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This is a first draft of the Show Cause Report due to ACCJC on March 15, 2013, based on the compilation of templates completed by the accreditation workgroups.

At this time, the following sections have been edited and are available in Word documents on the Accreditation website:

- Section 1.A. Introduction
- Section 1.B. Organization of the Self Evaluation Process
- Section 1.D. Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Eligibility Standards
- Portions of Section 1.G. Institutional Analysis of the ACCJC Standards:
  - Standard I.A.
  - Standard I.B.
  - Standard II.A.
  - Standard II.B.
  - Standard II.C.
  - Standard IV.A.
  - Standard IV.B.
  - Special Focus: Centers and Sites

Section 2. Closure Report

We will post the remaining sections (E and F) and Standards (III.A., III.B., III.C., and III.D.) as Word documents as they are edited.

Please note:

- In general, the “Actionable Improvement Plans” are still in progress for all standards.
- We are also still working on developing a style guide in line with that of ACCJC for purposes of consistency in matters such as capitalization, the placement of references to evidence, the elimination of passive voice, nomenclature, etc. We will address the current inconsistencies in later drafts.
- In the next round of editing we plan to incorporate feedback from reviewers, create consistent references to evidence, reduce redundancy, make the descriptions more concise where possible, incorporate exemplars where needed and as appropriate, clean up all formatting, and ensure that the relationship of Distance Education across the Standards is appropriately described.
- The final Show Cause Report will include a glossary of acronyms.
- This replaces the preliminary draft circulated to the Accreditation Steering Committee on January 14, 2013.

We need your feedback! Instructions for submitting feedback:

Faculty, please send comments to: Karen Saginor, ksaginor@ccsf.edu
Classified Staff, please send feedback to James Rogers, jrogers@ccsf.edu
Administrators, please send feedback to Kristin Charles, kcharles@ccsf.edu
Students, please send feedback to William Walker, ccsfwill@gmail.com
Key for highlighting used in the draft:

Sources of evidence are highlighted in yellow.

Information that is needed or needs to be checked is highlighted in fuchsia. (also at time indicated via comments)
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To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman, Interim Chancellor
(Name of Chief Executive Officer)
City College of San Francisco
(Name of Institution)
50 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112
(Address)

This Show Cause Report is submitted to the ACCJC for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's accreditation status.

I certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and I believe the Show Cause Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Signed

Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman, Interim Chancellor

John Rizzo, President, Board of Trustees

Karen Saginor, President, Academic Senate

James Rogers, President, Classified Senate

William Walker, Student Trustee
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1. Institutional Self Evaluation Report

A. Introduction
On July 3, 2012, City College of San Francisco (CCSF) received the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College’s (ACCJC) decision letter and evaluation report issuing a Show Cause sanction to the College. In that letter, ACCJC identified 14 Recommendations and communicated that the institution must submit a Special Report by October 15, 2012, and a Show Cause Report by March 15, 2013. The College organized itself in a very short timeframe, gathering input from over 200 CCSF faculty, staff, administrators, trustees, and students to develop and begin implementing plans to address the 14 Recommendations.

The Special Report was produced under the leadership of then-Interim Chancellor Dr. Pamila Fisher. Her appointment ended October 31, 2012. On November 1, 2012, Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman took over as Interim Chancellor with direction from the CCSF Board of Trustees to implement the plans set forth in the Special Report and to fulfill the College’s obligations in meeting the ACCJC Accreditation Standards.

On October 25, 2012, CCSF’s Board of Trustees accepted the State Chancellor’s nominee for a Special Trustee, Dr. Robert Agrella. On November 7, 2012, four Trustees were elected (three incumbents and one new member) who took office in January 2012.

B. Organization of the Self Evaluation Process
The following section describes the organization for developing and producing this Show Cause Report, the individuals who were involved in its preparation, and the chronological timeline of meetings and milestones.

The approach for City College’s Show Cause report was to conduct a new Self Evaluation that follows the ACCJC Guidelines for Institutional Self Evaluation (June 2011 Edition). This approach and format is based on the July 2012 ACCJC letter and evaluation report indicating that the College must “show cause” why it should be accredited, demonstrate compliance with all ACCJC Eligibility Requirements, demonstrate compliance with all ACCJC Accreditation Standards, demonstrate compliance with ACCJC Policies, and demonstrate progress toward correcting deficiencies noted by the Accrediting Commission. Additional communications between then-Interim Chancellor Dr. Pamila Fisher and ACCJC President Barbara Beno and between Accreditation Liaison Officer Gohar Momjian, Dean of Grants and Resource Development Kristin Charles (report writer/editor), and ACCJC Vice Presidents Susan Clifford and Jack Pond, confirmed this approach. Ultimately, the institution bears the burden of proof for showing why CCSF should be accredited.

Work on the Show Cause Report began immediately following the submission of the October 15 Special Report which described the College’s progress and additional plans to address the 14 Recommendations identified by the Accrediting Commission in its July 2012 Evaluation Report. Workgroups composed of administrators, faculty, staff and students provided input into the development of the October 15 report. Each of the workgroups was responsible for addressing one of the 14 Recommendations, which in turn related to the four ACCJC Accreditation Standards.
On October 16, 2012, the Accreditation Steering Committee met to debrief on the submission of the Special Report and review the organization for the Show Cause Report. The Steering Committee consists of the workgroup leaders (most of whom are administrators); constituent leaders of the College including the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, American Federation of Teachers (AFT) 2121, Service Employees International Union (SEIU) 1021, and Department Chair Council (DCC); the Student Trustee; and the Board President and Vice President. In addition, the Steering Committee includes the Accreditation Liaison Officer, Accreditation Assistant, and Dean of Grants and Resource Development, who is responsible for the final writing and editing of the Special and Show Cause Reports. Given its constituency representation, the Steering Committee plays a role in helping to provide transparency and promote communication around accreditation activities.

The Steering Committee reviewed a chart of responsibility that assigned each of the 14 workgroups (who had previously worked on the 14 Recommendations) to respond to specific Accreditation Standards. When a Standard did not clearly fall in a particular workgroup’s purview, the ALO assigned the administrator in charge of areas relating to that Standard to draft a response. The workgroups were responsible for drafting summary descriptions in response to the Standard, a self-evaluation, and actionable improvement plan(s). The Accreditation Liaison Officer requested that workgroup leaders utilize templates to submit a Show Cause Progress Report in November 2012 followed by a Show Cause Report in December 2012 for each of their assigned Standards. The Show Cause Report templates from each workgroup formed the basis for this Show Cause Report.

An additional component of the Show Cause report is a section focused on the College’s Centers and sites. Given the references to Centers and sites throughout the 14 Recommendations in the ACCJC’s July 2012 Evaluation Report, Interim Chancellor Fisher formed a “special focus” workgroup, which has been identifying and collecting the data necessary to conduct a fiscal and programmatic analysis of Centers and sites. This topic appeared explicitly in several of the Recommendations, primarily in Workgroup 1 (Mission), Workgroup 2 (Effective Planning Process), Workgroup 5 (Student Services), Workgroup 8 (Physical Resources), and Workgroup 10 (Financial Planning), and it was felt that the work would be better coordinated and more effective if addressed by a single group. Workgroup 15 members include the workgroup leaders noted above in addition to trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives. In November 2012, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Center Deans joined the workgroup.

The Chancellor is responsible for preparing the Closure Report, a required companion document to the Show Cause Report, in consultation with the CCSF Board of Trustees, the Accrediting Commission, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.

The Steering Committee also reviewed a timeline of milestones and key meetings of College stakeholders to provide input to the draft Show Cause report (see “Overview of Timeline” below). In addition to Steering Committee discussions on the Show Cause Report, the newly formed Participatory Governance Council played a central role in reviewing and providing feedback on the report. The Accreditation Liaison Officer provided monthly updates to the Board of Trustees during their regularly held meetings. In addition, the Board held a Special Meeting in early February to focus exclusively on the Show Cause Report and provide feedback and input prior to its final review of the report.
Overview of Timeline

- October 16, 2012 – Steering Committee Meeting
- October 25, 2012 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Accreditation Progress Report
- November 6, 2012 – Steering Committee Meeting
- November 9, 2012 – Workgroup Progress Report Forms Due
- November 15, 2012 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Accreditation Progress Report
- November 19, 2012 – Steering Committee Meeting
- December 7, 2012 – Workgroup Show Cause Templates Due
- December 13, 2012 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Accreditation Progress Report
- December 18, 2012 – Participatory Governance Council
- January 8, 2013 – Steering Committee Meeting – Review Preliminary Show Cause Report
- January 14, 2013 – 1st Preliminary DRAFT report (pdf) to Steering Committee
- January 18, 2013 – 1st DRAFT Show Cause Report online
- January 24, 2013 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Review 1st DRAFT Show Cause Report
- January 30, 2013 – Evidence due for all Accreditation Standards
- February 4, 2013 – Deadline for feedback on 1st DRAFT
- February 5, 2013 – Steering Committee Meeting – Review 2nd DRAFT Show Cause Report
- February 11, 2013 – 2nd DRAFT report online for college review and feedback
- February 28, 2013 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Last DRAFT Show Cause Report

Evidence/appendices: Overview Timeline; Assignment Chart of Responsibility; List of Steering Committee members; List of Workgroup members; Progress Report; Show Cause Template; Agendas/ Notes of Steering Committee and Participatory Governance Council, Board Meetings

C. Organizational Information

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief history of City College of San Francisco and to highlight major developments that the institution has undergone since the last educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, including enrollment data, summary data on the labor market, demographic and socioeconomic data, as well as names/locations of sites where 50% or
more of a program, certificate or degree is available to students and any other off-campus sites or centers.

Accreditation
In July 2012, the ACCJC issued a show cause sanction to City College of San Francisco. The burden of proof is currently on City College of San Francisco to show why it should continue to be accredited. In October 2012, City College of San Francisco submitted the first of two required reports (the “Special Report”) to the ACCJC to demonstrate progress toward resolving the issues raised by the ACCJC contained within four of the Eligibility Requirements and within 14 Recommendations regarding the Standards. This Institutional Self Evaluation Report, along with the enclosed Closure Report, collectively constitutes the “Show Cause Report,” the second of the two required reports.

In writing this institutional self evaluation, within the context of a show cause sanction, the College is providing documentation of major historical changes, as well as cultural shifts and struggles, as they take place in the present, a “History in the Making.”

History
City College of San Francisco was founded in 1935 in response to demand for a public institution to serve both academic and vocational needs of students as an integral part of the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). The College was first housed in temporary facilities with an enrollment of 1,074 students and 74 faculty members. The College rapidly expanded and held classes in 22 locations. In 1937, the San Francisco Board of Education approved a building plan for the College in 1937 which included a 56-acre site of what is now the Ocean Campus.

Beginning with the opening of Science Hall in 1940, and with federal and state grants, the College expanded and built many new buildings during the 1950s and 1960s. In 1970, the College separated from SFUSD, and a new entity, the San Francisco Community College District, was formed. This entity also included the Adult and Occupational Education Division of SFUSD. The College maintained these neighborhood education programs composed primarily of noncredit courses. With rapid growth, the College District subsequently formed two separate divisions: one for credit courses on the Ocean Campus and another for noncredit courses offered throughout San Francisco. The two divisions were merged in 1990 and a single City College of San Francisco was created.

With approved bond measures in 1997, 2001, and 2005, the College renovated, expanded and developed new buildings and facilities throughout the City of San Francisco. The College currently serves over 85,000 students (credit and noncredit) throughout the City through one main Campus, nine Centers, and a multitude of neighborhood sites.

Student Data – get from Pam use Aug. 14, 2012 data from BOT meeting, maybe update
Labor Market Data – see if can use same tables, limit to most pertinent ones
Demographic and Socioeconomic Data – get from Pam use Aug. 14, 2012 data from BOT meeting, update if can
Principal locations – Campus and Centers – include map w/locations
Table 1 summarizes the number of certificates and degrees having more than 50 percent of the unit requirements offered at Center outside the Ocean Campus, and the Centers where they are offered. These certificates and degrees represent 11 departments from across the College: Administration of Justice and Fire Science; Automotive/Motorcycle, Construction, and Building Maintenance; Business; Child Development and Family Studies; Culinary Arts and Hospitality Studies; English as a Second Language; Graphic Communications; Health Care Technology; Journalism; Licensed Vocational Nursing; and Transitional Studies.

### Table 1: Number of Certificate and Degree Programs
(At least 50% offered at a Center)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centers</th>
<th>Total Credit Certificates</th>
<th>Total Noncredit Certificates</th>
<th>Total Associate Degrees</th>
<th>New Credit Certificates since 2006</th>
<th>New Noncredit Certificates since 2006</th>
<th>New Associate Degrees since 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown/North Beach</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 60 credit and 46 noncredit certificates, and 9 associate degree programs have more than 50 percent of their unit requirements offered at one or more of the centers outside the main campus. Of these, 10 of the credit and 31 of the noncredit certificates, plus one of the associate degrees have attained this status since 2006.

### D. Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Eligibility Standards

#### 1. Authority

The institution is authorized or licensed to operate as an educational institution and to award degrees by an appropriate governmental organization or agency as required by each of the jurisdictions or regions in which it operates.

City College of San Francisco is a public two-year community college operating under the authority of the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District.
City College of San Francisco is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. This organization is recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education. [CCSF 2012-13 Catalog, pp. ii and 2]

The College also offers programs accredited by the American Culinary Federation Accrediting Commission, the California Board of Registered Nursing, the Commission on Accreditation of the American Dental Association, the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Programs, the Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management, the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation, and the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology. [CCSF 2012-13 Catalog, p. 2]

In July 2012, the ACCJC issued a show cause sanction to City College of San Francisco. The burden of proof is currently on City College of San Francisco to show why it should continue to be accredited. In October 2012, City College of San Francisco submitted the first of two required reports (the “Special Report”) to the ACCJC to demonstrate progress toward resolving the issues raised by the ACCJC contained within four of the Eligibility Requirements and within 14 Recommendations regarding the Standards. This Institutional Self Evaluation Report, along with the enclosed Closure Report, collectively constitute the “Show Cause Report,” the second of the two required reports.

2. Mission

The institution’s educational mission is clearly defined, adopted, and published by its governing board consistent with its legal authorization, and is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education and the constituency it seeks to serve. The mission statement defines institutional commitment to achieving student learning.

The Board of Trustees publicly affirms the College’s educational Mission Statement and, per Board Policy 1.00 (revised in October 2012), will review it annually in light of internal and external data and update it as necessary based on that review. This change to an annual cycle is in response to one of the ACCJC’s 14 Recommendations that it issued in July 2012. The most recent review of the mission occurred in Fall 2012 as part of the revisions to Board Policy 1.00, is aligned with California Education Code, and utilized data to inform revisions. The current statement explicitly references measuring student learning outcomes to enhance student success and equity. The Mission Statement appears in the CCSF Strategic Plan and is published in the official College Catalog. [CCSF Catalog, p. iii] It is also published on the College website. [http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/mission-and-vision.html]

3. Governing Board

The institution has a functioning governing board responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution’s mission is being carried out. This board is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the

---

1 The current Strategic Plan contains the previous Mission Statement; this will be updated to reflect the current Mission Statement at that time.
institution are used to provide a sound educational program. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities.

The governing board is an independent policy-making body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest in board activities and decisions. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The board adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

The seven-member Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District is an independent policymaking board that ensures that the District’s educational mission is being implemented. The Board is also responsible for ensuring the quality, integrity, and financial stability of City College of San Francisco. Members are elected for four-year, staggered terms. To ensure adherence to Board policy regarding conflicts of interest, Board members must disclose whether they have any financial interest (employment, family, ownership, or personal) in the College or the District; at this time, no current Board members have such interest in the College or District. [Board Policy 1.19]

As a result of ACCJC’s July 2012 show cause determination, the Board reviewed its bylaws and policies as contained in Policy Manual Section 1, “The Governing Board, The Community, The Chancellor,” resulting in changes to policies, the elimination of policies, and the development of new policies to be in line with the ACCJC Standards. [Policy Manual Section 1; Board agenda(s) that outline changes to policies, etc.]

In addition, the District revamped its annual assessment, planning, and budgeting process, with Program Review serving as a central mechanism for data-informed decision making—at all levels up to and including the Board—with respect to growth and reduction within the context of supporting the institutional mission. [Reference Board agenda in which planning process was approved]

Moreover, the Board approved a voluntary request for the appointment of a Special Trustee by the State Chancellor for California Community Colleges in September 2012 to assist in Board deliberations and to further enhance Board effectiveness. [September 2012 resolution re. Special Trustee]

4. Chief Executive Officer

The institution has a chief executive officer appointed by the governing board, whose full-time responsibility is to the institution, and who possesses the prerequisite authority to administer board policies. Neither the district/system chief executive officer nor the institutional chief executive officer may serve as the chair of the governing board. The institution informs the Commission immediately when there is a change in the institutional chief executive officer.

City College of San Francisco’s chief executive officer (chancellor) is appointed by the Board of Trustees. The chancellor’s primary responsibility is to the institution, and the chancellor possesses the authority to administer board policies. [Board Policy 1.25]

The District recently has undergone transitions in leadership due to the departure of Chancellor Dr. Don Griffin in May 2012. The Board appointed Interim Chancellor Dr. Pamila Fisher as his replacement; Dr. Fisher agreed to stay through the end of October 2012. Subsequently, the
Board appointed Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman to fill the role of Interim Chancellor in November 2012. All transitions have been communicated to the ACCJC. [Board resolutions appointing interim chancellors Fisher and Scott-Skillman; special report cover letter to ACCJC]

5. Administrative Capacity

The institution has sufficient staff, with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support its mission and purpose.

In light of the ACCJC recommendations issued in July 2012, City College of San Francisco continues to undertake organizational restructuring to ensure that staff are appropriately distributed and possess the appropriate preparation and experience to fulfill their roles and functions. The restructuring began with the consolidation of Vice Chancellors into three positions: Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor of Student Services and Development, and Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration. Two of these positions are currently interim; permanent hiring for these positions will occur in early Spring 2013. We have developed new organizational charts for Academic Affairs (which includes three Associate Vice Chancellor positions) and for Student Services and Development. Changes in the job descriptions of the administrative positions within these divisions include greater administrative accountability and authority to provide oversight to instructional programs and student services. As a result, we will undergo a hiring process throughout Spring 2013 to fill those positions with July 1, 2013 start dates. Reviews of Finance and Administration and the Chancellor’s direct reports will take place thereafter, with the exception of Research and Planning, which already underwent a reorganization resulting in the establishment of a Dean of Institutional Effectiveness position (hired in February 2013). Immediate and one-time solutions to meet shortcomings identified by ACCJC within Finance and Administration included the return of one retiree who has historical and in-depth knowledge of District operations as well as contracting with a private firm for part-time consulting services. An examination of evaluation procedures and professional development has accompanied restructuring activities. [September, October, November, December, and January Board actions items relating to organizational structure policies relating to administrator and staff hiring and evaluation; professional development agendas/list]

6. Operational Status

The institution is operational, with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

City College of San Francisco is operational, with more than 85,000 students actively pursuing degrees or certificates in noncredit, credit, and not-for-credit programs. [August 14 Board meeting data that informed mission statement]

7. Degrees

A substantial portion of the institution’s educational offerings are programs that lead to degrees, and a significant proportion of its students are enrolled in them.

75 percent of all programs and educational offerings lead to associate degrees or certificates of achievement, or prepare students for transfer to a four-year university or college; 75 percent of students are enrolled in these programs. [Catalog: Associate Degree Graduation Requirements pp. 45-54; Transfer Information, pp. 55-64; Programs and Courses, pp. 66-408]
8. Educational Programs

The institution’s principal degree programs are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education field(s) of study, are of sufficient content and length, are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered, and culminate in identified student outcomes. At least one degree program must be of two academic years in length.

The College Catalog contains a comprehensive statement of educational purpose and objectives for each of the academic programs offered. Degree programs are in line with the College’s mission, are based on recognized fields of study, are of sufficient content and length, are conducted at appropriate levels of quality and rigor, and culminate in identified student outcomes. Approximately 80 degree programs are two academic years in length. As noted in the response to Eligibility Requirement 10, the College is working on measuring the attainment of Student Learning Outcomes at the department/program, degree, and course levels.

9. Academic Credit

The institution awards academic credits based on generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education. Public institutions governed by statutory or system regulatory requirements provide appropriate information about the awarding of academic credit.

The College awards credit in accordance with Title 5 Section 55002.5 and 34 CFR 600.2, where one credit hour requires a minimum of 48 hours of lecture, study, or laboratory work. Courses may only be adopted upon approval of the Board of Trustees, which acts on the recommendation of the College Curriculum Committee. [Policy Manual 6.03 Course Development] The Curriculum Committee uses these standards in its review of the relationship of contact hours and units in proposed Course Outlines of Record. [Curriculum Handbook, Chapter 2] The credit associated with each course offered by the College is clearly indicated in the College Catalog. [College Catalog, Programs and Courses, pp. 66-408]

10. Student Learning and Achievement

The institution defines and publishes for each program the program’s expected student learning and achievement outcomes. Through regular and systematic assessment, it demonstrates that students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, achieve these outcomes.

Since July 2012, the College has engaged in a rigorous process of documenting progress in developing, assessing, and using Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for program improvement, which has also spurred the completion of identifying SLOs for all programs along with plans for assessing student attainment of those SLOs. A College website dedicated to documenting the assessment of SLOs and providing resources in establishing and measuring SLOs now exists. [www.ccsf.edu/slo] Instructional program outcomes (disciplines, majors, and certificates) are listed in the College Catalog. [College Catalog, Programs and Courses, pp. 66-408] For courses and instructional programs, these outcomes are focused on student learning. Course-level SLOs are listed in course outlines and are available publicly through department websites; they are also described on the syllabi for all courses. [https://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/slo/instructional_slo/slo_department.html] The Curriculum Handbook includes an entire section on defining good course-level SLOs. Service program outcomes are listed on each
11. General Education

The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The general education component includes demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it. Degree credit for general education programs must be consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. See the Accreditation Standards, II.A.3, for areas of study for general education.

All degree programs require a minimum of 18 to 24 units of general education to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. [College Catalog, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements pp. 46-51] General Education requirements include coursework in Areas A-H, which include communication and analytical thinking, written composition and information competency, natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, United States history and government, physical skills and health knowledge, and ethnic studies, women’s studies, and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender studies. [College Catalog, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements, p. 48] The College Catalog documents the comprehensive learning outcomes that students should gain as a result of completion of the general education requirements. [College Catalog, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements, p. 46] The College Curriculum Committee scrutinizes the institution’s courses for rigor and quality and the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements reviews the institution’s general education pattern for breadth and depth and decides which courses are included in the general education areas.

12. Academic Freedom

The institution’s faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general. Regardless of institutional affiliation or sponsorship, the institution maintains an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom and independence exist.

The College’s employees and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of work or major study as ensured by Board Policy 6.06 on academic freedom. [Board Policy 6.06, Academic Freedom]

13. Faculty

The institution has a substantial core of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The core is sufficient in size and experience to support all of the institution’s educational programs. A clear statement of faculty responsibilities must include development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning.
The College employs 776 full-time and 1,464 part-time faculty, all of whom are qualified under state-mandated minimum qualifications to conduct the institution’s programs. [College Catalog, Faculty and Administrators, pp. 437-482] Faculty duties and responsibilities are clearly outlined in the SFCCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Faculty Handbook. [SFCCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement; Faculty Handbook]

14. Student Services

The institution provides for all of its students appropriate student services that support student learning and development within the context of the institutional mission.

To fully meet this Eligibility Requirements and its related Standards, the College engaged in a comprehensive review and assessment of all student support services across the entire to ensure that students have access to the appropriate level of student services, regardless of location. As a result, the CCSF Board of Trustees approved a new administrative structure during its December 2012 meeting. While this restructuring of personnel and services is still in progress and its impact remains to be assessed, it is designed to be more responsive to student needs, reflecting best practices. [December 2012 Board meeting minutes with the report from Interim VC Shenk]

<Does Distance Ed deviate from this in any way? If so, need to make note of it.>

15. Admissions

The institution has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs.

City College of San Francisco maintains an “open door” admissions policy. [College Catalog, Admission to the College, pp. 14-15] This policy is consistent with the College Mission Statement, the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, and the statewide mission for California Community Colleges. [Application for Admission, Credit Division; Application for Admission, Noncredit]

16. Information and Learning Resources

The institution provides, through ownership or contractual agreement, specific long-term access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to support its mission and instructional programs in whatever format and wherever they are offered.

The College libraries house a variety of media collections and is staffed to assist students in their use. Internet access and online computer search capabilities are available without charge to students in the library, in computer labs, and in open media centers. Although currently struggling to determine the most appropriate oversight of information and learning resources as it undergoes administrative reorganization, the College is committed to continually enhancing its learning resources, regardless of location or delivery method. [Need to address the status of library and learning resources at all Centers]

17. Financial Resources

The institution documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

In July 2012, ACCJC found CCSF to be out of compliance with this Eligibility Requirement.
The College has undertaken a number of measures to address this issue, including revising its mission statement, fully integrating its planning and budgeting system to realize the necessary cost savings to achieve financial stability and inviting the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) to conduct a study of its finances. Cost-savings have been achieved through salary reductions for faculty, staff, and administrators during fiscal year 2012-13; a reduction in reassigned time, in part through reorganizing the Division of Academic Affairs; a reduction in the number of part-time counselors; classified staff layoffs; attrition; and the closure of four rented sites for Spring 2013. Although progress has been made, some of these measures are still evolving. The passage of a local parcel tax, Proposition A, will indirectly allow the restoration of the reserves to 5 percent of the total budget, although a longer-term plan has been developed to restore the reserves to 8 percent by 2020.

18. Financial Accountability

The institution annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant or an audit by an appropriate public agency. The institution shall submit with its eligibility application a copy of the budget and institutional financial audits and management letters prepared by an outside certified public accountant or by an appropriate public agency, who has no other relationship to the institution, for its two most recent fiscal years, including the fiscal year ending immediately prior to the date of the submission of the application. The audits must be certified and any exceptions explained. It is recommended that the auditor employ as a guide Audits of Colleges and Universities, published by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. An applicant institution must not show an annual or cumulative operating deficit at any time during the eligibility application process. Institutions that are already Title IV eligible must demonstrate compliance with federal requirements.

City College of San Francisco’s annual financial audits are conducted by externally contracted certified public accountants who utilize the Audits of Colleges and Universities, published by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants as a guide. The financial audit and management responses to any exceptions are reviewed and discussed in public sessions. In addition, the College submitted an Annual Fiscal Report to ACCJC in Fall 2012 (a new requirement), which resulted in ACCJC directing the College to describe within the October 15 Special Report the actions the institution intended to take to address the material weaknesses and significant deficiencies identified in the 2011 Audit Report. Financial reports are available on the CCSF website. [Annual Budget Final Recommendation, 2011-12 and 2012-13; PM 1.17: Audit Committee Guiding Principles; PM 8.3: Auditing; CCSF Budget Website (audit reports available in the section labeled “Reports”)]

CCSF complies with federal Title IV requirements.

In July 2012, ACCJC found that City College of San Francisco had “fail[ed] to conduct audits and provide reports to the college or community in a timely manner. The institution has also failed to implement corrective action to audit findings over multiple years.”

Immediate actions addressing these issues included one-time measures to increase staffing levels within the accounting department to ensure the timely preparation and submission of critical reports. This increase in staffing resulted in the on-time completion of the Annual 311 Report in October 2012; however, the Annual Financial Audit Report, which was due in December 2012, was completed by January 15, 2013. Longer term solutions included the hiring of three full-time
accounting/budget staff in January 2013 to ensure ongoing adherence to reporting timelines and the implementation corrective actions in response to audit findings.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The institution systematically evaluates and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. The institution provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.

To better meet the ACCJC Accreditation Standards and July 2012 Recommendations, City College of San Francisco has revamped its annual assessment, planning, and budgeting process, with Program Review serving as a central mechanism for data-informed decision making for the improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. Implementation of the new system has begun. The Program Review process and template, which continues to include information about Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), have also been updated in alignment with the planning process. Rubrics and guidelines now guide Program Review development and prioritization, along with a Program Review website. Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) have been developed by the Academic Senate, but are still in need of review by the Chancellor’s Executive Team and the Participatory Governance Council. The College website now houses a section dedicated to SLOs, thereby providing a centralized repository for posting the SLOs themselves, assessment of the SLOs, and changes made as a result of SLO assessment, all of which will support institutional evaluation and decisionmaking. Given that the planning and budgeting system is new, the College has not fully implemented the cycle and thus has not had a chance to assess the effectiveness of the process.

20. Integrity in Communication with the Public

The institution provides a print or electronic catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following (34 C.F.R. § 668.41-43; § 668.71-75):

General Information
- Official Name, Address(es), Telephone Number(s), and Website Address of the Institution
- Educational Mission
- Course, Program, and Degree Offerings
- Academic Calendar and Program Length
- Academic Freedom Statement
- Available Student Financial Aid
- Available Learning Resources
- Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty
- Names of Governing Board Members

Requirements
- Admissions
- Student Fees and Other Financial Obligations
● Degree, Certificates, Graduation and Transfer

**Major Policies Affecting Students**

- Academic Regulations, including Academic Honesty
- Nondiscrimination
- Acceptance of Transfer Credits
- Grievance and Complaint Procedures
- Sexual Harassment
- Refund of Fees

**Locations or Publications Where Other Policies May Be Found**

City College of San Francisco publishes in its Catalog, and posts on its website, precise and up-to-date information on the following:

**General information**, which includes official name, address(es), telephone number(s), and Website address of the institution as well as contact information for all employees; educational mission; course, program, and degree offerings; academic calendar and program length; academic freedom statement; available student financial aid; available learning resources; names and degrees of administrators and faculty; and names of its Board of Trustees members.

**Requirements** include admissions requirements; student fees and other financial obligations; and degree, certificate, graduation, and transfer requirements.

**Major policies affecting students** include those related to academic regulations, including academic honesty; nondiscrimination; acceptance of transfer credits; grievance and complaint procedures; sexual harassment; and refund of fees.

**Locations or publications where other policies may be found**

21. **Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission**

The institution provides assurance that it adheres to the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and policies of the Commission, describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. The institution will comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions and policies, and will make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure. Failure to do is sufficient reason, in and of itself, for the Commission to impose a sanction, or to deny or revoke candidacy or accreditation. (34 C.F.R. § 668 - misrepresentation.)

In July 2012, ACCJC found City College of San Francisco to be out of compliance with Eligibility Requirements 5, 17, 18, and 21, and issued a Show Cause determination to the College. These findings of ACCJC related to these Eligibility Requirements are also related to a number of the Accreditation Standards and policies. This new Self Evaluation (contained within this Show Cause report) documents the activities that the College has been undertaking since July 2012 to re-establish compliance.

The College fully understands the gravity of the Commission’s Show Cause determination, and it believes that the changes it is implementing as documented in this new Self Evaluation (as
outlined primarily in Section G which responds to the Standards) will go a long way toward addressing Eligibility Requirement 21. Of particular note is the CCSF Board of Trustees’ passage of a new policy with the title, “Accreditation Eligibility Requirement 21, Standard IV.B.1.i” on October 25, 2012. [Policy Manual 1.33] The College is not only addressing the deficiencies noted by the 2006 evaluation team and those noted by the 2012 evaluation team in July 2012, but also additional deficiencies discovered during the Self Evaluation activities that have taken place since July 2012.

The College is especially concerned with fully disclosing all deficiencies relating to the Eligibility Requirements, Standards, and Policies. In that spirit, in its October 15 Special Report, the College noted a deficiency related to substantive change. Specifically, in December 2011, the College prepared a substantive change proposal for submission to ACCJC concerning a shift in the percentage of online instruction offered. The College never submitted the proposal due to administrative transitions, and it is aware that this is a requirement it must address.

With respect to the College’s accreditation status, the College immediately posted on its website the July 2012 ACCJC determination and has continued to update all accreditation information on the website, including making available the October 15 Special Report and March 15 Show Cause Report. By posting all accreditation information on its website, and given the focused media attention on the College’s accreditation status, other accrediting agencies have had access to this information. These entities include the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), the California Board of Registered Nurses, State Fire Training, and the National Registry (Emergency Medical Technician and paramedic training). The College specifically provided information directly to the Commission on Dental Accreditation, and the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology conducted a special site visit to CCSF in the wake of the accreditation determination having been released.

E. Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Commission Policies

F. Responses to Recommendations from the Most Recent Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness Review

G. Institutional Analysis of the ACCJC Standards

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.
A. Mission

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

I.A.1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

I.A.2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.

I.A.3. Using the institution’s governance and decision making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.

I.A.4. The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.

I.A.-I.A.4. Descriptive Summary. All California community colleges are subject to the System’s mission as described in California Education Code §66010.4(a). [California Education Code §66010.4(a)] In addition, CCSF has two local statements, a Vision Statement and a Mission Statement, which define the institution’s educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. [CCSF Vision and Mission Statements]

In July 2012, the ACCJC found the following regarding CCSF’s mission:

[insert recommendation]

Given this Recommendation, the College immediately undertook a review of its Mission Statement. After an examination of internal and external data, a survey of CCSF personnel, a review of the California Education Code, and receiving input from the public, the Board narrowed the priorities of the District’s mission from seven to the following four: preparation for transfer, achievement of associate degrees, acquisition of career skills, and development of basic skills (including English as a Second Language and Transitional Studies). As part of that revision, the institution also refocused the mission on student learning and achievement and highlighted the role of assessment.

The College has begun more explicitly linking the mission to planning and resource allocation. For example, as units complete their Program Reviews in the fall, the first item to which they must respond is “Description of Programs and Services and their Locations – Insert description from previous program review and revise as necessary to remain consistent with the College’s Mission.” A Program Review checklist enables deans and supervisors to check all submitted program Reviews for completeness and to work with units to revise responses when they have not sufficiently addressed questions such as the congruence with the College mission.

Until the revision of the mission statement this past summer (2012), the College formally reviewed and revised the mission statement every six years, in line with revising the College’s Strategic Plan. When the Board amended Board Policy 1200 (now BP 1.00), it incorporated a statement that the Board will now review the District’s vision and mission annually during its summer planning retreat when it establishes its planning priorities for the subsequent year. [Planning and Budgeting Timeline; BP 1.00] The Board of Trustees adopted BP 1.00 containing the revised mission on September 11, 2012. [September 11, 2012 agenda/resolutions/minutes]
The vision statement and revised mission are published in the College Catalog, on the College website, and in other places such as the placard above the Board of Trustees meeting table at the District Business Office (33 Gough Street) and in the front of the Student Handbook and Planner that students receive at orientation. [CCSF College Catalog; College website; Student Handbook and Planner]

I.A.-I.A.4. Self Evaluation. In collecting input for the revised mission, technological issues interfered with reaching the entire student population. Moreover, stringent timelines limited the amount of feedback that any constituency was able to provide, and the transitional nature of the governance system meant that no formal review took place by that body, although the workgroups were representative. Nonetheless, individuals and groups expressed criticism about the process given these limitations.

The College has better aligned its mission to the currently available, and limited, financial resources from the state and has engaged in activities that responded to the concerns identified by ACCJC. The previous mission was broad and lacked priorities, which limited its effectiveness in providing focused guidance for planning and decision making. While the mission is more focused relative to its previous breadth, it qualifies the circumstances under which other programs and services could be pursued. The provision for expanding the breadth and depth of what the College offers is still open to interpretation when resources allow.

The now-tighter connection between the mission and the more integrated planning and budgeting system will theoretically yield decisions about learning programs and services that are clearly driven by the mission and vision. The now-annual review of the mission and vision will regularly draw on data regarding the College’s purposes, character, and student population, in order to revise these statements according to any changes in these data. This regular review of data to inform the mission will increase credibility and efficacy of the mission and provide for more sound decision making.

Given the recent implementation of these changes, the College will need to assess whether this hoped-for outcome takes place.

I.A.-I.A.4. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gather more constituent feedback, especially from students, on the mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain Participatory Governance Council feedback on the mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the mission and vision statements serve as sound drivers of decision-making</td>
<td>Through the annual evaluation of the planning and budgeting system, assess viability of mission and vision statements as drivers of decision-making and adjust as necessary</td>
<td>Ongoing, beginning in Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide data to Participatory Governance Council prior to presentation to the Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

I.B1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

I.B.1. Descriptive Summary. Dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes takes place through a variety of venues, including the Shared Governance structure that was in place through Spring 2012. While the College is currently implementing a new Participatory Governance system, the restructured system will likewise serve as a critical venue for these discussions.

The most current institutional dialogue has taken place primarily within the context of responding to the ACCJC’s show cause determination. In Fall 2012, 15 work groups assembled to draft the content of the October 15 Special Report and then reconvened to draft the content for this Show Cause Self Evaluation. These workgroups have engaged in extensive dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes throughout the course of the past eight months. Dialogue has also taken place through the Accreditation Steering Committee, which includes all constituent leaders and served as the temporary Participatory Governance Council during the governance system transition.

In prior years, dialogue about improving institutional processes has also taken place through the CCSF Board of Trustees’ Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which first met in March 2010 and last met in April 2012. Among its responsibilities, this Committee discussed items such as the Accreditation self-evaluation data, Accreditation Standards I.A. and I.B., and College Performance Indicators.

[http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_committee_agendas0.html]


[http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/BOT/BOT_Co mmity_Mtg_2011/May_24-2011-IE.pdf]

Adopted in September 2012, the modified and more integrated planning and budgeting system clarifies roles and delineates windows for specific discussions, relying more heavily
on data such as the documentation and measurement of Student and Institutional Learning Outcomes to inform those discussions. These discussions are intended to focus on decision making regarding necessary programmatic and institutional changes. During August and September of 2012, for example, two meetings of the Board of Trustees culminated in the identification of Board Priorities for the College for the upcoming fiscal year (2012-13). The Board priorities then influenced the program review process in Fall 2012, which required that all departments and units of the College discuss, reflect on, and incorporate Board Priorities into unit plans.

[Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Timeline]

Departmental dialogue about effectiveness also occurs during FLEX professional development days and throughout the semester. Two large-scale events in Fall 2012 focused and augmented departmental activities. The first, an all-day event on September 12, included all faculty and focused on SLOs, including bringing in guest expert Bob Pacheco who presented on turning evidence into action. On November 21, 200 faculty participated in an accreditation workshop focusing on SLOs. The recently appointed SLO Coordinator’s primary responsibility is to facilitate continuing dialogue about establishing and measuring attainment of SLOs and utilizing SLO assessment results for course and/or program improvement. [http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/slo.html]

I.B.1. Self Evaluation. While structures are in place (e.g., Governance), continuous improvement has not been emphasized. For several years the College was in a reactive, crisis management mode. While discussions about improvements have existed, they have been limited and have not necessarily been tied to the planning and budgeting system. The modified planning and budgeting system and new annual calendar create a framework to support systematic, regular, and ongoing discussions about improvement. In addition, the inefficiencies of the previous Shared Governance system did not always allow for action-oriented dialogue.

More dialogue occurs during the planning stages (e.g., Strategic Plan) than at the implementation and assessment stages. Dialogue needs to occur during all phases of the assessment, planning, and budgeting process.

Consistently building assessments into college-wide planning documents will make linkages more evident. For example, the draft Technology Plan includes summary assessments for each section. The Annual Plan for 2013-14 will include a section highlighting progress-to-date on the implementation of 2012-13 and showing the relevant linkages.

Events such as those that took place on September 12 and November 21 (described above) exemplify dialogue that engages the College at an institutional level as well as at a departmental/programmatic level. However, these types of activities need to occur more regularly and frequently, and plans for future events such as these are already in place for SLOs. [SLO website]

In future annual cycles, data and information used to inform Board Priorities will first be discussed by the new Participatory Governance Council to garner input, solicit clarifications, and prompt dialogue. This is built into the new Annual Timeline but was not possible in Summer 2012. [Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Timeline]
I.B.1. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the annual calendar to foster timely dialogue about improvement which includes all stages of the assessment, planning, and budgeting process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently build assessments into college-wide planning documents to make linkages more evident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule college-wide events for all employees to engage in robust discussions about student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.B.2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

I.B.2. Descriptive Summary. An extensively vetted, longer-range, six-year Strategic Plan last adopted in December 2011 has primarily guided the annual planning cycle. The College last updated its Education Master Plan in 2006 and has developed a schedule for updating the Education Master Plan during 2013-14.

Since 2000 or before, the Annual Plan has served as the mechanism for translating longer-term strategic priorities into measurable, near-term objectives. The March 15, 2012 evaluation team found that “many,” though not all, of the most recent Annual Plan objectives were stated in measurable terms (p. 21 of Evaluation Report).

http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_budget.htm

In prior years, the College required that all departments and units link resource requests to one or more College plans in their annual program review. During the program review process, the Office of Research and Planning provided a list of approved plans to which units might link. Most prominent on the list was the Annual Plan.

http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_college.htm

In September 2012, the College modified its annual process to facilitate clearer Board direction and to more clearly relate program reviews, which reflect the work of individual units, to College-wide objectives. In September 2012, the Board delineated Planning Priorities for 2013-14 which were widely publicized during College Council (now Chancellor’s Forum) and on the program review website. Several Board Priorities for 2013-14 are quantitatively measurable (e.g., increase productivity, decrease non-instructional). The first Annual Plan to be impacted by this new process will be that of 2013-14.
During Fall 2012, program review prompts asked all departments and units to refer to priorities throughout their review: “As you complete the form, please cite linkages to Board priorities and/or Board-approved college plans.” Per this new process, the results of program review will form the basis of the Annual Plan rather than the inverse. Beginning in December 2012 through early Spring 2013, program review objectives will be ranked by the administrative chain, reviewed via Participatory Governance, and distilled into an Annual Plan reflective of affirmed objectives in line with College plans and Board Priorities. In the newly created Rubric for Ranking Resource Allocation Requests, nearly all rating categories foster connection to priorities and prompt for measurability: Linked to Board Priorities and Approved College Plans, Cost/Benefit, Data Based Rationale, and Measurable Outcomes.

The End of Year Assessment (EYA) has been the primary mechanism for evaluating achievement of Annual Plan goals. However, in recent years the College did not produce it consistently. The most recent EYA was published last spring in May 2012. Despite the significant simplification of the EYA—19 pages long compared to prior versions which were often well over 200 pages—the CPBC and the Board only briefly discussed the assessment.

http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_budget.htm

For seven years or more, College Performance Indicators (CPI) Reports tracked performance on a variety of measures associated with the Strategic Plan. CPIs were last reported in April 2010 and included data through academic year 2008-09. As with the EYA, the last CPI Report was 19 pages long compared to lengthier versions of 80 pages or more from prior years. However, it similarly had a limited audience.

http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_strategic.htm2010

Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) data trends have been presented to the Board every year, as legislatively required, but these data have not been used to set goals and have not been widely discussed.

Enrollment management has been revamped and more systematically implemented beginning in Fall 2012. Goals were set for each department with follow up by School Deans to determine whether targets are being met.

I.B.2. Self Evaluation. While the College has institutional-level plans with largely measurable objectives (most notably the Annual Plan), the College lacks goals with explicit targets except in the area of enrollment management where department-specific targets have been set for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013.

Having multiple institution-level reports (EYA, CPI, ARCC) leads to confusion about measures and goals. The difference between the EYA and CPI has been unclear to most members of the College. Moreover, the lengthy reports have had a limited audience. To date, the College has not used any of these reports to set targets, only to track trends or to report progress in a given year. The forthcoming ARCC 2.0 provides an opportunity for the College to focus on state-specified targets for improvement.

The College does not have a current Education Master Plan to guide departments toward specified, longer-range goals. Once created, the Education Master Plan must explicitly integrate with the Strategic Plan.
I.B.2. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce a summary level dashboard of annual indicators that is widely understood during Spring 2013 in order to reach a broader audience and more clearly inform the upcoming planning cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement a benchmarking process for setting targets for each of the annual indicators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move forward toward creating a new Education Master Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the Strategic Plan prior to its expiration in 2016 to reflect changes in mission and explicitly integrate with Education Master Plan. A revised graphic was developed by WG 2 to reflect the integration of new Education Master Plan with an updated Strategic Plan. <a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/ACC/Group_2/IntegratedPlanning2.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/ACC/Group_2/IntegratedPlanning2.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

I.B.3. Descriptive Summary. The annual program review process, which began in 2008-09, integrates facilities, staffing, and technology. Unit-level needs are clearly identified by resource categories (e.g., staffing). However, since its reinvigoration in 2008-09, no resources have been allocated as a direct result of program review. Moreover, until Fall 2012 the program review process included only augmentations; it excluded reductions.

As an example of the lack of connection to resource allocation, the Budget for 2012-13 was not based on program review and contained no direct connections to it. The Board adopted the Final Budget in September 2012 with these changes: a larger summer session in 2013, a reduction in wages for all employees ranging from -2.85% to -5.2% depending on the employee group, and reductions in spending for non-instructional assignments of -$875,000. While critical for the College’s solvency efforts, these changes had no direct relationship to program review. As has been the custom for many years, the associated Annual Plan for 2012-13 was included as an appendix to the 2012-13 Budget; however, it contained only “cost neutral” objectives.

Some limited summaries of the program review process were created in Spring 2011, updated in Spring 2012, reviewed by PRC, and shared with CPBC both years. Resource recommendations corresponded with, but did not directly influence, budget items.


In the newly revamped process adopted in September 2012, annual program reviews due in December 2012 include for the first time a question requiring units to discuss possible reductions. In addition, for the first time, the process includes a rubric to prioritize resource
allocations. These program reviews and rubrics will form the basis of the Annual Plan for 2013-14 which will in turn inform the Budget for 2013-14.

The Perkins allocation process is now officially connected to program review as stated in the program review guidelines. Other restricted revenue funding streams (e.g., basic skills) need to be similarly addressed.

The College has never had a formal staffing plan. The College created a ten-year facilities plan in 2004. The last technology plan was updated and approved in Spring 2010; a first draft was developed during Fall 2012 and is currently being discussed and reviewed. A final version is expected to be created in Spring 2013 and formally adopted before the end of that semester.

The College does not have a current Education Master Plan which incorporates these areas but has plans in place as outlined in the response to Standard I.B.2.

Program review is data-based. Initial questions on the form require units to address trend lines on the following provided data:

- For all units (instructional, student services, and administrative units) staffing and budget data are provided for the last five academic years. However, these data are not always corrected after personnel move from one department to another; as a result, their accuracy is often questioned and expenditure data is not accurately attributed. Also, the College still does not provide information about restricted revenue; instead, units are encouraged to provide data from their records.
- Data for instructional units also include five-year trend lines for student enrollments, student headcounts, FTES, FTEF, FTES per FTEF ratio, student demographics, and course success by student demographics. Degree and certification totals by program are also provided. Additional data such as demand for courses is available via the Decision Support System (DSS). Departments are also prompted to include other relevant data and to discuss SLO assessment results.
- Data for student service areas also include trend information about student contacts and student demographics when available (primarily available for counseling units). Student and employee survey ratings are also provided when available.
- Data for administrative units also include student and employee survey ratings when available.
- When possible, additional data are provided upon request. For example, data about online sections and student success was provided to the Education Technology Department.
- As departments complete their program reviews, the quantitative data provided by Research and Planning is supplemented by the departments with additional data, both quantitative and qualitative. [List some specific examples as evidence; need to identify these]

The DSS is a dated system developed locally in 1998. The College is in the process of replacing this system with ARGOS, a new data management tool that provides easily produced, accurate reports for enrollment management and educational planning. The use of
ARGOS will modernize the provision of these data as well as expand the range of data available.

**I.B.3. Self Evaluation.** Connections between program reviews, the Annual Plan, and the Budget have been weak and indirect at best. Connections need to be much clearer and more direct. The 2013-14 Budget developed during Spring 2013 will demonstrate some strong, transparent connections given a successful implementation of the new process.

Via the program review form, individual units identify requests as related to facilities, staffing, or technology. However, requests have not been subsequently arrayed and aggregated by category for appropriate review by relevant offices and participatory governance processes. Such information will be used to prioritize facilities, staffing, and technology needs. For example, it will be used to modify and update the initial draft of the Technology Plan (drafted Fall 2012, scheduled for review and approval in Spring 2013). Similarly, categorized priorities will inform and be clearly integrated into the update of the Education Master Plan to be drafted during 2013-14.

The prompt requesting units are asked to cite progress in the current Program Review is as follows: “Summarize your department’s progress to date on the major planning objectives identified in the last program review.” Some units respond with summaries, others clearly delineate progress on each objective. The College will fully devise and implement a system that tracks individual objectives. Funded objectives will be clearly identified and monitored for impact and related outcomes.

Although several pages of data are used in program review, more data is needed. For instructional units there is scant data tracking student progress beyond the course level. The data for other units also has not been augmented for many years. The implementation of ARGOS provides an opportunity to investigate how this newer, modern tool might expand the provision of data to units. To inform this investigation, the Office of Research and Planning, as a member of the ARGOS Implementation Team (AIT), will poll program review units to find out what additional data would best inform their program reviews. During Spring 2013, AIT will evaluate the feasibility of responding to these requests via the new ARGOS tool.

The integrity of some of the program review data needs to be reviewed and appropriate corrections made. ARGOS will be a useful tool in this process since it can allow units to see record-level data. For example, record-level “exception reports” will be created in Argos which will make it easier to identify errors.

The College will need to ensure that departments become familiar the ARCC data used in the dashboard (see I.B.2.), understand how it relates to measures for their individual units, and know how to use related components of the CCCCO Data Mart.

**I.B.3. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2013-2014 Annual Plan will explicitly connect program reviews with the 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Budget

- Create breakouts of prioritized program review needs by category (facilities, staffing, and technology) for further use during college-wide planning activities.
- Via program review, closely monitor the outcomes of funded objectives.
- As Argos is implemented, expand the array of Banner data to which programs have access and develop procedures for correcting errors to improve data integrity.
- Leverage the CCCCO Data Mart to provide more data related to newly developed dashboard based on ARCC 2.0.

#### I.B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.


One primary mechanism for participation in planning is Participatory Governance (previously Shared Governance). During Fall 2012 this occurred via several work groups including planning and program review. These workgroups included all constituents—faculty, administrators, staff, and students—although student attendance and participation varies. Board members were also included in work groups.

Unit-level planning, which takes place through program review, includes all units of the college (student services, instructional, and administration).

The new annual timeline is designed to ensure that the College’s Annual Plan and related plans (e.g., Technology Plan updates) are directly informed by unit-level planning. In the annual program review form, units must “certify that faculty and staff in your unit discussed the unit’s major planning objectives.” In Fall 2012 a new “Key Dates” document outlined intermediate deadlines to further facilitate dialogue within and across departments.

http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Research_Planning_Grants/Program%20Review/ProgRevKeyDatesFall2012.pdf

Various constituencies provided feedback on long-range plans such as the Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, and Sustainability Plan, and these plans went through extensive governance processes. For documentation regarding strategic planning conversations:


One notable exception is the Education Master Plan which was last adopted in 2006. Two concerted attempts were made to substantially update the document but failed to reach an adequate conclusion and were not circulated for discussion.
For the last three years, School-level summaries were written by the School Deans based upon program review. These were provided to CPBC at the culmination of the 2009-10 and 2010-11 annual program review cycles. They were updated in 2011-12 and presented again to CPBC.


