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Please note:

- The “Actionable Improvement Plans” are still in progress for all Standards.
- We are in the process of applying the style guide for purposes of consistency in matters such as capitalization, the elimination of passive voice, nomenclature, etc.
- We are removing references to evidence as those will be contained within one master document that accompanies the report, continuing to reduce redundancy, continuing to incorporate exemplars where needed and as appropriate (largely in the form of evidence), continuing to clean up all formatting, and ensuring that the relationship of Distance Education across the Standards is appropriately described.
- We now have data to accompany the Show Cause Report. To access this data, visit: http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/internal_external_data_2013.pdf
- The general guidance from ACCJC regarding the length of Self Evaluations recommendations a word count of 25,000. The current document is over 100,000 words.
- The final Show Cause Report will include a glossary of acronyms.
- We are continually compiling the evidence; for the latest list, please visit: http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/Accreditation_2012/accreditation_documentsforshowcausereport.html

We need your feedback! Instructions for submitting feedback:
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Key for highlighting used in the draft:
- Sources of evidence are highlighted in yellow.
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1. Institutional Self Evaluation Report

A. Introduction

At the May 10, 2012 City College of San Francisco (CCSF) Board of Trustees meeting, then-Interim Chancellor Pamila Fisher reported that the draft Accreditation Report indicated fiscal problems with CCSF operations. On May 24, 2012, the Board of Trustees voted to request the assistance of the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) to conduct a study of CCSF’s fiscal condition and to ask for recommendations.

On July 3, 2012, City College of San Francisco (CCSF) received the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College’s (ACCJC) evaluation report and decision letter 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 College produced the October 15 Special Report 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, San Francisco voters elected four Trustees (three incumbents and one new member) who took office in January 2013.

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.

CCSF’s approach to the 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 CCSF Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) 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 comprising administrators, faculty, staff and students provided input into the development of the October 15 report. Each of the workgroups, including one that focused on centers and sites, was responsible for addressing one or more 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 ALO, 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 13 workgroups (which had previously worked on one or more of 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 ALO 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 July 2012 ACCJC 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 Recommendation 1 (Mission), Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process), Recommendation 5 (Student Services), Recommendation 8 (Physical Resources), and Recommendation 10 (Financial Planning). 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 – PRELIMINARY DRAFT Show Cause Report (pdf) to Steering Committee
- January 17, 2013 – Participatory Governance Council Discussion
- January 18, 2013 – 1st DRAFT Show Cause Report online (including Closure Report)
- 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 – Constituent feedback due on 1st DRAFT
- February 5, 2013 – Steering Committee Meeting – Review latest 1st DRAFT Show Cause Report
- February 7, 2013 – Special Board of Trustees meeting to discuss latest 1st 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
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.

Within the context of the Show Cause sanction, this Institutional Self Evaluation documents major historical changes, as well as cultural shifts and struggles.

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 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 merged in 1990 into a single City College of San Francisco.

With approved bond measures in 1997, 2001, and 2005, the College renovated, expanded and developed new buildings and facilities throughout 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.

The document accompanying this Show Cause Report entitled, “Internal & External Data Trends with a Focus on Student Achievement” provides a multitude of data, including (tables and sections noted below refer to this data document):

- Student Data (see Tables 5.1a – 5.14)
- Labor Market Data (see XXX)
- Demographic and Socioeconomic Data (see Sections I and III)

Table 1 below summarizes the number of certificates and degrees having more than 50 percent of the unit requirements offered at centers outside the Ocean Campus. 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; Culinary Arts and Hospitality 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 Ocean 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.

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.

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 (SLOs) to enhance student success and equity. The Mission Statement appears in the CCSF Strategic Plan and is published in the official College Catalog. It is also published on the College website.

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 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.

---

1 The current Strategic Plan contains the previous Mission Statement; this will be updated to reflect the current Mission Statement at that time.
The seven-member Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District is an independent policymaking board that ensures that the District is implementing its educational mission. 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

The District recently has undergone transitions in leadership due to the departure of Chancellor Don Griffin in May 2012. The Board appointed Interim Chancellor 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. The District has communicated all transitions have 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 ACCJC’s July 2012 Recommendations, 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. The College has 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, the College has begun a hiring process 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.

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.

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.

At least 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; \( \geq 75 \) percent of students are enrolled in these programs.

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 SLOs 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 55022.5 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. The Curriculum Committee uses these standards in its review of the relationship of contact hours and units in proposed Course Outlines of Record. The credit associated with each course offered by the College is clearly indicated in the College Catalog.

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.

Although SLO assessment has been present at CCSF in various forms for over a decade, since July 2012, the College has engaged in a rigorous process of consistently documenting progress. Milestones include ensuring that all programs have developed and published SLOs along with plans for assessing student attainment of those SLOs. The College has developed a robust website dedicated to documenting the assessment of SLOs across the College and providing resources in establishing and measuring SLOs, facilitating College-wide dialogue, and sharing ideas for course and program improvements. Instructional program student learning outcomes (disciplines, majors, and certificates) are listed in the College Catalog. Course-level SLOs are listed in course outlines, are available publicly through department websites, and are described on the syllabi for all courses. The Curriculum Handbook and SLO website include entire sections on defining good course-level and program-level SLOs. Service program outcomes are listed on each department’s assessment web page. The College gathers evidence of SLO achievement and planned and completed course and program improvements each semester. Work remains to be done before the College reaches closed-loop ongoing SLO assessment in all areas College-wide, but the College has made significant progress. A thorough plan is in place that faculty uniformly support for moving the College toward a culture of continuous improvement based on SLOs.

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. 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. The College Catalog documents the comprehensive learning outcomes that students should gain as a result of completing the General Education requirements. 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 to include 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 are of work or major study as ensured by Board Policy 6.06 on 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. Faculty duties and responsibilities are clearly outlined in the SFCCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement and the 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 Requirement and its related Standards, the College engaged in a comprehensive review and assessment of all student support services across the entire District 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.

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. This policy is consistent with the College Mission Statement, the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, and the statewide mission for California Community Colleges.

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 supplies sufficient information and learning resources 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. The College is committed to continually enhancing its learning resources, regardless of location or delivery method.

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. The District has achieved cost savings through salary reductions for faculty, staff, and administrators during Fiscal Year (FY) 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 the College has made progress, 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 the College has developed a longer-term plan 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.

Externally contracted certified public accountants conduct City College of San Francisco’s annual financial audits. The auditors utilize the Audits of Colleges and Universities, published by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants as a guide. The District reviews and discusses financial audit and management responses to any exceptions 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. CCSF complies with federal Title IV requirements.

In July 2012, ACCJC found that City College of San Francisco had

"failed 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 instead in January 15, 2013 due to delays from a whistle-blower allegation (see also Standard III.D.). 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. In alignment with the planning process, the College has updated its Program Review process and template, which continues to include information about SLOs. Rubrics and guidelines now guide Program Review development and prioritization, along with a Program Review website. The Academic Senate has developed Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs); the next step is for the Chancellor’s Executive Team and the Participatory Governance Council to review the ILOs. 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 decision making. 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 but has plans in place to do so on a continuous basis.

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 the 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 include the College website.

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 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. The College is not only addressing the deficiencies noted by the 2006 evaluation team and those noted by the 2012 evaluation team, 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. Per Commission policies, the College cannot submit substantive change proposals while on sanction.

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

“Prepare at end when full report is complete. Will address 2006 and 2012 Recommendations with a summary of the ways in which we are responding with a status report of those activities.”

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). 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.

In July 2012, the ACCJC recommended that:

“To improve effectiveness of Standard 1A Mission, the team recommends that the college establish a prescribed process and timeline to regularly review the mission statement and revise it as necessary. The college should use the mission statement as the benchmark to determine institutional priorities and goals that support and improve academic programs, student support services and student learning effectively linked to a realistic assessment of resources.”

Given this Recommendation, the College immediately undertook a review of its Mission Statement. After examining internal and external data, surveying CCSF personnel, reviewing the California Education Code, and receiving input from the public, the Board narrowed the priorities of the College’s Mission from seven to the following four top priorities: 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). Additional aspects of the Mission are now listed as important to fulfill when resources allow. 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. Some faculty have expressed concerns that making changes to the Mission in the summer, at a time when many students, faculty, and community members are not available will not promote a fully informed discussion and decision by the Board. The Board of Trustees adopted BP 1.00 containing the revised Mission on September 11, 2012, despite opposition by students and faculty to the Mission statement revision.

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).

I.A.-I.A.4. Descriptive Summary – Distance Education. CCSF’s commitment to distance education is aligned with its primary Mission. Specifically, the College offers courses in distance education that lead to transfer to baccalaureate institutions; achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Sciences; the acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace; and learning English as a Second Language. The 2012 Program Review for the Educational Technology Department, responsible for distance education, addressed the alignment between distance education and the College’s primary Mission.

I.A.-I.A.4. Self Evaluation. In collecting input for the revised Mission via an online survey, technological issues interfered with reaching the student population, with particular impact upon noncredit students without access to email. Materials presented to the Board at the meeting during which the Board discussed the new language for the Mission statement did not include student survey data. 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 the Governance Council. Individuals and groups expressed concerns about these shortcomings in collecting appropriate input.

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 intentionally unranked to promote all seven Mission components, 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 statement allows room for expanding the breadth and depth of what the College offers when resources allow. The Vision Statement of City College still asserts the College’s intention to “reach out to all people, especially to those communities that encounter barriers to education; develop sustainable campuses and sites to better serve students and neighborhoods …”

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, student population, and financial resources 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.

I.A.-I.A.4. Self Evaluation – Distance Education. With the aggressive timeline for revising the College’s Mission in Fall 2012, the College did not engage in a discussion about including a statement related to the College’s commitment to distance education in the Mission. With the new annual review cycle for the Mission, stakeholders in distance education can and should now participate in the dialogue about including distance education in the Mission.
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 and distance education</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>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly connect selected objectives in the Annual Plan for the following year to the Mission, as well as to Board planning priorities and the College’s strategic priorities</td>
<td>Explicitly connect selected objectives in the Annual Plan for the following year to the Mission, as well as to Board planning priorities and the College’s strategic priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the explicit inclusion of distance education in the Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage departments that have participated in distance education in limited ways in a dialogue about delivering courses such as basic skills at a distance in order to better meet the primary Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather more information about the technology limitations of distance education in non-credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain and analyze more detailed data specific to success and demographics of distance education students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.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.

One of the fundamental Recommendations of ACCJC in July 2012 was for the College to:

“develop a strategy for fully implementing its existing planning process to look at each campus and site, examine revenues and expenses, and systematically address instructional program planning, staffing requirements, provision of student and
library services, including facilities needs and competing priorities. The planning process should include clearly prescribed roles and scope of authority for all governance stakeholders involved in each component of the planning process.”

To address this and other related Recommendations, the institution has spent considerable time revamping its planning system, which now utilizes the Mission Statement and a more robust Program Review process (restored to an annual cycle) to make planning more integrated and effective—and thereby better aligned with the Accreditation Standards. The revised planning process is more heavily informed by data and timely assessment processes to support decisions relating to resource allocation. The revised process also specifies clear roles and authority with several venues for dialogue including the Program Review stage, Participatory Governance stage, and public Board meetings. Changes to the planning process are taking place within the additionally changing context of the Participatory Governance Council.

Given the recommended changes needed to fulfill ACCJC Recommendation 2, the College has determined that the District’s Research and Planning Office needed to expand immediately in order to address the need for increasingly data-informed, systematic, and fully coordinated planning processes. In light of this, on August 23, 2012, the Board approved a new structure for that office, to be implemented in the short term, that is consistent with the Research and Planning staffing at other colleges. In the near term, this structure includes the following four essential positions and increases this office from two persons to four. The College is in the process of finalizing the hiring of two individuals for the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions and transferred a staff member from the suspended Governmental Affairs Office to serve as the Research and Planning Management Assistant.

- Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (new)
- Management Assistant (new)
- Director of Research
- Administrative Analyst/Programmer

Long term, a Director of Planning position will need to be filled, but, as noted above, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness will directly oversee planning activities until such time that the budget allows for filling the Director of Planning position.

I.B.1. 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 professional development workshops, department meetings, and 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 varying degrees 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 with no current plans for continuing to meet given the changing governance structure. 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.

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 intent of these discussions is 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.

Departmental dialogue about effectiveness occurs during regularly held department meetings and SLO-specific meetings among faculty within the same program or who teach the same course. Some of these meetings incorporate students and faculty from other departments or other colleges. Professional development workshops both inside and outside CCSF provide further opportunities for shared dialogue on student learning and institutional effectiveness. Internal professional development opportunities include FLEX professional development days and regular workshops throughout the semester at a variety of times and locations. Two large-scale College-wide events in Fall 2012 focused entirely on the SLO and institutional effectiveness dialogue. The first, an all-day (and evening) event on September 12, 2012, included approximately 1,000 members of the College community (faculty, administrators, and classified staff). Guest expert Bob Pacheco presented on turning evidence into action. On November 21, 2012, 200 faculty participated in an accreditation workshop focusing on SLOs. The recently appointed SLO Coordinator’s primary responsibility is to facilitate continuing dialogue across the College to develop a College-wide culture of using SLO assessment results for course and/or program improvement.

I.B.1. Descriptive Summary – Distance Education. A particular area of ongoing, focused dialogue has been distance learning. Participatory governance includes the Distance Learning Advisory Committee (DLAC) and Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable (TLTR) established circa 1995. Both Academic Senate Committees are involved in a dialogue about the continuous improvement of student
learning in distance education. Additionally, the Educational Technology Department (ETD) engages both faculty teaching distance education and the wider College community in an ongoing dialogue focused on continually improving student learning.

I.B.1. Self Evaluation. While processes are in place to engage in College-wide dialogue, the College has not emphasized continuous improvement of SLOs and institutional effectiveness. For several years the College has been 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 the previous Shared Governance system and in additional forums (e.g., Chancellor’s Taskforce and Board equity hearings), significant, inclusive, and lively discussions and subsequent actions occurred regarding topics such as defining and narrowing the achievement gap, basic skills, and placement tests. These particular discussions have been on hold given the transition to the new Participatory Governance system and the College’s focus on addressing accreditation issues.

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, with student learning and institutional effectiveness as more consistent focal points for these discussions.

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 plans and showing the relevant linkages.

Events such as those that took place on September 12 and November 21, 2012 (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. In addition, these activities need to move beyond creating and documenting assessment processes and toward the ultimate goal of exchanging ideas on how to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness (based on collected data).

Plans for future events such as these are already in place for SLOs. The dialogue on improvement of student learning via the SLO process is now frequent, robust, and greatly improved. The Academic Senate has made significant progress in revamping committees to advise on instructional matters and relate their activities to accreditation standards and outcomes.

However, the Academic Senate has raised the following concern:

“Discussion between administrators and others on institutional processes has been very limited in Fall 2012 and early Spring 2013. Communication and discussion was expected to flow through very few individuals, very rapidly, with inadequate notice of meetings and robust documentation of discussion and efforts. Although the October 15 report for the ACCJC was detailed, some sections relating to institutional processes represented the input of very few people.
The Participatory Governance General Council is new and limited in membership. While a revised Participatory Governance system may have great potential for some improvement of functions, the size and scope of participation is unsettled. With administrative duties residing in fewer people and fewer forums in Participatory Governance as currently proposed, the potential for creating communication bottlenecks about institutional processes is significant. This should be taken into account as the system is fleshed out to improve the current lack of communication. A survey of employees about communication on institutional processes should be done very soon in order to find out where communication works well and not so well.”

In Fall 2012, the workgroup focusing on ACCJC Recommendation 1 (Mission) had some discussion about the data used to inform the Mission review. Similarly, the workgroup responsible for addressing Recommendation 2 (planning) had some discussion about the data used to inform the Board Priorities. In future annual cycles, data and information used to inform Board Priorities (as well as the review of the Mission statement) 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.

Recently, on February 7, 2013, the ALO circulated an Accreditation Pop Quiz to all College employees describing how to access data. The primary document emphasized in the email is the introductory data for accreditation. At least at the institutional level, this document contains all categories of data required per the September 2012 ACCJC Manual for Self Evaluation.

**1.B.1. Self Evaluation – Distance Education.** The College can do more to compare the use of educational technology tools to promote student learning. For example, the College has only compared the success and retention rates in distance education courses that use such tools to those that do not through qualitative data. The College will develop better quantitative measures to gain more information about the differences in the use of educational technology tools.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Timeline</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>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently build assessments into College-wide planning documents to make linkages more evident.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey College employees regarding venues for dialogue and avenues for communication</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule College-wide events for all employees to engage in robust discussions about student learning.</td>
<td>Fall 2013/ Flex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.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. In 2006, the College received a recommendation regarding the need to “develop an integrated process of planning and assessment.” The 2012 Visiting Team found that the College had partially addressed this recommendation but that the system needed:

“to be fully implemented and strongly associated with program performance, accountability, and the allocation of resources...”

Adjustments to the annual process emphasize and strengthen the connection between College-wide goals and program-level activities, delineate timely communication mechanisms regarding goals, and emphasize the role of assessment in determining whether goals have been achieved.

An extensively vetted, longer-range, six-year Strategic Plan that the Board 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 it 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.

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.

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, the administrative chain will rank Program Review objectives, with subsequent review via the Participatory Governance Council, after which the College will distill the objectives 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 College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) and the Board only briefly discussed the assessment.

For seven years or more, College Performance Indicators (CPI) Reports tracked performance on a variety of measures associated with the Strategic Plan. The College last reported CPIs 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.

Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) data trends have been presented to the Board every year, as legislatively required, but the College has not used these data to set goals, nor has the College widely discussed these data.

Soon after coming on board, Interim Chancellor Fisher recognized deficiencies in how the College approached enrollment management. In Fall 2012, the College engaged in significant enrollment management training. As a result, the College has prioritized enrollment management and formalized the mechanisms for enrollment management and identified a team to carry it out. Each department set goals for enrollment with follow up by school deans to determine whether targets are being met.

I.B.2. Descriptive Summary – Distance Education. The Strategic Plan and the Annual Plan include specific goals and objectives for distance education. The most recent draft of the Technology Plan includes a section that specifically identifies goals and objectives for the effectiveness of distance education.

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.

Program Review data includes financial data that many at the College question with respect to accuracy and completeness, particularly restricted fund data. Beginning in Winter 2012, the College began engaging in work sessions to correct the data with representatives from units who had access to Banner.

Comment [pm10]: I suggest moving this down to just before the last paragraph where EMP and SP are discussed.
Aside from the Annual Plan, the College has not adhered to a regular schedule to update longer-range plans.

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>Action Plan</th>
<th>Timeline</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>April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement a benchmarking process for setting targets for each of the annual indicators.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move forward toward creating a new Education Master Plan.</td>
<td>Ongoing through Spring 2014</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.</td>
<td>After Spring 2014</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. Historically, the College had a six-year Program Review process. In order to connect Program Review directly to annual budgets, the College transitioned to an annual Program Review process. The annual Program Review process, which began in 2008-09, integrates facilities, staffing, and technology. Units clearly identify their needs by resource categories (e.g., staffing). However, since its reinvigoration in 2008-09, the College has not allocated any resources 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 2012-13 budget contained no direct connections to Program Review. Shared Governance committees did not review the final budget in Fall 2012 before the Board adopted it, given the transition at that time to a new Participatory Governance model. The Board adopted the final budget in September 2012 with the following changes: a larger summer session in 2013, a reduction in wages for all employees ranging from 2.85 percent to 5.26 percent, depending on the employee group, and reductions in spending for non-instructional assignments of $875,000. In addition, the Board directed the administration to add $500,000 to the reserve. 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 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 the Program Review Committee, 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. The College similarly will address other restricted revenue funding streams (e.g., basic skills).

The College has never had a formal staffing plan. The College created a ten-year facilities plan in 2004. The College last updated and obtained Board approval of a Technology Plan in Spring 2010; during Fall 2012 the College developed a first draft of an new technology plan that the College is currently undergoing discussion and review. A final version is expected to be ready in Spring 2013 with formal adopted taking place 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, course success by student demographics, and degree and certification totals by program. Additional data such as demand for courses is available via the Decision Support System (DSS). The Program Review template also prompts departments 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) as well as student and employee survey ratings when available.

- Data for administrative units also include student and employee survey ratings when available.
Units may request additional data. For example, the Education Technology Department requested and received data about online sections and student success.

As departments complete their Program Reviews, the Research and Planning Office supplements the quantitative data with additional data, both quantitative and qualitative.

The DSS is a dated system developed locally in 1998. The College will fully retire the DSS by the end of 2013 and replace it with Argos, which the College is currently implementing. Argos is a newer 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.

Another example of the use of quantitative and qualitative data and assessments to support evaluation and planning was the complete revision of the Strategic Plan during 2010 and 2011. The planning process utilized Environmental Scan data on internal and external trends; Education Policy Landscape regarding legislative and budgetary issues; listening sessions impressions from education, business, and community partners; Student Equity Concerns; an assessment of long-term accomplishments and gaps during two day-long retreats; as well as a thorough review of unit-level Program Reviews and other planning documents.

I.B.3. Descriptive Summary – Distance Education. As with other areas of the College, planning for distance learning has not been clearly linked to budgeting. The Education Technology Department (ETD) identifies the fiscal, technical and human resources required for distance education in its Program Review. The dean over ETD then includes these needs in his report to Academic Affairs. Other departments can also reference distance learning objectives in College plans as they complete their Program Reviews. As integration improves, distance learning needs will be ranked and funded accordingly.

I.B.3. Self Evaluation. Connections between Program Reviews, the Annual Plan, and the budget need to be stronger and more direct. The College has not regularly and consistently practiced data-informed decision making in which the institution ranked needs College-wide.

The 2013-14 budget developed during Spring 2013 will demonstrate some strong, transparent connections given a successful implementation of the new process. However, some department chairs and other faculty have not found the process so far to be transparent, largely because the process of ranking priorities based on Program Review is still in the administrative stage; it will enter the Participatory Governance stage in early March 2013.

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. The College will use such information 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 during 2013-14.

The prompt requesting units 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 and will identify funded objectives and monitor them for impact and related outcomes.

