. Accreditation standards require that program level SLOs be developed, assessed, and used in decision-making for each degree and certificate.

Q: My department only does one program review – how can there be multiple programs within my department?

Departments are administrative units that can house multiple disciplines and programs. Especially if your department has multiple disciplines or specializations, you will likely have several distinct programs within your department.

You complete one program review because we organize our program review system by department at this college, but you should still consider each program separately.

Q: I’ve just written my program SLOs – where do they get recorded? Does anyone need to approve them?

By the end of Fall 2012, every program’s SLOs and course maps must be submitted and approved by the Curriculum Committee. Programs that already have program-level SLOs defined will need to submit a document showing mapping of courses to program-level SLOs. Those that do not have program-level SLOs defined, or that wish to redefine their existing program-level SLOs will need to submit their SLOs and a document showing mapping of courses to program-level SLOs.

Program-level student learning outcomes will appear in the College Catalog and should be available on department webpages.
APPENDIX G: PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FAQ

Q: What if my department has a course that is not part of a degree or certificate for my department?

Likely, that course fits into a program somewhere on campus. If it is not part of a program in your department, it may be part of another department’s program, or it might be part of a General Arts and Sciences degree or part of the GE program. As the college moves forward with its assessment of these larger, interdisciplinary program SLOs, you will be contacted to participate as needed.

Q: What about courses in my department that are part of another department’s program?

As the other department works on its program SLOs, you will likely be contacted for information about your course-level assessments. You may also be asked to collaborate on writing the program SLO for that program.

Q: Can I use the same SLO for my department’s degree and certificate?

It depends. If the only difference between the degree and the certificate is the completion of GE requirements, then it would be appropriate to use the same program SLO for both programs. However, if there is additional or more specialized learning that takes place in either the degree or certificate, you will need to adjust the program SLOs to match the learning that takes place in each degree and certificate.

Q: Can I use the SLO from one of my courses as my program SLO?

Possibly. If you have a capstone course that integrates the learning from the other courses in the program, the SLO from the capstone course could be used as the program SLO as well. Alternatively, if you have overlapping SLOs for the courses in your degree or certificate, you can base your program SLO on a more general statement of the overlap in the course SLOs.

Q: Once I’ve written program SLOs, how do I get started assessing them?

You should have a general plan for how you would go about assessing your program SLO as you are writing it. In general, it depends on how many program SLOs you have and how your program is organized.

- If you have several “strands” in your program, you will want to map your course SLO assessments to your program SLOs
- If you have a “capstone” course, you can use the same assessment for your program that you do for that course
• If you have overlapping course SLOs, you can combine the assessment data from your courses to assess your program
• You may also choose to use an indirect method (such as a survey) to measure students’ perceptions of their own learning in the program and/or gain information about your students after they leave your program
• You could choose to do an additional assessment for the program SLO that integrates skills and content learned throughout the program (this may be challenging if you have a large number of students and are not easily able to track students close to completion)
• You might consider additional information such as licensing exams and/or job placement if you are able to access that data

Q: Can I include program SLOs that are measured outside the classroom (such as passing a licensure exam or job placement)?

Only if you have a way of accessing that information. For example, if you are considering a program SLO related to job placement, consider whether you have the ability to track your graduates’ employment after they leave the college. If you can, then this would be an acceptable measure. If you cannot (or if it is very difficult), you would be better off using a measure that can be observed within the classroom.
Appendix H: Assessment Schedule Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Asses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use this action plan to review required SLO activities for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 and to record strategies and resources for accomplishing these activities. This action form is intended to help focus individual efforts in regards to SLO assessment at CCSF.

By Fall 2012, all California Community Colleges are expected to show proficiency in SLO Assessment, judged as:

- Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.
- There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.
- Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.
- Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.
- Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.
- Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.
- Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.

NAME: ____________________________________  DEPARTMENT: ________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✓</th>
<th>For Courses</th>
<th>Strategies &amp; Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All syllabi contain a complete list of SLOs for the course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each course employs methods employed that “demonstrates student awareness of course SLOs” (quizzes, projects, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO assessment is happening in all courses (ideally through authentic multiple methods that truly reflect student learning – collecting qualitative and quantitative data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO assessment data is reviewed for all courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course improvements are scheduled based on SLO assessment data (improvements in SLOs, assessment methods, or course components and their execution).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✓</th>
<th>For Services</th>
<th>Strategies &amp; Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO assessment is happening for all services (ideally through authentic multiple methods that truly reflect student learning – collecting qualitative and quantitative data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO assessment data is reviewed for all services (ideally with multiple department members providing insight).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service improvements are scheduled based on SLO assessment data (improvements in SLOs, assessment methods, or service components and their execution).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### For Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO assessment is happening for all programs</strong> (ideally through authentic multiple methods that truly reflect student learning – collecting qualitative and quantitative data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO assessment data is reviewed</strong> for all programs (ideally with multiple department members providing insight).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Program improvements are scheduled</strong> based on SLO assessment data (improvements in SLOs, assessment methods, or program components and their execution).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual and group SLO Assessment progress and data are recorded and are available for sharing to promote dialog.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assessment plans and progress reports are updated through online forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program mappings are submitted to Curriculum Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education mappings are submitted through online forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue/discussion among members of a department about:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Appropriateness &amp; refinement of SLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appropriateness and refinement of assessment methods (including “Are students getting enough information to know how to demonstrate the learning you’re assessing?”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis of assessment data and areas that need improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Suggested service/program/course changes to improve SLO achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sharing of tested best practices and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue/discussion across departments about:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Appropriateness &amp; refinement of SLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis of assessment data and areas that need improvement; Especially in regards to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- prerequisite skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- required program courses from other departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- external accreditation requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- external programs to which students are transferring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General Education SLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the three most important things you learned today?

What are three strategies discussed today that you plan to apply?

What are three things that you feel you need to know more about?

Do you have any other thoughts on the day?
Recommendation number and topic:

Recommendation #5:

• Systematically assess student support services using Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s) and other measures.
• Communicate plans for delivery and prioritization of student services regardless of location or means of delivery.

Full recommendation text:

To fully meet Standard II.B Student Support Services, the team recommends that the institution systematically assess student support services using student learning outcomes and other appropriate measures to improve the effectiveness of its support services and develop as well as communicate its plans for the expansion of delivery and prioritization of student services that support student learning and achievement regardless of location or means of delivery.

Related standards:

• II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.3.a, c, d, e, f and II.B.4

Work group members:

• Dr. Thelma Skillman (Lead Person)
• Chris Jackson (Trustee)
• Shanelle Williams (Student)
• Elitininanesi Mafua’ofa (Student)
• Karen Grant
• Terrance Hall
• Maria Heredia
• Barbara Hernandez
• Veronica Hunnicutt
• Marylou Leyba
• Michael McPartlin
Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

In July 2012, the Accreditation Work Group for Student Support Services SLOs was established in an effort to systematically assess student support services SLOs and other measures, and also communicates its plans for the delivery and prioritization of student services regardless of location or means of delivery. Prior to August 29, 2012, student support services were organized under two divisions: 1) Campus & Enrolment Services, and 2) Student Development Division: 3) Office of Student Affairs. On September 1, 2012, these divisions have merged under one Vice Chancellor of Student Services.

All three divisions have systematically collected SLOs, which vary in stages of implementation. Those SLO stages of implementation are: Awareness Level, Development Level, Proficient Level, and Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement Level. By the end of the Fall, 2012 semester, all City College Programs and Services are to be at the Proficiency Level, which means that SLOs are to become an integral part of guiding and reporting Student Services programs and services. Additionally, there is to be evidence that faculty in all areas within Student Services has entered into meaningful dialogue about the Student Learning Outcomes and has made deliberate changes to programs and services that directly link to Student Learning Outcomes measurements and benchmarks. To this end, Student Services has participated in the following step to comply with Wasc Standards.

Across all programs and services within the now one Student Services Division, there are numerous SLOs established by the 23 student support services areas. Below is a snapshot of the range of services within the Student Services Division.

The Division of Campus & Enrollment Services had 10 student services areas. Those areas included: 1) New Student Counseling, 2) Homeless at Risk Transitional Students (HARTS), 3) Puente Program, 4) Matriculation, 5) Scholarship Office, 6) Admissions and Records (Credit and Non-Credit), 7) CalWORKS, 8) Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), 9) Financial Aid Office, and 10) Guardian Scholars. In this Division, 16 SLO’s have been collected:

The Student Development Division had eight student services areas. Those areas included: 1) Continuing Student Counseling Department, 2) Veteran’s Educational Benefits Program, 3) Outreach and Recruitment, 4) Student Activities, 5) Psychological Services/Student Health Center,6) Students Advocacy, Rights & Responsibilities , 7) Student Affairs, and 8) Learning Academic Affairs Division had 5 student support services (also known as Retention Programs). Those areas included: 1) African American Scholastic Program, 2) Asian Pacific American Student Success Program, 3) Latino Services Network, 4) TULAY, and 5) Disabled Students Programs and Services.
With the recent reorganization of student support services under one division, Student Services, CCSF has strengthened its efforts in systematically assessing and collecting SLOs from these areas. This will also ensure that Student Services SLOs are directly tied to the mission of the College as well as connecting area SLOs to Institutional SLOs.

The SLOs with the Division range from assessing and measuring existing and in-progress programs to expanding upon current services and enhancing their quality through the SLO process and eventually using the SLO data for each unit’s program review.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

In an effort to address the Accreditation Team’s recommendation of systematically assessing student support services using Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s), the Student Support Services Accreditation Work Team has engaged in several activities. The team activities include:

- Scheduling weekly workgroup meetings to discuss in detail the standards related to SLO’s for Student Support Services: The work team scheduled weekly meetings beginning July 20, 2012 and will continue to meet weekly until March 27, 2013. The work team will meet to assess the progress of SLO completion of cycles by unit, continue discussing the established matrix for collecting unit SLO’s, establish an SLO Assessment Cycle Calendar, and identify challenges that it may encounter in addressing the Accreditation’s recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Meeting Dates</th>
<th>Summer/Fall 2012 Semester</th>
<th>Spring/Summer 2012 Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July: 20, 27</td>
<td>January: 9, 16, 23, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August: 3, 10, 22, 29</td>
<td>February: 6, 13, 20, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September: 5, 13, 19, 26</td>
<td>March: 6, 13, 20, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October: 3, 10, 17, 24, 31</td>
<td>April: TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November: 7, 14, 21, 28</td>
<td>May: TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December: 5, 12, 19</td>
<td>June: TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reading the Accreditation Report and Self Study references related to recommendations: The work team is continuously reading both the Self-Study and the Accreditation Report in preparation for addressing the accreditation team’s recommendations.

- Completing the WASC exam: The Student Support Services SLO work team completed the 90-minute training individually. All team members completed the training by July 27th, 2012.

- Providing 3 August flex day workshops to provide guidance to colleagues for writing and implementing the SLO process within programs throughout the Division. Additionally,
members of the work team are available to consult with faculty and staff to facilitate the SLO process.

- **Identifying and consolidating Student Services units by division:** The group worked on identifying the different Student Services and grouped them by division (Student Development, Campus and Enrollment Services, Academic Affairs).

- **Identifying, clarifying and consolidating SLO work previously completed by the different units:** To ensure that all SLO work completed within Student Support Services is collected systematically, the work team has developed a standard process to record the progress of SLO’s using a template. The first established deadline for submission of previous SLO assessment cycles (2010-11 and 2011-12) was August 3, 2012. A separate deadline for faculty chairs to submit SLO Assessments of the last two years has been scheduled for August 31st, 2012.

- **Developing a standard template/matrix to record SLO’s for the Student Services Unit:** The work team realized that a standard template/matrix was necessary in order for all Student Services units to have a consistent form of documenting SLO’s (Attachment #2).

- **Starting a Student Support Services Binder of Best Practices:** The work team has compiled previously completed CCSF Student Support Services SLO cycles and selected several examples as best practices.

- **Starting a central repository location of all Student Services SLO’s:** The work team discussed the need of a central repository location of all Student Services SLO’s. This is necessary for accountability purposes. The Team Leader is working with the office of Student Affairs to have available on the College’s website a central place to keep the SLO’s. The work group is also looking in appointing a point person to lead this effort.

**New Team Leader**

With the recent reorganization of student support services under one division on September 1st, 2012, the new Interim Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Thelma Scott Skillman became the Team Leader for group #5 and a new matrix that incorporates the WASC Rubric for Student Services was introduced (See attachment). All services within the division are asked to establish a timeline over the next two months to transition data from the Phase 1 Matrix to the now Phase two Matrixes.

The Vice Chancellor revised the current matrix by reviewing it through the eyes of a WASC visiting team member. The Vice Chancellor remarked that a team member will want to see a comprehensive view of all SLO reported on one form. With that view in mind, Dr. Scott Skillman added new components.

For example, the new matrix will display progress along the Proficiency Rubric. Additionally, a column for evidence and documentation has been added as well as a
column for location of evidence. Moreover, there is now to be an obvious alignment with WASC Standards and with Program Review.

Measurement and Assessment are now merged into one column called Measurement/Benchmarks. The other reporting columns remain the same such as timeline and change.

Student Services is investigating an appropriate template to build a web presence to report assessment progress within the Division. A point person will be identified to enter information about Student Services SLO’s on the CCSF website. Further an SLO manual is being developed and an email was sent to all Student Services staff to provide input for the manual. CCSF has received permission from College of the Canyons to use their existing manual and make it our own. Roland Montemayor serves on the Workgroup responsible for developing the Handbook.

- **Determining a timeline for when SLO’s will be completed in the Fall 2012 semester:** An SLO Assessment Cycle Calendar was established for Fall 2012 through Spring 2013. This calendar will be reviewed on an on-going basis and modified as necessary. During Fall 2012, units are to engage in several steps of the SLO process which includes: develop/regularly update SLO to be assessed and develop action plans; develop a multiple measures tool (pre/post survey, focus groups, etc.) for assessing SLO’s; collect SLO data using multiple measures tool; analyze data and summarize findings in matrix; submit SLO progress to date to Dean/Chairs; and Dean/Chairs give feedback to units.