The CCSF Board of Trustees formally adopts the College’s Annual Plan each year which provides an opportunity for public comment.

As noted in the response to Standard I.B.3., annual Budget allocations to date have not been made on the basis of program review.

For the past several years, the budgeting process was centralized in such a way that unit-level budgets were rendered less meaningful. This will change with the 2013-14 budget development process.

Each year within program review, units reflect upon their effectiveness vis-à-vis the prior year’s objectives, quantitative and qualitative data, and the results of SLO assessments. (See I.B.3.)

Given the inadequate connection between planning and budgeting, only a few units have used the program review process to make improvements. [provide as evidence, examples from program review of how existing budgets have been used to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness]

I.B.4. Self Evaluation. Governance structures and work group structures have provided venues for discussion and input.

Various student groups, e.g., SMAC, have voiced concerns about the limited participation of students in the planning processes. Student groups can and do attend public meetings (committees, work groups, and Board meetings), and the College supports a student government system.

There is broad, “bottom up” input into planning at the unit level and college level, especially for annual planning via program review. However, the quality and depth of program review activities vary by department. The delineation of “Key Dates” within the planning system was intended to prompt conversations and lead to improved overall quality; however, emphasizing and making time for these broader conversations is still new for the College.

Long-range plans also receive substantial input, yet the Education Master Plan is outdated. Two concerted attempts were made to substantially update the document but failed to reach an adequate conclusion, particularly because the plan needs to be fundamentally reconceived; the 2006 version has never served the College well. To fill the gap, School Deans provided summaries and Centers completed program reviews, but these mechanisms have also been insufficient. A fully supported, systematic effort is required. This will begin in Summer 2013 with expansive environmental scan data and will build upon program reviews completed in Fall 2013. The updated 2013-14 Education Master Plan will explicitly consider the following:
Center level planning needs more structure and formalization. It is included in the Education Master Plan, but this is outdated. The annual program review format has not worked as well for Centers which differ in many respects from other College units. See also section entitled, “Special Focus: Centers and Sites.”

School level planning also needs more structure and formalization. The format of the School Dean summaries has been too limited both in terms of format and discussion. The new Annual Timeline delineates a clear window for the development of unit-level budgets. These budgets will include accurate budget expenditure and revenue information, including restricted revenue, to show the appropriate funding of resources. (See I.B.3. for more about accuracy and comprehensiveness of unit-level budgets.)

Unit-level objectives in program review should be reported more clearly so that we “close the loop” on each funded objective. (See I.B.3.) As administrative restructuring goes forward, it is necessary to ensure the quality and continuity of this oversight.

I.B.4. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify mechanisms for student input, e.g., participatory governance and student government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build upon the “Key Dates” document to ensure dialogue takes place within units and across Schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an annual planning and evaluation format for Centers via WG 15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new Education Master Plan which builds upon program reviews (as well as other planning and evaluation activities) and provides direction for Schools and Centers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

I.B.5. Descriptive Summary. For both internal and external audiences, a variety of College-level reports and assessments are available online at the Research and Planning website. This includes ARCC, internal scan data, topical research reports, survey results, EYA and CPI Reports. The dashboard (see I.B.2.) will also be available via the Research and Planning website.

An outdated College-wide factsheet is available via the Marketing and Public Information website.

http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/Fact_Sheets/ccsf.pdf
Information about programs and departments is also online. Program reviews have been publicly available online since 2009 at the Research and Planning website. Previously only hardcopies were available—and only upon request.

SLO information is now available online. An “Outcomes & Assessment” link has been prominently placed within the “About City College” menu. Departmental webpages include SLO information and the most recent program review.

www.ccsf.edu/slo

Internally, the locally-developed DSS query tool (soon to be ARGOS) contains information about course and program achievement outcomes. See I.B.3. for more information about internal data.

The College complies with required reporting (75/25, IPEDS, various categorical programs, Student Right To Know, MIS).

In 2009 the College implemented a systematic and sustainable process for regularly reviewing all MIS data submitted to the CCCCO for quality and completeness. MIS data populates the CCCCO Data Mart and is the basis for ARCC Reports.

http://advancement.ccsf.edu/MISProcedure.htm

The Accreditation website will remain active as a communication vehicle and central location to inform internal and external constituencies about the quality of the institution in the context of the Accreditation Standards.

I.B.5. Self Evaluation. Overall the website has become more student-focused with more “public information” readily available, particularly with the development of the Accreditation website.

The College-wide factsheet available under Marketing and Public Information should be updated and modified to include the dashboard (see I.B.2.) as a mechanism for more transparent quality assurance for the general public.

I.B.5. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicize major programmatic improvements and highlight successful programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop targeted communications to internal and external constituencies from the Research and Planning Office using the dashboard as the primary tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Public Information Office should develop regular means of communication to internal and external communities for the dissemination of Research and Planning findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

I.B.6. Descriptive Summary. The College conducts regular evaluations of annual program review, focusing on it as a key component of the planning cycle. Evaluations were conducted in 2009 and 2011, and will be conducted again in 2013.

Evaluation results from 2009 were discussed by the Program Review Committee (PRC). As reflected in 2010-11 program review archives, changes were made to improve transparency through feedback loops to individual units (see “Committee Comments” documents). Also, the Program Review Committee formalized its reports to CPBC in an attempt to improve the connection between program review findings and the College’s budget. However, per the fall 2011 evaluation ratings which were generally lower than 2009, these changes were insufficient. In Fall 2011 the PRC discussed the results and possibilities for further improvements. In Fall 2012, the Special Report workgroup responsible for Recommendation 2 made further modifications to address these concerns.

Program review evaluation responses also highlighted concerns about data quality, especially unit-level expenditure and restricted revenue data. Some modifications were made following the 2009 evaluation (e.g., intermittent data workshops, greater access to record-level data upon request for verification). Currently, data quality concerns are being addressed most pointedly through the implementation of the Argos data reporting tool which will allow users to navigate between record-level data and aggregated data. See I.B.3.

Link to 2011 evaluation of program review with 2009 comparison


Links to two formal reports to CBPC
http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/PRC_Resources.pdf and

Minutes reflecting PRC discussion of evaluation results:

The 2013 evaluation will be even more comprehensive in scope. In Fall 2012, the Special Report workgroup responsible for Recommendation 2 reviewed and recommended several modifications to the annual planning system; these modifications will be reviewed for effectiveness. The workgroup recommendations (formalized in the new Annual Timeline adopted by Board in September 2012) clarified roles, specified activities, and delineated timeframes for each activity. Built into the timeline, the workgroup stated: “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.”

An Employee Survey conducted in Spring 2011 included several overarching questions about institutional effectiveness. These new questions (or similar questions) will be included in future surveys. Nearly all items were rated between 2.0 (Below Average) and 3.0 (Good).
Survey results were discussed during and included in the last self-evaluation process. Per the survey, satisfaction levels with several aspects of institutional effectiveness include the following:

- College dialogue regarding data and research about student learning 2.68
- College Advisory Council (CAC) as a channel for employee and student ideas regarding institutional decision-making, especially District policies 2.51
- College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) as a channel for employee and student ideas regarding institutional decision-making, especially planning and budgeting 2.46


In addition, the Office of Research and Planning is periodically evaluated via the Employee Survey. Below are results from 2011 (previous results in 2004 and 2000 ranged from 2.74 to 3.12):

- Institutional Advancement - Planning Services 2.80
- Institutional Advancement - Research Services 2.96

I.B.6. Self Evaluation. The College began evaluating program review biennially in 2009. The biennial process should be made systematic. However, comprehensive evaluations should encompass the entire planning and budgeting system. The Fall 2013 evaluation will be comprehensive. The Fall 2013 evaluation is scheduled so that it can include and reflect upon the entirety of the new process for developing the Annual Plan and Budget; the latter receives final approval in September 2013.

Additional, interim evaluations can be useful, especially when large-scale changes have occurred. Given the number of changes currently taking place, a preliminary evaluation will be conducted in early Spring 2013. The interim evaluation will include a focus on the new program review guidelines (Did all departments use them? What was useful? What was unclear? What was missing?) and the new rubric (How was it used? How could it be modified?). The interim evaluation will also provide an opportunity to reflect on how current work group activities have differed from previous Shared Governance activities. These findings will be provided to the new Participatory Governance Council which will take on oversight of the assessment, planning, and budgeting cycle.

Interim and comprehensive evaluations should document the culture shift currently occurring so that these changes can be tracked and evaluated longitudinally. Assessment, planning, and budgeting procedures and processes have been modified to emphasize the concept of “ongoing continuous quality improvement.” This includes a focus on assessing SLOs (not just “having” SLOs). Also, program review has historically been viewed by many departments as a place to identify “wish lists” and connection to Budget was viewed as augmentations only. To combat this extremely limited view, nearly all program review documents now include the new tag line “Looking at last year to plan for next year.” The new program review guidelines were developed to underscore the need to focus on all questions thoroughly, not just the question related to requests for augmentation. Evaluations are needed to see whether these types of changes are impacting the culture and orientation of the College.
Similarly, evaluations should include questions on whether and how assessments of SLOs and college-wide discussions of achievement and performance indicators are leading to improvements.

I.B.6. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop the instruments to be used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the Spring 2013 interim evaluation and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the comprehensive evaluation in Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.B.7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

I.B.7. Descriptive Summary. The College uses several mechanisms to gather evidence about the effectiveness of programs.

Program review is the primary means by which the effectiveness of individual units (instructional, students services, and administrative) is assessed.

Individual departments can and do use program review and SLO processes as a mechanism for identifying needed improvements, delineating objectives to make changes, and subsequently evaluating the impact of those changes. Some departments were cited as exemplars by the last visiting team.

The College also uses custom reports and surveys to evaluate effectiveness. As one example of a custom survey, the College participated in the first ever rigorous, Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges-sponsored Career and Technical Education (CTE) survey about job changes after leaving and/or graduating. CTE departments were convened and aggregated results were discussed on December 7, 2012. In early Spring 2013, program-level results will be distributed for further discussion. CTE departments will address the implications of the data in their next program reviews.

The College has just begun to engage in serious discussions about whether and how our implementation of program review and SLOs can be used to create college-wide culture of continuous quality improvement. During Fall 2012, the Special Report workgroup responsible for addressing Recommendation 2 met eight times to discuss planning and evaluation. The group consistently raised the themes for transparency, looping, and integration so that progress can be discussed more meaningfully. On November 30, 2012, the discussion was broadened to include WG 2, 3, 4, and 5. The broader group emphasized the need for a tool that has practical implications for improvement. The new dashboard, built upon ARCC 2.0, will be responsive to all of these concerns since many of the measures connect program-level activities to college-level indicators.
I.B.7. Self Evaluation. The program review process has been meaningfully used by several departments to reflect on program effectiveness in terms of student learning and to identify areas for improvement. [provide exemplars from visiting team as evidence; need to identify which ones].

Within the program review template, this documentation is solicited (“Summarize your department’s progress to date on the major planning objectives”). However, some units provide delineated objectives; others do not itemize objectives clearly.

In general, the quality of program reviews has varied from unit to unit. The Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting system was modified to address this. Per the Annual Timeline, immediate supervisors now have a greater role in reviewing and discussing program review content. In addition, guidelines were created to prompt more complete and introspective responses to the questions. The guidelines include sample responses from a range of units (instructional, student services, administrative).

http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Research_Planning_Grants/Program%20Review/ProgRevGuidelines.pdf

The institution actively evaluates the overall program review process to assess its effectiveness. The evaluation instrument includes questions about “transparent and rational planning,” and “unit-level [self] reflection.” The revised evaluation instrument will include questions about the guidelines and the new role of the supervisor.

Also, the current instrument focuses almost exclusively on program review (see I.B.6.). The revised instrument will encompass the entire assessment, planning, and budgeting system.

I.B.7. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update the evaluation instrument per I.B.6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the documentation within program review by requiring units to explicitly delineate progress on each objective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

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

A. Instructional Programs

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

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

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

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

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

Another body involved in upholding the institution’s integrity is the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. This committee consists of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and five administrators. The Bipartite Committee’s purview is the various requirements of the associate degree. Much of the Bipartite Committee’s work is in approving courses for inclusion in the various General Education areas, although the Bipartite Committee has also approved larger changes, including the major structural changes to its associate degree in 2007-08.
Many of our programs require approval by the State Chancellor’s Office. The application process for State Chancellor’s Office approval addresses five main areas: appropriateness to mission; need; curriculum standards; adequate resources; and compliance. [Chancellor’s Office Program and Course Approval Handbook, 3rd edition, p. 54-64]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Departments use a variety of means to assess program SLOs. In the past, CTE programs were the primary programs to have completed assessments of program SLOs in the past. All programs now have assessment plans that are included on program/department websites. Program Review requires departments to report on how they have used the results of program SLO assessment in making curricular changes.

The institution ensures program currency by requiring departments to report on the assessment of learning outcomes in Program Review. In addition, course outlines cannot be
more than six years old, and all departments must provide update plans in program review each cycle to show progress.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We’ve now identified Program SLOs for all programs and mapped them to courses; need to work on broad-based Program SLO assessment that includes external assessment methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting General Education SLO assessment in Spring 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate required two-year assessment of CTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.A.1.a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

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

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

Over the last several years, ongoing research of educational needs by departmental faculty has led to joint efforts with local community and industry advisory committees. New courses meeting demands for educated workers in biomedical equipment technology, green economy, and health and safety include: Biomedical Instrumentation Maintenance; Solar Thermal Panel Installation; Green and Sustainable Organizational Practices; and Group Facilitation and Field Work in Health Education. These have led to new certificate programs in Biomedical Equipment Technician, Green and Sustainable Business, and Youth Worker. Other avenues to investigate how College curriculum reflects industry employment needs are available through advisory meetings and DACUM (Developing A Curriculum) research groups.

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

Assessing Students’ Educational Preparedness for Program Planning. As part of the Matriculation process preceding enrollment in credit and noncredit courses, students participate in mathematics, English, or ESL placement assessment. Determination of the appropriate levels of courses to take is a “multiple measures” process, which is based on a number of factors, including the placement testing, standardized test scores (e.g. SAT, AP),

Comment [TB4]: We’ll want to follow up with this before the final report is determined.
other college coursework completed, and counselor assessment of relevant indicators during individual interviews. Student course placement data are also useful to basic skills departments in determining the schedule of classes for these departments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

For some time, the capacity of the Research Office to support faculty who wish to use research methods to determine if students are achieving stated learning outcomes has been limited due to its staffing. This limited capacity inhibits the College’s ability to engage in broader, multi-disciplinary approaches to the assessment of learning outcomes.
II.A.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

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

Comment [k5]: Assumes appointment of current research analyst to dean position

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation II.A.1.b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II.A.1.c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

II.A.1.c. Descriptive Summary. In July 2012, ACCJC recommended that “the college identify the intended student learning outcomes at the course, program, general education, certificate and degree levels, develop and implement assessments of student learning, and analyze the results of assessment to improve student learning. The results of ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes should foster robust dialogue and yield continuous improvement of courses, programs and services and the alignment of college practices for continuous improvement.”

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

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

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

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

Course and program SLOs are assessed in many ways, by discipline faculty. For courses, assessment methods are indicated in course outline and SLO-specific extra assessments are described on department websites. Program SLO assessment methods are described on department websites. All program SLOs are mapped to component courses.
Results are used for course and program improvement: examples include changes in course instructional methodology, creation of new courses, changes in the structure of certificates and majors, and even the deletion of certificates/majors.

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

Evidence: Departmental web pages (available from SLO web site: www.ccsf.edu/slo) that show breadth of assessment techniques and how results are being used

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire a permanent SLO coordinator.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build upon the pilot centralized reporting system and develop a more robust system to ensure that assessments continue to take place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [k5]: Can we elaborate, perhaps with examples of refinements needed?
II.A.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.

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

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

Discipline faculty develop credit and noncredit courses and programs for review and recommendation by the Curriculum Committee to the Board of Trustees for final approval. <Need to address how we decide to offer development and pre-collegiate courses/programs>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Determination of the Appropriate Credit Type, Delivery Mode, and Location of Its Courses and Programs.** Departments propose the credit type and delivery modes for courses, which the Curriculum Committee then reviews, and the Board of Trustees ultimately approves. Some courses, as noted above, require further approval by the State Chancellor's Office.
Department chairs, school and center deans, and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs jointly determine the location of courses and programs. In some cases, the choices for locating courses and programs are limited by the available facilities (for example, new credit programs in construction trades are at the Evans campus because it houses the appropriate space and equipment for construction training). In other cases, center deans consult with counseling, Admissions and Records staff, and other student support staff to solicit input on student course demand. This information is given back to school deans and department chairs during the schedule preparation process.

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

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

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

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

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

II.A.2.a. *The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the*
central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

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

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

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

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

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

Sample Improvements. There are a variety of improvements to courses and programs that have occurred as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes. For example:

- The Mathematics Department has created a course (MATH 45X) designed as an alternative pathway to their statistics class, and is engaged in an assessment of this
course, comparing the success of students who took this course vs. those that took the traditional prerequisite sequence.

- Earth Sciences is increasing its use of the iClicker technology, especially in larger classes, to increase student interaction.
- Cinema has created and/or updated course readers for a number of different courses.

More examples of improvements can be found on individual department’s SLO web pages, available from the College’s SLO web site (www.ccsf.edu/slo).

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

The College has not done well at ensuring that all course outlines are updated on a regular basis, however, a new timeline and policy have been put into place to resolve this. The College’s required reporting on the assessment of learning outcomes in its Annual Program Review system is another helpful method in ensuring that programs and courses are routinely reviewed. The College needs to integrate more specific review requirements for CTE certificate and degree programs.

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

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

II.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.
II.A.2.b. Descriptive Summary. Discipline faculty have the primary role in determining the competency levels and SLOs for courses and programs. New courses and programs are reviewed by the College’s Curriculum Committee, which reviews the SLOs for the course or program. CTE programs use advisory committees to perform regular review of their programs, including the learning outcomes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2010-11 Credit Student Opinion Survey Results**

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

[Comment [khc11]: Do we have a more recent survey?]
There is some natural institutional dialogue that occurs between the Curriculum Committee, department chairs, and discipline faculty as courses and programs are brought to the Curriculum Committee for approval.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no parallel language for noncredit courses.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Learning assessment methods include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We should have a regular survey of our students to ask about learning styles they find to be effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the College’s commitment to the assessment of learning outcomes, the effectiveness of new teaching methodologies will be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden our SLO assessment efforts to include discussion of and professional development opportunities for sharing new teaching techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create professional development opportunities on a more regular basis (in Spring we plan to have one every week at a variety of time and campuses and across a variety of topics).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage our in-house talent to share best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
practices across the college through workshops and web resources.

It'd also be great to make professional development requirements for new and continuing faculty (at least full-timers) to learn about learning styles and pedagogy.

II.A.2.e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an ongoing systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

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

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

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

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

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

To respond to Program Review prompts, units with courses are provided with the following data:
- Student success data, including grade point average and percentage of units passed. This data is reported for departments as a whole, and is also disaggregated by age, ethnicity, BOGG waiver status, and gender.

- Program Award data (number of certificates and degrees issued by the College).

- Demographic Data, again by age, ethnicity, BOGG waiver status, and gender.

- Enrollment data, including the demand for courses and sections.

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


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

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

www.ccsf.edu/slo

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

II.A.2.g. If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.

II.A.2.g. Descriptive Summary. During Fall 2010, all instructional departments were surveyed to assess which departments were using common examinations and assessments. The following courses were reported to have common exams or common assessments:

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

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

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

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

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

In French and Spanish courses, instructors make use of a common bank of test sections to minimize differences in assessment between instructors, and work is currently underway in Foreign Languages courses to incorporate common elements into final examinations.

Chemistry 101A sections use common, team-written questions for the midterm examination, and all students in these courses take the same final examination. Chemistry 101B sections share common portions of the final examination. These common materials have been developed by faculty consensus over time, and faculty conduct regular revision, looking for flawed or biased items and taking into account how different student populations are performing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.

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

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

In the case of degrees:

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

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

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

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

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

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

II.A.2.i. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:
II.A.3. The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.

General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including the following:

II.A.3.a. An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

II.A.3.b. A capability to be a productive individual and life-long learner: skills include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means.

II.A.3.c. A recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen: qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally.

II.A.3. Descriptive Summary. Students completing the Associate Degree have two different options for satisfying General Education requirements:

- Those completing the Associate in Arts or Associate in Science degrees follow the College’s locally developed General Education pattern
- Those completing the Associate in Arts for Transfer or Associate in Science for Transfer follow either the CSU GE or IGETC patterns

See the “Associate Degree Graduation Requirements” section of the College Catalog for details.

As the General Education pattern for the Associate Degrees for Transfer have been dictated by legislation, there is not a local faculty-developed rationale for that pattern per se, but the areas largely overlap the College’s local areas. The legislation for the Associate Degrees for Transfer (SB 1440) prevents the College from establishing additional graduation requirements beyond what is stated in the Catalog. As such, it is somewhat difficult to show
certain elements of the accreditation standards (e.g., II.A.3.c, regarding ethics and citizenship).

The local General Education requirements have been developed in accord with Title 5 Section 55061 et seq., which require some of the elements noted in the Accreditation Standards.

Evidence for a faculty-developed rationale for the local General Education pattern includes:

- Page 46 of the 2012-13 College Catalog contains “Goals of the General Education Program.” These goals are taken from the Academic Senate.
- In addition, each of the General Education areas has its own set of learning outcomes, also printed in the Catalog.
- The procedures of the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements require departments submitting courses for inclusion in a general education area to show how the course meets the goals and the learning outcomes of the requested area.

New rules adopted in Fall 2012 by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements require departments submitting courses for consideration for inclusion in general education to show how the course maps to the area under consideration. (we need to update the Bipartite Committee Handbook to reflect this change)

The Catalog includes not only the local General Education goals but also information about the inclusion of courses, which is also part of other student publications, including the 32,000+ CCSF GE/grad worksheets that are produced and disseminated annually.

The General Education philosophy is reflected in the degree requirements by virtue of requiring all students seeking the Associate Degree to meet the General Education requirements.

II.A.3.a. Descriptive Summary. Discipline faculty, who are subject matter experts in their fields, develop courses in these areas. The College relies on these discipline faculty to determine the basic content and methodology of these areas. Before a course is included in one of the General Education areas it is reviewed and approved by the College’s Curriculum Committee and the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.

Departments submit courses to the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. The submission process requires departments to show how the course meets the Goals of the General Education program, the related inclusion criteria, and the learning outcomes of that area. The members of the Bipartite Committee review the application and the approved Course Outline of Record to make their determination about course inclusion.

The College has had limited pilot efforts at assessing the General Education learning outcomes. In Fall 2012 the College reviewed all courses applicable to General Education, mapping the learning outcomes of the courses to the learning outcomes for the applicable GE area and assessing the fit between them. With this mapping process completed, a more robust effort at assessing the GE SLOs is planned for Spring 2013.

At this time, the College does not have a system for evaluating how well students who have completed general education coursework are able to apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors.
II.A.3.b. Descriptive Summary. The assumption is that, by requiring GE students to complete coursework in different GE areas where achievement of these capabilities and skills is assessed, they will attain the skills to be productive individuals and life-long learners.

The College’s local General Education Program includes required coursework in areas that are applicable to becoming a productive and life-long learner:

- Area A: Communication and Analytical Thinking
- Area B: Written Composition
- Area C: Natural Sciences, which includes a learning outcome on communicating scientific ideas and theories effectively
- Area G: Health Knowledge and Physical Skills
- Area H: Ethnic, Women’s, and LGBT Studies

For quantitative reasoning, there is also a Mathematics graduation requirement. The College’s Written Composition requirement is satisfied by taking English 1A. This English course requires students to take workshops in the library, developing student’s information competency and their ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means.

Each of the GE areas mentioned above has its own inclusion criteria and learning outcomes. The same Curriculum Committee and Bipartite processes are used for these courses as well, assuring that the skill levels meet collegiate standards and are included in course outlines.

Measurement of student skills varies from course to course, and is reflected in the Evaluation section of the approved Course Outline of Record. The College’s Curriculum Committee processes ensure that the measures are effective.

As noted in the answer to II.A.3.b, the College has had limited pilot efforts in assessing the learning outcomes of General Education coursework. Again, the College does not have a comprehensive approach to evaluating how well students who have completed General Education coursework are able to apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors.

Descriptive Summary II.A.3.c. The College included learning outcomes related to ethics and effective citizenship with the creation of GE areas that went beyond the requirements of Title 5 Section 55063:

- The College’s local General Education pattern includes Area F, United States History and Government. As noted in the learning outcomes for this area, courses satisfying this requirement allow students to “examine and understand the importance of participating in civic duties and responsibilities based on historical and political precedent”

- In addition, the College’s local GE pattern includes Area H, Ethnic/Women’s/LGBT studies. This local requirement reflects the College’s commitment to graduating students that have an appreciation and understanding of the history, culture, and perspective of diverse groups.

II.A.3.a-c. Self Evaluation. The College has a faculty-developed rationale for GE that serves as the basis for course inclusion. The College has a well-defined process for course
inclusion in General Education that takes learning outcomes into account. The rationale for GE is well communicated, and accurately reflected in degree requirements for those students pursuing the Associate Degree.

Those students pursuing the Associate Degree for Transfer satisfy their General Education requirements by completing either the CSU GE or IGETC patterns. While there is no faculty-developed rationale for this GE pattern per se, there is much overlap in the structure of these GE patterns. The legislation that created the Associate Degrees for Transfer prohibits the College from including any other requirements. As a result, there are elements of the local philosophy of GE that are not reflected in these requirements.

The College has a well-defined process to determine the basic content and methodology of traditional areas of knowledge and to ensure that all GE courses include this content and methodology. The College needs to build upon the work being conducted in Spring 2013 and develop sustainable assessments of GE outcomes. This process needs to also capture external assessments of how well students apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors.

Students following the College’s local GE pattern have a well-defined path to learning about ethics and effective citizenship. Those students pursuing an Associate Degree for Transfer do not necessarily take courses in these areas, but the legislation that created the Associate Degree for Transfer does not allow us to create any additional local requirements.

II.A.3. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College will continue its efforts at assessing the learning outcomes associated with traditional areas of knowledge. This will include expanding the assessment beyond the courses in the GE areas, but also subsequent coursework, employment, and other endeavors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

II.A.4. Descriptive Summary. The College offers four associate degrees: the Associate in Science (AS), Associate in Arts (AA), Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T), and Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T). The Associate Degrees for Transfer are relatively new additions.
For the AS and AA degrees, students are required to satisfy the Major requirement in one of several ways:

- Completion of 18 or more units in an Area of Emphasis of the Liberal Arts and Sciences program
- Completion of 18 or more units in a curriculum specified by the department and approved by the State Chancellor’s Office
- Completion of 18 or more units in a particular field of study when a major has not been specified by the department

For the AS-T and AA-T degrees, students are required to satisfy the Major requirement by completing the curriculum specified by the department and approved by the State Chancellor’s Office. These majors are developed in accordance with statewide Transfer Model Curricula. As of December 3, 2012, City College of San Francisco has three majors approved for the Associate Degree for Transfer: Psychology, Communication Studies, and English. Several other majors have been approved by the Curriculum Committee in Fall 2012 and are in the process of approval.

There has been no significant change in this standard since the 2012 report. Details of the major requirement for AA/AS degrees are on pages 51-52 of the 2012-13 College Catalog. Details of the major requirement for AA-T/AS-T degrees are on page 52 of the 2012-13 College Catalog.

II.A.4. Self Evaluation. All of the College’s degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

II.A.4. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.5. Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.

II.A.5. Descriptive Summary. The Research and Planning Office collects data for licensure pass rates for individual CCSF departments. The Office must rely upon licensing agencies for the data and in some instances has experienced difficulty retrieving them. However, the Office was able to obtain licensure exam data for 2009-10 and found the following pass rates for CCSF students: Radiation Therapy Technology (86 percent); Diagnostic Medical Imaging (100 percent); Licensed Vocational Nursing (94 percent); Registered Nursing (89 percent); Cardiovascular Tech/Echocardiography (100 percent); Emergency Medical Technician (81 percent); Pharmacy Technician (100 percent); Health Information Technology (92 percent); Medical Assisting (100 percent); Paramedic (100 percent); and Phlebotomy (92 percent) [II A-68]. Students completing the Real Estate program are eligible to sit for the Real Estate
Salesperson and Broker exams and students who complete the Aeronautics program are eligible to sit for the Federal Aviation Administration’s exams in Powerplant and Airframe.

The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office furnishes annual reports that reflect Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA) Core Indicator data uploaded from the College to the State Management Information System. Core Indicator #4 measures placement by matching the number of student completers to the California Employment Development Department Unemployment Insurance wage database. The most recent data available, 2008-09, show the College aggregate match rate of 87.3 percent. [II A-5 p. 2] This reflects an increase of almost 9 percent from the last report. These data, however, are not entirely conclusive in that they do not capture all student placement data, such as the number of graduates who become successfully self-employed or move out of state for employment.

The College also participated in the RP Group’s CTE Employment Outcomes survey and recently received the results.

Some individual departments are piloting their own tracking of program completers using social media (e.g., LinkedIn).

II.A.5. Self Evaluation. For those programs that have distinct licensure exams, the College has a well-defined process for collecting this data and passing it back to discipline faculty for use in continuous quality improvement. The use of Core Indicator data is helpful, but is incomplete (as noted above), and was only fully integrated into the College’s Perkins Allocation process.

The College’s participation in the RP Group survey will help evaluate outcomes. The College has committed to continuing its participation in this survey, which will continue to provide valuable information for CTE programs.

Although individual departments use social media to maintain contact with program completers, the lack of an institution-wide effort to gathering post-educational employment data needs to be addressed.

In Fall 2012, the College went through a process of identifying program-level SLOs for all programs, and also asked about external assessment methods that departments would like to use. A large number of the CTE programs expressed interest in having reliable job placement information.

II.A.5. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College needs to allocate resources to develop a more robust system of tracking the employment of program completers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College needs to infuse the analysis of post-educational employment information into the assessment of program-level SLOs and the program review process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.A.6. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution’s officially approved course outline.

II.A.6.a. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

II.A.6.b. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

II.A.6.c. The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.

II.A.6. Descriptive Summary. Information about programs is reviewed by the Curriculum Committee when programs are created or revised. The annual Catalog publication process also allows departments an opportunity to review and update information about their programs. The description of certificates, majors, and other programs in the College Catalog includes student learning outcomes. The Catalog is published in print and online, helping serve distance education students.

Students and faculty are periodically surveyed about the College Catalog. This information is used in the Program Review process for the Catalog Office. The Catalog Office has also recently developed administrative unit outcomes to help assess the clarity of information published in the Catalog.

Assurance that Students Receive a Course Syllabus with SLOs. Article 8 of the District/AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement requires faculty to abide by applicable provisions of the Faculty Handbook. Section 4.7 of the Faculty Handbook requires all faculty to provide students with pertinent written information, including the learning outcomes of the course. This section of the faculty handbook also requires faculty to provide a copy of their course syllabi to the department chairperson.

Students enrolled in distance education courses also receive course syllabi information that includes learning outcomes. Many faculty teaching distance education courses require students to certify that they have read the syllabi before beginning the course.

SLOs for all courses are found on assessment websites for all departments, making them publicly available to students and faculty.
Adherence to the Course Objectives/Learning Outcomes. The Faculty Evaluation process, as detailed in Article 9 and related Exhibits of the District/AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement, is the mechanism by which the College ensures that individual faculty members are teaching courses in accordance with the approved course outline, including the course learning outcomes. Faculty are evaluated on the following criteria:

- The course content is up to date and appropriate.
- The course content is taught in an approach that is acceptable to the discipline/department.
- The class segment observed and any materials furnished were pertinent to the course outline.
- Course SLO assessment plans and results are entered each semester into an online report by one Course Manager who gathers information from all instructors and facilitates the discussion and sharing and reviewing of data.

II.A.6.a. Descriptive Summary. Information about transferring coursework is detailed in the “Transfer Information” section of the College Catalog. The Catalog is available in printed version in the Bookstore and is also available online. The College has policies regarding transfer of incoming coursework. This policy is published in the “Academic Policies and Procedures” section of the College Catalog.

Transfer of coursework from CCSF to other institutions is detailed in the myriad articulation agreements the College has with the University of California, the California State University, California independent colleges and universities, and out-of-state public and private colleges. These agreements are continually expanded and updated as curriculum information and student needs and interests change. Articulation information is listed in the Catalog, which is available in print and online. Additional tools include general education worksheets for students, time schedule transfer information pages, the statewide ASSIST website, the College articulation website [II A-80], and a student transcript report generated from the Banner database. Updates are delivered through meeting presentations, end-of-year mailings, workshops, and emails. Listings in the CCSF Catalog routinely and consistently indicate whether courses articulate to UC or CSU.

The College supports an Office of Articulation with a full-time articulation officer and a half-time clerical assistant. The Office is responsible for the development and maintenance of articulation agreements and the dissemination of all information related to articulation.

The College participates in statewide efforts to streamline articulation through common course numbering and model curricula programs. Currently, it is engaged in the statewide Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) and Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) efforts. College faculty and an articulation officer have participated in statewide meetings to discuss C-ID and TMC, have provided input via the C-ID website, and have submitted several courses for C-ID review. Three transfer associate degrees based on TMCs were submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office for review; two of these have been approved as of June 2011 and the third one is still under review [II A-81].

Articulation agreements are based on course outlines that are reviewed and approved by the College Curriculum Committee. Courses that are intended for statewide UC transfer and UC/CSU general education are further reviewed by the College CSU/UC Breadth Committee
before they are submitted to the UC Office of the President or the CSU Chancellor’s Office. Course-to-course articulation, usually intended to meet requirements for the major at the university, is initiated by the articulation officer working with discipline faculty, particularly department chairs. Articulation requests are sent to transfer institutions for review. When articulation agreements are approved, the information is shared with the College community.

II.A.6.b. Descriptive Summary. The College is currently engaged in developing a program closure policy. The Academic Senate has had this on the agenda on the October 24, November 7, and November 28, 2012 meetings.

The College has a “Catalog Rights” policy to protect student rights. This policy is published in the “Associate Degree” section of the College Catalog, and allows students, when changes to a program take place, to follow the requirements of a certificate or degree program as it was published at the time of original enrollment as long as the student maintains continuous enrollment.

Primary responsibility for advising students when programs are modified rests with department chairs. While the Catalog Rights policy allows students to follow the original program requirements, there are times when the underlying courses are changed or eliminated. College practices give department chairs wide latitude in allowing substitutions or waivers of program requirements, allowing departments to accommodate affected students.

II.A.6.c. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco represents itself to students, personnel, and the public through a range of publications and statements. The College Catalog contains descriptions of all courses, information about programs of study, and statements of the College’s regulations, rules and policies. The Catalog is produced, updated, reviewed for accuracy, and reprinted annually under the supervision of the Office of Instruction, and is available in both print and electronic forms. Updates to program and course information are done based on Curriculum Committee actions—any new courses, modifications to courses, or course deletions are done through the Curriculum Committee.

Other sections of the Catalog (e.g., Library and Learning Resources, Academic Policies) are reviewed by the owners of that section. The Office of Instruction asks for such updates each year in the late fall/early spring, and incorporates all reported changes into the next printed version of the Catalog. Additionally, when policies are updated via the Shared Governance process, changes are made to the appropriate sections of the Catalog. These changes are highlighted in a Policy Update document on the online Catalog [II A-82].

The Office of Instruction also maintains two versions of the Catalog on the College website: the first is a PDF version that matches that year’s printed Catalog exactly, and has all sections of the Catalog; the second contains just course and program information, and is updated continuously throughout the year, based on Curriculum Committee actions. In addition to publishing the Catalog on the College website, the Office of Instruction gives paper copies to counselors and key offices. Students may also purchase a paper copy of the Catalog at the CCSF Bookstore.

When the Office of Instruction receives notification of approval of new certificate or degree programs after the Catalog has been published, it includes this information in an online Catalog addendum [II A-83]. Such programs are typically listed as “pending state approval”
in the printed version of the Catalog, and the addendum gives details of these programs once approval has been gained.

The College Class Schedule is published online three times a year. This schedule provides detailed information about each semester’s course offering and includes links to campus maps, and information about programs and services the College offers. With each publication, the Schedule is reviewed for accuracy, currency, and completeness by the Office of Marketing and Public Information.

The Office of Marketing and Public Information publishes a biweekly newsletter City Currents, which features faculty and staff accomplishments, Board news, student achievements, and current events at the College.

The Faculty Handbook informs CCSF professional staff of the principal rules, regulations, practices and procedures that are essential to their role in the operation of the District. It is produced by the Human Resources Department, is distributed to all faculty members and is available on the College website.

Academic policies are reviewed in response to identified issues and opportunities, Title 5 changes, and legislative or regulatory changes. They are revised through the Shared Governance System. Major changes to programs and policies are disseminated via Shared Governance committee meetings, trainings, email dissemination, College publications and the College website. The Board of Trustees, through its Policy Implementation Committee, is currently updating Board policies, which are made available to the public on the College website [II.A-84].

The College website provides information on the College’s mission, instructional programs, support programs, and administration, and can be translated into a number of languages. In 2007, after a public bidding process, City College of San Francisco contracted with Earthbound Media Group to redesign its website. By 2009, Earthbound had completed the overhaul, creating a unifying visual motif, organizing information for easier access, dramatically improving its search engine capabilities, and bringing the site into compliance with ADA standards. The College now has a “Webcred” working group that has been reviewing the transition from old to new formats and providing support for improving webpages.

Most recently, the Outreach Office started a City College Facebook page offering information about upcoming scholarship applications, registration deadlines, job opportunities, and campus events, as well as links to in-house videos about the College counseling programs, student achievements, and international student assistance programs.

The Research and Policy webpage found under Employee Services presents information on student achievement, both recent and archival reports. It posts Program Review reports, which contain current student achievement data for each academic department. Other posted reports include Accountability Reporting for the California Community College, College Performance Indicators, Basic Skills Accountability, The High School Report, and additional focused reports on student performance.

In addition to the information published on the Research and Planning web site, the College publishes information required by Federal Gainful Employment requirements for certain of its CTE certificate programs. This information includes the number of program completers.
and the number of students that complete the program within the normal time to completion. This information is published in the online section of the College Catalog near the relevant certificate programs.

After receiving the Show Cause determination from ACCJC, the College immediately posted the ACCJC letter and College response to the accreditation website. Given the resulting media attention on the College, the College has proactively provided information about its accreditation status and its impact on students in addition to responding to the negative press and media attention. For example, the College mailed a postcard to all residents of San Francisco highlighting that City College’s doors are still open. Shortly after Interim Chancellor Fisher was hired, the College also hired a public spokesperson to centralize media communications in anticipation of the negative news that would ensue as a result of the fiscal crisis and accreditation findings. This was necessary given that the Dean of Public Information and Marketing position had been vacant since Summer 2010. In late Fall 2012, the College also hired a consulting firm to reverse its declining enrollment given concerns that the College would not make base for 2012-13. This firm has concentrated its efforts on print and online advertising and social media, including Facebook and Twitter.

II.A.6. Self Evaluation. The College has made significant strides in the development of program-level Student Learning Outcomes, helping to assure that students receive clear and accurate information about programs.

The College has good policies and practices in place to assure students receive syllabi with information regarding course outcomes and that individual course sections adhere to those learning outcomes.

The College has a robust system of working with incoming and outgoing transfer of coursework, including the development and implementation of articulation agreements.

The College policy on Catalog rights helps to ensure students are able to complete work towards program completion in the face of program modification. This policy has been updated and clarified in recent years, addressing, for example, students who begin their studies in a summer session. However, the college needs to complete its work on developing a program discontinuance policy.

With respect to representing itself in Catalog and publications, the College has good practices in place for updating the printed and online versions of the College Catalog and Time Schedule, but could use better practices for ensuring the accuracy of other elements of its web presence. With respect to representing itself in statements, individuals affiliated with the institution have at times made statements in the wake of the Show Cause determination that have been captured in news articles and other media and have not accurately represented the College’s status or activities. The College instituted a media protocol when media attention increased that required that any individual contacted by the media channel communications to the Office of Marketing and Public Information and/or to the public spokesperson. Individuals have not always adhered to this protocol.

II.A.6. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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II.A.7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or world views. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

II.A.7.a. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

II.A.7.b. The institution establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty.

II.A.7.c. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such polices, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.

II.A.7. Descriptive Summary. The College has clear policies that illustrate its commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. Accessible through the SFCCD Board Policy Manual in print and online, Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Freedom” clearly defines academic freedom with its rights and responsibilities and contains guidelines for textbook selection, library selections, and public forums [II A-85]. Board Policy 6.06 includes language describing both the rights and responsibilities of faculty – “the right to exercise any liberty implies a duty to use it responsibly.”

The “Student Rights and Responsibilities” section of the CCSF College Catalog (“College Rules and Regulations”) contains Board-approved policy (Board Policy 6.11) on student academic honesty [II A-58 p. 401-402]. This document is available on line and in hard copy at the CCSF Bookstore. The policy is also in the Student Handbook, distributed at the start of each semester, and also available online [II A-87].

II.A.7.a. Descriptive Summary. The College communicates its expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views through many references in Article 8 of the SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement. For example, section C.4 states, “Faculty cannot, however, expect academic freedom to be unlimited, for the right to exercise any liberty implies a duty to use it responsibly. Academic freedom does not give faculty freedom to engage in indoctrination. Nor can faculty invoke the principle of academic freedom to justify non-professional conduct” [II A-86 p. 20 Lines 12-16].

A component of faculty evaluation (including tenure review) is an anonymous survey of students in one or more classes taught by the instructor being evaluated. Different surveys are used for credit, noncredit, ESL, and library courses. Each of these surveys include a question about instructor’s biases. For example:
Survey Item Relating to Credit Students: Does the instructor seem to be free of racial, sexual, religious and political prejudices?
Survey Item Relating to Noncredit Students: Shows respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups.
Survey Item Relating to ESL Students: The teacher respects the students.

The data from recent evaluations show that faculty score well in this regard. In Spring 2012, faculty under regular evaluation scored as follows:

Credit faculty: 4.8 out of 5.0, which compares well with the overall student evaluation question rating of 4.58.
Noncredit faculty: 4.88 out of 5.0 on this question, comparing well with the overall average of 4.77.
ESL faculty: 4.83 out of 5.0, comparing well with the overall average of 4.81

This survey mechanism is also used for students engaged in distance education courses.

II.A.7.b. Descriptive Summary. The College utilizes the following mechanisms to inform students of policies relating to academic honesty:

- The College publishes policies on academic honesty in the print and online versions of the College Catalog. Again, the online versions help serve our distance education students.
- Academic honesty also noted in the CCSF Student Handbook.
- Some departments have had further discussion on academic honesty and have published additional information for students (see 2012 report)
- Students who take Library Skills Workshops get additional information about plagiarism (see 2012 report)

The College utilizes the following mechanisms to enforce academic honesty:

- The College has a well-defined process for resolving violations of student rules and regulations through the Dean of Students office (see details in College Catalog).

II.A.7.c. Descriptive Summary. Not applicable—the College does not have conformity to a code of conduct.

II.A.7. Self Evaluation. The College has well-defined Board Policies on Academic Freedom and Academic Honesty.

The faculty evaluation and tenure review processes are an effective means of ensuring that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. Data from student evaluations shows that, on average, faculty are doing well.

While publication in the Catalog is an effective means of disseminating information about College policies, it would be good to also include language about college rules and
regulations in the Time Schedule, and to require a section on Academic Honesty in course syllabi.

On a Collegewide level, it does not appear that conversations regarding the distinctions between personal conviction and professionally accepted views take place. The College should consider engaging faculty in such discussions.

**II.A.7. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include section on College Rules and Regulations in the Time Schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Faculty Handbook to require discussion of Academic Honesty in course syllabi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College should include discussions on academic freedom in its flex day activities and in the orientation for new tenure-track faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II.A.8. Institutions offering curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals operate in conformity with Standards and applicable Commission policies.**

Not applicable.

**II.B. Student Support Services**

The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.

**II.B.1. The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.**

**II.B.1. Descriptive Summary.** Ocean campus maintains the largest offering of Student Services, open Monday – Friday during regular business hours. Select Student Services are offered at Centers with limited availability. Bilingual staff are available to assist students. Student Services distributes information via the CCSF website, with most programs maintaining their own sections on the CCSF website. Information about Student Services is also available in person, by phone, and through hard copy brochures.

To assess the quality of services provided to students, the College utilizes SLOs and surveys of students and employees to make program improvements and to expand services where necessary. Much of this evaluation takes place through Program Review, although the

**Comment [khc15]:** Need to list the types of services offered at Ocean and those offered at Centers.

**Comment [k16]:** At all sites? Select sites?
Research and Planning Office has also evaluated the effectiveness of Student Services through the use of the SARS Grid to collect data.

The College utilizes Program Review to evaluate and improve Student Services programming. It has led to a number of changes and expansions in programming.

II.B.1. Self Evaluation. ACCJC issued the following recommendation:

“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.”

In response to this recommendation, the College began conducting a comprehensive review and assessment of all student support services across the entire District, including the Ocean Campus and all Centers. Some of the findings are as follows:

- Student Services are not generally offered after business hours and at other Centers. This creates considerable hardship for students who only attend night classes and classes at Centers other than the Ocean campus. During business hours, services are available and wait times generally are acceptable.
- Students are often unable to access Student Services due to a lack of awareness and knowledge about Student Services. Students are often unable to locate information about Student Services on the CCSF website due to poor layout and over-complexity. While many materials are available in multiple languages, this is not true in all cases, resulting in some ESL students still having difficulty understanding the services available to them.
- When students do access services, many students frequently receive incorrect or confusing information from Student Services staff members, resulting in disuse of the services and student frustration. A reorganization of student services has been developed in order to better integrate services and consolidate where appropriate.
- Research and Planning reports about student services do not reflect current outcomes and demographics.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update all Research and Planning reports regarding Student Services to include current data for analysis needs.</td>
<td>Create new reports including relevant data not currently available.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide basic Student Services at all Centers to allow for maximum utilization. (Admissions, Enrollment and Records, Financial Aid, Counseling)</td>
<td>Distribute staff to have at least limited service at Centers throughout the CCSF system.</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Student Services are available during peak demand periods.</td>
<td>Create a system of extended hours for services such as Counseling and Admissions and</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyze and evaluate services to determine specific student needs at the Centers based on demographics.

Create regular Student Focus Groups and surveys to collect data to be analyzed by Research and Planning.

Fall 2013

Create, expand, or implement services needed at Centers based on analysis.

Redesign CCSF website to ensure usability and accessibility for all students.

Spring 2013

Provide clear and available information about Student Services on the CCSF website.

Ensure the City College of San Francisco Website is updated every semester to include current information for all Student Services for students who physically attend classes and those who chose Online classes.

Ensure all students are aware of and informed about relevant Student Services.

Conduct outreach and marketing of Student Services throughout the college.

Ongoing

II.B.2. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following:

a. General information
   - Official Name, Address(es), Telephone Number(s), and Website Address for the Institution
   - Educational Mission
   - Course, Program, and Degree Offerings
   - Academic Calendar and Program Length
   - Academic Freedom Statement
   - Available Student Financial Aid
   - Available Learning Resources
   - Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty
   - Names of Governing Board Members

b. Requirements
   - Admissions
   - Student Fees and Other Financial Obligations
   - Degree, Certificates, Graduation and Transfer

c. Major Policies Affecting Students
   - Academic Regulations, including Academic Honesty
   - Nondiscrimination
   - Acceptance of Transfer Credits
   - Grievance and Complaint Procedures
   - Sexual Harassment
   - Refund of Fees

d. Locations or Publications Where Other Policies may be Found.
II.B.2. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco publishes in its Catalog, which is available in limited print copies and posted on its website, precise, accurate, and up-to-date information on the following:

General information, which includes official name, address(es), telephone number(s), and Website address of the institution (the employee directory on the website also provides contact information for all employees); educational mission; course, program, and degree offerings; academic calendar and program length; academic freedom statement; available student financial aid; available learning resources; names and degrees of administrators and faculty; and names of its Board of Trustees members. (Need someone to look up pages in Catalog for this information)

Requirements include admissions requirements [College Catalog, pp. 14-20]; student fees and other financial obligations [College Catalog, p. 17]; and degree, certificate, graduation, and transfer requirements [College Catalog, pp. 46-64].

Major policies affecting students include those related to academic regulations, such as academic honesty [College Catalog, p. 417]; nondiscrimination [College Catalog, pp. 410-411]; acceptance of transfer credits [College Catalog, p. 432]; grievance and complaint procedures [College Catalog, pp. 418-420]; sexual harassment [College Catalog, pp. 410-411]; and refund of fees [College Catalog, pp. 17-18].

Locations or publications where other policies may be found include XXX

The Office of Instruction produces the College Catalog in conjunction with the Catalog workgroup. In addition, the Office of Instruction produces the now-exclusively online Class Schedule, which also includes the detailed information about course offerings for a given semester and contains links to important information about admissions, registration, course fees, and materials fees. It also includes telephone numbers web addresses and maps to guide students to additional sources of policies and other information. Given financial limitations, residents of San Francisco no longer receive the Class Schedule in the mail. In lieu of mailing the Class Schedule, the College sends postcards to San Francisco residents as a reminder that the Class Schedule is available online.

II.B.2. Self Evaluation. Administrative units review Catalog information for accuracy and relevancy annually. In addition, agenda items approved by the Curriculum Committee form the basis for updates to the Programs and Courses section of the Catalog. Given the centralized production of both the Catalog and Class Schedule by the Office of Instruction, updates to the Catalog inform updates to the Class Schedule. As a result of the review activities, both the College Catalog and Class Schedule contain precise, accurate, current, comprehensive, and essential information.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.B.3. The institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.
II.B.3. Descriptive Summary. In Fall 2012, the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Development conducted an assessment of student services through a number of focus groups comprising members of the various offices under the supervision of the Vice Chancellor. These focus groups completed forms identifying key areas of concerns and provided comments on the reorganization of the Student Development Division.

Historically, the Research and Planning Office has conducted studies related to various aspects of student achievement such as high school enrollment, transfers, and completion of certificate programs; progress of English and math classes and student success. [Appendix 2]

Based on these and other findings related to student needs, the College has also pursued and received grants or outside staffing support for Bridge to Success, Gateway to College, Veteran Services, TRIO, Health Services (Medical), and many other distinct grant-funded programs that service special populations, including a variety of National Science Foundation grants that target historically underserved populations.