Although Program Review incorporates several pages of data, more data is needed. Instructional units there is scant data tracking student progress beyond the course level. For many years, the College also has not augmented data. 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 College will review the integrity of some of the Program Review data and make appropriate corrections. Argos will be a useful tool in this process since it can allow units to see record-level data. For example, Argos allows for the creation of 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>Action Plan</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create breakouts of prioritized Program Review needs by category (facilities, staffing, and technology) for further use during College-wide planning activities.</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a system to closely monitor the outcomes of funded objectives.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage the CCCCO Data Mart to provide more data related to newly developed dashboard based on ARCC 2.0.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

I.B.4. Descriptive Summary. One primary mechanism for participation in planning is Participatory Governance (previously Shared Governance). During Fall 2012 this
occurred via several work groups including those responsible for planning and Program Review. These workgroups included all constituents—faculty, administrators, staff, and students—although student attendance and participation has varied. 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 will 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.

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.

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 also I.B.3.).

Given the inadequate connection between planning and budgeting, only a few units have used the Program Review process to gain new resources to make improvements, although there are many departments that have embraced Program Review as a planning tool they could use to internally reallocate their existing resources and implement new services, courses, and resources to improve student learning. Many departments have used these Program Review documents to pursue funding from donors.

I.B.4. Descriptive Summary – Distance Education. Assessment data collected for distance education is the same as for that collected for face-to-face learning. The distance education data is compared to data collected for face-to-face for both the online-only student, the telecourse student and the online+face-to-face student. The Ed Tech Department participates in the continuous quality improvement cycle by analyzing assessment data, making data available on their website, and discussing data in various venues. Argos will further help with more immediate data collection and distribution, as well as more detailed analysis. Additionally, the College participates in California Community College State Chancellor’s surveys including the 2010 “W” Survey. Distance education faculty and students are surveyed and the data is used to evaluate the
effectiveness of distance education. The survey instruments are specific to distance education. Ed Tech uses survey results to improve distance education.

I.B.4. Self Evaluation. The Academic Senate has expressed a need for professional development and training on matters related to Program Review and planning. The evaluation of the planning process will need to elicit information from all personnel about these needs.

Governance structures and work group structures have provided venues for discussion and input. However, various student groups 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. 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, and the quality and depth of Program Review activities have varied by department, although this is continually improving.

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 the College “closes 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.
The College recognizes that the changes it is making are occurring in the context of developing new structures for College-wide engagement. This is a time of great and rapid transition that has limited the opportunities for proactive input.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify mechanisms for student input, e.g., participatory governance and student government.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build upon the “Key Dates” document to ensure dialogue takes place within units and across Schools.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an annual planning and evaluation format for centers via WG 15.</td>
<td>May 2013</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>Spring 2014</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.

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

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.

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 and SLO websites.

The College-wide factsheet available under Marketing and Public Information is outdated. The College will not only update it but also 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>Action Plan</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Fall 2013</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>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicize major programmatic improvements and highlight successful programs.</td>
<td>Spring 2014</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 took place in 2009 and 2011 and will occur again in 2013.

The Program Review Committee (PRC) discussed valuation results from 2009. As reflected in 2010-11 Program Review archives, the College implemented changes 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. The College made some modifications following the 2009 evaluation (e.g., intermittent data workshops, greater access to record-level data upon request for verification). Currently, the College is most pointedly addressing data quality concerns through the implementation of the Argos data reporting tool which will allow users to navigate between record-level data and aggregated data. See also I.B.3.

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; the College will review these modifications 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, including evaluation of the entire planning system.

An Employee Survey conducted in Spring 2011 included several overarching questions about institutional effectiveness. Future surveys will include these new questions (or similar questions). Respondents rated nearly all items between 2.0 (Below Average) and 3.0 (Good). 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 undergoes periodic evaluation 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, but this biennial process should be more 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 take place 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 the College can track these changes and evaluate the changes longitudinally. Modifications to the assessment, planning, and budgeting procedures and processes emphasize the concept of “ongoing continuous quality improvement.” This includes a focus on assessing SLOs (not just “having” SLOs). Also, many units have historically utilized Program Review as a place to identify “wish lists” with connections to the budget in the form of 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 underscore the need to focus on all questions thoroughly, not just the question related to requests for augmentation. Evaluations will need to measure 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>Action Plan</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop an instrument to be used for the Spring 2013 interim evaluation.</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an instrument to be used for the comprehensive evaluation in Fall 2013.</td>
<td>May 2013</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 for assessing the effectiveness of individual units (instructional, students services, and administrative).

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. The 2012 Accreditation visiting team cited a number of departments as exemplars.

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 a 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 the workgroups responsible for Recommendations 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.
Within the Program Review template, this documentation is solicited (“Summarize your department’s progress to date on the major planning objectives”). Some units provide delineated objectives; others do not itemize objectives clearly.

Historically, the quality of Program Reviews has varied from unit to unit. In September 2013, 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, new guidelines now prompt more complete and introspective responses to the questions. The guidelines include sample responses from a range of units (instructional, student services, administrative). Similarly a checklist for school deans and vice chancellors will help them ensure that units addressed key areas. (See I.B.3. for more information on the guidelines.)

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 to help determine whether these changes have been useful and in particular whether they have resulted in more uniform quality.

Also, the current evaluation instrument focuses almost exclusively on Program Review (see I.B.6.). The revised instrument will encompass the entire assessment, planning, and budgeting system with a focus on the degree to which changes have been made that have resulted in documented improvements.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the documentation within Program Review by requiring units to explicitly delineate progress on each objective.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and quantify the progress identified via Program Review to determine the extent to which the annual assessment, planning, and budgeting system is leading to improved outcomes and improved efficiencies.</td>
<td>Spring 2014</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 the 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 Office, and other means.

The review, approval, revision, and deletion of academic programs and courses fall largely under the purview of the College’s Curriculum Committee, a quadripartite 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 College 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.

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, Drug and Alcohol Studies, 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 and on their assessment websites 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 appear in the document accompanying this Show Cause Report entitled, “Internal & External Data Trends with a Focus on Student Achievement.” Within that document, Section V provides longitudinal data related to student achievement, including transfer rates, degree and certificate completion, and licensure pass rates, among other indicators.

**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 Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T) degree in Sociology. The College’s new policy (as of Fall 2012) 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 not only for quality but also for currency and relevance.

The assessment of course SLOs serves as an evaluation of the teaching/learning strategies. 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. As of Spring 2013, all programs have assessment plans that are included on program/department websites and are reported on across the College each semester.

Program Review requires departments to report on how they have used the results of course and/or program SLO assessment to make curricular and program improvements. The institution ensures program currency by requiring departments to report on the assessment of SLOs in Program Review. In addition, course outlines cannot be more than six years old, and all departments must provide updated 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, the College will need to continue to make sure that it is making decisions based explicitly on the Mission and Vision.

Comment [K21]: Note: current version of program review does NOT ask about currency of course outlines nor requests updates of the cycle for improvement. (Though it WAS part of all past program reviews...) (from Katryn)
CTE programs and some other departments, notably English, have engaged in exemplary practices for ensuring that programs and services are high quality for some time. The College is making significant progress on extending those models to all programs.

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, the College needs 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. In Fall 2012, faculty identified Program SLOs for all programs and mapped them to courses. In Spring 2013, all departments developed program SLO assessment plans, and most departments will be engaging in some form of program SLO assessment. Service programs are also developing plans for service outcomes assessment.

The institution needs to better ensure that 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. Department Chairs now receive data on certificate and major completions from the Office of Research. This should be an ongoing process.

Although SLO processes were currently in place and required, the College needed more effective accountability measures. The new policy requiring periodic updates 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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting General Education SLO assessment in Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate required two-year assessment of CTE programs (job availability, certificate/degree completion, and job placement rates) into Program Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-43-
Continue to integrate Program Review and resource requests

Implement the new policy requiring periodic course outline updates.

ILOs, currently under development, will connect to Mission statement and be mapped to for all programs and courses. Plan for ILO finalization: Spring 2013 – with mapping to immediately follow

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 and Internal and External Data Trends reports, which include data on student demographics, student performance indicators, and community and labor market information. The Internal and External Scans inform the Strategic Plan and support the development of specific strategic priorities. They also inform the Educational Master Plan (scheduled to be updated) and support program planning priorities.

Over the last several years, ongoing faculty research of educational needs led to joint efforts with local community and industry advisory committees. 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.

Many courses across 14 disciplines integrate Service Learning into their curriculum, connecting students to their communities, promoting experiential learning, and, at times, becoming the springboard for future employment.

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 college admission test, Advanced Placement [AP] test), 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. In noncredit ESL, whose students often

Comment [TB22]: We’ll want to follow up with this before the final report is determined.
have very limited education, CASAS testing provides data used to identify students’ most urgent basic skills needs so that faculty can tailor the curriculum to address these areas.

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 and Planning Office to prepare an annual high school report outlining the readiness of incoming students in the areas of English and mathematics. The College shares this report with various SFUSD administrators, including principals at each of the high schools and distributes the report electronically to CCSF personnel. CCSF’s 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 SFUSD to discuss any gaps in educational preparedness among high school graduates.

Research on the Achievement of Student Learning Outcomes. Discipline faculty assess learning outcomes. While there has been some support from the Research and Planning 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 SLOs. However, as of Fall 2012, the approach to documenting and planning the assessment of SLOs for program improvement has become more centralized. The SLO website displays the wealth of results that faculty gathered during Fall 2012.

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. Nonetheless, faculty find it difficult to acquire noncredit research data.

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 and Planning Office to support faculty who wish to use research methods to determine if students are achieving stated learning outcomes has been restricted due to its staffing and software limitations. 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><strong>Hire Research Analyst</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment [k23]:** Assumes appointment of current research analyst to dean position; Move to I.B.

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 the College’s Curriculum Committee then reviews and approves. 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 SLOs 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. The ESL Department holds an annual colloquium in February in which Bay Area ESL faculty and students share pedagogy, methodology, research, and current professional trends. ESL also holds an annual Tech Camp, which focuses on professional development in the ESL field.

Effectiveness of Delivery Systems and Modes of Instruction in Facilitating Student Learning. Given the scope of the 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 individuals from a variety of perspectives examine 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.

The College engages in much dialogue on modes of instruction and delivery methods. However, there is no central location for storing evidence that this dialogue takes place. Even more dialogue can occur through the new Participatory Governance system.

II.A.1.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:
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 ensure that all disciplines, certificates, and majors have defined SLOs. Faculty now explicitly identify and report on ongoing assessment plans and have mapped all courses to program SLOs. Faculty also mapped all General Education (GE)-courses to existing GE outcomes. In Spring 2013, a follow-up report reviewed completed Fall activities for course and program assessment and asked for Spring 2013 assessment plans for all courses and programs. A GE outcome-assessment pilot is underway for Area C (natural science). The current online catalog contains program-level outcomes. Course-level outcomes, results, and assessment plans are available online at www.ccsf.edu/slo and on department assessment web pages.

Identifying, Measuring, and Using 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 appear in the Major Learning Outcomes section and strategies appear in the Content and Instructional Methodology sections.

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 identify learning outcomes on their respective documentation for the Curriculum Committee. By mandate, accredited programs in the career and technical education area hold industry advisory meetings. Programs that receive Perkins funding are also required to hold meetings with their advisory group to assure that curricula reflect current industry needs. The College holds noncredit course
outlines to the same standard as credit courses in terms of formatting, SLOs, and evidence of assessment standards.

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, the Curriculum Committee Chair, Dean of Instruction, Matriculation Prerequisites Officer, and Articulation Officer meet to discuss the proposals and schedule them for discussion at the Curriculum Committee. Assessment of learning outcomes also falls under faculty purview. Faculty select the specific assessment methods for courses, often in consultation with their department chairs, and exhibit the entire range of assessment modalities.

Discipline faculty assess course and program SLOs in many ways. For courses, faculty indicate content-specific assessment methods in course outlines and descriptions of SLO-specific extra assessments appear on department websites and in College-wide reports. Department websites describe program SLO assessment methods. All program SLOs map to component courses.

Results inform 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.

**Verification of the Appropriateness of SLOs.** As noted above, the Curriculum Committee vets SLOs, 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 during FLEX days and throughout the semester include sessions devoted to SLO discussions. The department websites describe these events. In Fall 2012, for example, faculty participated in three significant workshops on August 14, September 12, and November 21.

Departments have begun using departmental web pages to facilitate dialogue among discipline faculty and across the College through regular meetings such as those that occur biweekly in the English Department.

**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 the College established a process by which it 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. In Spring 2013, the focus is on carrying that energy forward into establishing routines of program learning outcome assessment. Over the last year, the College has been refining a reporting system for course and program SLO assessment activities. Refinement must continue, and incorporate GE outcomes assessment and ILO assessment. Pilot GE outcomes assessment happens in Spring 2013.
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). A College-wide SLO committee, headed by the SLO Coordinator and under the Participatory Governance structure, is working on College-wide long-term assessment plans—including website improvements, ongoing weekly professional development workshops in Spring 2013, and the development of a job description for a permanent SLO Coordinator position.

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 and to assist in tying course and program-level assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue working toward the Sustainable Continuous Quality improvement level of the ACCJC rubric for SLOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 needs of local business and industry.

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. Given the high numbers of students who enter the College in need of developmental and pre-collegiate coursework, and that it is in the Mission of the College to serve this need, the College has a long history of offering coursework at these levels. Placement data show no ebbing of this demand. Departments offering these pre-collegiate courses such as the English and Math Departments continue to assess the
effectiveness of the course sequence and course delivery through the analysis of data and make changes accordingly.

**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 noted above 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 they have established assessment methods that will allow them to determine the effectiveness of these sequences in achieving the desired learning outcomes.

Courses offered for credit under Contract Education also undergo review and approval through the Curriculum Committee process. Current faculty typically teach these courses; 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 are available on department assessment websites as are program learning outcomes, which are also 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 a number of SLO workgroups combined with faculty departmental leadership, there is now a wide and shared understanding of how the assessment of SLOs can provide a framework for course and program creation and improvement. The College requires discipline faculty to use the assessment of learning outcomes to evaluate courses and programs. Beginning in Fall 2012, departments were required to report on the assessment activities for all courses that were being offered. The College extended this requirement to all programs in Spring 2013 and will continue to enforce this requirement beyond Spring 2013. Departments report on how the assessment of learning outcomes have led to course and program improvement as a part of the Annual Program Review system.

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

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

- The Mathematics Department has created a course (MATH 45) 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 participation, interaction, engagement, and retention.
- 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); the website showcases monthly highlights from across the College.

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, the College’s central reporting requirement is fairly new, and the College will need to work to maintain its momentum in this area. The new SLO Coordinator position will aid this. The College has not yet developed a way to evaluate whether these processes relating to assessing student learning outcomes effectively
promote program improvement, but it is tracking improvements that departments have made through current reports.

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 a summary of annual 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>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>
</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>
</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>
</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, including 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 long-standing 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 reporting on 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 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>

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. Through the application to CCSF and the information forms completed during placement testing, the institution collects information about student needs that may affect their learning. The institution has not engaged in a centralized or systematic effort for identifying and/or documenting learning styles at regular intervals. However, faculty use a variety of teaching techniques and delivery modes to best serve the diverse needs and learning styles of their students. These methodologies are discussed campus wide in the College Curriculum Committee as course proposals are reviewed for approval. Discussions about appropriate delivery modes and teaching methodologies begin at the department and program levels at department curriculum committees or workgroups and various faculty forums. These discussions often lead to changes and innovative practices, as documented in the approved Course Outline of Record.

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, practicum, 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, a monthly series on Educational Technology Tools, and a series on “Flipping. Not Flopping,” supporting inverted course design (students cover content outside class and complete homework and group projects, discussion, and activities inside the classroom).

Discipline faculty determine the methodologies they deem appropriate for the discipline and 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.
A primary focus of Curriculum Committee review of proposed course outlines is the adequacy and “fit” between Instructional Methodology (Assignments, Evaluation, Instructional Materials) and the major learning outcomes and content of the course.

The majority of instructional programs and departments regularly discuss the effectiveness of current delivery modes and instructional methodologies. Evidence of this is seen in the numerous proposals for revisions to the Instructional Methodology section of course outlines that are approved at every College Curriculum Committee meeting (documented on the Curriculum Committee website). Revisions to Instructional Methodology requires discussion and consensus among the department chair, faculty who teach the course, and school dean.

With respect to acknowledging that learning needs vary and delivering instruction that meets these varied needs, certain initiatives and departmental workshops have helped 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.

In addition, College-wide, professional-development FLEX workshops at the start of each semester 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. In addition there are two faculty online discussion boards titled, “Tool Tips and Tricks – share any tips on how you've used a tool in your course” and “Instructional Tips and Tricks – share any tips and ideas you have for setting up your course or things you've addressed with students in your course that may assist other instructors.” Finally, the DSPS program will also work one on one with faculty to meet the specific needs of disabled students.

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. Examples of new strategies include the “accelerated course” options offered in the English and Math program sequences, which provide students an intensified learning experience. Adoption of this methodology was a data-driven decision, based on the College Researcher’s findings that intensity of study in a discipline leads to increased success.

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.

At the department level, the effectiveness of specific teaching methodologies and modes of delivery is directly observed and evaluated through the regular evaluation process of full-time and part-time faculty (every three years, and for six consecutive semesters for faculty undergoing tenure review). These team observations provide important opportunities for the faculty reviewing team, the department chair, and evaluate to engage in frank, constructive dialogue about techniques, assignments, materials, and other pedagogy that are working or which need improvement. The instructor evaluation process is also an opportunity for the department to observe and evaluate, across classes and instructors, the merits of a variety of teaching methodologies and modes of delivery.

The College has also 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 centralized assessments of student learning styles. While departments have engaged in discussions of matching methodologies to learning styles, these discussions have not occurred consistently across disciplines, system-wide. Any assessments that have taken place are those that individual faculty members or discipline faculty workgroups have performed. The College should expand such assessments College-wide and document discussions.

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 all cases, faculty successfully link their content expertise to pedagogical methods. The demanding CCSF hiring process, the College’s professional development requirements, and the faculty evaluation process in the faculty contract (Article 9) ensure that the faculty’s pedagogical content knowledge is current and extensive.

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 practices across the College through workshops and web resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, 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., SLO-specific end-of-semester exams, 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 for which it 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 review the activities completed the previous semester. Reporting is required for all courses offered in a given year and for all programs. Prior to Fall 2012, there was no centralized requirement for documentation. As such, there was a lot of variety in documentation of and progress on how faculty assessed SLOs to evaluate courses and programs with an eye toward program improvement. With the new centralized, online reporting system, the institution as a whole has a more comprehensive sense of shared effort, collaborative ongoing quality improvement, and commitment to student learning.

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 for all programs 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, starting in January 2013, the College has set an expectation of reporting every semester on assessment plans for all programs. The assessment of learning outcomes varies from program to program; the SLO website documents SLO assessment activities by program.

[evidence: 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 consistently documented and planned across the College. Reporting on the processes for course and program assessment (i.e. Program Review) are included in the College’s Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting cycle. The criteria used in the annual Program Review system is evenly applied across the College and includes relevancy, appropriateness, achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, and planning for the future. Although the annual Program Review system includes a wealth of data, challenges continue in the interpretation and use of this data.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Assuring Course and Program Currency through Integrated Planning. The unit-level Program Review process asks units to reflect on overall department directions that have occurred as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes. While reporting on major directions taken as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes has been included in the annual Program Review process since 2008-09, and while the assessment of learning outcomes has taken place since before then, the College has more recently (Fall 2012) embarked on a more thorough centralized system of planning and reporting on SLO assessment work. The College uses the SLO website 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 planned learning outcomes assessment activities 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 assessing one of the SLOs for CCSF General Education Area C.

• The expanded reporting system also involves student development and other services. It is truly the College’s one central system, and it is helping to develop a College-wide culture in which everyone plays a role in promoting student achievement.

**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 website and the departmental websites 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, educating everyone on expectations and methodologies, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An evaluation of the entire Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting process will be conducted in Fall 2013 via Program Review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 achievement of course SLOs and 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. [Noncredit ESL Student Learning Outcomes: http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/educational-programs/school-and-departments/school-of-international-education-and-esl/english-as-a-second-language-esl/about_esl/NC_SLOs.html]
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 through faculty dialogue and discussion of 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>
</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 5502.5 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 spurred plans for 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 recommendations for updates to the General Education outcomes themselves and some updated processes for inclusion of courses into the GE areas. The College does not currently have a process for ensuring that all previously accepted for GE-area-credit classes map to current GE SLOs (in other words, the College has classes that do not meet all the GE SLOs to which they provide credit—primarily because the GE SLOs were developed after the classes were accepted—and the College does not have a process yet for resolving that). The College also does not have a process for discussion to happen around GE outcomes except through a bipartite meeting. However, in Spring 2013, the College is conducting a pilot GE outcome assessment.
during which we pilot workgroups of faculty within GE Area C to meet to review the SLOs, development assessment rubrics, and plan ongoing assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

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” that the Academic Senate developed.
- 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.

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.

Students evaluate faculty, both for tenure and in three-year cycles, for, among other abilities, how well they connect course material to other courses and disciplines, which speaks to the College's concern that students make connections between disciplines and learn to recognize and acquire knowledge through a variety of means. Many faculty also take this feedback and adjust their course designs for improvement based on student feedback.

[Evidence: evaluation forms]

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

Comment [khc30]: Elizabeth Stewart can provide LERN documentation of its process for these assertions. Other programs with similar SLO assessments were not identified by the group. (from Academic Senate)

Comment [khc31]: Add Areas D, E, and F? See Academic Senate notes.
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.

The College continues to develop comprehensive approaches to evaluating how well students who have completed General Education coursework are able to apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors. The Research Office has compiled data (from CCC Data Mart) of the Performance of CCSF Students in Their First Year of Transfer to the CSU System. That data shows that the Post-Admission GPAs of CCSF transfer students for every year in 2000-01 to 2009-10 surpass the GPAs of “All CCC transfer students.”

A very useful tool to evaluate how well students apply GE coursework in subsequent courses is the College Researcher’s pivot tables (developed five years ago) that provide student-success data for every course offered by CCSF, based on prior Math, English, or ESL course taken or course level placed into. For years, the Math, English, and ESL Department chairs; other department chairs; and the Matriculation Office have accessed this data regularly to evaluate the relationship between MATH, ENGL, ESL preparation and success in subsequent courses (including courses within those programs). The College have identified valid course and program prerequisites on the basis of this data. The pivot tables contain data from the most recent five years, and is thus always up to date. This is an excellent example of available, relevant student data that the College uses to evaluate course and program effectiveness, make decisions about curriculum, and examine how well basic skills courses prepare students for content-area coursework.

**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.
It is noteworthy that faculty are hired and evaluated for tenure (also by the students) based on the questions regarding how well they demonstrate sensitivity in working with students, faculty, and staff from diverse backgrounds and how well their curricula represents contributors of various perspectives and backgrounds.

