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Executive Summary

More than 200 City College of San Francisco (CCSF) faculty, staff, students, administrators, and trustees have engaged in a tremendous amount of work in a very short timeframe to develop and begin implementing plans to address the ACCJC’s show cause letter of July 3, 2012. The work has been guided by 15 workgroups and a Steering Committee under the direct leadership of the Interim Chancellor and the Accreditation Liaison Officer who reports directly to the Chancellor. As of October 15, the outcomes of the workgroups include completed tasks, work in progress, and approved plans that now need to be implemented. All of these, and the revised Self-Evaluation, will be completed prior to March 15, 2013.

In addition to addressing ACCJC’s Recommendations, the Special Report includes a response to the Eligibility Requirements, which overlap with, and in some cases directly map to, the Recommendations. The Special Report also contains a section on the actions addressing the material weaknesses and significant deficiencies identified in the 2011 Audit Report and a plan for responding to the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team report.

The following highlights correspond to each workgroup’s response to the 14 ACCJC Recommendations as well as the response of a “special focus” workgroup.

Recommendation 1, Mission Statement. All necessary actions to address Recommendation 1 have been completed. The Board reviewed the mission statement, considered data, revised the mission statement to prioritize goals and link it with planning, and also established an annual review process within the policy statement.

Recommendation 2, Effective Planning Process. The annual assessment, planning, and budgeting process has been revamped, with Program Review serving as a central mechanism for data-informed decision making with respect to growth and reduction. Implementation of the new system has begun. A development schedule for the Education Master Plan has also been developed for review by the Board in December 2012. To support the new process, the Board approved expanded staffing for Research and Planning with two additional full-time positions.

Recommendation 3, Assessing Institutional Effectiveness. The Program Review template and process have been updated in alignment with the planning process. Rubrics and guidelines now guide Program Review development and prioritization, along with a Program Review website. Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are being developed by the Academic Senate for recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Recommendation 4, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Key milestones include: (1) a draft policy exists that limits the maximum age of course outlines to six years; (2) a draft timeline is in place to update course outlines that are older than six years; (3) a new process exists for submitting information about course SLO assessment efforts; (4) the College has a centralized web presence for SLO efforts, including Student Services; (5) SLOs are integrated into Program Review and will serve as one basis for making resource allocation decisions; (6) a drop-in Q&A SLO lab now exists; (7) a comprehensive assessment report will be developed each semester; (8) course SLOs are being mapped to program SLOs and to General Education SLOs; (9) students will have better access to course and program SLOs in an effort to raise their awareness of SLOs; and (10) the Academic Senate developed a new College SLO Handbook. In addition, faculty participated in a professional development day this past September dedicated to SLO documentation and assessment.
Recommendation 5, Student Support Services. A standard template/matrix has been developed to ensure that SLO documentation is consistent throughout the various service units and is aligned with the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. Student Services SLO activities have taken place in coordination with instructional SLO activities to ensure centralized communication regarding SLOs. An annual SLO cycle for Student Services has been developed, and guidance regarding non-instructional SLOs is included in the new College SLO Handbook. In addition, a comprehensive review and assessment of all student support services across the entire District is in progress to ensure that students have access to the appropriate level of student services, regardless of location. Changes in the delivery of those services is anticipated.

Recommendation 6, Human Resources Components of Evaluation. Recommendation 6 required that evaluations of faculty, classified staff, and administrators who work with students include an SLO component. Language has been drafted regarding SLOs for inclusion in job announcements, performance evaluations, bargaining contracts, and handbooks for all personnel responsible for student progress toward achieving SLOs. All constituent groups have agreed to incorporate this language as specified above.

Recommendation 7, Human Resources. Workgroup 7 examined possible options for more effective and efficient reporting lines and structures based on models of best practice. Restructuring at the Vice Chancellor level was recommended and has taken place, reducing the number of Vice Chancellors from five to three. Workgroup 7 examined issues relating to the reassignment of personnel and has concluded that the District’s current policies and procedures are appropriate, but that these are not always adhered to. The Workgroup also has recommended increasing opportunities for professional development, is reviewing the evaluation procedures for all employees, and has drafted a list of observations regarding barriers to administrative authority. They are proposing new practices designed to clarify and enhance the roles and authority of deans.

Recommendation 8, Physical Resources. Workgroup 8 has been examining the actual costs to operate and maintain existing facilities. Their findings will be incorporated into those of Workgroup 10 dealing with financial resources and those of Workgroup 7 dealing with human resources. Workgroup 8 also is developing a total cost of ownership model that will assist with Workgroup 15, which is analyzing centers and sites.

Recommendation 9, Technology Resources. Recommendation 9 requires that the College develop a comprehensive plan for equipment maintenance, upgrade, and replacement. The workgroup completed an inventory, developed replacement models, and determined equipment costs. Findings are integrated into Workgroup 10 and are integrated with the planning process. The Technology Resources Workgroup evaluated the CCSF information security infrastructure as part of its technology equipment review and has identified plans to continually improve the security infrastructure by incorporating vendor feature enhancements.

Recommendation 10: Financial Planning and Stability. To ensure fiscal stability, the Board took action on September 27, 2012 to direct the Chancellor to further study the list of cost-saving options drafted by Workgroup 10 and to prepare a plan in response to the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings. This year’s priority is to continue identifying new revenue or cost savings in order to increase the 2012-13 reserves. The Board also approved several specific cost-saving measures recommended by the Chancellor, including some site...
closures, reductions in general reassigned time, and a significant reduction in the cost of the Department Chair structure.

**Recommendation 11: Financial Integrity and Reporting.** Immediate actions addressing this issue include one-time measures to increase staffing levels within the accounting department to ensure the timely preparation and submission of critical reports. Longer term, full-time staff will be hired by January 2013 to ensure ongoing adherence to reporting timelines. The annual 311 report will be completed on time in October 2012, and the annual financial audit report will be completed on time in December 2012.

**Recommendations 12 & 13: Leadership, Governance and Decision-making/Governance Structures.** A new model of Participatory Governance and an accompanying policy have been developed with implementation planned for November 2012. This model reflects the advisory nature of college councils and committees and utilizes a new Governance Council that will provide recommendations directly to the Chancellor on matters pertaining to institutional priorities, policies, planning, and budget development, replacing the former College Advisory Council and Planning and Budgeting Council. Training related to participatory governance has occurred and will continue on an ongoing basis.