On a larger scale, the College has undertaken a comprehensive review of student equity in terms of achievement gaps and access. A Student Equity Plan was issued on February 28, 2005, which included an analysis of gaps in student equity as well as goals and objectives for Student Support Services units such as the Office of Outreach and Recruitment, the Disabled Students Programs and Services, the various counseling departments, and the various retention programs. [II B-38]

In 2010, several Trustees led an effort to close the achievement gap when they initiated a number of public student equity hearings. Findings from these hearings, along with findings from previous listening sessions in 2009-10 resulted the College’s establishment of a Chancellor’s Task Force on the Achievement Gap and Student Equity.

A current effort to research the learning support needs of the College’s student population is taking place within the dual enrollment program, which is maintaining and reviewing data to determine how SFUSD students perform once they matriculate to City College. In spite of summer bridge programs, the dual enrollment experience, and the development of long-term education plans, many students coming into the College are not doing well during their first year, and the College has recognized that there is a need for a first-year transition program for these student. The College is exploring a number of existing models of good first-year transition programs.

II.B.3. Self Evaluation. The Student Development Division and the Research and Planning Office have not always had access to accurate and relevant data for a complete program review and program planning related to the strategic plan.

Specifically, it is difficult to access data stored in BANNER, and what is stored is not clearly defined. In addition, the BANNER system does not currently allow for updating data nor for sharing data between various educational units. As a result, data and reports may not be accurate.

To address these data issues, the College purchased, and is in the process of installing, a new data management tool (ARGOS) that will provide easily produced, accurate reports for enrollment management and educational planning.

Staffing limitations in Research and Planning have made it difficult to update the various evaluations that the Research and Planning staff have conducted in the past on various
student services and to gather more specific information about student needs. In an effort to boost support for and improve institutional planning, CCSF committed to hiring a Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (appointed by the Board in February 2013) and to replacing the Director of Research who plans to retire in Spring 2013. [Appendix 1]

All areas within Student Support Services have developed Student Learning Outcomes. Each unit has posted online their SLOs, assessments, and timelines for assessing SLOs, viewable in each unit’s respective websites under “Assessment.” The assessments are currently underway.


While all service units complete a Program Review, this process does not address the quality of service delivered. The College has not conducted surveys that ask students to detail concerns with service delivery and issues with customer service. In the focus groups, student raised several issues, including poor customer service that is in need of a student-centered approach, delays in processing applications, and closed offices, all of which result in student frustration. Students also requested improved online services and require easier access to accurate information and electronic educational plans.

Not all College Centers provide comprehensive student services to address the large number of non-credit students at the Centers. Although Steps-to-Credit activities are held at some Centers, the District does not have a consistent method to ensure non-credit Adult Education students receive an educational plan and inquiry of interest to matriculate to credit programs. As a result, these students are not matriculating into credit programs as hoped for. The development of student educational plans will be required with the implementation of SB1456 and other Student Success Task Force recommendations.

[Appendix: Report on the Proposed Reorganization of Student Development]

II.B.3. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide accurate and relevant data for program planning and support for the implementation of new programs that have full staffing and space considerations</td>
<td>Research office provides standardized measures for program review and includes survey’s of students in relation to delivery of services</td>
<td>Develop Survey by March 15, 2013; conduct survey in April 2013; Continue Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous quality improvement</td>
<td>All units conduct and complete a annual SLO assessment cycle</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Stop Teams for Centers</td>
<td>Develop the structure, staffing, rotations and training for these teams and establish at the Centers, as needed</td>
<td>Develop - Spring 2013; training – Fall 2013; Implement – Spring, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service and related professional development Training for all staff &amp; faculty</td>
<td>Offer select customer service trainings and team building opportunities each term for all Student Development personnel</td>
<td>Start in Spring, 2013 and continue each term thereafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve institutional data reports</td>
<td>Implement ARGOS data management tool</td>
<td>February 2013 and follow-up with regular reports each term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using previous findings conducted by the research office on student success as a baseline, they will provide annual progress reports (See appendix 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assess, evaluate and determine needed student services by sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop “One Stop” model for service provision with integrated cross-trained team approach; cross train &amp; redeploy staff to accommodate needed services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service Centers will work as “student centered” teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new student service delivery models such as active online help, online interactive solutions for common problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make BANNER Curriculum, Advising and Program Planning (CAPP) modules and Student Educational Plans available to students online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a student progress status report based on each student’s identified educational goal and send/post for each student when final grades are posted and when they receive their registration appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a plan to survey students’ attitudes as to the quality of service delivered by each student service on campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.B.3.a. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.

II.B.3.a. Descriptive Summary. The College has faced challenges in providing student services equitably regardless of location and delivery method given that the communities served by CCSF’s Educational Centers are so diverse. The College is currently evaluating the provision of services within its fiscal realities.

In general, City College of San Francisco continues to provide an array of basic and specialized student services on the Ocean Campus but to a lesser degree at the Centers. [Appendix 1 provides a list of basic and specialized services offered at the Ocean Campus and Centers].

Programs available on the Ocean Campus that serve the diverse needs of students help to create multiple and equitable access points for students. One such effort is the Bridge to Success Program, which assists African-American and Latino high school students in enrolling at CCSF. Now in its third year, the Bridge to Success Program has catalyzed several pilot projects such as changes in registration priority for SFUSD seniors, more opportunities for on-site placement testing, and changes in math and English curriculum. Other efforts include Gateway to College (which targets students who have dropped out of
high school and need to earn their GED), Guardian Scholars (which supports emancipated foster youth), as well as Extended Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS) and Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S). The college also has a long standing agreement with SFUSD to offer career and technical education (CTE) dual enrollment courses to students in pathways and academies at their high schools. [Appendix 3]

Additionally, the College provides an array of financial aid services, which includes student grants, scholarships, loans, and college work-study funds. While federal financial aid programs focus primarily on credit programs, as resources allow, some financial aid services are provided at the Centers by financial aid counselors and staff for qualified noncredit certificate programs.

To further promote equitable access, the Student Activities Office provides support to seven active student councils at the Ocean campus and educational centers. Eight student resource centers ranging from family resources to GLBTQ resources to the VIDA center, which supports immigrant students. The College also has a nationally recognized Veterans Resource Center.

II.B.3.a. Self Evaluation. Standards II.B.1 and II.B.2. summarize the results of a recent series of focus groups that took place within the Student Development Division that provide direction for changes in services to ensure that students are able to access services more equitably.

One issue not noted earlier is that the available counseling services for distance learners are currently quite limited. Students initiate inquiries by e-mail through a link on the CCSF Distance Education website, which trained Student Ambassadors within the appropriate unit then triage. The Learning Assistance department offers a special class dedicated to assist online students by preparing them for the unique demands of online classes by enhancing their study skills, test-taking techniques, and participation in online forums.

To address a more comprehensive delivery of services to distance learning students, the College is implementing new online counseling services during Spring 2013. The Counseling Online Advisory Council will identify best practices for providing services to distance learners and pilot eSars (an online appointment booking system) and eAdvising (instant messaging/online chat in real time). Other media options such as Skype will also be employed. The College is also collecting data from distance learners and counseling providers regarding access, usage, and effectiveness, which it will then analyze in order to develop priorities for online student services and create a comprehensive plan for full-scale implementation of online counseling services for distance learners.

Course registration for high school students, which is still paper based, requires extensive labor on the part of the dual enrollment staff as well as staff at Admissions and Records. In addition, dual enrolled students are the last to register into a class, which means that they are not assured of a seat and do not know until the day of class if they are enrolled. The College is aware that better models exist for this process and the college would benefit from exploring this and resolving the cumbersome process that is now in place.

Overall, the College would like to improve the delivery of services efficiently and in a timely manner in order to assure student access. The reorganization of student services will help accomplish this given that it has an eye toward combining like services, minimizing
duplication, and improving the delivery of services through improved student-centered customer service. To deliver better customer service, the College will engage student services staff in customer service training through FLEX days and other professional development opportunities and create opportunities for greater communication among student services units (e.g., joint meetings). [Appendix 4; December 13, 2012 BOT agenda]

In addition to the reorganization, the College is investigating the use of technology in the delivery of services to compensate for decreases in staffing.

The District will also develop implementation plans to address state legislation regarding student success and enrollment priorities that require that students participate in core matriculation services (assessment, orientation, and counseling).

II.B.3.a. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement additional counseling services for distance learners and methods to evaluate their usage and effectiveness.</td>
<td>Create Online Advisory Council composed of the Dean of Student Support Services, the coordinator of distance learning, and representative counseling faculty. Conduct staff development for counseling faculty on use of eSars, eAdvising and SKYPE and implement these services for distance learners. Collect data on usage and effectiveness through online surveys. Analyze and discuss assessment results and incorporate improvements into the next academic year cycle.</td>
<td>Spring 2013 for implementation Fall 2013 for assessment Spring 2014 for analysis and continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide appropriate new support for service delivery through new online services</td>
<td>Explore and identify computer programs and online services to help provide timely information to students, such as Degree Works and Ask CCSF, based on ASK Foothill Program.</td>
<td>▶ Explore June 1, 2013 ▶ Implement Fall, 2013 ▶ Go live Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the delivery of services on an effective and efficient manner</td>
<td>Implement a re-organization of Student Development</td>
<td>July 1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a system for timely payment of student fees</td>
<td>Develop the program for payment of student fees at point of registration. Allow for deferral of special groups, a payment plan and a collection of fees plan</td>
<td>April 1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the service provided to students</td>
<td>Through identified trainings, staff will be able to learn about customer service techniques, delivery of accurate information and timely follow-through.</td>
<td>▶ Start January 11, 2013 ▶ Set schedule for Spring 2013 by February 1. ▶ Academic year 2013-14 by May 1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with student success and legislation (SB 1456)</td>
<td>The College will form a team to initiate plans to meet full compliance with the law</td>
<td>▶ Initiate team in Spring 2013 ▶ Complete by Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with enrollment priorities (Title 5, Section 58108)</td>
<td>The College will form a team to work on the implementation programming and notice to</td>
<td>▶ Initiate in February 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.B.3.b. The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

II.B.3.b. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco continues to provide an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. Its mission statement promotes the College’s commitment to “providing an array of academic and student development services that support students’ success in attaining their academic, cultural, and civic achievements.” Through the College’s vast array of programs, students are encouraged to be accountable and responsible to themselves and others. These programs include, but are not limited to:

- Multicultural and Retention Services Department (MRSD)
  
  <Need to list website>

- The Office of Mentoring and Service Learning (OMSL)
  
  http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Mentoring_and_Service_Learning/

- The Puente Program
  

- Student Ambassador Program
  

- The Office of Student Affairs (OSA)
  

- Concert Lecture Series
  

- Associated Students/Inter Club Council (ICC)
  

- Sustainability
  

- Athletics
  
II.B.3.b. Self Evaluation. Through the focus groups referenced earlier, the College has identified a need for students to have a better sense of the opportunities available to them in terms of developing personal and civic responsibility and how they can participate. The College needs to find a way to increase communication about these opportunities. The College could in part achieve this by developing a college/student events calendar.

The College has also identified a need for better collaboration among these units to improve cost efficiencies.

II.B.3.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College would like better communication among people providing the services toward the goal of coordinating the classes and programs, eliminating redundancies, and getting greater cost efficiencies.</td>
<td>Host a meeting with the pertinent people/groups to work toward this goal.</td>
<td>Begin in Spring 2013 with process in place by Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College would like better communication with students.</td>
<td>Work with the Associate Dean of Student Activities to host a meeting at the Ocean Campus and the Centers to help students become aware of the services that are offered.</td>
<td>Begin in Spring 2013 with process in place by Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College would pursue developing a new certificate option for students interested in careers in the non-profit industry and service learning</td>
<td>Work with OMSL Coordinator to see if this goal is doable.</td>
<td>Begin in Spring 2013 with process in place by Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College will develop an all college/student events calendar through the Office of Student Affairs and the CCSF Police Department.</td>
<td>The Dean of the Office of Student Affairs and Chief of Police will finalize the events calendar.</td>
<td>Continue in Spring 2013 and finalize Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.B.3.c. Descriptive Summary. Prior to Fall 2012, the College’s counseling services did not have a formal process to construct, measure, or assess student learning outcomes. Additionally, robust dialogue about how assessment data could drive improvements to services was not common practice within or among most counseling services. Consequently,
counseling departments operate in isolation from one another and are often unfamiliar with what other departments are doing to improve services to students. Moreover, few counseling departments collected or collated evidence that would support progress in the Student Learning Outcomes process.

Although Program Review has been a standard departmental function, few, if any, counseling departments within Student Services have used the Program Review process as a vehicle to involve department members in planning, measuring, assessing, and using the resulting analysis for continuous quality improvement. Although the Program Review process acted as a vehicle for discussion and service review in several counseling departments (either at department meetings or through e-mail), the resulting document was passed on to the next administrative level and not used in the planning or budgeting process. Most departments did not keep evidentiary minutes of their discussions and also did not see a resulting connection between their program review and their budget allocation. Although the dean provided input into the initial review, many often received no feedback after submission of the final report from the Program Review committee or upper management.

Student Services has made major improvements to the Student Learning Outcomes process during Fall 2012. Each counseling department within Student Services not only has SLOs in place, but the SLO process is documented and displayed on a 13-item matrix for each counseling program. These matrices convey the full spectrum of the SLO process, including measurement and assessment, noted changes, timelines for improvement, location of evidence, and the reciprocal relationships among SLOs, Program Review, and budget and planning. Individuals update these matrices frequently, and links to these matrices appear on the Student Services SLO Assessment web page.

During Fall 2012, counselors and other Student Services faculty and staff attended two college-wide staff development days dedicated to the SLO process. On August 14, 2012, counselors attended the workshop on developing SLOs, measuring and assessing them, and on using data collected to improve services to students. On September 12, 2012 counselors attended the college-wide training on SLOs which concluded with discussions within individual departments on the SLO process.

Additionally, the Continuing Student Counseling department appointed an SLO coordinator. The SLO coordinator has been assisting the various counseling programs within the department and other Student Services units in developing, measuring, and assessing SLOs and in using gathered assessment data to improve services to students. New Student Counseling recently administered a survey that gathered information about student satisfaction with services. Counselors and staff have analyzed the data and shared the results during department meetings. The College is in the process of incorporating findings into Spring 2013 service delivery.

Counseling faculty from all counseling areas will continue to have opportunities to engage in additional professional development. Each semester counselors are required to attend a FLEX Day counseling meeting in which counselors discuss topics such as curriculum changes, graduation requirement updates, and new/revised policy initiatives. In addition, counselors have access to an array of professional development seminars during the semester including an “All Counselors” meeting. Topics include important updates in areas that
impact students and their educational goals. Future seminars will provide an important opportunity for robust dialogue on SLOs across the many student service areas.

The Dean’s Professional Development Seminar Series takes place two to four times a semester and is available to all counseling faculty. Individual departments also hold separate trainings for their faculty and staff focusing on issues unique to each department or in areas directly affecting students accessing their services. Outside conference attendance is encouraged, although participation has diminished over the past several years as a result of the state budget crisis. The Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) offers stipends to a small number of selected faculty each semester to engage in specialized projects and then share the results in a professional development activity. MIP-sponsored guest speakers and seminars are also available to all faculty, administrators, and staff. The CCSF Speech and Debate Program provides college mentors to the Bay Area Urban Debate League, a pathway to take at-risk students to college.

Beginning in Fall 2010, through the Bridge to Success Partnership grant, a new counseling professional development seminar series was developed and is offered each semester to CCSF and SFUSD counselors.

II.B.3.c. Self Evaluation. Different units displayed wide variety in their approach to SLOs—particularly in the rigor of their assessment, data collection, analysis, discussion, and integration into a cycle of continuous quality improvement until Fall 2012 when all Student Service counseling areas participated in coordinated, consistent, and sustained SLO work and activities. Therefore, in many cases, prior to Fall 2012, existing evidence substantiating SLO work lacked quality, rigor, analysis, and subsequent application to programmatic improvements.

Adding to the above-mentioned deficiencies was the organizational structure in Student Services that placed the three largest counseling departments in three different Divisions (Student Development, Campuses and Enrollment, and Academic Affairs) under three different Deans and three different Vice Chancellors. As pointed out in the visiting team’s accreditation report, this separation contributed to the counseling silos and a lack of collaboration and communication among the different departments. It also added to the lack of a systematic and consistent approach to the evaluation of counseling programs. The proposed administrative reorganization of the Student Services Division and the departmental reorganization of counseling is expected to bring positive changes to both of these areas.

As noted in the descriptive summary above, a number of changes hold promise for the improvement of the College’s evaluation of counseling services and continues to provide ample opportunities for preparing faculty responsible for the advising function, in alignment with the institutional mission and the Board Planning Priorities. During Fall 2012, counseling units aggressively responded to the deficiencies in the above areas. All counseling programs have developed SLOs; a majority will reach proficiency or continuous quality improvement on the WASC rubric by Spring 2013. Regular semester meetings providing a forum for robust dialogue concerning measurement, data analysis, findings, and new ideas for service and productivity will ensure a continuous, integrated cycle of improvement across counseling programs. Regular collection and storage of evidence, and up-to-date web pages including assessment links and updated SLO matrices showing the progress of each SLO will support a shared and transparent process.
After conducting focus groups among personnel in the Student Services Division, the Board approved a plan in December 2012 for reorganizing the Student Services Division administratively and departmentally. All counseling programs are now under the Vice Chancellor of Student Services. Several counseling departments merged under the supervision of the Dean of Matriculation and Counseling. This reorganization will improve collaboration and communication throughout the many counseling locations.

The Dean of Student Support Services initiated a strong internal professional development program for counseling faculty in Fall 2007. Counselors augment this training with attendance at outside conferences (such as the annual Ensuring Transfer Success Conference) and individual “training academy” events offered within the larger counseling departments. Beginning in Fall 2010, through the Bridge to Success Initiative, the professional development program expanded to include joint activities with CCSF counselors, counselors from San Francisco Unified School District, and employees from community-based organizations who work in education-related areas. These professional development activities embed learning outcomes in the presentations and minutes and collect evidence of learning at the end. Additionally, one session each semester is dedicated to robust divisional discussion about current SLOs and ideas for program improvements.

Counseling programs will continue to be actively involved in initiatives focused on closing the student achievement gap, primarily through the institutionalization of current Bridge to Success activities and initiatives as well as through robust dialogue analyzing collected data including the recently released retention/completion studies and the annual high school reports.

List of Evidence (Hard copies available in the office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Services—Conlan Hall 207)
1. Student Services SLO matrixes
2. Individual department SLO semester reports
3. Professional development agendas, minutes, and related outcome evidence
4. Student Services (Re) Organizational Chart
5. Vice Chancellor’s Report on the Reorganization of Student Services
7. Assessment sections of counseling department web pages
8. Online Advisory Council agendas and minutes
11. CCSF Research link to high school and student success reports:
13. Bridge to Success Initiatives and Information: http://sfbridgetosuccess.org/
14. Bridge to Success Research Briefs and Reports:
   http://gardnercenter.stanford.edu/our_work/bts.html
II.B.3.c. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form counseling focus group (Online Advisory Council) to identify methods to enhance distance learning and evaluate their usage and effectiveness.</td>
<td>Create training models for counseling to utilize SKYPE and other on-line counseling methods and implement data-driven services for distance learners.</td>
<td>Spring 2013. Go live Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a robust professional development program to increase counselor preparation, promote stronger communication, and increase dialogue and teambuilding among all counseling programs.</td>
<td>Consolidate counseling programs under the Vice Chancellor of Student Services and reorganize administrative duties and reporting lines. Sustain and expand professional development opportunities for all counseling faculty through the Dean's Professional Development Seminar Series.</td>
<td>Fall 2012/Spring 2013 Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the full integration of counseling SLO-based cycles of continuous quality improvement with Program Review and institutional planning and budgeting cycles.</td>
<td>Standardize reporting methods and timelines to ensure consistency across counseling programs. Increase opportunities for robust dialogue through staff development activities and include discussion of SLOs, program review, and institutional planning documents.</td>
<td>Spring 2013/Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase active participation by counseling faculty in initiatives focused on closing the achievement gap in alignment with Board Planning Priorities, the College Mission, and the Student Success Act.</td>
<td>Create inclusive counseling teams to address new initiatives and requirements, participate in counseling activities aligned with these goals, analyze and discuss collected data, and make recommendations for counseling service improvements.</td>
<td>Spring 2013 through Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.B.3.d. The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.

II.B.3.d. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco seeks to build an inclusive community where respect and trust are common virtues, and where all people are enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding. A large number of programs support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity, including the following:

- Bridge to Success [http://sfbridgetosuccess.org/](http://sfbridgetosuccess.org/)
- Disabled Students Programs and Services
- Diversity Collaborative
  <website>
- Extended Opportunity Programs and Services
- The Gender Diversity Project
- IDST Diversity Studies
- International Student Counseling Department
- Family Resource Center - Dr. Betty Shavazz
- Latino Services Network
- Multicultural Infusion Project
  http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Multicultural_Infusion_Project/
- Multicultural Resource Center
  <website>
- Project Survive
- The Puente Program
- Queer Resource Center
- Re-Entry to Education Program
- (Office of) Student Affairs DiverCITY festival and program
II.B.3.d. Self Evaluation. While a vast array of programs that promote diversity and multicultural understanding exist, a number of issues relating to these programs have emerged, largely, although not exclusively, through the Fall 2012 student focus groups referenced earlier. These include:

- Information about courses, groups, issues and events regarding diversity does not reach the College Community in a systematic way.
- The lack of coordination among diversity related groups and programs may be hindering student success and is most likely not cost effective.
- The Diversity Collaborative is concerned that the proposed reorganization of Academic Affairs may group all diversity departments under one chair, which would remove the resources necessary for each department to remain sustainable into the future. The following statement elaborates on this concern:
  
  “A majority of the City College student body are people of color. The diversity departments (African American Studies, Asian Studies, Asian American Studies, Disabled Students Programs and Services, Interdisciplinary Studies, Labor and Community Studies, Latin American/Latino Studies, LGBT Studies, Philippine Studies and Women's Studies) need to each have a department chair so that they can continue to give a voice to those who have been historically silenced.”

- Diversity events do not always appear in the regular events calendar of the College.
- The District does not have a computerized system to coordinate the scheduling of rooms and events.
- LGBTQ students who are veterans, have expressed concerns regarding apparent homophobia among some people in the Veterans Center.
- CCSF employees do not sufficiently reflect the diversity of City College’s students.
- City College lacks a full-time Public Information Officer whose office would be charged with including diversity with its multi-media marketing campaigns.
II.B.3.d. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate existing programs.</td>
<td>Schedule a meeting of the diversity units.</td>
<td>Begin in Spring 2013 with process in place by Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire a full time Public Information Officer</td>
<td>Work with Human Resources and Administration in issuing a Job Announcement</td>
<td>Submit request in Spring 2013 for hiring by Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get the word out.</td>
<td>Work with the Public Information Office to get diversity messages to the College community and participatory governance groups.</td>
<td>Begin efforts in Spring 2013 with process in place by Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase diverse representation in Administration, Faculty, and Staff.</td>
<td>Work with the Dean of Human Resources to develop a strategy to increase diverse hires at CCSF.</td>
<td>Spring 2013 and Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a mechanism to disseminate student services information to students at the Ocean Campus and Centers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate a staff person or administrator to bring together all involved parties for the sole purpose of establishing better coordination and collaboration among the groups/programs, which will result in the elimination of duplicative services and greater cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly include diversity activities on the College's schedule of events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate technological improvements to resolve event and room scheduling issues at the College.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devote special attention to LGBTQ Vets, particularly within the Veterans Resource Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-visit discussions about increasing the representation of diverse individuals in faculty, staff, and administrative hiring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire a Public Information Officer to promote diversity and other College programs and activities. The Public Information Office should include diverse populations in the College's major marketing and update campaigns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.B.3.e. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

II.B.3.e. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco (CCSF) has an open admissions policy that accepts all students who are at least 18 years old or who have a high school diploma or equivalent. Utilization of the statewide application ensures that CCSF collects all state mandated information.

CCSF has representation on the CCCApply Steering Committee which meets regularly and reviews college concerns regarding the online application and reviews requests for revisions.
to the application. The State Chancellors Office is in the process of delivering a new application, Open CCCApply, which will be fully hosted and supported by the CCC Technology Center, and it will provide a new California Community Colleges application service for the colleges.

A student satisfaction survey allows students to comment on any concerns with the admissions application.

As mandated by the California Community Colleges, the State Chancellor’s Office must approve assessment instruments used to determine placement prior to their use. CCSF currently administers to its students locally written placement tests in English and ESL as well as Accuplacer assessment instruments in Mathematics—arithmetic, elementary algebra, and college-level math.

The CCSF English Placement Test is a locally developed, locally managed assessment. In April 2012, the College completed CCCCO-required test-validation studies for three placement instruments to obtain renewal of approval for those tests. Those instruments included the credit English Placement Test, the credit ESL Writing Sample, and the noncredit ESL Placement Test. The purpose of the testing was to examine whether CCSF’s placement tests are effective and free of biases. [Evidence: CCSF Validity Study] This required process was suspended by the CCCCO from March 2009-12, and reinstated in April 2012. [Evidence: CCCCO memo dated Dec 5, 2011] The studies conducted included content validity, cut-score validity, reliability, cultural and linguistic bias, and disproportionate impact. The latter study monitors for disproportionate rates of placement into the various levels of course-placement. Discussions of the findings of the cut-score validity study resulted in the lowering of cut-scores for all but one of the course placement levels. The English Department, Research, and Matriculation Offices will evaluate the effects of the cut-score changes on student success in English courses at the end of the Fall 2012 semester. The CCSF English Placement Test has received CCCCO approval for continued use through July 2018. [Evidence: CCCO Approved Assessment Instruments List]

Similar required test-validation studies for the CCSF ESL Writing Sample Test and the CCSF Non-credit ESL Placement Test were submitted to the CCCCO in November 2012 (Evidence: CCSF Validity Studies). Full, six-year approval for continued use of both assessment instruments is expected. The CCSF ESL Grammar and Reading Placement Test has been approved for use through March 2014. For mathematics placement assessment, the College administers the College Board Accuplacer tests, which have received CCCCO approval through June 2013.

Working collaboratively with the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), the CCSF Math Department and the Office of Matriculation implemented a new math placement pilot project. Using this alternate placement process, graduating seniors enrolling at the College in Fall 2012 had the opportunity to enhance their test placement by meeting two of the following criteria: GPA of 2.7 or higher; high school attendance rate of 90% or greater; a score on the CST test of Basic or higher. For Fall 2012 enrollment, out of 1400 applicants to the College, SFUSD identified 648 graduating seniors who met the aforementioned criteria. As a result, 276 first-semester CCSF students who had initially placed below college level math on the CCSF placement test during their last year of high school received a “bump” in their CCSF math placement.
In the coming academic term/year, the English department will be developing criteria to supplement the current placement testing process. The resulting process may provide students with opportunities to begin the English curriculum with a higher placement level.

Alternate approaches such as those recently developed by the Math and English departments enhance the multiple measures approach to student placement. Currently, CCSF uses placement test results along with self-reported student data to determine the appropriate course placement. An important part of this process includes counseling and educational planning.

II.B.3.e. Self Evaluation. Generally, the College does engage in regular review and assessment of admissions and placement instruments, both to comply with regulations and to voluntarily examine its practices to ensure validity and reliability.

Overall, the comments regarding the admissions application (CCCApply), have been positive but the application is extremely long and the customer service provided by a third party vendor is not readily available. That is, Customer Service hours are limited, and are not available evenings or weekends, making it very difficult for students to retrieve passwords. The State Chancellor’s Office is in the process of delivering a new admissions application, Open CCCApply, which will be fully hosted and supported by the California Community College (CCC) Technology Center and will provide students with Customer Service 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. CCSF will more than likely transition to Open CCCApply in spring 2014.

With respect to placement testing, the College has held student equity hearings initiated by the Board of Trustees since 2010 that have featured, in part, placement testing. Students have expressed their dissatisfaction with long math and English sequences and the lack of opportunities to receive higher placements. Given the importance of initial placement in math and English courses, relative to the math and English curriculum, the Board of Trustees has approved several policy changes since October 2010, including revisions to the policy regarding placement test retakes in October 2010 and again in April 2012. Students may now retake the placement test in math and English after 2 weeks for a maximum of two times per testing cycle. Numerous publications such as the College website, College Catalog, and Class Schedule describe these policies. During the enrollment process, counselors or the Math and English Departments may modify individual students’ test placement. While additional dialogue about multiple measures has occurred during Fall 2012 at departmental meetings, the College’s multiple measures criteria are still in need of refinement.

II.B.3.e. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improve use of multiple measures | Use curriculum materials being developed by instructional departments  
Communicate placement policies and pathways to student services faculty | Spring 2013 through Fall 2014  
Spring 2013 and thereafter |
| Implement components of Student Success Act of 2012, SB1456 and BOG SSTF recommendations as they relate to assessment | Implement use of statewide common assessment instruments in math and English  
Require student participation in assessment for | Initiate in Spring 2013  
Complete in Fall |
II.B.3.f. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

II.B.3.f. Descriptive Summary. The College annually and periodically publishes the policy about how student records are kept in the College Catalog, Class Schedule, and on the College website.

The security of student records in Admissions and Records and other departments at the College is paramount. Historically, the Office of Admissions and Records stored student records as hard copies in boxes in various storage areas throughout the District. Maintaining such records required an extraordinary amount of physical space and required the attention of multiple individuals responsible for the collection, storage, and security of documents. Additional staff was required to search and retrieve the records.

In response to this challenge, Admissions and Records began storing student records electronically. Student records are scanned in PDF format and then incorporated into the existing Student Record System (Banner Form - SWASDOC). Although scanning of existing paper records is ongoing, a considerable number of records still must be converted. It is estimated about one-third of the existing records have been converted electronically. Scanning priority is given to the most recent records, working back over time. Since 2006, over one million records have been scanned and stored into Banner. All scanned records are stored digitally and indefinitely in the College’s secured computer network system and can be transferred easily from one platform to another. Admissions and Record’s redundant backup system allows retrieval of all its records in the event one system should fail.

Security of all College information is a priority and is steadily improving. The existing firewall has been improved and a second firewall was installed in July 2010. A security and vulnerability audit was run in November 2010. At two Administrators Meetings, the former Chief Information Technology Officer provided security awareness and training presentations. An internal security investigation was completed to determine which employees had authority to access files, which in turn resulted in the College eliminating access to some. Access is now limited to only those employees who absolutely need it.

The College follows the guidelines mandated by Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) when it comes to the handling and release of student information and records. All Admissions and Records staff receive initial FERPA training and periodic updates are conducted regularly. Training specific to each area of the operation is also conducted and all requests for records are carefully reviewed before anything is released. Moreover, a privacy
statement is included annually in the College Catalog. Consultation with legal counsel is commonplace prior to releasing records, if there is any issue in question. Student workers employed by the Office of Admissions and Records are trained prior to actually working with any type of records or computer screen.

In the case where individuals or organizations request student data for the purpose of research, the College’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) assures privacy as a component of the protection of human subjects per Federal policy. The College provides data in an aggregated and/or otherwise unidentifiable format. When researchers utilize student records, students receive written information documenting the use of their information, which they must approve by signing a consent form.

II.B.3.f. Self Evaluation. Since the implementation of the scanning system in Admissions and Records, records are more securely stored since only designated individuals in the college can access certain screens and records. In addition, work efficiency and turnaround has improved dramatically now that many records can be located effortlessly on the Banner student database system. Records include Grades, Census, Academic Renewals, Admissions Applications, etc. Academic Counselors now have access to incoming transcripts and other documents such as course equivalency forms when advising students.

The process of implementing and maintaining the scanning system by Admissions and Records, however, is very timely and cumbersome. Admissions and Records has been discussing the possibility of purchasing a high production scanning solution to expedite the conversion process, such as the Banner Document Management System (BDMS), which the Office of Financial Aid is currently utilizing to scan their records. This system has offers a more quick and efficient method to secure records. Student records are easily available on Banner and staff can readily answer student questions.

Presently, Admissions and Records continues to transition archived records, converting records formerly saved in a proprietary file format into PDF files. The electronic record files are now being saved and housed on a more secured server, behind newly improved firewalls, maintained by ITS. Backup files are made of all records and stored offsite. All security software and patches are updated regularly both locally and systemically.

The College is committed to protecting the privacy of the public. ITS proactively continues to monitor system activities for any sign of security intrusion.

Aside from the initial IRB approval process, the College does not yet have a formal process in place to monitor that individual researchers adhere to the approved protocols once they conduct their research.

II.B.3.f. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement Banner Document Management System (BDMS)</td>
<td>Modify current system to interface with Banner Admissions and Records. Identify needed equipment such as scanners and servers. Collaborate with IT to provide training to staff.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a way to monitor adherence to research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.B.4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

II.B.4. Descriptive Summary. ACCJC Recommendation 5 noted that the College needs to “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.”

Standard II.B.3.c. describes the extent to which Student Services did not engage in a formal process for SLOs prior to Fall 2012 and positive changes that Student Services has begun to implement in response to ACCJC requirements and findings. Standard II.B.3.c. also describes the limited extent to which Program Review historically has driven improvements.

Standard II.B.3.a. discusses limitations related to the counseling services that students enrolled in distance education programs receive as well as the plans that the College has developed for addressing these limitations.

II.B.4. Self Evaluation. Prior to the 2012 accreditation report, assessment of learning outcomes was completed in isolation and to different degrees of completeness by the different Student Services units. This uncoordinated effort created obstacles for not only the synthesis and analysis of data but also for using data to improve services.

Student Services now places priority on increasing not only the knowledge of and utilization of Student Learning Outcomes, but also increasing dialogue within and among Student Services departments/units about measuring and assessing services provided. To support this effort, Student Services units have begun using a standardized matrix to record SLO progress and outcomes by department and/or unit.

By utilizing data that the Student Learning Outcomes process generates, Student Services will become able to engage in more regular data-informed and transparent decision making in budgeting and planning.

Already, focus groups have provided data to inform the creation and implementation of a comprehensive student support services plan to meet the varied needs of students regardless of location.

As noted earlier, the reorganization of the Student Services Division holds promise for creating an environment that resolves the challenges the College faces in evaluating the extent to which services meet student learning needs to ensure that students are achieving the desired SLOs—and making changes to services when students are not achieving the desired SLOs.

The College has made considerable progress in this arena, but given the emergent nature of the various activities that aim to resolve the challenges the College faces, it is too soon to evaluate the results.
II.B.4. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to develop awareness of and utilization of SLOs.</td>
<td>Dedicated staff development activities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase robust dialogue within and among Student Services departments about SLO measurement and assessment.</td>
<td>Dedicated staff development activities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop model to apply assessment data to improve services.</td>
<td>Dedicated staff development activities</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardize template for recording minutes of SLO related meetings and other actionables.</td>
<td>Dedicated staff development activities</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote stronger communication among departments.</td>
<td>Dedicated staff development activities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen links among SLOs, program review, budget and planning.</td>
<td>Dedicated staff development activities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

Library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the institution’s instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.

II.c.1. The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.

II.c.1. Descriptive Summary. Library and learning support services (LLSS) are a vital component of the “teaching and learning community” referenced in the College Mission Statement. LLSS directly contribute to instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities through the collections, services, courses, and facilities they provide. LLSS include: Library and Learning Resources (LLR), Learning Assistance Department (LAD), Broadcast Media Services (BMS), and student computer labs. Services, resources, and facilities directly supporting student learning include: (1) courses, workshops, and learning support services provided by LLR and LAD; (2) library exhibitions and programs; (3) facilities and services provided by the LLR Department, including Language and Media centers; and (4) delivery and broadcasting of videos and teaching support services provided by Broadcast Media Services and the Audiovisual Unit (AV).

Library and Learning Resources (LLR). LLR consists of one Library comprising ten units at six locations: Ocean Campus, Chinatown/North Beach Center, Downtown Center, John Adams Center, Mission Center, and the Southeast Center. Since the Rosenberg Library and Learning Resource Center opened in November 1995, LLR has grown to receive about one million visits each year.
LLR’s presence on the Ocean Campus is the largest, with five units: Rosenberg Library, Media Center, Language Center, Audiovisual Unit, and Alice Statler Library, which serves primarily the Culinary Arts and Hospitality Studies Department. Collections and services specific to the Rosenberg Library are the Diego Rivera Collection and the CCSF Archive.

Programs, resources and services directly serving students at all the campus libraries* include:

- Library research and information competency workshops that teach specific skills for finding appropriate information and critically evaluating it for assignments and independent learning
- Reference, research, and information assistance to individuals in person or by phone, email, or instant messaging
- Print collections of books, periodicals, and audiovisual resources serving specific courses (over 800 through Course Reserves) and the entire curriculum in general
- Online books and periodicals, which are also available 24/7 via the Internet
- Programs, events, and exhibitions that reflect and enrich the creative, intellectual, and cultural diversity of the College community
- Copying, printing, scanning, and faxing services
- Access to computers with Internet access and MS Office applications
- A quiet study environment, with group study rooms available at the Rosenberg, Mission, John Adams, and Chinatown/North Beach campus libraries
- Audiovisual learning materials and software applications for across-the-curriculum support and independent learning, particularly for foreign language courses in the Language Center locations at the Ocean and Mission campuses
- ESL and Basic Skills course-related learning materials, many supporting specific courses

*The Distance Learning and Electronic Services Librarian provides many instructional support services to faculty and students at College sites without libraries.

Library Exhibitions and Programs support CCSF’s mission by creating opportunities for all styles of learning, engaging students in curricular and co-curricular subjects, increasing understanding of diversity and differing perspectives, and bringing students together with faculty, staff, and the broader San Francisco community. Events and exhibitions, such as rich visual displays, exhibits, films, book readings, and panel discussions, are open to the entire community and co-sponsored with District departments and programs as well as community organizations. To enhance the curriculum, each program and exhibition has specific student learning outcomes and emphasizes the scope, breadth, and depth of related library resources.

The Language Center supports the curriculum for all languages taught by the Foreign Language Department with a Language Lab at the Ocean Campus and a Language Lab/Media Center at the Mission Campus, each equipped with audio and video workstations and, at the Ocean Campus, a classroom with 34 workstations. Language Center materials
and online language-learning and culture resources are selected, reviewed, and assessed by Foreign Language faculty and made available in the open lab, via the Electronic Classroom, and online. Textbook audio is digitized to allow word and phrase isolation and speed adjustment, especially important to beginning learners, enhancing student engagement and thereby student success and retention.

**The Media Center** provides audio, visual, and multimedia materials and equipment for academic and vocational programs on the Ocean Campus. The Media Center Librarian depends on faculty to assist with collection development. The Ocean Campus Media Center also houses an open access computer lab with 32 computers.

Other CCSF locations have alternate access to media materials and equipment. Campus library locations include media materials in their collections, The Alice Statler, John Adams, and Southeast campus libraries have video and audio equipment stations for student use, while the Downtown, Mission, and Chinatown/North Beach campus libraries have dedicated multimedia labs.

**Learning Assistance Department (LAD).** LAD faculty and staff assist students in achieving their academic, vocational, and personal goals through the following learning support offerings:

- College Success courses, LERN 50 and 51, serving 520 students per semester
- Successful Online Learning course, LERN 55, serving 110 students per semester
- Study Strategies workshops serving 85 students per semester
- Study Strategies for Standardized Exams, LERN 53A, B, C, and D, serving 90 students per semester
- Supplemental Instruction groups generally serving 120 students each semester (most of these groups are temporarily on hold until additional funding becomes available)
- Learning Assistance Center (LAC) tutoring and computer lab, 100 peer tutors in 34 subjects and 15 computer lab assistants together serving 9,500 students per semester and 125,000 hours per semester in association with designated department learning centers
  - Mission Campus LAC serving 1,200 students per semester with 2,800 hours per semester
  - Mobile LAC serving 15 incarcerated youth per semester

LAD faculty stay current with professional literature and practices in the field of student success through conferences, workshops, staff meetings, and reflective dialogues on student needs. College Success faculty teach using student-centered, outcomes-based strategies and measure student learning outcomes with practical examinations, portfolio development, and pre- and post-testing.

LAD collaborates with many departments and programs to provide comprehensive learning support services across the District. Collaborative efforts involve the Mathematics and Biology departments, EOPS, the Basic Skills Ad Hoc Committee, and many student retention programs. Additionally, the Transitional Studies Department offers professional and peer tutoring for students taking noncredit courses in literacy, reading, mathematics, and GED.
preparation at four campuses: John Adams, Mission, Southeast, and the Adult Learning and Tutorial Center (ALTC) at Gough Street.

LAC offers the largest open-access computer lab on the Ocean Campus with 107 student workstations, three scanners, and a printer for student access. The LAC Computer Lab provides Internet access and more than 50 software programs supporting academic courses.

Broadcast Media Services (BMS) and Audiovisual Unit (AV). BMS and AV support student learning needs indirectly by providing instructional audio and video production services, video distribution, and equipment delivery services to faculty for classroom instructional use on the Ocean Campus. AV has over 3,100 multimedia titles for classroom use and access to media rental sources nationwide; three multimedia viewing rooms equipped with services for instructional use and College events and functions; graphic production services; comprehensive audiovisual equipment repair and maintenance support services; and daily shipping services for the College via UPS®. Services provided by BMS include: classroom equipment delivery; teleproduction equipment and personnel for instructional and promotional video projects; project management for video projects; digitization of video clips for webpages; single- and multi-classroom video distribution to classrooms through the Ocean Campus closed-circuit television system; on-site videotaping for classes, meetings, and evaluations; international video conversion; off-air recording and duplication of videotapes within copyright guidelines; technical support for EATV Channels 27, 31, and 75 and KCSF Radio, Cable 90.0 FM; and consultations and expertise regarding satellite, webcasting, Internet television, video production equipment, audio and video streaming, and related services for instructional programs.

Computer Labs. Seventy-eight computer labs with approximately 2,000 computers serve nine campus locations across the District [II C-11]. Open access labs are in library and learning assistance centers and various retention program locations, such as the African American Scholastic Program, Latino Services Network, Asian Pacific American Success Program, Writing Success Project, and the counseling departments, and are available to all students. Multi-purpose labs address both the instructional needs of faculty and the computer access needs of students in individual departments or groups of departments.

II.c.1. Self Evaluation. The opening of two new Centers in recent years has impacted staffing and resources for both the Library and the Learning Assistance Center (LAC). The opening of the new Chinatown/North Beach (CNB) Center Library this semester added 34 open hours per week. Creative staffing solutions such as rotating staff on a daily basis between centers allowed the opening of CNB with a loss of only one hour at the Southeast Center. Many of these arrangements are temporary measures taken to fill an ongoing need, but they are not sustainable. To exacerbate the situation, there are four vacant full-time faculty positions and 11 vacant classified positions. Similarly, the LAC on the Ocean campus is now closed on Saturdays due to reduced staffing, and the LAC on the Chinatown/North Beach Center is built and furnished, but the College has had to postpone its opening due to lack of staffing.

In response to recommendations from FCMAT and the ACCJC 2012 Accreditation Report, District administration in October 2012 put forth a proposal to restructure Academic Affairs that indicated that the dean and chair positions specific to LLR would be eliminated and that LLR would share a dean with 12 other academic departments comprising 186 faculty. Since

Comment [s21]: Need to determine whether this is covered in III C.
that time the plan has been revised and the Library and Learning Resources Department is now proposed under the Associate Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management and Instructional Support Services, along with one other academic department and ten other offices. Neither of these proposals appear to meet the Standards of Practice for California Community College Library Faculty and Programs adopted by the ASCCC in 2011, which state that California community college library leadership should meet the minimum qualifications of the library profession and be an administrator, so as to effectively advocate for the library. [II C-(9), II C-(10)] Leadership with a strong understanding of libraries and their continual evolution is essential to initiate collaborative processes throughout the department and among faculty and staff that reexamine and improve workflows to incorporate current trends in library modalities (e.g. operations, functions, services, units). A professional background in libraries is also valuable in communicating the evolving role of libraries to District stakeholders.

**Other Library and Learning Support Services.** LAD recognizes the importance of variety and means of delivery to address diverse learning styles and provide more equitable access for students. Following an extensive SLO assessment research process, LAD implemented a new Successful Online Learning course and a new Supplemental Instruction small group program. LERN 50 College Success course students persisted to the next term at a rate on average of seven percent more than other students over the period 1998-2010. [II C-8 (12)]

Between 400 and 600 students visit the LAC Computer Lab every day, approximately 50,000 hours per semester. Student hours logged in the LAC increased considerably in the years between Spring 2006 and Spring 2010, from 92,488 to 132,038 hours. [II C-10 (13)] The Learning Assistance Center’s 157 open-access lab computers are now seven years old and also receive heavy use. Monitors malfunction at a rate of about one to two per month due to age, and the headphones accompanying each computer should also be replaced for age.

Use of the Online Language Lab continues to increase. In 2005-06, the total number of Language Center website views was approximately 104,000. By 2008-09, the number reached 550,000. [II C-7, p. 5]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Align LLR practices with ASCCC Standards of Practice for California Community College Libraries and ACRL Standards for Academic Libraries.</td>
<td>Complete LLR evaluation relative to ASCCC and ACRL standards Advocate through the Program Review process and other means for dedicated library leadership meeting the minimum professional qualifications for library administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set priorities aligned with the ACRL Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider state and national library standards in the reorganization of Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II.c.1.a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and
II.c.1.a. Descriptive Summary. Librarians are responsible for the selection of all library materials. Subject liaison librarians manage the collections with the guidance of the Collection Development Policy, course outlines, and input from District faculty to ensure library collections meet teaching and learning needs of the CCSF community. Professional selection tools aid the selection of specific books, periodicals, subscription databases, audiovisual materials, e-books, and websites.

The Outreach and Community Librarian facilitates collaboration throughout the District and subject librarians reach out to District faculty to assure that collection areas, print periodicals, and database subscriptions meet the needs of each department. Foreign Language faculty select, review, and assess Language Center materials and online language-learning and cultural resources are selected, reviewed. These materials and resources are available in the open lab, via the Electronic Classroom, and online.

The institution selects and maintains educational equipment to support student learning. Computers are critical to the LLR mission and learning outcomes across the curriculum. Students received instruction in information competency and research skills on computers. Access to online research databases, library catalogs, and the Web are necessary for research and critical thinking in most disciplines. Thus, reference, circulation, periodicals, and other library services are dependent on reliable and current hardware and software.

ITS installs and maintains all computers, printers, and other peripherals in the labs and manages them through a series of servers across the District. The Service Desk works closely with instructional faculty to ensure all course-related software is loaded, managed, and updated in support of student learning. Lab technicians directly support faculty and students in labs.

II.c.1.a. Self Evaluation. A reduced library budget necessitates a close relationship between librarians and their District faculty to ensure that money is strategically spent in support of the curriculum. In a Fall 2010 Library survey of District faculty, 81 percent of the 175 respondents were satisfied with their communication with subject liaisons [II C-3].

Funding for library materials has been inadequate, unstable and has decreased since 2006. Funding instability has meant that library faculty cannot plan from year to year to manage the collection and annual subscriptions.

The total budget available for print materials decreased 48 percent between 2005-06 and 2009-10 [II C-4 (2)], while supporting more locations (e.g. the new Mission Campus Library). Additionally, the $50,000 allocated for the Chinatown/North Beach Library opening collection was only one-third of the amount estimated as necessary to build a “core collection” of essential materials for the site [II C-4 (4) Daniel’s estimate]. The increasing cost of all materials, combined with a stagnant materials budget, jeopardizes the ability to provide adequate and appropriate updates to library collections and their purpose of supporting the College’s programs and curriculum; this risk is especially significant to subject areas where currency of materials is essential, notably for programs accredited by outside agencies, such as many of the vocational programs [II C-5 (5)].

These issues were recognized by the ACCJC in their 2012 Evaluation Report: “To improve the adequacy of the library book collection, the college needs to address the age of the book
collection as part of its institutional planning and budgeting activities” (p. 44). An appropriate benchmark for library materials funding is based on the average for California Community Colleges. A good example of such policy can be seen in the American River College Collection Development Policy which identifies this average as $15 per FTES. [http://web.arc.losrios.edu/~library/colldev.htm](http://web.arc.losrios.edu/~library/colldev.htm)

Title V §58724 of the California Education Code establishes a minimum standard for a library our size of 297,500 volumes on the shelf; LLR currently has 220,154 total items, including e-books, significantly short of the minimum standard. A 2011 Peer Comparison with seven other community college libraries revealed that, despite CCSF Library supporting a larger institution with more library locations, it spends significantly less on printed books, e-books and databases [II-C-2011 Peer Comparison].

In response to budget reductions, Library faculty have undertaken several measures to continue to ensure a current, quality collection. These measures include expanding the e-book collection (at a lower per-title cost than print), implementing a project to increase the number of textbooks on reserve and, most significantly, joining the San Francisco Public Library’s (SFPL) Community Redistribution Program, in which subject librarians obtain current, quality withdrawn materials at no charge. Since 2007, this program has added over 12,396 titles to the collection with an estimated value over $320,000 [II-C-1 (6 2012)]. The majority of items are copyrighted within the last three years and include materials in languages other than English, as well as general and subject-specific encyclopedia sets. It is uncertain, however, how long LLR can depend on the continued high quality of materials available from SFPL, since many of the withdrawals have resulted from SFPL branch renovations, which will soon be completed.

The inclusion of increasingly expensive periodical and research database subscriptions in the Library materials budget diminishes the budget even further. The loss of Telecommunication and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) funds has made continuing database subscriptions uncertain each year. In 2009-10, in order to retain databases, subject librarians chose to withhold portions of their print materials allocations for application toward database costs. The Community College Library Consortium (CCLC) has assisted in purchasing databases since TTIP money has disappeared. However, because CCSF’s curriculum is so multifaceted, the Library has had to augment these state-funded databases with additional subscriptions and accompanying costs to accommodate areas of research not covered via the CCLC-funded subscriptions. Article databases are essential to academic research. A stable funding source is crucial and becomes even more so as the District implements Strategic Priority #7 to offer more distance learning opportunities.

A combination of the acquisition of NetLibrary, the CCLC e-book vendor, and the absence of funds, prevented the acquisition of e-books in 2011-12, for the first time in six years. Since Netlibrary was acquired by EBSCO, a shared consortia collection has not been available to the CCLC and funds have been insufficient to purchase e-books in another manner.