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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College will continue its efforts at assessing the learning outcomes associated with being a productive individual and life-long learner. This will include expanding the assessment beyond the courses in the GE areas, but also subsequent coursework, employment, and other endeavors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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. 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 and as such include both focused study in one area of inquiry and an established disciplinary 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>
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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.

**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.

A student survey in February 2013 provided data on student awareness of course SLOs. Data:

**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 Coordinator 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 information is also provided to students by department chairs or their proxy (such as the English Eligibility Coordinator), who regularly meet with students who have questions or need transcripts evaluated for transfer. Transfer policies and determinations are regularly reviewed in conjunction with departmental curriculum committees, the Matriculation Office and the Articulation Office.

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 website, 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,
25th Hour Communications, 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 ensure 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. Professional development workshops (during the FLEX day in January 2013) focused on increasing student awareness of SLOs, including developing online resources (and examples).


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 Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete development of Program Discontinuance Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to communicate media protocols widely to the College community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 policies, 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 and creative 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].

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.
- Students who take Library Skills Workshops get additional information about plagiarism.

The College uses 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:
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 at selected sites.

[evidence: list of services offered at Ocean Campus and at Centers/Sites]

Student Services distributes information via the CCSF website, with most programs maintaining their own sections. 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. The Office of Research and Planning provides SARS Grid data during the Program Review process, which allows Counseling-related offices to assess the availability of services to students. Research and Planning staff investigated the degree to which enhanced achievement can be associated with specialized counseling services via a recent quantitative retention study which also used SARS Grid data. Through a Haas Foundation grant, the Career Ladders Project and Harder+Company also completed a qualitative study on CCSF retention programs and strategies, and the Gardner Center released a research report in December 2012 that combined these two...
studies. The research will inform discussions in Fall 2013 to develop future retention strategies after the implementation of the counseling reorganization.

The College utilizes Program Review to evaluate and improve Student Services, which 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 often do not 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 stemming from the many different services and counseling departments available. 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, some students receive incorrect or confusing information from Student Services staff members, which can result in disuse of the services and student frustration. The Board has approved a reorganization of student services in order to better integrate and consolidate services where appropriate. Regular professional development opportunities are available to counseling faculty, and staff will also have access to customer service training.
- 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 outcomes and demographics</td>
<td>Create new reports including relevant data not currently available.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data for analysis needs</td>
<td>Distribute staff to have at least limited service at centers throughout the CCSF system.</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</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 Records during the beginning of each semester.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and evaluate services to determine specific student needs at the centers based on demographics.</td>
<td>Create regular Student Focus Groups and surveys to collect data to be analyzed by Research and Planning.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create, expand, or implement services needed at centers based on analysis.</td>
<td>Redesign CCSF website to ensure usability and accessibility for all students.</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide clear and available information about Student Services on the CCSF website.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure all students are aware of and informed about relevant Student Services.</td>
<td>Conduct outreach and marketing of Student Services throughout the College.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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. The College also sends flyers to former students that highlight Continuing Education opportunities. The College also places ads in San Francisco newspapers, including neighborhood publications, to publicize programs.

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.
The Academic Senate has noted that many San Francisco residents are confused by the online catalog and find it particularly difficult to browse. It may be important to examine the impact of having no printed schedules on enrollment and to consider alternative, low-cost means of distributing schedules through public locations such as libraries, high schools, Beacon Centers, and other community centers.

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, 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. Although there is general agreement that the outcome was positive, these hearings were controversial. A few Board members were accused of stepping outside of their role at the hearings, acting individually and advocating for remedies that faculty had not yet evaluated nor that the entire Board approved.

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, and each program posts an updated SLO summary online every semester.


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>
<tr>
<td>Using previous findings conducted by the research office on student success as a baseline, they will provide annual progress reports (See appendix 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess, evaluate and determine needed student services by sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &quot;One Stop&quot; model for service provision with integrated cross-trained team approach; cross train &amp; redeploy staff to accommodate needed services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service centers will work as “student centered” teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new student service delivery models such as active online help, online interactive solutions for common problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make BANNER Curriculum, Advising and Program Planning (CAPP) modules and Student Educational Plans available to students online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a student progress status report based 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>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></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].

http://sfbridgetosuccess.org/policy/

Title 5-mandated Matriculation services (Math, English, ESL course placement assessment, college orientation, and counseling/advisement), which strive to increase equitable access to information critical for student success, are provided to all new credit students (who do not exempt from these services). Opportunities to complete these services are frequent, starting five months prior to the start of the fall semester, and three months prior to the start of the spring semester. The provision of equivalent Matriculation services is mandated for students enrolling in specific non-credit programs – ESL, Citizenship, Adult Basic Ed, Voc Ed/CTE, DSPS, and Parenting. The College provides these services at five of the six centers at which it offers non-credit programs. However, the opportunities for students to receive the services have become more limited, largely due to reduced availability of counselors and Matriculation, Admissions and Enrollment staff over the last two years (e.g., lay-offs).

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] CalWORKs provides counseling and funding for books and supplies to parents on public assistance. HARTS targets students who are homeless. The retention programs assist students with culturally relevant counseling and tutoring services. 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

Comment [khc39]: Received an additional paragraph to follow this from Academic Senate that we may include. Need to check with Ed Shenk.
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 range 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.

Counseling services for distance learners currently focus on information-based questions through email. Students initiate inquiries through a link on the CCSF Distance Education website, which trained Student Ambassadors in the Outreach Office then triage. The Learning Assistance department offers a special class dedicated to assist on-line students by preparing them for the unique demands of on-line classes by enhancing their study skills, test-taking techniques, and participation in on-line forums.

To address a more comprehensive delivery of services to distance learning students, the College is planning an expansion of online counseling services during Spring 2013 for implementation during the 2013-14 academic year. 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). Implementation will require hardware upgrades. Other media options such as Skype will also be employed. The College will collect 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.

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 effective and efficiency 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 1458)</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 students of the enrollment priorities</td>
<td>Initiate in February 2013 Implement for Fall 2013 Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve matriculation of noncredit students to Credit Programs</td>
<td>The College will form a team to develop a concerted plan to increase the number of noncredit students with an ed plan and enrollment in credit programs</td>
<td>Initiate in Spring 2013 Implement by Fall 2014</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
- Bridge to Success
  <Need to list website>
- Speech and Debate Team
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.

[Evidence: original list above from first draft containing descriptions of each program; websites listed above, CCSF Catalog, Program Reviews of various academic and student service areas, Student Service Focus Groups Analyses, CCSF Website, OMSL Civic Engagement document, Bridge to Success Philanthropic Council document, CCSF Student Handbook, and CCSF Career & Technical Education Program Guide]

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. The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

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. Beginning in Spring 2013, the College centralized SLO reporting and regularly updates SLOs through the SLO semester reports.

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. She coordinates with the College-wide SLO Coordinator.

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 ACCJC 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
semester reports showing the progress of each SLO will support a shared and transparent process.

Based on focus groups among personnel in Student Services, the Board approved a plan for reorganizing the Student Services Division administratively and departmentally in December 2012. All counseling programs are now under the Vice Chancellor of Student Services. Several counseling departments will merge 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 efforts focused on closing the student achievement gap, primarily through the institutionalization of current Bridge to Success activities and other 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 online or else in binders in the office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Services—Conlan Hall 207)
1. Student Services SLO matrices (on each unit website)
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
6. Notebook of SLO projects and evidence prior Fall 2006 through Spring 2012 (binder)
7. Assessment sections of counseling department web pages (Student Services websites)
8. Online Advisory Council agendas and minutes
11. CCSF Research link to high school and student success reports: http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports_success.htm
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:

- African American Scholastic programs
- Asian Pacific American Student Success Program
- Associated Students Clubs
Bridge to Success
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
In addition, a number of academic departments offer course content that explicitly promotes students’ understanding, knowledge, and tolerance of diversity, particularly those departments that focus on ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation.

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:

- **Communication Issues:** Information about courses, groups, issues and events regarding diversity does not reach the College Community in a systematic way.
- **Coordination Issues:** The lack of coordination among diversity-related groups and programs may be hindering student success and is most likely not cost effective.
- **Reorganization Issues:** 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.”

- **Marketing Issues:** City College lacks a full-time Public Information Officer whose office would be charged with including diversity with its multi-media marketing campaigns. Diversity events do not always appear in the regular events calendar of the College.

- **Technological Issues:** The District does not have a computerized system to coordinate the scheduling of rooms and events.

- **Vet Center Issues:** LGBTQ students who are veterans, have expressed concerns regarding apparent homophobia among some people in the Veterans Center.

- **Diversity Issues:** Students perceive that CCSF employees do not sufficiently reflect the diversity of City College’s students.

### 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>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.

Several course placement tests are locally developed, locally managed assessment instruments. In April and November 2012, the College completed CCCCO-mandated test-validation studies for three placement instruments to obtain renewal of approval for their use in CCSF course placement processes. This required process was suspended by the CCCCO from March 2009-12, and reinstated in April 2012. [Evidence: CCCCO memo dated Dec 5, 2011] Those instruments included the credit English Placement Test, the credit ESL Writing Sample, and the noncredit ESL Placement Test. The purpose of the studies was to examine whether CCSF’s placement tests generate valid and fair placement recommendations, free of cultural or linguistic biases. [Evidence: CCSF Validity Study] 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 English Placement Test cut-score validity study resulted in the lowering of cut-scores for all but one of the course placement levels. The English Department and Research, and Matriculation Offices will conduct a study of Fall 2012 student data to examine the effects of the cut-score changes on student success in English courses. The CCSF English Placement Test has received CCCCO approval for continued use through July 2018. [Evidence: CCCO Approved Assessment Instruments List]
CCSF submitted the test-validation studies for the CCSF ESL Writing Sample Test and the CCSF Non-credit ESL Placement Test to CCCCO, which CCCCO will review in February 2013 (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.

As part of the Bridge to Success Partnership grant, 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. The John Gardner Center for Youth at Stanford University through the Bridge to Success grant is providing research on these “bump up” initiatives; preliminary data will be available for math during the spring 2013 semester.

Board Reso re. English placement
http://gardnercenter.stanford.edu/our_work/bts.html

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 (Customer Service hours are limited, and are not available evenings or weekends, making it very difficult for students to retrieve passwords). The State Chancellors 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 two 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 (i.e., raise) individual students’ test placement based on their assessments of other, non-test indicators of course readiness. At the end of Spring 2012, the Matriculation Office convened a collaborative workgroup of counselors and basic skills faculty to identify relevant “multiple measures” that have been found to be useful indicators of course readiness. The workgroup developed guidelines for multiple measures assessment and updated procedures for documenting changes to student course placement.

http://gardnercenter.stanford.edu/our_work/bts.html (Initial research report on test retake impact due March 2013)

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 all matriculating students | Initiate in Spring 2013  
|                                |                                                            | Complete in Fall 2014, or as directed by the CCCCO |
| Transition from CCCApply to Open CCCApply | Collaborate with IT to design technical aspects of transition and implementation | Initiate Fall 2013  
|                                |                                                            | Implement Spring 2014 |
| Continue to evaluate assessment instruments every 6 years as required by the State Chancellor’s Office. | | |
| Implement Board Policy XXX | | |

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 in 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 protocols in cases where researchers utilize student data.</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.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.

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.

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 began using a standardized matrix to record SLO progress and outcomes by department and/or unit. All units submit SLO semester reports online through the centralized CCSF Outcomes and Assessment web page: http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/slo/results_2013_spring.html

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</td>
<td>Dedicated staff development activities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services departments about SLO measurement and assessment.</td>
<td>Dedicated staff development activities</td>
<td>Spring 2013</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 institutional 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 reached a peak of over one million visits a 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.

Programs, resources and services directly serving students at all library locations* include:

---
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- Library research and information competency workshops that teach skills for finding 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 online
- Programs, events, and exhibitions that reflect and enrich the creative, intellectual, and cultural diversity of the College community
- Copying, printing, scanning, and faxing facilities
- 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 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

ESL and Basic Skills course-related learning materials

*The Distance Learning and Electronic Services Librarian provides instructional support 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 are 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 both Ocean Campus and Mission, each equipped with audio and video workstations and a classroom with 34 workstations. Language Center materials and online language 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. **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. 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 John Adams, Mission, Southeast, and the Adult Learning and Tutorial Center (ALTC) at Gough Street.

LAC offers the College’s largest open-access computer lab with 98 student workstations, three scanners, and a printer for student access; the 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. 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.** Over 100 computer labs serve students across the district. 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 facilities in recent years has impacted staffing and resources for both the Library and the Learning Assistance Center (LAC). Creative staffing solutions for the library such as rotating staff on a daily basis between centers allowed the opening of CNB with only minor loses at another center.. This arrangement is a temporary measure taken to fill an ongoing need and it is not sustainable. Exacerbating the situation are four full-time faculty and 13 classified vacancies. The LAC on the Ocean campus has also closed on Saturdays due to reduced staffing, and although the LAC on the Chinatown/North Beach Center is built and furnished, its opening is postponed due to lack of staffing.

Successive District administration proposals in 2012-13 to restructure Academic Affairs jeopardize the Library’s compliance with the Standards of Practice for California Community College Library Faculty and Programs, adopted by the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges in 2011. These standards state that California community College library leadership should meet the minimum qualifications of the library profession and have administrative status, so as to effectively advocate for the library [II C-1]. An informal review of websites, organizational charts, College catalogs, and the Council of Chief Librarians – California Community Colleges directory, found of the largest 20 community colleges in the state (of which CCSF is the largest), all have leadership with an MLS, 10 with administrative status [II C-2].

Leadership with a strong understanding of libraries and the evolution of the information landscape is essential to initiate and guide collaborative processes that reexamine and improve workflows throughout the department to incorporate emerging developments in library modalities (e.g. operations, functions, services, units) and ensure effective, current, relevant offerings. A professional background in libraries is also essential in effectively 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-3]. The Learning Assistance Center’s 98 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.

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>Work toward full alignment with ASCCC Standards of Practice for California Community College Libraries and ACRL Standards for Academic Libraries.</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider state and national library standards in the reorganization of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Advocate for dedicated library leadership with administrative status and which meets the minimum professional qualifications for library administration as outlined in ASCCC standards</td>
<td>Spring 2013, ongoing</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 materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

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. 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,
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 respondents (N=175) were satisfied with their communication with subject liaisons [II C-4].

Funding for library materials has decreased to inadequate levels and been unstable since 2006. Such instability has stymied efforts at multi-year planning and maintaining currency of the collection.

The total budget available for print materials decreased 48 percent between 2005-06 and 2009-10, while supporting more locations (e.g. the new Mission Campus Library) [II C-5]. Monies allocated to establish the CNB library were one-third the amount estimated necessary to build a core collection of essential materials for the site [II C-6].

Title V §58724 of the California Education Code establishes a formula for the minimum number of volumes in a library based on FTES, setting CCSF’s minimum at 297,500.; 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 multiple locations, it spends significantly less on printed books, e-books and databases [II C-7].

Library faculty have undertaken several measures to continue to ensure a current, quality collection, including 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-8]. CCSF cannot 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 ACCJC 2012 Evaluation Report addressed these issues, stating that “... the college needs to address the age of the book collection as part of its institutional planning and budgeting activities” (p. 44).

Increasingly expensive database subscriptions included in the Library materials budget further diminishes the budget’s purchasing power. The Community College Library Consortium (CCLC) has assisted in purchasing databases since TTIP money has disappeared, however, the multifaceted nature of CCSF’s curriculum has required additional subscriptions for subject areas not covered via CCLC. 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.
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. 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-4]. The 2011 LLR Student Survey showed that 71 percent of students ($N = 2,075$) have two or more courses requiring use of library collections and equipment [II C -9, Question 7]. For each of the following LLR program SLOs, 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 -9, Question 11]. Furthermore, student perception of the importance to academic success of both on-site and online library services and resources is very high; of the 2,021 respondents, 87 percent marked either Very Important (66.7 percent) or Important (19.8 percent) [II C -9, 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].

All LLSS units have expressed the need for planned replacement cycles for equipment, especially computer equipment and furnishings, with allocations from the General Fund. Aside from the two exceptions, all LLSS student computers are eligible for replacement under the replacement and upgrade plan in the 2013-15 Technology Plan [II C-10]. All LLSS student computers, except those at Chinatown/North Beach and Alice Statler, which experience heavy use, are over five years old. The Learning Assistance Center’s open-access lab computers are now seven years old. In both the Fall 2010 LLR Faculty Survey and the Spring 2011 LLR Student Survey, faculty and students expressed dissatisfaction equipment available for faculty and student use. 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-4; II C -9; II C-11]. Some staff equipment is also outdated; plans for replacement are also outlined in the 2013-15 Technology Plan. Rosenberg funds were allocated and used to upgrade multimedia equipment in the three Rosenberg multimedia viewing classrooms in 2012, however, multimedia equipment at other locations throughout the District is old and needs replacement.

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 an annual line-item library materials budget from unrestricted funds at a standard rate per FTES. Continue to build Chinatown/North Beach and Mission collections</td>
<td>Resume e-book acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace all old LLSS workstations that meet the replacement cycle specifications. Advocate for the maintenance of Library equipment and District multimedia equipment as</td>
<td></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.

The Academic Policies and Bipartite Graduation Requirements Committee approved IC student learning outcomes in 2006. 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-12 p.48].

Successful completion of English 1A, which includes a minimum of five hours of library/information competency skills workshops and assignments accomplishes this requirement.

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 from basic skills to more advance search techniques. 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-13].

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 all center libraries. IC instruction is also available via the one-credit, transfer-level LIS 10 course, which enrolls approximately 160 students each year. Additionally, 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.

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
email and instant messaging. At all library locations and online, librarians conduct instruction-based reference work by using active learning techniques to engage students in the research process, rather than simply providing answers.

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 collaborating with instructors to develop assignments that promote 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.

II.C.1.b. Self Evaluation. Opportunities to teach information competency continue to increase in both individual reference sessions and classroom settings, driven at the reference desks in particular by the vast increase in workshop assignments students bring for review. Workshop completion has increased significantly with the creation of online versions of all workshops, the addition of Workshop G: Orientation to Library Resources & Services and Workshop P: Citing Sources to Responsibly Use Information, and the inclusion of 5 hours of library skills workshops in the ENGL 1A course outline. The number of course-specific instructional sessions continues to rise: 2011-12 data shows 301 sessions reaching 7,545 students, serving 60 unique credit courses in 26 different departments and programs, and 28 different non-credit courses in 5 programs [II C-14].

To improve LIS 1000 workshop content and teaching effectiveness, librarians conduct a variety of assessments, analyze results, make improvements and share best practices on a rotating basis, 1 to 2 a year. Assessment methods include student feedback forms, review of workshop assignments, pre- and post-testing, and input from workshop instructors. Resulting changes include more practical examples and engaging learning activities, and training sessions for librarians on active learning techniques. Assessments also showed the importance of the one on one instruction provided when a librarian corrects a student’s workshop assignment [II C-15, IC Assessment Reports].

Since 2006, librarians have collaborated with District faculty to assess IC skills in the coursework of more than 6 disciplines. These assessments included analysis of research assignments, surveys and pre- and post-test assessment results guide revisions to research-based assignments and workshop presentations (see Library Assessment webpage for reports). These assessments resulted in the English Department including five IC workshops in the ENGL 1A course outline, and the Culinary Arts program requiring two IC workshops for CAHS 100. [II C-15, IC Assessment Reports]. The Library also created Workshop P - Citing Sources Responsibly as a result of assessment
activities. While librarians partner with discipline faculty across the curriculum to teach information competency skills, a standard assessment tool for subject-specific workshops has yet to be created. Development of an assessment instrument is planned for Spring 2013.

In Spring 2011, the LIS 10 credit course was substantially revised to better support SLOs, define final project SLOs and add a grading rubric, all based on student performance and several years’ results of pre- and post-assessments [II C-15, IC Assessment Reports]. End of semester reviews prompt instructors to make minor changes to the course as needed for continual quality improvement.

A valuable measure of effectiveness of IC instruction that has not been explored is to compare academic success of students who have completed LIS 1000 workshops or LIS 10 with students who have not.

In Fall 2012, the library administered a survey assessment to evaluate effectiveness of reference transactions. The assessment showed an overwhelming satisfaction with finding the information needed, and revealed the need to emphasize evaluating resources in all reference transactions. The large number of respondents who stated that they learned technology skills (80 percent, \( N = 112 \)) shows how closely related technology and information competency are and indicates a need for future assessments to examine what technology skills students are learning in the library and what skills they still need [II C-15, IC Assessment Reports].

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. Also, despite the large number of subject specific instructional sessions, a gap in the library’s assessment plan is the lack of authentic assessment reaching each session.

Information competency assessment is planned, executed and shared frequently, and it improves curriculum content, teaching methodology, assignment instructions, and sequencing not only in the library but in other departments throughout the College as well (see Library Assessment webpage for reports).

**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>Develop and promote a standard assessment to be used for subject-specific workshops</td>
<td>Spring/Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore feasibility of Office of Research and Planning tracking students who have completed LIS 10 or LIS 1000 workshops through their education at CCSF</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II.c.1.e.** 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 33 hours per week. The newest location, the Chinatown/North Beach Center Library, is open 33 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 support distance education and evening and weekend faculty and students, as well as those at centers 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. In Spring 2013, due to reduced staffing inadequate to support LLR’s inter-center delivery (ICL), LLSS began utilizing District mail delivery to transfer items between library locations, enabling expanded service to five days a week with less LLSS staff time. This new arrangement will be evaluated on an ongoing basis.

An Outreach and Community Librarian has been assigned since 2010-11 to increase outreach throughout the district, and library coordinators serve as liaisons to the faculty and courses offered at their centers and nearby locations. The Outreach and Community Librarian has provided workshops at the 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 librarians are embedded in online courses.

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. 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 centers. The Southeast Center 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.

**Language Center.** 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 centers, 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. 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 [II C-9, Q 10, 15; II C-16, Q8]. 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 is a decrease of 24 percent from peak open hours in the last decade. With some exceptions, such as reductions in number of days open and reduced hours at some locations, hours at center libraries have remained stable since 2007 [II C-5].

A Fall 2011 ACRL Peer Comparison showed that CCSF has more library locations and more computer workstations than any of the other libraries surveyed, yet its library hours at the main library are significantly less than the survey average [II C-7].

Students and District faculty have also expressed dissatisfaction with Library hours, including for services such as Audiovisual, in the form of faculty and student survey responses and direct action. 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-4; II C-9, II C-17].