**Recommendation 14: Effective Board Organization.** The Board has engaged in a number of training and retreat sessions to ensure full understanding of their role and responsibilities. In addition, the Board has reviewed its bylaws and policies as contained in Policy Manual Section 1, “The Governing Board, The Community, The Chancellor,” resulting in changes to policies, deletions, and new policies; while some have been adopted already, the others will be adopted on October 25, 2012. Following a second reading, one of these is a policy calling for an annual professional development plan. The plan for 2012-13 has been adopted and a number of the activities have been completed.

**Special Focus: Centers and Sites.** Given the references to centers and sites throughout the ACCJC Recommendations, the Chancellor 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. On September 27, 2012, the Board took action to direct the Chancellor to actively market the options for a long-term lease of 33 Gough Street and to relocate class offerings at the Castro and Park Presidio sites to other appropriate centers. At least one, and possibly two more, sites will be identified by October 25. The remaining Centers will be assessed by January 2013.
1. Report Preparation

The following section describes the organization for developing action plans and making progress in response to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Recommendations, the process of report preparation, the individuals who were involved in its preparation, and the chronological timeline of activities and events.

More than 200 City College of San Francisco (CCSF) faculty, staff, administrators, and trustees have engaged in a tremendous amount of work in a very short timeframe to develop and begin implementing plans to address the ACCJC’s show cause letter of July 3, 2012. Much of the work began during July when a number of faculty and others were not present. Given the short turnaround and the need to begin work when not everyone was back on campus, adjustments may be necessary, but this report captures where the College is at this moment with respect to the concerns voiced by ACCJC.

Context

Upon hearing the accreditation visiting team’s exit report, the College did not expect a positive accreditation outcome. The accreditation site visit was followed, less than two months later, by the sudden retirement of then-Chancellor Dr. Don Griffin due to illness. The CCSF Board of Trustees quickly appointed Interim Chancellor Dr. Pamila Fisher, who began to actively communicate that she expected a sanction based on her review of the draft evaluation report received soon after she arrived at CCSF, although the severity of the sanction was unknown. Along with messages related to the precarious financial situation the College was facing at that time, the Interim Chancellor simultaneously conveyed serious concerns regarding CCSF’s accreditation findings that confirmed her own observations. The Interim Chancellor was in communication with ACCJC staff to remain apprised of the timeline for the release of the Commission’s decision letter and evaluation report and to be prepared to respond to the findings. At that time, the media began to place attention on City College regarding its accreditation status based on the draft report having been leaked to the press.

On July 3, 2012, the College received the Accrediting Commission decision letter and evaluation report. The College placed both documents immediately on its website, as well as a response to the decision, indicating the gravity with which the College views the Accrediting Commission’s findings and outlining next steps to address the Recommendations. The following few days were filled with inquiries from both print and broadcast media representing local, national, and educational organizations and press. In an effort to educate the community at large, as well as the internal community, about the College’s accreditation status, the Interim Chancellor held forums attended by over 200 people, distributed a series of talking points, and coordinated a media response protocol to streamline the sources of communication.

On July 6, 2012, the Interim Chancellor called a special meeting to provide information on the College’s accreditation status, and she continued to communicate with the CCSF community on every occasion possible to keep everyone apprised of progress.

---

1 Staff later developed an expanded accreditation website to provide easy access to accreditation information.
2 See CCSF response letter to ACCJC and memo from Dr. Pamila Fisher, Interim Chancellor, to CCSF community (7/13/12).
3 See CCSF community email updates (7/13/12 and 7/23/12), leadership team meeting notes (7/10/12), and Flex Day Remarks (8/14/12).
Process of Organization

On July 10, 2012, the CCSF Board of Trustees held a Special Meeting to discuss City College’s accreditation status. Interim Chancellor Dr. Pamila Fisher presented an overview of the decision and recommendations from ACCJC. She also described the preliminary plans and next steps to address the recommendations. After the discussion, ACCJC President, Dr. Barbara Beno, with Trustee William “Bill” McGinnis of Butte-Glenn Community College District, presented a three-hour workshop on the topic of accreditation’s purposes, processes, and standards; the roles and responsibilities of Trustees in accreditation; and advice for board excellence. All Trustees were in attendance and participated in the workshop.4

On July 11, 2012, CCSF’s Interim Chancellor appointed and directed a large Accreditation Response Team to discuss a strategy to address the Commission’s specific recommendations. The Accreditation Response Team included trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives. The Accreditation Response Team suggested names to the Chancellor who planned to appoint smaller accreditation workgroups responsible for developing plans to address the 14 Recommendations.5 The Chancellor later appointed a Steering Committee to monitor accreditation progress. The Steering Committee was composed of each workgroup leader addressing the specific Recommendations and the president of each College constituency group.

On July 16, 2012, the Chancellor appointed these smaller workgroups focused on each of the 14 Recommendations and charged them with developing timely action plans. The 14 Recommendations relate to the following areas of College operations:

2. Planning Process/Roles and Authority
3. Institutional Effectiveness/Program Review
4. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)/Instruction
5. SLO/Student Services
6. SLO/Evaluations in HR
7. Adequacy of Staff and Administrators/Planning
8. Physical Resources/Operation/Maintenance
9. Technology Resources
10. Financial Planning and Stability
11. Financial Integrity and Reporting
12. Leadership/Governance/Decision-Making
13. Governance Structures/Barriers to Decision-Making
14. Effective Board of Trustees Organization

Each workgroup is led by a workgroup leader, typically the administrator responsible for the unit most closely associated with the related Recommendation. In some instances, where the administrator would naturally be responsible for more than one Recommendation, another administrator or classified staff member was assigned. Workgroups include trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives. The entire Board of Trustees

4 See Board meeting agenda and ACCJC Presentation to the Board of Trustees.
5 See Accreditation Response Team meeting agenda and notes.
constitutes Workgroup 14 (Effective Board Organization). The Chancellor plays a facilitation role to compose the workgroups and identify and implement action plans that address the specific Recommendation; she has also led Workgroups 1, 12, 13, and 14.⁶

The Chancellor established and led an additional workgroup, Workgroup 15, to assess and analyze the issues related to the College’s sites and centers. This topic appears in several of the Recommendations, primarily in Workgroup 1 (Mission), Workgroup 2 (Effective Planning Process), Workgroup 5 (Student Services), Workgroup 8 (Physical Resources), and Workgroup 10 (Financial Planning), and it was felt that the work would be better coordinated and more effective if addressed by a single group. Workgroup 15 members include the workgroup leaders noted above in addition to trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives.