The following calendar establishes a deadline for each step to ensure units fulfill the SLO process throughout the semester. The SLO timeline for Fall 2012 is as follows:

Further an SLO manual is being developed and an email was sent to all Student Services staff to provide input for the manual. CCSF has received permission from College of the Canyons to use their existing manual and make it our own. Roland Montemayor serves on the Workgroup responsible for developing the Handbook.

- **Determining a timeline for when SLO’s will be completed in the Fall 2012 semester:** An SLO Assessment Cycle Calendar was established for Fall 2012 through Spring 2013. This calendar will be reviewed on an on-going basis and modified as necessary. During Fall 2012, units are to engage in several steps of the SLO process which includes: develop/regularly update SLO to be assessed and develop action plans; develop a multiple measures tool (pre/post survey, focus groups, etc.) for assessing SLO’s; collect SLO data using multiple measures tool; analyze data and summarize findings in matrix; submit SLO progress to date to Dean/Chairs; and Dean/Chairs give feedback to units.

The following calendar establishes a deadline for each step to ensure units fulfill the SLO process throughout the semester. The SLO timeline for Fall 2012 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Who and What</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td><strong>Who: Units, Deans/Chairs</strong></td>
<td><strong>August 31st</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop and regularly update SLO to be assessed, and develop action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Developing a Master Calendar for ongoing SLO development, analysis and continuous improvement: The work team also developed a Master Calendar to guide on-going development and analysis of SLO’s for continuous improvement. The calendar includes Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 SLO assessment cycle activities. Spring 2013 SLO activities include having discussions within the unit on the findings from the data collected; revising SLO’s based on findings; refining assessment and developing SLO’s for next academic cycle; and submitting final SLO Cycle Matrix to Dean/Chairs, who then submit to SLO Team Leader for data compilation and finally, Dean/Chairs giving units feedback on their SLO report. The Master Calendar also includes deadlines to ensure all units complete SLO activities by the established deadlines and includes the Student Support Services SLO Accreditation Response Team activities and dates of meeting.

The following table is a summary of the SLO activities progress, which reflects the status of completion per activity. Out of 13 activities, 6 activities are ongoing and do not have a completion date, while 4 activities have been completed by the Work Team. Three other activities are in-progress and will be finalized shortly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule weekly workgroup meetings to discuss in detail the standards related to SLO’s for Student Support Services.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the Accreditation Report and Self Study</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dialogue about student learning throughout this process is ongoing, pervasive and robust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Flex Day activity for all faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for workgroups to submit SLO’s in new matrix in preparation for the October 15th Accreditation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Report to WASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data and summarize findings in Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit SLO progress to date to Dean/Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Chairs give feedback to Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 12

September 26th

October 15th

November 15th

December 1st
The Student Support Services Accreditation Work Team has encountered some challenges with respect to addressing the recommendations. Those challenges have been listed below, along with possible solutions in addressing each challenge:

- **Data Collection**: Data collection of previously completed SLO work remains a challenge for the work team. Specifically, many faculty and department chairs responsible for SLO management have either retire or assumed other responsibilities. Additionally, many department chairs were unavailable during the summer months. Consequently the SLO work remains inconsistent and incomplete in some areas. To address this issue, the work team is currently working on establishing two calendars, which includes deadlines for completing each step of the SLO assessment cycle within the academic year to ensure all data is collected systematically before the end of the academic year.

- **Goal Setting**: The work team realizes it must be realistic about what it does, and it must always maintain integrity. Goal setting will help the team to establish realistic tasks and deadlines. Revisiting the processes will assist the units and teams in determining how to improve the process for the next SLO assessment cycle.
• **Changing College Mission:** The work team realizes that its work will be greatly impacted by any changes to the CCSF Mission Statement. Therefore, it will establish strong communication with the team revising the mission statement.

• **SLO Website:** To address this challenge the work team identified the need to have a centralized SLO website for Student Services and is currently working with the Office of Student Affairs to create a centralized website for the Student Services Division. The group has also recommended that each area publish their SLO’s on their department website.

• **SLO Leadership:** The work team identified the need to organize all SLO’s in a cohesive manner that unifies efforts and recommends that the district identify an SLO Coordinator for each of the Student Services units of the college.

• **Sustainability:** Because the work team recognizes the need for a sustainable, continuous quality improvement process to guide these efforts, the team created a master annual calendar to use for the SLO cycle; in addition, each unit will have their own master unit calendar of activities matching the master annual calendar. Progress will be continuously recorded on the master calendar.

• **Year-round student representation:** The work team recognizes the importance of student representation in the workgroup and recommends appointing students on an ongoing basis throughout the year.

• **Linking SLO’s to program review plans:** The incorporation of learning outcomes assessment data as part of program review recommendations and priorities, should assist each unit to prioritize and communicate the delivery of student services regardless of location or means of delivery.

**Evidence**

Student Services Division has systematically collected SLO work previously developed by all student support services areas. The Student Support Services Accreditation team utilized an SLO matrix that helped facilitate the collection of SLO collected in previous SLO cycles. The SLO evidence collected shows that the levels of implementation vary by student support area, but also by SLO. Some areas have previously implemented SLOs, while others did not previously implement any SLOs.

Might want to move this up closer to where you introduce it earlier in the report.

The new SLO Matrix consists of ten columns. Those columns include: WASC Rubric SLO Statement, Timeline, Lead person, Changes, Success Measurements/Bench Mark, Evidence Documentation, Location Alignment (Reference WASC & Strategic Plan) Program Review The SLO Statement is defined as the knowledge we want students to acquire through workshops, units, class, program or process, The Timeline is used to identify the steps the student support service area takes to make it all happen such as meeting to develop the SLO plan. The lead
person is responsible to ensure that the indicated SLO is being successfully implemented in his area of responsibility. Success Measurement/Benchmark indicates that the SLO has been analyzed and discussed. Evidence/documentation is to provide a summary of the evidence as well as the means and locations where the evidence is kept. Location indicates the area where the SLO is being implemented; alignment references the respective WASC standard as well as the strategic plan, and the last line is for alignment to program review.

The Measure is defined as the tool used to determine that student has learned the thing we want the student to learn through writing, quiz, discussion, observation, change in behavior. The Assessment is the review of data each Student Service area will engage in to determine what the student has learned through analysis of pre- and post-data, and will then develop material, train presenters, and debrief on the process. Continuous Quality is defined as how each student service area will keep improving the SLO process by identifying how to make the process better for the next cycle.

While not all student support service areas have previous SLO assessment data, today all student services areas have at least 1 to 3 SLOs implemented in the current SLO cycle. The following table reflects the current SLO work by student services area, the number of SLOs currently being assessed, and the level of implementation of each SLO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Services SLO Cycle 2012-13</th>
<th>Area/Department</th>
<th>Number of SLOs</th>
<th>Levels of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Admision and Records (Credit &amp; Non-Credit)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 at Proficiency, 2 at Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. African-American Scholastic Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asian Pacific American Student Success Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CalWORKs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 at Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Continuous Student Counseling Department</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 at Proficiency, 17 at Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Disabled Students Programs &amp; Services (DSPS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 at Continues Quality Improvement, 1 at Proficiency, 1 at Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extended Opportunity Programs &amp; Services (EOPS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 at Development, 3 at Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Financial Aid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>at Sustainable Quality Improvement at Proficiency at Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Guardian Scholars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>at Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Homeless at Risk Transitional Students (HARTS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>at Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Latino Services Network</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>at Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Assistance Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New Student Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 at Sustainable Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 at Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Outreach &amp; Recruitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Psychological Services/student Health Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 at Sustainable Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Puente Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Student Advocacy, Rights &amp; Responsibilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TULAY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>At development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Veteran’s Educational Benefit Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Office of Career and Technical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>at awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timelines**

Two calendars have been developed in order to establish a timeline for the different SLO activities. One calendar is the Master Calendar, and the second calendar is the SLO Assessment Cycle Calendar. Initially, the SLO Assessment Cycle Calendar included the full accreditation cycle; however, the Accreditation Work Team condensed it to only cover the current 2012-13 year with specific fall and spring SLO activities. This calendar also includes established deadlines for completing each step of the SLO process and submission of SLO data to appropriate Deans and Department Chairs.
Accreditation Work Group Progress Form

Prepared: October 1, 2012

Recommendation number and topic:
6 – Human Resources Components Evaluation

Full recommendation text:
To fully meet Standard III.A Human Resources, the team recommends that the evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include a component that assesses the effectiveness in bringing about those learning outcomes (III.A.1.c).

Related standards:
- III.A.1.c – Evaluate results of Assessment identify gaps

Work group members:
- Clara Starr, Tom Boegel, Vennette Cook, Elisa Daniels, Bob Davis, Steven Hale, Mia Rusali, Janey Skinner

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

July 18, 2012, 1:00 p.m.
Initial meeting – Introductions, reviewed the provided accreditation response matrix, decided on starter activities.

July 27, 2012, 10:00 a.m.
Reviewed/discussed SLO materials and information provided by team members, decided what findings were applicable to incorporate in the Accreditation Response Matrix due August 3rd.

August 8, 2012, 3:00 p.m.
Meeting did not take place formally due to unforeseen schedule conflicts with Steering Committees. Team members who reported for the meeting identified available next meeting dates.

August 21, 2012, 2-4:00 p.m.
Confirmed that AFT negotiations commenced on revised evaluation provisions. Reviewed and edited Faculty Handbook and Job Announcement to include SLO language (draft attached).
Confirmed that AFT resolution to include SLO language in Faculty Evaluation document would be presented to Board of Trustees on Tuesday, September 25. Confirmed that SEIU agreed to proposed SLO language for Classified Staff Evaluation document. Discussed DCC expectation to resolve having SLO language included in Evaluation by the end of Fall 2012. No update provided for Administrator evaluation.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

The plans for addressing the recommendation is to continue regular and ongoing discussions/communications (with AFT, Administrators Association, Department Chairpersons Council, SEIU), and simultaneously provide draft document recommendations for related components such as the faculty handbook, job announcement and evaluation documents to ensure that the SLO component is included in the evaluation process by October 2012. After agreement is reached, the above mentioned documents and reference documents must be updated with final language. The next phase of work will include re-engineering the professional development components including new hire orientation and flex days.

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

Negotiations with AFT have commenced. It is the expectation of the team that progress will be made with AFT negotiations between now and the end of September.

Update – 9/11/12: Modified evaluation document targeted for early Fall 2012 for implementation in Spring 2013

Update – 9/27/12: Board of Trustees adopted the Amendment to the Collective Bargaining Agreement to modify the Evaluation provisions

Added: The Administrators Association Co-Chair and Dean Clara Starr discussed including an evaluation objective that assesses effectiveness in promoting the achievement of Student Learning Outcomes in the area(s) supervised.

In addition the team has confirmed that the District and the DCC have agreed to reopen the evaluation provision of the DCC contract to negotiate on the subject of SLOs in the evaluation of department chairpersons.

Update – 9/11/12: SLO Responsibilities of Dean and Department Chairs, draft document prepared in consultation with DCC

Update – No formal meeting has taken place yet. It is expected that meetings will take place in October 2012.
To Date – Faculty SLO Flex Event taking place Wednesday, September 12, 2012 (schedule of events attached); SEIU Meeting to discuss including SLOs in Classified evaluations scheduled Thursday, September 13, 2012 (proposed document change attached)

Update – Meeting held with SEIU and agreement reached on proposed SLO language for Classified Staff Evaluation

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.

The challenges encountered to date include scheduling conflicts and multiple team responsibilities for some members.
15. Leadership / Supervision

Effectively assigns and delegates work in a manner that promotes productive and quality work; motivates others to realize their potential; oversees systems/operations effectively.

Not Applicable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates excellent supervisory skills in directing and assigning work; is fair, consistent, and responsible; perceived as a leader by work group.</td>
<td>Performs effectively as a leader. Plans, sets objectives and assigns responsibility.</td>
<td>Meets the requirements of the job.</td>
<td>Reluctant to assign responsibility and delegated authority. Does not want to confront conflict.</td>
<td>Performs poorly in directing and assigning work. Not perceived as a leader in the work group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks

16. Other Performance Indicators (Separately list all those that apply.)

Other performance indicators are defined as areas unique to the position. such as Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) which continually assess the learning process, and strategies as necessary Performance Indicator evaluated: to retain student interest, stimulate independent thinking, and encourage students to be analytical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly skilled in job function.</td>
<td>Good working knowledge of job function.</td>
<td>Meets the requirements of the job.</td>
<td>Lacks knowledge in some important areas of the job.</td>
<td>Unable to perform critical functions of the job.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks
SLO Workshops for Student Services Administrators: Status report on SLOs for each area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard template/matrix for recording SLOs developed</th>
<th>September 6, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second series of three FLEX Day workshops – Speaking with one Voice focused on SLO development and program review</td>
<td>September 12, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO manual for Student Support Services developed</td>
<td>September 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO Master Calendar developed</td>
<td>September 17, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central repository for all Student Services SLOs available online</td>
<td>September 30, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 6, Human Resources Components of Evaluation**

To fully meet Standard III.A Human Resources, the team recommends that the evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include a component that assesses the effectiveness in bringing about those learning outcomes (III.A.1.c).

Throughout the course of four meetings beginning in July 2012, the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 6 (Human Resources Components of Evaluation) has focused on the following: (1) drafting language for inclusion in job announcements, performance evaluations, and handbooks for all personnel responsible for student progress toward achieving stated SLOs and (2) initiating conversations and negotiations with employee bargaining units to reach agreement on the inclusion of SLO language in job announcements, performance evaluation instruments, and handbooks. To date, SLO language has been drafted for the following, in consultation with the appropriate bargaining units:29

- faculty job announcements
- Faculty Handbook
- classified staff evaluation

Faculty negotiations should be complete by the end of September for the inclusion of SLO language in faculty evaluations.

✓ <NOTE: what can we say about the status of administrator evaluations/documents?>

The workgroup has also begun re-engineering professional development to incorporate SLOs as a topic whenever possible. The first effort in this regard was the provision of a FLEX Day dedicated to SLOs on September 12, 2012.