In 2011, two faculty positions were approved for the new Chinatown/North Beach library, but subsequently were put on hold. No position had been approved to replace a full-time librarian who also retired that year, and the freeze on classified hiring prevented consideration of new positions. The strain of staffing the new location without the necessary classified and faculty hires, threatens quality of service at other locations where the human resource hours have been necessarily stretched. Several classified retirements within LLR have compounded the problem. Reallocation of hours at other library locations, based on FTES, helped make staffing Chinatown/North Beach possible in the short term. 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 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 center evolve [II C-4]. 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-5].

Library faculty have undertaken measures to increase students access to materials based on District faculty input with measures such as a course reserves request system where faculty are contacted about materials not on reserve. Bibliographic access has improved since the last Self Study through automated library system upgrades; the addition of multilingual catalog interfaces; the addition of local subject headings for foreign films, ESL materials, and Basic Skills materials; cleanup of authority records and bibliographic records; and the creation of bibliographic records for print periodicals. 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-18].

As part of the CCSF website redesign, a Library committee planned the Library website overhaul during a three-year effort, guided by a student website evaluation [II C -19]. Since the new website debuted in January 2010, Library website hits increased almost 70 percent from the year before and that number has almost tripled since then [II C-18, ERef use has remained limited, but instant-message reference, now available on most Library webpages, rapidly increased after the redesign. [II C-20]

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 eight 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]) 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 Spring 2011 LLR Student Survey of all credit and noncredit students, 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-9, 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. Full services did not resume until 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 nearby 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-21]. 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-22] 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>Investgate logistics of migrating the online library skills workshops into Insight.</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase library service and resource access in distance courses</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore library hours to fully serve course offerings at all centers</td>
<td>As funding permits</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 centers without libraries.</td>
<td>Ongoing</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-9]. Rosenberg Library carpeting is heavily stained, with multiple patches and worn areas, and many chairs are threadbare. 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-9]. 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. 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.

Maintenance and security for library equipment and computer systems are provided by a combination of Library Automation Services and the IT department. 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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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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. CCSF approved computer vendors offers a five-year warranty on each system.

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, adequate evaluation and oversight mechanisms are in place.

Limitations on the computer access management system to reliably manage the number of workstations the Library offers, 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. 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 EBSCOhost dramatically increased, from 562,039 searches in 2007-08 to 6,071,381 in 2011-12—a massive increase even when considering the addition of several EBSCO databases—and satisfaction has been high [II C-9; II C-18].

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>Work with College on implementing College wide access management system in Library, if necessary or investigate alternatives to PCCop access management</td>
<td>Fall 2014</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 ensures all LLSS are sufficient in meeting student learning needs. Data from assessments inform the Program Review process and assist each unit in program planning and prioritizing requests for resource allocation. 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. Types of 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.

Library & Learning Resources. 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.

To facilitate assessment, 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 webpage provides a central location for all LLR assessment information, including: planning documents, timelines, survey instruments, and
assessment report. 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 continuous quality improvement in meeting student needs in the Library. Recommendations identified through assessments are brought to the appropriate LLR committee for planning and implementation. 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. Faculty and student reactions to library programs and exhibitions are tracked through 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. 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 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 within the LLR incorporates computer usage data and other measures to examine technology support for student learning outcomes. Assessment of media and audiovisual services for faculty is conducted through LLR surveys and employee surveys administered College wide. Assessment of computer labs overall falls under the auspices of ITS. Standard III.C.2 describes this in greater detail.

**II.C.2. Self Evaluation.** In the 2010 College credit student opinion survey 92.1 percent (N=2,558) found librarians to be supportive of them and 82.7 percent rated library collections and services, both in print and online, excellent (34.4 percent) and good (48.3 percent). 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 C16].

**Library and Learning Resources.** The library conducted its own student survey in Fall 2011 (N=2,217). The survey data was sorted by centers as well as by online and noncredit students so that data could be analyzed by the various populations separately. Key findings include the need for more evening and weekend hours and the need for more upgraded computers. A significant student perception revealed 87 percent found the use of Library services and resources to academic success in College to be important or very important [II C-9].

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.

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 library service areas and measurements have been 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 [II C-23], [II C-42 (28)] 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 LAD/LERN Assessment webpage includes comprehensive information on LAD assessment activities, including assessment processes, curricular mapping, program-level outcomes, and departmental highlights of recent assessment activities [II C-24].

Language Center. The Language Center identified student learning outcomes in Spring 2010 and began assessing them in Spring 2011. Surveys are emailed directly to a representative sampling of Foreign Language Department classes at the end of each semester as well as made 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 felt 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-25].

Computer Labs. LLR and LAC have accumulated usage data in recent years to aid in assessment, planning and budgeting. ITS has supported usage data gathering in selected other labs, but statistics to do a comparison of labs across the District have not been available. ITS is expanding its data-gathering capabilities with the intent to more
effectively use District resources to meet student needs. (See Standard III.C.1.d) In a College wide student survey conducted in 2010, student rated computer labs 44% good and 37% excellent (II C-16). 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>Use more hard data to accompany findings from student and faculty perception surveys when assessing program outcomes</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create benchmarks for program-level outcomes for library facilities, collections, services and organization structure, based on ACRL and ASCCC standards.</td>
<td>Fall 2014</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
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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. In July 2012, ACCJC recommended that “the college assess the adequacy of its current number of qualified classified staff and administrators and their appropriate preparation and experience necessary to support the institution’s mission and purpose.” In light of this Recommendation, a workgroup formed to review hiring and reassignment procedures; the response below includes the results of this review.

Replacement/New Positions Procedures. The Human Resources Department (HR) oversees the hiring processes for all District personnel to ensure that the District equitably and fairly administers established and published hiring procedures 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.

For faculty, the hiring departments establish the hiring criteria, including job announcements, paper screening criteria, and interview questions in consultation with the Department Chair or other unit manager, which the Dean, Vice Chancellor, and/or the Chancellor then review. Key personnel in HR and the Affirmative Action Office also review and approve these criteria, announcements, and interview questions to ensure the hiring of knowledgeable and qualified personnel to 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. In order to add a new or additional classified position to a College department, the department must complete a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) or Express Classification form (EXP). 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, the level of authority.

The Human Resources Department drafts the criteria and job announcements for administrative positions in consultation with the Chancellor and the Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) Officer, with input from other senior administrators where appropriate. As a courtesy, the Academic Senate also reviews administrative job announcements.

Job announcements for each employee category list the required employment qualifications, the minimum qualifications, and the desirable qualifications established by the hiring department. Additionally, job announcements relate directly to the institutional Mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.
The formation of hiring search committees is an established participatory process outlined in District hiring procedures. Search Committee members for administrative hiring committees comprise representatives from the faculty, classified staff, administrative ranks, and students (if applicable). The Academic Senate selects faculty to serve on administrative hiring committees. For faculty hiring, the respective department chair appoints members based on a democratic process that takes place at the department level. SEIU Local 1021 selects the classified staff search committee members. The Chancellor selects administrators to serve on search committees with input from the Administrators Association; and the Executive Board of the Associated Students selects students representatives on hiring committees. 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 (Article 12).

To recruit large and diverse numbers of applicants, HR places job announcements in various local, state, and national mediums, including 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 must provide evidence of their qualifications and experience in their application materials and show their potential for contributing to the institution’s 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 demonstration 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 employees (including 115 full-time faculty and 143 classified staff).]
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.

In accordance with Education Code §87405, in September 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, HR staff, and a representative of the U.S. District Court Probation Office, the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department, or related associations. HR updates the application forms, employee handbooks, and relevant materials 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 placing greater emphasis 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 all interviews must include a question related to diversity.

District procedures call for an Equal Employment Opportunity monitor to attend every interview to ensure compliance with federal and state labor laws, rules, and regulations. Due to the lack of availability of trained monitors and funding to pay them, committees at times conduct interviews without monitors. All administrative hiring, however, includes a monitor.

Reassignments. Administrative reassignments—interim, acting, additional duties, 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/administrative appointment. In recent years, significant numbers of retiring administrators during concentrated periods have largely driven the need for reassignments along with the lack of an overall staffing plan for filling positions.

Changes Addressing ACCJC Findings. As a result of Board direction at the August 27, 2012 special Board of Trustees meeting, the College has reduced the number of Vice Chancellors from five to three and has eliminated the Office of Governmental Affairs and the Office of Shared Governance. These changes also included moving the Research and Planning Office, Grants Office, and Development Office under the Chancellor’s direct supervision. On September 27, 2012, the Board of Trustees took action to direct the Interim Chancellor to propose a new instructional administrative structure, congruent
with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings, that has academic integrity and increases administrative oversight and accountability with the ultimate goal of being more effective and efficient. 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 amount of non-instructional reassigned time for department chairs. The Board also approved a structural change within the Office of Student Services in December 2012 (see also the response to Standard II.B.).

During this time of transition, the individuals serving as Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor of Student Development are serving in an interim capacity. The College posted these Vice Chancellor on December 18, 2012, and they closed on February 7, 2013.

Twenty nine administrators have received notice that they are terminated as of June 30, 2012, and Human Resources prepared job announcements for dean positions considered as new given the changes in scope, authority, and accountability. The College posted job announcements for XX School Dean and XX Center Dean positions on XX. In addition, the College posted job announcements for XX other administrative positions within Academic Affairs and Students Services in XX. Hiring committees will work throughout Spring 2013 to finalize the hiring 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, such as long-term illness or 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 have also been meeting to address a much-needed classified staff reorganization that addresses the recommendations raised by the ACCJC and FCMAT; the College has already several individuals into high-need areas. Addressing classified staff reorganization is all the more critical now that the College laid off more than 30 classified staff members, some of whom had bumping rights into other College positions, and the administrative reorganizations will likely dictate additional changes.

III.A.1/III.A.1.a. Self Evaluation. 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 the hiring of knowledgeable and qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. However, job descriptions for administrative positions must emphasize clearly defined job roles, responsibilities, expectations, and authority.
Overall, 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. The Academic Senate has raised concerns about the practice of conducting some hiring processes without trained EEP monitors. On November 15, 2013, the Board approved Policy Manual 3.04 that authorizes the Chancellor to make changes to this administrative hiring process. Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman has reviewed this procedure and has identified changes to better streamline the process.

The College needs to enforce the processes for reassigning personnel in all employee groups, which includes: administrative upgrades, lateral transfers, reclassifications, and additional temporary duties; the faculty expedited upgrading process; and classified reassignments. Transparency in these transactions is necessary.

With respect to the administrative reorganization, there has been substantial opposition to the administrative changes taking place, largely focusing on concerns about the process of doing so, although many have questioned the reasons for doing so, and the process has not moved as quickly as planned. The Academic Senate raised concerns about the greatly increased workload of administrators as contained within the new administrative job announcement, and the District is engaged in negotiations with the bargaining unit that represents department chairs.

III.A.1/III.A.1.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>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to ensure that future administrative job announcements clearly define roles, responsibilities, and expectations of management personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the classified personnel structure to better assess the effective use of staffing resources.</td>
<td></td>
<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 has established systems for evaluating all personnel to ensure the effectiveness of its human resources. The SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement defines the criteria for evaluating faculty. District policies and procedures outline criteria for evaluating classified staff and administrators.

[evidence: SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement; PM 3.18; what about classified staff policy re. evaluation?]

The purpose of evaluation for all employee groups is to identify strengths and special qualities of the evaluatee and to define areas for improvement when needed. At all levels, the evaluations incorporate a criterion that effectively measures and evaluates an employee’s work performance. The evaluation process includes performance indicators that link to institutional effectiveness and improvement. At all levels, where employees receive a less than satisfactory rating, the District implements a remediation process.

Faculty Evaluation. The faculty evaluation process is administered by the Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, in accordance with the SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA, Article 9. In general, the College evaluates classroom faculty every three years on the following: (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, conducted via an in-class survey, are a crucial component of every classroom instructor’s evaluation.

Faculty evaluations carefully consider survey responses, which can reveal 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 evaluation includes an examination of the extent to which librarians: communicate ideas effectively during workshops and instructional sessions at the reference desk; contribute to building, organizing, and maintaining library collections and resources; and strive to maintain an environment conducive to study, research, reading, and learning. Job performance evaluations for counselors consider how individual counselors help students define problems, support students in seeking solutions to problems, and provide opportunities for students to express concerns. For resource instructors, job performance evaluations focus on how effectively they develop instructional resources.

The College evaluates full-time faculty under tenure review more frequently, and they prepare additional self evaluations. The process for gaining tenure also requires faculty to create and maintain a portfolio of their work.

To further improve the evaluation process and provide feedback for improvement to faculty members, the College added a category 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 issues in question 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
Faculty evaluations now include a component measuring their effectiveness in producing desired learning outcomes (see III.A.1.c.).

Department chair evaluations assess their supervisory performance 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 files the results in the evaluatee’s personnel file.

Classified Staff Evaluation. 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. The College evaluates new permanent classified staff 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 within library and learning support services (e.g., instructional lab aides) include a component for rating these employees’ effectiveness in this area. See also the response to Standard III.A.1.c.

The Classified Performance Appraisal serves as mechanism for 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. HR staff prompt the supervisor via an email notice about the need for an evaluation, and sends reminders to the employee’s department head prior to evaluation due dates. HR also sends reminders if supervisors do not meet the deadline. The HR Classified Unit monitors this process. Prior to Fall 2010, supervisors only evaluated permanent classified employees, the College now requires evaluations for all classified employees.

Administrator Evaluations. The College evaluates administrators 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 College first implemented the
current Administrative Evaluation and Contract Renewal Procedures during FY2003-04. Since then, the College has updated this process to ensure a more direct relationship between the evaluatee and his/her direct supervisor. The Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee gave greater weight, 25 percent of the overall evaluation rating, to the supervisor’s review.

Much discussion regarding the Administrative Evaluation process has taken place, specifically focusing on the role of the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee and the anonymous surveys that the Academic Senate and the Classified Senate administer. Although the College also evaluates faculty on the basis of anonymous surveys submitted by students, a number of individuals have questioned the value of this input for administrators and whether or not these additional mechanisms are equitable and fair. **Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman has begun reviewing these procedures.** Changes will include eliminating the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee.

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 that align with the Chancellor’s objectives and derive from the Strategic Plan and the College’s Annual Plan. The Chancellor’s Office oversees the administrative evaluation process, and the 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.

### III.A.1.b. Self Evaluation

As stated in the description above, the administrative evaluation process is changing.

Although the Human Resources Department prompts supervisors annually to evaluate their classified staff, not all supervisors complete the evaluations in a timely manner. SEIU 1021 has raised concerns about this. If a classified staff member does not receive an evaluation, the individual automatically gets a de facto satisfactory rating.

### III.A.1.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>Revamp the Administrative Evaluation Process to produce a more effective model guided by a review of best practices.</td>
<td></td>
<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.** In July 2012, ACCJC recommended “that the evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include a component that assesses the effectiveness in bringing about those learning outcomes (III.A.1.e).” In response to this Recommendation, senior administration negotiated with employee labor groups to include SLO components in all applicable performance evaluation instruments for
faculty, department chairs, classified staff, and administrators with direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes. Full implementation is occurring this Spring (2013).

Additionally, SLO language is added to relevant job announcements accordingly.

**III.A.1.c. Self Evaluation.** The explicit inclusion of SLO components in evaluations of College personnel is new. The College will need time to effectively utilize this information to effect change when needed.

**III.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>
</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.

III.A.1.d. Self Evaluation. CCSF has written policies and procedures pertaining to professional ethics intended to promote a supportive work environment that ensures healthy and collegial working conditions and fosters an environment of respect, trust, and collaboration. The College keeps all policies and procedures up to date with current law. However, since implementation of the changes resulting from ACCJC and FCMAT recommendations, members of the College community have felt that the environment currently does not reflect these positive intentions.


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. ACCJC found that human resource planning is not fully integrated with institutional planning. Standard III.A.6 specifically addresses this concern. Moreover, the ACCJC evaluation team expressed concern that the College had 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.

FCMAT, however, 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. On the other hand, 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. FCMAT 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.

FCMAT 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]

FCMAT also recommended that the College examine the report for accuracy in all areas.

With regard to staffing and operational costs, 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.

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, as noted in the response to Standard III.A.1., the Board of Trustees directed the Interim Chancellor to propose a new instructional structure, congruent with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings. The reorganization is currently in progress with a goal for completion by July 1, 2013.

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.

**III.A.2. Self Evaluation.** 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, while at the same time aligning with budget restrictions. This is a time of significant transformation that the College will have to re-evaluate once firm changes have taken place. The Academic Senate has raised concerns that the College has not fully examined the effects of implementing the administrative changes per FCMAT findings prior to carrying out the reorganizations.

*Evidence: Academic Senate edits to this section*

Staffing plans are not sufficiently linked to institutional planning. Better linkages will help the College assess more effectively the adequacy of staffing and how the institution’s personnel work to support its programs and services.

**III.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>Plans are underway to implement a new instructional administrative</td>
<td>Plans are underway to revamp Institutional Planning, including integrating a staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure, congruent with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance</td>
<td>plan that more effectively and systematically assesses the adequacy of the District's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team (FCMAT) findings. The new structure includes academic integrity</td>
<td>human resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and increased administrative oversight and accountability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans are underway to revamp Institutional Planning, including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrating a staffing plan that more effectively and systematically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assesses the adequacy of the District's human resources.</td>
<td></td>
<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. The College equitably and consistently administers and regularly reviews personnel policies and procedures. Through the collective
bargaining process, the District and Employee Labor groups work collaboratively to find common ground regarding policies affecting their respective members. Employees voice needs and concerns 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 comprises 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. The Board of Trustees considers and approves recommendations for adopting new and/or amending personnel policies. 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 College has improved this process by including 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.

III.A.3/III.A.3.a. Self Evaluation. 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. However, given the magnitude of the changes currently taking place, many would not at this time describe the process as collaborative.

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>
</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 provides 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 CBA. Classified employees may also view their personnel files upon written notice in accordance with the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA. 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 outlines 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, each academic and classified employee can only have one official District personnel file. 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. The College secures and files medical records and investigative reports separately in the same manner as previously noted records.

An online, 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.

The College implemented an exit interview process 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.

**III.A.3.b. Self Evaluation.** 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. The College has implemented a clearly documented exit interview procedure for resignations and retirements, including an exit interview and an automated employee exiting checklist and employee acknowledgment. For classified employee lay-offs, the College follows civil service guidelines and the SEIU 1021 collective bargaining agreement.

**III.A.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>Automation of the exit interview is scheduled for Spring 2013</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.

**III.A.4./III.A.4.a. Descriptive Summary.** CCSF demonstrates through major planning documents, policies, and daily practice, an understanding that equity and diversity are key to the success of the institution. The **Vision Statement** summarizes CCSF’s perspective on diversity as: “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” [III A-26].

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.” Included in the objectives is a focus on fostering a supportive, positive, and productive environment for the College's diverse employees.

The College includes diversity as a component of all new employee orientations as well as in FLEX Day workshops.

The College also has a standing College Diversity Committee, which has been on hold during the transition of the Participatory Governance system. With respect to supporting diverse personnel, its revised purpose is to: XXX.

CCSF has offered a variety of diversity-related programs and services that support its personnel. The “Grow Your Own Program” was designed to encourage and help prepare City College of San Francisco graduates to return as teaching, counseling, or library faculty at CCSF after they have completed their upper division and graduate education. The students participate in a special support program, receive scholarships to pursue advanced degrees, and serve as teaching interns at the College. This initiative was intended to increase the extent to which faculty are representative of the College’s student populations. There was one incoming class of Grow Your Own students/faculty in 2007, and there are four more students/faculty in the pipeline. Three of those are currently interns; one is applying to graduate school [III.A.32]. NEED UPDATE FROM Jessica Williams — GYO new applicants discontinued due to lack of funding.

The Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP) was established at CCSF in 1990 in response to a recognized need for the College to better represent California’s increasing cultural diversity. The purpose of the program is to identify and assist members of underrepresented groups who are in graduate degree programs, have no experience in a community college classroom, and are interested in community college faculty careers. Interns learn and practice teaching and interaction techniques appropriate for community college students from a veteran CCSF faculty member, which helps to make them more competitive when applying for regular community college faculty positions. The program was on hiatus from 2007 to 2011 and welcomed its first incoming class in years during the Fall 2011 semester. There are currently four interns working as FDIP interns. NEED UPDATE FROM Jessica Williams.

III.A.4/III.A.4.a. Self Evaluation. The College has been focused on making dramatic changes with fewer staff and has not been able to focus on supporting the diversity of its current personnel as much as it has in the past. With the new Participatory Governance system now in place, the Diversity Committee will be active once again and can serve as venue for reinstating this focus throughout the College.

III.A.4/III.A.4.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 work in this area.</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. In compliance with Title 5 and at the request of the Board of Trustees, HR prepares an annual Employee and Hiring Data Report (see also Section III.A.2). This document provides an extensive summary of the institution’s hiring record and is used as a reference and educational tool for the institution’s hiring needs and goals. The historical data in these reports show that the institution is committed to hiring people with varied backgrounds and experiences. This is reflected across the District as indicated in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators (Fall 2011)</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty (Fall 2011)</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty (Fall 2011)</th>
<th>Full-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2011)</th>
<th>Part-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21 53%</td>
<td>473 60%</td>
<td>542 54%</td>
<td>370 57%</td>
<td>106 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19 48%</td>
<td>311 40%</td>
<td>459 46%</td>
<td>280 43%</td>
<td>58 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6 15%</td>
<td>57 7%</td>
<td>73 7%</td>
<td>72 11%</td>
<td>16 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7 18%</td>
<td>139 18%</td>
<td>180 18%</td>
<td>245 37%</td>
<td>70 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>15 38%</td>
<td>431 55%</td>
<td>571 57%</td>
<td>129 20%</td>
<td>34 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>27 3%</td>
<td>33 3%</td>
<td>70 11%</td>
<td>11 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9 23%</td>
<td>89 11%</td>
<td>85 8%</td>
<td>105 16%</td>
<td>25 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>3 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>3 8%</td>
<td>38 5%</td>
<td>59 6%</td>
<td>29 4%</td>
<td>7 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>4 10%</td>
<td>71 9%</td>
<td>52 5%</td>
<td>9 1%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>24 3%</td>
<td>44 4%</td>
<td>19 3%</td>
<td>2 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>42 5%</td>
<td>28 3%</td>
<td>31 5%</td>
<td>6 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators (Fall 2012)</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty (Fall 2012)</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty (Fall 2012)</th>
<th>Full-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2012)</th>
<th>Part-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21 50%</td>
<td>456 60%</td>
<td>488 54%</td>
<td>346 57%</td>
<td>103 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21 50%</td>
<td>301 40%</td>
<td>408 46%</td>
<td>266 43%</td>
<td>54 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7 17%</td>
<td>53 7%</td>
<td>65 7%</td>
<td>68 11%</td>
<td>12 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7 16%</td>
<td>136 18%</td>
<td>155 17%</td>
<td>235 38%</td>
<td>68 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>16 38%</td>
<td>414 55%</td>
<td>516 58%</td>
<td>120 20%</td>
<td>32 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>27 4%</td>
<td>33 4%</td>
<td>65 11%</td>
<td>11 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9 21%</td>
<td>84 11%</td>
<td>78 9%</td>
<td>98 16%</td>
<td>25 16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty and staff are also diverse with respect to their age [III A-4].