The College also hired two retired community college presidents to assist in addressing the recommendations. Dr. Betty Inclan, retired President of Berkeley City College, has been providing her expertise and knowledge to the workgroups focused on Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, Program Review, and Student Learning Outcomes. Dr. Robert Agrella, retired Superintendent/President of the Sonoma County Junior College District, has been contributing to the workgroups focused on staffing and financial resources and the review of board policies, a component of Workgroup 14. Both consultants have been instrumental in sharing their knowledge, expertise, and, most important, outside perspectives in the workgroups.

On July 18, 2012, ACCJC Vice Presidents Mr. Jack Pond and Dr. Susan Clifford came to City College and presented a workshop to the Accreditation Response Team and workgroup members. The presentation was entitled “Accreditation and College Responsibilities.” Topics included: the purposes and processes of accreditation; elements of evaluation and improvement; the standards of accreditation; ACCJC policies; federal regulations; resources for institutions; model for effective program review and integrated planning; and Commission expectations. Approximately 70 individuals attended. In addition, with encouragement from ACCJC and the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), approximately 400 individuals affiliated with CCSF participated in ACCJC’s online accreditation basics course.⁷

On July 18, 2012, the Board of Trustees held a Special Meeting to review the work of the Accreditation Response Team and draft action plan. The Chancellor and Accreditation Liaison Officer provided an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the Board, Chancellor, ALO, constituent groups, workgroups, and consultants. They reviewed the summary of recommendations, workgroup membership, and overall timelines to meet the ACCJC deadlines for the Special Report and Show Cause Report. The ALO presented the workgroup matrices which were the tools used initially by the ALO and Chancellor to monitor and track each workgroup’s progress. The matrices identified the Recommendation, workgroup membership, specific activities, timelines for the activities, related Recommendations and Standards, and resources needed to accomplish their task.⁸ The Board of Trustees asked questions, provided direction, and approved the work plans.

---

⁶ See Accreditation workgroups list of members; the Chancellor’s Office distributed the initial workgroups membership list on July 16, 2012. It continued to modify this list to ensure appropriate expertise and balance of perspectives.
⁷ See ACCJC Presentation to the CCSF Accreditation Response Team and attendees list.
⁸ See 7/18/12 Board of Trustees agenda and handouts.
Process of Report Preparation

In addition to completing the matrices by August 3, 2012, written narrative progress reports were due to the Accreditation Liaison Officer by August 16, 2012. Follow-up progress reports were due September 7. The narrative progress reports, workgroup notes, handouts, and described outcomes formed the basis for writing the Special Report.9

On August 8, 2012, the Chancellor convened the Steering Committee. This Committee is responsible for reviewing the plans and outcomes of the workgroups and for ensuring that the workgroups are coordinating with each other when activities overlap and/or are dependent upon each other. The Steering Committee consists of the workgroup leaders; constituent leaders of the College including the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, AFT 2121, SEIU 1021, and Department Chair Council (DCC); the Student Trustee; and the Board President/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 work.10 The Committee met on August 8, August 22, and September 6. On September 19, 2012, the Steering Committee reviewed and edited the draft Special Report.

On August 23, 2012, the Interim Chancellor and ALO provided a comprehensive report to the Board of Trustees on the structure, activities, timeline and progress of the workgroups addressing the 14 Recommendations and unmet Eligibility Requirements cited by the Accrediting Commission. The Board reviewed the report and approved the working plans.

Outcome

During the September 27, 2012 Board meeting, the Board reviewed and approved the draft Special Report. At that meeting, they also approved specific implementation actions recommended by the Chancellor for those areas where the workgroups’ charge had been to identify possible options rather than a single recommendation. This was true for Workgroup 7 (Administrative Staffing) and Workgroup 10 (Finances/Stability). With regard to Financial Stability, some actions were to be taken immediately and have occurred already, others are being implemented, others will be considered through the collective bargaining process, and some may not be selected at all. For the other workgroup recommendations, the Board directed the Chancellor to oversee the completion and implementation of the full work plan, and to provide monthly updates on progress toward that goal. It is anticipated that all goals will either be accomplished or a concrete process will be in place with measurable progress toward the achievement of these goals by March 15, 2013.

---

9 See workgroup calendar of meetings, matrices, progress reports, agendas, and notes on Accreditation website and compilation of Workgroups’ Progress Reports #2.
10 Meetings have been held regularly since the group first convened (8/8/12; 8/22/12; 9/6/12; 9/19/12). See Steering Committee membership list, meeting agendas, and meeting notes.
2. Response to the Commission Letter

A. Eligibility Requirements

While the Show Cause Report due to the Commission by March 15, 2013 will address all 21 ACCJC Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation, the focus here is on the four Eligibility Requirements called out in the Commission’s July 2, 2012 letter.

All of the Commission’s Recommendations relate to these four Eligibility Requirements in varying degrees, and the response to those Recommendations provides additional details beyond the information presented in this section.

Eligibility Requirement 5, Administrative Capacity

ACCJC Finding: The college does not have sufficient administrative staff with appropriate experience to support the necessary services for an institution of its size, mission, and purpose.

In responding to a number of the Commission’s Recommendations, especially Recommendations 1, 2, 7, 8, and 11, the College has begun to examine and take action on issues relating to staffing in order to comply with this Eligibility Requirement. Thus, this response to Eligibility Requirement 5 draws on the actions of the workgroups addressing these Recommendations, as described below and again later in the Special Report.