---

29 See draft faculty job announcements, draft Faculty Handbook, and draft classified staff evaluation.
### Recommendation 6 Outcomes and Timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFT, SEIU, Department Chair Council, and Administrators Association approve inclusion of SLO evaluation components in performance evaluation instruments</td>
<td>By end of September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All applicable performance evaluation instruments for faculty, department chairs, classified staff, and administrators with direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving the stated SLOs contain SLO components</td>
<td>Early Fall 2012 (Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation instruments containing SLO components implemented</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Administrator Handbooks contain language regarding the inclusion of SLOs in performance evaluation instruments</td>
<td>&lt;DATE&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant job announcements contain language regarding SLOs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development activities, including new hire orientations and FLEX days, incorporate SLOs</td>
<td>Initial FLEX activity took place on September 12, 2012; professional development activities will be ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation 7, Human Resources

To fully meet Standard III.A Human Resources, the team recommends that the college assess the adequacy of its current number of qualified classified staff and administrators and their appropriate preparation and experience necessary to support the institution's mission and purpose. The college must ensure that human resource planning is fully integrated with the institutional program review, planning and budgeting processes and linked to the annual allocations of funding to maintain and improve institutional effectiveness.

The workgroup responsible for Recommendation 7 (Human Resources) has been at the core of efforts to propose options for more effective and efficient reporting lines and structures by using models of best practice to inform discussions. Discussions have included exploring the optimal number of direct reports to Vice Chancellors as well as how to maximize the number of hands-on administrators while not increasing the number of personnel. Most likely this will occur by decreasing the number of department chairs and increasing the number of deans resulting in greater effectiveness, efficiency, and cost-savings. The workgroup’s analysis has taken into consideration the level of administrative and staff support for centers and sites beyond the Ocean campus. This workgroup has also been investigating the policies, procedures, and practices associated with reassignments (interim appointments, transfers, additional duty assignments), training and professional development, and evaluation for both administrators and classified staff.
Accreditation Work Group Progress Form

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Tuesday, September 11, 2012.

Recommendation number and topic:
7: Human Resources

Full recommendation text:
To fully meet Standard III.A Human Resources, the team recommends that the college assess the adequacy of its current number of qualified classified staff and administrators and their appropriate preparation and experience necessary to support the institution’s mission and purpose. The college must ensure that human resource planning is fully integrated with the institutional program review, planning and budgeting processes and linked to the annual allocations of funding to maintain and improve institutional effectiveness.

Related standards:
III.A.2, III.A.6, I.B.4

Work group members:
Clara Starr, Chair
Andre’ Barnes, Kristin Charles, David Dore’, Katie Gelardi, Enrique Mireles, Francine Podenski, James Rogers, Lety Sazo, Athena Steff, and Kathleen White, Jennifer Worley

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

07/27/12 – Introduction, First discussion on group task & recommendations
07/31/12 – Discuss Group recommendations, activities, applicable resources and evidence and work on completion of response matrix
08/07/12 – Started working on proposed administrative re-organization
08/10/12 – Discussed Chancellor’s Division
08/21/12 – Continue work on administrative re-organization
             Discussed Research & Planning, and Grants
08/27/12 – Discussed Student Services Division
09/05/12 – Discussed Student Services Division and Finance & Administration Division
09/10/12 – Discussed Academic Affairs Division

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

Please see the attached WK Group #7 RECAP
Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

Please see the attached WK Group #7 RECAP

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.
The discussions have been difficult and it is challenging to remain objective coming up with what is best for the College versus what is best for the constituency group represented by the members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>DISCUSSION ITEMS</th>
<th>TO DO</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Accurately assess the preparedness &amp; experience of staff &amp; administrators</td>
<td><strong>Permanent Positions</strong>&lt;br&gt;-current hiring procedures for permanent admin &amp; clsfd hiring are rigorous&lt;br&gt;  - Admin – update Appendix A – Admin&lt;br&gt;  - Hiring Search Committees’ composition&lt;br&gt;  - Classif – update hiring procedures to include delineation of functions between Budget &amp; HR (include contact #’s)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Interim &amp; Acting Admin Positions</strong>&lt;br&gt;- enforce process for interim &amp; acting admin appts&lt;br&gt;<strong>Admin Upgrades / lateral transfers / reclassifications/ add’tl temp duties</strong>&lt;br&gt;  - Chancellor is permitted under Title 5 §53021 to upgrade, reclassify, rename, lateral transfer&lt;br&gt;<strong>Vacancy Review Group - (VRG)</strong>&lt;br&gt;  - Recommend a Committee Composition/Structure for VRG&lt;br&gt;  - Add: regular scheduled mtgs., timeline/calendar, include requesting administrator/dept head, including req to requestor, and appeal process&lt;br&gt;</td>
<td>-Review other Districts process for appointing interim &amp; acting admin’s&lt;br&gt;-Discuss option to conduct internal two-week open hiring process</td>
<td><strong>Consensus Reached:</strong>&lt;br&gt;  1) To seek outside assistance to conduct a review of the background and experience of current administrators: a) serving in interim appointments; b) that were laterally transfers to other administrative positions; and c) performing additional duties in other administrative position.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Recommendations:</strong>&lt;br&gt;  - Enforce hiring procedures for all processes&lt;br&gt;  - Consider a shorter internal hiring process for interim, acting, lateral transfers, add’tl duties, etc.&lt;br&gt;  - The group recognizes that the Chancellor has some authority under Title 5 §53021 to upgrade, reclassify, rename, or laterally transfer and administrator/ admin appointment.&lt;br&gt;  - Classified transfers&lt;br&gt;  - Civil Service&lt;br&gt;  - HR works to match MQ requirements &amp; reviews staffs’ professional backer with new appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>DISCUSSION ITEMS</td>
<td>COMPLETION or TO DO</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Propose options for improving appointments for professional development for staff</td>
<td>-Reinstate and develop a schedule for Orientations/Trainings for deans, department chairs, program coordinators, and expand for other groups as applicable. Topics to consider: hiring processes, purchasing; budget monitoring; student services; understanding union contract; financial aid guidelines; hiring staff workers (work study &amp; lab aides); developing courses; Banner training. -Develop a set of recommendations to reinstate a centralized professional development office. -Faculty on release at least 40%. -Reinstate professional development for all employee groups. -Professional Dev for all groups; initiative ongoing training. -Explore in-house training opportunities, including providing training taught by faculty/staff. -Encourage participation on college Accreditation teams via WASC. -Explore developing a mentoring program. Consider asking retiree’s to train/guide staff re: expertise &amp; historical knowledge. -Evaluate/assess training. -Link professional development activities to opportunities with Performance Appraisal and Evaluation process &amp; component of professional enhancement.</td>
<td>Funding amount was debated – TO DO: David Dore’, Andre’ Barnes, and Dr. Agrella will review comparable Districts’ professional development budget allocation and bring info back to group to present to Planning Group. Meet with Planning Group and present recommendation with funding amount.</td>
<td>Consensus Reached: Reinstate Professional Development and mandate funding as part of the planning and budget process for all employees. Funding amount to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>DISCUSSION ITEMS</td>
<td>COMPLETION or TO DO</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Build on Chancellor’s efforts to create a required Leadership Developmental program for current administrators</td>
<td>Chancellor formed leadership team regular on-going meeting schedule</td>
<td><strong>Consensus Reached</strong>&lt;br&gt;To continue with the leadership team meetings even after Dr. Fisher leaves</td>
<td><strong>Recommend:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Developing a schedule for delivery of and expand required Training topics, including supervisory/management training - use internal resources: staff/classes &amp; external resources&lt;br&gt;Explore developing a Mentorship Program for new deans, department chairs, mgrs, supervisors, etc.&lt;br&gt;Consider: asking retirees’ to train/guide new staff re: expertise, historical knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TASK

4) Determine process for ensuring needed administrative & staff positions are included in the college’s planning process

### DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Include a mechanism for replacing staff in vital areas and ensure that the delivery of services is maintained through cross training, etc.
- Limitations due to barriers, i.e., Civil Service classifications

### COMPLETION or TO DO

Met with Workgroup #2 Planning Process to discuss how to address developing and incorporating a STAFF PLAN in the Program Review and Planning & Budget process

### PROGRESS

**Consensus Reached**
- Communicate to the Program Review Workgroup the need for including data-driven requests/recommendations for staffing expansion and reductions in the program review template, unless already addressed

**Recommend:**
- Need to implement a mechanism by which staff allocation is equitable based on the under or over-utilization of staff throughout the District & include administrative oversight in this process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>DISCUSSION ITEMS</th>
<th>COMPLETION or TO DO</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Identify Barriers to administrators having needed authority to carry out their roles</td>
<td>Develop a list of observations regarding barriers to administrative authority to share with Group 13 – Barriers to Decision Making Topics discussed: -Administrators need to have authority to oversee their departmental resources, budget, and staffing -chain of command is not adhered to -shared governance serves in an advisory capacity; administrators should consider shared governance feedback but reserve the authority to make decisions – and be held accountable for their decisions/actions -need clear definition, understanding, &amp; communication of respective roles &amp; responsibilities for board, admin, &amp; the shared governance committees -perception that administrators acting in interim or acting positions are not rigorously evaluated – lack credibility -Vacancy Review Group – Create a transparent process that may remove additional barriers to decision making staffing – invite requesting administrative department head/rep to VRG to state their case</td>
<td>Clara to share list with Group 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>DISCUSSION ITEMS</td>
<td>COMPLETION or TO DO</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6)   | Review progress & make recommendations to change the current administrative evaluating process to ensure fairness & accountability |  to do  
- need a Performance-Driven evaluation process, including clear performance expectations, regular/on-going feedback & adjustments, informed changed practices, & recognition where applicable  
- hold all employees accountable  
- Facilitate peer feedback, Example: create a website page where employees can view all employee duties & Goals & objectives to use as basis for evaluating them  
- Link performance management to Workplace culture – to effectuate transformative change, i.e. shifting of resources if and when needed |  to do  
- Research best practices for Admin Evaluations  
**Faculty Evaluation Process**  
Question raised in Group #13 – Barriers to Decision Making: Should chairs be given more autonomy in the faculty evaluation process? | Recommendation  
Reconsider need for and appropriateness of the Admin Evaluation Oversight Committee |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>DISCUSSION ITEMS</th>
<th>COMPLETION or TO DO</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td><strong>Assess the effectiveness of the current administrative organizational structures in terms of logical reporting lines appropriate for decision making.</strong></td>
<td>Include need for creating a top level mgmt Team that provides stability to the institution, has institutional knowledge, and works together as a team – and shares feedback with College community Board needs to back Chancellor Accountability at all levels Legal – District of this size may need both internal general counsel and external counsel for critical issues Request to add Classified Managers and Classified Supervisors on ORG Charts.</td>
<td>Areas for further discussion in <strong>Chancellor Division</strong> Employee Relations direct report? to Chancellor or HR Legal – In-house &amp;/OR external counsel Fundraising Foundation &amp;/OR Dean Need to explore/review the value of the position and/or refocus the position to make it valuable to the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>DISCUSSION ITEMS</td>
<td>COMPLETION or TO DO</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 7 CONTINUED</td>
<td>Discussion regarding the need for an ombudsman-position type to serve as liaison between Instruction and Accounting – May be problematic as it would create an additional level of bureaucracy with no authority for implementing change – rather we should work to ensure that the culture of the Business Departments change to become customer-service driven.</td>
<td>Areas for further discussion in Finance &amp; Administration Division</td>
<td>Drafted proposed Administrative Org Charts for VCFA Divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong> Recommend that Purchasing [Procurement] go back to reporting to the CFO. Recommend that the vacant position: Superintendent, Maintenance, Buildings, and Grounds revert to a high-level Classified Managerial Position (reference Jim Keenan’s Classified position).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>DISCUSSION ITEMS</td>
<td>COMPLETION or TO DO</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Within instruction identify options for increasing the number, role, &amp; responsibilities of 12 month instructional deans while reducing the number of administrative tasks prepared by department chairs</td>
<td>Split Academic Affairs into two main areas: Instruction &amp; Campuses  Separate Credit &amp; Non-Credit  Explained that prior to 1990 this was the structure and the accreditation recommended that we merge  09-10-12 meeting discussion  Need to take into consideration the department chair structure when Developing proposal for implementing new admin Academic Affairs/Instruction organization</td>
<td>Reviewed and discussed the List of suggested Structure for Academic Affairs from the Admin Association (9-7-12)  Reviewed Dr. Agrella’s Discussion draft and sample org chart  Includes legal definition of Campus &amp; Center  Request for : Department Info Report containing size of depts. measured by WSCH and by FTEF  Present a DRAFT Org Chart – Academic Affairs Division at 09/17/12 meeting based on discussion &amp; suggestions of the above items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>DISCUSSION ITEMS</td>
<td>COMPLETION or TO DO</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>Within Student Success, identify options for bringing all student services together as one unit to more effectively serve students</td>
<td>Reviewed and discussed suggested Student Services Structures from Enrique Mireles, Counselor &amp; work group member</td>
<td>Pending review of suggestions by Admin Association (9-5-12 mtg) and Continuing Student Counseling Department Faculty Discussion (9-5-12 mtg) Committee draft proposed VCSD ADMIN ORG based on above discussion, recommendations, &amp; Resos 120827-F2, F3, F4, &amp; F5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
Counseling report to one Dean, include the following Counseling areas:
New Student
Continuing Student
International Student
Career Counseling
Transfer Center
Campus Counseling

Keep the following departments separate due to specialty/legality:
Financial Aid & CalWorks
EOPS

Recommend that the Veterans Office be managed by a high-level Classified Manager
Accreditation Work Group Progress Form

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gnomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Thursday, August 16.