HR, in conjunction with appropriate College groups, has made a concerted effort through hiring procedures to maintain the highest level of commitment to academic excellence as well as to diversity and equity. HR actively recruits underrepresented populations and participates in the California Community College Affirmative Action Job Fairs.

On February 23, 2012, the Board of Trustees adopted Resolution No. 120223-S5, “Strategy for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection.” The resolution called for the Chancellor’s Office to develop a comprehensive College-wide policy and implementation strategy for improving equal opportunity in faculty recruitment and selection. The Chancellor formed task force workgroups who met and reviewed the hiring data and diversity statistics contained in the Human Resources Hiring Data and Employee Data Reports. Without prior review by the Academic Senate, the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, or the Diversity Committee, Chancellor Griffin placed the “Blueprint of College-Wide Policy and Implementation Strategy for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection” on the April 2012 Board of Trustees meeting agenda. Because serious inaccuracies in the document were a source of concern, a “Diversity Blueprint Workgroup,” including the Dean of Human Resources and representatives from the DCC and the Academic Senate, reviewed this document. This group came together on April 23, 2012, and a summary of their findings, corrections, and timeline for implementation was presented by the Academic Senate to the Interim Chancellor Fisher in May 2012. Many of the groups’ recommendations regarding the hiring process are already in place (i.e., copies of transcripts versus original transcripts), and those recommendations concerning recruitment (i.e., letters of recommendation) can be accommodated and adapted into the current hiring process.

The recruitment of classified employees for the San Francisco Community College District is governed by the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA and the City and County of San Francisco Civil Service System.

III.A.4.b. Self Evaluation. 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.

While the Blueprint document generated much dialogue, members of the College community raised concerns about the process leading to the development of the document. See also the response to Standard IV.B.2.c.

Comment [khc61]: I think elsewhere we indicate that we need to improve the diversity of personnel. Need to determine our stance on this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.A.4.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>Update Employee &amp; Hiring Data</td>
<td>HR prepares a report</td>
<td>March 15, 2013</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.** CCSF subscribes to and advocates for integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff, and students by adhering to a number of regulatory policies and laws, including union contracts, the State Education Code and Title 5, the City and County of San Francisco’s Civil Service Charter, District personnel policies and practices, and federal, state, and local labor laws. The institution has also established procedures and guidelines to enable it to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds, sexual orientation, or disability.

In addition, the institution has an Equal Opportunity Statement that addresses CCSF’s policy on equal employment and educational opportunities [III A-37]. The compliance officer for this policy is the Title 5/EEO/ADA Compliance Officer. The Title 5/EEO/ADA Compliance Officer is also responsible for disseminating informational brochures to all students and employees regarding District policies and procedures pertaining to sexual harassment and unlawful discrimination. This information may also be found on the Office’s webpage and in employee handbooks. As required by law, sexual harassment training for employees serving in management and supervisory ranks has been ongoing since 2005.

The District has identified the Title 5/EEO/ADA Compliance Officer to the State Chancellor’s Office and to the public as the single District officer responsible for receiving all unlawful discrimination complaints filed pursuant to Title 5 § 59328, and for coordinating any investigation [III A-38]. The Title 5/EEO/ADA Compliance Officer is leading the update of the District’s EEO Plan in accord with the State Board of Governors’ proposed Title 5 EEO regulations.

The Office of the Director of Student Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities is responsible for student conduct and complaints. College Rules and Regulations pertaining to conduct are also contained in the College Catalog, in the Faculty Handbook, and on the CCSF website.

As stated in Section III.A.4.a, FLEX Day events have served as a forum for presenting informational workshops and trainings about the institution’s policies and practices related to respectful treatment of employees and students.
III.A.4.c. Self Evaluation. Based on its policies and procedures, the College does strive to demonstrate integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff, and students. However, given the large and rapid nature of changes taking place within the institution at this time to define roles, responsibilities, and accountability, members of the College community have not felt that the College has consistently upheld this intention.

III.A.4.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>Spring 2013 – comply with the State Board of Governors’ proposed Title 5 EEO Regulations by updating the District’s EEO Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<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. The College’s Faculty Handbook, the Office of Professional Development’s webpage, and FLEX Day programs outline professional development requirements for faculty. The Office of Professional Development plans annual FLEX Day activity programs for faculty and staff. The FLEX Day programs respond to the teaching and learning needs that faculty and staff have identified and are consistent with the institutional Mission. Examples of such programs include teaching with technology, methods to motivate and aid student learning, diversity, and multicultural topics [III A-36].

The discontinuation of AB 1725 resulted in the elimination of travel funds. This has directly affected the quality of FLEX Day events, as funding is not currently available for guest keynote speakers, diversity workshop presenters, and informational seminars from outside agencies. However, the College has continued to offer a limited program.

Another issue related to offering an extensive array of FLEX Day programs is the reduction in the number of days devoted to FLEX. Prior to 2003, the fall semester FLEX event took place over three days, and the spring semester events were two days. This allowed for a varied and quality offering of workshops. Negotiations between the College and Collective Bargaining Units have reduced the programmed FLEX Days down to one day each semester. Faculty received the other four days as independent FLEX Days to attend conferences or pursue individual developmental activities. However, due to severely limited travel budgets, it is increasingly difficult for faculty to attend conferences or off-site workshops.

These changes have directly affected the Flex Day events by reducing overall attendance, constraining the College’s ability to solicit and contract with outside presenters, and limiting the number of quality workshops that could be offered. Negotiations are underway to restore one of the programmed FLEX Days to the fall semester.
Other outlets available for faculty professional development include the Basic Skills Faculty Colloquia, the Technology Learning Center’s (TLC) technology training sessions (see also the response to Standard III.C.1.b.), the Department Chairpersons Council-sponsored Student Learning Outcomes Workshops, the Multicultural Infusion Project activities, and individual department workshops.

[evidence: agendas/outlines, handouts, etc. for these initiatives/activities]

An additional professional development option offered through contractual agreement with AFT 2121 is sabbatical leave (SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA Article 17.N), which allows 4 percent of the faculty, including department chairs, to take sabbatical leave during an academic year. The Sabbatical Committee makes decisions about those who are awarded sabbaticals [III A-2, p. 92-97].

Individual professional development targeted to specific faculty teaching/learning needs has been enhanced by the Union-District program to reward ongoing education and training with salary column movement. Since Fall 1999, AFT 2121 and the District have agreed to grant salary column movement to faculty who do not possess a Ph.D. Faculty wishing to take college courses to accumulate units for salary column movement may: (1) take undergraduate courses, which require prior approval from their respective School Dean and Vice Chancellor; (2) take graduate courses; or (3) develop a long-term professional development plan (SFCCD/AFT 2121 CBA –Professional Development Plan). HR administers the evaluation of faculty coursework [III A-2]

The Chancellor grants administrative sabbaticals. In accord with the Sabbatical Leave Policy for Administrators, up to two sabbatical leaves may be granted per academic year and the award may be for one semester, one year, or a split (two non-consecutive semesters). Approval is based on seniority, benefit to the institution, and benefit to the individual, and consideration is given to the timing of the leave and its consistency with institutional priorities. Administrators may also receive a short-term paid or unpaid leave for professional development. Due to the reduction in the number of administrators, no administrator has received a sabbatical in recent years [III A-8 p. 28].

In cooperation with the leadership of the classified employees (SEIU 1021 and the Classified Senate), the Office of Professional Development and the Chancellor’s Office sponsor a classified employee FLEX Day once a year. The District provides release time for training and/or presenting during Flex Days. The Classified Senate established the Joan McClain (founding member of the Classified Senate) scholarship to aid classified employees pursuing academic goals.

The following educational opportunities are also available to classified SEIU 1021 members: (1) enrollment fee waiver program; (2) Book Loan Program; and (3) the SEIU 1021 Enrollment Fee Reimbursement Grant. Specific information about each of the aforementioned programs is available in the Classified Handbook and in Article 13– “Staff Development” of the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA [III A-17, III A-19].

III.A.5/III.A.5.a Self Evaluation. The College can only offer limited professional development opportunities given fiscal constraints. However, to respond to ACCJC’s Recommendation relating to administrative capacity, Senior Administration has agreed to allocate $150,000 for employee professional development. The workgroup addressing
this issue also recommended exploring low- or no-cost options for professional
development, including participation on accreditation site visit teams, establishing a
mentoring program, and the possibility of providing professional development, in some
cases through existing CCSF classes.

In addition, the workgroup addressing administrative capacity recommended that the
College restore orientations and training for deans, department chairs, program
 coordinators, classified staff and expand to others as applicable.

Interim Chancellor Fisher instituted a series of Leadership Training activities for the
management team with a $100,000 donation for this purpose. Topics to date have
included accreditation, enrollment management, Banner usage, SLOs, Shared
Governance, and leadership strengths. The accreditation workgroup reviewing
professional development has recommended that these activities continue and that the
College develop a formal annual schedule.

III.A.5/III.A.5.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 work to fully implement and fund a professional development program that promotes training and professional growth opportunities for all employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for staffing of the Professional Development Office including a faculty on 40 percent release, to handle the increased workload resulting from tracking of faculty professional development credits and grants processing due to $150,000 allocation for employee professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<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. The primary ways that the College evaluates FLEX
Day sessions and other professional development opportunities is through the Employee Survey, administered at regular intervals, the FLEX workshop evaluation forms, and evaluation forms completed by faculty and staff related to the TLC and online course training sessions offered by staff in the Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) area.

Professional Development staff use the suggestions made on the FLEX evaluation forms to plan future FLEX Day sessions and share the evaluations with the presenters so that any comments can be addressed by the presenter before offering that training session in the future. They also use informal feedback and suggestions from faculty to plan future professional development sessions.

The results of the 2011 Employee Survey show a near good rating for Flex workshops, and a slightly higher than good rating for the TMI training programs and the TLC’s distance learning training and support.
III.A.5.b. Self Evaluation. The FLEX sessions are limited to one day per semester, some of which is devoted to departmental meetings. The reduced schedule makes it difficult to schedule a sufficient variety of workshops. Because of this, the value of assessing workshops and using the findings for improvement are limited. Nonetheless, FLEX workshops and the evaluations thereof will continue.

When staffing allows, the College will examine the feasibility of including an online “suggestion box” for professional development on their website. In addition, the College will investigate a way to systematically and centrally measure the extent to which professional development activities effect changes in practice.

III.A.5.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 work to fully implement and fund a professional development program that promotes training and professional growth opportunities for all employees. Increase staffing resources to better implement evaluation practices</td>
<td></td>
<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. In the previous Shared Governance system, hiring requests were reviewed by the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) and the inactive Classified Position Allocation Committee (CPAC). FPAC played a key role in setting the criteria and procedures for departments requesting full-time faculty replacements, using Decision Support System (DSS) data to assess faculty position requests. Although FPAC still exists on paper within the Faculty Hiring Procedures Agreement, it does not at this time have a “box” on the Participatory Governance structures. The College plans for units to submit future staffing requests through the Program Review process as part of the integrated planning and budgeting system. These requests make their way through several levels of prioritization by the administrators responsible for the area in question. The Chancellor has the ultimate decision-making authority.

In assessing the adequacy of staffing, managers consider the following factors: (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.
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. Human resource planning has not been integrated with institutional planning, but plans are in place for this integration to occur in the future. Staffing requests did not follow a streamlined, transparent process. The primary reliance for the future on Program Review as the mechanism for making staffing decisions will help integrate human resource planning with institutional planning. To fully integrate human resource needs with planning, the College must develop a separate staffing plan that feeds into the resource allocation process through Program Review.

III.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 Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue integrating planning with resource allocation/redirection by considering budget constraints and enrollment and aligned with the College Mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish transparent and consistent practices for determining how replacement positions are prioritized.</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.

In July 2012, ACCJC issued the following recommendation regarding physical resources

“To fully meet Standard III.B Physical Resources, the team recommends that the college incorporate all costs required to appropriately operate and maintain existing facilities, whether owned or leased, into its annual and long-term planning and budgeting processes and annually allocate the required human and fiscal resources to effectively and equitably operate and maintain physical resources at locations where courses, programs and services are offered.”
The changes that the College has implemented with respect to better integrating its planning and budgeting system establish a foundation for addressing this Recommendation. In addition, the College has placed on hold any major projects until the Total Cost of Ownership model is implemented. The College is sorting spending FY2012-13 data by major location to better understand the costs associated with operating each center and site. This data will begin to become automated with the development of the FY2013-14 budget and will help College leaders to make better informed decisions going forward. The responses below outline the extent to which the College conforms to this Standard and this related ACCJC Recommendation.

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. The Office of Facilities Planning, which reports to 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 for Finance and Administration also oversees the Buildings, and Grounds Department, which is responsible for maintaining facilities and undertaking minor repair projects. Custodial Services, which is responsible for keeping the facilities clean and operational, is also part of the Maintenance, Buildings, and Grounds Department. Due to retirements the lead positions in these two departments are currently vacant. At the same time the College is not presently moving forward with any major projects, as a result the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration will reorganize these departments under a single position Superintendent of Building and Grounds. This position should be filled during Spring 2013. The Campus Police Department ensures College-wide security. CCSF appointed an ADA Compliance Director to coordinate and resolve issues regarding access, safety, and security to ensure a healthful learning and working environment.

Centers and Sites. CCSF offers most of its classes at the following district owned locations: Ocean Campus, , John Adams Center, Chinatown Center, Downtown Center, Alemany Center (Civic Center), Evans Center, 33 Gough Street. The College also offers classes at the following leased locations Mission Center, Southeast Center, Fort Mason, and the Airport. In total the College offers classes at over 100 sites.

On September 27, 2012, the Board took action to direct the Interim Chancellor to actively pursue options for generating revenue from the 33 Gough Street property and to relocate class offerings at the Castro Center and two Park Presidio sites to other appropriate centers. The College has taken action accordingly, and is now working with the firm of SBRE for expert real estate advice.

Comment [K64]: At least one other site was to be identified by October 25 per our Special Report. Jorge/Joy are investigating updates.
Public Safety. A Chief of Police heads the College’s full-time Public Safety Department that works closely with the San Francisco Police Department (See Appendix A). The District’s Public Safety Department is a state Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)-certified department under 830.32 (a) of the California Penal Code and provides onsite law enforcement and/or security services at the main Ocean Campus, as well as designated centers and sites. City College of San Francisco’s 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 monitoring crime statistics for locations within CCSF and within neighboring communities (See Appendix B). Additionally, the Public Safety Department is required to review Cleary Act data in order to track crime trends. The information gathered from the Cleary Act data is often disseminated through electronic means to the campus community.

In the past, the Public Safety Department operated 24 hours. Due to budget cuts, the Department now operates for 19 hours a day. 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 text messaging alert system that provides text messages to the College community regarding any emergencies. Approximately 1,000 people have signed up for the text messaging alert service. Although this communication is optional, the College encourages its community to select this service to receive instantaneous messages as the need arises. The College does not currently have formal protocols for using the text messaging alert service, and instead relies on the judgment of the College Chief of Police to determine when such messages should be issued.

In 2009, the District appointed an Emergency Preparedness Coordinator to ensure the District’s safety and security. The College has completed an assessment of its Emergency Evaluation Plan (See Appendix M); prepared an Emergency Response Plan Binder (See Appendix N); provided Standardized Emergency Management System (STEM), National Incident Management System (NIMS), and Incident Command System (ICS) Trainings (See Appendix O) along with “table top” exercises; collaborated with the Emergency Operation Center (EOC) for joint training and sharing of resources; created a San Francisco Colleges and Universities Resource Group for Emergency Preparedness; assigned primary Emergency Response Team personnel at each educational center and site; hosted Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) training for 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.

Facility Safety and Access. The College formerly used the safety inspection services of the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC) Joint Powers Authority for property and liability coverage, however, starting in FY2012-13, the College now uses the Alliance for Schools Cooperative Insurance Program (ASCI). CCSF also tracks the safety of its facilities by using the Foundation for California Community Colleges-operated “Facilities Utilization Space Inventory Options Net” (FUSION), a web-based suite of tools to support the integrated management and reporting on California community college facilities throughout the state. 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 District’s inventory, as well as the current state of usefulness (See Appendix C). FUSION conducted the most recent inventory assessment in October 2012.

**Effective Space Utilization.** The Office of Instruction, along with the center Deans, assigns 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 provides information that will guide the College in ongoing efforts to determine how to effectively utilize its facilities.

CCSF relies heavily on the expertise of center Deans and Department Chairs to articulate departmental and program needs regarding space. In addition, the College formerly relied on the Shared Governance Facility Review Committee where requests and projects were considered and prioritized (See Appendix D and Appendix E and “Facilities Planning,” below). The College still needs to work out the details regarding input from College constituencies in facilities decisions in the new of the new Participatory Governance Council.

**Facilities Planning.** The College has been fortunate to have received three major local bond issues to upgrade a significant portion of its facilities; however, with limited bond funds remaining, the College will need to find other resources for facility improvements. The age of most classrooms, labs, lecture halls, etc., exceed their life expectancy and will not provide an environment that supports student learning if the College does not provide resources for major maintenance needs. The long term plan for fiscal stability presented to the Board of Trustees in January 2013 provides substantial funding for maintenance. However, these funds will not be sufficient to address all maintenance needs.

Historically, the College has not had a way of prioritizing 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 by focusing on Program Review and Annual Planning, which will inform the College at large about program and service needs by better centralizing the planning process (See Appendix J).

**III.B.1. Self Evaluation.** Since the ACCJC team visit in March 2012, the College has begun to address the ACCJC Recommendation regarding physical resources (Recommendation 9).

The College has assembled a workgroup with representatives from various disciplines to examine all centers and sites (see “Special Focus: Centers and Sites” at the end of the response to the Standards). The workgroup has been responsible for sorting and assigning 2012-13 operating costs for the main Ocean Campus and for all centers. The College has also started to assess the annual allocation of the required human and fiscal resources to effectively and equitably operate and maintain physical resources at locations where it offers courses, programs, and services.

The College’s Buildings and Grounds Department responds to maintenance requests requiring immediate attention, such as plumbing leaks, lighting issues, and broken elevators, among others. However the College’s skilled crafts workforce is now greatly reduced as a result of the need to save operating expenses during several years of budget

---

Comment [K68]: This is true at all Centers/Sites? Joy is checking with Chief Barnes.
cuts. As a result it is not possible for the College to address maintenance issues in a timely manner.

For large-scale facilities improvements, the College has not utilized a centralized process to connect its 10-year Facilities Master Plan to planning and budgeting activities. However, all College programs and departments participate in the annual cycle of Program Review [See Appendix J and Program Review Files in Library], and Program Review has become the primary mechanism through which College units identify their resource needs—including facilities and equipment—to support learning and/or operations and through which each unit formally requests their required resources for the upcoming fiscal year (see also the response to Standard I and Standard III.c.1.c.). While in the past the Program Review process has not been linked to facilities improvements or equipment purchases, in the future, the result of this process will correct a current deficiency in the College’s ability to prioritize capital improvement projects.

In 2003, the District Facility Condition Assessment Report indicated that existing District facilities were in generally poor condition, and only limited improvement has taken place since then. While the College now has an up-to-date FUSION database that it can use to assess, prioritize, and implement facility improvements, during the current fiscal year there are no funds available to address these needs.

While the College has been able to rely on bond initiatives to build new facilities, the College needs to refocus its attention on existing facilities where conditions are deteriorating and are at times inadequate to support student learning. The long term plan for fiscal stability would improve the College’s ability to address maintenance needs, but a larger source of funding such as a future local bond issue would be needed to fully upgrade facilities (See District Wide Replacement Costs of Physical Resources).

With respect to public safety, the College developed its Emergency Response Plan in 2008 and will need to update it within the next XX years/months. The College has conducted annual evacuation drills for several years and has also conducted tabletop exercises for emergency responders. Additional exercises need to be conducted in the future.

### III.B.1. 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>Adopt, create, and implement the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate an individual to monitor the FUSION website and TCO Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace the former supervisor of Physical Resources, as well as designating an additional individual as a back up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and implement Association of Physical Plan Administrators (APPA) of Universities and Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop annual budget in a manner that allows for tracking expenditures for each center and site separately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment [k69]:** Probably need to rewrite this to better align with the response to Standard II, etc.
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Develop and implement a plan in order to fund and replace facilities that have outlived its life expectancy

Increase awareness about waste management, in addition to encouraging the community to recycle;

Increase custodial and recycling staffing to accommodate the growing College needs;

Provide appropriate level of staffing in the Facilities Office;

Hire a Superintended of Bldgs and Grounds for the District;

Provide budget support to invest in District recycling infrastructure;

Continue to use, Program Review and Annual Planning, to create a priorities list for Facilities and Planning to effectively create process and action plan;

Base future bonds on the FUSION data;

Hire Project Managers for future buildings and maintenance projects;

Develop protocols for using the text messaging service to ensure timely communication about emergencies;

### 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. The College has a 10-year Facilities Master Plan that prioritizes capital outlay projects for the District. Additionally, the College has started to use Program Review and other department-level requests to consider maintenance priorities for the District. In addition the College submits an annual Five-Year Construction Plan to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office identifying major projects (See Appendix E). Buildings in need of renovation that the College has identified in the past include the Downtown Center, Arts Building, Evans Center, Science Hall, Rosenberg/Learning Assistance Center, and Cloud Hall.
In recent years, the College has completed facilities improvements based on emergency needs and the availability of bond funds. Maintenance requests have not been closely linked to the Facility Master Plan. With the enforcement of the new planning system, the College will start linking these requests to the allocation of resources through the Program Review process. In the past, the College has not implemented a total cost of ownership concept approach for its major capital projects. The College has recently placed its last remaining funded major project, the Performing Arts Center on hold until the total cost of ownership is fully developed.