Related Actions of Recommendation 1, Mission Statement. The first step has been to redefine City College of San Francisco’s mission (see also the response to Recommendation 1). After an examination of internal and external data, a survey of City College of San Francisco personnel (and, to a lesser extent, students), a review of the California Education Code, and receiving input from the public, the Board identified the following four priorities for the District’s mission: preparation for transfer, achievement of associate degrees, acquisition of career skills, and development of basic skills (including English as a Second Language and Transitional Studies). As part of that revision, the institution also refocused the mission on student learning and achievement and highlighted the role of assessment; has begun more explicitly linking the mission to planning and resource allocation; and has amended Board Policy 1200 (which will become BP 1.00) to incorporate a statement that the Board will review the District’s vision and mission annually during its summer planning retreat. Ultimately, the mission will guide us toward appropriate staffing levels once all planning systems are fully operational, with decisions regarding human and other resource allocation stemming from the District’s vision and mission. As the College moves forward in responding to the other Recommendations, the prioritization of facets of the mission may result in changes to administrative staffing as the College makes decisions that impact its educational programs, services, and sites.

Related Actions of Recommendation 2, Effective Planning Process. In addition to addressing the mission, 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 (see also the response to Recommendations 2 and 3). The planning process will be heavily informed by data and assessment to support decisions relating to resource allocation, inclusive of staffing expansions or reductions. The workgroup responsible for
Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process) has also discussed mid- and long-range planning for staffing.

Moreover, given the recommended changes needed to fulfill Recommendation 2, the College has determined that the District’s Research and Planning Office must be expanded 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.\textsuperscript{11} In the near term, this structure includes the following four essential positions and increases this office from two persons to four. The new positions are currently being advertised and should be filled by early November.

**Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.** This is a new position and is consistent with the Research and Planning staffing at other colleges. The Dean will oversee and direct all Research and Planning activities and ensure coordination between the two areas. This position will also be responsible for overall quality control and adherence to accreditation requirements, working closely with the Directors of Research and of Planning, once the latter position is filled (see note below). For the time being, the Dean will be directly responsible for carrying out all planning activities with the support of a Management Assistant.

**Management Assistant.** This position will focus primarily on planning-related responsibilities under the direction of the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (later to be supervised directly by a Planning Director at such time that the College can fill that position). Given the retirement of the District’s Associate Vice Chancellor of Governmental Affairs and the decision not to fill that position and thus suspend activities relating to that area, the College has transferred the remaining staff person, a Management Assistant, to the Research and Planning Office to support planning activities.

**Director of Research.** This position is currently filled; however, this individual had planned to retire by August 2012. Given the vital functions of this role, the individual currently in this position has agreed to stay on for several months to train the new person to be hired into this position. This temporary overlap in coverage will ensure a smooth and efficient transition, given the specialized nature of the duties of this position.

**Administrative Analyst/Programmer.** Under the supervision of the Director of Research, this position is responsible for conducting institutional research, including accessing and analyzing Banner data and other data as well as creating, administering, and analyzing surveys. The individual in this position was temporarily reclassified in February 2009 to Special Assistant to the Chancellor and has been managing Research and Planning in this temporary classification.

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.

**Related Actions of Recommendation 11, Financial Integrity and Reporting.** The District’s Finance and Administration area is also in dire need of staffing to ensure compliance with Eligibility Requirements and the Accreditation Standards; the College has been addressing this need as outlined in the response to Eligibility Requirement 18 (Financial Accountability) below.

\textsuperscript{11} See organizational chart for Research and Planning.
Related Actions of Recommendation 7, Human Resources. The workgroup responsible for Recommendation 7 (Human Resources) has been at the core of efforts to propose options for more effective and efficient reporting lines and structures, using models of best practice to inform discussions. This workgroup has also been investigating the policies, procedures, and practices associated with interim appointments, transfers, additional duty assignments, evaluation, and training and professional development for both administrators and classified staff.

Consistent with ideas discussed by the workgroup to date, on August 27, 2012, the Board approved a new administrative structure with only three Vice Chancellors (instead of the previous five): Finance and Administration, Academic Affairs, and Student Services.¹² The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration has been in that position for approximately 20 years. The Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs will continue to be filled as an interim position until the District conducts a full search to fill that position by March 2013.

The Trustees also approved the hiring of a retired President, Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman, to serve as interim Vice Chancellor of Student Services. Dr. Scott-Skillman is a retired community college leader with over 42 years of experience in the community college system, as well as founder of Folsom Lake College. The decision to bring this individual into the District is based on the need to build the District’s administrative capacity while leveraging the long-standing and deep expertise of the individual chosen. On October 2, 2012, the Board of Trustees appointed Dr. Scott-Skillman as Interim Chancellor effective November 1, 2012. At the time Dr. Fisher was appointed as Interim Chancellor, she had only agreed to a term ending October 31, 2012. The College intends to fill this Vice Chancellor of Student Services position on a permanent basis by March 15, 2013.

The College has also been utilizing two other retired community college leaders, Dr. Robert Agrella and Dr. Betty Inclan, as consultants in the areas of planning and budgeting, finances, Student Learning Outcomes, and human resources. All three of these individuals bring a much-needed outside perspective to the District along with tremendous expertise.

In making this organizational change, three interim Vice Chancellors reverted to their previous status, two as Deans and one as Associate Vice Chancellor. Having two Vice Chancellors (both of whom were interims) over Student Service areas created confusion and thus was neither effective nor efficient. Moreover, the administrators responsible for campuses resided within both Academic Affairs and Student Development, which further compounded 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.

The District’s immediate focus with respect to staffing has been on core institutional needs. As noted earlier, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Government Affairs has retired. Rather than filling that position, the District has suspended the activities of that office and has transferred the management assistant previously employed in Governmental Affairs to Research and Planning. Similar reassignments are taking place in other areas of great need as well, such as the reassignment of the full-time Shared Governance coordinator to help manage the Downtown Center while the College redesigns its Shared Governance system. To assist with organizing the

---

¹² See Administrative Organizational Charts (October 2012).
accreditation efforts, the Evans site assistant was reassigned to the Chancellor’s Office (see also the response to Recommendations 12 and 13).