The Library assesses the effectiveness of its collections in a variety of ways: with comparative data about the quantity, variety, and currency of the collections in relation to the curricula; survey data from students and faculty; and collection analysis reports prepared for in-house assessment and professional association accreditation studies. In 2010, department and program faculty on average rated the library's online and on-site services and resources
3.6 out of 5 \( (N = 175) \) for meeting student learning needs. [II C-3] The 2011 LLR Student Survey revealed that 71 percent of students \( (N = 2,075) \) have two or more courses requiring use of library collections and equipment [II C-6 (7) Question 7]. For each of the following LLR program student learning outcomes, the majority of students found that as a result of using library collections, services, and facilities, they were better able to (1) acquire, evaluate, and use information; (2) understand and appreciate diverse peoples; and (3) effectively use computers and information technology [II C-6 (7) Question 11]. Furthermore, student perception of the importance of library services and resources, whether on-site or online, to academic success is very high; of the 2,021 respondents, 87 percent marked either Very Important (66.7 percent) or Important (19.8 percent) [II C-6(7) Question 12]. Similarly, the Media Center receives a high rating from faculty for providing material supporting the curriculum and supplementing coursework and programs [II C-4 (1), II C-3 (2)].

The various LLR units use approximately 10 computers to manage login and printing access. An additional 3 will be needed to bring Statler, and Southeast Center LLR units onto the computer access management system.

All LLSS units have expressed the need for planned replacement cycles for equipment, especially computer equipment and furnishings with allocations from the General Fund. The Learning Assistance Center’s 157 open-access lab computers are now seven years old and also experience heavy use. Monitors malfunction at a rate of about one to two per month due to age, and the headphones accompanying each computer should also be replaced for age. All Library student computers, except those at Chinatown/North Beach and Alice Statler, are over five years old, and therefore are eligible for replacement under the proposed replacement and upgrade cycle in the College Technology Plan [cite]. In the Spring 2011 LLR Student Survey, numerous comments expressed dissatisfaction with the number of computers available and many students find the computers old and slow [II C-6 (7) Question 16]. Comments in the Fall 2010 LLR Faculty Survey expressed the need for updated equipment at the Downtown Campus and for AV in general [II C-3 (1)]. The high usage statistics, in addition to student and faculty survey responses show a strong need for replacement as soon as funds are available [II C- (8)11-12 ROS Monthly Report, II C-6 (7), II C-3 (1)]. Some staff equipment is also outdated. Rosenberg funds were allocated and used to upgrade multimedia equipment in the three Rosenberg multimedia viewing classrooms in 2012.

### II.c.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plans

The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for adequate collection budget</td>
<td>Advocate for a year to year library materials budget based on community college state-wide average of $15 per FTES Continue to build CNB and Mission collections Resume e-book acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for funding the Library Technology Plan</td>
<td>Replace all old LLSS workstations that meet the replacement cycle specifications. Advocate for the maintenance of Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.C.1.b. The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.

II.C.1.b. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco is committed to providing students with opportunities to develop information competency (IC) skills, which support lifelong learning. Both the Library and Learning Resources (LLR) Mission Statement and program-level student learning outcomes include this goal and support the teaching and learning of these critical skills in accordance with the general education goals of the College. IC instruction aligns with the Association of College and Research Libraries Information Literacy/Competency Standards for Higher Education. Librarians and department instructors share responsibility for providing opportunities for students to learn and practice IC skills.

The Academic Policies and Bipartite Graduation Requirements Committee approved the following IC SLOs in 2006.

Upon completion of the requirement, a student will be able to:
1. Recognize when information is needed by identifying and narrowing a topic;
2. Develop effective research strategies by selecting appropriate search tools (e.g., catalogs, databases, indexes, search engines, human experts) and using effective search techniques to obtain desired information;
3. Locate and retrieve information in a variety of formats, such as online full-text, paper-copy, microfilm, audio-visual;
4. Critically evaluate the quality and appropriateness of the information, using such factors as currency, reliability, accuracy, point of view/bias, credibility of author/sponsoring organization, and relevancy for the assignment;
5. Effectively communicate and document information by synthesizing information obtained, developing outlines and drafts in a format suitable for the audience and purpose of assignment, and documenting sources using a standard citation format;
6. Competently use computers and other information technology tools to search and retrieve information as well as use application software to communicate;
7. Understand some of the legal and ethical issues relating to information and its use by properly attributing information used in assignments/projects and by complying with institutional policies on access and use of computer equipment and software.

The Library’s instructional services/information competency plan consists of three components: drop-in and online library/information competency workshops, course-related workshops, and the one-credit course LIS 10: Use of Information Resources. Since Fall 2006, all students completing a degree and/or who plan to transfer to the UC or CSU systems are required to satisfy the IC requirement by successfully completing the Area B Written Composition requirement, which states: “Upon completion of this coursework, a student will be able to:

1. develop a topic using non-narrative writing techniques, using abundant detail and examples, including comparison, summary, argument, analysis and definition.
2. show control of all major conventions of standard English grammar usage and punctuation.

3. obtain appropriate information, evaluate the credibility and accuracy of information, and document” [II C-13 p. 48 (14)].

Successful completion of English 1A, which includes a minimum of five hours of library/information competency skills workshops and assignments covering such topics as evaluating source reliability, creating an annotated bibliography, and completing essay/research paper assignments, accomplishes this requirement. A Self-Guided Walking Tour and Workshop G: Introduction to Library Services and Resources, address the needs of new and Basic Skills students by providing orientation to the library collections, facilities, and services.

The Library’s Curriculum Development/Information Competency (CD/IC) Committee, with input from faculty and students, has clarified the core information competencies and designed the series of workshops that teach these skills; all are available online. The library skills workshops, required in many academic and vocational courses in addition to ENGL 1A, are divided into two skill levels. All students are encouraged to take the workshops to improve their research skills. From 2007-08 to 2008-09, faculty revised the seven workshop course outlines and SLOs and submitted them to the College Curriculum Committee, which requested the merging of the workshop SLOs and content into a revised noncredit course outline (LIS 1000), effective Spring 2011. [II C-14 (15)]

In addition to teaching library skills workshops, Library faculty, collaborating with District faculty, teach IC skills in course-specific and -integrated instruction sessions as well as in orientations at campus libraries.

Each library location has a librarian at the reference desk during all open hours. To meet the needs of distance education students, electronic reference services are available via eRef (email reference) and instant messaging during most open hours, except Saturday. At all library locations and online, librarians engage in instruction-based reference work. Librarians use active learning techniques to engage students in searches, rather than simply providing students with an answer.

Some programs are noteworthy for the large number of IC instruction sessions incorporated into the curriculum, especially Health Education, ESL, Learning Assistance, and English. IC instruction is also available via the one-credit, transfer-level LIS 10 course, which enrolls approximately 160 students each year.

Since 2008, Library faculty have conducted two pilot programs to extend services and resources to more online students. As a result, the online course management portal has a direct link to the library homepage; increasing numbers of online faculty are utilizing online library skills workshops; and several online courses now include an “embedded librarian.” An embedded librarian is a department’s subject librarian actively participating in an online or hybrid course, assisting students with topic formulation, research strategy, and citations, as well as helping develop assignments that promote information competency.

The Instructional Services Plan outlines the goals and learning opportunities for information competency. Library faculty assess competencies with an ongoing and multi-method approach. As part of a continuous feedback loop, the Library typically administers student surveys and pre and post testing every two years, which guide the revision of the drop-in and
online basic IC workshop outlines and instructional materials. In addition, an emerging trend in IC assessment is collaborative efforts between librarians and District faculty assessing assignments outside of the library to show proficiency in IC skills. Examples of this can be seen in Sociology, English, Learning Assistance, Culinary Arts, Visual Arts, and Political Science.

II.C.1.b. Self Evaluation. Opportunities to teach information competency continue to increase in both individual reference sessions and classroom settings. The increase in opportunities at the reference desks is due in part to the huge number of workshop assignments students bring for review. The number of students completing these workshops has increased significantly with the addition of two new workshops, *Workshop G: Orientation to Library Resources & Services* and *Workshop P: Citing Sources to Responsibly Use Information* as well as online equivalents to all the workshops. The change in the ENGL 1A course outline has also increased workshop enrollment. The number of course-related instructional sessions supporting specific courses and assignments continues to rise. 2011-12 data shows 277 sessions (although not everyone has reported) reaching 6857 students, serving 60 unique credit courses in 26 different departments and programs, and 28 different non-credit courses in 5 programs. [II C-(16)Library Instructional Stats 2011-12]

To improve LIS 1000 workshop content and teaching effectiveness, librarians conduct a variety of assessments, analyze results, make improvements and share best practices. Subject librarians also work with District faculty to measure how information competency outcomes are applied in course work.

A Spring 2008 analysis of the processes used by students in three ENG 1A sections to conduct their research culminated in the English Department’s revision of the ENG 1A course outline, requiring five IC workshops with a minimum of five hours, thus increasing student preparation and experience with online research tools [II C-16 (17)]. Also as a result, the Library created *Workshop P - Citing Sources Responsibly*, which is now offered in the classroom and online.

The Library CD/IC Committee planned three assessments for *Workshop P: Citing Sources to Responsibly Use Information*, to determine student satisfaction and performance: student surveys, workshop assignments, and a pre- and post-test. Assessment revealed both the importance of instruction provided when a librarian corrects a student’s workshop assignment and the need to revise the MLA/APA citation guides [II C-19 (18)]. The C and D workshops were evaluated in Fall 2010, and A and C workshops in Spring 2012 using student feedback forms and input from workshop instructors; minor changes resulted from both assessments. Survey results indicated the need for more practical examples and engaging learning activities, and prompted training sessions for librarians on new workshop content and techniques to promote active learning [IIIC-(19)].

A gap in the library’s assessment plan is the lack of authentic assessment of subject specific workshops, which have primarily been assessed through instructor perception surveys.

Since 2006, librarians have collaborated with District faculty to assess IC skills in discipline coursework, of which, Sociology, English, Learning Assistance, Culinary Arts, Visual Arts and Political Science are examples. Survey and pre- and post-test assessment results guided revisions to research-based assignments and workshop presentations. The Statler librarian
also identified the need for CAHS students to complete IC workshops on database searching and citing sources earlier in the program, rather than in the third or fourth semester, when CAHS students typically complete the General Education English requirement. As a result of librarian/instructor collaboration, the 2011 revision of the introductory CAHS 100 course outline now requires two IC workshops [II C-18 (21)].

In Fall 2012, the Statler Librarian collaborated with the CAHS 100 course to review reference pages and in-text citations in 100 research papers from two sections of the course. The analysis reveals that students who had taken the workshop were proficient in citation format, whereas the students who did not take the workshop were not. The librarian is working with the instructors to provide a grading rubric on citations to all research paper assignments to prompt students to meet the goals [II C-(22)]. Additionally, the librarian will start a discussion posting on citation formats in the online section the week before the papers are due.

The exhibitions librarian has developed three visual literacy outcomes for assessing student learning from library exhibitions. In Fall 2012, the exhibitions librarian collaborated with District faculty in Learning Assistance and Political Science to assess one of the three outcomes in their courses. The librarian and faculty co-created an assignment and rubric to assess student competencies. The initial assessment revealed the need to include more contextual information accompanying the exhibits; to rewrite all compound questions in future survey instruments and assignments; and for continual improvement of the visual literacy rubric. Additionally, the exhibitions librarian plans to identify opportunities for teaching visual literacy as both an embedded librarian in relevant DE courses and in-person, subject-specific workshops [IIIC-(21)]

In Spring 2011, the LIS 10 course was substantially revised to better support SLOs, define project SLOs, and add a grading rubric, all based on student performance and several years’ results of pre- and post-assessments [II C-20 (23)]. An end of semester review prompted the instructors to make minor changes to the course as needed for continual quality improvement. Beginning Fall 2012, this process has become more formalized through the Office of Instruction; specific course SLOs are identified, assessed and reported each semester.

In Fall 2012, the library administered a survey assessment to evaluate effectiveness of reference transactions. Results from respondents at six library locations over a one week period show that fewer than 5 percent ($N = 114$) did not find information that fulfilled their need. Of the over 95 percent who found what they needed, librarians helped them find the information 69 percent of the time. The disparity in the number of students who felt they learned to find information (78 percent) versus the comparatively smaller number of students who learned to evaluate information (24 percent) points to a need to use reference transactions as opportunities to make students more aware of the need to evaluate sources when seeking information. The large number of respondents who stated that they learned technology skills (80 percent, $N = 112$) deserves reflection and follow-up. Technology and information competency are closely related and future assessments can more closely examine what technology skills students are learning in the library and what skills they still need [II C-(24)].
Librarians embedded in Distance Education courses continue to realize and apply more effective ways to contribute to student success in the online environment. However, no formal assessment has been developed targeting this type of reference and instruction.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement Exhibitions Program Assessment</td>
<td>Improve visual literacy rubric for exhibitions</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow partnership with district faculty in teaching and assessing IC skills</td>
<td>Develop and promote a standard assessment to be used for subject-specific workshops</td>
<td>Spring/Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop standard IC rubric</td>
<td>Spring/Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create an on demand FLEX credit for District faculty who meet with subject liaisons to incorporate library resources and instruction into curriculum</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore feasibility of tracking students completing LIS 10 or IC workshops through their education at CCSF</td>
<td>Consult with Research and Planning for assistance</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the development of multi-method assessment including a standard pre and post student survey, accompanied by the deployment of a standard IC rubric to be used by District faculty to assess students' skills in using the Library’s resources effectively, ultimately determined by how well students incorporate and synthesize the information into their research assignments. Collecting data across departments will provide a broader institutional level assessment of information competency as well as strengthen the partnership of District faculty and librarians in teaching these 21st century skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II.c.1.c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.**

**II.c.1.c. Descriptive Summary.** The following sections describe library hours, electronic access to library resources, and equitable access to library resources regardless of the location of services or their delivery.

**Library Hours.** As of Fall 2012, the Rosenberg Library on the Ocean Campus is open 58.75 hours per week, 7:45 a.m. to 7:45 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 7:45 a.m. to 2:45 p.m. on Friday, and 10 a.m. to 1:45 p.m. on Saturday. The Mission Center Library is open 46.75 hours per week, John Adams 42 hours, Southeast 32 hours, Downtown 41.25 hours, and Statler Library remains open 30 hours per week. The newest location, the Chinatown/North Beach Center Library, is open 30 hours per week.

Reference and circulation services facilitate access to library collections and are available at each library location during all open hours.
Electronic Access. The Library website provides 24/7 access to the online catalog and electronic collections, including article databases and electronic books, as well as research, writing, and subject guides, tutorials and more.

Equitable Access. The Library continues to work with distance education and evening and weekend faculty and students, as well as those at campuses without libraries. All seven library workshops are now available to be taken and graded online, and electronic course reserves were piloted in 2009-10, with full implementation during Spring 2011, enabling access to reserve materials 24/7 via the Internet. The intercampus delivery service continues twice a week between all campus libraries, with the exception of Chinatown/North Beach.

An Outreach and Community Librarian has been assigned since 2010-11 to increase outreach to all CCSF locations, and campus librarians serve as liaisons to the faculty and courses offered at their campus and nearby satellite locations. The Outreach and Community Librarian has provided workshops at the Castro, Civic Center (formerly Alemany) and Evans Centers.

The Distance Learning and Electronic Services Librarian provides dedicated service to distance learning faculty and students. Subject librarians and the Distance Learning and Electronic Services Librarian help online faculty develop assignments that use library resources, and two have embedded in online courses, to investigate establishing a practice of embedded librarian services.

The Library collaborates with DSPS to ensure library services and resources are accessible. Libraries have accessible computer workstations with peripheral accessories for people with motor, visual or other impairments; CCTV readers; magnifiers and accessible workspaces. Library faculty consult with DSPS counselors when necessary to ensure that students with disabilities receive high quality service appropriate to their needs.

Hours, electronic access, and equitable access of other Library and Learning Support Service units

Media Center. The Media Center is open Monday through Thursday 8 a.m. to 6:45 p.m., Friday 8 a.m. to 2:45 p.m. and Saturday 10 a.m. to 1:45 p.m. Multimedia materials at other library locations are available whenever the library is open. All registered students, faculty, and staff may use Media Center materials and facilities. Ten percent of the media carrels are wheelchair accessible and a special reader that slows down books on tape is available.

Audiovisual Unit and Broadcast Media Services. The Audiovisual Unit at the Ocean Campus, open Monday through Thursday 7:30 a.m. to 6:45 p.m. and Friday 7:30 a.m. to 2:45 p.m., provides equipment maintenance and delivery District wide, as well as three multimedia rooms in the LLRC, each equipped for DVD, videocassette, film, 35mm slide, and computer projection, including Internet access. Broadcast Media Services at the Ocean Campus, open Monday through Thursday 8:00 a.m. to 10 p.m. and Friday 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., provides video production and distribution services District wide and Ocean Campus classroom video playback equipment delivery services.

The Mission, Downtown, and John Adams libraries handle AV equipment requests at those campuses. The Southeast Campus has a designated audiovisual room. The Rosenberg AV Unit provides equipment and materials to campuses without their own AV resources by arrangement with instructors and departments.
The Language Center on the Ocean Campus provides access to all students enrolled in foreign language courses at CCSF during Media Center hours, with additional labs at the Downtown, Mission and Chinatown/North Beach campuses, all of which have stations for disabled users. The Rosenberg Language Center offers assistance from faculty monitors and student workers, as well as general orientations both days and evenings, on-site, or in classrooms at any campus. Workshops introduce students to various textbooks and ancillary materials, increasing their use. The Online Language Lab provides remote access for distance education students and others to textbook audio and video materials and supplemental resources 24/7. The Language Center also increases access to collections and services by providing space and equipment for instructors to create ancillary materials and allow students to submit oral assignments electronically.

Learning Assistance Department (LAD). The Learning Assistance Center is now open 49.75 hours per week, including evening hours. The Learning Assistance Center increases access via collaborations with other departments and programs, such as academic department labs like the Writing Lab and the ESL Center for Learning and Academic Development, retention programs, and EOPS. Online courses and the new LAD website provide alternative access to services if location or time is a barrier to physical access.

II.c.1.c. Self Evaluation. CCSF provides adequate access to library and learning support services in a number of modes to support student learning on campus and at satellite locations and for day, evening, and weekend courses, as well as for distance education and online learning.

Library and Learning Support Services. CCSF’s ability to provide adequate access to library and learning support services has been significantly affected by worsening fiscal constraints. The District has made significant strides in increasing access, regardless of ability or location, with initiatives such as the expanded online workshop offerings, redesigned websites, expanded Online Language Lab and innovations such as the electronic course reserves and embedded librarian pilots. Use of online resources and services continues to increase, and survey feedback indicates a high level of satisfaction with online services and resources. However, some areas of improvement identified in the last Self Study have remained stagnant or declined.

The 2006 Self Study indicated a need to reinstate Sunday hours; instead, hours have further decreased. The Rosenberg Library’s current schedule of 58.75 hours per week is a decrease of 24 percent from 77.5 hours in 1999-2000. With some exceptions, hours at center libraries have remained stable since 2007; Mission Center Library hours decreased from a high of 61.5 hours over 6 days for Fall 2007 to a low of 43 hours over 4 days for Fall 2011. An ACRL recommended Peer Comparison was conducted in Fall 2011. The study showed: (1) CCSF has more library locations than any of the other libraries surveyed and thus the number of computer workstations in the libraries is far greater (CCSF=295; Survey Average=110); (2) CCSF has three times the average number of library locations; and (3) CCSF’s library hours at Rosenberg (the main campus library) are significantly less than the survey average (CCSF=59; Survey Average=65).
Students and District faculty have also expressed dissatisfaction with Library hours. In February 2010, a grassroots group comprising mostly CCSF students staged an event in which approximately 80 students, faculty, and staff occupied Rosenberg Library to keep it open to its previous closing time of 8:45 p.m. [II C-23(28)] Faculty write-in comments in the Fall 2010 Library Survey included requests for more hours of access to Audiovisual equipment, that District faculty have input into the question of whether to reduce library hours, and, more directly, for “longer open hours.” Responses also included the need for increased evening and weekend hours to serve evening classes and working students. [II C-3 (1) Appendix 1] In the Spring 2011 LLR Student Survey, 75 percent of 2,013 respondents indicated that the library (1) opens too late; or (2) closes too early; or (3) needs additional hours on Saturday. [II C-6 (7)Question 5] These comments came after library hours had been increased for Spring 2011—one hour in the evening and 15 minutes each weekday morning, made possible by faculty and staff volunteering to absorb the additional service hours, to allow students some access before 8 a.m. classes, especially for printing and reserves. Increasing library hours remains a priority along with adequate staffing and resources to support them.

Two faculty positions were approved in 2011 to replace a retiring full-time librarian and for the two full-time positions required for the Chinatown/North Beach Library, but both positions have been put on hold. The freeze on classified positions has been compounded by several classified retirements within LLR. The Chinatown/North Beach Library opened with 30 hours a week, offering new library access to collections, computers, and library staff. The library is staffed by one librarian and classified staff rotating from other library locations. Reallocation of hours at other library locations, based on FTES and programs served at the campuses, helped make staffing Chinatown/North Beach possible in the short term. The reallocation also enabled the restoration of Saturday hours at the Mission Center Library in Fall 2012, leaving weekly hours there decreased by almost 24 percent, with plans to restore 3.75 Friday hours in Spring 2013.

The Fall 2007 opening of the Mission Center Library increased access to physical collections and to Language, Learning Assistance and Media center services to Mission, as well as Castro campus students, through the outreach efforts of the Mission Center Librarian The John Adams Center renovation, completed in 2009-10, increased library space for collections and study and added a group study room. The Alice Statler Library and CAHS department were awarded a Perkins Grant to upgrade and increase the number of workstations in the Gifford Resource Center, enabling the librarian and CAHS instructors to incorporate a computer lab component into their curriculum, in addition to increasing open access to computers.

In Fall 2009, Library faculty and staff assisted the Civic Center Center in setting up a reading room and lending collection for ESL students. Similarly, the Evans Center has developed its own lending collection while it advocates for a campus library. Comments by Evans Center faculty from the Fall 2010 LLR Faculty Survey expressed an increasing need for an on-site library as programs at the campus evolve. [II C-3 (1) Evans worksheet] The 2011 District Five-Year Capital-Outlay Construction Plan includes among its top ten priorities a new campus with a library and learning assistance center in the Bayview/Hunter’s Point neighborhood. [II C-29 (29)]
Intercampus delivery requests for 2011-12 numbered 2,768. [II C-(30) LLR 2011-12 Annual Totals] In the Spring 2011 LLR Student Survey, over 27 percent of 1,983 respondents had requested delivery of books from other CCSF campuses. [II C-6 (7)] Recommendations made in the 2006 Self Study, but which have not come to fruition, included dedicated staffing and expansion of the intercampus delivery service to include CCSF sites without libraries. [II C-33 (31) Standard II C] Center Deans have discussed the expansion, but there has been no staff allocation to expand the delivery schedule and service to District sites without libraries, nor to be able to expand service to include the Chinatown/North Beach library in its first year.

The increased demands on staff to accommodate Chinatown/North Beach in the absence of new positions, further compounded by lack of hires to replace retirements, is unsustainable.

In spite of reduced hours, use of LLSS services and collections has increased. The number of reference desk transactions has more than doubled from 48,741 in the 2005-06 academic year to 111,703 in 2011-12, and the number of circulated items, both reserve and non-reserve, has increased more than 6 percent over the same period. While circulation of physical materials has not increased at the pace of reference transactions, e-book sessions numbered 49,843 for 2011-12 [II C-4 (2)].

In response to faculty survey results indicating lack of awareness of course reserves and to increase student access to textbooks, in Fall 2010, librarians and circulation staff tested a practice of recording unfilled searches for reserve materials and contacting the appropriate instructor. Of 140 instructors contacted in the first semester, 20 percent submitted materials for reserves. Library faculty voted to formalize this as an ongoing practice.

Bibliographic access has improved in several ways since the last Self Study. The Library upgraded its online catalog in 2010-11, incorporating feedback from faculty, staff and students [II C-26 (32)]. In 2012, the Library added Spanish and Chinese language versions of many of the online catalog interfaces. The Technical Services unit has added 21 new location codes; added local subject headings to increase access to foreign films, ESL materials, and Basic Skills materials; conducted multiple authority record cleanup projects; and corrected tens of thousands of errors in bibliographic records. The READ collection, a centralized and easy to locate collection for English language learners and Basic Skills students, was made possible by these efforts. The creation of bibliographic records for print periodicals also improved access.

Remote access to article databases and electronic books has been improved for end-users with the implementation of EZProxy®, which enables users to log in with their CCSF ID barcode only once per session. During 2011-12 alone, there were 7,679,549 article database searches, as compared to 297,122 in 2005-06 [II C-25 (33)].

As part of the CCSF website redesign, a Library committee planned the Library website overhaul during a three-year effort. A Fall 2008 student website evaluation helped guide the restructure. The new structure comprises four primary areas, represented on the homepage, with a search box to give immediate access to the online catalog, a specific student request. [II C-26 (32)] As a cost-effective solution to providing subject guides that are more current and incorporate multimedia, the new subject-guide template uses a social bookmarking tool, which enables librarians to update subject guides in the new content management system instantly, simply by bookmarking a resource from any Internet connection. The prior system
was labor intensive and the technical work of updates fell primarily to the Distance Learning and Electronic Services Librarian to implement as time allowed.

Since the new website debuted in January 2010, Library website hits increased almost 70 percent from the year before (621,637 in 2009 as compared to 1,056,457 in 2010), and for the 2011-12 year, were at 2,992,308 hits. [II C-25 (33)] ERef use has remained limited, but instant-message reference, now available on most Library webpages, rapidly increased after the redesign. [II C-27 (34)]

Until Fall 2012, the Distance Learning Librarian’s duties included grading of online library skills workshops. The number of workshops submitted for grading electronically has increased so dramatically that a system for grading workshops online was implemented in Fall 2012, distributing the work on a rotational basis among campus librarians throughout the semester. The department is investigating how to incorporate the online workshops into Insight, the online learning platform, and thus automate much of the initial work of grading without losing the instructional opportunities inherent in manual grading. In 2011-12 alone, 7,931 students took the library skills workshops online rather than in person. [II C- (14) Librarians_InstrucStats_2011_12.xlsx, Totals worksheet] Two examples of LLSS dedication to increasing access are the embedded librarian service, which “embeds” librarian support directly into the online course environment, and the use of Rosenberg Grant funds for awards to four online faculty to incorporate information competency in their courses.

In spite of these efforts and gains, there is still room to increase access to collections and services for vocational and technical students, as well as students who do not currently utilize the physical locations. In the 2011 LLR Student Survey, which in Spring 2011 was emailed to all credit and noncredit students, posted to the Library website and distributed at service desks in library locations, almost 29 percent of respondents (N = 2,126) reported visiting a library location once or twice a semester or less (12.3 percent never and 16.6 percent once or twice a semester). Only about 3 percent reported only using library resources online. [II C-6 (7)Question 3]

Other Library and Learning Support Services Units. Media Center hours paralleled those of Rosenberg Library until Spring 2011, when the Media Center could not restore the evening hour along with the library. Departments that consistently utilize Media Center services include Music; ESL, English, Health Education, Physical Education, and telecourses. Since the AV unit serves only faculty, the Media Center now takes student requests for AV materials to use in the Media Center.

Broadcast Media Services and Audiovisual have coordinated to provide clear information. Each department’s hours, services, equipment, deliveries, and process for making service requests can be found on a one-stop shared media services webpage, in the Faculty Handbook, and at other locations.

The Language Center moved in Spring 2012 to a smaller, but more visible, location on the 4th floor of the Rosenberg building, from their space on the 2nd floor. The timing and short notice of the moved meant the Language Center did not open until the third week of the term, and then, without Internet access, printing services, computers and multimedia access initially. Full services were available upon opening in Fall 2012. The strong natural light and easy-to-find location are improvements, but the Center is still determining where to place all their resources in the reduced space.
The Learning Assistance Center’s current hours, including the elimination of Saturday hours, are a reduction due to loss of staff in Spring 2012. However, the relocation of the Reading and Writing Labs from the Learning Assistance Center to a separate space across the building atrium facilitated the expansion of the LAC computer lab to 98 stations, utilizing computers from elsewhere on campus, the creation of a laptop area, and computer stations for group work. [II C- (35)LAC Program Review] The LAD also gained a location in 2007 with the new Mission Center Library and an additional, smaller location at the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus which, however, remains closed due to lack of staffing.

The Learning Assistance Department is within the Student Development division, whose structural changes have yet to be determined, and so any effect on the LAD is unknown.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate logistics of migrating the online library skills workshops into Insight.</td>
<td>Discuss w/…. (see WO, MA) re student ID and course registration to facilitate self registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase library presence in Distance Courses</td>
<td>DE Libn Work with DE Chair to incorporate library elements into the online course template.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to explore ways to increase number of items on reserve, especially electronic reserves</td>
<td>Provide e-reserves FLEX Day workshop on advantages of e-reserves over class websites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand intercampus delivery to all library locations and sites without libraries</td>
<td>Advocate for funding for necessary staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore library hours to fully serve course offerings at all centers</td>
<td>Advocate for increased hours with data from Program Review and other assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore additional avenues to serve student populations not currently utilizing library resources and to investigate more ways to reach students at campuses without libraries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.c.1.d. The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services.

II.c.1.d. Descriptive Summary. CCSF provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services. Each Library location employs a 3M® security system to secure materials within the facility and the District contracts with Sonitrol® to alarm all facilities. Video cameras record activity on the three floors of Rosenberg Library for security purposes, as well as at the rear entrance to Rosenberg LLRC and adjacent parking lot. Video cameras also monitor the Mission Campus Library. Campus Police respond quickly when called for emergency situations or disturbances.

All LLSS locations rely upon District maintenance and janitorial services. The Buildings and Grounds Department makes general repairs, while Pinnacle contracts with the District to provide printer and photocopier maintenance. Library Automation Services (LAS) is responsible for Millennium, the integrated library system, including maintenance and
upgrades. ITS supports all open access labs and some department and program multi-purpose labs District wide.

Broadcast and Electronic Media Arts (BEMA) facilities are closely monitored by staff. All equipment is locked and physically secured and students must sign an Open Lab Use Agreement regarding equipment and facility security. The Ocean and Mission campus BEMA facilities also have additional Sonitrol alarm systems.

**II.c.1.d. Self Evaluation.** The College effectively maintains and secures its library and other learning support services, although there are areas where improvement is possible. Strengths include the collaborative relationship with Campus Police in support of a safe and secure learning environment and the responsiveness of LAS and ITS in keeping student computers operational and available.

The 2011 Library Student Survey revealed that 84.5 percent of respondents \((N=1994)\) rated the library as a place to study as very important (68.6 percent) or important to their studies and coursework \([II C-(7)]\). Rosenberg Library carpeting is heavily stained, with multiple patches and worn areas, and many chairs are threadbare. Rosenberg Grant funds have proven inadequate to cover these costs \([II C-34 (31)]\). Despite these issues, in the same survey, 79.4 percent of students \((N=1928)\) are very satisfied (42.1 percent) or satisfied with the library as a place to study \([IIC-6 (7)]\). The Library anticipates that the District’s integration of facilities maintenance into planning will help produce allocations to accomplish building maintenance goals that have been unmet, such as replacing carpeting and resolving ongoing problems with the Rosenberg building’s climate control systems.

In Spring 2012, LAS was unable to acquire a significant upgrade to the library system at a discounted price, despite carefully considered assessment and justification within the LLR and the availability of funds through the Rosenberg bequest. This missed opportunity resulted from miscommunication at the College Administration and Board level. A goal in the 2013-15 Technology Plan is to acquire this significant upgrade.

In 2009, Information Technology Services (ITS) was restructured and some members of LAS were reassigned to ITS part-time, reducing LAS staff availability for maintaining Library computers and projects such as testing new programs the Library is investigating.

The Learning Assistance Center print server and printer are fully operational during all hours the lab is open, with up-to-date patches, drivers, and firmware. The lab staff maintains spare hardware and an up-to-date Ghost image so maintenance and repairs can be performed with minimal downtime. In addition, the lab staff keeps an up-to-date inventory, including verified and documented software licenses. All this is accomplished by a classified staff that has been reduced 50 percent over the past ten years.

ITS provides maintenance and security for library equipment and computer systems throughout the District. ITS keeps hardware, network, applications, and antivirus software up to date with security and other patches, and antivirus software virus definitions are updated weekly. The last Self Study recommended an inventory and tracking system for instructional equipment throughout the District. The recent reorganization of the Information Technology Services Department, and the hiring of a Chief Technology Officer, brought District computer equipment under the auspices of ITS, and a plan is in development by the District...
Technology Committee at time of writing. Standard III.C. discusses maintenance of District computers in further detail.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement appropriate sections of the Library Technology Plan as resources become available. (Library Technology Plan 1.2 and 1.6)</td>
<td>Upgrade the Library's integrated library system to Sierra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include and prioritize general building issues, such as maintenance and replacement of worn carpets, in the departments' planning and review processes to advocate for funding to perform necessary maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.c.1.e. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution’s intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.

II.c.1.e. Descriptive Summary. The Library, as a participant in OCLC®, in addition to cataloging agreements, maintains an agreement through its Interlibrary Loan program (ILL) to borrow and lend materials. An agreement also exists with Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (III) for the provision of services and maintenance of the integrated library system. Standard licensing agreements are in place with software vendors and online databases such as EBSCOhost® and Gale®. The District contracts with Pinnacle for copier and printer service and maintenance.

Services provided by III, EBSCO, Gale, and Pinnacle are all integral to library use. Usage statistics for searches in both the library catalog and article databases are maintained in a shared server directory for use as needed. Student surveys assess user satisfaction with the computers and photocopy machines.

Database licensing agreements are reviewed annually prior to renewal by the Acquisitions Librarian, and product changes are reviewed by subject liaisons, with input from their subject area departments, before approval by Library faculty and administration.

Library administration consults with Library Automation Services and ITS regarding purchases of new equipment. The vendor from which CCSF purchases computer hardware offers a five-year warranty on each system, addressing hardware maintenance and repair needs.

II.c.1.e. Self Evaluation. The College has no formal or contractual agreements with outside vendors to directly provide library or learning support services. However, for the agreements
which do exist with library and learning support service units, adequate evaluation and oversight mechanisms are in place.

The purchase of PC-Cop, the computer access management system currently used by the Library, was a direct response to survey results that showed students were dissatisfied with their ability to find an open computer in the library [II C-35 (26)]. Limitations on the system to reliably manage the number of workstations the Library has grown to offer, as well as the potential for the College to move to using a single access management application, have prompted the need to explore alternatives. Tests were initiated, but lack of staff time to work with the vendor led to the abandonment of the test.

The number of subscription database searches has vastly increased in recent years [II C-1 (6)p. 6]. In 2007 the Library conducted a thorough comparison of databases from EBSCO and Gale, including full-text title review and assessment of student preference and usability of both vendors, resulting in a license agreement with EBSCO. Use of EBSCOH<sup>host</sup> dramatically increased, from 562,039 searches in 2007-08 to 6,071,381 in 2011-12 [II C-25 (32)] — a massive increase even when considering the addition of several EBSCO databases— and satisfaction has been high [II C-6 (7)].

### II.c.1.e. Actionable Improvement Plans.

The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to test and implement a more effective system of managing public computer access based on the needs assessment and evaluation of available options that are more suited to accommodating the amount of use and specific needs of Library open access computers.</td>
<td>Investigate alternatives to PC-Cop access management. Work with College on implementing college wide access management system in Library, if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate EBSCO contract to treat LLR as single organization in subscription pricing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.C.2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

### II.C.2. Descriptive Summary.

The annual program review process reviews assessments to set goals and ensure that all LLSS are sufficient in meeting student learning needs. Regular goals outlined in program review include increasing collaborative efforts with District faculty; maximizing staffing and open hours equitably throughout all centers; and improving and expanding services to all students. Unit goals are aligned with College plans and priorities.

Assessment cycles evaluate SLOs, services, resources, and facilities usage and access. Assessments include: statistical data analysis, student and faculty surveys, focus groups, faculty and student evaluation of workshops, pre- and post-testing within specific programs, and informal anecdotal feedback from the College community. College wide surveys rate overall satisfaction with all of the library and learning support service units. Data from
assessments inform the program review process and assist each unit in evaluating and planning future and prioritizing resource allocation requests.

Faculty participate in a four-year tenure review process and then peer evaluations every three years once tenure is granted. Classified staff are evaluated by their supervisors on an annual basis.

**Library & Learning Resources.** LLR monitors the quality of its services and resources via data collection and assessment activities to improve programs and services, and to prepare reports for state, regional, and national professional and accreditation associations. For the past nine years, the Library Instructional Services program has conducted research skills workshop assessment, since the Library’s role in teaching information competency directly supports the College’s general education learning goals and many of the academic programs’ student learning outcomes. The workshops have had student learning outcomes and assessment strategies since 2004.

In response to changes in Program Review requirements and regional accreditation standards, LLR centralized and streamlined statistical data collection for resources, services, and facilities usage, as well as developed program SLOs and a comprehensive assessment plan addressing non-instructional services and facilities. The Library Assessment page on the Library website provides a central location for all LLR assessment information, including: a seven-year timeline of assessments to conduct each year, measurements by Library service area, process documents to guide assessment work groups, survey instruments, an assessment analysis form, and a chart to identify assessments performed, with recommendations and results. In Fall 2012, a review of the Library mission statement was added to the assessment timeline, and will be repeated every three years beginning Spring 2013.

Assessment results are the foundation of continued improvements in meeting student needs. Recommendations identified through assessments are brought to the appropriate LLR committee for planning and implementation. For example, the 2006-08 LLR Student Survey revealed students were dissatisfied with their ability to find an open computer in the library. The Library’s Technology committee investigated computer access management systems and recommended PCCop which LAS installed and implemented [IIC-35 (26)]. Other recent examples of assessment follow through include: the Library website redesign; the electronic reserves pilot project; and ongoing advocacy for restoring library hours.

Ongoing, informal faculty dialogue between librarians and the College community help shape library services and collections and focus on specific student learning and curricular needs. Each year when the library assesses article databases and print subscriptions, librarians solicit feedback from District faculty on the titles essential to support curricular needs. Library programs and exhibitions receive faculty and student reactions via blog entries, evaluation forms, and contact with event organizers.

**Learning Assistance Department.** LAD first developed student learning outcomes, activities, tutor reflections, and faculty assessments specific to its tutor training course in Fall 2007. LAD developed two surveys to assess the student learning outcomes in the LERN course with the intent to understand (1) how the course SLOs were used by tutors who completed the tutor training course; and (2) if students who were tutored believed they were recipients of the same outcomes. The two surveys have been used for eight semesters, and the LAD has learned which tutoring strategies are most used, least used, most valued, and
requires changes. The assessment has led to a number of changes in the course curriculum to improve student learning.

The LAD also maintains the College’s largest open-access computer lab for students. The Learning Assistant Center student survey provides information on staff performance and SLOs in the LAC Computer Lab. The LERN Assessment page provides a central location for LAD/C assessment processes and highlights.

**Broadcast Media Services, Audiovisual Unit and Computer Labs.** Assessment of media and audiovisual services for faculty is conducted through LLR surveys and employee surveys administered College wide. Computer labs outside of the LLR are assessed through College wide faculty and student surveys as well. A technology-focused College wide survey to determine the overall satisfaction of instructional technology services to the College community has not been conducted since 2005; lack of adequate staffing in Research and Planning has limited the ability for this type of integrative ongoing assessment.

Departmental and multi-use computer labs fall under the auspices of ITS. Program level outcomes developed with input from managers and staff within each ITS program area (e.g. Computer Labs), were established in Fall 2012. Outcomes are refined through group review and discussion and continually reviewed and augmented as necessary based on input from assessment data. Assessment methods include: feedback from the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) and a college-wide annual faculty and staff satisfaction survey. Informally, ITS lab managers work closely with department liaisons to address concerns related to each lab’s day-to-day and long term operation. The ITS Assessment page provides a central location for ITS assessment processes and highlights.

**II.C.2. Self Evaluation.** The College conducted a credit student opinion survey in fall 2010 and approximately 2,558 students responded. The survey shows 92.1 percent found librarians to be supportive of them. It also revealed that students rate library collections and services, both in print and online, excellent (34.4 percent) and good (48.3 percent). A small number of students rated the collections and services fair (14.6 percent) and poor (2.7 percent). These results show that the Library is effective in providing collections and services relevant to student needs. Similarly, the media center, language center, learning assistance centers and computer labs received between 77 and 82 percent ratings of excellent and good. All LLSS units are perceived by students to be of value and useful based on these survey results. [II.C-(27)]

**Library and Learning Resources.** The library conducted its own student survey in Fall 2011 and approximately 2,217 students responded. Of the responses received, 86 percent were credit students; 76 percent take classes weekdays during the day, and 47 percent take evening classes; and over 58 percent use the library weekly, several times a week or daily. The survey data was sorted by campus as well as by online and noncredit students so that data could be analyzed by the various populations separately. Key findings include the following:

- 35 percent want additional evening hours; 28% would like additional Saturday hours
- Majority of respondents found library services and resources to be important or very important to their coursework
- 87 percent found the use of Library services and resources to academic success in college to be important or very important.
The most common areas covered by survey comments were: positive feedback; increased hours and computer issues.

- Majority of students state the best way to communicate is via email and posting on library website
- 57% of online courses do not require any library use (reserve books, workshops, database use)
- 60 percent of all respondents and 67 percent of online student respondents have never attended a library workshop
- 68 percent of all noncredit respondents have never attended a workshop
- 34 percent of all respondents and 72 percent of online student respondents haven’t used reserve textbooks
- 41 percent of all respondents have never used databases

Several library initiatives were informed by the survey results. In outreach efforts to department faculty, subject librarians are placing more emphasis on online and hybrid courses, and promoting databases, reserves and workshops. The Distance & Electronic Services Librarian is collaborating with the Distance Education chair to provide a larger library presence in the college’s online course management system; this objective is in the planning stages. The embedded librarian pilot is part of this initiative; however lack of adequate staffing has slowed down progress.

Also, data received from both the student and faculty surveys confirm the need to increase course reserves. As a result, subject librarians are promoting both print and electronic reserves with department faculty, especially for online and hybrid courses and library faculty piloted a course reserve project whereas librarians and circulation staff record unfilled requests for course reserve materials and notify the instructor. In the first semester, of the 140 instructors contacted by the library, 20 percent submitted reserve materials. This project has since been formalized as an ongoing practice.

In Fall 2012, the library re-evaluated its program level outcomes (PLOs) and revised them to better align with the library’s mission and services. The outcomes were mapped to our service areas and measurements are identified. Both library faculty and classified staff gave input into the PLOs and are working on measurements.

**Learning Assistance Center.** During Fall 2006, College Success faculty engaged in an extensive dialogue to develop SLOs and teaching “best practices” for the LERN 50 course. As a result, the course was redesigned with redefined SLOs, content, and assessment activities, including an SLO rubric. During Spring 2007, a College Success Survey was developed and administered to students who had completed LERN 50 in Fall 2006 with an A, B, or C grade, enrolled in a subsequent term, and had an email address in Banner. The survey was also administered Spring semesters 2008-10. The purpose of the survey was to assess the students’ application of SLOs in current classes in addition to assessing the overall usefulness of SLOs for the course. The data from this survey have been used to redesign the SLOs for LERN 50. LAD faculty are beginning to understand which SLOs for LERN 50 are being applied to other courses and which SLOs students apply more/less frequently. These data assist faculty in the development of the College Success course.
In Fall 2010, all LAD assessment surveys were reformatted following the purchase of a Survey Monkey® license. The following SLO assessment surveys continue to be utilized: (1) LAC Tutor Survey assesses tutors’ ability to use tutoring techniques taught in the course; (2) LAC Student Survey assesses (a) students’ review of tutors’ abilities and (b) students’ own learning while tutoring; (3) LAC College Success Survey assesses students’ use of college success skills one semester after completing their College Success course; and (4) LAC Computer Lab Survey assesses (a) students’ review of computer lab and its staff and (b) students’ own learning while using the LAC computers.

Language Center. The Language Center identified student learning outcomes in Spring 2010. [II C-39 (29)] Assessment includes surveys emailed directly to a representative sampling of Foreign Language Department classes at the end of each semester. The survey is also available online via the Language Center homepage and in print at the Center itself. Of responses received in Spring 2011 (N = 247), more than 97 percent of respondents felt the Language Center helped them to do better in their foreign language courses. Seventy-eight percent indicated that the Language Center helped them to identify the language-learning resources that are most effective for them personally. More than 33 percent felt their computer skills increased by using the Language Center. Eighty-four percent indicated their study habits and focus improved, and 68 percent felt they developed a better understanding of other cultures and people by using the Language Center [II C-40 (30)].

Computer Labs. Usage statistics from ITS have not been made available to fully understand how District computer labs unaffiliated with LLR and LAD are used and whether they meet student need. The District technology committee is evaluating District computer labs with the intent to more effectively use District resources to meet student needs. In a college wide student survey conducted in 2010, student rated computer labs 44% good and 37% excellent [II C-(27). In 2012, computer lab program outcome assessment data and results are being analyzed and discussed. This data together with student and faculty input will provide a better picture as to the relationship of computer lab usage to student learning.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase multi-measures for LLR program SLOs</td>
<td>Develop survey questions that target the LLR program SLOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use more hard data to accompany findings from student and faculty perception surveys when assessing program outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the library against ACRL and ASCCC library standards</td>
<td>Create benchmarks for library facilities, collections, services and organization structure that meet the standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Accredited colleges in multi-college systems may be organized such that responsibility for resources, allocation of resources and planning rests with
the system. In such cases, the system is responsible for meeting standards on behalf of the accredited colleges.

III. A. Human Resources

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III. A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

III. A.1.a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

III. A.1./III. A.1.a. Descriptive Summary. The Human Resources Department (HR) oversees the hiring processes for all District personnel to ensure that the established and published hiring procedures are equitable and fairly administered in accordance with the requirements of Title 5 California Code of Regulations, the California Education Code concerning equal employment opportunity and the State Minimum Qualifications as outlined in the Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges.

Replacement/New positions procedures-

For each category of employee, hiring criteria, including job announcements, paper screening criteria, and interview questions, are established by the hiring departments, reviewed by key personnel, and approved by HR and the Affirmative Action Office to ensure results yield effective hiring of knowledgeable and qualified personnel who will effectively support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness.

Pursuant to California Education Code §88137, the City and County of San Francisco’s merit system, overseen by the Civil Service Commission, governs the District’s employment of classified employees. All permanent and provisional positions, with the exception of positions exempted from the merit system process, have been classified by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR) according to their duties, responsibilities and authority. If a classified position is new or an additional position is to be added to a College department, a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) or Express Classification
form (EXP) must be completed. The JAQ or EXP serves as the survey instrument designed to elicit complete and thorough information for a specific position, such as major functions, essential duties and responsibilities, and if applicable level of authority.

Job announcements for each employee category list the required employment qualifications, the minimum qualifications, and the desirable qualifications established by the hiring search committee. Additionally, job announcements are directly related to the institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.

Drafts of job announcements for administrative positions are prepared by the Human Resources Department in consultation with the Chancellor and reviewed by for EEOC compliance. As a courtesy, administrative job announcements are also reviewed by the Academic Senate. Faculty positions are prepared by the Search Committee in consultation with the Department Chair and are reviewed by the Dean, Vice Chancellor and/or Chancellor, and the Affirmative Action Office. As a courtesy, administrative job announcements are also reviewed by the Academic Senate.

The formation of hiring search committees is an established participatory process outlined in District hiring procedures. Search Committee members for administrative hiring committees are comprised of representatives from the faculty, classified staff, administrative ranks, and students (applicable). Faculty are selected by the Academic Senate, the classified staff are selected by the SEIU Local 2121, administrators are selected by the Chancellor, and students are selected by the Executive Board of the Associated Students. Faculty search committees are formed through a democratic process at the departmental level. The composition of Search Committees for all employee categories is consistent with federal and state guidelines on race and sex. Furthermore, in accordance with faculty hiring procedures, the background of search committee members should reflect the diversity, range of interests, philosophies, and programs in the department. The HR Academic Hiring unit and Dean, along with the Affirmative Action Office, ensure that search committee members are oriented on the hiring procedures, fair employment practices and procedures, equal opportunity and non-discrimination, and relevant sections of the collective bargaining agreement, i.e. Article 12.

To recruit large and diverse numbers of applicants, job announcements are advertised in various local, state, and national mediums, i.e. newspapers, publications, trade journals, employment websites, and internet job boards. HR contracts with Jobelephant, a recruitment advertising agency recognized globally as an authorized agent for employment advertising. Examples of ad placement include the Chronicle of Higher Education, Community College Week, Outlook in Higher Education, Women in Higher Education, cccregistry.org, Insidehighered.com, Higheredjobs.com, sfbay.craigslist.org, AisansinHigherEd.com, IMDiversity.com, BlacksinHighered.com, HispanicsinHighered.com, communitycollegejobs.com, and ACCCA.org.

Prospective candidates for administrative and faculty positions are required to provide evidence of their qualifications and experience in their application materials and show their potential for contributing to the institutions’ mission. Application materials include copies of transcripts verifying the degree required by the state-mandated minimum qualification, a letter of interest, a diversity statement, letters of recommendation, and in some instances, a portfolio of work and additional department-specific questionnaires.
Hiring processes are rigorous and nearly all departments hiring faculty require a teaching demonstrations and a portfolio of work as part of the interview process. Search committees paper screen the applicants and interview candidates based on stated criteria agreed upon by all committee members and certified by the HR department. 

The Human Resources hiring units are responsible for ensuring that applicants meet the state-mandated minimum qualifications (academic positions) and the minimum qualifications (classified staff), including verification of degrees from accredited institutions, and relevant work experience. Procedures are in place for determining equivalency through the Academic Senate Equivalency Committee and for evaluating foreign degrees where applicable.

These processes yield faculty and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The College employs over 800 full-time faculty and slightly more than 1,000 part-time faculty. Ninety-five percent of faculty and administrators hold master’s degrees and approximately 250 hold doctorates. They bring to the students extensive backgrounds gained through years of study, research, and extensive experience in business, industry, education, the arts, and government service. Many are prominent in a variety of communities. Many part-time faculty are working professionals in their fields. Others are officers and policy makers in professional organizations. Some are authors of nationally and internationally published texts in their fields and a large number have done pioneer work in developing special courses and curricula.

In accordance with Education Code § 87405 on September 30, 2008, the Board of Trustees adopted Resolution No. 080926-S4 implementing a procedure whereby the District would consider job applicants with previous controlled substance convictions if the applicant successfully demonstrates five years of rehabilitation. This process includes the formation of a Committee on Rehabilitation composed of a classified employee, a faculty member, the District’s Chief of Police, human resources staff, and a representative of the US District Court Probation Office, the SF Sheriff’s Department, or related associations. The application forms, employee handbooks, and relevant materials were updated to disclose the requirements and exceptions to Ed. Code § 87405, and to ensure effective implementation of Resolution No. 080926-S4, the Dean of HR is required to provide a status report at each August and February Board meeting.

The institution serves a great diversity of students in a wide variety of programs, including credit, noncredit, contract education and continuing education. This variety requires that greater emphasis be placed on understanding and sensitivity of current issues pertaining to equity and diversity. For this reason, the District’s philosophy on hiring requires the College to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse backgrounds. In addition to a required diversity statement as part of the application materials, job applications also include a question regarding diversity, and the interview processes include a question related to diversity.