While the College constructed several new buildings in recent years, such as the Wellness Center, Student Health Center, Multi-use Building, and the Chinatown-North Beach Center, older buildings have significant maintenance needs that have not been addressed. Resources for purchasing equipment have been relatively scarce in recent years with the exception of Perkins funds for academic departments.

III.B.2. Self Evaluation. Since the last evaluation, completed in Fall 2012, the College has convened a workgroup to examine the physical resources of the College. The workgroup has made recommendations on how to include physical resources as part of the College-wide planning process. The College needs to continue developing an effective process that includes a regular review and evaluation of classrooms, equipment, and other physical resources. Now that the 2012 facilities inventory is complete, the College is in a good position to develop this regular review.

Starting in December 2012 departments use the Program Review process as a way to inform the College community on departmental facilities needs (See Appendix J). The new protocols and process of prioritization regarding Program Review should build in an annual process for allowing these needs to compete for resources with other College needs. The Education Master Plan is outdated and needs to be updated, and linked to other College plans including the Strategic Plan and Facilities Plan. 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 to ensure that capital projects support College goals, the College is working on updating the outdated plans in order to ensure the alignment between the plans and College goals.

In the past, College units working independently to promote individual program or unit needs, at times not fully engaging the planning process. Consequently, discussion and decision making about facilities needs has reached the Board of Trustees without sufficient analysis.


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.a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.

III.C.1./III.C.1.a. Descriptive Summary – ITS. The Information Technology Services Department (ITS) is the primary provider of technology support. The Department provides base-level services for general operations such as email, telephones, desktop computers, network services, and Internet access to all faculty and staff as well as specialized technology services for specific administrative and academic departments. In addition to this, ITS maintains the systems and databases used for Student registration, Payroll, Financial Aid and Finance. Support is also provided for 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). The Board of Trustees’ Facilities, Infrastructure and Technology Committee (FIT) approves policies related to technology.

A part-time, interim Chief Technology Officer (CTO) currently supervises the ITS Department under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration. The ITS Department comprises 41 people and consists of two primary units, Technical Services and Technical Operations.

Technical Services focuses on providing technical support to all CCSF employees and approximately 113 computer labs. Support includes determining technical needs, recommending equipment, setting up and installing hardware and software, and providing ongoing service. To assist with this process, ITS staff use an online Work Order Request and Incident Tracking system from the vendor SchoolDude. The organization is responsible for over 5,000 computers in 11 locations and provides support via phone, onsite support, in-house repairs, coordination of vendor repairs, and computer lab management.

ITS Technical Operations provides technical support in the areas of Programming, Systems, Networking, and Telephone Operations. CCSF benefits from institution-wide support by this organization in the form of systems design, management, operations, and capacity planning.

In addition to ITS, the following CCSF departments and units employ an additional 21 technology support staff: Admissions and Records (A&R), Disabled Students Programs/Services (DSPS), Educational Technology Department (“Ed Tech”), Financial Aid, Finance and Administration, Human Resources (HR), Matriculation, and the Library. In order to directly meet their technology needs, the managers of the departments in which these technology support staff are located determine the priorities and direction of activities. The Library supports an integrated library system, Millennium, which is used for resource management and access to library materials, services, equipment and Library and Learning Resource (LLR) room use. (Further information in Standard II.C.1.d)
The primary administrative software application in use at CCSF is Banner. It is an integrated software solution developed by Ellucian (formerly Sungard Higher Education) designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of CCSF. The Banner system is a database that supports and manages student information, accounts receivable, financial aid, finance, payroll, human resources and position control. In addition, Banner includes a number of self-service features locally called Web4, which allow students, faculty, and staff to access personalized online services. Data from Banner informs Program Review, enrollment management, MIS reporting, and other ad-hoc needs.

ACCJC Recommendations 2 and 9, as contained within the July 2012 accreditation determination, both call for more effective planning with respect to technology needs. In light of these Recommendations, the Program Review process has become the primary mechanism through which College units identify their technology needs to support learning and/or operations and through which each unit formally requests their required resources for the upcoming fiscal year (see also the response to Standard III.C.1.c.). 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, because these requests should be based on data that inform technology (and other) needs. The College will implement these prioritized projects in addition to the projects and operational tasks that ITS specifies in its own Program Review. Generally, Program Review is the mechanism by which units make relatively large-scale requests that require more resources to purchase.

Given the dynamic nature of technology, College units also make ad hoc technology requests throughout the year that are less resource intensive. For example, ITS reconfigures the computer labs each semester based on recommendations from faculty members to incorporate new features and functionality into the learning and teaching environment. The College community and technology staff engage in continuous dialogue to modify and adjust technology systems based on day-to-day needs. ITS proactively monitors and supports all major systems by using system management tools consisting of online applications and associated databases. The specific systems ITS monitors include Network Switches, WiFi Services, Internet Utilization, Telephone Systems, Storage Area Networks, and Firewalls.

III.C.1./III.C.1.a. Descriptive Summary – Ed Tech. The Educational Technology Department (“Ed Tech”) provides services to faculty and staff for the use of educational technologies to promote student learning in face-to-face classrooms and via distance education (online and telecourses). The Educational Technology Department includes the Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) unit and the Technology Learning Center (TLC).

The Department is currently responsible for the funding, training, and managing of the development of all distance learning classes (between 8-10 new online classes are developed each academic year); the funding and managing of the delivery and support of all existing distance learning classes (averaging 300 sections an academic year; generating $6.02 million in academic year 2011/12); training, and support in educational technologies relevant to face-to-face and distance education; and funding and managing the delivery of all telecourses.
Consistent with the College’s Mission, the Educational Technology Department strives to provide programs and services that achieve the following major program objectives: first to successfully teach and learn through CCSF’s learning management system; and second, to promote the use of educational technologies to enhance teaching and learning including innovative hardware and software.

City College of San Francisco identifies and evaluates its technology needs for both distance learning and the general use of educational technologies in the classroom in a variety of ways: Program Review, the Employee Technology Survey (the next survey will be administered in Spring 2013), TLC Surveys, Surveys for both distance education students and faculty, the Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable (TLTR), the Distance Learning Advisory Committee, Educational Technology Department meetings, and institutional initiative for SLOs and assessment.

The College makes decisions to adopt or not to adopt technology based on the impact such technology will have on student learning and after extensive feedback from users. Additionally, decisions are based on the availability of fiscal and human resources. The Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable (TLTR) discusses new ideas about technology. Faculty discuss technologies related to distance education at Ed Tech Department meetings. Outside vendors often present new educational hardware and software technologies to the TLTR.

CCSF uses an outside vender to host the learning management system (powered by Moodle). In the contract between CCSF and the vendor there are provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy and security to ensure that the system is reliable and sustainable for both distance education and tech-enhanced courses.

In spring 2011 the Telecourse Office relocated to the same location as the TLC and TMI offices. With this move, Ed Tech is now able to provide support for all distance education faculty and students in one location, maximizing space, staff and equipment. Faculty teaching online receive priority for a desktop or laptop. Ed Tech received new equipment in Spring 2011 to replace equipment such as desktops. 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 Educational Technology staff to talk about any technology or pedagogy questions they might have in their distance learning class. Additionally, the Ed Tech computer lab was upgraded in summer 2010. This lab is a valuable resource for faculty teaching both distance education and traditional modes.

III.C.1. Self Evaluation – ITS. ITS performs technical systems management to proactively monitor, expand, and improve the availability and performance of College-wide communications and operational systems. An online Work Order and Incident Tracking System facilitates technical support services and provides a method of reviewing past incidents in order to improve service levels for future incidents. The use of automated tools is beneficial in achieving greater efficiency, but they cannot completely compensate for a shortage of technical staff. While having technology staff assigned to individual departments directly meets the technology needs of that particular department, the College could achieve greater operational efficiencies if the ITS Department supervised all technology staff. The ITS Technology Services unit requires
expansion in order to provide technical assistance and support during evenings and weekends. In the future, the College needs to better integrate technology planning with Program Review to ensure alignment with learning, teaching, College-wide communications, research, and operational systems. The College also needs to continue conducting the Technology Survey on a regular basis to assess the effectiveness of technology and receive suggestions for improvement.

The Program Review process ensures centralized prioritization of technology needed throughout the institution, and the annual budget now allocates resources for this purpose annually in addition to the resources already included in annual budgets for ITS itself. The plan to maintain, upgrade and replace equipment is expected to enhance the District’s ability to keep unit-based operational systems current.

The College has customized Banner to improve its effectiveness by aligning it better with College operations, but this customization has reduced its efficiency, and the College is examining whether it would be more efficient to use the standard California Community College version of Banner (CALB) for at least some components. ITS staff responsible for programming play a key role in maintaining the Banner system; due to attrition, ITS will need additional staff to ensure the optimal continuation of this role.

Moreover, although Banner is an effective enterprise application, the College has experienced limitations in accessing and interpreting Banner data for decision making in part due to a need for more training. The College is in the process of implementing Argos to address this need as it will provide users with a more accessible, intuitive interface with Banner that will require less technical training. Argos is essentially a reporting tool that can be used for enrollment management, financial planning, and other activities. ITS began implementing Argos in November 2012 and will issue reports to CCSF decision makers beginning in February 2013. Argos is an example of how the College implements new systems and services as funding and other resources become available; a donation made it possible for CCSF to purchase Argos.

The College has selected a hosted email service for Faculty and Staff from Microsoft, Office 365, for future use at CCSF. Migration will begin in January 2013 with completion scheduled for June 2013.

III.C.1./III.C.1.a. Self Evaluation – Ed Tech. Given the rapid pace of change in educational technology, it is vital that Ed Tech staff receive training 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 the College must keep up with changes in technology, 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 then-newly hired CTO re-allocated the $5,000 budget that Ed Tech had been using to hire peer trainers for the TLC. Previously, Ed Tech used these funds 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 professional development in teaching and learning with technology that Ed Tech can provide. The College has still not hired a faculty Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist position and in Spring 2013, the reassigned time of the TLC Coordinator position was reduced to 0.4 from 0.8 FTE. This is a significant loss in support for distance learning faculty as all staff in Ed Tech are cross-trained.

III.C.1./III.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>ITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Technology Priorities</td>
<td>Conduct Annual Program Review</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Technology Effectiveness</td>
<td>Conduct Technology Survey</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Banner Customization</td>
<td>Migrate Towards Banner CALB</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Technology Services</td>
<td>Hire or Re-Allocate Additional Staff (2)</td>
<td>December, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Programming Staffing Levels</td>
<td>Replace Staff Due To Attrition</td>
<td>December, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore TLC Coordinator re-assigned time to 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire a Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist to replace the previously filled IT 1033</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Tech Support personnel so there is back-up to the System Administrator.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2013</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 – ITS. The Information Technology Services Department (ITS) provides training to all City College employees for technology needs related to general operations. This includes three types of training: in-person, web-based, and handouts. Employees can take in-person classes at the Ocean Campus as well as at the other major centers. These classes are scheduled throughout the semester and cover a wide range of topics such as Microsoft Windows, Microsoft Office and the Office 365 email system. The web-based aspect of training centers on the College’s website and on the effect that IT changes have on end-users. Hand-outs provide tips and self-paced “how-to” guides on popular software and services. New technology related to Banner is demonstrated at the monthly Banner Advisory Group (BAG). Employees from multiple departments attend the annual California Community College Banner Group Conference (3CBG) and have an opportunity to learn from their peers throughout the State.

III.C.1.b. Descriptive Summary – Ed Tech. The Educational Technology Department provides faculty training on educational technologies and distance learning. Ed Tech faculty and staff support online documentation and tutorials. TLC staff work 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), the purpose of which 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 emerge from discussions that take place at Distance Learning Advisory Committee (DLAC) and Ed Tech FLEX Meetings and through 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 software through a schedule of ongoing workshops and FLEX Day activities each semester. Since the ITS reorganization, the creation of the Educational Technology Department, and the significant loss in human resources within TMI, the TLC has shifted its focus to educational technology applications; primarily distance education. The TLC delivers training in a variety of modes to meet the needs of CCSF faculty and staff. From hands-on workshops to online training and sessions created specifically for departments’ needs, the TLC staff provide tools that educators use to increase student access and success. The TLC also delivers training on CCSFmail and Google applications for faculty and tech-enhanced Insight training.

TMI staff support online, technology-enhanced, and telecourse curricula. 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 web-enhance a face-to-face course. The training has been extremely popular, increasing from 100 tech-enhanced sections in Fall 2010 to over 300 in Fall 2012. With the shortage of staff within the TMI unit of Ed Tech, TLC staff have stepped in and filled human resource needs. The Employee Survey Report and Library Student Survey indicate high levels of satisfaction with Ed Tech training.

As a result of surveys, Ed Tech made a number of changes to the Telecourses Program, the Online Program, the Distance Learning website, the Tech-Enhanced Program, and the TLC. Changes include redesigning websites, creating additional learning resources such as videos, adding additional hours for drop-in support, and using educational technology to support SLOs and assessment, among many others.

Ed Tech also provides various means of support to students and faculty beyond the direct training activities described above. For example the website for the learning management system (Insight) hosts a searchable FAQ for students and faculty; provides an online tracked ticketing system for students and faculty; students and faculty can drop-in to the Ed Tech office for support; and 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. With the relocation of the Telecourse Office to Batmale Hall, students and faculty are now able to drop-in or call five days a week for Insight support.

III.C.1.b. Descriptive Summary – Library and Learning Resources. Students get training in the use of information technology in classrooms, via in-person and online workshops, and individually. Library and Learning Resources (LLR) course offerings and
workshops cover basic use of information technology and in-depth information competency. Faculty and staff in open computer labs provide individual instruction in using hardware and software on computers, accessing network resources and more. Specialized instruction in technology use is available through the Disabled Students’ Programs and Services department. Finally, specific course offerings through CS, CNIT, Business and other departments provide technology training, and many departmental labs extend these offerings through individual instruction.

<insert information here from p. 53 of the ACCJC evaluation about how the Library trains students in information competency, etc.>

III.C.1.b. Self Evaluation – ITS. A current priority for ITS is preparing the transition to the new email system, Office 365. Training is being provided to employees for this system via weekly training sessions that are scheduled throughout the District. Focused Banner training is provided for specific functions by units such as Finance and Purchasing. Student Development also conducts training for Staff and Faculty on the use of Banner for accomplishing designated tasks, but overall there is a need for a broader scale approach to this important issue. In January 2013, the primary person responsible for training in ITS was laid off as part of the classified staff reduction. In light of this and in line with industry trends, ITS will begin posting more materials online for self-paced training.

III.C.1.b. Self Evaluation – Ed Tech. The Ed Tech Department continues to function with fewer human resources yet with 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, which has been Ed Tech’s focus since the last Program Review. 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, the decrease in human resources (both faculty and classified) is not sustainable. The additional decrease of the release time for 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.

With the ITS re-organization, the then-newly hired CTO re-allocated the $5,000 budget that Ed Tech had been using to hire peer trainers for the TLC. Previously, Ed Tech used these funds 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 professional development in teaching and learning with technology that Ed Tech can provide. The College has still not hired a faculty Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist position and in Spring 2013, the reassigned time of the TLC Coordinator position was reduced to 0.4 from 0.8 FTE. This is a significant loss in support for distance learning faculty as all staff in Ed Tech are cross-trained.

The lack of a Dean of Educational Technology has been a significant factor in increasing the workload for existing staff. Ed Tech has the potential to significantly increase enrollment if it were to receive additional human resources and if the online development budget were restored. A full-time Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist position,
needs to be filled. Additionally, provisions need to be made given the administrative reorganization potentially resulting in an additional loss of staffing for Ed Tech.

III.C.1.b. Self Evaluation – Library and Learning Resources. Students have many choices for training in information technology, both in-person and online. Communication among units about available instruction for students is generally available through the CCSF website. Lack of staff in certain areas does sometimes limit hours of availability and matching appropriate expertise with student needs.

III.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>ITS</td>
<td>Develop Plan for Coordination and Delivery of Banner</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td>Restore TLC Coordinator re-assigned units</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire Distance Learning and Teaching Specialist position</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restore internal grants management program for training</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers in educational technology software.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC Workshops on SLO integration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops for DE Faculty on SLO integration in Insight</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.C.1.c. Descriptive Summary. The CCSF technology infrastructure and associated equipment continues to evolve as new technologies emerge and become available for business and educational purposes. Until recently, while institutional needs have driven the selection and purchase of technology, the College did not employ a systematic process for doing so. In response to ACCJC Recommendations 2 and 9, the College has established a strong relationship between technology and the entire CCSF planning process, particularly through Program Review, which the College will utilize to inform the need for equipment upgrades, replacement, and maintenance. The Program Review process will allow the College to evaluate and prioritize all administrative and academic technology needs in a centralized manner. Beginning with the 2013-14 budget, the College has included a line item to cover the costs of technology; the amount for 2013-14 is $1.5 million and increases in subsequent years. This amount is in addition to the current ongoing Information Technology Services Department (ITS) operations expenses which are approximately $1,135,000 annually.

For replacement of instructional technology and equipment, grant programs are expected to continue in the future at some level, but the newly instated General Fund budget for technology referenced above will include all necessary expenses required for acquiring, maintaining, upgrading and replacing technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs. This will include a desktop replacement strategy based on a five-year
cycle for employee and student computers. For cost efficiency, ITS will measure the utilization of academic lab and academic center PCs in order to evaluate the extent to which consolidation and sharing of resources across multiple departments and programs can occur.

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 about technology policies and procedures; 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 serves in an advisory 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. The ITAC also advises 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.

Once the College procures technology as a result of the process outlined above, ITS has the primary responsibility for the management, maintenance, and operation of the College's technological infrastructure. ITS performs monitoring and management of the infrastructure and equipment through 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. The College has maintenance agreements with major technology vendors for critical systems in order to ensure software upgrades and technical assistance is available as needed. Vendors that provide ongoing maintenance through contracts include Oracle, Ellucian (formerly Sungard), Lilien LLC, and Alcatel-Lucent. In addition to this, PCs that the College purchases through the primary PC supplier, OmniPro, are covered by a three-year warranty and Ethernet switches the College purchases through the primary network supplier, HP Networks, are covered by a Lifetime Warranty which does not require a paid maintenance agreement.

CCSF ensures reliability of its technology systems by two primary methods. First, the College selects high-quality products to the greatest extent possible during the Request for Proposal (RFP) and subsequent acquisition process. Second, 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, the College has installed additional power equipment for the most important servers and Ethernet switches. This equipment includes dual power supplies, Uninterruptible Power Supplies (UPS), and backup generators. The CCSF ITS Department also makes provisions for Disaster Recovery of critical systems. 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 College has not planned for and acquired new and replacement equipment in a centralized, institution-wide manner. The ITS Department has performed internal planning and implementation services to develop the College’s technology infrastructure and to provide base services for the College 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 qualify as CTE programs 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 a centralized process for identifying needs, prioritizing requests and allocating funding. 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.

CCSF has not been effective in keeping the Banner application up to date. Implementing upgrades from the vendor are a significant task because of the need to reapply past local software modifications. The College needs to continue to move toward the baseline application and stay current with the new releases.

Although automation and efficiency tools are helpful, technically qualified employees perform the primary tasks associated with managing, maintaining and operating technology equipment. Due to budgetary constraints and attrition, the number of technical employees at the College 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 meet the rapidly evolving technology needs of the College, ITS will need to be more efficient in the services it provides while also filling senior technical staff positions promptly. The availability of technology support staff has been affected by the need to meet other institutional priorities to limit the College’s liabilities, particularly in the area of paid-time off given that limitations in the accrual of vacation days and the Reduced Work Week (RWW) are serving as an incentive for employees to use up those hours, often in the form of extended time off.

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>Establish Technology Priorities Thru Program Review</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use General Funds for Technology Budgeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Technical Staff Due to Attrition</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Banner Customization</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete a Disaster Recovery Strategy</td>
<td>12/31/13</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 – ITS. Decision-making for the use and distribution of technology resources is tied to the planning process as the response to Standard III.C.1.c. describes above. The Facilities, Infrastructure and Technology (FIT) Committee of the Board of Trustees reviews proposed Board resolutions regarding technology to verify that those resolutions meet the institution’s goals and objectives as defined in the Strategic Plan.

The Technology Plan informs the prioritization process for technology distribution and utilization during the budgeting and planning cycle. The College has rewritten the Technology Plan for 2013-15 which links 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 Reviews 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 align with the strategic Technology Plan goals. As noted in Standard III.C.1.c., ITS prepares its annual Program Review based on needs for common technology that serves all departments and units within CCSF. Each academic and administrative department also describes and requests their technology needs through Program Review. The respective Deans and Vice Chancellors use a rubric to evaluate and rank the priority of requests.

Technology resources for students are distributed throughout CCSF in approximately 113 academic facilities including computer classrooms and student labs. In addition to this, WiFi services are available in designated areas to allow students to utilize their own computing devices for academic purposes.

The network infrastructure is separated by firewalls into an Administrative side and an Instructional side to ensure effective distribution of technology resources while simultaneously protecting internal resources from security threats. 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. 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 all programs and services. 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 uninterruptable power supplies combined with emergency generators to minimize the impact of power outages.

III.C.1.d. Descriptive Summary – Ed Tech. The decision making process specific to the use and distribution of both hardware and software resources for distance education is discussed above in III.C.1.a. Software is regularly updated and new application are adopted for use by faculty teaching distance education classes (e.g. Voicethread).

The current learning management system is Moodle. Before choosing this LMS, the distance education faculty engaged in a rigorous selection process including consideration of the most used systems by community colleges.
The College contracts with an outside provider to host the learning management system. The vendor is a well-known nationally recognized Moodle host. The contract with the outside vendor includes a 99.9% uptime guarantee insuring maximum reliability for students and faculty. Additionally, the contract includes provisions for security, archiving, and restoration. CCSF does regular updates to Insight per the host's recommendations. Updates are scheduled between semesters and/or during times that will not significantly impact distance education faculty and students. Migration to 2 will be complete by December 2013. With the back-end challenges to Moodle 2, CCSF has chosen to migrate more slowly so that as many of these issues are worked out before rolling out a new version to our distance education students and faculty.

Before deciding to migrate from Moodle 1.9 to Moodle 2 the core Ed Tech staff considered other learning management systems. A decision to remain with Moodle was based on the positive impact the current learning management system has on student learning, the current knowledge base of faculty, students and staff in relation to Moodle, the significant increase in cost migrating to a different learning management system, the ability to support faculty and students, and human resources in Ed Tech. Additional consideration was given to the scalability of a new learning management system. The learning management system is currently only available to faculty teaching credit courses because the non-credit positive attendance system is not automated. The process for adding students from Banner to the learning management system is not automated. There is not a stable system in place to email all students enrolled in an online class.