A full reorganization that better supports the institution’s size, revised mission, and fiscal realities is under study with the intent of implementing those portions that are outside the collective bargaining arena during the Fall 2012 semester. To that end, on September 27, 2012, the Board approved a resolution directing the Chancellor to propose a new instructional administrative structure, congruent with Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings and a list of cost-saving possibilities developed by Workgroup 10. It will have academic integrity and include an increase in the administrative instructional deans and a reduced number of department chairs that results in significant cost savings (see also responses to Eligibility Requirement 17 and Recommendation 10).

Workgroup 7 has also reviewed issues relating to the reassignment of personnel, particularly administrators and classified staff. The workgroup has concluded that the hiring processes for permanent administrators and classified staff members are rigorous and ensure that the individual hired has the requisite experience and expertise to carry out the job duties. Reassignments, however, often have not followed the District’s policies and procedures. Reassignments include interim and acting appointments, transfers, and additional duty assignments. At the moment, much of this concern regarding administrators has been mitigated by the change in the organizational structure at the Vice Chancellor level (referenced above).

Another concern is that the District has not been able to support training and professional development at optimum levels. Workgroup 7 has recommended that the District restore orientations and training for deans, department chairs, program coordinators, and classified staff, and expand to others as applicable.

The Interim Chancellor has already instituted a series of Leadership Training activities for the management team (inclusive of administrators and classified managers). Topics to date have included accreditation, enrollment management, Banner usage, Student Learning Outcomes, Shared Governance, and leadership strengths. Workgroup 7 has recommended that these activities continue, with a formal schedule developed annually.

In addition, Workgroup 7 has identified the need to reinstate professional development funding as soon as possible while at the same time 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.

Workgroup 7 has also begun examining evaluation procedures for all staff and is developing recommendations for improvement that would link evaluation outcomes with professional development opportunities to address areas for improvement when necessary.

Please also refer to the activities of and response to Recommendation 7 as they are integrally linked with Eligibility Requirement 5.

**Related Actions of Recommendation 8, Physical Resources.** Members of the workgroup charged with Recommendation 8 (Physical Resources) have been developing a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model that will include costs associated with staffing (e.g., oversight, maintenance, custodial) to allow the District to better project its staffing needs for each site,
existing or new, which is a critical aspect of planning for the appropriate level of staffing to
operate District buildings and sites.

**Eligibility Requirement 5 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Policy 1200 regarding mission statement approved and adopted by Board (includes annual review of mission)</td>
<td>August 23, 2012 (1st reading) September 11, 2012 (2nd reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement explicitly linked to planning and budgeting system</td>
<td>September 18, 2012 (Board approval and acceptance of Planning Process; see also the response to Recommendations 2 and 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Planning staffing structure approved by Board</td>
<td>August 23, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions posted</td>
<td>September 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates for new Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions selected and approved</td>
<td>October 25, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring policies, procedures, and practices reviewed</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and professional development recommendations developed</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership training implemented</td>
<td>As of July 2012 and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation procedures for all personnel assessed, using models of best practice for comparison</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Ownership Model identified</td>
<td>August 16, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Ownership data gathered</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time, temporary measures taken to increase human resource capacity within accounting</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll developed</td>
<td>August 29, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll executed</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eligibility Requirement 17, Financial Resources**

ACCJC Finding: The institution cannot document a funding base, financial resources or plans for financial development that are adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

The trustees, administration, faculty, and staff are working toward achieving the College’s revised mission in a more cost-effective and efficient way. The redefined mission does not automatically prescribe how to achieve cost savings but it was a significant step forward. Only with a fully integrated planning and budgeting system will the College be able to realize the necessary cost savings to achieve financial stability.

On September 11, 2012, the CCSF Trustees adopted a balanced budget for 2012-13 reflecting
some adjustments to the tentative budget approved on June 28, 2012. This budget has taken
important first steps: all union partners have agreed to and implemented changes in
compensation agreements that achieve immediate savings for the fiscal year, as they have now
done each year for several budget years. However, these concessions are one-time only. Other
savings have already been and are being further achieved through attrition and by reducing the
costs of reassigned time. Other short-term savings continue by delaying or reducing purchases
of supplies and equipment.

Reorganization, as outlined in the response to Eligibility Requirement 5 (Administrative
Capacity), will yield additional savings in 2013-14.

There is significant analysis, planning, and work left to do both with respect to implementing
permanent cost-saving measures and finding resources to raise financial reserves to a minimum
5% of overall budget, contribute to retiree health plans, fund a technology replacement plan, and
fill key vacancies in classified and administrative positions.

To identify more sustainable measures for cost savings in both the near and long term, prior to
receiving the ACCJC determination letter dated July 2, 2012, CCSF Trustees approved a request
to the State Chancellor of California Community Colleges for the assistance of the Fiscal Crisis
and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) on May 31, 2012. FCMAT is assisting CCSF in
the development of a multi-year financial plan, with specific recommendations on revenues,
expenditures, and overall strategies for achieving financial stability. These findings are
contained within the September 18, 2012 FCMAT report, which includes 45 recommendations.13

In addition to FCMAT, the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 10 (Financial Planning
and Stability), which began meeting in July, has developed a broad list of more than 50 possible
options for reducing costs on an ongoing basis for presentation to the Board of Trustees. This
list was released on September 7, 2012, and presented to the Board during the September 27,
2012, meeting. At that meeting, the Board took action to direct the Chancellor to further study
the list of cost-saving options and refer the appropriate items to the collective bargaining process.
Workgroup 10 also developed calculations to determine that the possibilities presented would
yield actual savings.14

The District will need to implement dramatic systemic changes. CCSF has been spending as
much as 92 percent of its budget on personnel costs, placing it at the very highest end of the
state’s community colleges. Reducing this number, to allow funding of the other critical needs
identified in the Accreditation Report and achieving fiscal stability, is central to a meaningful
resolution of the College’s fiscal crisis.

Even if Proposition 30 passes in November, CCSF will face a projected deficit of more than $14
million in FY 2013-14 if no action is taken to reduce costs. If it fails, automatic trigger cuts
would once again be levied against community colleges. For CCSF, that would mean additional
cuts this year of over $11.5 million. Therefore, the College knows that it must make plans, as
many other Community Colleges have already done or are doing, for this possible outcome.