Recommendation number and topic:
8: Physical Resources

Full recommendation text:
To fully meet Standard III.B Physical Resources, the team recommends that the college incorporate all costs required to appropriately operate and maintain existing facilities, whether owned or leased, into its annual and long-term planning and budgeting processes and annually allocate the required human and fiscal resources to effectively and equitably operate and maintain physical resources at locations where courses, programs and services are offered (III.B.1)

Related standards:
- 10: Financial Planning and Stability
- 11: Financial Integrity and Reporting

Work group members:
Lawrence Wong Trustee Board
Jorge Bell VC Campuses / Enrollment Administrator
Minh Ta Dean ESL/CHN/NB Campus Administrator
    Lidia Jenkins Assoc. Dean / Matriculation Administrator
    Steven Brown Dept. Chair / Horticulture / Flrsty Dept. Chair
    Maya Novelli Broadcasting Staff
    Brian Leong Buildings / Grounds Staff
    Scott Cline Buildings / Grounds Staff
    Gohar Momjian Executive Asst. to Chancellor Accreditation Liaison
    David Liggett Facilities Staff

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

26 July 2012 – Read and discussed standard, self-study report, commission letter and evaluation report. Looked at effective models, identify resources / additional information needed, assign tasks and set next meeting date.

9 August 2012 – Discussed State vs. CCSF use of the terms Campus, Center and Site. Discussed chart of accounts, Banner codes, budget FY 12/13. Discussed draft Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) matrix. Discussed need to obtain annual Buildings and Grounds (B&G) operations and maintenance costs. Discussed difficulty of discussing annual and long-term operational,
maintenance and staffing costs since the work group does not know how the annual budget is determined.

23 August 2012 – preliminary date for next work-group meeting

On Monday, September 10, 2012, the Physical Resources/Operation/Maintenance Committee held a meeting at City College of San Francisco’s Ocean Campus. The work group members that attended the meeting are as follows:

1. Jorge Bell
2. Lidia Jenkins
3. Carlita Martinez
4. Steven Brown
5. Scott Cline
6. Jaime Martine (representing Xiomara Martinez)
7. Brian Leong
8. Maya Novelli

After providing information to the group regarding their responsibility as a team, the members decided that the charge of the group includes only the specified account numbers:

- 5450 Self-Insurance Claims
- 5510 Water/Sewage
- 5520 Gas/Electricity
- 5530 Telephone
- 5540 Other Utilities
- 5560 Housekeeping
- 5610 Other Property Leases
- 5620 Property Leases- SFUSD
- 5631 Vehicle Leases
- 5632 Copier Leases
- 5633 Other Leases
- 5640 Maintenance and Repair – Non Equipment
- 5650 Maintenance and Equipment
- 5655 Maintenance and Repair - Vehicles

Although the members of this group have concerns about the lack of expertise in this specified area, Dean Bell assured the members that everyone’s time and effort is needed in order to accomplish this task. Dean Bell will do his best to keep the members of the group focused while concentrating on the specific assignment only.

David Liggett joined the meeting via telephone. He provided an explanation on the work he has completed on the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Model. In addition, he indicated that he has requested Pam Merry to provide the FTE and FTES figures for all of City College of San
Francisco’s campuses and sites in order for him to complete the TCO matrix in full. While reviewing the TCO matrix, Dean Jenkins and Novelli raised the concern that the TCO matrix portrays the District budget as being equally distributed among the facilities regardless of size and/or need. Consequently, the presented approach may not accurately reflect the actual costs by center and/or campus. Dean Bell and Jenkins will revise the provided draft of the TCO matrix, in addition to calculating staffing estimates using the APPA guidelines.

Furthermore, Novelli introduced the MiraCosta College Institutional Self Study Report formula from the 2002 Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA). This formula focused on the staffing guidelines and the resulting recommendations made by MAAS Company, which demonstrates the quantity of the staffing needs. In order to address the staffing needs at City College of San Francisco, Novelli and Cline agreed to work together using the same formula presented in the MiraCosta College Institutional Self Study Report and will report their findings at the next meeting.

Cline provided the group with a copy of the 2 year, 5 year, and 10 year Capital Improvement Matrix separated by location. Cline will report the dollar amount for each of the areas on the matrix at the next meeting.

Additionally, Leong presented copies of the Staffing Matrix for City College of San Francisco. The matrix included three columns for the current staff, the needed staff, in addition to the ideal number of staff at City College of San Francisco. This matrix was developed based on Leong’s experience and past practices at the college. Dean Bell was concerned with how this particular matrix was developed and requested a more scientific method to be created. Leong and Brown will complete this project and provide their findings at the next meeting.

Martinez agreed to work on the custodial aspect of the recommendation in order to identify current practices/costs and explore recommendations for recycling and waste management.

Lastly, the Physical Resources/Operations/Maintenance group felt they needed more information in the areas of Leasing, Vehicle Leasing, Copier Leasing, and Other Leases. Dean Bell agreed to follow up with Lani Baptiste and Kathy Hennig in regards to these areas and the access to additional information. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 19th at 11:00am.

FUTURE MEETINGS
The group schedule the following meetings: Wednesday, September 19th at 11:00 AM and Wednesday, September 26th at 11:00 AM Location to be determined.
Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

3 August 2012 – Complete matrix and give progress report to Chancellor’s Office
16 August 2012 – Complete Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model and forward to work groups 10 & 11 and give progress report to Chancellor’s Office
September 19th complete Total Cost Ownership Model using only the accounts pertinent to the group.

The members indicated that the charge of this group includes ONLY the following account numbers:

- 5450 Self-Insurance Claims
- 5510 Water/Sewage
- 5520 Gas/Electricity
- 5530 Telephone
- 5540 Other Utilities
- 5560 Housekeeping
- 5610 Other Property Leases
- 5620 Property Leases-SFUSD
- 5631 Vehicle Leases
- 5632 Copier Leases
- 5633 Other Leases
- 5640 Maintenance and Repair –Non Equipment
- 5650 Maintenance and –Equipment
- 5655 Maintenance and Repair –Vehicles

Jorge Bell and Lidia Jenkins will work on revising the TCO template and calculate staffing estimates using the APPA guidelines.

Carlita Martinez and Brian Leong will work on Custodial to identify current practices/costs and explore recommendations for recycling and waste management.

Brian Leong distributed a Staffing Matrix for the College. The Matrix included 3 columns for the current staff, the needed staff and the ideal number of staff. He indicated that he obtained these figures based on his experience and past practices. Brian Leong and Steven Brown agreed to work on this project and they will report at the next meeting.
Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

3 August 2012 – Completed matrix and gave progress report to Chancellor’s Office

16 August 2012 – Completed Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model and forwarded to work groups 10 & 11 and gave progress report to Chancellor’s Office

23 August 2012 – Compile all TCO costs that we have been able to determine and allocate to sites. For actual annual budget FY 12/13 and for realist costs. Will concentrate on the TCO for the new Chinatown Campus rather than attempt to determine all District wide costs.

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.
Discussed difficulty in understanding the chart of accounts, Banner codes, budget FY 12/13. Discussed difficulty in obtaining annual Buildings and Grounds (B&G) operations and maintenance costs. Discussed difficulty of discussing annual and long-term operational, maintenance and staffing costs since the work group does not know how the annual budget is determined. (Exampled, how was 5640 – Maint & Repair – non-equipment - $815,000 determined and set in the budget?)

One of the concerns of the group is that most of the members are not experts in this area. In addition, the group needs to follow up with Lani Baptiste regarding Leases and with Kathy Henning regarding Vehicle Leases, Copier Leases and Other Leases.
Recommendation number and topic:
Recommendation #9 – Technology Resources

Full recommendation text:
To fully meet Standard III.C Technology Resources, the team recommends the college develop a comprehensive plan for equipment maintenance, upgrade and replacement that is integrated with the institution’s budget allocation processes; and that the college continues to monitor its information technology systems and implement measures to more fully secure the technology infrastructure.

Related standards:
III.C.1.a, c-d, III.C.2

Work group members:
Tim Ryan, Eric Raznick, Doug Re, James Hall, Cynthia Dewar, Carmen Lamha, Carol Reitan, Craig Persiko, Kim Ginter-Webster, Monika Liu, Lidia Szajko

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

Tuesday, July 24 (9am-11am): Introduction to team, establish baseline knowledge of the accreditation response process and the Technology Resources recommendation and Standards.

Tuesday, July 31 (9am-11am): Discuss Planning and Budgeting timeline and role of the Technology Plan. Identify and define Activities and complete Matrix for submission.

Tuesday, August 7 (1pm-3pm): Discuss revised Planning and Budgeting timeline, prepare outline of response document, discuss and improve flowchart for lab replacement strategy.

Tuesday, August 21 (9am-11am): Determined alignment of technology replacement with Program Review including additional language to include in Program Review Guidelines. Discussed Perkins grant annual timeline and its current independent/uncoordinated process.

Tuesday, August 28 (9am-11am): Discussed feedback from Steering Committee including which type of technology we will be addressing and also Banner baseline (CalB). Identified Bridge plan for upcoming fiscal years and prepared spreadsheets with anticipated technology resources costs.

Tuesday, September 4 (9am-11am): Discussed the latest information from the Planning Work Group and the format of the Progress Report due on September 7.
Thursday, September 6 (12:30pm-2:30pm) Finalized language in the Progress Report.

**Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.**

1. Articulate Relationship with Planning Process. This activity is the key component of the Technology Resources Recommendation. It will be dependent on the efforts of the Planning Work Group to determine the timeline of the overall planning and budgeting process and will require sufficient information be provided to our decision makers to determine the CCSF priorities for a given year. The next meeting of the Planning Work Group is September 10, 2012. This plan is primarily completed on September 7, 2012 although it will need to be continued on a regular basis to ensure the detailed coordination is proceeding as required.

2. Complete Academic Equipment Inventory. It is important for us to know what technology assets CCSF currently owns and their age in order to determine the replacement strategy and priority. The inventory includes computer classrooms, computer rooms and classroom projectors. Completed on August 31, 2012, although there will be ongoing updates.

3. Develop Models for Replacement. Technology equipment will be upgraded or replaced on a pre-defined schedule using model based on age, functionality or other factors. Models for consolidation and sharing of resources across multiple organizations are also required and will be included in this activity. (Completed September 4, 2012).

4. Redefine Technology Plan Dates. The 2009-2011 Technology Plan has been extended for one year while the 2013-2016 plan is finalized. Technology-related projects will be incorporated into the Program Review process beginning in the Fall semester. Departmental submissions are due by mid-December for inclusion in the upcoming fiscal year. (Completed).

5. Determine Cost and Staff Requirements for Technology Resources. These items will also be incorporated into the Program Review process described above. All technology-related staffing requests will be submitted by ITS to enhance technical services across all organizations. (Completed).

6. Identify Constraints of Funding Sources. The funding sources for technology equipment are General Fund, Bond measures, grants and donations. Grants are typically limited to funding Academic equipment and the Bond is limited to funding Administrative equipment. It is important to identify the differences between the funding sources as a specific one will be allocated as part of the technology acquisition process. (Completed September 4, 2012).

7. Identify Guiding Principles. This activity is analogous to redefining the ITS Mission Statement to be inclusive of operating principles for issues such as standards and staffing. (Completed August 7, 2012).

8. Identify Sources of Equipment Usage Data. We do not know how frequently many of our computing assets are used and hence do not have the information available to make data-driven
decisions. This is especially important considering our goal of computer classroom consolidation instead of a direct one-for-one replacement. (Completed August 31, 2012).

9. Prepare Second Progress Report and Draft Accreditation Response. A draft outline was completed on August 15, 2012 to ensure the scope of activities are sufficiently inclusive for preparing the final response and that all of the key discussion points are defined in the final document. (Completed September 7, 2012).

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

I. CCSF Technology Equipment

City College technology equipment is used in a standardized and integrated manner throughout the college community. Based on the unique requirements of college academic and administrative departments the types of technology and the associated support fall into two distinct groups as described below.

    Instructional and Program Technology: This category includes technology directly related to academic or program needs and includes student computer labs, projectors, learning management system, and software for instructional purposes.

    Administrative and Institutional Technology: This category includes the administrative systems necessary to run the college and include Banner (ERP), databases, email, telephones, network, firewalls, employee computers, student health systems and library systems.

A plan has been developed in which each of these types of technology resources are incorporated into the annual planning and budgeting process for equipment upgrades, replacement and maintenance. In previous years, this has occurred on a best effort basis and has not been part of a well-defined process. Therefore, there is a need for a temporary “bridge plan” to bring our equipment, primarily faculty and staff desktops, up to the appropriate levels of technical performance. First, a “bridge plan” process will be described by which we will arrive at a standardized level where a permanent process can begin. Second, the permanent process will be described which will be used after a standardized equipment level has been achieved.

Bridge Plan Process:
It is the goal of CCSF to utilize desktop computers that are a maximum of five years old. A large-scale deployment of desktop computers for faculty and staff occurred in 2002 and 2003. Approximately 700 desktop computers currently in use have not been replaced since that time. In order to provide modernized equipment to employees as soon as possible, a financial summary which includes 700 employee desktop computers in addition to an augmentation of student desktop computers and other equipment has been prepared and is summarized in Table 4. The financial summary will be included in the ITS Program Review submission for FY13/14. Replacement of the oldest desktop computers will occur between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014 (FY13/14) and will be done on a geographic and departmental basis.
**Permanent Process:**

Ongoing technology equipment needs will be prioritized through the college planning and budget process which is described in Section II, Program Review Alignment. Departments will include technology needs in their Program Reviews and the needs will be prioritized by governance committees and administrators according to the mission of the college. A financial summary of ongoing equipment needs, including employee computers, student computers and other equipment has been prepared and is summarized in Table 5. The student desktops in computer classrooms and computer centers will be evaluated for replacement using two criteria. First, if they exceed the standard age of five years, and second if their function continues to meet the needs of CCSF as indicated by the Mission Statement and prioritized by the Program Review process. Computer classrooms and centers will be consolidated whenever possible in order to achieve operational efficiencies and to serve the needs of the entire college community.

Administrative and Institutional Technology needs will be the responsibility of the Information and Technology Services Department (ITS) in partnership with appropriate stakeholders. They will be responsible for submitting requests through the Program Review process to keep the administrative and institutional systems operational at a high level of availability by performing the required upgrades, replacement and maintenance. A Technology Survey will be conducted along with each revision of the Technology Plan (every 3 years) to ascertain the overall direction and scope of CCSF technology use. In addition to this internal process, international standards and processes for IT service alignment and delivery as developed by the IT Infrastructure Library (itil.org) will be followed when appropriate.