The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 requires that higher education institutions offering distance education must use an authentication system to verify that the student enrolled in the class is the same student completing the coursework. Reading the intent of the legislation and talking with other California Community Colleges, a student login system, such as is used for Insight, is sufficient.

III.C.1.d. Self Evaluation – ITS. 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 the 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, the College developed plans to streamline and improve the ongoing maintenance, replacement, and upgrading of equipment, tying these to College-wide planning and budgeting. The College’s plan for long-term fiscal stability includes an annual allocation for technology of $1.5 million in 2013-14. The College will now use a rubric to rank requests. In addition, after extending the 2009-11 Technology Plan for one year, the College developed a new, more strategic Technology Plan for 2013-15, which ITAC approved 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 the future, the Program Review process will provide decisions on lab consolidation when appropriate in order to effectively distribute limited staff and technology resources. The presence of only one electrician in the District has occasionally slowed the implementation and distribution of technology resources. Wireless printing has been requested by students and ITS has been engaged in an effort 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. 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 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 five-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.

III.C.1.d. Self Evaluation – Ed Tech. Insight could be a valuable tool for non-credit students and faculty. More exploration needs to be done to determine how Insight can serve the non-credit population including costs both for the LMS and human resources for Ed Tech. Ed Tech needs to work with ITS to automate the load of students from Banner to Insight. A better way to email students enrolled in distance education classes needs to be identified. While Insight does have a student authentication system, Ed Tech needs to be continue participating in the state-wide conversation with the CCC State Chancellor’s Office regarding this important topic. As CCSF migrates to Moodle 2 it needs to support Ed Tech for both front-end and back-end transitions that will occur. Currently, the Ed Tech staff is depleted and there are concerns about this migration and the impact on distance education.

III.C.1.d. Actionable Improvement Plans – ITS and Ed Tech. 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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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand wireless access</td>
<td>ITS will work with College units for additional or reallocated funding in FY 13-14 to increase coverage from 20% to 30% 6/30/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide wireless printing capability</td>
<td>ITS will consult department needs and propose method(s) 12/31/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Information and Network Security</td>
<td>Monitor systems on a daily basis, evaluate and deploy new security features and functionality Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Technology Plan objectives related to distribution and use of technology</td>
<td>Work with departments to specify tasks related to goals, link them to outcomes, timelines, Program Review and annual plans ongoing - completion at end of plan (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve mechanisms for gathering data on effectiveness of technology distribution</td>
<td>Pursue objectives in Technology plan for improved and uniform methods of tracking computer use ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain acceptable levels of security and robustness</td>
<td>Continue to maintain all existing security measures and investigate potential improvements or additions ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review effectiveness of decisions about distribution of technology made under new planning, budgeting and administrative structure</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ed Tech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td>Identify a system to include non-credit classes on Insight (loading, training, etc)</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement an automated student load process from Banner to Insight</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a system to email all online students</td>
<td>Fall 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 – ITS.** As the response to Standard III.C.1.c. indicates, technology planning is now integrated with institutional planning. The 2013-15 Technology Plan provides objectives for reviewing and improving the Technology Planning process, recognizing that technology resources are dynamic in nature and require ongoing assessment in order to remain effective. It was developed with participation from multiple CCSF departments including ITS, Ed Tech, BEMA, Student Services and the Library.

The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) is part of the Participatory Governance structure and performs an advising role and assists with evaluating the effectiveness of technology resources to meet institutional needs. Planning for Banner is conducted at the Banner Advisory Group (BAG). BAG membership is made up of
various constituency groups including Student Services, Finance, Financial Aid, Payroll and Education Technology. The Teaching, Learning and Technology Roundtable (TLTR) recommends policies for the effective use of technology in instructional support and student services programs. The College conducts an employee Technology Survey to determine the effectiveness of current technology 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.

Program level outcomes for assessment, 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 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.

III.C.2. Descriptive Summary – Ed Tech. Technology decisions for distance education are based on the results of careful evaluation. As noted in III.C.1.a-b., decisions are based on both quantitative and qualitative data. Discussions occur in participatory governance meetings and Ed Tech meetings. The Ed Tech Program Review identifies the decisions made regarding technology and includes evaluations of such technology. Additionally, various survey instruments are used. Of primary concern when making decisions to adopt new technology, migrate to a different version of an existing software application, or discontinue the use of current hardware or software, is the impact on student learning. Included in this decision-making process is the availability to provide support for the new hardware/software for both faculty and students. In the last three years technology purchases have been based on relevancy to distance education over tech-enhanced and traditional modes. Effectiveness of the learning management system is measured by both faculty and student surveys. Effectiveness for telecourses is measured by student entry and exit surveys. The growth in the use of Insight for face-to-face classes has been tremendous over the last three years. Faculty use the learning management system to measure student learning outcomes creating an easily accessible repository for shared data. The student help ticket and the faculty help ticket systems both provide key feedback in determining that the learning management system is meeting the needs of distance education.

III.C.2. Self Evaluation – ITS. Prior to FY12-13, the College did not centrally review or prioritize technology needs identified in the Program Review process. This made it difficult to evaluate the outcomes of those decisions. These critical steps are now part of the strategic planning process and will require ongoing oversight and evaluation to ensure the process functions as it is intended and results in the use of technology that enhances programs and functions of the College. Program Review now includes a rubric for ranking resource allocation requests, but the rubric itself 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 draw from 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.

III.C.2. Self Evaluation – Ed Tech. With the decrease in human resources to Ed Tech, priority has been given to supporting Insight and distance education over general training for educational technologies for faculty. Tickets are tracked and monitored. Ed Tech staff regularly analyze the tickets making changes to the Insight homepage, training documents, videos, and other materials in order to make certain that the system is working as effectively as possible to support student learning in distance education.

III.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>ITS</td>
<td>ITS priorities will include the prioritized list produced through Program Review</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>All technology budgeting will be done using General Funds</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Desktop computers will be replaced on a 5-year cycle</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Utilization metrics will be used to access effective use of technology resources</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td>Migrate to Moodle 2.0</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td>Restore TLC Coordinator to .8</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence
TLC Workshops website: [https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/tlc-workshops/home](https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/tlc-workshops/home)
Insight and Google Sites Comparison: [https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/tlc-workshops/options-overview/insight-google-sites-comparison](https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/tlc-workshops/options-overview/insight-google-sites-comparison)
TLC Calendar: [https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/tlc-workshops/tlc-calendar](https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/tlc-workshops/tlc-calendar)
TLC Training Information Survey: [https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/tlc-workshops/tlc-training-list](https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/tlc-workshops/tlc-training-list)
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.
Prior to receiving the ACCJC determination letter in July 2012, the CCSF Board of Trustees approved a request on May 31, 2012 to the State Chancellor of California Community Colleges for the assistance of the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT). FCMAT delivered a report on September 18, 2012, which includes 45 recommendations. The College has prioritized and has been addressing the FCMAT recommendations which generally align with those of ACCJC related to financial resources.

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 provides 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, is in need of updating. When this revision is complete, it will be used to drive 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 2012-13 budget 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 redesigned its annual planning and budget cycle and documented the specific sequence of steps in an annual timeline, as captured in Standard I.B. The College began implementing this integrated planning and budgeting cycle in August 2012 and September 2012 with the review of the College's Mission and the delineation of Board Priorities. Following through with the full cycle as
documented in Standard I.B. will be critical to ensuring the integration of institutional and financial planning along with continually evaluating that system.

In addition, the College must continue its efforts to ensure that data used for budgets and Program Review is accurate and more easily useful for all managers. A number of managers have expressed concerns that budget-related data has not always been accurate and useful; compounding this issue is confusion about which office—Finance and Administration or Research and Planning—is responsible for extracting this data.

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 from which other plans should draw.

**III.D.1./III.D.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>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>
<tr>
<td>The College must update and reissue its Education Master Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.** 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 Budget and Financial Report ("311 Report") that the College submits to the State Chancellor’s Office. However, the College’s managers have not had regular access to accurate data for their unit-level budgets, making it hard to directly connect unit-level plans and budgets. Departments with a significant amount of grant activity have expressed concerns that data for these restricted funds are inaccurate and incomplete; this may lead a reviewer to an unfair conclusion about a program with respect to its financial impact on the College. The new Argos system should prove useful in providing more accurate and timely financial data.

Program Review is now a core element for decision making with respect to planning and budgeting, but the issues surrounding the accuracy of data, unless resolved, may temper the extent to which managers are able to make sound decisions based on available resources. Data accuracy will in part require developing a system for better tracking of costs (e.g., faculty reassigned time) so that the College bases decisions on a full understanding of the nature and scope of that data. In the past, the Program Review template only solicited information from units about the need for increases in budgets to
allow for expanded staffing or activities. As of Fall 2012, the Program Review template now includes a prompt asking for each units plans should the coming year require a budget reduction.

The College communicated information about available resources via multiple shared governance bodies in the past; the College will need to establish a new home for these types of presentations in the new participatory governance system.

The annual budget details ongoing commitments such as the employer share of fringe benefits in general and the “pay-go” portion of post-retirement health benefits in particular.

III.D.1.b. Self Evaluation. 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 College cannot easily document the level of priority student learning has received. The new Mission statement is a step toward changing this. The College needs to fully implement the annual budget process to ensure that this occurs.

III.D.1.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) related to this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create New Restricted Funds Reports</td>
<td>Business Office to Post Restricted Funds Reports Quarterly On Website</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core group trained to enter budget corrections</td>
<td>Training for entry of data in Banner Budget module</td>
<td>January 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>Participatory governance system needs to designate appropriate group to receive ongoing information about available resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 budget 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 Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability which is the College’s only significant long-term obligation. The College currently has only a draft 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 College needs to distribute the three-year budget model for review through 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 and needs to increase this annual allocation. While the College has a draft plan for addressing this OPEB liability in place, it must complete negotiations on this issue with the labor unions that represent the workforce regarding employee contributions and eligibility criteria.

III.D.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>Distribute three-year budget model in participatory governance system and receive input from College constituencies</td>
<td>Participatory Governance Council establishes group(s) to review and monitor three year budget model</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a plan for fully funding long-term OPEB liability</td>
<td>Conclude negotiations with labor unions Independent district action as needed</td>
<td>March 2013</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. The 2012-13 processes for planning and budget development did provide some opportunities for participation for constituency representatives in the early stages of its development, however, constituencies did not receive the final budget for their endorsement.

Standard I.B. describes the new planning and budgeting system that the College developed in response to ACCJC recommendations for greater integration between planning and budgeting.

The 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, and the new system will need to clarify how this will now take place and communicate this new process to all the College community.

III.D.1.d. Self Evaluation. The old shared governance system did provide opportunities for constituency representatives to participate in planning and budget development. The 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.

### III.D.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>Participatory governance system establishes processes and opportunities for constituent participation</td>
<td>Decision by Participatory governance Council</td>
<td>January 2013</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>
<td>February 2013</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. For example, the College uses detailed matrices to designate signature authority for contract execution and invoice payments. Financial transactions and internal controls are subject to review by both external auditors. The College also had an internal auditor who performed a very limited review. The College eliminated this position in the January 2013 layoff of a number of classified employees due to lack of funds.

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 FY2010-11 was unacceptably late. The College has added temporary staff to complete the 2012 audit report in a timely manner, but the need for a special investigation prompted by a whistleblower’s allegations caused delivery of the report to occur after December 31, 2012. The investigation concluded that the allegations were not true.

**III.D.2.a. Self Evaluation.** The budget planning cycle used for FY2012-13 does not adequately document the allocation of resources in a manner that supports student learning. The annual financial statement audits conducted by the external auditors find that the College presents its financial statements fairly in all material respect and that the institution has an adequate financial management system.

The College needs to add permanent accounting staff. While the hiring process for accounting staff began in Fall 2012, the College has not yet hired anyone to fill the vacant positions.

---

Comment [khc74]: Will need to make sure this is updated if any hires are made.
III.D.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>Address all remaining audit findings from 2010-11 and any new findings from 2012-13.</td>
<td>Increase staffing in accounting department</td>
<td>Partial completion by 6/30/13, full completion by 1/1/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.D.2.b. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

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. The College identifies and implements those recommendations that the College can effectively implement within the next audit cycle. Typically, the College receives the audit findings in December; therefore some recommendations require a longer time horizon for completion than the next audit year.

The District is currently working on implementing changes related to three separate material weaknesses identified in the FY2010-11 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.

A noted above, the institution continues to work on corrective actions recommended by its auditors in 2010-11, 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.

In the past, the College has not regularly addressed audit findings. With the most recent audit, the College has successfully eliminated two material weaknesses and has a plan to address the third.

III.D.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>District Business Office needs to coordinate</td>
<td>Improve staffing in accounting department</td>
<td>3/1/13</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.** While much budget-related information is available on the College’s website, this data is generally not up to date. Monthly Board meetings include financial reports. In the past, Finance and Administration shared financial information through the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) of Shared Governance. The new Participatory Governance Council will serve many of the same functions as the PBC did and will serve as another venue through which Finance and Administration will share budget information.

The College has acquired Argos software to make data more usable and more useful to managers.

**III.D.2.c. Self Evaluation.** The College needs to continue working on providing better access to accurate and up-to-date financial data. Although the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration makes monthly financial reports at the Board meetings, any handouts or other presentation materials associated with those reports are not included on the Board of Trustees website where other meeting documents and details are archived. The College has begun adding all monthly financial report presentation materials to the District Business Office website to increase access.

**III.D.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>Increase the Board Designated Reserve to ensure that it meets the minimum five percent guideline established by the State Chancellor’s Office</td>
<td>Transfer additional funds into the Board Designated Reserve</td>
<td>May 2013 for FY 2013-14 budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure timely informative information is available to the College constituencies regarding budget</td>
<td>Update College business office website more frequently</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable managers to make data driven decisions.</td>
<td>Offer widespread training in the use of Argos software</td>
<td>June 2013</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.

Grantees abide by funder guidelines and, when requires, request approval from the funder when changes in the budget are required to carry out the agreed-upon scope of work.

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 emerge.

The external auditors, as well as the financial Program Reviews, provide guidance to senior management about fiscal management of the College through 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.

III.D.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>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. 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 external auditors annually test the College’s system of internal controls to evaluate and assess the validity and effectiveness of its controls, both for general (unrestricted) and special or designated (restricted) funds. Other auditors also test the system during their fieldwork. 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. The Board of Trustees and the Chancellor review those recommendations. Senior management implements as many recommendations as possible, given its current resource constraints, before the next audit cycle.
External funders provide annual monitoring questionnaires to the College. The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration or a designee responds to these questionnaires as expeditiously as possible.

The U.S. Department of Education routinely audits the College’s Student Financial Aid systems.

Expenditures of special/designated 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.

The District Business Office is moving towards addressing and coordinating implementation of all recommendations made by external auditors but this will take additional time.

**III.D.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>Coordinate implementation of audit</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer will work with other</td>
<td>Some by June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations</td>
<td>managers to address audit recommendation</td>
<td>others by January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 $49.6 million.

While total fund balance was $17.6 million on June 30, 2012, the usable portion of the College’s fund balance did not meet the 5 percent minimum threshold at the end of FY2011-12. Pre-audit data shows the Board Designated Reserve at about $4 million on June 30, 2012 with unrestricted general fund expenditures of $194.6 million.

**III.D.3.a. Self Evaluation.** Although challenging, 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 State Proposition 30 and local Proposition A.
The College’s reserves are currently inadequate. Thus, the College must increase its reserves to meet and then exceed the 5 percent minimum threshold. The College can address this need 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. The Board took action to direct the administration to place any additional unexpected funding from the state into the Board-designated reserve, although such funding did not materialize.

In addition, the College needs to set aside funds in a reserve for unforeseen occurrences that can happen in any fiscal year.

III.D.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>Meet 5 percent minimum threshold for fund balance</td>
<td>Allocate funds into the Board Designated Reserve in 2013-14, and in subsequent years</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create reserve for emergencies</td>
<td>Allocate funds into the special reserve in 2013-14, and in subsequent years</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to manage cash flow with the use of TRANs</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 with an independent auxiliary organization, the Bookstore, and with the Foundation of City College of San Francisco, a 501(c)3 organization. Each of these entities 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. The Board of Trustees subsequently approved this recommendation in December 2012 for implementation in Spring 2013. The lease payments will cover any remaining liabilities.
III.D.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>Avoid insolvency for College Bookstore</td>
<td>Lease Bookstore to Private Firm</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and implement comprehensive Program Review process to assess effective use of financial resources</td>
<td>Require all cost centers to complete comprehensive Program Reviews</td>
<td>January 2013</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.d. The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is prepared, as required by appropriate accounting standards.

III.D.3.c./III.D.3.d. **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.

Actuarial studies for OPEB liability are updated regularly, with the last report issued in November 2011. The College currently does not have an agreed-upon plan for fully funding its Annual Required Contribution.

III.D.3.c. **Self Evaluation.** The College performs actuarial studies to establish the long-term liability associated with post-retirement health care. That amount is currently $180.8 million for retirements that occur at age 65 and an additional $54.3 million if retirements occur prior to age 65, bringing the total to $235.1 million if all retirements occur before age 65.

The College has set aside a 2012-13 allocation for OPEB of $7.5 million 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. Given that the College has only allocated $500,000 in 2012-13 for the long-term liability, the institution is not funding its annual required contribution. This amount needs to increase to more than $8 million per year to reach the level needed to fully fund this liability. The goal for reaching full funding is FY2020-21.

III.D.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>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.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 College’s only locally incurred debts 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 issues TRANs each year to deal with cash flow needs. For FY2012-13 the amount issued was approximately $49 million. With the passage of Proposition 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; the unrestricted general fund covers this cost. 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.

III.D.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>
<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 College’s student loan 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.

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 not have a plan for reducing this default rate, but needs to develop one.

III.D.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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop plan for reducing default rate?</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 legal counsel prior to sign off. The District does not pay invoices without a signed contract.

III.D.3.g. Self Evaluation. Contracts are generally consistent with the institutional Mission and goals. Appropriate controls are in place to manage contracts, although restoring the position formerly responsible for initial review and tracking of contracts is vital as this process currently experiences significant delays and has so for some time. 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.

III.D.3.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>Restore position that reviews and tracks contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop plan to meet all requirements for monitoring subrecipient agreements</td>
<td>Designate personnel responsible for monitoring subrecipient agreements</td>
<td>7/1/13</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 now 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 FY2010-11 was delivered unacceptably late. The College has employed multiple additional resources to generate an “on-time” audit for FY2011-12 and must ensure that it continues to address the timeliness of audits going forward.

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.

As noted by ACCJC in its Recommendations regarding institutional planning, previous planning and budgeting cycles have not been sufficiently integrated, nor has Program
Review been sufficiently comprehensive to inform this process. The College has begun addressing these issues.

III.D.3.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>Timely independent annual audit reports</td>
<td>Increase staff in the accounting department to ensure timely reports</td>
<td>3/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement comprehensive Program Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 FY2012-13 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.

The College has developed a new detailed cycle for planning and budgeting it is currently implementing.

III.D.4. Self Evaluation. The College’s 2012-13 budget process did not adequately integrate financial planning with institutional planning. The College designed its new integrated financial and institutional planning system with this deficiency in mind. It is too soon to measure the effectiveness of this new system.

III.D.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>Improve connection between planning and budget: uses assessments of programs for future planning</td>
<td>Implement new planning and budget cycle for the annual budget for FY2013-14.</td>
<td>June 2013</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 four committees (Academic Policies, Curriculum, Staff Development, and Student Prep/Success) and many subcommittees.
- **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 Planning and Budgeting Council included: Classified Position Allocation (inactive), Faculty Position Allocation, Program Review, Research, and Facilities Review.


The Faculty Position Allocation Committee, established by the Faculty Hiring agreement, reported to the Planning and Budgeting Council for allocation purposes only. 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 45 committees and other groups in which over 400 members of the College community participated. Among those were many of the institution’s 1,600 faculty, since full-time faculty had received strong encouragement to
participate in Shared Governance and other professional work as part of their responsibilities.

While the previous system was comprehensive and encouraged Collegewide participation, among other merits, the workgroup focusing on ACCJC’s Recommendations 12 and 13 discussed a number of shortcomings and barriers that impeded decision-making. The workgroup also recommended 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.

[evidence: Workgroup 12/13 minutes, Shared Governance reviews/surveys]

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 Budgeting 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.

  Membership on the Executive Council is for two-year terms. The Council elects officers each Spring for the following year. The Academic Senate has term limits. After a second two-year term, faculty must sit out at least a year and then may run for election to Council again, if desired.
The Academic Senate Executive Council reviewed the Evaluation report of the March Visiting team lead by Dr. Sandra Serrano, the July recommendations of the ACCJC, and the Participatory Governance Technical Assistance Report prepared by Pilati and Lay, discussing changes and improvements to the Academic Senate committee structure and charge at Executive Council meetings at many of its meetings through 2012-13 (July 25, August 22, September 5, September 19, October 24, November 7, November 28, December 12, January 23, February 6). In addition, the Academic Senate Executive Council solicited input from all faculty about committee structures and roles, receiving input from many, including participants in Academic Senate Committees. The Academic Senate Executive Council adopted a plan and outcomes for the restructuring of its committees on October 24th, 2012, with a streamlined structure and a model for committee descriptions to include identifying committee support for Accreditation Standards. On February 6, 2013, the Academic Senate Executive Council confirmed the new structure with the approval of new committee descriptions.

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 individuals 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. Confounding this, administrators did not always exercise their authority and responsibility in carrying out administrative duties.

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. Title 5 calls for different levels of participation for different constituent groups for some types of issues. However, the difference in participation rates was experienced by some as inequitable, and students, the main beneficiaries of much of what is deliberated in Shared Governance, were confused and felt unsupported. Lacking, at times, adequate training or notice for student participants and assurance of a process for equitable representation, 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 and only recently resumed. 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. Because the Participatory Governance Council includes elected leaders of each constituency, some are concerned that this continuity in membership from the previous Shared Governance system may limit the emergence of new perspectives and practices. Others point to the desirability of having top-level leaders of constituencies participate ex officio in a top-level governance group—regardless of who they may be—in order to attach maximum legitimacy to the advisory input received on important College decisions.

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. 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. The Accreditation Steering Committee has been an effective forum for review of most matters related to accreditation, but it did not provide Participatory Governance review or communication with constituent groups for budget or operational issues.

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>
</tbody>
</table>
Establish and clearly describe and publicize protocol for stakeholders to introduce proposals, concerns and new ideas.