A potential new revenue source is the local parcel tax, Proposition A, which is also in the
November ballot. It would provide the College with an additional $14 million annually for the
next eight years. If approved by San Francisco voters, this would mitigate many of the College’s

---

13 See FCMAT Report and document entitled, “Excerpts from FCMAT Report RECOMMENDATIONS Only”
14 See list entitled, “Options for Reducing Expenditures”
most immediate fiscal needs. However, it is not sufficient to address the College’s full financial issues for the long term. The College is not counting on its successful passage in its fiscal planning.

The College recognizes that clear, difficult choices must be made, immediately, and at a number of levels, to fully address this Recommendation and its related Eligibility Requirement (17, Financial Resources) and the underlying Standards. The FCMAT report and the list of cost-saving measures identified by the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 10 are guiding these decisions. Several have already been made. These include a $1.5 million reduction in reassigned non-instructional faculty costs, a reduction in part-time counselors, and the closer of four rented sites for Spring 2013. Going forward, greater integration between planning and budgeting that utilizes annual Program Review as a driver for both budget increases and reductions will also be critical for sound decision-making.

*Note that the response to this Eligibility Requirement maps directly to the response to Recommendation 10, Financial Planning and Stability.*

**Eligibility Requirement 17 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation concessions agreed to by bargaining units/constituencies</td>
<td>June 28, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor reorganization implemented</td>
<td>August 27, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of cost-saving ideas developed</td>
<td>September 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation methodology for quantifying cost savings developed</td>
<td>September 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCMAT report issued</td>
<td>September 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-bargainable cost-saving measures selected by Trustees utilizing</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCMAT findings and list of cost-saving ideas prepared by Workgroup 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargainable cost-saving measures selected by Trustees utilizing FCMAT</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>findings and list of cost-saving ideas prepared by Workgroup 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-saving measures implemented</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eligibility Requirement 18, Financial Accountability**

*ACCJC Finding: The institution fails 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.*

To remedy this issue in the coming year, the District has already taken one-time measures to increase staffing levels within the accounting department to meet deadlines for critical reports (Annual Financial Audit and Annual 311 Report). These measures have 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. The District also has sought to reassign, on a short-term basis, current classified staff from other departments whose expertise will be particularly useful during audit preparation. To date, this last strategy has had very limited success.
These measures are only intended to address the 2012 Annual Financial Audit and the 2012 Annual 311 Report. An ongoing solution is essential, and Workgroup 11 (Financial Integrity and Reporting) is discussing options to address these issues in the mid to longer term. In line with the staffing plan, funding to fill three vacant positions in the accounting/budget department and two in the payroll department are included in the fiscal year 2012-13 budget.  

*Note that the response to this Eligibility Requirement maps directly to the response to Recommendation 11, Financial Integrity and Reporting.*

### Eligibility Requirement 18 Outcomes and Timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/ To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-time, temporary measures taken to increase human resource capacity within accounting</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Annual Financial Audit Report distributed</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Annual 311 Report completed</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Annual 311 Report distributed</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll developed</td>
<td>August 29, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll executed</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eligibility Requirement 21, Relations with the Accrediting Commission

*ACCJC Finding: The institution does not adhere to each of the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and has failed to follow Commission directives to address the deficiencies noted by the 2006 evaluation team.*

The College fully understands the gravity of the Commission’s show cause determination, and it believes that the changes it is implementing as outlined above and in the sections that follow will go a long way toward addressing Eligibility Requirement 21. The College is not only addressing the deficiencies noted by the 2006 evaluation team, but also those now noted by the 2012 evaluation team.

On September 27, 2012, the Board conducted a first reading of a new policy with the title, “Accreditation Eligibility Requirement 21, Standard IV.B.1.i” (Policy Manual 1.33). The Board will adopt this policy at its October 25, 2012 meeting.

In addition, the College has noted another deficiency which is related to substantive change. 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 an additional deficiency it needs to address. The College will continue to report any additional deficiencies it finds that relate to the Standards and Eligibility Requirements and develop plans for acknowledging and attending to those findings.

---

15 See Accounting, Budget, and Payroll Staffing Plan.
16 See draft new policy regarding Accreditation Eligibility Requirement 20, Standard IV.B.1.i (PM 1.33).
In a number of cases, this Special Report refers to the need to “comply” with the Eligibility Requirements (or Standards), but the College wants to do more than merely comply. The College recognizes that what drives these Requirements and Standards is simply best practice, and this recognition underlies the responses contained within this report. The College is committed to adapting its practices to reflect those that are proven to be state of the art and/or to adopting new practices in cases where it does not have a similar practice in place or where a complete overhaul of College practices is necessary.

**Eligibility Requirement 21 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 1.33 “Accreditation Eligibility Requirement 21, Standard IV.B.1.i” approved and adopted by Board</td>
<td>September 27, 2012 (first reading) October 25, 2012 (second reading/adoptions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Recommendations

Recommendation 1, Mission Statement

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

The critical first step to addressing the Commission’s Recommendations was to respond to Recommendation 1, given that the resulting statement serves as a driver behind many, if not all, of the other 13 Recommendations. Thus, the workgroup responsible for addressing the issues relating to the College’s mission began meeting as soon as possible once the workgroups were established. Their first meeting was at the end of July, followed by three additional meetings in August.

The first task of the workgroup was to examine City College of San Francisco’s current mission statement. Identifying the appropriate focus of the mission required a number of steps, including examining internal and external data, surveying CCSF personnel and students, reviewing the California Education Code language regarding the mission of community colleges, considering desirable components of a mission statement as described in ACCJC materials and trainings, and engaging the Board of Trustees in dialogue about the mission.

Internal data included credit and noncredit trends in:
- headcount
- age distribution
- ethnic group distribution
- educational goals
- awards and certificates
- basic skills English, Math, and ESL enrollment
- FTES

External (San Francisco) data included trends in:
- population
- ethnicity/race
- age
- foreign born populations
- legal immigration
- educational attainment by age group

An electronic survey was distributed to all College employees that asked them to prioritize the nine areas explicitly bulleted in the current mission statement.17 Over 1,200 employees responded (out of approximately 2,500). Respondents included classified staff, faculty,

17 See employee survey results (“CCSF Mission Statement Priorities”).
department chairs, and administrators. In addition, the workgroup made an effort to contact students enrolled in Spring, Summer, and Fall 2012 by email. Unfortunately, technical difficulties did not allow for a complete survey of the students; however the 1,254 Credit students who were able to respond indicated priorities similar to those of employees.