District procedures call for an Equal Employment Opportunity monitor to attend every hiring search committee interview process to ensure compliance with federal and state labor laws, rules, and regulations. A monitor is not always available to serve on every hiring search committee, however, all admin hiring does have monitor. Due to the lack of availability of trained monitors and funding to pay them, committees at times conduct interviews without monitors.
WHAT SAFEGUARDS ARE IN PLACE TO ASSURE THAT HIRING PROCEDURES ARE CONSTANTLY APPLIED?

The hiring processes for faculty, permanent administrators and classified staff are rigorous and ensure that the individual hired has the requisite experience and expertise to carry out the job duties effectively. However, for administrative reassignments, i.e. interim, acting, additional duty assignments, and lateral transfers have not always followed the District’s hiring policies and procedures. The Chancellor does have authority under Title 5 § 53021 to upgrade, reclassify, rename, or laterally transfer an administrator/admin appointment. The need for reassignments has been largely driven by staffing shortages and the lack of a staffing plan overall for filling positions.

On September 27, 2012, the Board of Trustees took action to direct the Chancellor to propose a new instructional administrative structure, congruent with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings. Additionally the new structure will have academic integrity and include an increase in administrative oversight and accountability. As a result, several changes were implemented in the Office of the Chancellor, specifically the reduction in number of Vice Chancellors to three from five, and the elimination of the Office of Governmental Affairs and the Office of Shared Governance and moving the planning and research and grants and development to the Office of the Chancellor. Consequently, the Board of Trustees at their October 25, 2012 Board Meeting adopted the reorganized Office of the Chancellor and a proposed plan to reorganize the Academic Affairs administrative structure, including reducing the number of department chair non-instructional reassigned time. Additionally, the Office of Student Services is currently undergoing a review of services and related issues and a proposed structural change to this area is expected by December 2012.

While some concern regarding the administrative structure has been mitigated by the recent changes in the administrative organizational structure at the Vice Chancellor level, some consternation remains as to the continued practice of appointing temporary interim administrators while the permanent positions are reorganized, developed, recruited, and finally selected. The individuals serving in the above referenced interim positions were selected due to their proven experience and knowledge in community college leadership and administration and have previously served in this capacity at other California community college districts. The Chancellor’s goal is to begin the hiring process of approximately 24 administrative positions in January 2013, whereby hiring committees work throughout the Spring 2013 to finalize the selection of new administrators effective July 1, 2013.

In March 2011 the District and AFT 2121 agreed to revise a process for temporary faculty employee and substitute hiring. Included in this review was the implementation of an expedited upgrading procedure (above 67% of a load for part-time faculty) for short-term temporary or long-term temporary vacancies that would address unforeseen circumstances where the day-to-day substitute or the long-term-substitute hiring processes would not satisfy/fulfill the emergency situation, i.e. long-term illness, death. In theory this process should meet fair hiring processes that comply with Title 5 and the Education Code; however, in practice no safeguards are currently in place to ensure that a fair, equitable hiring process is followed at the departmental level. In fact, the HR department has no active role in this process.
The Chancellor and senior administration has also been meeting to address a much-needed classified staff reorganization that addresses the recommendations raised by the ACCJC and FCMAT.


The self study and documented evidence reveal that City College of San Francisco employs faculty, classified staff, and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The overall search and hiring processes overseen by HR and the work of search committees ensure results yield effective hiring of knowledgeable and qualified personnel who will effectively support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness.

The permanent hiring processes are rigorous, equitable and fairly administered in accordance with the requirements of Title 5 California Code of Regulations and the California Education Code. However, hiring processes for reassignments of personnel in all employee groups: administrative upgrades, lateral transfers, reclassifications, and additional temporary duties; faculty expedited upgrading process, and classified reassignments need to be enforced. Collaborative transparency in these transactions is necessary.

Additionally, job descriptions for administrative positions must emphasize clearly defined job roles, responsibilities, expectations and authority.

III.A.1./III.A.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plans. Recognizing that the Chancellor has authority under Title 5 § 53021 to upgrade, reclassify, rename, or laterally transfer an administrator/admin appointment, implementing clear, consistent, and transparent processes in the appointment of reassignment positions for all employee groups is strongly recommended.

Continue to ensure that future administrative job announcements clearly define roles, responsibilities, and expectations of management personnel. Work toward permanent hiring processes for current interim administrative appointments.

Review the classified personnel structure to better assess the effective use of staffing resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.A.1./III.A.1.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for
evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

III.A.1.b. Descriptive Summary. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The criteria for evaluating faculty are defined in the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA. District policies and procedures outline criteria for evaluating staff and administrators.

The purpose of evaluation for all employee groups is to identify strengths and special qualities of the evaluatee, and to define areas where improvement is needed. At all levels, a criterion that effectively measures and evaluates an employee’s work performance is incorporated. The evaluation process includes performance indicators that are linked to institutional effectiveness and improvement. At all levels, where employees receive a less than satisfactory rating, a remediation process is implemented.

The faculty evaluation process is administered by an Instructional dean responsible for faculty evaluation in accordance with the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA, Article 9. In general, classroom faculty are evaluated every three years on: 1) professional qualities, including keeping current in their discipline; 2) performance – classroom instruction; and 3) classroom presentation, including demonstrating sensitivity to the learning difficulties of students. Student evaluations, taken via an in-class survey, are a crucial component of every classroom instructor’s evaluation. Survey responses are weighed seriously, and may serve as a revealing indicator of potential areas of concern.

The “job performance” component of an evaluation for classroom faculty consists of an in-depth evaluation of course content, subject knowledge, and classroom presentation. For librarians, job performance is evaluated in areas such as: communicating ideas effectively during workshops and instructional sessions at the reference desk; contributing to building, organizing, and maintaining library collections and resources; and striving to maintain an environment conducive to study, research, reading, and learning. For counselors, job performance is evaluated according to how they help students define problems, support students in seeking solutions to problems, and provide opportunities for students to express concerns. For resource instructors, job performance is evaluated on how effectively they develop instructional resources.

To further improve the evaluation process and provide feedback for improvement to faculty members, an additional category was added to the ratings component of the evaluation. The category of “Satisfactory But Needs Improvement” addresses issues prior to a faculty member falling into the “Unsatisfactory” category. The process also includes a provision that addresses the matter through an Improvement Plan. More specific evaluation components, which clearly describe the formal and timely processes that produce documented actions following evaluations, are outlined in the Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review Guidebook available from the Office of the dean responsible for Faculty Evaluation webpage.

Negotiations with AFT took place in September 2012 to address including in the faculty evaluation a “job performance” component measuring the effectiveness of faculty and others
directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes. The Board of Trustees adopted the proposed modification to the Faculty Evaluation provisions of the AFT CBA, and full implementation is scheduled for Spring 2013.

Department chairs are evaluated with regard to the performance of their supervisory duties and responsibilities in accordance with Article 8: Evaluation, of the SFCCD/Department Chairpersons Council CBA. This article specifies that each department chairperson should be evaluated by the academic and classified members of the department during February or March of each year of his or her term of office as department chair, except for the third or last year of the term. The department chairperson and the administrator to whom he or she reports examine and discuss the feedback submitted by faculty and staff in the Faculty and Classified Staff Review Form for Department Chairperson. The administrator then summarizes the review results, and then filed in the evaluatee’s personnel file.

The classified employee evaluation currently follows the Performance Appraisal System of the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR). The purpose of the performance plan and appraisal are to: 1) evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the employee’s work; 2) communicate these to the employee; and 3) set goals for performance, improvement, and career development. New permanent classified staff are evaluated after three months, and on the anniversary date of employment. The current appraisal/evaluation process does not provide for a specific rating on dedication to professional growth as made evident by an employee’s participation in District-wide committees, organizations, and projects (for example, Classified Senate or Accreditation workgroups).

Evaluations for classified employees working in positions directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes, i.e. instructional lab aides, library and learning support services, including a component for rating their effectiveness in this area.

The Classified Performance Appraisal serves as a means of dialogue between supervisor and evaluatee, and as a way to create progressive work plans. To further improve the ease and timeliness of evaluations for classified staff, HR has made the forms available online. The supervisor is prompted by the HR staff via an email notice about the need for an evaluation, and reminders are sent to the employee’s department head prior to evaluation due dates. Reminders are also sent if due dates are not met. The process is monitored by the HR Classified Unit. Prior to Fall 2010 only permanent classified employees were evaluated, evaluations are now required for all classified employees.

Administrators are evaluated on their performance related to program planning, problem solving, professional relationships, job knowledge and application, human resource skills, communication skills, organizational leadership skills, personal leadership skills, and teamwork. The current Administrative Evaluation and Contract Renewal Procedures were implemented during fiscal year 2003-04. Since then, the process has been updated to ensure a more direct relationship between the evaluatee and his/her direct supervisor. A greater weight, 25 percent of the overall evaluation rating, was given to the supervisor’s review.

The procedures also require that early in the evaluation process, in addition to identifying responsibilities of the position, administrators set a minimum of five performance objectives aligned with the Chancellor’s objectives, derived from the Strategic Plan and the College’s Annual Plan. Oversight of the administrative evaluation process is performed by the
Chancellor’s Office and an Oversight Committee reviews the evaluation process for fairness and consistency in the application of District-wide feedback and inclusion of this feedback in administrative evaluations.


However, much discussion regarding the Administrative Evaluation process has taken place, specifically the role of the Oversight Evaluation Committee and the anonymous survey feedback mechanism instituted by the Academic Senate and the Classified Senate. No other employee group is subjected to these additional steps and their effectiveness in providing valuable input in the evaluation of an administrator is dubious. Doubt also arises as the equitable treatment of administrators as compared to other employee groups in the evaluation process.

III.A.1.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. Revamp the Administrative Evaluation Process to produce a more effective model guided by a review of best practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.A.1.b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated Action(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.1.c. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

III.A.1.c. Descriptive Summary. Outcomes are developed and assessments take place for the following areas: Student Learning Outcomes (for courses, instructional programs, counseling, and workshops) Student Service Outcomes (for additional services provided to students, such as transcript procurement, registration, and financial aid) and Administrative Unit Outcomes (for services provided to faculty, staff, vendors, external organizations, etc. to produce an environment of learning for our students).

Instructors are directly responsible for creating and publishing SLOs for new and existing courses. City College of San Francisco systematically assesses student support services through student, faculty, and staff input along with student achievement data and student learning outcomes assessment to improve the effectiveness of our services.

The College has designated an official SLO Coordinator to improve the process of documenting and assessing SLOs, Institutional Learning Outcomes, Administrative Unit Outcomes and Service Area Outcomes. The SLO Coordinator sends regular updates through email and updates the website [www.ccsf.edu/slo](http://www.ccsf.edu/slo) accordingly. The website includes
highlights, reviews and reminders of semester timelines and tasks, plans for future assessment timelines and tasks and upcoming professional development workshops for improving our teaching and learning and assessment process. Additionally, the website serves as a communication tool used to facilitate departmental and interdepartmental dialogue, share best practices, and facilitate tracking of departmental progress and planning. As an additional resource a lab was set up to avail faculty with assistance in developing department outcomes & assessment web-page editing, form processing, other outcomes-and-assessment-related, and explore assessment methods.

Members of each department and program engage each other in the development and assessment of outcomes. Assessment methods are developed within divisions and departments and assessed to determine the method(s) that best generate valuable data on outcomes and best promote continuous quality improvement. On September 12, 2012 the College held a faculty FLEX day focused on SLO development and program review. During the Fall 2012 semester, the Student Development division met regularly to examine and align SLOs to department Program Learning Outcomes (PSLOs). These discussions and recommendation sessions facilitated robust dialogue among counselors about the delivery of student development services to students. SLO workshops will be held at all future FLEX events.

**MORE INFO NEEDS TO BE ADDED HERE FROM STANDARDS DEALING SPECIFICALLY WITH SLOs**

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.

During the Fall 2012, Senior Administration and Employee Relations met with Employee Labor groups to negotiation the inclusion of SLO evaluation component in the performance evaluation instruments. Effective Spring 2013, performance evaluation instruments containing SLO components will be implemented. Language for inclusion in the Employee handbooks was updated to include the revised evaluation materials containing the inclusion of SLOs, including Section 4.7 Instructors Responsibilities in the Classrooms & Labs – Introductory Information. This section was edited to include, that during the first week of instruction, instructors are required to give each student pertinent written information including: **Student Learning Outcomes as they appear in the course outline of record.** Additionally recommendations were made to revise the Faculty Handbook, Appendix ‘G’ – Elements of Syllabus to include in section I. Course Identify, Course description and student learning outcomes.

Additionally, SLO language is added to relevant job announcements accordingly.

**III.A.1.c. Self Evaluation.** The College meets the standard.

Outcomes assessment is a process that permeates all areas of the college at all levels, SLOs in the classroom, service outcomes in the student development division and in the administrative departments. The District has a designated official SLO Coordinator, an SLO website, and open lab available as resources for faculty and staff to effectively plan program improvements, identify needs and develop resources to meet the common goal of
strengthening student learning. Forums for continuous dialogue are implemented, i.e. professional development workshops.

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.

III.A.1.c. Actionable Improvement Plans. Continue to work with departments to develop SLOs and/or service outcomes and to integrate continuous assessment. Continue to provide professional development workshops specific for SLOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.A.1.c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.1.d. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.

III.A.1.d. Descriptive Summary. In addition to Board Policy 3050: Institutional Code of Ethics [III A-15], expectations for ethical behavior by employees of the District are covered in various District policies, employee handbooks, and collective bargaining agreements. (See noted documentation reference.)

District policies concerning instructors’ responsibilities in classrooms and laboratories are published in the Faculty Handbook [III A-16]. Additionally, Article 8 of the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA speaks to Academic Freedom, Duties, and Responsibilities; Article 8.D specifically addresses faculty-student relationships [III A-2]. The Classified Handbook outlines the requirements of classified employees at the time of hire, such as fingerprinting, misrepresentation of falsification of information, the arrest and conviction policy, and security clearance section 2.8 [III A-17]. District Policy 4.09 – Use of Slurs [III A-18] is included in both the Classified, Faculty, and Administrative Handbook on pages 12, 15, and 12 respectively. All new employees are provided with a handbook at the time of their new-hire processing. The handbooks are updated regularly and are distributed via an interoffice mailing to all employees as well as made available on the HR website.

Other relevant policies and articles that define professional ethics expectations at CCSF include:

The SFCCD/SEIU 1021 Collective Bargaining Agreement (SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA) Article 9 – Discipline covers the discipline process for represented SEIU classified employees. Article 9.C – Causes for discipline outlines circumstances under which unit members may be disciplined for cause [III A-19].

The Board of Trustees adopted a Workplace Violence Policy on June 10, 2004 [III A-20]. A Workplace Violence Policy and Procedure Brochure for distribution to all employees was
developed and reviewed through the formerly Shared Governance procedure (now Participatory Governance adopted by Board 10/25/12, Policy 2.07) during the Fall 2005 semester. The policy is included in the latest versions of the faculty and classified employee handbooks under section 2.6 B, and on page 32 of the Administrative Handbook. All new employees are provided with a handbook at the time of their new-hire processing.

The Affirmative Action Office disseminates information to all employees pertaining to the District’s Sexual Harassment and Unlawful Discrimination policies and procedures for filing complaints. This includes a review by the District’s Police Department to address any criminal violations. Additional information is available on their webpage [III A-21]. The Classified and Faculty Handbooks also addresses the areas of Equal Opportunity section 2.1, Unlawful Discrimination section 2.2 and Americans with Disabilities protocols section 2.4.

On July 29, 2010, The Board of Trustees passed Board Policy 3052 – Conflict of Interest [III A-22]. This policy stated that no trustee, officer, or employee of the District shall make, or in any way attempt to use his or her official position to influence a District decision in which he or she has an economic interest. CCSF policy requires that all administrators complete the state Conflict of Interest form 700 annually.

District policies and procedures may be found in the College Catalog, as well as the College website at http:/www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals.


CCSF promotes a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration and improved levels of communication, and policies and procedures that ensure healthy working conditions and foster an environment of respect and trust. All policies and procedures are kept up to date in line with current law.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.A.1.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.

III.A.2. Descriptive Summary. By what means does the institution determine appropriate staffing levels for each program and service?
In normal budget years, the District has been able to maintain a sufficient number of qualified employees to maintain the integrity of its services and programs. As is the case with many California community colleges, the College has had declining state revenue for a number of years. The effects of budget reductions necessitated spending reductions throughout the District, including restrictions on hiring. The effect of budget reductions on District spending has focused on ensuring the continuance of core educational programs and student services. However, this effort has had a direct impact on hiring of personnel, specifically in the classified and administrative staff levels.

Currently, 40 administrators are responsible for overseeing more than 2,000 employees and nearly 90,000 students at the main campus, education centers, and nearly 100 sites throughout the City and County of San Francisco. With respect to faculty ranks, the District exceeded the state requirement, “seventy-five percent rule”, in its full-time faculty obligation for Fall 2011 by 177.53 FTE or 36.9 percent (FCMAT report p.29 -- from District data).

As a component of the institutional planning process, department heads, supervisors, administrators include a staffing request as a component of the yearly Program Review process. Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. The Program Review reports and respective budget requests are then reviewed by the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) in consultation with the respective employee group allocation committees. For example, the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) plays the key role in setting the criteria and procedures for departments requesting full-time faculty replacements. The Committee is comprised of three administrators and four faculty members. The Committee utilizes the Decision Support System (DSS) data to assess faculty position requests. This system is also used to inform the Program Review reports about data such as the supply and demand for courses or subjects. The FPAC committee reviews departmental faculty allocation requests, and communicates their findings/recommendations to the PBC, who in turn identifies the allocation of resources. Classified position requests are submitted to the Vacancy Review Workgroup (VRG) consisting of District and SEIU representatives. The VRG reviews requests and makes recommendations to the Chancellor or his/her designee regarding all new classified positions and any changes to existing classified positions. If a position is new or an additional position is to be added to a College department, a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) or Express Classification form (EXP) must be completed by the requesting department. The JAQ or EXP serve as the survey instrument designed to elicit complete and thorough information for a specific position, such as major functions, essential duties, and responsibilities.

These processes were impeded during the last years due to severe hiring restrictions. While the FPAC committee continued to meet, they only accepted requests for critical replacements of tenure track faculty positions. The VRG was suspended for the duration, and classified position requests were reviewed and approved by the Vice Chancellor Finance and Administration in consultation with the Chancellor.

How does the institution decide on the organization of administrative and support staffing?

The Chancellor has primary responsibility for the allocation of the Administrative structure. If a new administrative position is needed to ensure the effective operations of the District,
top administration work with the Human Resources Department to conduct a job analysis
survey to determine the administrative level, i.e. dean, associate dean, director, etc., and
related job duties and responsibilities. The Chancellor and top administration work with the
budget unit to determine funding and as a courtesy the draft job description is shared with the
Academic Senate Executive Council for their feedback. The Chancellor also has primary
responsibility for Administrative reorganizations. The Chancellor may consult with top
administrators, the Dean of Human Resources, and the Academic Senate. Proposed changes
to the Administrative organization are taken before the Board of Trustees for review and
adoption. The Chancellor has authority under Title 5 § 53021 to upgrade, reclassify, rename,
or laterally transfer and administrator/administrative position.

A significant percentage of the District’s administrators retired in 2010, creating tremendous
stress and a loss of historical knowledge and experience throughout the institution. To
minimize disruption of critical operations and services, administrative positions were filled
on an interim basis, some administrators were laterally transferred to critical areas, and other
administrators were given additional administrative duties. Other key management positions
remained vacant consequently overtaxing support staff with carrying out additional duties.

**How effectively does the number and organization of the institution’s personnel work to
support its programs and services?**

How does the institution evaluate this effectiveness?

Staffing needs and allocation are identified at the departmental level, whereby department
heads prioritize staffing needs within their program, department, or division by connecting
staffing levels and adequacy to District planning priorities. In assessing the adequacy of
staffing example of factors that are considered may be: (1) support needed to provide a
specific function/service/course and the quality of that service; (2) the health and safety of
students, faculty, staff, and District assets; (3) staffing required by law and/or to provide
critical support of tasks required of regulatory bodies; (4) support needed to perform critical
technology services; and (5) support needed to maintain facilities and physical operations.

As stated above, the yearly Program Review process is the tool used by department to
address staffing needs. Effective – link to ACCJC finding that CCSF commitment to
students, and delivery of services and instruction AND to progress on SLO (for student
services and instruction) – performance metrics for measuring institutional
effectiveness – full implementation of Prgm Review.

Nonetheless, the ACCJC found that human resource planning is not fully integrated with
institutional planning. Standard III.A.6 specifically addresses this standard.

The ACCJC evaluation team noted their concern of insufficient classified and administrative
staff with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the leadership, management or
services necessary to support the institution’s mission and operations.

With regard to staffing and operational costs, the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance
Team (FCMAT) found that the College employs significantly more regular full-time
equivalent (FTE) employees than comparison districts, both in total and per FTES and
employs significantly more classified staff support at higher average salaries than
comparison districts. Furthermore, FCMAT disagreed with the ACCJC’s finding that the
College has too few academic managers; noting that the number of educational
administrators (identified as 38 total administrators) employed by the College per 1,000
FTES is comparable with comparison districts. Nonetheless, FCMAT agreed with ACCJC’s
findings that the District’s administrative structure is lacking in stability given that at the time of their review, four out of its five vice chancellor positions were interim and the chancellor is also an interim assignment. They further found that the structure and responsibilities of department chairs differ significantly from typical California community colleges and that consequently the decision-making authority of the deans and vice chancellors has been marginalized. Their recommendations regarding the administrative structure include: (1) clearly defining and communicating the roles, responsibilities and expectations of management personnel and holding managers accountable for their performance; (2) implementing an administrative structure that will eliminate the redundancy of roles of the department chair and dean positions; (3) reducing the department chairs’ non-instructional reassigned time by collapsing and restructuring the assignment of disciplines and reducing the positions’ role in oversight of the instructional program; and (4) strengthen the roles and responsibilities of the deans, particularly in the administration of the instructional program. (FCMAT Report p. 49)

Under the direction of the Interim Chancellor and the Accreditation Liaison Officer, District employees began implementing plans to address the ACCJC’s show cause letter of July 3, 2012. Workgroup 7 was assigned to examine Recommendation 7, Human Resources. The workgroup was tasked with: (1) addressing possible options for more effective and efficient organizational structure to determine logical reporting lines and structures that support timely decision making and accountability; (2) reviewing the appropriate number of administrators needed to support and manage the District’s instructional programs and services; (3) examining issues relating to the reassignment of personnel; and (4) proposing new practices designed to clarify and enhance the roles and authority of deans and department chairs.

At the same time, the Board of Trustees took action on September 27, 2012, to direct the Chancellor to propose a new instructional administrative structure, congruent with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings. The new structure would include academic integrity and increased administrative oversight and accountability. As a result, several changes were implemented in the Office of the Chancellor, specifically the reduction in number of Vice Chancellors to three from five, and the elimination of the Office of Governmental Affairs and the Office of Shared Governance and moving the planning and research and the grants and development offices to the Chancellor’s division. Consequently, the Board of Trustees at their October 25, 2012 Board Meeting adopted the reorganized Office of the Chancellor and a proposed plan to reorganize the Academic Affairs administrative structure, including reducing the number of department chair non-instructional reassigned time. Additionally, the Office of Student Services is currently undergoing a review of services and related issues and a proposed structural change to this area is expected by December 2012.

While some concern regarding the administrative structure has been mitigated by the recent changes in the administrative organizational structure at the Vice Chancellor level, some consternation remains as to the continued practice of appointing temporary interim administrators while the permanent positions are reorganized, developed, recruited, and finally selected. The Chancellor’s goal is to begin the hiring process of approximately 24 administrative positions in January 2013, whereby hiring committees work throughout the Spring 2013 to finalize the selection of new administrators effective July 1, 2013.
Plans are currently underway to begin the recruitment of the permanent Vice Chancellors for the Student Services and the Instructional divisions. Additionally, Human Resources has begun the work of back filling the vacant and key management position in the Facilities area with a Classified manager position. Moreover, the hiring of additional custodial positions at the new Chinatown center is being addressed.

### III.A.2. Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

The number of faculty is sufficient; however, the number of administrators and classified staff has fluctuated greatly due to budgetary restrictions.

The District needs to fully implement a new instructional administrative structure that includes academic integrity and increased administrative oversight and accountability.

Staffing plans need to be linked to institutional planning to more effectively assess the adequacy of staffing and how the institution’s personnel work to support its programs and services.

### III.A.2. Actionable Improvement Plans

Plans are underway to implement a new instructional administrative structure, congruent with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings. The new structure includes academic integrity and increased administrative oversight and accountability.

Plans are underway to revamp Institutional Planning, including integrating a staffing plan that more effectively and systematically assesses the adequacy of the District’s human resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.A.2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III.A.3. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

**III.A.3.a.** The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

**III.A.3./III.A.3.a. Descriptive Summary.** Personnel policies are governed by District policy and procedures, the California Education Code and Title 5, union contracts, and state, federal, and local labor laws. For example, Education Code § 87359 and Title 5 § 53430 regulations specify minimum qualifications for faculty and administrative hiring. The employment of classified employees is governed by the City and County of San Francisco Civil Service Commission. Personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently
administered and reviewed regularly. Through the collective bargaining process, the District and Employee Labor groups work collaboratively to find common ground regarding policies affecting their respective members. Employee needs and concerns are voiced and addressed via the Joint Labor Management Council, the College Diversity Committee, The Chancellor’s Cabinet, the Academic Senate, and the unions. AFT 2121 has a Grievance Committee that meets on a regular basis with the head of Employee Relations to work out any perceived problems between the District and faculty. Additionally, the Human Resources Committee meets every other week to address pertinent personnel issues, employee concerns, new and updated employment laws, and personnel policies. The Human Resources Committee is composed of the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, Legal Counsel, the Employee Relations Officer, the Dean and Associate Dean of Human Resources, the Affirmative Action Officer, and the Human Resources Supervisors. Recommendations for adoption of new and/or amended personnel policies are taken before the Board of Trustees. All policy manual amendments and additions go through two readings before the Board of Trustees prior to adoption.

HR communicates updates and new personnel policies, procedures, and/or laws by disseminating the information to employees through institutional mailings and making the information available via the Department website. Moreover, employment policies and procedures are stated in the Policy Manual [III A-25], the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA [III A-2], the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA [III A-19], contracts with other recognized bargaining units, and in the Faculty and Classified handbooks under sections 2.1 Equal Opportunity Statement, in the Administrative Handbook under section Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment Policy, section 3 SF City and County Charter, section 4 District Employment & Requirements 4.1-4.7, section 6 Leaves 6.1-6.14 and section 7 Professional Development 7.1-7.2, as well as posted on job announcements and on the Department website. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies that ensure informational brochures pertaining to unlawful discrimination are distributed to all employees. Employee handbooks contain as an appendix the San Francisco Community College District Policy and Procedures for Handling Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination under Title 5 § 59300 et. Seq. [III A-16, III A-17]

It is the responsibility of HR and the Affirmative Action Office to orient faculty and administrative hiring committees on the hiring procedures, employment regulations, and the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA Article 12-Upgrading provisions [III A-2]. The process has been improved to include samples and forms on paper screening criteria, interview questions, and teaching demonstrations.

HR and the Office of Instruction hold new employee orientations once yearly to educate all incoming employees on the District’s policies and to inform employees about their rights and responsibilities. The Employee Relations Officer is responsible for ensuring that College constituents are educated on new contract language.

HR is responsible for developing and distributing employee handbooks that inform employees of the principal rules, regulations, practices, and procedures essential to their role in the District. The handbooks are updated every two years. Current handbooks for Classified, Faculty, and Administrators can be found on the HR website.

The institution successfully ensures that all state, federal, local, and other relevant personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered and reviewed regularly. Through the collective bargaining process, the District and Employee Labor groups work collaboratively to find common ground regarding policies affecting their respective members. HR satisfactorily communicates updates and new personnel policies, procedures, and/or laws by disseminating the information to employees through institutional mailings, employee handbooks, and making the information available via the Department website.


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

III.A.3.b. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

III.A.3.b. Descriptive Summary. The institution takes its role as stewards of employee confidential files seriously by providing provisions for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Classified and academic files are kept in secure and locked areas in HR. Personnel records are confidential and may only be viewed by authorized personnel. Academic employees may view their personnel files during regular business hours by appointment with authorized Human Resources personnel as described in the provisions of the SFCCD/AFT 2121 DBA. Classified employees may also view their personnel files upon written notice in accordance with the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 DBA. Additionally, an employee may authorize/designate a union or other representative to review the file upon written authorization as described by both AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021 collective bargaining agreements [III A-2, III A-19]. Administrators and classified employees not represented by SEIU 1021 have equivalent rights to inspect their personnel files, as outlined in their respective employee handbooks. For all employees, Education Code and Labor Code provisions are assured.

In accordance with the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA, the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA, and District policy, there must be only one official District personnel file for each academic and classified employee. Each personnel file consists of District employment records, educational advancement records, and other work experience that relates to employee service. The following items are considered part of a classified and academic personnel file but are maintained separately: time rolls, attendance records, payroll records, work orders, TB records, history cards, salary cards, credential records, schedule files, and assignment files.
The District may add similar categories of routine personnel recordkeeping as long as both AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021 are notified respectively as described in the contracts. Medical records and investigative reports are filed separately and secured in the same manner as previously noted records.

An outline, password-protected database called Web4 allows employees access to certain types of information. Employees are able to access and update some of their personal information, such as payroll information, benefits and deductions; sick days credited and used, and tax withholding, via their online account on Web4.

Additionally, the ITS Department takes great measures within its technical infrastructure to secure employment records in the CCSF Banner information system. Each user has a unique Oracle logon and password. Within CCSF Banner, each user is given limited permissions to view or update only specific areas appropriate for his or her job duties. Moreover, only select staff members in the administrative area of the College are granted access to the CCSF Banner information system.

An exit interview process was implemented in Spring 2011 including an exit interview and employee exiting checklist, supervisory and/or key departmental sign-offs, and an employee acknowledgement. The next stage, scheduled for implementation in Spring 2012, is automation of the exit checklist, including electronic routing and electronic sign-offs.


Security and confidentiality of personal records is diligently provided, primarily through locked files of paper-copy documents in HR with only authorized personnel allowed viewing right. Employee access is provided by appointment, and limited information is available online via password protection. A clearly documented exit interview procedure has been implemented; including an exit interview, and an automated employee exiting checklist and employee acknowledgment.


### Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.A.3.b.

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

III.A.4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.

III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.

- CCSF demonstrates through major planning documents, policies and daily practice, an understanding that equity and diversity are key to the success of the institution.
- Vision Statement: “In our community, respect and trust are common virtues, and all people are enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding. We will maintain a supportive, positive, and productive working environment for our diverse faculty and staff, as well as a responsive environment in which student needs are met in a friendly, timely and caring manner.”
- In the 2011-16 Strategic Plan, one of the six identified strategic priorities is dedicated to diversity and inclusiveness. The goal of this priority is to “Promote diversity and inclusiveness at all levels of the College.” Objectives are outlined to advance this priority such as providing more access to education technology, providing better support for and expanding the success of underrepresented students in meeting transfer goals, and improving the registration process to enable students to better access all pre-collegiate courses in a manner that promotes persistence.
- In April 2009, the Board of Trustees passed a “Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution”, acknowledging the college’s commitment to ensuring equal treatment for all students.
- In October 2009, the Chancellor published the “Preliminary Report on the Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution” which helped drive discussions all through the college community.
- College community identified programmatic changes such as increasing number of sections of mathematics and English, identification and implementation of professional development for English faculty
- Hiring process for student workers has been streamlined
- Students can retake placement tests. Multiple data measures are being used to assess placement.
- CCSF offers a variety of diversity-related programs such as “Grow Your Own”, the Faculty Diversity Internship Program, retention programs such as African American Scholaristic Program, Disabled Student Programs and Services, the Extended Opportunity Programs, Second Chance, Latino Services Network, Writing Success Project, Asian Pacific Islander, TULAY, Puente Program, Math Bridge, Bridge to Biotech, MESA/STEM.
- The College has an active Diversity Committee

AFTER SHOW CAUSE

Visiting team commended CCSF for its commitment to diversity and equity. (p. 46 of visiting team report)


There are many opportunities for faculty and staff to increase their understanding and awareness of diversity and equity issues.

Annual review and analysis of data are important to continuing the dialogue and implementing effective changes to increase completion rates.

CCSF should continue to find new ways to address achievement gaps while maintaining
methods and programs that the institution has initiated.


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

III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

III.A.4.b. Descriptive Summary.
Before Show Cause Rating:
- Human Resources prepared an annual Employee and Hiring Data Report with an extensive summary of CCSF hiring record
- Data shows that CCSF is committed to hiring people with various backgrounds and experiences. (need chart added)
- Classified staff is 76% ethnically diverse (full time), 72% ethnically diverse (part-time); Faculty is 39% ethnically diverse; administrators are 56% ethnically diverse. Percentage of Gay, Lesbian, Veteran, and Disabled employees can also be seen on the chart. (see chart III.A.4 from 2012 study)
- HR, in conjunction with appropriate college groups has made a concerted effort through hiring procedures to maintain highest level of commitment to academic excellence, diversity, and equity.
- HR actively recruits underrepresented populations and participates in the California Community College Affirmative Action Job Fairs. INCLUDE CHART FOR FALL 2010-SPRING 2011
- Faculty and staff are diverse with respect to age.
- The recruitment of classified employees for the San Francisco Community College District is governed by the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA and the City & County of San Francisco Civil Service System.

AFTER SHOW CAUSE RATING
The above activities continue.
As of October 2012 there were 782 Classified employees (down from 903 the previous year) and 1726 Certificated employees (down from 1937 the previous year).
III.A.4.b. **Self Evaluation.** The college meets this standard.

The college publishes the annual Employee and Hiring Data Report and uses this information to assess how effective recruiting and hiring practices are related to increasing the diversity of its staff. The data in the chart are evidence of the diversity of the College’s employees.

A total of 332 employees left the district in the past year and hiring is essentially frozen. As a result, the diversity of employees may have changed. – NEED SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

III.A.4.b. **Actionable Improvement Plans.** An updated Employee and Hiring Data Report should be prepared to reflect current employee diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Employee &amp; Hiring Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.4.c. **The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.**

III.A.4.c. **Descriptive Summary.** BEFORE SHOW CAUSE

- CCSF maintains integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students by adhering to regulatory policies and laws, including union contracts, the State Education code and Title 5, and the City and County of San Francisco’s Civil Service Charter.
- CCSF has an Affirmative Action Officer to monitor and ensure compliance with governing board policy on equal employment and educational opportunities. This position along with the associate dean of affirmative action and the director of student advocacy, rights and responsibilities create a team that assures institutional integrity and fair and equitable treatment of administration, faculty, staff and students.

AFTER SHOW CAUSE

Does the college still have the Office of Student Advocacy or was this discontinued? Not sure how student discipline is dealt with in the new Student Development org.

III.A.4.c. **Self Evaluation.** The college meets this standard, though it’s unclear how student conduct and discipline issues are dealt with in the new Student Development re-org.

III.A.4.c. **Actionable Improvement Plans.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.A.4.c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.A.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.

III.A.5./III.A.5.a Descriptive Summary. TO DO – Copy pertinent text from current Self Study – Descriptive Summary

III.A.5./III.A.5.a Self Evaluation.
- Need additional SLO training and professional development
- Need additional flex day workshops tied directly to identified needs in program reviews
- Need more FLEX Days – need to return to 4-5 flex days
- HR needs more support and resources to fund and coordinate flex days
- Need departmental funds for specific professional development and training
- Travel and conference funds are gone. Need ability to send faculty and classified staff to specific conferences and training opportunities
- Need to ensure that everyone participates in college orientations. HR needs more support and staffing to track and offer additional orientation sessions.
- Need opportunities or funds for classified and faculty to engage in professional development together.
- Current status of sabbatical leaves not clear
- Consultants or independent contractors may not participate in professional development and if they interact with students or staff may need it
- Faculty hiring and step process works well

Address – Faculty Salary Column Movement

III.A.5./III.A.5.a Actionable Improvement Plans. Need assurance that $150,000 budget was allocated for employee Professional Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.A.5./III.A.5.a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

III.A.5.b. Descriptive Summary. TO DO

- FLEX Day workshops and program is evaluated and satisfaction is good but not enough – need more flex days.
- Departmental and unit professional development opportunities are not always evaluated systematically and outcomes not always shared.
- Technology training staff has been reduced. Technology training opportunities limited and additional training needed for technology use… especially at Department or unit level.
- Professional development resources, staffing, coordination and technology needs to be increased.
- Process for requesting remediation or professional development to address specific problems or areas of concern is not clear.

III.A.5.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. <text>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.A.5.b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.6. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

III.A.6. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco integrates human resource planning with college planning through its institutional planning process. Through the Program Review process each College unit identifies its planning objectives for the following year(s) and links these objectives to college-wide plans, i.e. the Annual Plan, the Strategic Plan. The Program Review process is also the mechanism by which each unit assesses its progress toward achieving their planning objectives and assesses their resource needs, including staffing. An analysis of the program review reports informs the subsequent Annual Plan. Human resources planning is integrated at the Planning and Budgeting level through the program review process.
Staffing needs and allocation are identified at the departmental level, whereby department heads prioritize staffing needs within their program, department, or division by connecting staffing levels and adequacy to District planning priorities. In assessing the adequacy of staffing example of factors that are considered may be: (1) support needed to provide a specific function/service/course and the quality of that service; (2) the health and safety of students, faculty, staff, and District assets; (3) staffing required by law and/or to provide critical support of tasks required of regulatory bodies; (4) support needed to perform critical technology services; and (5) support needed to maintain facilities and physical operations. As stated above, the yearly Program Review process is the tool used by department to address staffing needs.

As a component of the institutional planning process, department heads, supervisors, administrators include their staffing requests as a component of the yearly Program Review process. Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. The Program Review reports and respective budget requests are then reviewed by the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) in consultation with the respective employee group allocation committees. For example, the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) plays the key role in setting the criteria and procedures for departments requesting full-time faculty replacements. The Committee is comprised of three administrators and four faculty members. The Committee utilizes the Decision Support System (DSS) data to assess faculty position requests. This system is also used to inform the Program Review reports about data such as the supply and demand for courses or subjects. The FPAC committee reviews departmental faculty allocation requests, and communicates their findings/recommendations to the PBC, who in turn identifies the allocation of resources. Classified position requests are submitted to the Vacancy Review Workgroup (VRG) consisting of District and SEIU representatives. The VRG reviews requests and makes recommendations to the Chancellor or his/her designee regarding all new classified positions and any changes to existing classified positions. If a position is new or an additional position is to be added to a College department, a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) or Express Classification form (EXP) must be completed by the requesting department. The JAQ or EXP serve as the survey instrument designed to elicit complete and thorough information for a specific position, such as major functions, essential duties, and responsibilities.

These processes were impeded during the last years due to severe hiring restrictions. While the FPAC committee continued to meet, they only accepted requests for critical replacements of tenure track faculty positions. The VRG was suspended for the duration, and classified position requests were reviewed and approved by the Vice Chancellor Finance and Administration in consultation with the Chancellor.

The Chancellor has primary responsibility for the allocation of the Administrative structure. If a new administrative position is needed to ensure the effective operations of the District, top administration work with the Human Resources Department to conduct a job analysis survey to determine the administrative level, i.e. dean, associate dean, director, etc., and related job duties and responsibilities. The Chancellor and top administration work with the budget unit to determine funding and as a courtesy the draft job description is shared with the Academic Senate Executive Council for their feedback.
III.A.6. Self Evaluation. The College partially meets this standard. City College has in place processes that guide the institution in its allocation of staff and faculty positions as well as determining the allocation of funding replacement and new positions. However, planning has not been fully integrated with institutional planning. The College does not currently have a separate staffing plan that feeds into the resource allocation process.

III.A.6. Actionable Improvement Plans. Plans are underway to develop a staffing plan that includes assessing the appropriate levels of personnel to support workforce practices that put students first and that are economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable for the College and its employees.

Continue integrating planning with resource allocation/redirection by considering budget constraints and enrollment and aligned with the college mission. Establish transparent and consistent practices for determining how replacement positions are prioritized.


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

III.B. Physical Resources

Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

III.B.1.a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

III.B.1.b. The institution assures that physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

III.B.1. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco’s (CCSF) Public Safety Department uses many sources to evaluate the safety of the District’s facilities, including, but not limited to assessing data on calls for service and type, campus population and hours of operation, as well as locations within CCSF and the neighboring crime statistics (See Appendix B). Additionally, the Public Safety Department is required to review Query Data
in order to track common trends. The information gathered from the Query Data is often disseminated through electronic means to the campus community. Moreover, CCSF has a full time Public Safety Department that works closely with the San Francisco Police Department and is headed by the Chief of Police (See Appendix A). The District’s Public Safety Department is a state POST certified department under 830.32 (a) of the California Penal Code and onsite law enforcement and/or security services at the main campus (Ocean), as well as designated centers and sites.

Additionally, it is required for CCSF to have property and liability insurance coverage in order to conduct the college’s daily operations. Also, according to the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, he College formerly used the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), which performed regular safety inspections, however, starting in fiscal year 2012 – 13; the College will be using Alliance for Schools Cooperative Insurance Program (ASCIP).

CCSF also uses the Foundation for California Community Colleges database Facilities Utilization, Space Inventory Options Net, FUSION to evaluate the safety of the facilities. FUSION is a database of “71 million square feet of California community colleges facilities that tracks the condition assessments and develops cost modeling for maintenance projects, enabling colleges to plan budgets and help facilitate the passing of much-needed bond measures” (www.foundationccc.org). Every three to five years, staff from the Foundation inspect, assess and evaluate all District facilities. During this review a FUSION employee completes a walkthrough of all District classrooms, lecture halls, offices, labs, and other facilities to develop an updated, more accurate, list of the Districts inventory, as well as the current state of usefulness (See Appendix C). The most recent inventory assessment was conducted in October 2012.

While CCSF uses the FUSION data for inventory purposes, the Office of Instruction, along with the Center Deans, determines the utilization and allocation of classroom space in order to meet student needs. The most recent inventory count took place in Fall 2012 (See Appendix C). The recent inventory count and assessment, specifically, gives the College ongoing opportunities to determine how to effectively utilize its facilities.

CCSF relies heavily on the expertise of Centers Administration and Department Chairs to articulate departmental and program needs with regards to space. In addition, the College has a Shared Governance Facility Review Committee where requests and projects are considered and prioritized (See Appendix D and Appendix E). Currently, the Shared Governance structure is being revised at the College.

Furthermore, according to the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration and a CCSF Consultant (Appendix F) the District is required to submit a Five Year Construction Plan annually to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. This Five Year Plan provides measured utilization of lecture, laboratory, office, library, and AV/TV (media) spaces. The results are enumerated as “capacity to load ratios.” If the cap-load ratio exceeds 100%, the category of space is said to be excessive (See Appendix G).

The College has been fortunate to have two major local bonds issued to upgrade a significant portion of its facilities, however, with limited bond funds remaining the College will need to identify facility improvement and capital outlay projects. The age of most classrooms, labs, lecture halls, etc., exceed their life expectancy and possess potential health and safety issues
if the college does not develop a plan for improvements (See District Wide Replacement Costs of Physical Resources).

Although CCSF has not had the resources to effectively maintain its facilities, the College has been able to meet the needs of the students, including the continued use of classrooms in their current condition. The College is in the process of developing a planning process that will evaluate the use of District facilities. In addition, the College has hired a Consultant, Merle Cannon, to assist in ensuring the use of standards and guidelines as an outside control mechanism to avoid overbuilding projects and evaluate needs for space based on existing and reasonably projected FTE’s for program areas.

The College operates many Centers and Sites some of which are under various lease agreements. As a result, the College is responsible for maintaining facilities to the extent agreed upon in terms of each location. Similar to the aforementioned, facility conditions at some of the educational Centers and Sites have also exceeded their life expectancy and require significant attention. According to the CCSF Consultant, the Five Year Construction Plan also provides the capacity to load ratios for each State-recognized center. In the District, the instructional delivery centers are; City College (Ocean), Airport (at SFO), Alemany (Civic Center), Chinatown, Downtown, John Adams, John O’Connell (Evans), Mission, Southeast (See Appendix G). According to the CCSF Consultant, the capacity to loads ratios is used to determine the need for future space based on enrollment projections provided by the State Chancellor’s Office. These projections are made annually. Planned projects to address program needs are prepared taking into account the need to improve capacity to ratio loads.

While the College has primarily relied on bond initiatives to build new facilities, the College needs to refocus their attention on existing facilities where conditions are potentially inadequate. However, it is important to keep in mind that it will cost the College a large amount of funds to upgrade its facilities and/or systems (See District Wide Replacement Costs of Physical Resources).

Currently, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration is responsible for directing and coordinating all projects relating to physical resources. These projects include planning new facilities, as well as undertaking major maintenance and renovation projects each year. The Vice Chancellor also oversees the Maintenance, Buildings, and Grounds Department, which is responsible for maintaining facilities and undertaking minor repair projects. The Maintenance, Buildings, and Grounds Department also include Custodial Services, which is responsible for keeping the facilities clean and operational. According to the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the College is currently analyzing the efficiency of its overall operation. This analysis will help the College determine the efficiency of all its locations.

Lastly, security is provided by the Campus Police Department. According to CCSF Chief of Police, the Public Safety Department’s radio communication system is connected to the City and County of San Francisco’s Department of Emergency Management Services via its 800hz system that includes, but not limited to the following: San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Fire Department, Department of Public Works, and City and County Emergency Dispatch Services. Further, the District provides “Blue Light”
emergency telephones at the main campus and centers (See Appendix H), in addition to burglar alarm systems (See Appendix I).

All College programs and departments participate in a six year cycle of Program Review (See Appendix J and Program Review Files in Library) which provides an opportunity for physical resource needs and equipment to be addressed. Integrating these processes would help complete the planning and assessment “feedback loop,” which would ensure effective support of the College’s academic programs and student support services. Though the College has a 10-year facilities plan, the Facilities Master Plan, currently, CCSF does not have an institutional mechanism for improvement of facilities. However, CCSF does respond immediately to maintenance requests when they are informed of dangerous conditions, such as plumbing leak, lighting, broken elevators, etc.

Given that in 2003 the District Facility Condition Assessment Report indicated that existing District facilities were in generally poor condition, 20 of the 32 buildings assessed were constructed prior to 1975 and were in need of repairs (CCSF Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, 2006). And not enough improvement has been done; low rating is to be expected. Despite this, programs and services are not compromised; they are still operational. In addition, in Fall 2012, CCSF’s Information, Technology, and Systems Department developed a plan to review the College’s technology infrastructure, which includes a process to deploy a number of upgrades and replacements. Again, the College continues working towards bringing its facilities and equipment up to date.

CCSF’s Information Technology Services (ITS) supports the College and all its departments by maintaining classroom and administrative technology, providing technical expertise and services to improve productivity, effectiveness, and efficiencies. ITS is customer centric and empowers the CCSF community by providing needed technology that in turn improves student success (See Appendix K). However, with the reduction of state funding, the College has fallen behind in replacing instructional equipment to support the needs of the distance delivery modes the College offers.

The Office of Facilities Planning and Construction at CCSF, under the supervision of the Office of Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration is responsible for the management of planning, design, and construction of buildings District Wide. Projects are supported by various funding sources (See Appendix L). According to the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the College has followed a program planning process for the development of each new building. This process includes hiring an architect that meets with the future building users in order to identify needs of the department. The College clearly demonstrates a commitment to providing a state of the art environment for student learning programs and services. However, the College is deficient in developing and implementing a process of prioritizing large capital improvement projects. Currently, competing demands for limited college resources drives the prioritization of capital improvement projects.

In the past, the College followed a shared governance process (See Appendix D) that included college community input. The process included the following: (1) Projects Sub Committee; (2) Project Presentation; (3) [If step 2 was approved] it is forwarded to Facility Review Committee (FRC) for consideration; (4) [If step 3 was approved] the project is recommended to the Budget and Planning Committee, which reports to the College Advisory Council (CAC); (5) The CAC would make recommendations to the Board of Trustees FIT
Committee, which would recommend the project to the Full Board for approval (See Appendix E). However, the College is currently in the process of restructuring and reviewing the Shared Governance model.

Historically, the College has not had a way of synthesizing information gathered from the departments with regards to maintenance and replacement. Therefore, some of those needs have not been addressed. However, recently CCSF has made improvements to processes such as Program Review and Annual Planning, which will inform the college at large about program and service needs (See Appendix J).

Most of the classes offered at CCSF are offered at the Ocean Campus, Centers, and Sites. The District owns the following Campus, Centers, and Sites: Ocean Campus, John Adams Center, Chinatown Center, Downtown Center, Alemany (Civic Center) and Evans Center (John O’Connel), and the District Office at Gough Street. Mission Center, Southeast Center, Fort Mason Center, and the Airport Site are all buildings that are leased. Additionally, classes are offered at over 100 other sites. Since the last accreditation report, some facility improvements have been undertaken (See District Wide Life Cycle of Physical Resources). However, currently, the institution is in the process of downsizing in order to use more effectively its physical resources (The Castro/Valencia Center has closed already).

As stated above, the College has a Public Safety Department that works closely with the San Francisco Police Department at many of the Districts locations (See Appendix A). In the past the Public Safety Department operated 24 hours. However, due to budget cuts, the Department was forced to change to a 19 hour operation. For the locations that do not have Public Safety Officers on site, the Public Safety Department responds on an as needed basis.

The College has a self-selecting text messaging alert that provides text messages to the College community in regards to any emergencies. According to the CCSF’s Chief of Police, there are approximately 1,000 people signed up for the self-selecting text messaging alert service. Although this communication is optional, the College encourages its community to select this service to receive instantaneous messages as they arise. In addition, the College is considering a formal process for the delivery of this service.

Additionally, there are alarm systems installed District wide and many of the locations have installed video cameras and public announcement systems. The Chief of Police is the lead liaison, along with designated building managers, to set up and monitor the alarms and camera systems where appropriate (See Appendix I). The District also has contracts with professional alarm companies that specifically provide services such as installation, monitoring, and maintenance.

In 2009, a District Emergency Preparedness Coordinator was appointed in order to assure the districts access, safety, and security. During this year, the College was able to complete an assessment of our District’s Emergency Evaluation Plan (See Appendix M); an Emergency Response Plan Binder (See Appendix N); provides Standardized Emergency Management System (STEM), National Incident Management System (NIMS), and Incident Command System (ICS) Trainings (See Appendix O); a minimum of two “table top” exercises; collaborated with the Emergency Operation Center (EOC) for joint training and sharing of resources; create a San Francisco Colleges and Universities Resource Group for Emergency Preparedness; assigned primary Emergency Response Team personnel for each educational center and site; provided NERT training to the CCSF community; participated in state-wide
earthquake drills; and completed several evacuation drills. The College is in the process of updating the Emergency Plan by 2013.