Review and assess governance systems periodically by conducting College-wide surveys. Expand on most recent survey.

**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.”

**Comment [k79]:** How does BP 1.16 differ from BP 1.04 other than in the numbering?

**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, there had not been consistent clarity 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.

Constituent groups and leaders participated in training sessions in Summer and Fall 2012 to better understand how an ideal system operates. Participants included two members of the Board of Trustees. 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 the College will need to evaluate their effectiveness once they are in place.

The Academic Senate has restructured its committees and adopted new “Guidelines for Academic Senate Committees” to provide clarity of committee goals and responsibilities and streamlined pathways for the development of recommendations.

**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>?? ASCCC Annual Faculty Leadership Institute each summer</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 “academic and professional matters” 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.
- Interim Chancellor Fisher and staff associated with the Research and Planning Office 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. 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, during which time there was not a designated contact for posting information online. Going forward, the Chancellor’s Office will be maintaining a Participatory Governance website to post agendas, minutes, 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, although the Academic Senate has raised concerns that the Steering Committee and accreditation workgroups were more heavily weighted with administrators. 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. Some 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 revised Mission Statement draft in its entirety.
- 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 that 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:
Goal | Associated Action(s) | Expected Completion Date
--- | --- | ---
Finish process of putting new participatory governance into place. | Set guidelines for meeting day and times and committee conduct of business 
Revise web presence for committee materials 
Identify process for posting agendas, minutes, etc. |  
Procedures need to be established for each committee to assess and evaluate their work | Write committee self-evaluation procedures and recommend timelines |  
Evaluation of participatory system needs to be planned, conducted, completed and results published | Collect information on levels of participation by constituency group, clarity of governance role, and access to information. 
Assess effectiveness of input by constituency, governance role, availability of communication |  
Effective student governance structures need to be put into place |  
Obtain and include appropriate input for reorganization of instruction departments before it is implemented | Dialogue with constituency groups, including students, regarding the proposed system 
Examine and analyze workload issues |  
Assess impact of structural reorganizations on student outcomes, achievements and completions |  

**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 relating to 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

Comment [khc82]: Review submission from Karen on Dec 27; appear to have cut out too much and need to revisit. Academic Senate made many structural changes in response to Recommendation 12; need to make sure we reflect this somewhere, if not here.
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, the Academic Senate and the Department Chair Council remain concerned 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>Improve effectiveness of Academic Senate Committees.</td>
<td>1. Complete implementation of plans for restructuring Academic Senate Committees</td>
<td>March, 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>
</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. [Participatory Governance Council agendas and minutes] 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. [Board policy 2.07] While the committees are being developed, the accreditation workgroups have taken over some of the advisory functions of discontinued committees under the previous Shared Governance structure. The new Participatory Governance structure includes 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. [evidence: representative agendas]

The Academic Senate will continue to have a number of committees reporting directly to its Executive Council, in a flatter committee structure under its new reorganization.

The Chancellor takes recommendations from the Participatory Governance 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]

Comment [khc84]: And/or ITAC? Need to clarify what was decided at the 1/17 meeting.
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 documents from all governance structures.</td>
<td>Post all agendas, meetings and other public documents to websites in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure constituent participation in Participatory Governance.</td>
<td>Conduct outreach and evaluation to fill all vacancies at least once a semester.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. More conversation could take place so that all members of the College Community can process and understand the actions the College has undertaken and still needs to undertake.

**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. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.**

**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 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.

NOTE: The organization of Standards IV.B.1 and IV.B.2 begins with a descriptive summary of each subsection and then discusses all subsections within one self-evaluation.

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.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.a. As described in CCSF Board Policies 1.01, 1.02, and 1.17, the CCSF Board of Trustees is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions and that acts as a whole once it reaches a decision.

[BP 1.01, BP 1.02, BP 1.17]

Beginning in July 2012 and in the following months, the Board participated in various training activities and presentations on board roles and responsibilities. Dr. Barbara Beno, ACCJC President, and William McGinnis, Butte-Glenn Community College District Trustee, facilitated a three-hour workshop on the topic of accreditation, covering its purposes, processes, and standards; the roles and responsibilities of trustees; and advice for board excellence. Subsequently, Dr. Narcisa Polonio, Vice President of Board...
Services for the Association of Community College Trustees, facilitated a two-part retreat designed to enhance board performance. The focus was on roles and responsibilities of the Board, a Board Self-Assessment, and the drafting of Board goals. During these events, Board members expressed concerns, and at times disagreed with presenters and each other, about their role and conduct. As evidenced by the Board’s own self-evaluation, the Board has begun demonstrating greater awareness about its performance. The Board President and Vice President also attended a ACCT conference in Boston during Fall 2012.

The Board goals for 2012-13 are:

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

These goals are consistent with the Board’s responsibility for advocating for the institution, and the Board has been working toward completing these goals.

The self-evaluation section of this Standard addresses the extent to which “the governing board 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.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.b. Given ACCJC’s findings that the College could not sustain its Mission statement as written at the time of the 2012 Self Study, the CCSF Board of Trustees revised the Mission Statement in Fall 2012 that now emphasizes a focus on student achievement, student learning outcomes, and links to resource allocation processes.

BP 1.00 DISTRICT VISION AND MISSION STATEMENT
In Board Policy 1.00, the Board has also included a statement about conducting an annual review of the Mission statement. The Board Goals and Board priorities for the Annual Plan 2012-13 focus on meeting the accreditation recommendations, providing quality programs, and obtaining fiscal stability, all of which are in line with the current Mission. Following the revision of Board Policy 1.00, the Board revised Section 1 of the Board Policy Manual as well as prioritizing other policies relating to governance and the role of the Academic Senate that needed to be revised to meet ACCJC’s Recommendations and ultimately provide for meeting the Mission of the College. Because the revision of the
Mission was the first policy that the Board of Trustees revised, the Board’s subsequent revisions reflect changes to the Mission. With the guidance of Dr. Betty Inclan, the consultant assisting with Standard II, the College is continuing to review its policies within Section 6 of the Board Policy Manual (Instructional Programs), and the Board of Trustees will be adopting revisions throughout Spring 2013.

IV.B.1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.c. The responsibility of the Board for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity is defined in Board Policy 1.02, Powers and Duties of the Board.

In September 2012, the Board began reviewing all of its policies related to Board Organization, and the Board adopted new and revised policies in October 2012. Board Policy 1.02, Powers and Duties of the Board, describes the role of the governing board as follows:

- Determine broad general policies, plans and procedures to guide its officers and employees;
- Establish administrative policies by which authority and responsibility for services will be defined and determined;
- Conduct all business in open and public meetings, except in those matters as specified by the Brown Act and the Education Code that may be dealt with in Closed Sessions;
- Select, hire and evaluate the District’s chief executive officer, the Chancellor;
- Deliberate with its chief executive officer upon matters initiated by its own members and grant or withhold its approval of proposals brought before it by its executive officer by application of the principle of pre-audit;
- Focus on deliberations on policy determination, broad District planning, hiring and evaluation of the Chancellor, and maintaining fiscal stability;
- Be responsible for developing a balanced annual budget;
- Determine and control the District’s operations and capital outlay budgets;
- Delegate authority in all administrative matters to the Chancellor, including, but not limited to, hiring or promotion of specific individuals;
- Approve construction contracts and contracts for services and equipment in conformance with the Education Code and Public Contract Code;
- Evaluate and criticize, and by veto, correct and revise policies and actions as need may arise as provided for in Section 1.05.; and
- Order elections as authorized by the Education Code.

Other policies which specifically relate to the duties of the board and their conduct include the following:

- BP 1.00 District Vision and Mission Statement
BP 1.01 Election and Membership
BP 1.03 Organization of the Board
BP 1.04 Officers - Duties
BP 1.17 Governing Board Code of Ethics and Responsibilities
BP 1.18 Institutional Code of Ethics
BP 1.19 Conflict of Interest
BP 1.20 Protected Disclosure of Improper Government Activity

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.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.d. The Board Policy Manual is published on the City College website, which the College updates when new policies are adopted or amended. Several sections of the Board Policy Manual are still outdated and are in need of review. The following policies specify the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures:

BP 1.01 Election and Membership
BP 1.02 Powers and Duties of the Board
BP 1.03 Organization of the Board
BP 1.04 Officers – Duties
BP 1.05 Regular Meetings of the Board
BP 1.06 Closed Sessions
BP 1.07 Special and Emergency Meetings
BP 1.08 Quorum and Voting
BP 1.09 Agendas
BP 1.10 Public Participation at Board Meetings
BP 1.11 Speakers at Board Meetings
BP 1.12 Decorum
BP 1.13 Minutes of Meetings
BP 1.14 Recording Meetings
BP 1.15 Policies and Administrative 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.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.e. As noted in the response to Standard IV.B.1.a., the Board engaged in a variety of training workshops focused on their role and responsibilities in response to Recommendation 14 of the ACCJC that “the board act in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws.” These trainings included a focus on
professional codes of conduct. The self evaluation for Standard IV.B.1. addresses this further.

As described in sections above, the Board has begun the regular evaluation of its policies beginning with Board Policy Manual Section 1 on Board Organization. The College has also revised other sections that pertain directly to accreditation recommendations, including Board Policy 2.07 and 2.08 on Participatory Governance and Collegial Governance with the Academic Senate. As noted above, a consultant is reviewing Board Policy Manual Section 6, Instructional Programs, for its currency and effectiveness.

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.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.f. In response to ACCJC’s recommendation that the Board of Trustees “develop and implement a plan for board development,” Board members participated in several training workshops as noted above. In addition, in October 2012, the Board adopted a new policy and a professional development plan for continuous improvement.

[BP 1.35] [Board’s professional development plan]

In January 2013, six of the seven Board members participated in the California Community College League Effective Trusteeship Workshop. The Board President and two additional trustees also participated in the League’s Board Chair Workshop as well as in an accreditation workshop organized by the California Community College League and the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges in February.

The Interim Chancellors met with two new Board members to provide them with an orientation and materials published by the California Community College League as well as accreditation information from the CCSF Chancellor’s Office. In the case of Rodrigo Santos, Dr. Pamila Fisher provided the orientation (the Mayor of San Francisco appointed Trustee Santos to replace the late Milton Marks; Trustee Santos served until December 31, 2012). Subsequently, Rafael Mandelman was elected to the Board in November 2012; Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman provided his orientation.

The members of the Board of Trustees are elected at large by the voters of San Francisco. The seven publicly elected Trustees serve four-year terms; the terms are staggered so that a subset of Board members’ terms expire every two years. Board members serve four-year terms with the exception of the Student Trustee, who is elected for a one-year term. Trustees are not subject to term limits.

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.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.g. Board Policy 1.23, “Board Self Evaluation,” specifies that the Board will conduct a self-assessment process every summer. In August 2012, the Board participated in a two-day retreat conducted by Narcisa Polonio in which the Board evaluated its performance and conduct with respect to its roles and responsibilities. Based on this self assessment, the Board developed its professional
development plan. The purpose of the retreat was also to provide guidance on how to improve the Board’s internal relationships and dialogue to better advocate for the institution.

In October 2012, the Board adopted revisions to streamline the existing Board Policy on self evaluation (BP 1.23).

**BP 1.23 BOARD SELF EVALUATION**

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.

**Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.h.** The following governing board policies pertain to a code of ethics:

- BP 1.17 Governing Board Code of Ethics and Responsibilities
- BP 1.18 Institutional Code of Ethics
- BP 1.19 Conflict of Interest

The self evaluation for Standard IV.B.1. addresses the extent to which the Board adheres to these policies.

IV.B.1.i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

**Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.i.** When the Accreditation Steering Committee formed in July 2012, the Board President and Vice President were appointed to serve as the Board constituent representatives. Every month, the Accreditation Liaison Officer provides accreditation updates to the Board. In addition, Board members volunteered to serve on various workgroups addressing the ACCJC’s 14 Recommendations; participation levels varied. All Board members have publicly expressed their desire to ensure that the College retains its accreditation. Three Board members provided formal feedback on the Show Cause report and Standard IV. Much of the Board’s feedback and proposed directions for improvement informed the Board retreat in early March 2013. As referred to above, Dr. Barbara Beno, President of ACCJC, facilitated a workshop for Board members regarding accreditation and the Board’s responsibilities in relationship to accreditation. The President and Vice President of the Board of Trustees also participated in the accreditation institute of the California Community College League and Academic Senate of California Community Colleges that took place in February 2013.

**BP 1.24 EVALUATION OF THE CHANCELLOR**

**BP 1.25 CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR: AUTHORITY, SELECTION, AND TERM OF OFFICE**

Board member emails to Gohar

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.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.j. Per Board Policies 1.24 and 1.25, the Board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the Chancellor of City College of San Francisco. Board policy specifies that the Board delegate to the Chancellor the full administrative authority to implement and administer Board policies. Most recently, the Board selected and hired Interim Chancellors Dr. Pamila Fisher and Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman. The self evaluation for Standard IV.B.1. addresses the extent to which the Board adheres to these policies.

IV.B.1.a-j. Self Evaluation. While the Board has sufficient policies in place that inform its conduct, roles, and responsibilities, and has received training in widely established best practices for governing boards, the Board is still struggling with the following specific aspects of its own code of ethics and responsibilities as contained within BP 1.17:

- **Code of Ethics Items 1 and 2.** Board meetings provide examples of how Trustees, while clear in their commitment to providing high-quality education, at times resist fiscal limitations by favoring particular interest groups over the institution as a whole. In some cases, even after the Board has arrived at a decision, individual Board members have publicly expressed viewpoints that contradict the Board decision.

- **Code of Ethics Item 3.** The Board of Trustees generally functions better as a team since receiving the Show Cause sanction and subsequent training evidenced by unanimous voting on all issues since the August 2012 Board meeting, with the exception of the vote to request that the State Chancellor’s Office place a Special Trustee on the CCSF Board. However, the tone of Board meetings is often still disrespectful. While the Board seeks to remain informed, members at times seek and rely on information from particular groups or individuals other than the Chancellor.

- **Code of Ethics Item 5.** Board members have not always maintained confidentiality of privileged information.

- **Code of Ethics Items 6 and 7.** Disrespectful communication at Board meetings continues. This is particularly true when deliberation about controversial issues takes place.

- **Code of Ethics Item 8.** Board meetings do not always follow Board Policy 1.10 with respect to time limitations and the process regarding public input.

In recognition of its challenges, the Board unanimously approved the acceptance of Dr. Robert Agrella as Special Trustee in October 2012. This individual has been working closely with the Board and the Chancellor to continue addressing the issues noted above with the goal of meeting the ACCJC Accreditation Standards and addressing the FCMAT findings.

The Board has also continued to have limited success in delegating authority for implementing and administering Board policies to the Chancellor, per Board Policy 1.25.
At times, the Trustees continue to undermine the Chancellor’s authority to execute Board directives by publicly questioning or not supporting the decisions that they made as a Board. In addition, individual Board members sometimes attempt to micromanage aspects of the College’s operations by contacting the Chancellor and other administrators directly with special requests. Board meetings continue to focus on the implementation of policies, which draws Board members into discussing a level of detail that is neither appropriate nor effective and results in meetings continuing late into the night, and, on several occasions, into the next day.

By approving the plans contained within the October 15 Special Report, the Board has created a pathway to realizing the priorities it has set for 2012-13. This work is still in progress but holds promise for completion if the Board is able to withstand public pressure.

The Board had little turnover for a number of years, gained several new members in quick succession four years ago, and has had little turnover since. This led to a divided Board that has struggled to become a cohesive team. This has perpetuated an undercurrent of distrust, which sets the tone for the governance system overall.

IV.B.1.a-j. 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 training with external agencies such as CCLC, AACC, ACCJC, and ACCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Board development plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue reviewing and updating Board policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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, 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. 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.a. Descriptive Summary. Since 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, who only agreed to stay until 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.

Confounding the turnover in Chancellors, when Interim Chancellor Fisher came on board, there were a number of interim senior-level administrators as a result of a large number of retirements of long-term administrators that occurred in 2010. Dr. Fisher hired three retired community college CEOs to help the College address the ACCJC Recommendations and to mitigate the loss of seasoned leadership. Members of the College community and leadership have been uneasy about the hiring of consultants to fulfill various roles and have questioned the underlying motives for bringing these individuals on board.

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. All current administrators in Academic Affairs have received notice that their positions will end in June 2013. 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.

[contracts or new evaluation procedures as evidence]

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.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. Doing so has included making dramatic changes within an institution that has had a long-standing, independent, and, at times, isolated, culture for over 20 years. 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 were 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. 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.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. In the recent past, the previous Chancellors did not always take action that was consistent with the Chancellor’s own role, the role of the Board, policies, and the governance structure.

[evidence: Chancellor’s Office records]

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. Constituent groups have also raised concerns about recent Board actions they believe to be out of compliance with the governance process.
IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

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. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

IV.B.2.e. Descriptive Summary. 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. Chancellor Griffin played a key role in developing a stronger relationship with SFUSD and the Mayor’s Office, particularly in the context of the Bridge to Success initiative.

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. Members of the College community have consistently criticized the College’s public relations effort, indicating that public relations consultants could do more to maintain a positive image.

[Evidence: Chancellor’s Reports and communications to the community]

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, following on the heels of substantial turnover in senior administrators due to retirements beginning in 2010. Accompanying these personnel changes have been changes in leadership styles that have 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. This challenge and the changes it demands have not been readily accepted by all and at times have met with resistance and distrust. The challenge also takes place in a context in which the Board has not yet fully recognized its appropriate role.

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 about how
the changes will yield results that demonstrate that the College meets the ACCJC Standards.

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 appear 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 CCSF facilities that the committee has focused on:
- Airport
- Castro/Valencia
- 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:
- Reviewed the state definition for “Centers” and “Campuses” and applied those definitions to CCSF facilities accordingly, resulting in the majority of locations previously called “Campuses” now being called “Centers” with only the Ocean Avenue location termed “Campus”
- Reviewed which sites receive Foundation Grants and the amounts of funding
- Assessed the real estate value
- Collected data regarding program and course offerings/sections per center
- Collected student data by center (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.

The District has already taken several steps 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 operated during evening hours at a junior high school. 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 Richmond District 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 discussed 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 to 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 94112

Submitted to

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

March 15, 2013
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DATE: March 15, 2013

TO: Accrediting commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

FROM: City College of San Francisco
50 Phelan Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

This Accreditation School Closure Report is submitted to accompany the Show Cause Report for City College of San Francisco for the purpose of assisting in the determination of accreditation status.

We certify that there was broad participation by representatives of the campus community and we believe the plan for closure accurately reflects the nature and substance of the institution.

__________________________
President, Board of Trustees

__________________________
Special Trustee (State Chancellor's Office)

__________________________
Interim Chancellor

__________________________
Accreditation Liaison Officer

__________________________
President, Associated Students

__________________________
President, Academic Senate

__________________________
President, Classified Senate

__________________________
President, AFT

__________________________
President, SEIU

__________________________
President, DCC

__________________________
President, Other Union(s)?

__________________________
Co-Chairs, Administrators’ Association Executive Council

__________________________
Mayor of the City of San Francisco

__________________________
Superintendent, San Francisco Unified School District
Background and Preparation for Closure

In a letter dated July 2, 2012, the ACCJC places City College of San Francisco (CCSF) on Show Cause. As a result of this 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

The Commission issues Show Cause when it 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.”(1)

The Commission has required 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 and submit this Closure Report with its Show Cause Report.

The District will only implement the steps associated with closure should the ACCJC determine such steps are necessary. The Commission will present its findings and determination as to the status of CCSF’s accreditation in a July 2013 correspondence to CCSF. That determination will be based upon the CCSF Accreditation Show Cause Report (submittal date to AACCJC is March 15, 2013); the Spring (March-April) 2013 site visit; the October 15, 2012 Special Report; and other pertinent information and data.
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 March 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 subsequent team visit in Spring 2013. Due to the parallel requirement to address the Commission’s policy on closing an institution,
the College is taking this Closure Report seriously and will submit it 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.”

(2) It is imperative that CCSF work diligently to ensure that it protects the interests of the students.

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:

<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 Consortia, 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 TASK</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</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>
</tbody>
</table>
### Disposition of Assets
By 12/31/2013

### Obligation of Assets
By 12/31/2013

### Coordination with the ACCJC
Ongoing

### Key Governing Board Obligations
By 06/30/2013

---

**Footnotes:**

1. July 2, 2012 AACJC letter to Dr. Pam Fisher, CCSF Interim Chancellor
2. ACCJC Policy on Closing an Institution (June 2012)
A. Student Completion

Closure requires provisions for the academic needs of students who have not completed their degrees and educational programs.

- The College will make arrangements to permit those students who have completed 75% of an academic program elsewhere 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.
- The College will notify neighboring districts 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.
- The College will submit to the ACCJC for approval arrangements made with other institutions to receive transferring students and to accept records.
- The College will make arrangements 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, the College will need to negotiate appropriate agreements or fully inform students.
- If accreditation is removed, the College will generate a list of students who have completed 75% of an academic degree/educational program/certificate program by the end of Spring 2013.
- 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. The College will inform students of their status for a degree or certificate and their option to receive a 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 College will contact the following neighboring districts: 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, and 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 provide 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. The District will accept early resignations and/or retirements 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 receive written notification immediately about the Commission’s determination. In the event of closure, faculty will receive a notice as required by
Ed Code and contract and classified employees will receive their layoff notices per contract.

- The College will contact neighboring districts (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, the College will terminate all long-term off-site (credit/non-credit instruction) existing contracts/MOU’s or Lease Agreement with month-to-month continuations in some locations based on summer course offerings.
- The College would review and establish all lease agreement in collaboration with any potential merger district upon notification of closure.
- The College will notify the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) 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.
- The College will develop procedures for collecting any outstanding student loans, reconcile any over-awards, overpayments, and/or withdrawal calculations.
- The College will 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.
- The College will notify all donors and grantors of the College’s disposition of endowments and donations.
- The District will adhere to State or federal laws regarding the disposition of funds 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, the College would terminate all long-term off-site (credit/non-credit instruction) existing contracts/MOU’s or Lease Agreement 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.
- The District will 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 ACCJC 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.
The College will disclose to the ACCJC the permanent storage location of all student records.

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>Engage in 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>Discuss Draft Closure Report.</td>
<td>CCSF CEO; PGC</td>
<td>February 17, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by: Thelma Scott-Skillman, Interim Chancellor (November 5, 2012)*
San Francisco Community College District

---

**Reviewed by:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Governance Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators’ Association Executive Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX Union(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, City of San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Unified School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>