The workgroup proposed possible structural and language changes for consideration by the Board. The Board of Trustees met on August 14, 2012 during one of several retreat sessions to review the mission and policy regarding annual review. After discussion and comments from the audience, the Board identified the following four priorities for the District’s mission: preparation for transfer, achievement of associate degrees, acquisition of career skills, and basic skills (including English as a Second Language and Transitional Studies). Overall, the statement refocused the mission on student learning, achievement, and assessment. As recommended by the workgroup, the Board also amended Board Policy 1200 to incorporate a statement that the Board will review the District’s vision and mission annually during its summer planning retreat (note that the policy numbering is in transition; this will become BP 1.00).

Subsequently, the first reading of the Board policy on the mission statement (as amended during the Board retreat) took place on August 23, 2012, at which time no additional changes were made. After appearing on the Board agenda three times, the Board of Trustees adopted it on September 11, 2012.

As described in the College’s response to Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process), the mission is now more explicitly linked to planning and resource allocation. That is, the revised planning system now utilizes the mission 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 (see also the response to Recommendations 2 and 3).

### Recommendation 1 Outcomes and Timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/ To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised mission statement developed by workgroup</td>
<td>August 3, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement reviewed and discussed by Board</td>
<td>August 14, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Policy 1200 regarding mission statement approved and adopted by Board (includes annual review of mission)</td>
<td>August 23, 2012 (first reading) September 11, 2012 (second reading/adoption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement explicitly linked to planning and budgeting system</td>
<td>September 18, 2012 (Board approval and acceptance of Planning Process; see also the response to Recommendations 2 and 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 See Board of Trustees meeting agenda for August 14, 2012.
19 See Board of Trustees meeting agenda for August 23, 2012.
Recommendation 2, Effective Planning Process

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

As noted in the response to Recommendation 1 (Mission Statement), the institution has spent considerable time revamping its planning system. The workgroup responsible for addressing Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process) has met on five different occasions, beginning in late July.

During the first meeting, the group discussed a proposed Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting timeline developed by Research and Planning staff which would reflect a number of characteristics of effective planning:

- directed by Board priorities and the College’s Mission Statement;
- informed by data and assessments;
- supported by unit-level planning that addresses Board priorities, references data trends, and is sufficiently timely so as to inform the following year’s annual plan and annual budget;
- transparent and efficient in prioritizing allocation and resource decisions, including resource reductions when necessary, for the upcoming year; and
- characterized by broad communication and dialogue at several critical junctures.

The planning process and timeline encompasses the following, with each action informed by and building on the previous actions:20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012 –</td>
<td>Annual Performance Indicators and College-Wide Assessments for 2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>Board’s Annual Priorities and Planning Assumptions for Resource Allocation for 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Unit-level Program Reviews for 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013 – April</td>
<td>Budget Preparation for 2013-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 See Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Timeline and Flowchart for details.
During the course of subsequent discussions, the workgroup acknowledged that Program Review had historically been viewed as a mechanism for new allocations but would now need to be used to identify areas for reduction as well.

The planning and budgeting process now incorporates an evaluation of the process, which the College will conduct each fall (beginning in Fall 2013) via Program Review. The results will inform the need for making changes to the system during the subsequent spring with implementation of the changes the following fall.

In addition, Research and Planning staff developed a planning and budgeting flowchart to accompany the timeline. Overlays to the flowchart make it easier to visualize the various components of planning (e.g., assessment, dialogue, etc.) and to understand their frequency and connection to the other components. Both the timeline and flowchart will facilitate broader understanding of the annual planning and budgeting process.

The workgroup has also established a development schedule for the Education Master Plan. The Education Master Plan will strengthen the process of continually connecting annual planning with enrollment, staffing, technology, facilities, and other resource-related plans. The development of an effective Education Master Plan will be time-consuming; given the need to focus the College’s attention on implementing the new planning and budgeting process now that it has been approved by the Board, the development of the Education Master Plan will begin in Spring 2013. The first step will be to conduct environmental scans and facilitate dialogue about data in Spring and Summer 2013 to support decision-making with respect to the Education Master Plan. The Fall 2013 Program Review will contain vital information for drafting the Education Master Plan, approval of which would follow in Spring 2014.

In order to support the new and increasingly data-informed, systematic, and fully coordinated planning process, the College has determined that the District’s Research and Planning Office must be expanded immediately, as noted and elaborated on in the response to Eligibility Requirement 5 (Administrative Capacity). In light of this, on August 23, 2012, the Board approved a new structure for that office, to be implemented in the short term (see also the response to Eligibility Requirement 5). In the near term, this structure includes the following four essential positions:

- Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (new position to be filled immediately)
- Management Assistant (internal transfer)
- Director of Research (existing position filled by an individual who will retire during Spring 2013; new individual will be hired immediately)
- Administrative Analyst/Programmer (existing position)

---

21 See Planning and Budgeting flowchart.
22 See organizational chart for Research and Planning.
Long term, a Director of Planning position will need to be filled, but the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness will directly oversee planning activities until such time that the budget allows for filling the Director of Planning position.

The new Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions were posted on September 10, 2012 with an application deadline of September 28, 2012.

Recommendation 2 Outcomes and Timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual planning and budgeting process and timeline developed</td>
<td>August 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning documents (process, timeline, flowchart) approved by Board</td>
<td>September 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial implementation of new planning process: planning priorities for fiscal year 2013-14 identified based on College mission, internal and external trend data, and realistic budget scenarios for 2013-2014</td>
<td>September 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Master Plan development schedule drafted</td>
<td>September 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Master Plan development schedule approved by Board</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental scans for Education Master Plan conducted</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Master Plan drafted</td>
<td>End of Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Planning staffing structure approved by Board</td>
<td>August 23, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions posted</td>
<td>September 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates for new Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions selected and approved</td>
<td>November 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 3, Assessing Institutional Effectiveness

To improve the efficacy of evaluation and planning to enhance institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college complete its work to fully implement its model for Program Review for all courses, programs and support services and advance its framework for defining and assessing Student Learning Outcomes for all courses, programs, support services and certificates and degrees, in order to develop and report performance metrics to measure institutional effectiveness, including information on noncredit students and specified indicators for the Annual Plan and the End-of-Year Assessment Report to the Board of Trustees (I.B.5 and ACCJC Rubric for Evaluation Institutional Effectiveness) (I.B.5).