Reference: IT Infrastructure Library

**II. Program Review Alignment**

Technology equipment upgrade, replacement and maintenance will be part of the Program Review process as detailed in the Annual Assessment, Planning and Budgeting Timeline.

ITS program review will incorporate the administrative/institutional equipment in the maintenance, replacement, upgrading cycle, in consultation with stakeholder groups using institutional technology. In their regular workflow, ITS will maintain inventories of institutional equipment with maintenance schedules and dates of replacement. ITS will keep records of maintenance activities to justify ITS staffing levels, and to identify equipment that may need to be replaced outside the regular replacement cycle (exclusive of warranty replacements). Equipment usage data and other metrics will be gathered by ITS and by stakeholder units using administrative and institutional systems (e.g. Admissions and Records for Banner).

ITS will also have regular consultation and communication channels with appropriate stakeholder groups to assess continuing needs for institutional systems. Stakeholder groups will have primary responsibility for needs assessment. This information will be combined with the aforementioned workflow and metrics information to describe equipment maintenance, replacement and upgrade costs in ITS program review for the forthcoming budget year.
Instructional and Program equipment needs will be stated in the program reviews for specific departments. For equipment already in place that is supported by ITS, ITS will maintain inventories and maintenance records for staffing costs. The department will assess the continued need to provide the equipment based on metrics and learning outcomes. The department and ITS will share this information and consult to determine the continuing costs, and provide this information in the department’s program review.

In most years, continuing staff maintenance costs and consumables for equipment is all that will be needed in department program reviews. ITS will remind departments when a replacement year is coming up so that departments may incorporate replacement costs into the program review. In general, maintenance and replacement of both administrative and institutional and instructional and program equipment will be routine calculations based on experience, metrics, schedules, and known costs that can be projected several years into the future, and can be easily inserted into program review.

Requests for upgrades and additional equipment will also appear in appropriate program reviews as priorities. In addition to justification based on changing needs, metrics and/or technology shifts, consultation between ITS and departments about equipment standards, additions or shifts in staffing costs, changes to consumables, replacement cycles and so forth is critical before the request can be completed in the program review. ITS will provide standard equipment cost lists, procedures and forms to departments for guidance in this process. For administrative and institutional equipment upgrades, it is equally important that ITS consults with stakeholder departments about the proposed changes to anticipate impacts on users before the upgrade request is completed.

In the case where data and needs analysis show potential reductions of equipment needs in departments or institutional systems, ITS will facilitate planning for reduction strategies such as consolidation and redeployment of equipment. As much as possible, this planning will take place during the program review cycle, but may take place in the prioritization process if necessary.

ITS will review prioritized plans coming out of the program reviews and provide input to ensure the estimated costs are accurate and ensure proposed systems will provide the desired function. Staffing requests related to maintaining and upgrading technology equipment will be funded through an ITS Program Review request. It is expected that Technology Resources will be considered along with Finance, Human Resources, and Facilities as part of the request prioritization process as well.

The ITS review will be part of the Annual Review Cycle shown in Figure 1 which is part of the Annual Assessment, Planning and Budgeting Timeline.

**Figure 1: Annual Review Cycle**
III. Technology Resources Utilization

A need has been identified for determining the utilization of computer classrooms and centers. This is essential for leveraging our resources and becoming as efficient as possible. There are currently two systems in use at CCSF which are capable of performing this task, Accutrack and PC Cop, each of which has features that are beneficial to particular organizations. CCSF will work towards standardization of these systems to achieve efficiencies and will continue to expand the use of these systems to include all student desktop computers. The utilization data will be used as part of a data-driven decision making process to determine which labs and centers can be consolidated in order to meet the overall needs of CCSF, a flowchart describing this process has been developed. In addition to providing equipment usage data, the systems above have the added benefit of collecting usage information which can be used for attendance reporting purposes.

IV. Technology Resources Costs

The largest expense for technology equipment in use at CCSF is incurred during the replacement process. Continuous technical advancements allow a longer useful life than was previously possible, but the amount of time a given system can be used is dependent on how heavily it has been used in the past and how well it meets current technical performance requirements.

A standard replacement cycle for Instructional and Program technology equipment has been developed and is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Instructional and Program Technology Replacement Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>S/W Upgrade Cycle</th>
<th>H/W Upgrade Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In order to assist the CCSF college community in preparing accurate Program Review requests, the costs for standard Instructional and Program technology equipment have been determined and are shown in Table 2 below. The costs for non-standard technology equipment will be provided to a requesting department through consultation with ITS to determine the overall project goals and the most cost effective approach.

**Table 2: Instructional and Program Technology Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Computer (includes monitor)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop Computer</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projector Replacement</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projector Installation</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes mounting and control panel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A standard replacement cycle for Administrative and Institutional technology equipment has been developed and is shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Administrative and Institutional Technology Replacement Cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>S/W Upgrade Cycle</th>
<th>H/W Upgrade Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERP Software (Banner)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP Servers</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade Servers</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Area Network</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Switches</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Switches</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone System</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Sets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewalls</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiFi System</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Computers</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are predictable ongoing annual costs associated with the upgrade, replacement and maintenance of Administrative and Institutional technology. These are detailed in Table 4 below and are included in the current CCSF budget for FY12/13.
Table 4: FY12/13 Administrative and Institutional Technology Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Expense Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Maintenance/Licenses</td>
<td>1,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total FY12/13 Cost</td>
<td>1,135,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combined FY13/14 technology cost for both Instructional/Program needs and also Administrative/Institutional needs has been determined and is summarized in Table 5 below. This table includes the ongoing annual costs as well as two approaches to the Bridge Plan of providing 700 PCs for Faculty and Staff. The first approach entails buying used PCs at a cost of $350 each which are typically purchased at the end of a three year lease period and include a three year warranty. The second approach entails buying new PCs at a cost of $1,000 each.

Table 5:
FY13/14 Instructional/Program and Administrative/Institutional Technology Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Expense Item</th>
<th>Amount (Used PCs)</th>
<th>Amount (New PCs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Maintenance/Licenses</td>
<td>1,070,000</td>
<td>1,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Ongoing Cost</td>
<td>1,135,000</td>
<td>1,135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Data Center Equip.</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee PCs</td>
<td>Faculty Desktops (350)</td>
<td>122,500</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee PCs</td>
<td>Staff Desktops (350)</td>
<td>122,500</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Lab PCs</td>
<td>Student Desktops (300)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Center PCs</td>
<td>Student Desktops (200)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Infrastructure</td>
<td>Classroom Projectors</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Infrastructure</td>
<td>Lab Utilization System</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Additional Cost</td>
<td>995,000</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total FY13/14 Cost</td>
<td>2,160,000</td>
<td>2,615,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The combined technology cost for future fiscal years, beyond FY13/14, has been determined and is summarized in Table 6 below.

### Table 6:
**Future FY Instructional/Program and Administrative/Institutional Technology Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Expense Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Maintenance/Licenses</td>
<td>1,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Ongoing Cost</strong></td>
<td>1,135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Operations</td>
<td>Data Center Equip.</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee PCs</td>
<td>Faculty Desktops (175)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee PCs</td>
<td>Staff Desktops (175)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Lab PCs</td>
<td>Student Desktops (300)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Center PCs</td>
<td>Student Desktops (200)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Infrastructure</td>
<td>Classroom Projectors</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Infrastructure</td>
<td>Lab Utilization System</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Additional Cost</strong></td>
<td>1,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Future FY Cost</strong>*</td>
<td>2,265,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A 5% annual cost increase due to inflation is anticipated.*

### V. CCSF Grants

As with many large academic institutions, grants can and have been a significant source of funding for technology equipment at CCSF. However, grants are not a guaranteed source of funding and cannot be depended upon as a funding source for a given year. Hence, the complete technology equipment funding needs are reflected in Tables 5 and 6 above. It is important to include the impact of grants in the overall annual planning and budgeting process. For example, when grant funding is used to purchase technology equipment, budgetary items concerning the upgrade, replacement and maintenance of equipment will be considered. Some grant-funded programs are for a specific time period while others are designed to continue on a regularly scheduled renewal cycle. Following is a description of some of the current grant programs at CCSF:

**Career and Technical Education (CTE)**

The Federal government's Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (formerly VTEA) has been the primary source of technology equipment for eligible departments, but Perkins awards can also be used for expenditures beyond technology. Perkins largely focuses on better serving special populations students (e.g. underrepresented minorities and genders) and awards are given to support program improvement. Perkins funds cannot be used for maintenance purposes. The Federal Perkins authorization ends in 2012 and its reauthorization may include different criteria.
The changing guidelines and stiff competition for awards, as well as the exclusion of technology maintenance, require CCSF to have other sources of technology funding available. Therefore, these departments will continue to seek Perkins funding for their technology needs when possible, and when that funding cannot support their needs they will request technology through the Program Review process like all other departments.

Beginning in 2013, the Perkins grant application process will be merged with the Program Review process. Instead of separate forms, departments will submit just Program Review, and when the Vice Chancellor is prioritizing funding requests she/he will work with the Perkins coordinator to determine which can be funded by Perkins. This will allow those funds to be used to maximum benefit and general college funds to be used to fund prioritized items that aren't Perkins-eligible.

**Administrative and Institutional Grants**
This category of grants includes programs such as Medical Assistance Administration (MAA) and Board Financial Assistance Program (BFAP). Both of these programs have been used in the past by CCSF to fund technology equipment and may be sources of future funding based on program availability. CCSF will pursue these programs in accordance with the appropriate guidelines, but the associated technology resources will be funded independently of the outcome of the grant awards process.

**VI. CCSF Technology Plan**
The Annual Assessment, Planning and Budgeting Timeline states that units’ program reviews are developed in response to various College Plans, among other things. One of these plans is the Technology Plan. Since Fall 2011, CCSF has been in the process of updating the 2009-11 Technology Plan, using various departmental technology planning groups and a Technology Plan Steering Committee.

Work in 2011-12 on the Technology Plan included a review of the existing plan, data sources, and the need to link a new plan more closely to the Strategic Plan, SLOs and budgets. The Technology Plan Steering Committee identified a need to add information for more college departments and update information on employee technology needs before a new plan could be finalized.

For the purpose of Fall 2012 Program Review and planning, the 2009-11 Technology Plan has been extended through 2012, as there are carryover goals already identified.

It is recommended that the Technology Plan Steering Committee revisit the Technology Plan format and content to synchronize more effectively with the District’s Mission, Strategic Plan, and other District Planning documents and hierarchies. Specifically,

- The Technology Plan should provide a framework for three years of technology support, including purpose, vision, mission, guiding principles, assumptions, goals and objectives
- The level of content should be consistent with other plans in the same area of the District’s planning flow chart, such as the Education Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan
- Goals in the Strategic Plan, institutional learning outcomes and Accreditation Standards should be explicitly referenced in the Technology Plan.
• Data gathering methodologies and resources for ongoing review and updating of the Technology Plan should be identified and documented in the plan
• Timelines for the annual review and revision of the Technology Plan should be established and included in the plan
• Budgeting related to the Technology Plan should be linked to technology requests identified in Program Review and Annual Planning priorities. Specific technologies continued or recommended through these processes should be linked to learning outcomes and accreditation standards.
• A completed Technology Plan for 2013-16 will be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval by the end of December 2012.

VII. Information Security Improvements

Overview
The CCSF information security infrastructure is improved on an ongoing basis to incorporate vendor feature enhancements, adapt to new threats and provide the necessary capacity to meet the needs of Instructional and Administrative programs. Following is a summary of the current major components of the CCSF defense-in-depth infrastructure and the anticipated improvements to be made during the next twelve months. Additional improvements to overall data security and information assurance will be defined and implemented by the ITS Management Team, ITPC and other organizations as required. It is important to emphasize that hardware-based systems are only one component in a successful network security strategy. Active participation and precautions are also required by all individuals entrusted with sensitive information. When possible, international standards will be followed for information security implementation as outlined in the Control Objectives for Information and Related Technology (COBIT) guidelines.

Reference:
Control Objectives for Information and Related Technology (COBIT):

Checkpoint Firewall
The Checkpoint firewall consists of a management console and two enforcement points in a high-availability cluster with one active and one standby system. It was recently upgraded to version R75.20 and an Intrusion Prevention System (IPS) software blade was activated. Prior to the end of 2012, the enforcement points will be migrated to new hardware platforms, HP DL380 server, which will increase the number of network interfaces. The additional interfaces will provide a redesigned server environment and facilitate clearer and more stringent enforcement of security policies.

Palo Alto Networks Firewall
The Palo Alto firewall consists of a single system, Model 2050, running PAN OS version 4.1.6. It is currently used for controlling peer-to-peer (P2P) traffic, conducting threat analysis and performing anti-virus filtering. The current threat analysis license is due to expire in July, 2013.
During the next six months the need for this level of the multi-tiered security environment will be re-examined. If this system is determined to be required, the current licenses will be extended in one-year increments and an evaluation will be performed to determine if a larger and/or alternative system should be implemented to provide this function in the future.

**Intrusion Detection System**

An Open Source Intrusion Detection System (IDS) was installed at CCSF in January, 2012, and is based on an application called AlienVault. The IDS system is currently installed on a set of three servers. In order to consolidate the servers and leverage new hardware capabilities, the AlienVault application will be re-installed on a new HP server prior to the end of 2012. It is estimated it will take two weeks to complete the installation and the subsequent tuning before the new system becomes operational.

**Desktop Anti-Virus Software**

CCSF has a site license for McAfee Anti-Virus software which is used for Faculty, Staff, and Student desktops. The site license provides access to the latest versions of software on an ongoing basis and is valid until October, 2013. Replacement solutions are being evaluated and tested with the goal of selecting a new anti-virus solution during the first quarter of 2013. The improved desktop computer replacement cycle of a maximum of five years will provide sufficient performance capacity to utilize the capabilities of desktop anti-virus solutions.