CCSF appointed an ADA Compliance Director to coordinate and ensure that the issues regarding access, safety, security, and healthful learning and working environment are resolved. The College recently completed a series of ADA projects in order to improve access for students with mobility disabilities. CCSF worked with the City and County of San Francisco to install traffic lights and improvements to the pedestrian and traffic flow directly leading to the Campus, Centers, and Sites. Although the College has limited resources, the College makes an effort to keep the elevators and other important systems functioning.

Lastly, as needed, the College deploys Facilities and Buildings and Grounds staff to repair off site requests. Besides the aforementioned, the College is downsizing in order to maximize resources on off-site facilities to ensure their quality and safety (The Castro/Valencia Center has been closed).

III.B.1. Self Evaluation. Based on the descriptive summary, CCSF partially meets Standard III.B.1. Since the accrediting teams visit in March 2012, the College has made significant steps in addressing the numerous recommendations. With regards to Facility Resources, the College now has an up to date FUSION database that can be used to assess, prioritize, and implement needed facility improvements.

Secondly, the College has assembled a workgroup with contingents in various disciplines. The workgroup was responsible for incorporating 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. The established workgroup has determined that the College has partially met Standard III.B.1 of this recommendation. This conclusion is based on the recent improvements and changes the College has implemented, such as up to date inventory of the District in the FUSION database. In addition, based on the information, the established workgroup believes the appropriate contingents can continue the task that needs to be completed.

III.B.1. Actionable Improvement Plans. The following are actionable improvement plan recommendations the established workgroup has for the CCSF District:

- Adopt, create, and implement the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Model;
- Designate an individual to monitor the FUSION website and TCO Model;
- Replace the former supervisor of Physical Resources, as well as designating an additional individual as a back up;
- Research and implement Association of Physical Plan Administrators (APPA) of Universities and Colleges;
- Monitor the Districts expenditures for each Center and Site separately;
- Develop and implement a plan in order to fund and replace facilities that have outlived its life expectancy;
  - For example, at registration students are asked to voluntarily donate one dollar to the Associated Students. The District should consider asking the students to voluntarily donate one dollar toward maintaining the districts buildings.
- Include the following positions into the staffing plan:
- Waste Management/Recycle;
- Lock Smith;
- Mail Services;
- Shipping and Receiving; and
- Engineer;
- Teach the CCSF community the importance of waste management, in addition to encouraging the community to recycle;
- Increase custodial and recycling staffing in order to accommodate the growing college needs;
- Increase staffing in the Facilities Office;
- Hire a Superintendent for the District;
- Hire Project Managers for future buildings and maintenance projects;
- Review the organizational structure of Finance and Administration to determine the appropriate number of office and departments to effectively maintain operations;
- Create a Buildings and Grounds Unit;
- Provide budget support to invest in District recycling infrastructure;
- Improve teambuilding and leadership;
- Continue to use other college processes, such as Program Review and Annual Planning, to create a priorities list for Facilities and Planning to effectively create process and action plan;
- Streamline all College Plans;
- Base future bonds on the FUSION data and then assess the budget;
- The College can stand to improve its approach to ensuring a healthy working environment by establishing ergonomic standards and other safety upgrades; and

Lastly, Physical Resources cannot be reviewed as an isolated Standard. It has provided the foundation of all services and programs provided to students. Physical Resources affects not only financial planning, but it also has a direct impact on our instructional and support services, as well as the overall brand of the institution. Therefore it is imperative that all College constituent groups share responsibility in the ongoing improvement of our facilities.

### Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.B.1.

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

### III.B.2. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

### III.B.2.a. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.
III.B.2.b. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluations as the basis for improvement.

III.B.2. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco (CCSF) has a past practice of relying on participatory governance in order to assess the use of its facilities. The College has a 10-year Facilities Master Plan that prioritizes capital outlay projects for the District. Additionally, the College uses Program Review and other department level requests to consider maintenance priorities for the District. Currently, departments have an opportunity to describe their needs for equipment, classroom, and/or general facility requests in their Program Review (See Appendix J). The responses from Program Review are then filtered to the Annual Plan, Strategic Plan, and Facilities Master Plan.

CCSF uses the results of the Five Year Construction Plan, which is submitted annually to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (See Appendix E). This particular Plan provides measured utilization of various spaces within the District. In addition, CCSF uses the Facility Utilization Space Inventory Option Net (FUSION) system in order to “standardize and streamline the management of the College facilities…FUSION provides a clear, comprehensive information to justify requests for funding and form the foundation for capital renewal programs” (http://cccfusion.org/). Since the last self-evaluation study completed in Fall 2012, the District has conducted and completed the District Facility Condition Assessment in the FUSION database in which the physical condition of all buildings was inventoried and assessed (See District Wide Life Cycle of Physical Resources). Now that the 2012 inventory is complete, the College is in a great position to develop a more regular cycle of monitoring the inventory and assessment in a regular basis.

Projects for major renovation are often identified within the Five Year Construction Plan that is submitted to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (See Appendix E). For example, the arts buildings (Center for Pan American Unity) included in the plan the renovation of the following buildings (1) Creative Arts, (2) Creative Arts Extension, (3) Visual Arts, (4) Environmental, and (5) Horticulture & Floristry.

In recent years facilities improvements have been completed based on the availability of funds for physical resources. However, due to a lack of coordinated efforts, the maintenance requests have not been closely linked to the Facility Master Plan, according to the Vice-Chancellor of Finance and Administration the College will start linking the requests to the Facility master Plan. The College has used bond funds in order to improve the most critical and immediate requests on facilities, and also to complete some maintenance and operation projects (See Appendix L). Although the College has submitted annual information to the State Chancellor’s Office, at this time, the College has limited physical resources to undertake new and old facilities improvements.

Moreover, at this time, the College does not have a highly sustainable model of the total cost of ownership for the facilities in the District, the College does have long-range capital plans that meet the Colleges mission (Appendix E). Among the capital projects planned for the future are the Performing Arts Center, a Student Development building, and a center in the Bay View area of San Francisco. The College has considered and developed these long-range plans based on the needs expressed by community, faculty, and students.
It is imperative to note that some long-range capital plans have been listed since the mid 2000’s and continue to be on the College’s list of capital improvement projects. However, the College has not maintained the linkage between facilities needs and institutional planning. The various College constituencies have shown a past practice of working independently, only to connect at the highest level when the College plans are submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval. Consequently, the approval process comes by way of the Board of Trustees action when plans need to be submitted to the State Chancellors Office and other agencies for approval. However, the College continues making progress in its planning process.

In the past, City College of San Francisco’s efforts to provide the total cost of ownership, a concept that seeks to measure not just the cost of planning and construction, but the cost of operating a facility over its expected lifetime, have been limited. According to the Vice-Chancellor of Finance and Administration the College is in the process of replacing a vacant facilities position that will be responsible to develop, implement and maintain the total cost of ownership model to use when making decisions about facilities equipment. In addition, the College has created the District Wide Allocation of Physical Resources (See District Wide Allocation of Physical Resources) to assist in the creation of the future Total Cost of Ownership Model.

CCSF is aware that the Education Master Plan is outdated and needs to be updated and revised. The Education Master Plan should essentially be linked to other College plans such as, Strategic Plan, Facilities Plan, etc. One of the primary focuses of all College plans should be to make the learning environment better for the entire college community. Although the College does not have a formal process in to ensure that capital projects support college goals, the College is working on updating the outdated Plans in order to ensure the parallelism between the Plans and the College goals.

In an effort to continue providing students with facilities that offer newer classrooms and facilities to meet their needs, including accessing and engaging in college wide programs and courses, the college constructed new buildings, such as the Wellness Center, Student Health Center, Multiuse Building, etc. An example of this is the Chinatown-North Beach Center, consisting of 93,554 assignable square footage (ASF) of new instructional and student support space was completed in 2012 (after many years of environment contestations and mitigations). The Performing Arts Center on the Ocean Campus, when constructed, will provide 59,454 ASF of new instructional space for the Music, Drama, and Performing Arts programs. It is scheduled for completion in 2013 – 2014. Plans for other long-range projects including modernization of a number of buildings has been delayed due to the lack of funds. However, the College also recognizes that it also has many facilities that are older and has room for improvement on its physical resources. Additionally, according to the CCSF consultant, there is an expectation that a state bond issue is forthcoming in 2014. In the meantime, according to the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the District has made efforts to assure that minimum requirements to support the programs are provided.

Every department in the College completes a Program Review (See Attachment J) on an annual basis. Program Reviews are specifically for departments to depict their current state including needs such as personnel and facilities. The College has moved to an annual Program Review cycle, which will include linking the Program Review, institutional needs...
and plans for improvement. In the past, the requests made in Program Review have not informed institutional planning decisions.

City College of San Francisco currently does not have evidence that the institution bases its physical resources decisions on the results of evaluations of programs and service needs. The College does document and has evidence that Program Reviews are completed in the Research and Planning Department. Departments use the Program Review process as a way to inform the College community on departmental needs (See Appendix J). Although the results of the Program Reviews are incorporated into the Annual Plan, the College lacks execution on the reports findings except during emergencies.

Although resources for purchasing equipment is often limited throughout the District, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration is responsible for prioritizing and approving necessary equipment purchases as requested by the various departments.

### III.B.2. Self Evaluation

Based on the descriptive summary, City College of San Francisco partially meets Standard III.B.2. Since the last evaluation, completed in Fall 2012, the College has convened a workgroup to examine the physical resources of the College. The workgroup is making recommendations on how to continue making physical resources a college wide planning process. There are a number of college plans that should be integrated with each other, in addition to Facilities Master Plan, Program Review, etc. The College needs to continue developing an effective process that includes a regular review and evaluation of classrooms, equipment, and other physical resources. In conclusion, the College needs to implement a follow up and action plan to the review and evaluation process.

### III.B.2. Actionable Improvement Plans

The following are actionable improvement plan recommendations the established workgroup has for the CCSF District:

- Adopt, create, and implement the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Model;
- Designate an individual to monitor the FUSION website and TCO Model;
- Replace the former supervisor of Physical Resources, as well as designating an additional individual as a back up;
- Research and implement Association of Physical Plan Administrators (APPA) of Universities and Colleges;
- Monitor the Districts expenditures for each Center and Site separately;
- Develop and implement a plan in order to fund and replace facilities that have outlived its life expectancy;
  - For example, The District should consider asking students and employees to voluntarily donate one dollar each semester toward maintaining the districts buildings;
- Include the following positions into the staffing plan:
  - Waste Management/Recycle;
  - Lock Smith;
  - Mail Services;
  - Shipping and Receiving; and
  - Engineer;
- Teach the CCSF community the importance of waste management, in addition to encouraging the community to recycle;
• Increase custodial and recycling staffing in order to accommodate the growing college needs;
• Increase staffing in the Facilities Office;
• Hire a Superintended for the District;
• Hire Project Managers for future buildings and maintenance projects;
• Review the organizational structure of Finance and Administration to determine the appropriate number of office and departments to effectively maintain operations;
• Create a Buildings and Grounds Unit;
• Provide budget support to invest in District recycling infrastructure;
• Improve teambuilding and leadership;
• Continue to use other college processes, such as Program Review and Annual Planning, to create a priorities list for Facilities and Planning to effectively create process and action plan;
• The College can stand to improve its approach to ensuring a healthy working environment by establishing ergonomic standards and other safety upgrades; and
• Lastly, Physical Resources cannot be reviewed as an isolated Standard. It has provided the foundation of all services and programs provided to students. Physical Resources affects not only financial planning, but it also has a direct impact on our instructional and support services, as well as the overall brand of the institution. Therefore it is imperative that all College constituent groups share responsibility in the ongoing improvement of our facilities.
• Streamline all plans

Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.B.2.

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

III.C. Technology Resources

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.C.1. The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.

III.C.1. Descriptive Summary. Technology support is primarily provided by the Information Technology Services Department, ITS. The Department provides base-level services such as email, PCs, telephones, LAN/WAN services and Internet access to all Faculty and Staff as well as specialized technology services for specific Administrative and
Academic departments. The ITS Department is comprised of 42 people. The primary organization within ITS responsible for technology support is Technical Services. Technical Services is focused on providing technical support to all CCSF employees and over 100 computer labs. Support includes determining technical needs, recommending equipment, setting up and installing hardware and software, and providing ongoing support. An online Work Order Request and Incident Tracking system from the vendor SchoolDude is used to assist with this process. The organization is responsible for over 5,000 computers in 13 locations and utilizes the following tiered support structure:

- **Phone support (Tier 1):** Basic tech support on all IT related equipment to include computers, printers, software, phones, network connectivity (wired or wireless), and server services such as password reset and data share permissions.
- **On site support (Tier 2):** Advanced tech support at end-user’s computer or printer. Services include installation, configuration and/or troubleshooting.
- **In house repairs (Tier 3):** Repairs and/or upgrades of hardware. This may require the item to be removed.
- **Coordination of vendor repairs (Tier 4):** Repairs that require vendor service outside of CCSF (i.e. warranty repair).
- **Computer Lab management:** This includes day to day operations, supervision of student workers, and interacting with departments to ensure lab meets their needs.

In addition to ITS, the following CCSF Departments employ an additional 20 technology support staff: Admissions and Records (A&R), Disabled Students Programs/Services (DSPS), Educational Technology Department (ETD), Financial Aid; Finance, Human Resources (HR), Matriculation and the Library. In order to directly meet their technology needs, the priorities and direction of activities for the technology support staff in this category is provided by the managers of the department in which they are located. In 2011 an attempt was made to reorganize all technology staff into the ITS Department. This reorganization was not completed and hence some IT staff are in non-IT departments and report to non-IT supervisors.

All major systems supported by the ITS Department are proactively monitored and supported using system management tools consisting of online applications and associated databases. The specific systems monitored include Ethernet switches, WiFi, Internet Utilization, Telephone systems, Storage Area Networks and Firewalls.

**III.C.1. Descriptive Summary – Ed Tech.** The Educational Technology Department provides services to faculty and staff for the use of educational technologies in both the face-to-face classroom and via distance education (online and telecourses). The Educational Technology Department includes the Technology Mediated Instruction unit and the Technology Learning Center.

The Department is currently responsible for the following:

1. Funding, training, and managing the development of all distance learning classes (between 8-10 new online classes are developed each academic year).
2. Funding and managing the delivery and support of all distance learning classes (averaging 300 sections an academic year; generating $6.02 million in academic year 2011/12)*.

3. Supporting faculty teaching online classes using *Insight* (approximately 110 faculty).

4. Training and supporting faculty who enhance a face-to-face class using *Insight* (over 600 sections an academic year).

5. Funding, managing and, supporting the Technology Learning Center.

6. Providing consulting, training and support in educational technologies relevant to face-to-face and online instruction.

7. Supporting students enrolled in all online classes.

8. Supporting students enrolled in all tech-enhanced classes using *Insight*.

9. Funding and managing the delivery of all telecourses (five a semester).

10. Funding, managing and, supporting an open computer lab for faculty and staff on the Ocean Campus.

11. Funding, managing and, supporting the Educational Technology Department’s Satellite Laboratory, an open computer lab for faculty and staff.

12. Administering and supporting grants in the development and delivery of online classes (e.g. BTOP).

13. Supporting contract education programs in the development and delivery of online classes (e.g. Year Up).

*Provided by Research and Planning: Approximate Credit Apportionment Rate Per FTES = $4632.94.

The Educational Technology Department listed three major program objectives from our mission statement. Consistent with the College’s mission, the Educational Technology Department strives to provide programs and services that achieve the following major program objectives:

1. We promote access to distance learning classes leading to student success in academic, cultural and civic achievements.

2. We promote successful teaching and learning to meet the needs of our distance learning students as globally competent learners; closing the equity achievement gaps and enhancing student success.

3. We promote the use of educational technologies to enhance teaching and learning including innovative hardware and software.

4. We provide support for programs and services leading to transfer to baccalaureate institutions, achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Sciences, and the acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace.

- City College of San Francisco makes sure that its technology needs for distance learning are identified and evaluated in a variety of ways:
  - The Employee Technology Survey (the next survey will be administered in Spring 2013)
TLC Surveys
Online Faculty Survey
Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable
Distance Learning Advisory Committee
Faculty focus groups
Educational Technology Department meetings
Feedback from TLC workshops participants
Onliners list-serv
Institutional initiative for SLOs and Assessment

Identified a Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist faculty position to replace the IT position that was moved with the ITS re-organization

- Decisions to adopt or not adopt technology are primarily fiscally and human resources based. New ideas about technology discussed at TLTR. Outside vendors often present new educational technologies to the Roundtable.
- Faculty teaching online have been given priority for a desktop or laptop. Ed Tech received new equipment in spring 2011. Faculty teaching distance learning classes have access to new desktops, a scanner, and a multi-media station along with software to support their teaching needs. Faculty also can make an appointment with Ed Tech staff to talk about any technology or pedagogy questions they might have in their distance learning class.

- Evidence: Work Order and Incident Tracking System
- Evidence: System Management Examples
- Future Need: Closer integration is required with Program Review to ensure alignment with learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.
- Future Need: A Technology Survey needs to be conducted on a regular basis to assess the effectiveness of technology and receive suggestions for improvement.

Future Need: The ITS Technology Services organization requires expansion in order to provide technical assistance during evenings and weekends.

III.C.1. Self Evaluation – Ed Tech. Given the pace of changes in educational technology, it is vital that Ed Tech staff are trained in the most up-to-date hardware and software. Given the recent budget situation both at the College and State-wide, funding for such professional development has been non-existent. Realizing that we must keep up with the changes, both the Ed Tech Chair and the TLC Coordinator have used personal funds to attend conferences related to distance learning and educational technology. For example, both attended the Teaching and Learning Online Conference in June 2012 and the Chair attended Moodle Moot in July 2011. Additionally, to support the changing focus of Ed Tech, the TLC Coordinator completed @One’s Online Teaching Certificate in fall 2011.

- With the ITS re-organization, the $5000 budget that was used by Ed Tech to hire peer trainers for the TLC was re-allocated by the newly hired CTO. Previously, the budget was used to award grants to faculty so they could provide professional development workshops related to educational technologies. This loss in funds has significantly
impacted the amount of trainings in teaching and learning with technology that Ed Tech can provide.

- The College has still not hired a faculty DLTS position.

In Spring 2013, the TLC Coordinator position as reduced to a .4 from a .8 re-assigned time. This is a significant loss in support for distance learning faculty as all staff in Ed Tech are cross-trained.

### III.C.1. Actionable Improvement Plans.

- Establish Technology Priorities
- Measure Effectiveness of Technology
- Expand Technology Services


- Restore TLC Coordinator re-assigned time to 80%
- Hire a Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist to replace the previously filled IT 1033.
- Restore Tech Support personnel so there is back-up to the System Administrator.
  Restore internal grants management program for training teachers in educational technology software.
- Migrate the learning management system to Moodle 2.0 (includes training staff, faculty, and back-end set-up).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.C.1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Technology Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Effectiveness of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore TLC Coordinator re-assigned time to 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire a Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist to replace the previously filled IT 1033.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Tech Support personnel so there is back-up to the System Administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore internal grants management program for training teachers in educational technology software.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III.C.1.a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.

**III.C.1.a. Descriptive Summary.** The Information Technology Services Department (ITS) provides universally common technology services such as email, PCs, telephones, network
services and Internet access to all Faculty and Staff. In addition to this, ITS maintains the systems and databases used for Student registration and records as well as Student WiFi services, Academic Labs and the associated network infrastructure. The decisions regarding the design and operation of these systems and services are made by ITS working in conjunction with the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC). Policies related to technology are approved by the Board of Trustees Facilities, Infrastructure and Technology Committee (FIT). Specialized technology services for specific Administrative and Academic departments are determined and prioritized by the Program Review process and are incorporated into the standard infrastructure and systems design.

The ITS Department is comprised of 45 people and is organized according to the following structure:

**CITO:** A Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) was hired in June 2010. He was placed on Administrative Leave in May 2012. This has led to a leadership vacancy in the department and the position is currently filled on a part-time, interim basis by a contractor from Strata Information Group (SIG).

**Technical Services:** Focused on providing tech support to all CCSF employees and over 100 computer labs. Support includes determining tech needs, recommending of equipment, setting up / installing hardware and software, and providing ongoing support. Unit is responsible for over 5,000 computers in 13 locations. A centralized ticketing system from School Dude is used to meet user driven needs and provide support interaction with clients/customers as part of a tiered support structure.

**Technical Operations:** Provides a wide range of services to the College including network and Internet Services, Telephony Services, WiFi Services, Server Support Services, Building Construction Planning, Building Management Systems and Emergency Preparedness.

**E-mail:** Provides email resources to staff both from within the college and over the Internet. GroupWise shared documents are provided for various departments and individuals. A hosted email service from Microsoft, Office 365, has been selected for future use at CCSF. Migration will begin in January, 2013 and be completed in June, 2013.

**Programming:** The focus of this group is Banner, its ancillary applications and the CCSF Web site. Banner is a fully integrated software solution developed by Ellucian (formerly Sungard Higher Education) and used by CCSF to manage its business operations. The Banner system supports and manages student information, accounts receivable, financial aid, finance, human resources/payroll and position control. In addition, Banner includes a number of self-service (a.k.a. Web4) features so that students, faculty, and staff can access personalized online services. Data from Banner is used for program review, enrolment management, MIS reporting and other ad-hoc needs.

**Computer Room Operation:** The Computer Room operations unit is primarily responsible for the functioning of the computers in the computer room and other distributed computers. They perform data backups and restores of critical servers, print reports and forms, and maintain operations of the enterprise-wide servers.

Along with all other CCSF Departments, the ITS Department submits an annual Program Review in which they review results of the previous year in order to plan for the upcoming year. This plan provides an opportunity to prioritize needs within ITS and submit them for evaluation as part of the Institution-wide Program Review process. This process provides a
mechanism for technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software
to be designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution. Upon completion
of the Program Review process, prioritized projects which meet the needs of Academic and
Administrative projects will be assigned to the ITS Department for implementation along
with the required resources. These prioritized projects will be completed in addition to the
projects and operational tasks which ITS specifies in their own Program Review.

In addition to the annual Program Review process, some technology-related systems are
designed and operated over a multi-year period and require a long-term approach in order to
ensure a sufficient level of effectiveness. This need is met with a Technology Plan which is
developed on a three-year cycle and is a dynamic roadmap that follows from the Strategic
Plan to further define the direction that the College needs to take to support its Mission.

In addition to the pre-defined processes described above, new systems and services are
implemented as funding and other resources become available. A recent example of software
which is designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution is the
implementation of Argos from the vendor Evisions. This application was recently purchased
as a result of a donation to CCSF and is a reporting tool which can be used for Enrollment
Management, Financial Planning and other activities. Implementation of this application
began in November, 2012 and reports will be available to CCSF decision makers beginning
in February, 2013.

III.C.1.a. Descriptive Summary – Ed Tech. Much of what was written in the 2012 Self
Study is still applicable.

• The College has expanded its online course offerings from 85 sections in Fall 2005 to
  147 sections in fall 2012.
• Distance-learning courses are offered in 27 academic departments, all six schools within
  Academic Affairs, and in Library and Learning Resources.
• In some departments, a student can complete all of the requirements for a certificate by
taking online classes or telecourses.
• Students can complete approximately 90 percent of the courses required to fulfill the
  CSU GE or IGETC pattern by taking online classes or telecourses.
• By the end of fall 2012, over 300 face-to-face credit sections were tech-enhanced, an
  increase of over 300 percent from the Fall 2009 semester where only 100 sections were
tech-enhanced.
• Nine percent of students taking an academic class at CCSF have taken a distance-learning
  course. (This is from former Dean How’s data. I cannot support this as the new data from
  Research and Planning has just been received and is still being analyzed. I should have
  the updated data by early January).
• As of Fall 2009, CCSF converted all online academic courses from the learning
  management system WebCT to Insight (Moodle™). When the College contracted with a
  vendor to host the learning management system, provisions for reliability, disaster
  recovery, privacy, and security were all negotiated within the contract between the
  vendor and CCSF. In fall 2013 the College will need to migrate to Moodle 2.0. This is a
  major migration.
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CCSF’s Educational Technology Department partnered with EduStream to offer faculty access to a centralized library of on-demand videos that can be streamed for a face-to-face class, referenced in a tech-enhanced course, or required as part of an online class. EduStream is being used by the Language Lab to host their videos. This model could be applied across the curriculum. Online faculty use EduStream to house videos used in their classes.

Equipment is now installed in the Multi-media building to prepare for faculty to create video content to place in their Insight shells. The production of video is on hold due to human resources allocation or lack there of.

The College makes a commitment to distance learning via Program Review, Shared Governance (ITAC, TLTR, DLAC), Board of Trustees priorities, the decision to create a Chair position for the Ed Tech Department, and the numerous surveys mentioned in C.1.

The College contracts with an outside vendor to host its learning management system, Insight. The contract with the vendor includes provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy and security. The contract was reviewed by the College’s legal counsel and is in following with standard industry practice.

City College of San Francisco makes sure that its technology needs for distance learning are identified and evaluated in a variety of ways:
- The Employee Technology Survey (the next survey will be administered in spring 2013)
- TLC Surveys
- Online Faculty Survey
- Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable
- Distance Learning Advisory Committee
- Faculty focus groups
- Educational Technology Department meetings
- Feedback from TLC workshops participants
- Onliners list-serv
- Institutional initiative for SLOs and Assessment
- Identified a Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist faculty position to replace the IT position that was moved with the ITS re-organization


Evidence: ITAC Minutes 2012
Evidence: FIT Agendas 2012
Evidence: ITS Organization Chart
Evidence: ITS Program Review 2012
Evidence: Technology Plan 2013-2015
Evidence: Argos Application
Future Need: The ITS Programming organization requires additional staff due to attrition.
Future Need: The Program Review process is required to ensure institution-level projects are prioritized and resources are allocated to the ITS Department.
• Future Need: The development of the Technology Plan will continue to be needed to ensure a sufficient level of effectiveness.

III.C.1.a. Self Evaluation – Ed Tech. The College does need to make a stronger human resources commitment to distance learning. Staff have retired or been reassigned from Ed Tech without replacement. The TLC Coordinator position was reduced to a .4 from a .8 for spring 2013. The commitment to distance learning has decreased with this combined loss in human resources.

III.C.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plans.
Replace ITS Programming Staff
Complete Program Review Process
Continue Technology Plan Development

III.C.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plans – Ed Tech. The College needs to take action and restore vital human resources positions to Ed Tech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.C.1.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace ITS Programming Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Program Review Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Technology Plan Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore TLC Coordinator to .8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire DLTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrate to Moodle 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.C.1.b. The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.

III.C.1.b. Descriptive Summary. Faculty training for educational technologies and distance learning needs are provided by Ed Tech. Ed Tech faculty and staff support online documentation and tutorials. The TLC staff works with faculty to decide on the most appropriate training to conduct each semester given the budget allowance. Discussions and suggestions concerning the needs for educational technology and training also emerge from the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable (TLTR), whose purpose is to recommend policies for the use of technology for instructional support and student services. Training in all these areas has decreased with the recent and ongoing budget cutbacks. Ideas for training are also discussed at DLAC, Ed Tech FLEX Meetings, and gathered via surveys and workshop feedback.

The TLC organizes the Technology Professional Development Training Program, which provides training for faculty and staff on a variety of educational and applications software through a schedule of ongoing workshops and FLEX Day activities each semester. Since the ITS reorganization and the creation of the Educational Technology Department, the TLC has shifted its focus to educational technology applications. Training is delivered in a variety of applications.
modes to meet the needs of CCSF faculty and staff. From hands-on workshops to online training and sessions created specifically for departments’ needs, TLC staff provide tools educator use to increase student access and success.

The TLC delivers training on CCSFmail and Google applications for faculty and tech-enhanced Insight training. With the shortage of staff on the TMI side of Ed Tech, TLC staff have stepped in and filled human resource needs. During the 2010-11 academic year, TLC staff provided 111 workshops in the TLC Lab for 677 faculty, classified staff, and administrators. Individual consultations numbered 287, equating to 98 hours of training time during the same year. In order to gauge the success of the training workshops by TLC staff, evaluation forms are provided to all participants. The 2010-11 workshop evaluations show that 83 percent of attendees who filled out the forms (N=126) rated the workshops as excellent and 17 percent who filled out the forms (N=25) rated them as good.

TMI staff supports the online, technology-enhanced, and telecourse curriculum. TMI provides training for faculty converting a class from a face-to-face mode to online delivery. With budget cuts in Fall 2009, TMI sustained a 50 percent cut to its training budget, resulting in funding only 24 units of online credit course development per academic year. In Spring 2010, TMI began providing training for faculty wanting to use Insight, the College’s learning management system, to technologically enhance a face-to-face course. The training has been extremely popular with increase from 100 sections tech-enhanced in fall 2010 to over 300 in fall 2012.

Evidence for the effectiveness of Ed Tech training activities comes from the 2011 Employee Survey Report [III C-13], where the mean rating of the 361 respondents was a 3.12 (“good”) for training on educational and applications software and, for the item related to distance learning training and support, the 220 respondents assigned a rating of 3.1. The 2011 Credit Student Opinion Survey had no specific question asking students to rate technology training but the Spring 2011 Library Student Survey had three related items. Of the 968 student respondents who had completed one or more of the online or in-class research information competency skills workshops, 97.2 percent (N= 935) were satisfied or very satisfied with the training they received in the workshops. In response to the statement “Due to the library facilities, services, and programs, I am better able to effectively use computers and information technology” 40 percent of the 1,862 respondents marked “usually” and 31 percent marked “often” (this was in the 2012 Self-Study).

Changes made to the Telecourses Program as a result of assessment (Below were implemented starting in spring 2012)

- Created a dedicated email address for students enrolled in telecourses.
- Emailed all telecourse students before the start of the semester with reminders about meetings times and locations.
- Included more detailed notes in the online Class Schedule such as information about meeting times and locations and links to the instructor’s website (if applicable).
- Began the process of training all telecourse faculty in developing a Google site for their telecourse.
Taught telecourse faculty how to email their entire class with meeting time and location reminders.

Re-designed the Telecourse section of the website so that it is easier for students to locate instructor, course and meeting information.

The Telecourse Entry Survey was distributed in August 2012 and the Exit Survey will be conducted in December 2012. The results will be available in early spring. A major goal of the surveys is to improve enrollment and retention. Results from previous surveys are on the Ed Tech Assessment webpage.

Changes made to the Online Program as a result of assessment (Below were implemented starting in spring 2012)

- Moved from GroupWise email system to Google email system. Created a dedicated email address for students enrolled in online classes.
- Created an easily identifiable email address for students so that they would know the email related to their online class; welcome2.insight@mail.ccsf.edu.
- Revised the "Welcome to Insight" email. The email was shortened and included links to a website.
- Created a website dedicated to helping students log in to the learning management system. The website clearly addresses log in and password challenges as well as browser issues.
- Created videos for students about how to log into the learning management system.
- Standardized the section notes for all online classes. Included more detailed notes in the online Class Schedule such as information about meeting times and locations and links to the instructor's website (if applicable).
- Expanded hours for students to drop-in for face-to-face support to include the entire semester.

Results from the above changes were positive. The number of Student Help Tickets and phone calls decreased significantly. Ed Tech is now electronically tracking phone calls and student drop-ins with the goal of identifying areas that can be improved. Results from previous surveys are on the Ed Tech Assessment webpage.

Additional changes have been made to the Distance Learning website to identify the ways Student Services supports distance learning students.

- The Student Services email, askme@ccsf.edu, was placed on more of the Distance Learning website pages.
- Links to various Student Services such as Counseling, Matriculation, Financial Aid and Admissions and Records were placed on more of the Distance Learning website pages.
- In collaboration with Student Services the following statement was added to the Distance Learning website, “We will either answer your question or direct it to the Student Service that can best help you including Counseling, Financial Aid, Matriculation, and Admissions & Records”.

Ed Tech Assessment webpage
In collaboration with Student Services the following statement was added to the Distance Learning website, “Online advising and appointment scheduling is being piloted and will be live in early spring”.

In collaboration with Student Services the following statement was added to the Distance Learning website, “Financial Aid accepts paperwork from distance learning students who live more than 90 miles from City College of San Francisco. Please contact them for more information”.

In working collaboratively with Admissions and Records and ITS, password resets for Web4 can now be completed remotely.

Changes made to the Tech-enhanced Program as a result of assessment (Below were implemented starting in spring 2012)

- Moved from GroupWise email system to Google email system. Created a dedicated email address for students enrolled in tech-enhanced classes.
- Created an easily identifiable email address for students so that they would know the email related to their online class: welcome2.insight@mail.ccsf.edu.
- Emailed students in tech-enhanced classes who were new to Insight.
- Revised the "Welcome to Insight" email. The email was shortened and included links to a website.
- Created a website dedicated to helping students log in to the learning management system. The website clearly addresses log in and password challenges as well as browser issues.
- Created videos for students about how to log into the learning management system.
- Created a “best practices” handout for faculty using Insight to tech-enhance a face-to-face class. Mailed to faculty the handout along with two additional handouts for students about how to log in to Insight and the Insight Quick Start Guide.
- Expanded hours for students to drop-in for face-to-face support to include the entire semester.
- Further developed the Educational Technology Support Site to assist tech-enhanced faculty.

Changes made to TLC as a result of assessment

- Refocused training efforts on Insight and Google Apps for Higher Education.
- Phased out Contribute in favor of using Google sites (an institutional initiative).
- In spring 2012 the TLC created an online class for tech-enhanced Insight training and coordinated with the Human Resources Department to award staff development (FLEX) credit for successful completion of the online course.
- Publicized the lab aid schedule on the TLC website.
- Added drop-in CMS workshops to support the SLO Coordinator and IT efforts in College-wide CMS training.
• Began to work on online Google Sites workshops with the goal of coordinating with the Human Resources Department to award staff development (FLEX) credit for successful completion of the workshops.

• Began to focus training on using educational technology to support SLOs and Assessment (e.g. Adobe Forms for building rubrics, Google Sites for e-portfolios).

Ed Tech provides various means of support to students and faculty. There is a searchable FAQ for students and faculty; students and faculty can drop-in to the Ed Tech office for support; students and faculty can call Ed Tech for support. Various videos are now on the Insight homepage that provide students support with simple access to the learning management system.

All of these are assessed via surveys. See links above.

The Information Technology Services department provides in-service training to all of City College’s employees. The one trainer assigned to Information Technology Services is responsible for three types of training: In-person, web based, and handouts. The in-person classes are offered both at the Ocean campus as well as at the other major centers. They are scheduled throughout the semester and cover a wide range of topics; such as, MS windows, MS Office, and Web Design. The web-based aspect of training is centered on the college’s web site and focuses on the effect that IT changes have on end-users. Finally, the hand-outs provide tips and self-paced how-to guides on popular software.

III.C.1.b. Self Evaluation. The Ed Tech Department continues to function with fewer human resources and increased responsibilities and continued growth while working within its allotted budget. With retirements and classified reassignments, staff and faculty within Ed Tech have taken on additional duties and responsibilities to ensure that all Insight users are fully supported. Since the last Program Review the department focus has been on Insight. Staff are now cross-trained and have a back-up member trained as needed. While a shortage of staff has prompted Ed Tech to become more efficient, such a decrease in human resources (both faculty and classified) is not sustainable. The additional decrease of the TLC Coordinator in spring 2013 jeopardizes the ability of Ed Tech to serve both the educational technology needs of the faculty and the needs of distance learning.

The Department Chair, TMI Coordinator, TLC Coordinator, and classified personnel have all taken on more responsibilities. The lack of a Dean of Educational Technology is significant given the workload still exists; it has just been distributed among staff and faculty with the department. For 2011-12, in looking at the total credit apportionment of $124,814,785.65, distance learning accounts for 4.8% of the total generating approximately $6.02 million dollars in apportionment.

With an increase in human resources and the restoration of the online development budget, Ed Tech could make a significant impact to enrollment by giving access and increasing student success.

Without an increase in human resources in Ed Tech the College runs the risk of not meeting Accreditation Standard III.C.
The ETD training budget for faculty to develop online courses has been significantly cut. ETD will not be able to expand the number of online classes without a budget to train new instructors. In addition, the lab spaces used to train instructors and for faculty to use for on-campus meetings were reassigned. Currently, facilities for these activities are not available. Expansion of online programs will require adequate support, including funding for equipment and maintenance of hardware and software, and the replacement of staff who retire from or leave CCSF. Recruitment is currently underway to fill the full-time Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist position.

III.C.1.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The College needs to provide much needed support to Ed Tech in the form of human resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.C.1.b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore TLC Coordinator re-assigned units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire DLTS position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide back-up support for Insight System Administrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.C.1.c. The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.

III.C.1.c. Descriptive Summary. The CCSF technology infrastructure and associated equipment continues to evolve as new technologies are manufactured and become available for business and educational purposes. The design, quantity and types of equipment in use at CCSF have been driven by internal requirements in order to meet institutional needs. A strong relationship with the entire CCSF planning process, particularly the annual Program Review, has been established and will be utilized for equipment upgrades, replacement and maintenance. The Program Review process will perform an Institutional level evaluation and prioritization of all Administrative and Academic technology needs. To ensure a cohesive Institutional process, a centralized funding source will be allocated for technology beginning with FY2013-2014. The cost of implementing this process is estimated to be $1,130,000 annually and has been included in the CCSF FY2013-2014 Financial Plan. This amount is in addition to the current ongoing Information Technology Services Department (ITS) operations expenses which are approximately $1,135,000 annually.

ITS is the primary organization tasked with the management, maintenance and operation of the technological infrastructure and provides common Administrative and Institutional technology that serves all departments and units within CCSF. This includes equipment such as the telephone system, networking systems, email services, the Banner ERP system and desktop PCs for Faculty and Staff. It also includes an extensive copper and fiber-optic cabling infrastructure which enables communications services and Internet access in all classrooms and employee workspaces. By standardizing on common equipment whenever possible, ITS also provides management and maintenance services of Instructional and Program technology which directly supports academic programs and includes student computer labs, projectors, library systems and software for instructional purposes. For replacement of Academic-specific technology equipment, the Perkins grant program for CTE programs is expected to continue in the future at some level, but a sufficient level of funding
is being allocated in the centralized funding source independently of this program. Utilization of Academic Lab and Academic Center PCs will be measured in order to evaluate consolidation and sharing of resources across multiple departments and programs.

Monitoring and management of the infrastructure and equipment is performed by ITS using a combination of standards-based software tools and vendor-specific applications. These tools provide alerts when a service-impacting event occurs and also provide a mechanism for distributing patches and new images to specific pieces of equipment. Examples of this include InMon Sentinel and HP Procurve Manager for networking equipment and Symantec Ghost for desktop computers. Maintenance agreements are in place with major technology vendors for critical systems in order to ensure software upgrades and technical assistance is available as needed. Vendors which are contracted by CCSF for ongoing maintenance include Oracle, Elluiician (formerly Sungard), Llilien LLC and Alcatel-Lucent. In addition to this, PCs purchased through the primary PC supplier, OmniPro, are covered by a 3-year warranty and Ethernet switches purchased through the primary network supplier, HP Networks, are covered by a Lifetime Warranty which does not require a paid maintenance agreement.

Reliability of CCSF technology systems is provided by two primary methods. First, high quality products are selected to the greatest extent possible during the Request for Proposal (RFP) and subsequent acquisition process. Secondly, system redundancy and high-availability are included in the overall design strategy when feasible to include spare components and a mechanism for easy system replacement. In order to improve the reliability of critical systems and reduce the number of service-impacting outages, additional power equipment has been installed for the most important servers and Ethernet switches. This equipment includes dual power supplies, Uninterruptible Power Supplies (UPS) and backup generators. Provisions are made for Disaster Recovery of critical systems by the CCSF ITS Department. This includes storing backup copies of key data offsite by utilizing the services of Iron Mountain, a leading company in the field of information management services.

III.C.1.c. Self Evaluation. In past years the planning and acquisition of new and replacement equipment has not been entirely done on an Institutional basis. The ITS Department has provided centralized planning and implementation services to meet the equipment needs of Administrative Departments and employees using a combination of General Funds and Bond Funds from the 2001 and 2005 Bond measures. Academic Departments have used a combination of grant programs and other funding sources in order to meet the specific equipment needs of the academic programs. Academic departments that are part of the Career and Technical Education (CTE) program have been able to apply for Perkins funding in order to purchase new equipment for their specific needs. This process has met the needs of some departments but not others and has resulted in a non-uniform implementation and replacement method that lacks an Institutional-level funding process. It has also resulted in a situation where the academic lab PCs are in many instances much newer and faster than the Faculty and Staff PCs.

Although automation and efficiency tools are helpful, the primary tasks associated with managing, maintaining and operating technology equipment are performed by technically qualified employees. Due to budgetary constraints and attrition, the number of technical employees at CCSF has declined in recent years and has resulted in a reduction of service
levels and a longer period of time for replacement of inoperable equipment. The ITS Service Desk has also experienced a loss of technical staff due to layoffs which has resulted in reduced levels of technical support for employees. In order to fully meet the requirements of this Standard and to meet the support expectations of Faculty and Staff, additional staffing efficiencies will need to be achieved and vacated technical staff positions will need to be filled promptly.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT resources will be prioritized at the institution level thru Program Review</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All technology budgeting will be done using General Funds</td>
<td>7/1/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete a Disaster Recovery strategy and allocate appropriate resources.</td>
<td>12/31/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace technical staff upon departure due to attrition</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.C.1.d. The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.

III.C.1.d. Descriptive Summary. Decision-making for use and distribution of technology resources is tied to the planning process at the Board of Trustees and Strategic Plan levels and those drive the Annual Plan, Technology Plan and departmental and unit level process of Program Review. The Facilities, Infrastructure and Technology (FIT) Committee of the Board of Trustees reviews proposed Board resolutions to verify that they meet the institutions goals and objectives as defined in the Strategic Plan.

The Technology Plan is used as part of the prioritization process for technology distribution and utilization during the budgeting and planning cycle. The Technology Plan for 2013-15 was rewritten at a strategic level and linked to the goals in the College’s Strategic Plan. The 2013-15 Technology Plan also provides objectives for review and improvements to the Technology Planning process, recognizing that distribution and utilization of technology resources are dynamic in nature. In the college’s new planning structure, Program Review and Annual Plans detail specifics in keeping with learning outcomes and institutional planning documents. Technology objectives, activities, and funding requests included in departmental Program Reviews and Annual Plans will be aligned with the strategic Technology Plan goals. A Program Review document is submitted by the Information Technology Services Department (ITS) based on needs for common technology which serves all departments and units within CCSF. Each Academic and Administrative Department also submits a Program Review document in which their technology needs can be described and requested. All Program Review requests are evaluated and prioritized by the respective Deans and Vice Chancellors using a rubric to rank requests. The approved requests incorporate resources required in order to complete the associated implementation.

In addition to the above process and due to the fast-changing nature of technology it is necessary to gain input from the College Community; this is achieved via the Information
Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC). It meets approximately once per month during the academic year and provides a forum for faculty, staff, administrators and students to comment and make recommendations on technology policies and procedures. In this capacity, the ITAC performs an advising role with respect to the use and distribution of technology resources through the Participatory Governance process. An example of this is the recent process for evaluating and selecting a new email system (Office 365) for use at CCSF beginning in 2013. The ITAC also provides an advising role to the ITS Department for operational decisions and short-term planning. Members of ITS regularly participate in the ITAC meetings and discuss upcoming activities related to the use of technology and receive information related to operational decisions.

Network and information security services are provided for CCSF by the ITS Department working in conjunction with the ITAC. As part of this collaboration, the CCSF Network Management Policies and Procedures have been developed and provide guidelines for all support staff involved with the configuration and maintenance of technology systems. Guidelines have also been established for appropriate operation and use of technology systems and are provided to all employees in the form of a Computer Usage Policy: CCSF information security strategies include redundant firewalls in a high-availability configuration to ensure there is an active primary firewall at all times. There is also a physical separation of the network infrastructure into an Administrative side and an Instructional side to protect internal resources. Other components of the security strategy include use of standardized anti-virus and anti-spam software and secure logon and passwords for all enterprise information systems. The network and 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 Administrative and Instructional programs. The security systems continue to be monitored on a daily basis and new security features and functionality continue to be evaluated and deployed in order to ensure the integrity of the technology infrastructure. A physical security system utilizing individual security tokens is in place to control access to the primary CCSF data center located in Batmale Hall.

CCSF has deployed industry-standard solutions for redundancy within its primary technology infrastructure which includes a ring design for the Metro Area Network to minimize the impact of a fiber cut and uninterruptible power supplies combined with emergency generators to minimize the impact of power outages. Hosted or cloud-based solutions are utilized when it provides a greater level of reliability, this includes Remote Learner for online courses and Meraki for WiFi services. In order to ensure the technology infrastructure is kept reasonably current and sustainable, technology products are purchased early in the product life-cycle whenever possible to ensure a maximum lifespan of use before becoming obsolete. Primary infrastructure components including cabling and servers are reviewed by ITS on a proactive basis to determine the level of usability and an estimate on the remaining useful life. The equipment is then replaced as a result of the relevant Program Review procedures. Technical standards for cabling infrastructure are used in all new construction projects to ensure the cabling will meet CCSF technical needs for the maximum period of time.

III.C.1.d. Descriptive Summary – Ed Tech. The Educational Technology Department provides services to faculty and staff for the use of educational technologies in both the face-to-face classroom and via distance education (online and telecourses). The Educational...
Technology Department includes the Technology Mediated Instruction unit and the Technology Learning Center.

The Department is currently responsible for the following:

- Funding, training, and managing the development of all distance learning classes (between 8-10 new online classes are developed each academic year).
- Funding and managing the delivery and support of all distance learning classes (averaging 300 sections an academic year; generating $6.02 million in academic year 2011/12)*.
- Supporting faculty teaching online classes using Insight (approximately 110 faculty).
- Training and supporting faculty who enhance a face-to-face class using Insight (over 600 sections an academic year).
- Funding, managing and, supporting the Technology Learning Center.
- Providing consulting, training and support in educational technologies relevant to face-to-face and online instruction.
- Supporting students enrolled in all online classes.
- Supporting students enrolled in all tech-enhanced classes using Insight.
- Funding and managing the delivery of all telecourses (five a semester).
- Funding, managing and, supporting an open computer lab for faculty and staff on the Ocean Campus.
- Funding, managing and, supporting the Educational Technology Department’s Satellite Laboratory, an open computer lab for faculty and staff.
- Administrating and supporting grants in the development and delivery of online classes (e.g. BTOP).
- Supporting contract education programs in the development and delivery of online classes (e.g. Year Up).

*Provided by Research and Planning: Approximate Credit Apportionment Rate Per FTES = $4632.94.

The Educational Technology Department listed three major program objectives from our mission statement. Consistent with the College’s mission, the Educational Technology Department strives to provide programs and services that achieve the following major program objectives:

- We promote access to distance learning classes leading to student success in academic, cultural and civic achievements.
- We promote successful teaching and learning to meet the needs of our distance learning students as globally competent learners; closing the equity achievement gaps and enhancing student success.
- We promote the use of educational technologies to enhance teaching and learning including innovative hardware and software.
● We provide support for programs and services leading to transfer to baccalaureate institutions, achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Sciences, and the acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace.

City College of San Francisco makes sure that its technology needs for distance learning are identified and evaluated in a variety of ways:

● The Employee Technology Survey (the next survey will be administered in spring 2013)
● TLC Surveys
● Online Faculty Survey
● Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable
● Distance Learning Advisory Committee
● Faculty focus groups
● Educational Technology Department meetings
● Feedback from TLC workshops participants
● Onliners list-serv
● Institutional initiative for SLOs and Assessment
● Identified a Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist faculty position to replace the IT position that was moved with the ITS re-organization

Decisions to adopt or not adopt technology are primarily fiscally and human resources based. New ideas about technology discussed at TLTR. Outside vendors often present new educational technologies to the Roundtable.

Faculty teaching online have been given priority for a desktop or laptop. Ed Tech received new equipment in spring 2011. Faculty teaching distance learning classes have access to new desktops, a scanner, and a multi-media station along with software to support their teaching needs. Faculty also can make an appointment with Ed Tech staff to talk about any technology or pedagogy questions they might have in their distance learning class.

III.C.1.d. Self Evaluation. In past years there has not been a College-wide systematic process for prioritizing and funding technology needs including updating and maintaining both hardware and software. Prior to Fall 2012, decision-making on acquisition and distribution of computer lab equipment was not well coordinated. The Technology Plan includes goals for improving data gathering by expanding the use of AccuTrack and other existing software to help evaluate the efficiency of equipment distribution and utilization. Academic program needs combined with usage data and human, financial and facilities resources to support technology will determine redistribution and consolidation decisions.

As a result of recommendations by the ACCJC, plans to streamline and improve the ongoing maintenance, replacement and upgrading of equipment were developed. These were tied to college-wide planning and budgeting improvements. In the FY13-14 budget approved by the Board of Trustees, $1,130,000 has been allocated for improvement of Technology Resources. A rubric has been developed to rank requests coming through Program Review and has been implemented for the FY13-14 academic year. In addition, after extending the 2009-11
Technology Plan for one year, a new, more strategic plan was developed for 2013-15, approved by ITAC in October 2012, and sent to the FIT Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Students have requested one lab with long hours that can access all software for homework assignments. In some cases staffing for labs limits availability of hours more than equipment or facilities. In addition to this, the presence of only one electrician in the District occasionally slows the implementation or distribution of technology resources. Wireless printing has been requested by students, and efforts continue to be made to evaluate how best to accomplish this. Additional efforts are needed in order to minimize the impact due to PG&E power outages. This will include redesigning key infrastructure component to leverage the capabilities of existing backup generators.

In January, 2012, the press reported on suspected virus infections at CCSF. In response, the ITS department conducted extensive virus scanning of desktop machines, educated faculty, staff, and students on the importance of having up-to-date anti-virus software, and closely examined computer systems and network traffic to determine the extent of any problems. It was determined that the virus infection was essentially limited to the International Students computer lab which had old computer systems that had their anti-virus software disabled in order to improve their speed. District policy forbidding the disabling of anti-virus software has since been clarified in the Network Management Policies and Procedures approved by ITPC (now ITAC) in May 2012. This incident points to one of the problems faced when computer systems are out of date, the virus protection software runs too slow. CCSF is addressing this issue by allocating resources for desktop computer replacement on a regular 5-year cycle. In addition to this, the U.S. higher education community, including CCSF, receives cyber security services from an organization called the Research and Education Networking Information Sharing and Analysis Center (REN-ISAC). This organization monitors the Internet for certain types of viruses and determines where infected systems are located. It then notifies responsible parties and provides information allowing them to take action to remove the virus and other malware. CCSF received one notice from REN-ISAC during 2012 regarding a virus on college-owned equipment. Action was taken immediately to remove the virus and place the equipment back in service.