**Server Anti-Virus Software**

OSSEC clients have been installed on the majority of ITS-administered server platforms to be used in combination with the IDS system. Additional enterprise level anti-virus solutions will be evaluated for Windows, Linux and HP-UX to enhance localized intrusion detection and reporting capabilities. An emphasis will be placed on Linux as it will potentially become the operating system for Banner in 2013.

**VIII. Efficiency Improvement Initiatives**

**Expanded Use of Insight**

**Background**

The Educational Technology Department (ETD) includes the Teaching Learning Center (TLC) and the Technology Mediated Instruction (TLM) areas. ETD oversees the development, delivery and support of all online classes using Insight (CCSF’s learning management system); trains and supports faculty to use technology to enhance face-to-face classes with Insight; manages the TLC Laboratory which serves as an open computer lab for faculty and staff as well as an area for training faculty.

**Current Usage/Application**

The College has expanded its online course offerings from 65 credit courses in 2005 to 126 credit courses and 168 sections in spring 2011. ETD supports 269 tech-enhanced course sections in addition to 163 sections of online courses in the fall 2012 semester. Distance-learning courses are offered in 27 academic departments, all six schools within Academic Affairs and within the Library and Learning Resources. In certain departments, a student can complete approximately 85 percent of the requirements for an AA or AS degree by taking online classes and/or
telecourses. Students can complete approximately 95 percent of the courses required to transfer to the CSU or fulfill the IGETC pattern by taking online classes or a telecourses.

Insight is also currently being used by departments within Academic Affairs as a tool for communication, a means to gather SLO data and a repository to share materials specific to courses and department business.

**Future Application**
Increase the use of Insight by converting high demand face-to-face courses to hybrid online sections. For example, where a face-to-face section of Speech 2 is scheduled for TR from 9:30-11 am a hybrid online section of Speech 2 can be scheduled for Tuesday from 9:30-11 am and instead of meeting in class that Thursday, the students can instead complete their work on Insight. Given that the classroom is now vacant during a prime Thursday 9:30-11 am timeslot, a second section of Speech 2 can be scheduled to use that room with the remaining course work for this section being completed online.

An Insight course shell can be created for every face-to-face course each semester. Faculty can use the shell to upload course materials and communicate with students. The increased use of Insight will decrease the constant demand on Duplicating Services with the outcome being a significant decrease in copier and paper expenses.

Increase the development of online classes. Currently only about eight online courses are developed each school year. With an increase to development units approximately 15-25 online classes could be developed each school year. Target courses to develop are high demand, high FTES yielding, IGETC pattern courses.

**NOTE:** The above can only be completed with an increase in staff to ETD.

**Data Display and Analysis**
In order to facilitate a data-driven decision making process at CCSF, a software application called Argos will be purchased and implemented prior to the end of 2012. The application is developed by a software vendor called Evisions and will be used to provide simplified budgetary and enrollment information in a CCSF-specific format.

**California Baseline Banner**
CCSF currently uses the Banner application developed by Ellucian for student records, finance and other critical functions. Ellucian has developed a version of Banner customized for California Community colleges referred to as CalB. Within this version is a standardized program for information submission to the State Chancellor’s Office CCFS-320 Reporting System. CCSF does not currently utilize the CalB standardized program, but adoption and implementation of this standard would provide an efficiency improvement and reduce the amount of staff time required for this submission.

**Lab Utilization**
The information detailed in Section III. Technology Resources Utilization describes an efficiency improvement initiative as it will assist in a desktop computer consolidation effort to reduce the quantity of systems supported by technical staff.
Reduce Paper Forms
Efficiency improvements can be achieved by reducing the number of paper forms in use at CCSF through online initiatives. Specific examples to be implemented in 2013 include submission of online grades, online census reports and online Positive Attendance Records (PARs).

IX. Information Technology Services (ITS) Mission Statement
Information Technology Services (ITS) supports City College of San Francisco (CCSF) and all its departments by: creating services and maintaining technology being used by students and employees; providing technical expertise to improve productivity, effectiveness, and efficiencies; and providing customer support for technology. ITS is customer-centric, empowering the CCSF community by providing needed technology that in turn improves student success. The following Guiding Principles will be followed by ITS in order to support the overall mission of CCSF. These Guidelines are part of a continuous improvement process to adapt to technological changes and allocate resources based on prioritized needs.

Sustainability
Information technology equipment will be purchased, maintained, replaced and recycled using a continuous sustainable model.

Coordination
Information technology resources will be allocated in accordance with the annual needs of CCSF through the ongoing Program Review process.

Standardization
All information technology systems will be configured to CCSF standards to ensure adequate support and reduce downtime.

Shared Resources
Efforts will be taken to make all appropriate information technology equipment accessible to the entire college community.

Staffing
Adequate staffing levels and training programs will be maintained to accommodate for technological changes and employee attrition.

Innovation
New technologies will be evaluated and implemented at CCSF in order to achieve cost savings and a high level of technical excellence.

X. Evidence
Annual Assessment, Planning and Budgeting Timeline:
(See document dated 2012-08-31)

Academic Lab and Center Inventory:
List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.

Creating an atmosphere of shared resources among all departments, including both Academic and Administrative areas, will be a challenge. Currently many organizations fund equipment independently. This has created a challenge in that computer labs are often locked and are unavailable to students who are not enrolled in a particular program. The solution to this is further complicated by the need for staffing of lab aides and/or lab monitors in order for the lab to be opened.

Measuring utilization of assets is needed to determine if a given classroom or center can be consolidated. It is a currently a manual process for the computer classrooms, prepared one at a time and reflective of the class schedule for the given semester. It is even harder to measure the utilization of computer centers that are available on a drop-in basis.

Determining a computer lab consolidation plan is a major challenge. This step is important because it will dictate how many computing system we purchase and hence will have a direct impact on the budget request process. It is challenging to determine the impact of sharing labs by multiple departments as it may impact the teaching schedules of particular faculty members. For example, it does not appear to be feasible to change what is typically a day class into an evening class and vice versa.
A financial plan that can meet the goals of our technology upgrade and replacement plan will be an indirect challenge. If the financial plan is not adequate the upgrade and replacement plan cannot be implemented as designed.

Ensuring adequate staffing levels to maintain the technology equipment has been and will continue to be a challenge. This is complicated by the fact that many new technology systems are more complex than previous systems and employees will need to be either re-classified into the appropriate role or new employees in new job classifications will need to be hired. Continuing to collaborate effectively across all internal organizations will become a larger challenge than it currently is due to the changes that are anticipated as a result of the Accreditation report. For technology support staff this challenge will be compounded by the ever changing nature of technology itself.
Recommendation # 10 Financial Planning and Stability

Full recommendation text:

- Use mission statement to inform allocation of resources; match expenditures with financial resources.
- Increase reserves.
- Manage financial impact of unfunded long-term liabilities.

Related standards:

- III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c

Work group members:

- Alyssa Messer, Athena Steff, Susan Lopez, Carole Meagher, James Armstrong, John Bilmont, Steve Ngo, Ric Jazaie, Madeline Mueller, Mike McKeever, Rebeca Chavez, Stephanie Duncan, Steve Hale

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

1st Meeting July 27, 2012 – Chancellor informed the workgroup that their task is to create a list of all options for reducing costs on an ongoing basis and to provide that list intact for consideration by the Board of Trustees. Workgroup focuses on Recommendation #10 and the plan for adding resources to the accounting department to ensure that critical reports such as the Annual Financial Audit and the State 311 Report are completed before their due dates. Such action would allow these reports to be used during the new planning/ budgeting/assessment cycle.

2nd Meeting August 7, 2012 – Background data was presented to the workgroup showing the College’s financial outlook for the coming years. The workgroup reviewed a list of potential actions and strategies for reducing costs. The Workgroup discussed part of the list and offered modifications and additional ideas. The group suggested that columns should be added to the list for estimating potential savings and identifying issues related to each strategy.

3rd Meeting August 10, 2012 – The Workgroup further discussed the list of strategies to reduce spending. The chair reminded the group that their task is to create a list of all options for reducing costs on an ongoing basis; therefore the only reason to leave an idea of the list is if it does not generate savings.

4th Meeting August 17, 2012 - The Workgroup further discussed the list of strategies to reduce spending. Detailed discussion occurred regarding potential issues associated with each option.

5th Meeting August 29, 2012 The Workgroup further discussed the list of strategies to reduce spending. Spreadsheets were reviewed related to how savings will be calculated in a realistic fact based manner. These spreadsheets are attached. Detailed discussion occurred regarding potential issues associated with each option.
Small Group Mtg August 31, 2012 – A subgroup of five workgroup members met to go over the savings calculation methodology and assumptions in detail. Some modifications to estimated savings resulted from his session.

6th Meeting September 6, 2012 - The Workgroup added a few additional items to the matrix of savings options as well as revenue option related to non-resident fees. A lively discussion followed related to the importance of referring many items on the matrix to the appropriate collective bargaining tables.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

The completed list will serve as the first step for addressing this recommendation. Final decisions regarding which strategies are selected will be made by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. Implementation will need to begin during fiscal year 2012-13, this is particularly true if the Governor’s and the College’s ballot initiatives are not approved by voters.

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

The evidence documenting the group’s progress is the list of savings options. This list is attached. None of the actual strategies have been approved at this time.

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.

The list itself describes issues associated with each option.
Accreditation Work Group Progress Form

Recommendation # 11 Financial Integrity and Reporting

Full recommendation text:

- Provide accurate and timely reporting of financial information to internal users.
- Prepare information for audits so they can use it in annual and longer-term planning and budgeting processes.

Related standards:

III.D.1.d, III.D.2.g

Work group members:

- Alyssa Messer, Athena Steff, Susan Lopez, Carole Meagher, James Armstrong, John Bilmont, Steve Ngo, Ric Jazaie, Madeline Mueller, Mike McKeever, Rebeca Chavez, Stephanie Duncan, Steve Hale

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

1<sup>st</sup> Meeting July 27, 2012 – Chancellor informed the workgroup that their task is to create a list of all options for reducing costs on an ongoing basis and to provide that list intact for consideration by the Board of Trustees. Workgroup focuses on Recommendation #10 and the plan for adding resources to the accounting department to ensure that critical reports such as the Annual Financial Audit and the State 311 Report are completed before their due dates. Such action would allow these reports to be used during the new planning/ budgeting/assessment cycle.

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting August 7, 2012 – Background data was presented to the workgroup showing the College’s financial outlook for the coming years. The workgroup reviewed a list of potential actions and strategies for reducing costs. The Workgroup discussed part of the list and offered modifications and additional ideas. The group suggested that columns should be added to the list for estimating potential savings and identifying issues related to each strategy.

3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting August 10, 2012 – The Workgroup further discussed the list of strategies to reduce spending. The chair reminded the group that their task is to create a list of all options for reducing costs on an ongoing basis; therefore the only reason to leave an idea of the list is if it does not generate savings.

4<sup>th</sup> Meeting August 17, 2012 - The Workgroup further discussed the list of strategies to reduce spending. Detailed discussion occurred regarding potential issues associated with each option.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.
For the current fiscal year a variety of one-time resources will be brought in to meet deadlines for critical reports. These include one retiree returning to work, a contract with a private firm for part time consulting services, and short term reassignment of current staff. This effort is also assisted by the return of a current employee from maternity leave in September.

**Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.**

The accounting department has already secured two additional resources, a retired employee has returned temporarily to help with audit preparation work, and an auditor from a firm that has previously contracted with the college has been brought on a temporary part time basis to assist with key tasks needed for the audit. The accounting department is also seeking to temporarily reassign some existing employees from other departments whose expertise will be particularly useful during audit preparation. This has met with very limited success. All of these activities need to occur between August and December of 2012. These measures will only address the 2012 audit. A staffing plan will also be created to address the need for resources in the accounting department on an ongoing basis. Funding to fill three vacant positions in the accounting/budget department and two in the payroll department are included in the fiscal year 2012-13 budget.

**List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.**

The additional resources that are being brought in to produce an on time Annual Financial Audit and an on time Annual 311 report are not ongoing solutions. Additional permanent accounting staff is needed to fully address this recommendation. Staffing plan is attached.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Position Description</th>
<th>Target Hiring Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager IV</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>District Controller</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824 Senior Analyst</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget Analyst</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657 Senior Systems Accountant</td>
<td>Grant Fiscal Services</td>
<td>Assistant Controller over Grant reporting and management</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823 Senior Administrative Analyst</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Payroll management, reporting, and reconciliation over CALPERS, CALSTRS, SFERS retirement systems</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220 Payroll clerk</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Payroll processing</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Position Description</td>
<td>Target Hiring Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager IV</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>District Controller</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824 Senior Analyst</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget Analyst</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657 Senior Systems Accountant</td>
<td>Grant Fiscal Services</td>
<td>Assistant Controller over Grant reporting and management</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823 Senior Administrative Analyst</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Payroll management, reporting, and reconciliation over CALPERS, CALSTRS, SFERS retirement systems</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220 Payroll clerk</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Payroll processing</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Options for Reducing Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reduce the number of sites where classes are offered                  | • Consolidate into fewer sites to reduce cost of rent, utilities, services and administration without the loss of state “foundation grants”.  
• Consolidate programs even when it causes the loss of a “foundation grant” if savings are greater than the loss of income | See Attachment for expenses related to locations where the college incurs expenses for rent/utilities and supervision. | 1) Decreased access for some students who are unable to travel further for classes, with possible decline in enrollment.  
2) Loss of visibility for CCSF in some neighborhoods.  
3) Could cause faculty/staff layoffs, although not necessarily. |
| Eliminate specific instructional and student services programs and reduce the size of programs in decline | • Revised mission statement shows where resources should be allocated  
• Consolidate, reduce, or end programs based on data that shows which programs are experiencing declining enrollment and declining productivity  
• Consolidate, reduce, or end programs where research office data shows that employment or transfer opportunities are not available for students during the next five years  
• Consolidate, reduce, or end classes that are similar in content  
• Consolidate, reduce, or end special programs created by the Board of Trustees and/or by senior management | Assuming changes impact FTers and in turn PTers lose assignments, or PTers directly, the savings per PT FTE are $60,000. This number can be used to calculate savings for ending or reducing a program. FT savings would require March 15th letters and updated FSA analyses. | 1) Decreased enrollment could result in decreased revenue unless enrollment management is successful  
2) Possible elimination of a viable program based on limited data.  
3) Would cause faculty/staff bumping and layoffs. |
| Reduction of non-instructional faculty assignments                     | • Reduce district-funded reassignments of faculty away from teaching classes                                                                                                                                                                           | Assuming changes impact FTers and then PTers or PTers directly savings per PT FTE are $60,000               | 1) Increased workload for department chairs and administrators.  
2) Potential reduction of program and service quality.  
3) Would reduce part time faculty assignments. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Restructure academic and student services administrative functions</td>
<td>• Consolidation of existing academic and student services departments, with a goal of reducing the number of department chair positions&lt;br&gt;• Reorganize administrative functions including elimination of department chair positions, with department chair functions reassigned to new administrator positions.</td>
<td>See Attachment</td>
<td>1) Increased workload for administrators and remaining chairs, and possible need for additional administrators.&lt;br&gt;2) Loss of discipline/campus expertise and historical knowledge in some deptmts.&lt;br&gt;3) Would cause faculty layoffs as chairs return to full teaching loads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Administrator, and classified staff layoffs and / or work calendar reductions</td>
<td>• Layoff of administrators and classified employees&lt;br&gt;• Closure of all facilities on designated days. Employees would not be paid for these days.&lt;br&gt;• Consolidate classified staff assigned to administrators, classified managers, department chairs into smaller shared pools&lt;br&gt;• Reduce hours when libraries are open</td>
<td>Estimated savings per administrator avg $180K per FTE including all fringe benefits&lt;br&gt;Estimated savings for classified vary by job class see attachment for relevant classifications</td>
<td>1) Increased workload for remaining classified staff and/or administrators.&lt;br&gt;2) Less access to student services on non-instructional days.&lt;br&gt;3) Additional backlogs in understaffed units.&lt;br&gt;4) Loss of institutional expertise&lt;br&gt;5) Some services/functions could not continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Lab Aide Assignments</td>
<td>• Hire fewer students for fewer hrs worked&lt;br&gt;• Consolidate, reduce, or end off campus assignments</td>
<td>10% Reduction = $140K</td>
<td>1) Loss of income to students&lt;br&gt;2) Loss of work hrs for deptmts, making it difficult for some depts. to operate.&lt;br&gt;3) Decrease in student retention and loss of FTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Potential Actions</td>
<td>Estimated Savings</td>
<td>Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * Workload increases for faculty | • Reduce or eliminate load factors for faculty that exceed “1.0”, thereby increasing faculty workload  
• Increase work hours per week for counselors and librarians and other non-instructional faculty  
• Increase productivity by increasing enrollment capacity per section and reducing the number of sections offered. Establish WSCH/FTEF goals | Changes in workload would ultimately generate savings in the form of fewer assignment for PTers and less overload for FTers | 1) Potential decrease in the quality of instruction  
2) If workload is greater than other colleges, it may become more difficult to attract and retain candidates for faculty positions.  
3) Faculty may limit enrollment  
4) Would cause layoffs.                                                                 |
| * Other Workload changes for faculty | • Reduce or eliminate paid sabbatical leaves for faculty  
• Increase the number of annual work days for faculty  
• Limit banking related to overload assignments to reduce the potential unfunded liability for the college created by banked units.  
• Reduce or eliminate extra pay for “other professional responsibilities” | Estimated cost of sabbaticals when backfilled for 2012-13 = $800K | 1) Potential decrease in the quality of instruction  
2) If workload is greater than other colleges, it may become more difficult to attract and retain candidates for faculty positions.  
3) Could impact curriculum development                                                                 |
| * Workload increases for classified staff | • Increase classified work hours to forty hours per week  
• Increase number of work days for full year classified staff | Overtime pay is about $175k/yr | 1) Potential increased stress for staff.  
2) Potential loss of experienced staff.                                                                                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload increases for administrators</td>
<td>• Increase number of work days per year without a pay increase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Potential loss of experienced administrators. 2) It may become more difficult to attract and retain candidates for administrative positions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * Reduce the number of full-time faculty | • Reduce the number of full-time credit faculty with a goal of exceeding the “Full-time Faculty Obligation Number” (FON) issued by the State Chancellor’s Office by a small amount.  
• Reduce the number of full-time non-credit faculty. (FON obligation does not apply) |                   | 1) Decrease in overall faculty time/effort available to students 2) Increased workload for remaining full-time faculty. 3) Could cause faculty layoffs 4) Difficult to implement 5) May cause overreliance on part-time faculty |
| *Reduce the number of full year classified staff | • Reduce specific year-round classified positions to school term only                |                   | 1) Increase in workload for full-year employees, particularly during school breaks. 2) Possible backlogs in understaffed units. 3) Partial year layoffs, with consequent economic hardship. |
| *Changes to retiree benefits – New Hires | • Create 2nd Tier that eliminates retiree health benefits for anyone hired after a certain date.  
• Create 2nd Tier that reduces retiree health benefits for anyone hired after a certain date. |                   | 1) Creation of a “second-class” status for new hires, may generate resentment. 2) Addresses long-term liability but has no effect on current budget |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Changes to retiree benefits – Current employees and Retirees</td>
<td>● Require current employees to contribute towards the retiree health care benefit while they are working. &lt;br&gt;● Increase District contribution towards retiree health care long term liability by reducing other areas of spending (shift in cost no net savings) &lt;br&gt;● Reduce the cost to the district for health benefits for current retirees, by increasing the cost for current retirees</td>
<td></td>
<td>1)Reduces “take home pay” 2)Reduces resources for overall current compensation 3)Legally questionable unless entity becomes insolvent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Salary &amp; Wage Reductions and Changes</td>
<td>● Across-the-board % cuts for all employees  &lt;br&gt;● Reduce wages/salaries by a greater % for employees who are paid more, by a lower % for employees who are paid less  &lt;br&gt;● Reduce wages/salaries by type of work activity (i.e. overload, non-teaching assignments, subs, etc)  &lt;br&gt;● Reduce or eliminate the DCC stipend.  &lt;br&gt;● Shift all employees to monthly payroll system  &lt;br&gt;● Change criteria for salary/column movement</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Imposes economic hardship for all current employees. 2) May increase difficulty in attracting and retaining high-quality candidates for job openings. 3) Possible pay gap for all employees at startup of monthly payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>● Terminate employment funded by grants when grant expires  &lt;br&gt;● Set minimum acceptable indirect cost rate for grants  &lt;br&gt;● Only apply for grants that match mission statement priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1)Would result in layoffs after grant expires 2)District might not apply for grants that could improve programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Potential Actions</td>
<td>Estimated Savings</td>
<td>Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * Reduce Spending on Fringe Benefits for current employees | • Reduce district contributions for employee health plans, increase employee contributions  
• Change criteria for qualifying for health benefits  
• Elimination or reduce fringe benefits such as vision, dental or life insurance that employees do not contribute to  
• Requiring employees to pay for benefits that are currently district paid (dental care, etc.)  
• Switch to less expensive health care options (different plan, reduced benefits) if available  
• Two tier system for all benefits for all employees for all funds  
• Cafeteria style approach to fringes with reduced overall spending | | 1) Reduces take home pay for all affected employees.  
2) May increase difficulty in attracting and retaining high-quality candidates  
3) Likely to generate considerable resentment depending on how implemented |

Reduce Collegiate Athletics  
• Reduce the number of sports for which the College fields team

Reduce Costs for Testing and Assessment  
• Adopt practices of other districts

REVENUE ITEMS

Lease District Owned Property  
• Not a cost reduction but would generate revenue for the district.

Increase Non Resident Fees  
• Shift practice to average of Bay Area districts instead of lowest of Bay Area districts

# After fiscal analysis is completed, items that do not generate net savings will be dropped from this list

*This option involves issues that require bargaining. Action could not be taken without prior negotiations with one or more labor unions.
Accreditation Work Group Progress Form – 9’12’12
Workgroup #12/13

Updates to original document are highlighted in yellow

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Thursday, August 16.

Recommendation number and topic:
#12 -- Governance and Decision Making
#13 -- Governance Structures

Full recommendation text:

#12 – To fully meet Standard IV Leadership and Governance, the team recommends that the district engage the services of an external organization to provide a series of workshops for all college constituencies, including the members of the governing board, the chancellor, faculty, staff, students and every administrator, in order to clarify and understand their defined roles of responsibility and delineated authority in institutional governance and decision making (IV.A, IV.B).

#13 – To fully meet Standard IV.A Decision-making Roles and Processes, the team recommends that college leaders from all constituencies evaluate and improve the college’s governance structure and consequent processes used to inform decision making for the improvement of programs, practices and services. The college must ensure that the process does not create undue barriers to the implementation of institutional decisions, plans and initiatives (IV.A.1, IV.A.3).

Related standards:
Staffing – Workgroup #7
Board Organization – Workgroup #14

Work group members:
Pamila Fisher, Clara Starr, Tom Boegel, Laurie Scolari, Francine Podenski, Andrew Chandler, Doug Re, James Rogers, Attila Gabor, Aaron Holmberg, Raja Sutherland, Joshua Beisiegel, Hal Huntsman, Karen Saginor, John Rizzo, William Walker, Natalie Berg

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

July 19, 2012 – The workgroup introduced themselves, read over the recommendation and discussed generally what was working and not, and their experiences in shared governance. Members were assigned to come to the next meeting with more detailed information including a report on what is not working, what are barriers to decision making in negotiated contracts, and report on what is working.
August 1, 2012 – Group members discussed in further detail based on reports presented on the many aspects of shared governance that was/was not working. Perceptions of shared governance and participatory governance were discussed. The workgroup reviewed other college district models. Dr. Fisher shared with the group the various meetings and trainings planned for the future, including: Board meeting with guests Dr. Jack Scott and Dr. Scott Himbelstein; FCMAT oral remarks on Aug. 3; Aug. 6/7 board retreat; future training on governance issues by the California Community College League and State Academic Senate.

August 10, 2012 – Workgroup members reviewed the Shared Governance Evaluation document. The workgroup also discussed criteria, charge, and structure of ideal model of shared governance. Homework assignments included drafting language which would form the narrative/introduction of the values and criteria, and the structure of an ideal governance system.

August 27, 2012 – Workgroup members discussed outcomes of the CCCL/AS Training with Scott Lay and Michelle Pilati. They reviewed draft narratives of an ideal policy – workgroup members suggested edits and added additional concepts, e.g. the role of committee chairs, how we operationalize values in the charge, adding term limits, training, pathways for ideas. The workgroup agreed in principle to the concept of having one “super-council” which is advisory. Homework assignments were distributed to combine the structure and values statement and to further review the shared governance policy (separating out sections related to the Academic Senate).

September 10, 2012 – Workgroup members continued to discuss the shared governance policy, including the introductory new narrative for an ideal model, and discussed a new draft policy. Under continued discussion is defining further the charge, structure, and operating guidelines for the policy. Model policies will be reviewed again to refine the policy.

September 24, 2012 – Next meeting.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

1. ACCJC Training with Board of Trustees – The Accrediting Commission President, Dr. Barbara Beno, with Trustee William “Bill” McGinnis of Butte-Glenn Community College District presented a 2-hour workshop on the topic of accreditation’s purposes, processes and standards, the roles and responsibilities of trustees, advice for board excellence and examples. (Completed July 10, 2012)

2. Community College League Training with State Academic Senate – Scott Lay, President of the California Community College League, and Michelle Pilati of the State Academic Senate, conducted a training workshop titled “Participating Effectively in District and College Governance – The Law, Regulation and Guidelines.” They provided a half-day training for all constituent groups and then met individually with the leadership of constituent groups. The College expects to receive a report with their recommendations in late September. (Completed August 23, 2012)

3. Association of Community Colleges Trustees (ACCT) Training – Dr. Narcisa Polonio, President of ACCT, conducted a self-evaluation of the board and held a two part retreat to better understand the roles and responsibilities of the board, and to outline common board goals. (Completed August 6 and 7, 2012)
4. Report on what is working – Discussion included the merits of representation and diversity in committee appointments, shared governance provides for connectivity and district-wide communication, makes use of volunteer time supplementary to operations, allows proposal of new ideas, and feedback mechanisms. (Completed August 1, 2012)

5. Report on what is not working – Discussion focused on lack of understanding of shared governance, confusion with participatory governance, culture of circumventing governing bodies. Other issues included the number and level of committees, unclear decision making processes, lack of authority for administrators, sense of frustration and disenfranchisement, scheduling and communication issues. (Completed August 1, 2012)

6. Report on barriers to decision making in negotiated contracts – Areas discussed in the workgroup included the vacancy review group, the AFT2121 contract, the issue of part-time loads, Counseling transfers, calendar, and grievances procedures, organizational culture, and unavailability of chairs over the summer. Items relating to Workgroup #7 were forwarded to them, including the AFT2121 contract, training of supervisors/administrators, counseling issues, department chair issues. (Completed August 1, 2012)

7. Review sample policies on shared governance – Workgroup members reviewed the Yosemite, Pasadena, San Mateo, Contra Costa, and Santa Rosa models. (Completed August 1, 2012)

8. Identify ideal criteria of model – The workgroup discussed the criteria, charge, and structure of an ideal model. The following table represents the draft brainstorm of the group. Workgroup members will formalize this at following meeting into statement/narrative format. (Completed August 10, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Grounded in solid processes and outcomes</td>
<td>• Understanding roles</td>
<td>• Clarity of components and roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collegiality</td>
<td>• Training</td>
<td>• No one component can dominate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mutual trust and respect</td>
<td>• Promotes better college</td>
<td>• Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Simplicity</td>
<td>• Authority/responsibility/accountability</td>
<td>• Accessibility for participation / opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficient</td>
<td>(with default deciders)</td>
<td>• Promote student voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action-oriented</td>
<td>• Timeliness</td>
<td>• Term limits/appointment process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparent</td>
<td>• Clarify charge of committees</td>
<td>• Pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages diversity of voices</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear chair/responsibilities/agendas/minutes (need template)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recruits experience/expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Agenda building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data informed decisions (quantitative vs. qualitative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culture of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student centered (impact on students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect for decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholder input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advisory Committee which ultimately may get formed should be charged with following:

• Budget
• Planning
• Policy
• Institutional Effectiveness
9. Draft new model – With step 8 in progress, the model will be further discussed at the August 27 meeting. The Workgroup continues to work on a draft board policy which includes an introductory statement embracing the values noted in the brainstorm session on Aug. 10 and defining the charge, structure, and operating guidelines. The workgroup reviewed an initial draft policy at its September 10 meeting and will continue to work on refining the statement.