- Given the pace of changes in educational technology, it is vital that Ed Tech staff are trained in the most up-to-date hardware and software. Given the recent budget situation both at the College and State-wide, funding for such professional development has been non-existent. Realizing that we must keep up with the changes, both the Ed Tech Chair and the TLC Coordinator have used personal funds to attend conferences related to distance learning and educational technology. For example, both attended the Teaching and Learning Online Conference in June 2012 and the Chair attended Moodle Moot in July 2011. Additionally, to support the changing focus of Ed Tech, the TLC Coordinator completed @One’s Online Teaching Certificate in fall 2011.

- With the ITS re-organization, the $5000 budget that was used by Ed Tech to hire peer trainers for the TLC was re-allocated by the newly hired CTO. Previously, the budget was used to award grants to faculty so they could provide professional development workshops related to educational technologies. This loss in funds has significantly
impacted the amount of trainings in teaching and learning with technology that Ed Tech can provide.

- The College has still not hired a faculty DLTS position.
- In spring 2013, the TLC Coordinator position as reduced to a .4 from a .8 re-assigned time. This is a significant loss in support for distance learning faculty as all staff in Ed Tech are cross-trained.


- Action agendas to improve meeting this standard include improving wireless capabilities;
- consolidating computer access for more effective use within budget constraints; implement, review, and communicate the Technology Plan; improve usage data gathering; examine and re-evaluate security structures and options, review new decision-making structures as relates to distribution and use of technology; improve the human resources provided to Ed Tech in support for distance learning.
- Future Requirement: Information and Network Security requires a continuous ongoing improvement process due to the dynamic nature of this technology.


- Restore TLC Coordinator re-assigned time to 80%
- Hire a Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist to replace the previously filled IT 1033.
- Restore Tech Support personnel so there is back-up to the System Administrator. Restore internal grants management program for training teachers in educational technology software.
- Migrate the learning management system to Moodle 2.0 (includes training staff, faculty, and back-end set-up).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.C.1.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand wireless access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide wireless printing capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Information and Network Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Technology Plan objectives related to distribution and use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve mechanisms for gathering data on effectiveness of technology distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain acceptable levels of security and robustness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review effectiveness of decisions about distribution of technology made under new planning, budgeting and administrative structure

Examine program review requests submitted in 2012, use of rubrics, rankings, and decisions made for the 2013 budget through participatory governance groups and evaluate results

12/31/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed Tech</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restore TLC Coordinator re-assigned time to 80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire a Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist to replace the previously filled IT 1033.</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Tech Support personnel so there is back-up to the System Administrator.</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore internal grants management program for training teachers in educational technology software.</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrate the learning management system to Moodle 2.0 (includes training staff, faculty, and back-end set-up.</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.C.2. *Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.*

III.C.2. **Descriptive Summary.** Technology planning is integrated with the institutional planning process at the Board of Trustees and Strategic Plan levels. This process determines the Annual Plan, Technology Plan and departmental and unit level processes including Program Review. The Technology Plan for 2013-15 was rewritten at a strategic level and linked to the goals in the College’s Strategic Plan. The 2013-15 Technology Plan provides objectives for review and improvements to the Technology Planning process, recognizing that technology resources are dynamic in nature and require ongoing assessment in order to remain effective. In the college’s new planning structure, Program Review and Annual Plans detail specifics in keeping with learning outcomes and institutional planning documents. Technology objectives, activities, and funding requests included in departmental Program Reviews and Annual Plans will be aligned with the strategic Technology Plan goals.

The Technology Plan is used as part of the prioritization process for decisions about technology purchases during the budgeting and planning cycle. It is developed on a three-year cycle to allow comprehensive and intermediate term planning. It includes technology resources utilized by the Information Technology Services Department, the Library Learning Resource Center, Broadcast and Electronic Media Arts, the Educational Technology Department and Student Development. As a result of this broad scope and the participation of associated staff members, the needs of multiple programs and service areas are incorporated into the plan in order to assist with institution-wide effectiveness.

A Program Review document is submitted by the Information Technology Services Department (ITS) based on needs for common technology which serves all departments and
units within CCSF. Each Academic and Administrative Department also submits a Program Review document in which their technology needs can be described and requested. All Program Review requests are evaluated and prioritized by the respective Deans and Vice Chancellors using a rubric to rank requests. The approved requests incorporate resources required in order to complete the associated implementation. Some decisions about the distribution of technology resources for Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs are made as a result of allocation of funding under the Perkins Act. The College has an internal review process for Perkins funding that includes an application process and committee review.

The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) is part of the Participatory Governance process and performs an advising role and assists with evaluating the effectiveness of technology resources to meet institutional needs. The Teaching, Learning and Technology Roundtable (TLTR) recommends policies for the effective use of technology in instructional support and student services programs. An employee Technology Survey is conducted to determine the effectiveness of technology that is currently in use and is a mechanism for improving future technology deployments. ITS has an online suggestion box to receive feedback from employees on an ongoing basis in order to implement improvements or incorporate new functionality to meet program needs.

**III.C.2. Descriptive Summary – Ed Tech.**

- City College of San Francisco makes sure that its technology needs for distance learning are identified and met in a variety of ways:
  - The Employee Technology Survey (the next survey will be administered in spring 2013)
  - TLC Surveys
  - Online Faculty Survey
  - Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable
  - Distance Learning Advisory Committee
  - Faculty focus groups
  - Educational Technology Department meetings
  - Feedback from TLC workshops participants
  - Online list-serv
  - Institutional initiative for SLOs and Assessment
  - Identified a Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist faculty position to replace the IT position that was moved with the ITS re-organization

Technology needs for distance learning are prioritized based on budget, human resources and the actual educational value of the technology.

**III.C.2. Self Evaluation.** Prior to FY12-13 technology needs identified in the Program Review process were not reviewed at the institution level and institution-wide prioritization was not done. These critical steps are now incorporated into the strategic planning process and will require ongoing oversight to ensure the process functions as it is intended. Program Review now includes a rubric for ranking resource allocation requests, but the rubric will require evaluation and possible modification to ensure a continuous improvement process. The prioritization and allocation process will need to be transparent to the college community to allow for effective analysis and evaluation.
Annual technology replacement costs have been estimated and funding has been included in the FY13-14 Financial Plan. Existing grant programs have been beneficial to CCSF and will remain active although all required funding will be included in the General Fund. A systematic assessment regarding the effective use of technology resources will need to be performed based on utilization metrics. The results will be used to implement improvements to the overall process. This will have to take into account the evolving nature of technology combined with the evolving needs of CCSF programs. Technology-based services used at CCSF are broad in scope and decision metrics will not necessarily be the same for all services nor will the same metrics be used for all academic programs.


- Insight (Moodle) is one of the top learning management systems in the world. It is used in both the corporate and educational environments. We recognize that we need more human resources in order to continue to support the rapid growth in the use of Insight for face-to-face classes. Also, the College should be able to offer the use of Insight to non-credit instructors for their face-to-face classes. It is important that the College complete the upgrade to Moodle 2.0 in order to continue to take advantage of this robust learning management system. Insight has assessment tools within it and it is important to keep in the most current version to use these tools.

- TLC Workshops can focus more on institutional goals regarding SLOs and Assessment.

- The TLC Workshops cannot meet the above without the restoration of the TLC Coordinator to a .8 re-assigned time in Ed Tech.


- IT resources will be prioritized at the institution level (Annually starting Spring 2013)

- ITS changing practices to better evaluate taking on projects (June 2013)

- ITS priorities will come from the prioritized list produced through Program Review (June 2013)

- CCSF changing funding model to pay for IT resources (July 2013)

- All budgeting will be done with “U” funds (no more reliance on Bonds, Grants, or other one time monies) (Spring 2013)

- Metrics will be used to ensure computer replacement is justified (July 2013)


- Actionable items related to this standard focus on providing more workshops related to SLOs.

- Collaboration between the Ed Tech Department and the SLO Coordinator can provide more specific topic training in areas such as e-portfolios, rubrics, SLO mapping in Insight shells, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.C.2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-187-
IT resources will be prioritized at the institution level thru Program Review

ITS priorities will include the prioritized list produced through Program Review

All technology budgeting will be done using General Funds

Utilization metrics will be used to access effective use of technology resources

Desktop computers will be replaced on a 5-year cycle

TLC Workshops on SLO integration

Migrate to 2.0

Restore TLC Coordinator to .8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT resources will be prioritized at the institution level thru Program Review</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS priorities will include the prioritized list produced through Program Review</td>
<td>7/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All technology budgeting will be done using General Funds</td>
<td>7/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization metrics will be used to access effective use of technology resources</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computers will be replaced on a 5-year cycle</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC Workshops on SLO integration</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrate to 2.0</td>
<td>More human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore TLC Coordinator to .8</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.D. Financial Resources

Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning at both college and district/system levels in multi-college systems.

III.D.1. The institution’s mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning.

III.D.1.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

III.D.1./III.D.1.a. Descriptive Summary. The College’s new Mission Statement adopted in Fall 2012 will improve the College’s ability to plan the distribution of resources. The prior mission statement did not provide specific priorities for the College to follow in planning and budgeting. The new statement corrected that deficiency, and is a step toward the College acknowledging that it cannot do everything requested of it with current resources. The new Mission Statement will provide guidance for the development of the 2013-14 budget. Similarly, the Annual Priorities that the Board of Trustees adopted in early Fall 2012 will also provide direction for the development of the 2013-14 final budget.

The 2012-13 budget did contain an Annual Plan with many institutional goals, covering virtually all of the College’s activities. However these goals need to be fully informed by the Program Review process as part of a continuing cycle of planning budgeting and assessment.

The institution does have other plans that can be incorporated into the annual planning and budget development process, such as the Technology Plan, and the Sustainability Plan but the most important of these plans, the Education Master Plan needs to be updated. When this revision is complete, it will be used to drive the some of the goals of the other institutional plans. The priority for 2012-13 was to maintain solvency, beyond that priorities for competing needs were not clearly established. The revised Mission Statement and Board of Trustees priorities will help to address this deficiency in 2013-14.

The 2012-13 final budget document includes the College’s Annual Plan, but it does not provide any documentation linking the budget to planning. Annual assessments do provide information to help determine if the College is making progress on institutional priorities, but
also do not demonstrate the link between budget and planning. The Board of Trustees budget book for 2012-13 budget document did not contain documentation linking the annual plan to the annual budget. An example of progress in this area is the new Technology Plan that will be incorporated in the development of the 2013-14 budget.

**III.D.1./III.D.1.a. Self Evaluation.** The College does not currently meet the standard. The annual planning and budget cycle needs to be redesigned and clearly spelled out in a specific annual timeline. “Workgroup 2: Planning” has done this. To meet the standard the College will need to begin implementation of this cycle in December 2012 with the current round of Program Review. This must be followed by Administrative recommendations for the distribution of resources that are based on the results of program review. These recommendations in turn must go through the participatory governance review process before a proposed budget is developed. After the budget is approved and the new fiscal year is underway, annual performance indicators must be distributed and reviewed so that they can inform the establishment of new planning priorities for the next fiscal year allowing the cycle to continue. (For additional detail see Workgroup 2) (PLEASE CHECK TO MAKE SURE THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH PAM MERY’S WRITEUP)

In addition, the College must continue its efforts to ensure that data used for budgets and program review is accurate and useful for all managers.

It is also critical that the College generates an updated Education Master Plan, as this is a vital piece of the overall planning process, and is a document that other plans should draw from.

**III.D.1./III.D.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plans.** During December 2012 the College must conduct a comprehensive Program Review.

The College needs to immediately begin the implementation of the revised planning and budget system.

In addition, the College must ensure that data used for budgets and program review is accurate and useful for all managers.

The College must update and reissue its Education Master Plan

**Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.1./III.D.1.a.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct comprehensive Program Review</td>
<td>Resource Allocations for Annual budgets based on results of Program Review</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Revised Planning and Budgeting System</td>
<td>Board Adoption of Preliminary Budget that is a product of the revised system</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish which office is responsible for meeting the need for accurate useful Program Review data and take further steps to ensure that data is accurate and useful</td>
<td>Senior manager ensure that programming resources are available for improved data</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III.D.1.b.** Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.
III.D.1.b. Descriptive Summary. Information about available resources was communicated via multiple shared governance bodies in the past, a new home for these types of presentations should be established in the new participatory governance system. Accurate information about available unrestricted funds on a district wide level is generally available to individuals involved in the planning process. This data is contained in annual budget documents and in the annual 311 report submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office. More work is needed for the College’s managers to have accurate data for their unit level budgets so that unit level plans and budgets are directly connected.

Information related to restricted funds needs to be provided in a more understandable manner.

Ongoing commitments such as the employer share of fringe benefits in general and the “pay-go” portion of post retirement health benefits in particular are detailed in the annual budget.

While funding priorities were not at odds with the mission statement or annual goals in the past, the mission and goals were quite broad and did not provide directional focus for the budget. The new mission statement is a first step toward changing this. In the recent past, student learning has been an increased priority, particularly in the area of student equity.

III.D.1.b. Self Evaluation. The college partially meets this standard. Data related to restricted funds needs to be more readily available for college wide planning purposes. Data for unit level budgets needs to be more accurate in 2013-14 and thereafter.

While funding priorities were not at odds with the mission statement or annual goals in the past, the mission and goals were quite broad and did not provide directional focus for the budget. As a result the level of priority student learning has received cannot be easily documented. The new mission statement is a step toward changing this. The annual budget process needs to be fully implemented to ensure that this occurs.

III.D.1.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. Data related to restricted funds needs to be more readily available for planning purposes.

A core group managers and staff need to receive training to enter corrections into unit level personnel budgets to make these budgets more accurate.

Participatory governance system needs to designate appropriate group to receive ongoing information about available resources.

The College needs to immediately begin the implementation of the revised planning and budget system to allow for increased focus on student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.1.b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create New Restricted Funds Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core group trained to enter budget corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Revised Planning and Budgeting System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.D.1.c. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

III.D.1.c. Descriptive Summary. The College used a three year model to project future costs and revenue as part of the process for monitoring the 2011-12 and for developing the 2012-13 budget. The priorities for the 2012-13 budget were to reduce spending sufficiently to achieve a balanced budget assuming the passage of Proposition 30, and to achieve base enrollment with that level of state funding. Another priority was to maintain resources available for instruction at about the same level on a percentage basis as in recent years.

The college has a relatively small ongoing expense that is financed in the form of a multi year lease.

The budget for 2012-13 contains the full current year obligation but only a modest amount for the unfunded OPEB liability which is the college’s only significant long term obligation. The College does not currently have an agreed upon plan in place for funding its long term OPEB liability.

The College is developing an eight year plan for allocating funds it will receive from a local parcel tax beginning in 2013-14.

III.D.1.c. Self Evaluation. The three year budget model needs to be distributed and reviewed as a function of the new participatory governance system.

The college is currently budgeting only $500,000 per year for its share of the long term OPEB liability for retiree health insurance. The college needs to increase this annual allocation. The College also needs to complete negotiations on this issue with the labor unions that represent the workforce regarding employee contributions and eligibility criteria.

The college partially meets the first part of the standard but does not meet the second part of the standard as it lacks a plan for funding OPEB. The college has a draft plan for this important item but it has not yet been approved.

III.D.1.c. Actionable Improvement Plans. Wide distribution of three year budget model in participatory governance system for the purpose of sharing data and receiving input.

Implement a plan for fully funding long-term OPEB liability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.1.c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of three year budget model in participatory governance system and receive input from college constituencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a plan for fully funding long-term OPEB liability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.D.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.
III.D.1.d. Descriptive Summary. For 2012-13 processes for planning and budget development did provide some opportunities for participation for constituency representatives in the early stages of its development. The final budget was not submitted to constituencies for their endorsement.

New planning and budget system is being developed by Workgroup #2 the details are contained in that section

New participatory governance system will establish the processes and opportunities for constituent participation that will replace the ones that were in place under the old shared governance system. The former system included a College Planning and Budget Council that served as a forum for budget matters and budget development.

These decisions will be posted on the college website and emailed as a link to all employees

III.D.1.d. Self Evaluation. The old shared governance system did provide opportunities for constituency representatives to participate in planning and budget development.

New participatory governance system needs to quickly establish the processes and opportunities for constituent participation that will replace the ones that were in place under the old shared governance system.

These decisions need to be posted on the college website and emailed as a link to all employees.

The college has met this standard in the past but needs new participation forums to meet the standard in the future.

III.D.1.d. Actionable Improvement Plans. New participatory governance system needs to quickly establish the processes and opportunities for constituent participation that will replace the ones that were in place under the old shared governance system.

These decisions need to be posted on the college website and emailed to all employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.1.d.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Associated Action(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory governance system establishes processes and opportunities for constituent participation</td>
<td>Decision by Participatory governance Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide spread communication of participatory governance council decisions</td>
<td>Decisions posted on the college website and emailed to all employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.D.2. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of its financial resources, the internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.

III.D.2.a. Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

III.D.2.a. Descriptive Summary. The College employs a variety of control mechanisms to ensure responsible use of financial resources in accordance with Board policies. Detailed
matrices are used for designating signature authority for contract execution and invoice payments. Financial transactions are subject to review by both external auditors and to a very limited review by the College’s internal auditor.

The annual budget, the annual audit report, and all quarterly financial reports are available on the College’s website. The annual budget document reflects the cost of carrying out the District’s annual operating objectives in support of student learning programs and services and in accordance with Board of Trustees’ mandates. The final budget incorporates the availability of state and local funding, and includes a summary of the activities the budget will support.

The annual audit for fiscal year 2010-11 was unacceptably late. In addition, recent annual audits have detailed several findings that require action by the college, for 2010-11 this included three separate material weaknesses.

### III.D.2.a. Self Evaluation.

The budget planning cycle used for fiscal year 2012-13 does not adequately document the allocation of resources in a manner that supports student learning. The annual financial statement audits provide the readers of those statements the opinion of the external auditors that the financial statements are presented fairly in all material respect. The readers may also infer from the independent auditors, opinion that the institution has adequate financial management system.

The institution continues to work on corrective actions recommended by its auditors, but needs to accelerate progress in this area. While some of the audit findings have been corrected, more significant and costly audit exceptions continue to be in the implementation phase. For example, funding the OPEB liability and accounting for the federally funded fixed assets continue to be a high priority for the College.

The college only partially meets this standard, and needs to add accounting staff to fully meet it. The hiring process for accounting resources began in Fall 2012.

### III.D.2.a. Actionable Improvement Plans.

The College will need to address all remaining audit findings from 2010-11 and any new findings from 2012-13. This includes the need to develop a plan to fund its unfunded OPEB liability, the need to address the annual inventory of assets and compliance issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.2.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address all remaining audit findings from 2010-11 and any new findings from 2012-13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III.D.2.b. Descriptive Summary.

The independent auditor presents all audit findings directly to the Board of Trustees or the Board’s Audit Committee in an open public session. The District’s Business Office responds to all audit recommendations in as timely a manner as feasible. Those recommendations that can be effectively implemented within the next
audit cycle are identified and changes are implemented. Typically, audit findings are brought to the College’s attention in December; therefore some recommendations require a longer time horizon for completion than the next audit year. In the past some audit findings have not been addressed in a timely manner. The District is currently working on implementing changes needed as identified in the fiscal year 2010-11 audit report.

III.D.2.b. Self Evaluation. During the budget planning process, District’s Business Office meets with various constituent groups, the Board of Trustees, and other stakeholders to prepare the tentative and final budgets. Each year, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration (VCFA) receives information from State Chancellor’s Office and the City and County of San Francisco about the revenues to anticipate for that fiscal year. Other restricted funding sources provide letters of funding to the District to ensure restricted programs continue to be funded and operational. During meetings with all stakeholders, VCFA provides monthly updates on the budget and the fiscal condition of the College at public Board of Trustees’ meetings.

The 2011 audit report was unacceptably late. The college has added resources to make the 2012 audit report timely, but the need for a special investigation prompted by a whistleblower’s allegations caused the report to be delivered after December 31st. The investigation concluded that the allegations were not true.

The college only partially meets this standard.

III.D.2.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The District’s Business Office needs to provide updates regarding progress on addressing audit findings and communicate this information to college constituencies. Accounting staff must be added to accomplish this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.2.b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Business Office needs to coordinate making progress addressing audit findings and communicate this information to college constituencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.D.2.c. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution in a timely manner.

III.D.2.c. Descriptive Summary. The most severe economic downturn since the Great Depression and the slow recovery that has ensued has created significant financial challenges for the College.

For fiscal year 2010-11 the five per cent available unrestricted general fund balance as recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office was achieved.

For fiscal year 2011-12 available unrestricted general fund balance was significantly less than the five per cent recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office.

While much budget related information is available on the college’s web site, this data needs to be more timely.
The Board designated Reserve on June 30, 2012 was only $4M, an inadequate amount. The institution has secured enough cash to handle its needs by issuing TRANs and making use of line of credit extended each year by the County Treasury.

The college is a member of the ASCIP and SELF insurance pools for property and liability insurance. The college is self-insured for workers compensation claims of up to $500,000 and independently purchases excess coverage for claims greater than amount.

The College has acquired Argos software to make data more usable and more useful to managers.

**III.D.2.c. Self Evaluation.** The District’s reserves are not sufficient to address emergencies. Beginning in fiscal year 2013-14 the College will improve its reserves, and meet the five per cent guideline established by the State Chancellor’s Office.

The State of California continues to be behind on making its apportionment payments and this has caused severe cash-flow problems for California Community Colleges. City College of San Francisco uses short-term instruments known as Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) to cover its expenditures until the cash is received from its apportionment (unrestricted) and grants (restricted) funds. These needs should decrease in 2013-14 with the passage of Proposition 30.

The College property and liability insurance coverage with ASCIP and SELF is adequate. The college works with an actuary to make sure that adequate resources are being set aside for the self-funded portion of Worker’s Compensation claims.

Because of its inadequate reserves the college does not currently meet this standard.

**III.D.2.c. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The College needs to increase the Board Designated Reserve to ensure that it meets the minimum five per cent guideline established by the State Chancellor’s Office.

Offer widespread training in the use of Argos software to enable managers to make data driven decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.2.c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the Board Designated Reserve to ensure that it meets the minimum five per cent guideline established by the State Chancellor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure timely informative information is available to the college constituencies regarding budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable managers to make data driven decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III.D.2.d.** All financial resources, including short and long term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.
III.D.2.d. Descriptive Summary. The College uses its financial resources, including all financial resources from short- and long term debt instruments (such as bonds and TRANs), auxiliary activities, fundraising efforts, and grants with integrity and in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source. Oversight processes are in place and independent audits are conducted annually to ensure the integrity and compliance with those funding sources.

III.D.2.d. Self Evaluation. The College goes through annual audits and takes recommendations made by its external auditors as a means to improve its fiscal management. In addition, the College’s administrators meet regularly to review their procedures and improve fiscal management when deficiencies are noted and identified.

The external auditors, as well as, the financial program reviews provide guidance to senior management about fiscal management of the college through a well established guidelines and industry business practices. Recommendations are developed and reported to the Board of Trustees when the current conditions are materially different than the criteria they were compared with.

While design and implementation of internal controls are a management function, external and internal auditors test those controls and express an opinion about the efficiency and effectiveness of those controls. The College has been very slow at implementing some of the more significant recommendations made by its external auditors due to lack of resources.

The District reviews its debt repayment obligations annually with its external auditors and sets aside funds to repay its obligations. The College has received audit findings and/or negative reviews from its external auditors and has not always managed to address those findings and recommendations in a timely manner. Resource limitations have caused a delay in implementation of addressing those audit findings.

The college partially meets this standard.

III.D.2.d. Actionable Improvement Plans. The College will accelerate its efforts to address audit recommendations by adding accounting staff and by maintaining contract services for fixed assets inventories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address audit recommendations</td>
<td>Address audit recommendations by adding accounting staff and by maintaining contract services for fixed assets inventories</td>
<td>3/30/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.D.2.e. Descriptive Summary. The institution’s internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

III.D.2.e. Descriptive Summary. The College’s system of internal controls are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness annually via testing by its external auditors, as well as, other auditors during their fieldwork. The results of those assessments are communicated to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor and improvements are initiated by senior management.
External funders provide annual monitoring questionnaires to the College. The VCFA or designee responds to these questionnaires as expeditiously as possible.

The College’s Student Financial Aid is routinely audited by the U.S. Department of Education.

The College relies on its external auditors to perform the assurance activities necessary of the special or designated funds as part of their annual audit work. The annual external audits conducted by the Independent Accountants provide recommendations to senior management about the integrity of the financial management practices at the College and means to improve those controls. Those recommendations are reviewed by the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor. Senior management implements as many recommendations as possible, given its current resource constraints, before the next audit cycle.

Expenditures of those special/designated (also referred to as restricted) funds meet the intended requirements of the funding agency and in cases where exceptions are noted, the College reverses the charges and allocates the charges to its general fund. The College also seeks the advice and counsel of its General Obligations Bond Counsel, as needed with respect to use of bond proceeds. The legal counsel provides directions and assistance in interpreting the bond language when a particular expenditure may be in question.

III.D.2.e. Self Evaluation. Financial integrity and sound management practices are important to the College. Senior management relies on independent auditors to evaluate the internal control systems and to identify weaknesses if they exist.

The District Business Office is moving towards addressing and coordinating implementation of all recommendations made by external auditors but this will take additional time.

The College meets this standard.

III.D.2.e. Actionable Improvement Plans. <text>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.2.e.</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate implementation of audit recommendations</td>
<td>Some by June 2013, others by January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chief Financial Officer will work with other managers to address audit recommendation

III.D.3. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability.

III.D.3.a. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and develops contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

III.D.3.a. Descriptive Summary. Cash flow has been a significant challenge due to state deferrals of apportionment payments. The College has managed this with both Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) and with short term cash provided by the City and County of San Francisco. Total TRANs issued for 2012-13 are $49.6M.
While total fund balance was $17.6 M on June 30, 2012, the usable portion of the College’s fund balance did not meet the 5 per cent minimum threshold at the end of fiscal year 2011-12. Pre-audit data shows the Board Designated Reserve at about $4M on June 30, 2012 with unrestricted general fund expenditures of $194.6M.

**III.D.3.a. Self Evaluation.** While it has not been easy the College has managed its cash flow with a combination of TRANs and assistance from the City. This should improve in 2013-14 with the recent passage of Prop 30 and Prop A. the College meets this part of the standard.

The College must increase its reserves to meet and then exceed the five per cent minimum threshold. The College can meet this part of the standard with the adoption of the 2013-14 budget by making prudent allocations of new parcel tax revenues that the College will begin to receive in 2013-14.

In addition the College needs to set aside funds in a reserve for unforeseen occurrences that can happen in any fiscal year.

Because of inadequate reserves the college does not currently meet this standard. The college last met the five per cent minimum threshold for fund balance on June 30, 2011.

**III.D.3.a. Actionable Improvement Plans.**

Continue to manage cash flow with the use of TRANs

Allocate funds into the Board Designated Reserve in 2013-14 to meet the five per cent minimum threshold for fund balance.

Set funds in a reserve for unforeseen occurrences that can happen in any fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.3.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet five per cent minimum threshold for fund balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create reserve for emergencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III.D.3.b. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.**

**III.D.3.b. Descriptive Summary.** The College relies primarily on the Program Review process to assess the effective use of financial resources by all departments, including the use of grants and other external funds. This review is performed at the unit level.

The College has master agreements an independent auxiliary organization, the Bookstore, and with its foundation. Each of these auxiliaries is subject to an independent financial audit and each has a Board of Directors responsible for direct oversight.
III.D.3.b. Self Evaluation. Program Review to date has not been implemented in a comprehensive manner, it has only been used to identify and advocate for additional resources. Beginning with the new Program Review cycle in Fall 2012 this is being corrected.

The Foundation has significant assets and recent audits have not identified any significant problems in need of correction.

Changes driven by the digital world have had a major impact on the College Bookstore. In its current version, the Bookstore has at best two years before it becomes insolvent. As a result, the Bookstore Board recently approved a resolution to lease Bookstore operations to a private firm. This recommendation will be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval in December 2012 for possible implementation in Spring 2013. The lease payments would cover any remaining liabilities.

Once the bookstore is leased to a private operator the college will meet this standard.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.3.b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid insolvency for College Bookstore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and implement comprehensive program review process to assess effective use of financial resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.D.3.c. The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations.

III.D.3.c. Descriptive Summary. Through 2010-11 the College only allocated funds for the “pay-go” portion of OPEB. Beginning in 2011-12 the College allocated $500,000 per year towards this liability. The institution is not fully funding its annual required contribution.

III.D.3.c. Self Evaluation. The College has had actuarial studies performed to establish the long term liability associated with post retirement health care. That amount is currently $180.8 M for retirements that occur at age 65 and an additional $54.3M if retirements occur prior to age 65, bringing the total to $235.1M if all retirements occur before age 65.

There is a 2012-13 allocation for OPEB of $7.5 M that only covers the pay-go portion, and this allocation will need to increase by $600,000 to $1,000,000 per year in the future. There is $500,000 allocated in 2012-13 for the long term liability. This amount needs to increase to more than $8M per year to reach the level needed to fully fund this liability.

The college does not currently meet this standard.

III.D.3.c. Actionable Improvement Plans. Begin increasing the employer contribution for the College’s long term OPEB liability in 2013-14 and negotiate employee contributions for this liability with labor unions representing the College’s workforce. The College needs to
designate an increasing amount each year to reach full funding of the ARC. The goal for reaching full funding is fiscal year 2020-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address long term OPEB liability</td>
<td>Increase Employer Contribution</td>
<td>7/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate Employee Contribution</td>
<td>7/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach full funding of OPEB ARC</td>
<td>Annual increases in both employer and employee contributions</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III.D.3.d.** The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is prepared, as required by appropriate accounting standards.

**III.D.3.d. Descriptive Summary.** Actuarial studies for OPEB liability is updated regularly. Last report was issued November 2011. The college currently does not have an agreed upon plan for fully funding its Annual Required Contribution.

**III.D.3.d. Self Evaluation.** See III.D.3.c

**III.D.3.d. Actionable Improvement Plans.** See III.D.3.c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See III.D.3.c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III.D.3.e.** On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.

**III.D.3.e. Descriptive Summary.** The only locally incurred debts the college incurs are annual Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) for cash flow needs and general obligation bonds associated with local bond measures.

**III.D.3.e. Self Evaluation.** The college TRANs issues each year to deal with cash flow needs. For fiscal year 2012-13 the amount issued was approximately $49M. With the passage of Prop 30, the college expects to be able to reduce its TRANs in the future. The college has repaid its TRANs in a timely manner without fail. The college incurs net interest costs for this borrowing of about $500,000, this cost is incurred by the unrestricted general fund.

General obligation bonds associated with local bond measures are repaid by the local property tax base and do not impose a cost on the college’s operating budget.
The college meets this standard.

**III.D.3.e. Actionable Improvement Plans.** Modify projected annual cash needs for 2013-14 now that state Proposition 30 and local Proposition A have been passed by voters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce borrowing for cash needs</td>
<td>Modify 2013-14 TRANs based on Prop 30 and Prop A</td>
<td>6/30/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III.D.3.f.** Institutions monitor and manage student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements.

**III.D.3.f. Descriptive Summary.** The default rate for the past three years is:

- 19.43% for 11/12
- 17.6% for 10/11
- 18.33% for 9/10

This rate is within federal guidelines.

The college does not have a plan for reducing this default rate.

**III.D.3.f. Self Evaluation.** The college’s default rate has stayed at about the same rate for the past three years. The college does need a plan for reducing this rate.

**III.D.3.f. Actionable Improvement Plans.** ASK STUDENT SERVICES TO PROVIDE THIS

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

**III.D.3.g.** Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.

**III.D.3.g. Descriptive Summary.** The college enters into a great many contractual agreements with outside entities each year for a variety of purposes including but not limited to personal services contracts, capital projects contracts, software licenses and clinical agreements for placing students.
Generally any contractual agreement goes to the Board of Trustees for advance approval. Exceptions include smaller personal services agreements that are entered into under authority granted to the Chancellor.

After Board approval, current practice requires all contracts that do not use college boiler plate language to be reviewed by counsel prior to sign off. Invoices are not paid without a signed contract.

III.D.3.g. Self Evaluation. Contracts are generally consistent with institutional mission and goals. Appropriate controls are in place to manage contracts, although a restoration of the position formerly responsible for initial review and tracking of contracts would be helpful. Federal guidelines are adhered to for contracts, however the college has not met all requirements for monitoring subrecipient agreements, this is particularly true as it relates to site visits.

The college is becoming more selective in its pursuit of grants due to the wide variance in indirect cost reimbursement rates offered by grantors.

The college partially meets this standard.

III.D.3.g. Actionable Improvement Plans. College needs to either designate personnel responsible for monitoring subrecipient agreements or not take on the role of fiscal agent for federal grants that generate subrecipients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.3.g.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet all requirements for monitoring subrecipient agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.D.3.h. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management practices and the results of the evaluation are used to improve internal control structures.

III.D.3.h. Descriptive Summary. The college has an independent external audit conducted for each fiscal year, the results of which provide feedback on financial management practices and internal controls.

The college reviews past fiscal planning to improve future fiscal planning.

III.D.3.h. Self Evaluation. Annual audits are performed by qualified CPA firms. The audit for fiscal year 2010-11 was delivered unacceptably late. The college has employed multiple additional resources to generate an “on-time” audit for fiscal year 2011-12.

Annual budget plans are reviewed during the biweekly forecasting process that goes on throughout the fiscal year. Information generated in this process is used to inform budget strategies for the succeeding fiscal year.

The college partially meets this standard, on time audits and comprehensive program review connected to planning and budget will be need to fully meet this standard.
III.D.3.h. Actionable Improvement Plans.

Increase staff in the accounting department to ensure timely independent annual audit reports.
Implement comprehensive program review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation III.D.3.h.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely independent annual audit reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.D.4. Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement of the institution.

**III.D.4. Descriptive Summary.** Financial decisions for fiscal year 2012-13 were based on the need to maintain solvency, beyond that priorities for competing needs are not yet clearly established. Allocations for 2012-13 were not clearly based on an evaluation of program and service needs. The 2012-13 final budget document includes the College’s Annual Plan, but it does not provide documentation linking the budget to planning. Annual program review documents have provided information to help determine if the College is making progress on institutional priorities, but do not yet demonstrate the link between budget and planning.

Workgroup 2 – Planning, has developed a new detailed cycle for planning and budget that will be implemented for fiscal year 2013-14.

**III.D.4. Self Evaluation.** The college’s 2012-13 budget process did not adequately integrate financial planning with institutional planning. To meet the standard the College will need to begin implementation of the newly developed planning and budget cycle in December 2012 with the next round of Program Review. This must be followed by Administrative recommendations for the distribution of resources that are based on the results of program review. These recommendations in turn must go through the participatory governance review process before a proposed budget is developed.

After the budget is approved and the new fiscal year is underway, annual performance indicators must be distributed and reviewed so that they can inform the establishment of new planning priorities for the next fiscal year allowing the cycle to continue. (For additional detail see Workgroup 2)

The college does not currently meet this standard, but will meet it with implementation of the budget planning cycle for 2013-14.

**III.D.4. Actionable Improvement Plans.** Implement new planning and budget cycle for the annual budget for fiscal year 2013-14. This must include a systemic assessment of the effectiveness of the use of resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve connection between planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

IV.A.1. Descriptive Summary. In its July 2012 determination letter, ACCJC recommended “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).

The Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District established the City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System, in accordance with Title 5, Section 53200 in 1993. To support the Shared Governance System, the Chancellor and the Academic Senate, with the approval of the College Advisory Council (CAC), created the Office of Shared Governance in 1994.

Until Fall 2012, the CCSF Shared Governance organization consisted of three systems, each with a set of permanent committees:

- **Collegial Governance System**: The Academic Senate Executive Council was responsible for making recommendations to the Chancellor and Board based on input from the following committees: Academic Policies, Curriculum, Staff Development, and Student Prep/Success.

- **College Advisory Governance System**: Membership was comprised of senior administrators and elected leaders from student, faculty and classified organizations.

- **Budget and Planning Governance System**: The Planning and Budget Council met monthly and more often when needed to review budget and planning issues. Committees reporting to the Budget and Planning Council included: Classified Position Allocation, Faculty Position Allocation, Program Review, Research, and Facilities Review.
All constituent groups of the City College community—students, faculty, classified and administrators—were represented in Shared Governance committees. The committees established sub-committees and task forces, wherever needed and appropriate. Collectively, there were over 80 committees in which over 400 members of the college community participated.

While the previous system was comprehensive and encouraged Collegewide participation, among other merits, the workgroup focusing on ACCJC’s Recommendations 12 and 13 identified a number of shortcomings and barriers inherent in the system that impeded decision-making. The workgroup also discussed the value of using the term “Participatory Governance” versus “Shared Governance” in that it more accurately reflects the advisory nature of college councils and committees. This process involved input from College leaders from all constituencies.

During this same time period, administrators, classified managers, faculty and trustees participated in training sessions to better understand roles and responsibilities within a Shared Governance environment as an advisory participatory governance process. Facilitators included: Dr. Barbara Beno (President, ACCJC) & Trustee William McGinnis (Butte-Glen Community College), Scott Lay (President, Community College League of California), Michele Pilati (President, Academic Senate for Community Colleges), Dr. Narcisa Polonio (Association of Community Colleges Trustees).

The workgroup responsible for Recommendations 12 and 13 reviewed sample policies on Shared Governance from other districts and established a list of the ideal criteria for a Participatory Governance system. Given the review activities taking place, the Fall 2012 CCSF Shared Governance committee meeting schedule was suspended. The review activities resulted in a proposal for a revised Participatory Governance system and draft policies.

On November 15, 2012, the Board of Trustees established two new separate governance systems through Governance Board Policies 2.07 and 2.08:

- **Policy 2.07** established a **Participatory Governance System** that replaces the College Advisory Council and Planning and Budget Council with a new Governance Council which will have 16 appointed members representing all college constituent groups.

  The new Governance Council comprises four appointed members from each stakeholder group and allows for the provision of alternate stand-in members for the student stakeholder group. Membership to the Governance Council is for two year terms; except for students who would serve a one-year term. The Chancellor has the sole responsibility of supporting the Governance Council, and the Council is charged with determining committees and their charge.

- **Policy 2.08** established a **Collegial Governance System** with the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate in comprised of all full time and part time faculty represented by a 29 member elected Executive Council.
The Academic Senate Executive Council comprises 29 elected faculty members. Membership is for two-year terms. The Council elects officers each Spring for the following year. After a second two year term, faculty must sit out for a year and then may run for election to Council again.

The Academic Senate Executive Council discussed the Academic Senate committee structure and charge at Executive Council meetings on [dates of meetings/agenda and minutes as evidence].

The Academic Senate Executive Council is reviewing proposals for new committees with specific charges directly related to Accreditation Standards such as Educational Policies, Matriculation Advisory, Student Equity Strategies, Works of Art, Learning Communities & Career Pathways, Student Grade and File Committee and others.

**IV.A.1. Self Evaluation.** Since the inception of shared governance, the college had clearly written policies that delineated roles and responsibilities of all constituents in the decision-making process with formal structures for participation by staff, faculty, administrators, and students that facilitated cross-constituent communication. However, the College had difficulty maintaining a central repository of agendas, minutes and other records.

The process was nonetheless mysterious and cumbersome to some, and some groups lost sight of the fact that shared governance was advisory and thought it was their role to make decisions rather than present recommendations to a parent committee or Council.

Although there was typically representation from all stakeholders, and participants worked together and respected one another across all constituent groups, at times some stakeholder groups in attendance were outnumbered on committees. This created an inequitable system where students, the main beneficiaries of much of what is deliberated in participatory governance, were left confused and feeling unsupported. Without a process for equitable representation from all stakeholder groups, a level of distrust sometimes occurred, delaying the completion of committee business.

The fact that students have not been participating in Shared Governance at an optimal level was of particular concern. At one time, students received stipends from Associated Students for their participation, but that was stopped a few years ago. The workgroup believes that this is a major contributor to the lower participation rates and recommended reinstating this practice of providing students with stipends to boost participation. The Associated Students have reinstated the stipends as of Fall 2012 and will discuss further ways to enhance student contributions to Shared Governance.

The College believes it has addressed the overarching concerns relating to governance structures through the development of the new Participatory Governance system. A number of concerns remain.

For example, the College has not clearly defined procedures for how the two separate systems will interact. At the same time, the membership on the Participatory Governance Council is largely the same as it was in the previous Shared Governance system. This may limit the emergence of new perspectives and practices.

Although the regularly scheduled meetings of the Planning and Budgeting Council and the College Advisory Council were officially suspended during Fall 2012. This has raised
concerns that the College has been out of compliance with this Standard. However, the Accreditation Steering Committee served as a de facto governance council during this time given the representation of all constituencies on the Committee and until the Participatory Governance Council membership formed.

Given the streamlining of the Participatory Governance system, fewer individuals will have the opportunity to engage directly through participation in committees. Currently the system encompasses the Participatory Governance Council and four subcommittees. As the Participatory Governance system becomes more established, additional committees and workgroups may emerge which will provide more opportunities to serve.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the advisory roles of Participatory and Collegial Governance systems. Ensure that recommendations be made through proper channels within these systems. Final authority rests with the Board of Trustees without exception.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get council and committee systems underway as soon as possible to ensure compliance with this standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to encourage student participation in Participatory and Collegial Governance systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue governance professional development activities for the college as a whole to support academic democracy and a culture of inclusion in the newly established governance systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore options for increasing opportunities for faculty, staff, students administrators to serve on governance councils and committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and clearly describe and publicize protocol for stakeholders to introduce proposals, concerns and new ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and assess governance systems periodically by conducting college-wide surveys. Expand on most recent survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

IV.A.2. Descriptive Summary. Board Policies 2.07 and 2.08 describe the College’s governance system. Prior to the July 2012 Show Cause determination, only Board Policy 2.07 “Shared Governance Policy” described the Shared Governance system along with then Board Policy 1.04, “Public Access Sunshine Policy,” which pertains to “providing the public with timely and wide-ranging access to its meetings, written records and information,” including meetings of any committees within the governance system.
On November 15, 2012, the Board adopted two new policies to replace the previous version of Board Policy 2.07, one that retains the number of the old policy (2.07) and a new policy numbered 2.08. These revised and new policies grew out of the work that the College undertook as described in Standard IV.A.1. above in assessing its governance system. The new version of Board Policy 2.07, now entitled “City College of San Francisco District Policy on Participatory Governance,” describes how the four constituent groups (faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students) can participate in the decision-making processes of the College. Board Policy 2.07 specifies that administration, students, classified staff, and faculty are equally represented with four members from each group on the Participatory Governance Council and that the Chancellor shall bring recommendations from the Governance Council to the Board of Trustees, including divergent views in the event of lack of substantial unanimity.

Representatives of the Academic Senate and the Administration developed the new Board Policy 2.08 “City College of San Francisco Collegial Governance: Academic Senate” based on Title 5, Section 53200. The Academic Senate has reviewed and made changes to its committees and the procedures for individuals to bring forward and work collaboratively on ideas relating to the purview of the Academic Senate.

On November 15, 2012, the Board of Trustees also replaced BP 1.04 with the new BP 1.16 “Public Access Sunshine Policy.”

[Evidence: BP 20.7]
[Evidence: BP 2.08]
[Evidence: BP 1.16]

IV.A.2. Self Evaluation. Since the inception of the Shared Governance system at City College of San Francisco, the College has had written policies in place. While there has been a genuine commitment of all constituencies to the creation and implementation of a governance system, constituencies generally agree that a lack of clarity existed about the distinction between recommending groups/individuals and decision-making groups/individuals. Many individuals found no clear pathway to bring forward ideas from their constituencies, and students were under-represented on Shared Governance committees. To a certain extent, these issues resulted in a lack of trust within and toward the governance system. Moreover, not all individuals or entities consistently followed the procedures within the Shared Governance Handbook; this included protocols regarding the posting of agendas/minutes/recordings.

The participation of constituent groups in training sessions in Summer and Fall 2012 relating to participatory governance yielded greater understanding of how an ideal system operates, although some groups, such as the Board of Trustees, did not fully participate in the training sessions. The College designed the new and revised policies with the intention of better capturing the spirit of participatory governance and creating greater clarity and levels of trust, specifically addressing the operational flaws outlined in the evaluation report from the ACCJC site visit that took place March 11-15, 2012. The implementation of the new policies is currently taking place, and, while the new system reflects best practice, the College will need to evaluate the effectiveness of the way in which the College puts into practice the new system and its associated committee structure.

Comment [k38]: How does BP 1.16 differ from BP 1.04 other than in the numbering?
**IV.A.2. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing training in governance roles</td>
<td>Biennial presentations on participating effectively in college governance, with the attendance of all governing board members, as well as administrative, faculty, staff, and student leaders. Annual retreat for senior constituency leaders. Participatory Governance Training from ASCCC for Academic Senate President</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete structures and procedures to support BP 2.07</td>
<td>See IV.A.2.a</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete structures and procedures to support BP 2.08</td>
<td>Procedure for governing board: with the assistance of senior administrative staff, to communicate when it intends to discuss or deliberate on &quot;academic and professional matters&quot;. Procedures for Committees of the Academic Senate. See IV.A.2.b.</td>
<td>February, 2013?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine BP 1.16 Public Access Sunshine Policy for applicability to governance structures</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the new participatory governance system and associated committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV.A.2.a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.**

**IV.A.2.a. Descriptive Summary.** The response to Standard IV.A. outlines historical issues relating to the role and voice of various constituents in institutional governance. From July 2012 through November 2012, the College developed new structures to define the roles of faculty, administrators, students, and staff in what the College now terms “participatory governance,” as contained within Board Policy 2.07 approved on November 15, 2012. The new policy is intended to clarify the role and level of input that faculty, administrators, staff, and students have in institutional policies, planning, and budget. During Summer and Fall 2012, a time of massive transition both in the governance structure and in the leadership of the College, the Accreditation Steering Committee served as the de facto governance council until the College could fully establish the new Participatory Governance Council (no meetings took place of the College Advisory Council, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council, the Program Review Committee and several other bodies that had been the mechanisms for members of the constituent groups to participate in institutional governance). The Accreditation Steering Committee includes the leadership of all constituencies.

During this transitional time, the Interim Chancellors also consulted with appropriate administrators, brought issues to meetings of the Chancellor’s cabinet and other
administrative meetings, and brought issues to the Accreditation workgroups appointed by
the Chancellor with input from constituent leaders. Examples include the following:

- Members of Accreditation Workgroup 3 suggested an adjustment to the Program
  Review Template. Academic Senate leadership and other faculty and administration
  had the opportunity to respond to this suggestion and provide additional input.

- Staff associated with the Research and Planning Office and Accreditation Workgroup
  7 recommended new administrative positions for the Research and Planning Office.

- Accreditation Workgroup 7 endorsed a proposal to create new associate vice
  chancellor positions in Academic Affairs. Outside of Workgroup 7, the faculty
  leadership does not believe they had the opportunity to provide input or feedback.

In addition, the Interim Chancellors also met periodically with leadership of the Academic
Senate, the Classified Senate, SEIU 1021, and Associated Students to discuss issues and
receive input concerning institutional policies, planning and budget relating to their areas of
responsibility and expertise.

The College has begun the initial stages of implementing Board Policy 2.07.

To encourage greater student participation in governance structures, Associated Students has
reinstated student stipends. However, students who participated in training provided by the
Community College League of California and the Academic Senate for California
Community Colleges (facilitated by CCLC President, Scott Lay and ASCCC President,
Michelle Pilati) identified “tension among the separately elected student governments for
each of the campuses.”

**IV.A.2.a. Self Evaluation.** While the College’s previous Shared Governance system and its
structures were clearly defined, the implementation of these governance structures was not
fully effective. The College intends for the new participatory governance system to address
the issues that ACCJC and the College itself have identified.

The transition to the new participatory governance system, coupled with changes in College
leadership, has been challenging. For example, the College closed the Office of Shared
Governance and reassigned the Shared Governance Coordinator to the Downtown Center
(which was in need of administrative support). Although meetings of Shared Governance
committees were generally on hold, some committees continued to meet and did not know to
whom agendas, minutes and other committee information should be sent for posting online.
The College needed clearer communication about expectations regarding institutional
governance during the transitional time from July to November 2012. Going forward, the
Chancellor’s Office will be maintaining a Participatory Governance website to post agendas,
moments, and other committee information and will need to ensure that communication about
this is clear.

Moreover, the utilization of the Accreditation Steering Committee as the de facto
participatory governance council during the transitional time was reasonable in that the
Steering Committee includes leaders from all constituencies. However, changes in the
scheduling of the Steering Committee and its feeder workgroup meetings have at times
resulted in students and faculty being challenged to attend these meetings due to conflicts
with classes.
In addition, the procedures for faculty, classified staff, and students to provide input into
decisions normally taking place through the governance system have been inconsistent
during this transitional time. In some cases, the old systems continued to operate to provide
opportunities for constituent groups to provide input, and in some cases, transitional ad hoc
processes have provided appropriate opportunities for input. In other cases, however,
appropriate opportunities for input have been lacking. That is, during this transitional time,
the Interim Chancellors presented some significant institutional policies, planning, and
budget issues to the Board of Trustees. Constituent groups felt that they were not included in
a formal review process with respect to these issues, and specifically did not have sufficient
opportunity to:

- Review the 2012-13 Budget.
- Provide input into the proposal to alter all instructional departmental structures, the
  numbers of instructional department chairs and deans, the affiliations of departments
  in schools, and the duties of deans and department chairs.

While student participation theoretically should increase as a result of reinstating student
stipends, Associated Students will need to assess whether this takes place. In addition,
Associated Students will need to resolve issues relating to the tension the separately elected
student governments at each Center are experiencing.

IV.A.2.a. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable
improvement plans associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finish process of putting new participatory governance into place.</td>
<td>Set guidelines for meeting day and times and committee conduct of business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revise web presence for committee materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify process for posting agendas, minutes, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures need to be established for each committee to assess and evaluate their work.</td>
<td>Write committee self-evaluation procedures and recommend timelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of participatory system needs to be planned, conducted, completed and results published.</td>
<td>Collect information on levels of participation by constituency group, clarity of governance role, and access to information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assess effectiveness of input by constituency, governance role, availability of communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective student governance structures need to be put into place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain and include appropriate input for reorganization of instruction departments before it is implemented</td>
<td>Dialogue with constituency groups, including students, regarding the proposed system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examine and analyze workload issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess impact of structural reorganizations on student outcomes, achievements and completions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty
structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about
student learning programs and services.
IV.A.2.b. Descriptive Summary. The policy for this standard has been revised. It had been a part of the old Board Policy 2.07 but is now a stand-alone policy, Board Policy 2.08, adopted by the Board of Trustees on November 15, 2012. In both the old BP 2.07 and the new BP 2.08, the Board elects to rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in all academic and professional areas defined by Title 5, Section 53200:

- Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
- Degree and certificate requirements
- Grading policies
- Educational program development
- Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
- District and College governance structures, as related to faculty roles
- Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
- Policies for faculty professional development activities
- Processes for program review
- Processes for institutional planning and budget development
- Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the Academic Senate

Other faculty structures that the institution relies on for recommendations about student learning programs and services include

- **Curriculum Committee.** Includes 18 faculty, six administrators, two students, and one classified member, all of whom are appointed by constituent groups. It reviews and determines the academic merit of curriculum proposals, as well as ensuring that they conform to the requirements and guidelines for form and style. Recent (Fall 2012) actions include reviewing program-level outcomes and the mapping of courses to program-level SLOs for every instructional program in both credit and noncredit offered by the College.