10. Identify ways to improve student participation – Students receive stipends for participating in meetings, a practice which had stopped for a few years. This practice is being reinstated and is anticipated to help increase participation.

11. Proposed revised policy – The workgroup initially intended on having a draft ready for board feedback by Sept. 27, 2012. This work will likely not be completed by then, though much progress has occurred. At its September 24 workgroup meeting, the workgroup will discuss next steps after reviewing the 2nd draft of the policy.


13. Address Climate/Culture issues – This is an item to consider when time allows to articulate the campus climate and culture and how it can be improved upon as the governing structure evolves.

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

The workgroup has completed its analysis of the shared governance process and is now working to develop a model which will be more efficient and effective. Several trainings have been held with the board, and further training will be conducted for the other constituent groups by the California Community College League and State Academic Senate.

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.

The dialogue has been honest and difficult in recognizing the challenges of the shared governance system. As a model is developed and discussed, there may be some resistance to improvements since the status quo roles and authority of various stakeholders are questioned and redefined to meet the accreditation recommendation.
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Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Thursday, August 16.

Recommendation number and topic:
Recommendation #14  Board Organization

Full recommendation text:
To fully meet Standard IV.B Board and Administrative Organization, the team recommends that the board act in a manner consistent with its policies and by-laws, assess and develop operating procedures, develop and implement a plan for board development, and regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its policies and practices (IV.B.1.a, e-h).

Related standards:
- Leadership Governance Decision Making and Governance Structures: #12/#13

Work group members:
- Board of Trustees: John Rizzo (President); Anita Grier (Vice President); Natalie Berg; Chris Jackson; Steve Ngo; Rodrigo Santos; Lawrence Wong; William Walker (Student Trustee)

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

August 23, 2012 – At its regular meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Board discussed the following items related to the recommendation and accreditation. This included the following:

1. Board of Trustees Self-Assessment Retreat and Draft Goals for 2012-2013 – On August 6 and 7 the Board of Trustees participated in a retreat that focused on Board roles and best practices. Facilitated by Dr. Narcisa Polonio of the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), the Board also identified some tentative goals and priorities for the coming year. Most of these goals were related either to the self-assessment or the accreditation recommendations, or both. Dr. Polonio prepared a set of recommendations based on the retreat and her individual conversations with trustees. These recommendations and a draft statement of Board goals were presented for the Board’s consideration. The Board reviewed and adopted the following goals for 2012-13:

   The Board of Trustees will:
   1. Ensure appropriate responses to the recommendations of the Accrediting Commission.
   2. Adopt a short and long term plan for acquiring fiscal stability.
   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 shared 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!

2. Recommendation #14: Board of Trustees Plan – Recommendation #14 pertains strictly to Board organization, performance and effectiveness. Thus the team members are the entire board and they need to confirm the response plan and determine who will take responsibility for carrying out the various components of the plan. The Chancellor presented a draft plan which the Board discussed. There was general consensus on the plan and activity matrix. Many of the specific activities/items noted in the recommendation had already taken place or were organized immediately upon receipt of the Accrediting Commission’s evaluation report. Some of the activities are also directly related to the workgroup dealing with shared governance and leadership (Workgroup #12/#13). Board members volunteered to take responsibility for certain activities.

3. Accreditation Progress Report – The Chancellor and the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Gohar Momjian presented a comprehensive report on the structure, activities, timeline and progress of the workgroups addressing the 14 recommendations and unmet eligibility requirements cited by the Accrediting Commission. The Board of Trustees reviewed the report and approved the working plans.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

1. ACCJC Training with Board of Trustees - The Accrediting Commission President, Dr. Barbara Beno, with Trustee William “Bill” McGinnis of Butte-Glenn Community College District presented a 2-hour workshop on the topic of accreditation’s purposes, processes and standards, the roles and responsibilities of trustees, advice for board excellence and examples. (Completed July 10, 2012)

2. Board Self-Assessment - Dr. Narcisa Polonio, President of Association of Community Colleges Trustees (ACCT), conducted a self-evaluation of the board and held a two part retreat to better understand the roles and responsibilities of the board, and to outline common board goals. (Completed August 6 and 7, 2012)

3. Review of Board Bylaws and Policies – Specific policies noted on the work matrix include:
   a. Mission Statement – This is specifically addressed in workgroup #1 report; at a speciation meeting the Board reviewed a proposed statement and provided additional direction for revisions (completed August 14, 2012); first reading of revised statement completed August 23, 2012; second reading and adoption of revised mission statement completed on September 11, 2012.
   b. Self-Assessment – The policy is under review and will be included in Item e below as all board policies are reviewed; the board conducted its self-assessment (completed August 6-7, 2012), with adoption of 2012-13 goals (completed August 23, 2012)
   c. Attendance at Meetings – The Board of Trustees adopted revisions to its Board Policy 1.01, titled “Election and Membership” which deals with Board compensation. This policy amendment is intended to adhere to best practices of the District. The
amendment is based on language recommended by the California League of Community Colleges. First reading of the policy was conducted on July 26, 2012. At its second reading, the board adopted the revised Board Policy 1.01 ELECTION AND MEMBERSHIP (Completed August 23, 2012).

d. Shared Governance – This policy will be under review and is being addressed specifically in Workgroup #12/#13. As part of workgroup #12/#13 activity, Mr. Scott Lay, President of the California Community College League, and Michelle Pilati of the California Community College Academic Senate [need formal title] presented a workshop on [need title]. The workshop was attended by three Trustees and further professional development on the topic will be considered as part of the Board’s professional development plan.

However, the Board’s agreement with the Academic Senate regarding the 10+1 and ‘rely primarily’ or ‘consult collegially’ will need to be addressed directly. [Need to better describe plan for moving forward on this]

e. Board Organization, including committees, agenda development, etc – The Chancellor and staff has completed its review of Board’s Policy Manual Section 1, titled The Governing Board, the Community, and The Chancellor. The Board’s Policy Committee will review the proposed amendments to the policies in October (date tbd) to bring the policies up to date and align them with best practice models.

4. Create Professional Development Plan – [Steve Ngo was assigned to this item. What is plan to move forward on it?] – CCCL/AS Training

5. Adopt Board Goals – The Board reviewed and adopted its goals for the 2012-13 year as described above. (Completed August 23, 2012)

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

See above list. Related documents:

- ACCJC Training on Board Roles and Responsibilities presentation (July 10, 2012)
- ACCT Self-Assessment Retreat documents and presentation (August 6-7, 2012)
- Board Goals 2012-13 (August 23, 2012)
- Amended policies to date: Mission Statement; Board Election and Membership

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.
Accreditation Work Group Progress Form – 9’12’12

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Thursday, August 16.

Recommendation number and topic:
Special Topic: Centers and Sites

Purpose of the workgroup is to analyze and assess the issues regarding centers and sites as referenced in the accreditation recommendations; and to identify and where possible collect data necessary for a fiscal and programmatic analysis of CCSF centers and sites.

Full recommendation text:
N/A

Related standards:
#2 – Planning; #5 – Student Services; #8 - Physical Resources; #10 /11 - Finances

See attached document highlighting specific references to centers and sites within the various recommendations.

Work group members:
Pamila Fisher; Pamela Mery; David Liggett; Jorge Bell; Peter Goldstein; Thelma Scott-Skillman; Sunny Clark; Beth Cataldo; Fred Teti; Ms. Bob Davis; Steve Kech; Linda Shaw; Bouchra Simmons; Emanuel Andreas; John Rizzo; Anita Grier; Bob Agrella; Shannell Williams; Mary Kapp

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

August 17, 2012 – During the first meeting, members introduced themselves and the Chancellor explained the initial charge of the workgroup. Members reviewed the many references to centers and sites found within the recommendations. The workgroup focused on further defining its charge, exploring possible activities, and identifying the kinds of information necessary to conduct an analysis of CCSF’s centers and sites. The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration provided an overview of the types of centers and sites the college utilizes, e.g. Category A (College and Centers that receive Foundation Grants); Category B (leased sites, no foundation grants and pay significant rent); Category C (leased sites, no foundation grant, pay very little amount of rent); Category D (owned sites).

September 6, 2012 – The Deans of the following centers and sites provided background information and reports such as what sections are offered, programs and/or departments represented, how many faculty teach, how many staff work there, hours of operation, how space is used, what student populations are served, etc.
Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

The workgroup will review data and information relevant to conducting a fiscal and programmatic analysis of centers and sites, in order to more cost effectively and efficiently serve students. The following information will be considered:

- Definitions of Centers/Sites
- Total Cost of Operation
- Foundation Grants
- Course Offerings / Sections per Center
- Human Resources Allocation
- Student Data (including addresses)
- Proximity to Alternative Locations/Transportation
- Real Estate Value
- Site Utilization
- Productivity
- Other Factors/Data

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

This workgroup’s analysis will take more time compared to the other workgroups. Many factors within the other recommendations will affect the analysis of this workgroup, e.g. staffing plans, financial decisions, and board direction.

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.
Recommendation 2: Effective Planning Processes

To fully meet Standard I.B Institutional Effectiveness, the team recommends the college to develop a strategy for fully implementing its existing planning process to look at each campus and site, examine revenues and expenses, and systematically address instructional program planning, staffing requirements, provision of student and library services, including facilities needs and competing priorities. The planning process should include clearly prescribed roles and scope of authority for all governance stakeholders involved in each component of the planning process (I.A.3, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.B.3.a, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a-b, III.C.1.a-c, III.C.2, III.D.1.a-c, III.D.2.a-c, III.2.g, III.3, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, and IV.2.a).

Recommendation 5: Student Support Services

To fully meet Standard II.B Student Support Services, the team recommends that the institution systematically assess student support services using student learning outcomes and other appropriate measures to improve the effectiveness of its support services and develop as well as communicate its plans for the expansion of delivery and prioritization of student services that support student learning and achievement regardless of location or means of delivery (II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f and II.B.4).

Recommendation 8: Physical Resources

To fully meet Standard III.B Physical Resources, the team recommends that the college incorporate all costs required to appropriately operate and maintain existing facilities, whether owned or leased, into its annual and long-term planning and budgeting processes and annually allocate the required human and fiscal resources to effectively and equitably operate and maintain physical resources at locations where courses, programs and services are offered (III.B.1).

Recommendation 10: Financial Planning and Stability

To meet the Standard III.D Financial Resources, the team recommends that the college use its mission statement to inform its allocation of resources decisions to match annual, ongoing expenditures with ongoing financial resources. This action is needed to increase its reserves to a prudent level that will allow it to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences, to meet its operating expenses without excessive short-term borrowing, and to effectively manage the financial impact of its unfunded, long-term liabilities (III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c).
Specific references from March 2012 Evaluation Report:

Pg. 23 on Mission: The team finds that the current, ongoing funding for San Francisco City College appears insufficient to fully fund the mission of the college as it is currently conceived. CCSF’s commitment to distributed instructional sites, and community-specific educational programming for those sites, strains the college’s ability to adequately fund and staff those sites and programs.

Pg. 28 on Planning: In order to carry out the institutional priorities, it will be necessary for City College of San Francisco to conduct comprehensive and continuous evaluation and integrated planning processes that are effectively linked to a more realistic assessment of the supply of human, physical, technological and financial resources, in order to make informed resource allocation decisions in accordance with clearly delineated roles and scope of authority.

Pg. 40 on Student Support Services: The institution’s pride in the expansion of student support services to several of the primary campuses was evident. Student services personnel reported that the college determined which services would be offered at which of its nine primary campuses based on feedback received from students by various methods that included equity hearings, listening sessions, and meetings with students enrolled in basic skills as well as from faculty teaching basic skills at the different campuses. Although the college offers a variety of services at the different locations, the array of services are different by location (II.B.3.a).

The team concluded that not all services give the impression of being equitably or adequately offered to students regardless of service location or delivery method (II.B.3.a). This impression was underscored by the differing reporting lines for the same and like services. For example, counseling services at each of the primary campuses are assigned to different divisions with different reporting lines. This structure created challenges to effective communication and collaboration (II.B.1). In general, the decentralization of some support services increased student access for some to some services, but not all, along each student’s academic journeys at the campuses of the City College of San Francisco (II.B.3.a, II.B.4).

Pg. 41: The recently designated Interim Vice Chancellor of Campuses and Enrollment Services is enthusiastic about the prospects for providing comprehensive student services at the primary campuses. This leadership and enthusiasm should be aimed at creating and implementing a comprehensive student support services plan to meet the varied needs of its students regardless of location and through distance education. The plan should document the evaluation that is occurring and the program review and SLO assessment yet to be completed to close the loop to improve student support services.

Pg. 51 on Physical Resources: Recent staff reductions have resulted in an administrative realignment of duties among positions with management oversight of facilities and their operations. The adequacy of administrative oversight for facilities maintenance and operations is dubious considering the size of the facility plant and the age of many buildings and could quickly jeopardize compliance with the standard (III.A.2, III.B.1, and III.B.2).

The team encourages the college to expand its understanding of the Total Cost of Ownership Model and to utilize this model when planning for new capital construction projects, including facilities, equipment, maintenance and replacement decisions. The team urges the college to continuously evaluate the effective use of physical resources to improve the college’s ability to provide the physical resources to support the educational programs and services to the diverse communities it serves on nine primary campuses (III.B.2).

Pg. 57 on Financial Resources: The financial situation at City College of San Francisco continues to deteriorate. The budget does not realistically provide the financial resources necessary to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.