- **Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.** Includes the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and Academic Administrators. Makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees on associate degree policies and on the addition of specific courses into area graduation requirements. Recent actions (Fall 2012) include reviewing General Education Outcomes (GEOs) and the mapping of GEOs to draft Institutional Learning Outcomes. The committee made recommendations and plans for GEO assessments.

- **Department Chairs.** Multiple roles include providing primary day-to-day responsibility for coordinating the work of other faculty; providing resources and making recommendations to foster program success and development; collaborating with groups and individuals within the college and out in the community to implement discipline-specific improvements to student learning programs and services; and serving as a resource to students and faculty to foster student success. Recent (Fall 2012) actions relating to student learning programs and services include:
- writing and submitting plans for SLO assessment for every course being offered;
- submitting outcome mapping for every Program SLO and GE applicable course;
- coordinating assessment, gap analysis and improvements for SLOs;
- fostering SLO professional development and dialogue within and among departments;
- documenting SLO activity online;
- researching and correcting data for program review and submitted reports in accordance with new requirements; and
- responding to a proposal approved by the Board of Trustees on October 25, 2012 to alter all departmental structures, the numbers of department chairs and deans, the affiliations of departments in schools, and the duties of deans and department chairs.

IV.A.2.b. Self Evaluation. The new Board Policy 2.08 has not changed the fundamental decision of the Board of Trustees to rely primarily on recommendations concerning the academic and professional matters articulated in Title 5 Section 53200. Instances of the misunderstanding of this policy were documented in the report of the March 15th ACCJC visiting team.

In July and August 2012, members of the Board of Trustees and members of the Academic Senate participated in training opportunities provided at City College by the ACCJC, by the Association of Community Colleges Trustees, and sessions provided jointly by the Community College League of California and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (facilitated by CCLC President, Scott Lay, and ASCCC President, Michelle Pilati). It is hoped that improved understanding on both sides will lead to more productive relations.

However, faculty concerns remain about the extent to which they have had the opportunity to provide input into the recent restructuring of the Academic Affairs Division. The following statement captures their concerns:

“A proposal for restructuring Academic Affairs was adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 25th. The proposal to alter the structure of departments and the role of chairs was made public only three days before the Board meeting. The authors of that proposal did not invite input from the Academic Senate, members of the faculty, nor from the academic deans. Although members of the Academic Senate were provided with an opportunity to speak about the proposal at 12:30 am when the Board considered it, the brief discussion of the Trustees before adopting the proposal did not acknowledge concerns raised by members of the Academic Senate. Members of the Academic Senate perceive this decision of great magnitude made in three days with insufficient evidence and no input from constituent groups as an action that is out of compliance with numerous accreditation standards, including I.B.3, I.B.4, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, and IV.A.3.”

IV.A.2.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans associated with this Standard:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet accreditation standards for governance.</td>
<td>Pervasively apply the standards, such as setting goals, basing decisions on evidence, and working collaboratively.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information to Board of Trustees about effectiveness in encouraging and supporting participatory governance</td>
<td>Survey for constituent groups to offer input on Board performance in accordance with BP 1.23</td>
<td>May, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding of governance roles</td>
<td>Board/Constituent Leadership retreat</td>
<td>Spring, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess effectiveness of Department Chair Structures.</td>
<td>For Academic Affairs, employ same process used for Student Development -- set goals, collect evidence of impacts on student learning, conduct focus groups, collaborate in the proposal of improvements.</td>
<td>March, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Effectiveness of Participatory Governance</td>
<td>Conduct full scale evaluation of participatory governance structures</td>
<td>May, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

IV.A.3. Descriptive Summary. Per Board Policy 2.07, the new Participatory Governance Council has begun meeting regularly with multiple representatives from each constituent group to discuss and represent ideas from their constituents with the Chancellor. In addition, the overarching Participatory Governance Council and the Chancellor have created Standing Committees, each of which include a Chancellor-appointed Chair; constituent groups will be naming representatives for these Standing Committees. These include the following four Standing Committees: Enrollment Management, Accreditation, Planning, and Diversity. At this time, the Accreditation Committee currently has 15 Subcommittees (Steering Committee Workgroups) and the Planning Committee has seven proposed Subcommittees (Annual Plan/Budget/Program Review, Educational Master Plan, Human Resources Plan, Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, Sustainability, and Program Review). The Subcommittees are subject to change depending on the College’s needs. For example, the 15 Subcommittees reporting to the Accreditation Committee may evolve in the coming years as the College reorganizes itself to continue meeting the Accreditation Standards.

Theoretically, feeding into the Participatory Council and its associated committees will be proposals from the Administrators’ Association, Classified Senate, Academic Senate, and Associated Students Executive Board, all of which meet regularly to discuss relevant policies and issues in alignment with institutional priorities. The Chancellor takes recommendations from the Council to the Board of Trustees when necessary for the Board’s discussion and approval. The Chancellor will refer
recommendations not subject to Board of Trustee approval to the administrator(s) with authority over a given area for implementation.

Communication from these governance structures, including the constituent groups, to the larger CCSF audience takes place through the posting of agendas, meeting times, and other information on the appropriate sections of CCSF’s website as well as through email communications and meetings with constituent stakeholders. Policies, procedures, and updates for these processes are available online as well. [evidence: website, sample documents, sample emails from all groups]

The purpose underlying all activities, including discussions and communication, of the Participatory Governance entities is to continually improve the College and its impact on students.

IV.A.3. Self Evaluation. The previous Shared Governance system was large and inefficient, often holding up important issues with limited administrator authority and effectiveness. Students have been generally insufficiently informed about governance structures and ways to get involved with the Participatory Governance process; some have indicated that there was not enough student representation built into the institutional governance, which the new Participatory Governance process should mitigate. Similarly, some classified staff members have felt disenfranchised in the institutional governance structure both in terms of participation and communication. [evidence: 2012 Shared Governance Evaluation; Shared Governance Appointment Roster?]

Historically and recently, many constituents feel that there is not enough communication on a school-wide level and that they are not adequately informed of the governance and future of the school. [evidence: Student Focus Group Report?; others?] Some governance structures have not regularly posted minutes, agendas, or meetings online, further exacerbating the general concern about the lack of communication.

The current Participatory Governance system is in the early stages of implementation, and the College cannot yet analyze its effectiveness overall or with respect to how well it promotes a forum in which everyone can work together for the good of the institution.

IV.A.3. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create effective communication with constituents through online posting.</td>
<td>Re-design Participatory Governance? website with input from all constituent groups to ensure usability.</td>
<td>Summer 2014 public debut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure all constituents understand and utilize established governance structures.</td>
<td>Implement FLEX day governance structure training for all faculty, staff and administrators.</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure effective communication from governance structures to all constituent groups.</td>
<td>Outreach to constituent groups to locate weaknesses and breakdowns in two-way communication. Address these with improved e-mail and web communications schoolwide.</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure full accessibility of public</td>
<td>Post all agendas, meetings and other public</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
documents from all governance structures.  
Ensure constituent participation in Participatory Governance. 
Documents to websites in a timely fashion.  
Conduct outreach and evaluation to fill all vacancies at least once a semester.  
Ongoing

IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission Standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self evaluation and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

IV.A.4. Descriptive Summary. Upon notice of ACCJC’s Show Cause determination, the College immediately assembled workgroups to address the ACCJC Recommendations. The October 15 Special Report captured the plans for, and in many cases, the initial progress made on, responding to the 14 Recommendations based on the activities of the workgroups. The changes the College is implementing as documented in this new Self Evaluation better address the ACCJC Eligibility Requirements, Standards, policies, and guidelines. Of particular note is the CCSF Board of Trustees’ passage of a new policy with the title, "Accreditation Eligibility Requirement 21, Standard IV.B.1.i" on October 25, 2012. [Policy Manual 1.33] The College is not only addressing the deficiencies noted by the 2006 evaluation team and those noted by the 2012 evaluation team in July 2012, but also additional deficiencies discovered during the Self Evaluation activities that have taken place since July 2012.

The College is especially concerned with honestly communicating all deficiencies relating to the ACCJC Eligibility Requirements, Standards, policies, and guidelines. In that spirit, in its October 15 Special Report, the College noted a deficiency related to substantive change. Specifically, in December 2011, the College prepared a substantive change proposal for submission to ACCJC concerning a shift in the percentage of online instruction offered. The College never submitted the proposal due to administrative transitions, and it is aware that this is a requirement it must address.

With respect to public disclosure of the College’s accreditation status, the College immediately posted on its website the July 2012 ACCJC determination and has continued to update all accreditation information on the website, including making available the October 15 Special Report and March 15 Show Cause Report. By posting all accreditation information on its website, and given the focused media attention on the College’s accreditation status, other accrediting agencies have had access to this information. These entities include the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), the California Board of Registered Nurses, State Fire Training, and the National Registry (Emergency Medical Technician and paramedic training). The College specifically provided information directly to the Commission on Dental Accreditation, and the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology conducted a special site visit to CCSF in the wake of the accreditation determination having been released.

IV.A.4. Self Evaluation. To fully exhibit honesty and integrity in its relationship with the accrediting commission and other external agencies, the College must first be honest with itself. To that end, the College has begun to engage in honest and at times difficult, if not
conflicting, assessments of its own policies, procedures, and practices. The actions the College has taken since July 2012 testify to its ability to mobilize quickly to move toward achieving a common goal of better meeting all ACCJC requirements. This Self Evaluation attempts to capture progress made as honestly as possible, acknowledging where necessary that differing perspectives remain along with work that the College must continue to carry out.

Despite the institution’s efforts at educating the College community about the Show Cause determination and the associated shortcomings, members of the College community have at times communicated misleading information in a variety of venues about ACCJC and its findings. The College recognizes that these actions undermine the College’s efforts to maintain an honest relationship with ACCJC and the community about accreditation issues.

**IV.A.4. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans for this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in more regular and consistent communication to the college community about accreditation and associated actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase participation by members of the college community in ACCJC-sponsored events and trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominate members of the College community to participate in accreditation site visits in an ongoing manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV.A.5. Descriptive Summary.** The College evaluated the Shared Governance system bi-annually through an online Shared Governance questionnaire. However, there was a gap from 2007 to 2012 in which the evaluation did not occur bi-annually. In prior years, College Advisory Council members reviewed the survey results, which the College also shared with the entire college community as well as the Board of Trustees.

The College conducted the most recent evaluation in Spring 2012, the College conducted an evaluation of its Shared Governance system. This evaluation occurred after the College submitted the Self Study but prior to issuance of the Show Cause sanction.

After the Show Cause sanction, the workgroup responsible for addressing ACCJC Recommendations 12 and 13 took into consideration the results of the Spring 2012 evaluation while also gathering additional data and input. The review resulted in the new Participatory Governance system.

With respect to evaluating the role of leadership in the institution beyond Participatory Governance, the Board evaluates the Chancellor annually per Board Policy 1.24. Board
Policy 1.24 pertains to the Board’s self evaluation, which will now occur annually during Summer. See also the response to Standard IV.B.1.

IV.A.5. Self Evaluation. While the College has conducted evaluations of the role of leadership and the governance system, it has struggled to conduct these evaluations regularly and to make improvements based on the evaluation results. This has been particularly true for evaluations of the governance system and the Board of Trustees. The Principles of the Participatory Governance system as detailed in Board Policy 2.07 include a focus on evaluation. Moreover, the new Participatory Governance Council is charged with regularly assessing its accomplishments and outcomes. Given that this is a new system, the College will have to assess the extent to which this takes place going forward.

IV.A.5. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans for this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop evaluation process for new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participatory governance model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

IV.B.1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

IV.B.1.a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

IV.B.1.b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

IV.B.1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

IV.B.1.d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

IV.B.1.e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.
IV.B.1.f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

IV.B.1.g. The governing board’s self evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

IV.B.1.h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

IV.B.1.i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

IV.B.1.j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively. In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

NOTE: Section IV.B.1.a-j. is under review by the CCSF Board of Trustees. Discussion will take place at the January 24, 2013 Board meeting.

IV.B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

IV.B.2.a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

IV.B.2.b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

- Establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
- Ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;
- Ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and
- Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

IV.B.2.c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

IV.B.2.e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.
NOTE: The organization of Standard IV.B.2 begins with a descriptive summary of each subsection and then discusses all subsections within one self evaluation.

**IV.B.2. Descriptive Summary.** Per Board Policy 1.25 and as specified in the Chancellor’s contract, the Chancellor has administrative authority to implement and administer Board policies. With this directive, the Chancellor is ultimately responsible for the quality of the College, which relies on effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

**BP 1.25 Chief Administrator: Authority, Selection, and Term of Office**

**IV.B.2.a. Descriptive Summary.** Beginning in April 2012, City College of San Francisco has experienced significant leadership changes. Dr. Don Q. Griffin, who had served as Chancellor for four years, retired earlier than expected due to illness. The Board of Trustees immediately moved to identify and appoint an Interim Chancellor to serve the College while it prepared for a permanent Chancellor search. In May 2012, the Board appointed Dr. Pamila Fisher as Interim Chancellor with a term ending October 31, 2012. The Board suspended plans to continue the permanent Chancellor search after receiving the ACCJC Show Cause determination in July, with the recognition that finding a qualified candidate for the permanent Chancellor position would be challenging under the circumstances.

With Interim Chancellor Fisher’s departure scheduled for the end of October, the Board appointed Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman, who had been serving as Interim Vice Chancellor of Student Services, as Interim Chancellor for a one-year period beginning on November 1, 2012.

During Interim Chancellor Fisher’s appointment, she began reorganizing the administration in response to the ACCJC Recommendation 7 regarding administrative capacity and FCMAT findings to ensure that an appropriate structure is in place to administer all aspects of the College to support the purpose (mission), size, and complexity of the institution.

In carrying out the plans for administrative change as described in the October 15 Special Report, the Board approved the following organizational change:

- The Chancellor’s Office direct reports now include three Vice Chancellor positions (Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Finance/Administration) as well as a number of deans and other administrators responsible for overarching institutional areas. (October 2012)
  [http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2012/October25/Appendix_C.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2012/October25/Appendix_C.pdf)

- Direct reports to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs now include three Associate Vice Chancellors. In addition, the College has separated responsibilities of School Deans from Center Deans. (October 2012)
  [http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2012/October25/Appendix%20D.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2012/October25/Appendix%20D.pdf)

- The College will reduce FTE allocations for Department Chairs to incur cost savings in response to FCMAT recommendations and ACCJC’s general concerns about administrative capacity and authority; in light of this, selected responsibilities will shift from the Department Chairs to the School and Center Deans. (October 2012)
  [http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2012/October25/Appendix%20D.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2012/October25/Appendix%20D.pdf)
The Vice Chancellor of Student Development will directly oversee all four deans within the division, which include the Dean for Matriculation and Counseling Services; the Dean of Admissions, Records, and Outreach; the Dean of Financial Services and Scholarship; and the Dean of Students Affairs and Wellness. 


All counselors will report to the Dean for Matriculation and Counseling Services (until now, counselors reported to three different deans)


At the outset of Interim Scott-Skillman’s appointment, she directed Human Resources to develop job descriptions with more authority and clarity of responsibility for administrators as part of the organizational restructuring. The College is undergoing a massive hiring process for all of the administrative positions within the Division of Academic Affairs given the changes in authority and responsibility of those positions. The Division of Student Development has also begun a hiring process in line with the changes made to its structure. In both Divisions, the hiring process began with the posting of the Vice Chancellor positions. While administrators currently serving in each Division are encouraged to apply for positions for which they qualify, the search is national in scope. The Division of Finance and Administration will undergo a review beginning in February 2013. The College will revisit the organization of the Chancellor’s Division in Summer 2013.

The Chancellor has also been working with Legal Counsel to develop contracts for administrators. Until now, the Board has granted administrators rolling three-year contracts on the basis of satisfactory annual performance evaluations, but administrators have never received a written contract detailing the terms of their employment. The College is currently reviewing practices relating to the evaluation of administrators as well.

IV.B.2.b Descriptive Summary. The focus of the Interim Chancellors has, by necessity, been on resolving the fiscal crisis and responding to the ACCJC Show Cause determination. This context has driven the priorities of the Interim Chancellors as they carry out their obligations as the chief administrator of the College. Institutional planning has been a key focus given that integrated planning and resource allocation must serve as a foundation for all decision making and resulting actions within the College.

One of the first activities that Interim Chancellor Fisher undertook was to add resources to the Research and Planning Office to begin increasing staffing that better serves institutional needs. At the same time, the Research and Planning staff are charged with establishing an integrated, data-informed planning and budgeting system that incorporates Student Learning Outcomes. In concert with this, the Division of Academic Affairs was also charged with responding fully to the ACCJC requirements regarding the development, documentation, assessment, and evaluation of SLOs. Subsequently, Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman assigned an SLO Coordinator to continue leading and guiding this effort.

Interim Chancellor Fisher established a new process for participatory governance with the goal of creating a collegial process for discussing matters pertaining to institutional priorities,
policies, planning, and budget development. The Participatory Governance Council first convened under Dr. Scott-Skillman’s direction.

Both Interim Chancellors have communicated Collegewide on the status of the institution, its priorities, and goals to remain accredited. To ensure that administrators can carry out College priorities and in response to ACCJC Recommendations, the Interim Chancellors have implemented a series of professional development workshops on a variety of management topics for the management team which includes administrators and classified managers.

IV.B.2.c. Descriptive Summary. Board Policy 1.25 and the Chancellor’s contract direct the Chancellor to carry out the mission of the College by implementing and administering Board policies. The primary focus for the Interim Chancellors has been to respond to the fiscal crisis and ACCJC Show Cause determination. With this in mind, the Interim Chancellors have focused on reviewing institutional policies and procedures to ensure that actual practices align with these policies and procedures and are consistent with the mission of the College and meet the ACCJC Standards. As pointed out in the ACCJC evaluation report and further reflected on by the accreditation workgroups, the Interim Chancellors have noted a number of cases in which the College has not been in compliance with its own policies and procedures.

IV.B.2.d. Descriptive Summary. Working with the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, a key focus of the Interim Chancellors has been on addressing the fiscal crisis by implementing FCMAT and ACCJC recommendations to ensure a return to fiscal stability. The Chancellor has taken a number of steps to reduce costs as is outlined in Standard III.D., Financial Resources.

IV.B.2.e. Descriptive Summary. Given the current crisis mode of the College, the Interim Chancellors have focused efforts on working closely with the San Francisco Mayor’s Office and other agencies including donors to keep them apprised of the status of the institution and to enlist their continued support. The Interim Chancellors have also engaged the support of their statewide and national networks to assist in resolving the fiscal and accreditation issues. Given media attention on the College at this time and declining enrollments, the Interim Chancellors have contracted with two consulting firms to more effectively communicate with the public and current and prospective students.

Historically, the Chancellor’s level of engagement with the community has varied. During the 10-year term of Chancellor Philip R. Day, Jr., there was a high level of engagement with government, business, and educational agencies at the local, state, and national levels. Chancellor Don Q. Griffin focused on developing relationships with local public, private, and community-based organizations representing neighborhoods within the San Francisco Community College District.

IV.B.2.a-e. Self Evaluation. The College has experienced an inordinate amount of turnover in its senior leadership beginning with the departure of Chancellor Griffin in May 2012. Accompanying these personnel changes has been a change in leadership style that has yielded two-way challenges in acculturation and communication. While at the same time
fulfilling the core mission of the College, the primary focus for the Interim Chancellors has been to respond to the fiscal crisis and ACCJC Show Cause determination.

At this juncture, the Board of Trustees and Interim Chancellor’s assessment is that the administrative reorganization reflects best practices elsewhere and are in the best interest of the College in order to promote administrative and fiscal soundness. Changes have occurred rapidly; the stringent timeline for enacting these changes has resulted in what some of the internal constituent groups view as insufficient communication coupled with resistance from various College constituents.

IV.B.2.a-e. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase communications to keep college on task with shared goals, values, priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire permanent Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop outcomes to measure effectiveness of administrative structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV.B.3. In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.

Not applicable.

IV.B.3.a. The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

Not applicable.

IV.B.3.b. The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.

Not applicable.

IV.B.3.c. The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.

Not applicable.

IV.B.3.d. The district/system effectively controls its expenditures.

Not applicable.
IV.B.3.e. The chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without his/her interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.

Not applicable.

IV.B.3.f. The district/system acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district/system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.

Not applicable.

IV.B.3.g. The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Not applicable.
Special Focus: Centers and Sites

Given the references to centers and sites throughout the ACCJC Recommendations, the Interim Chancellor formed a “special focus” workgroup (“Workgroup 15”) to look specifically at issues concerning CCSF centers and sites. The goal of the workgroup since August 2012 has been to analyze and assess the issues regarding centers and sites as referenced in the accreditation recommendations and to identify and collect data necessary for a fiscal and programmatic analysis of them.

The references to centers appears in several of the Recommendations, primarily in Recommendation 1 (Mission), Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process), Recommendation 5 (Student Services), Recommendation 8 (Physical Resources), and Recommendation 10 (Financial Planning), and it was felt that the work would be better coordinated and more effective if addressed by a single group. Workgroup 15 members include the Chancellor in addition to administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives.

The following is a list of centers that the committee has focused on:

- Airport
- Chinatown/North Beach
- Civic Center
- Downtown
- Evans
- Fort Mason
- John Adams
- Mission
- Southeast

Update:

Since August, members of the group have met and engaged in the following activities, which has begun the process of allowing them to complete a programmatic analysis of each center:

- Centers defined
- Foundation Grants reviewed
- Real estate value assessed
- Data regarding program and course offerings/sections per center collected
- Student data by center collected (including zip codes)

To date, the committee has also reviewed other information about the cost and productivity of each Center. These data have been in a variety of formats with a range of information. Since the goal is to create a cohesive plan in a standardized format that can give CCSF and external stakeholders a programmatic analysis of and operational costs for each center, a template was provided to each Dean to collect data deemed relevant for analysis and the final report. This information should be provided to the workgroup before the end of the year.

The workgroup also needs to understand the productivity potential for each center and, therefore, needs a solid understanding of Center Utilization/Capacity of each center. These data are not easily gathered right now, but it will be necessary to gather them before the analysis and final report are complete.
In related workgroup studies, Workgroup 5 (Student Services) has focused on planning steps to conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of all student support services across the entire District, including the main campus and all centers. This effort is specific to the task identified in Recommendation 5 for the College to communicate plans for delivery and prioritization of student services regardless of location but also pertains to the work being completed in Workgroup 15.

A calendar and specific steps were finalized at Workgroup 5’s September 26, 2012 meeting. Preliminary discussion and planning are focused on a process to ensure the development of guiding principles to identify needed support services; a definitive process designed to engage students and all student services personnel, including faculty, classified staff, and administrators; and a process to conduct needs and cost analyses of the delivery of services.

The review and assessment will provide opportunity for input from all constituent groups through focus groups led by administrators within Student Services. Findings and recommendations resulting from the review and assessment will be presented to the accreditation steering committee in early Spring 2013 and will inform the future plans for student services at all the CCSF centers.

In other related matters, Workgroup 8 (Physical Resources) has been examining the costs of ownership associated with the District’s physical resources. To understand how the annual budget items pertained to District facilities and maintenance, the workgroup reviewed the College’s annual budget and major chart of accounts. This review revealed several challenges related to center based budgeting, confirming that the College has not had a practice of allocating or expending money by campus/center.

In light of this challenge, Workgroup 8 looked to other college models for facilities/physical plant plans. Through consensus, the workgroup felt that the College would benefit from developing and implementing a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model for its campus and centers. In reviewing documents from Santa Monica College, Workgroup 8 found a model that incorporated principles based on the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) staffing standards. It was decided that APPA staffing standards could be utilized by the College to determine appropriate levels of staffing in Buildings and Grounds, Facilities, Custodial services and the like. This TCO Model will be used in Workgroup 15’s efforts to analyze center’s costs.

Finally, Workgroup 7 (Human Resources) is currently looking at the level of administrative and staff support for centers beyond the Ocean Campus and will report back during the early 2013 timeframe.

Several concrete steps already been made concerning CCSF sites. The Board approved three recommendations related to site closures on September 27, 2012. The first was to consolidate the course offerings that had been offered at the Castro site (approximately 20-25 sections) to other centers throughout the city. The Castro site was located at a junior high school that operated as a College site in the evening. This move will allow the classes to be offered in a more appropriate facility for higher education and provide cost savings from cancelation of rent and reduction of staff time needed to oversee the facility.

Coincidentally, these classrooms contain District-owned furniture that was desperately needed at other sites in order to increase classroom capacity and increase productivity. The College ceased
buying new desks/chairs several years ago, and some faculty have indicated a willingness to accept additional students in their classes if more chairs were available.

Similar to the first recommendation regarding the Castro site, the second recommendation was to relocate classes currently offered at the two Park Presidio sites to other centers.

The third recommendation was to immediately begin the process of pursuing options for generating revenue from the 33 Gough Street property. This property is in a prime location for development, located one block off of Market Street. The facility does not receive a Foundation Grant and houses fiscal and administrative staff. The goal is to relocate those staff to other District-owned property.

Organizational changes to help streamline the reporting structure of the Centers have also been already made: three interim Vice Chancellors reverted to their previous status, two as Deans and one as Associate Vice Chancellor. The administrators responsible for centers resided within both Academic Affairs and Student Development, which created reporting inefficiencies. The new structure will streamline reporting lines and create greater cost efficiencies as the College continues to work on the organizational structure for the layers beneath the Vice Chancellors.

WORKGROUP 15 MEETING SUMMARY:

Workgroup 15 has met five times since August. Below is a summary of the material covered in each meeting.

During the first meeting, on August 17, 2012, 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).

On September 6, 2012, the Deans of the centers and sites provided background information and reports about each of their centers, including 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 and what student populations are served. They presented their information in different formats with varying levels of detail.

At the October 29 meeting, several topics were discuss to further investigate the finances and management of resources for each center:

FCMAT Findings and Analysis – The group discussed the plan to develop accounting protocols and criteria to evaluate and change descriptions of off-campus locations and to account for expenditures to figure out real costs. The group reviewed FCMAT data concerning the foundation grant funds for the Ocean Campus and state-approved centers and the costs for rent, utilities and enrollment.

Course Sections/FTES/Productivity per Center – The committee discussed the data that Pam Mery handed out concerning section count by center and FTEs, including:
a. What neighborhoods students attending come from for each center.
   The committee discussed the data that Pam Mery provided about student
   attendance at each center by neighborhood zip code to help determine how
   students would be effected if CCSF decided to close certain centers. The group
discussed the data and whether students cluster around a center or if they go to a
program they are interested in no matter where it is held. Is there a unique draw to
each center?

b. Center Utilization/Productivity – The group discussed how to track center
capacity and determined that the group needed more information about center
utilization when looking at the possibility of consolidation of classes. Currently,
there is no centralized place to get this information. Peter Goldstein and JoAnne
Low are gathering the utilization information for the centers for the January 2013
meeting.

c. Total Cost of Operation draft – Dean Bell passed out a physical resources report
outlining what it would cost to run a center. There wasn’t enough data to
determine what it currently costs to run each center. The group agreed that they
needed to figure out the current staffing and facility costs per center to determine
a baseline figure, including rent, utilities, staff and other budget items.

At the end of the meeting, Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman asked the deans to identify a baseline of
these costs in a cost estimate template that she was going to provide to them. The group would
have a standardized format for each center to more accurately understand and analyze the data.
The workgroup would review the data in those templates at the next meeting.

At the November 13 meeting, Center Deans were present to discuss the costs associated with
their Centers and to share the cost estimate template. The group underlined the need to
understand cost issues associated with centers template to make it simpler to ID these costs. The
Deans shared their experience about using the template to reflect current costs, including:

   ▪ questions about faculty split assignments
   ▪ the fact that faculty assignments do not necessarily reflect productivity due to the cost
difference among faculty
   ▪ a confusion over the combination of 11–12 FTEF and FTES data with the 12–13 costs
data. The group did agree that using last year’s budget data would not the most relevant
approach. An example of this is that the current staffing for the new Chinatown center is
much different from the old Chinatown center.
   ▪ the need for more direction on what the program will be at each site to be viable
   ▪ that it was a tedious exercise

There was discussion about the purpose for the completing the cost estimates. The response was
that there was a need to have more informed discussions on centers and their productivity. The
intention of the template was not be exact since data change but to start with a standard format
for comparison purposes.

There was consensus that an average faculty cost would be easier to use to complete the
template. Peter Goldstein said that he would provide the average costs per FTEF (full time and
part time combined) for 11–12; other costs used in the template should be actual costs for 12-13.
At the December 4 meeting, the workgroup discussed each of the Center’s updated templates and raised questions concerning which average faculty cost should be used and how to determine benefit costs for staff. The templates were approaching a standardized form, but Deans were asked to refine the work one more time for the final meeting of the year on December 10.

At the December 10 meeting, the workgroup reviewed the most recent cost estimates from each Center. The group also discussed some of the remaining challenges, such as the fact that the Banner system is not completely accurate, which makes it difficult to find exact information.

Another challenge has to do with grant accounting. Grants are complicated and are infused throughout the district. They are often used to grow departments. And they are awarded to programs, not centers. However, there isn’t a grant accounting office.

In addition, going forward CCSF will have to consider how to allocate the cost of many items that are currently not charged clearly to each operational unit. This includes hardware, software, librarians, police and other staff. In the future, the system should be set up to include the assignment by center and should be available through accounting.

Pam Mery discussed site utilization information and told the group that CCSF will be purchasing Argos, software that will help with planning and implementation, and should be able to help with site utilization. This software should be up and running by February 2013. This software should help with creating efficiencies and alternative scheduling methods.

Some of the issues that the group would like to resolve with systematic enrollment management and site utilization software came up during the conversation, including:

- How to make sure the class capacity is always current
- How to show those classes that don’t make the minimum class size
- How to compare enrollment first day, at census and at the end of the semester
- How to handle non-credit, which is currently done by hand on paper. How do you account for students in a Par period? Right now, this is currently done by counting headcount by hand every day (Downtown Center), which wastes personnel time. Some suggested that CCSF should move towards electronic Par reporting
- How to measure short-term classes in credit (The group determined that it was not high on the list of concerns)

The current student services utilization software has the ability to create electronic education plans and complete degree auditing. However, students do not have access to their education plans or degree audit. The group thought it important that students should have access to that.

At the end of the meeting, with the Center deans agreeing to provide a final cost estimate to Gohar by December 19 so that she could use them for the Accreditation Report. In turn, Gohar will convene the group early in 2013 to begin the analysis of the Center data and to then write the recommendations.

**NEXT STEPS:**

The following needs to be gathered by Workgroup 15 in order to complete a report that provides a fiscal and programmatic analysis of CCSF’s centers:

- All center data from standardized template collected, reviewed and analyzed
- Human Resources allocation examined
- Standardized template of center utilization/productivity collected
- Standardized template of center utilization/productivity analyzed
- Consideration of the proximity to alternative locations/transportation
- A business plan for each center
- List of options for more cost-effectively and efficiently serving students generated (for example: consolidation, elimination, property sales, property leases, etc.)

Challenges to Managing Centers:
The group should also recommend ways the college can provide Deans the tools that will help them better manage going forward, including how to:
- Implement Total Cost of Operation Model
- Measure cost/productivity
- Accurately do Enrollment Management
- Create a more systematic planning process at each center
- Manage employees and class sections, including:
  - Employees whose managers are absent from the center
  - Creating clarity about who evaluates classified employees
  - Providing a feedback loop concerning employee performance
  - Scheduling employees
  - Scheduling classes

Final Report:
Given that many factors within the other Recommendations will affect the analysis of this workgroup (e.g., administrative structure, staffing plans, financial decisions, and board direction), this analysis is to a certain extent dependent upon the outcomes of other decisions. The ultimate outcome of this will be recommendations for a comprehensive set of options for serving students as cost-effectively and efficiently as possible.

List of Policies Referenced in the Standards
1. Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education
2. Policy on Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals
3. Policy on Transfer of Credit; Policy on Award of Credit
4. Policy on Closing an Institution.
7. Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems.
2. Closure Report

The College is required to prepare a Closure Report in conjunction with the Show Cause Report in the event that ACCJC does not find cause to continue City College of San Francisco’s accreditation. The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees are responsible for developing the Closure Report.

The ACCJC’s policy on closing an institution appears on page 33 of the Accreditation Reference Handbook, accessible at the following link:

CLOSURE REPORT

City College of San Francisco
50 Phelan Avenue
San Francisco, CA

Submitted to
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BACKGROUND AND PREPARATION FOR CLOSURE

Preparation of the City College of San Francisco (CCSF) Closure Report is a requirement of the Show Cause status determined in June 2012 by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The steps associated with closure, outlined in this report, will only be implemented should the ACCJC determine such steps are necessary. The Commission will present its findings and determination as to the status of CCSF’s accreditation status in a July, 2013 correspondence to CCSF. That determination will be based upon the CCSF Accreditation Show Cause Report (submittal date to ACCJC is March 15, 2013; the Spring (March-April) 2013 site visit; the October 15, 2012 Special Report; and, other pertinent information and data.

In a letter dated July 2, 2012 from the ACCJC, the college was placed on Show Cause. As a result of such sanction, the following were required:

1. Develop and submit a Special Report – due October 15, 2012 (The overall plan describes how CCSF will address the mission, institutional assessments, planning and budgeting issues identified in several of the 2012 evaluation team recommendations.)
3. Prepare for a team to conduct a comprehensive accreditation site visit of Commission representatives

Show Cause is issued when the commission finds an institution in substantial non-compliance with the Commission’s Eligibility Requirements, accreditation Standards, or policies, or when the institution has not responded to the condition imposed by the Commission. “CCSF failed to demonstrate that it meets the requirements outlined in a significant number of Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards. It also failed to implement the eight recommendations of the 2006 evaluation team (five partially addressed, and three completely unaddressed). The college is expected to fully address all of the recommendations of a comprehensive evaluation team before the next comprehensive evaluation visit occurs.” The Commission is requiring CCSF to Show Cause as to why its accreditation should not be withdrawn. CCSF must demonstrate through evidence that it has corrected the deficiencies noted by the Commission and is in compliance with the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission Policies. The burden of proof rests on the institution to demonstrate why its accreditation should be continued. During the Show Cause period, the institution must make preparations for closure according to the Commission’s Policy on Closing an Institution. The Commission also requires CCSF to submit this Closure Plan with its Show Cause Report on March 15, 2013.

SANCTION HISTORY

Date: March 2006

Accreditation Status: Accreditation reaffirmed

Definition of Status: The institution substantially meets or exceeds the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies, but has recommendations on a small number of issues of some urgency which, if not addressed immediately may threaten the ability of the institution to continue to meet the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies. Additional reports required: Progress Report was filed on 3/15/2007; Focused Mid-Term Report was filed on 3/15/2009.
Deficiencies Noted: Recommendation #2: Planning and Assessment; Recommendation #3: Student Learning Outcomes; Recommendation #4: Financial Planning and Stability.

Date: March 2012

Accreditation Status: Show Cause

Definition of Status: Institution is in substantial non-compliance with its eligibility requirements, accreditation standards, or commission policies or the institution has not responded to the conditions imposed by the Commission.

Deficiencies Noted: Recommendation #1: Mission Statement; Recommendation #2: Planning and Assessment; Recommendation #3: Student Learning Outcomes; Recommendation #4: Financial Planning and Stability; Recommendation #5: Physical Facilities contingency Planning; Recommendation #6: Physical Facilities Maintenance Planning; Recommendation #7: Technology Planning; Recommendation #8: Board of Trustees Evaluation.

According to the Commission, “the accredited status of CCSF continues during the period of Show Cause and until the Commission acts to terminate accreditation or when issues that gave rise to Show Cause are fully resolved and the institution is removed from sanction. Since the loss of accreditation would likely cause CCSF to close, during the show cause period, CCSF must make preparations for closure according to the Commission’s Policy on Closing an Institution.”

The loss of accreditation would likely result in a loss of state and federal funds, including all general fund and categorical apportionment revenues, financial aid, and maintenance and operations funds. The magnitude of this loss would cause all functions of the college to cease. Although technically, the district could remain as a legal entity, removal of funding could have the same effect as closing the institution. CCSF is developing and implementing every step and precaution to address all ACCJC recommendations so that the institution can demonstrate why its accreditation should be continued. Tremendous progress is being made. However, given the magnitude of the deficiencies, not all deficiencies will be resolved by the March 15, 2013 submittal date of the report, nor by the team visit in Spring 2013. Due to the parallel requirement to address the Commission’s policy on closing an institution, this Closure Report is being taken seriously and submitted to ACCJC by March 15, 2013.

CCSF is following ACCJC’s Policy on Closing an Institution to develop a closure plan to ensure students’ interests are protected. Therefore, the challenge is to develop a closure plan that would provide services to students and the community with the least disruption while CCSF corrects deficiencies as noted in the July 2, 2012 letter.

The ACCJC Policy on Closing an Institution stipulates that “Before closing, the governing board should consider carefully such alternatives as merging with another institution, forming a consortium, or participating in extensive institutional sharing and cooperation.” It is imperative that CCSF work diligently to ensure the interests of the students are being protected.

In the event the Closure Plan needs to be active by the beginning of Fall 2013, CCSF would, in advance and using a consultative process, implement the following:
### DEFINED TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINED TASK</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY ENTITY</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of each identified constituent group in consultation and closure planning</td>
<td>Special Trustee, Board of Trustees, CEO, Administration and Participatory Governance Council</td>
<td>By 01/24/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of State and/or National Law Relative to Legal Responsibilities: Employee entitlements</td>
<td>Special Trustee, Board of Trustees, CEO, and Administration, Unions</td>
<td>By 06/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of State and/or National Law Relative to Legal Responsibilities: Title to Real Property/Other Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>Special Trustee, Board of Trustees, CEO, and Administration</td>
<td>By 09/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Closing (Merging, Forming Consortiums, Inter-Institutional Sharing/Corporation)</td>
<td>Special Trustee, Board of Trustees, CEO, Administration and Participatory Governance Council</td>
<td>By 06/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Services Agreement (ISA) with an accredited college to offer contracted instructional services. (A substantive change proposal would need to be approved by AACJC for this to be a viable option.)</td>
<td>Special Trustee, CEO, Board of Trustees, Administration, Academic Senate</td>
<td>By 06/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Board fully informs all affected constituents</td>
<td>Board of Trustees, CEO, Administration</td>
<td>By 08/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for Student Completion of Programs and the securing of student records</td>
<td>Board of Trustees, CEO, Administration</td>
<td>By 10/31/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In adherence to the ACCJC’s requirements identified in its Policy on Closing an Institution, the following is a list of the activities that the CCSF needs to fully address to ensure that transition for students is smooth. A complete analysis/address of the following elements will be accomplished:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINED TASKS</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Student Completion</td>
<td>By 12/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Disposition of Academic Records and Financial Aid Transcripts</td>
<td>By 12/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Provisions for Faculty and Staff – Adhere to Appropriate Code Sections</td>
<td>By 03/15/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Disposition of Assets</td>
<td>By 12/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Obligation of Assets</td>
<td>By 12/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Coordination with the ACCJC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Key Governing Board Obligations</td>
<td>By 06/30/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Student Completion

_Closure requires provisions for the academic needs of students who have not completed their degrees and educational programs._

- Arrangements will be made to permit those students who have completed 75% of an academic program elsewhere, but to receive the degree and educational program from the 'closed' institution [CCSF]. Arrangements shall be made with the ACCJC for continuation of the college's accreditation by the ACCJC for this purpose only.
- Neighboring districts will be notified with the goal to provide students the opportunity to complete courses at their colleges.
- Arrangements for transfers to other institutions will require complete academic records and all other related information gathered in dossiers that can be transmitted promptly to receiving institutions.
- Arrangements made with other institutions to receive transferring students and to accept records will be submitted to the ACCJC for approval.
- Arrangements will be made with the appropriate federal or state grants agencies to transfer the grants to the receiving institutions. For student-held scholarships or grants or other available funds that can be legally used, appropriate agreements must be negotiated or students must be fully informed.
- If accreditation is removed, a list of students who have completed 75% of an academic degree/educational program/certificate program by the end of Spring 2013 will be generated.
- The Vice Chancellor of Student Services will be responsible for notifying students who have completed 75% of an academic degree and educational program and/or certificate program of their potential graduation/completion status. Students will be informed of their status for degree or certificate and their option to receive degree or certificate under CCSF or other institutions if they are to complete the respective curriculum. After a loss of accreditation, CCSF student would have no other option except to transfer to another accredited institution.
- The college will issue a letter for each student indicating the closure of the college and to ensure the acceptance of the credits by other accredited institutions. If applicable, the Chancellor will send CCSF closure notifications to the neighboring colleges for them to accept the CCSF transfer students and their credits before any termination date.
- The following neighboring districts will be contacted (San Mateo CCD; Marin County CCD; Peralta CCD; Contra Costa CCD; San Jose-Evergreen CCD; Chabot-Las Positas CCD; Ohlone CCD).
- The district will provide EVERY student with the most up-to-date transcript at the time of request as well as by mail, telephone hotlines, college website, public and social media as to where they can retrieve a copy of their transcript. Communication will be in English and all languages utilized by current CCSF students.
B. Disposition of Academic Records and Financial Aid Transcripts

All academic records, financial aid information, and other records must be prepared for permanent filing, including microfilming. Arrangements must be made to preserve the records. Notification must be sent to every current and past student indicating where the records are being stored and what the accessibility to those records will be. Where possible, a copy of a student’s record should also be forwarded to the individual student. The ACCJC must be notified of the location where student permanent records will be stored.

- Digitize and microfilm ALL student files. Student records have been electronic since XXXXXX.
- All student records are filed (identify location and record dates such as 1977 – 2012).
- Digitize and store ALL financial aid records, human resources records, and business office records (identify location and record dates).
- Notify ACCJC and students of the location of stored records and accessibility once the process has been completed.
- Work with the State Chancellor’s Office to contract with an entity to electronically store all transcripts and provide the students with the process to order them.
- Announce the process and procedure on how students can obtain their transcripts through the news media in English and other languages commonly spoken by CCSF students.
- Make arrangements for the Admissions and Records Office to be open for pick-ups as campus closure is in effect.
- Establish a dedicated hotline and utilize other social media and the college website to provide students with instructions on how and where they can order transcripts. Continued maintenance of the website, social media and hotline will occur providing accurate and up-to-date information for all students.

C. Provisions for Faculty and Staff

The institution must arrange for continuation of those faculty and staff who will be necessary for the completion of the institution’s work up to and after the closing date.

- The District will work in good faith to assist faculty and staff in finding alternative employment.
- The District cannot make any guarantees to future employment beyond the closure of CCSF. Early resignations and/or retirements will be accepted should faculty or staff members obtain new positions outside the District or choose to retire.
- Following Commission action on the District’s Show Cause Report, all faculty and staff will be notified in writing immediately. In the event of closure, faculty will receive a March 15th notice as required by Ed Code and contract and classified employees will receive their layoff notices per contract.
- Neighboring districts will be contacted (San Mateo CCD; Marin County CCD; Peralta CCD; Contra Costa CCD; San Jose-Evergreen CCD; Chabot-Las Positas CCD; Ohlone CCD) regarding available employment opportunities in their district for information sharing with current CCSF employees.
- The Human Resources Department would actively list job opportunities across the District and work with faculty and staff in alternate placement.
D. Disposition of Assets

Determinations must be made to allocate whatever financial resources and assets remain after the basic needs of current students, faculty, and staff are provided for.

- The District will remain as the legal entity to monitor the disposition of its assets.
- In the event the District does not have sufficient financial resources to honor obligations to creditors, the Board of Trustees will determine the necessary steps to proceed with possibility declaration of bankruptcy. Should such action be taken, the bankruptcy court judge will determine the disposition of assets.
- In the event of closure, all long-term off-site (credit/non-credit instruction) existing contracts/MOU's or Lease Agreement would be terminated with month-to-month continuations in some locations based on summer course offerings.
- All lease agreements would be reviewed and established in collaboration with any potential merger district upon notification of closure.
- Notification to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) will occur upon closure with the submittal of financial reports and performance reports within 45 days. The District will notify the USDE how records will be retained and stored.
- Procedures will be developed for collecting any outstanding student loans, reconcile any over-awards, overpayments, and/or withdrawal calculations.
- Return all unexpended funds of all categorical programs to the respective agencies if these agencies require such action.
- The District will work with the Foundation for CCSF to ensure that the assets would honor the intentions of the original providers including endowments, donors, and grantors.
- All donors and grantors will be notified of the college’s disposition of endowments and donations.
- The District will adhere to State or federal laws regarding the disposition of endowments and institutional assets.
- The District will determine the value of real and personal properties.
- The District will explore all viable options and confirm that employee long-term retiree benefits, vacation and compensation time obligations are satisfied.
- The District will satisfy vendor obligations as required by federal and State regulations.
- With the assistance of legal counsel, the District will also explore the sales of physical plan, equipment, library, special collections, art, or dispensation of other funds if necessary.

E. Obligations to Creditors

The institution must establish a clear understanding with its creditors and all other agencies involved with its activities to assure that their claims and interests will be properly processed... All concerned federal, national and state agencies need to be apprised of the institution’s situation, and any obligations relating to estate or governmental funds need to be cleared with the appropriate agencies.

- In the event of closure, all long-term off-site (credit/non-credit instruction) existing contracts/MOU’s or Lease Agreement would be terminated with month-to-month continuations in some locations based on summer course offerings.
All lease agreements would be reviewed and established in collaboration with any potential merger district upon notification of closure.

The District will identify all outstanding creditor obligations for all funds, including local bond fund creditors.

The District will follow the State or federal laws regarding payments of creditors.

The District will apprise all agencies of the institution’s arrangements in order not to be subject to later legal proceedings.

The District will process properly all claims and interests with creditors and other agencies.

Develop publicly defensible policies for dividing the resources equitably among those with claims against the institution.

In the event the District does not have sufficient financial resources to honor obligations to creditors, the Board of Trustees will determine the necessary steps to proceed with possibility declaration of bankruptcy. Should such action be taken, the bankruptcy court judge will determine the disposition of assets.

F. Coordination with the ACCJC

The ACCJC and other specialized accrediting bodies must be consulted and kept fully apprised of developments as the plan to close an institution progresses. Arrangements must be completed with the ACCJC in advance of closure in order to assure that a legally authorized and accredited institution awards degrees. A final report on the closing must be submitted to the ACCKC for its records. The ACCJC must also be notified of the location where student records will be stored.

The Governing Board of CCSF will consult with and keep the ACCJC apprised of all matters pertaining to the closure of the college.

Consultation with AACJC will occur to assure that students have transferred to legally authorized and accredited institutions including any partnership institutions.

Student completion, including all records will be provided for as detailed in section A of this document.

Permanently storage location of all student records will be disclosed to the AACJC.

G. Key Governing Board Obligations

The governing board must take a formal vote to terminate the institution on a specified date. Also, the board must identify the person or persons authorized to determine whether or not these requirements have in fact been satisfied.

The CCSF Board of Trustees will take a formal vote to terminate the college by ACCJC’s termination-of-accreditation decision and based on the progress of the closure activities.

The Board of Trustees will ensure that the current students who are at 75% completion will be able to be graduated from CCSF by completing their requirements elsewhere or through any approved partnerships.

The Board of Trustees will take legal action to set a deadline for completion of degrees and certifications, authorize the Chancellor to determine whether or not these requirements have in fact been satisfied; and make arrangements with ACCJC in advance regarding CCSF granting degrees.
• In the event of termination, CCSF will not be authorized to award accredited degrees nor enroll new students.
• The Board of Trustees will decide the date to file for bankruptcy if necessary and determine whether or not all obligations to students have been satisfactorily discharged.

H. Fruition

*Should closure occur, students are to be provided appropriate and essential support services during and after the closure period.*

• In the event of closure, during the final semester, CCSF will provide the students with appropriate and necessary services in academics, the business office, the financial aid office, the registrar’s office, counseling, and other essential support services.
• The District will notify management, faculty and classified staff that personnel are to be retained.
• The District will make every effort to honor long-term financial obligations (loans, debentures, etc.)
• The District will continue to operate in its legal capacity regarding relevant personnel services, fiscal services, facilities services, and other related student services during and immediately following the closure period until such time as all legal obligations are met.
# PROCEDURES IMPLEMENTED TO DEVELOP CLOSURE REPORT

## CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>CEO and LEAD GROUPS</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review policy WASC policy on Closing an Institution</td>
<td>CCSF CEO; Special Trustee</td>
<td>November 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Show Cause Report, assessment of CCSF status (progress), and Closure Policy. Clarify role and responsibility of State Chancellor’s Office with the closure of CCSF</td>
<td>CCSF CEO; Special Trustee; Executive Vice Chancellor-CCCCCO</td>
<td>December 19, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Closure reports for: Diablo Valley College (DVC); Solano College (SC); College of the Redwoods (COR); Cuesta College (CC)</td>
<td>CCSF CEO; Special Trustee</td>
<td>December 23, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Closure Policy and clarify role and responsibility of State Chancellor’s Office with the closure of CCSF</td>
<td>CCSF CEO; Special Trustee; Executive Vice Chancellor-CCCCCO</td>
<td>January 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue with CEOs responsible for the above mentioned closure reports: Kathryn Lehner, CEO (COR); Gil Stork, CEO (CC); Bob Jensen, CEO (SC); Helen Benjamin, CEO (DVC)</td>
<td>CCSF CEO</td>
<td>January 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Closure Report – Framework. Review with Board president and vice president</td>
<td>Board President &amp; Vice President</td>
<td>January 17, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss Closure Policy, timeline, and, process with constituent leadership</td>
<td>CCSF CEO; Special Trustee; PGC</td>
<td>January 17, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Reading Draft Closure Report (and Show Cause Report)</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>January 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain feedback on draft Closure Report (and Show Cause Report)</td>
<td>Open for CCSF community to submit feedback</td>
<td>January 24 - February 28, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft Closure Report to State Chancellor’s Office</td>
<td>CCSF CEO</td>
<td>February 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss Draft Closure Report</td>
<td>CCSF CEO; PGC</td>
<td>February 17, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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