The work on Recommendation 3 (Assessing Institutional Effectiveness) has necessarily overlapped with that of Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process), given that Program Review is one of the key mechanisms for effective planning. Workgroup 3 has focused on revising the Program Review template, establishing criteria for dean-level comments, developing Program Review guidelines, developing a Program Review website, and developing the Program

---

23 See Board Planning Priorities for 2013-14.
Review timeline in coordination with Workgroup 2 (Effective Planning Process). These activities are described below.

**Program Review Template.** The Program Review template has been updated to ensure that its contents promote effective planning. The elements of the pre-existing Program Review document were relevant, but Workgroup 3 has tightened the language of the items to bring clarity to the questions being addressed. This was especially true on the SLO-related items. In an effort to provide a stronger link to planning and budgeting, the previous question soliciting future objectives has been separated into three distinct questions on maintenance of effort, growth, and reduction. Each dean will also rank unit needs/goals as it relates to the allocation of resources. Over time, additional changes will be made to include all pertinent financial and other data related to each department as part of the annual review and evaluation of the Program Review process to ensure continuous quality improvement.

**Guidelines.** To provide direction to those completing the Program Review reports for their units, Workgroup 3 has been developing a simple and easy-to-use set of guidelines. The goal is to obtain more uniform quality across all units by providing better guidance. Work on the guidelines has been continuous in order to make the examples fit with the changes to the improved template.

**Rubric.** Workgroup 3 has developed a rubric that will be used by the deans to rank/evaluate requests for additional resources. These rankings will be forwarded to the Vice Chancellors and then the Chancellor for consideration, then discussed by the College’s primary Governance Council to directly inform the development of the subsequent year’s budget and annual plan.

**Program Review Website.** The website for Program Review will serve as a resource that establishes Program Review as an ongoing process throughout the year. The website has been updated with the assistance of members of Workgroup 3. All information will be in one place for easy reference of the writer and reader to aid in more effective and efficient decision-making.

**Key Dates for Fall 2012.** The Program Review timeline must be synchronized with other annual planning and budgeting activities in the College. Workgroups 2 and 3 continue to communicate and jointly develop this timeline. The Research Office will roll out data for Program Review after September 18, 2012, and all Program Review reports will be due before the end of the fall semester. In addition to synchronizing with annual planning and budgeting, a chief goal of Program Review is to foster dialogue and collaboration among interrelated units and with supervisors. To facilitate these practices, a companion timeline with key target dates for Fall 2012 has been developed.

A continuing challenge has been that the data variance provided in the Program Review template compared to other sources of data generated questions as to accuracy of data. Meetings with other groups, such as the Enrollment Management Team, have resulted in agreed-upon data sources and a better understanding of variances in reporting. For data on enrollment, it is agreed that a set calendar for generation of reports would greatly reduce the variances. This understanding should contribute toward reducing the amount of variance.

Another area of concern with regard to data has been the unit-level accuracy of staffing and budget-related data. While overall expenditure data for the College is audited and verified, unit-level data has not, until recently, received similar scrutiny, resulting in some misidentifications such as an employee’s salary being charged to the wrong unit. To correct these miscodes, all
budget managers will participate in mandatory sessions in late Fall 2012 during which budgets will be reviewed and misidentifications will be corrected on-the-spot.

To date, discussion of performance metrics to measure institutional effectiveness has occurred primarily within Workgroups 2 (Effective Planning) and 4 (Student Learning Outcomes). In May 2012, the College assembled an End-of-Year Assessment report corresponding to the 2011-2012 Annual Plan. This report was shared with the Board and published on the College’s website. In June 2012, the College’s Research and Planning staff participated in a summit focused on identifying additional noncredit metrics. The summit was facilitated by the State Chancellor’s Office, and the additional metrics will be included in future ARCC reports, beginning in Spring 2013. In September 2012, the Board reviewed ARCC achievement measures in a format that included several comparison institutions. Additional achievement measures are being identified by Workgroup 2. For example, the College participated in a survey conducted by the RP Group which collected information about job placement rates for CTE students at both a program level and college-wide; these data will be available shortly and will be widely shared and discussed.

**Recommendation 3 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Review template updated and aligned with planning process</td>
<td>September 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for dean-level comments on Program Review developed</td>
<td>September 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric for ranking requests developed</td>
<td>September 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for preparing Program Review reports written</td>
<td>September 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review website developed</td>
<td>September 24, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline for program review synchronized with planning process</td>
<td>September 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 4, Student Learning Outcomes**

To fully meet Standard II Student Learning Programs and Services, the team recommends that the college identify the intended student learning outcomes at the course, program, general education, certificate and degree levels, develop and implement assessments of student learning, and analyze the results of assessment to improve student learning. The results of ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes should foster robust dialogue and yield continuous improvement of courses, programs and services and the alignment of college practices for continuous improvement.

Throughout the course of six meetings from mid July through the end of August, the workgroup responsible for addressing Recommendation 4 (Student Learning Outcomes) created plans based on the elements of the Proficiency Level of ACCJC’s *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes*. The team reviewed the rubric elements, determining for each: (a) the College’s current status, (b) goals for the College, and (c) means of achieving those goals.
This review resulted in the development of actions (numbered 1.1 through 7.2) that the workgroup is undertaking; these actions are clustered within the elements of the ACCJC rubric, as presented below:

- **Element #1** – Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates, and degrees.
  - *Action 1.1* Clearly define SLOs for all courses.
  - *Action 1.2* Define SLOs for programs.
  - *Action 1.3* Document course SLO efforts.
  - *Action 1.4* Document program SLO efforts.
  - *Action 1.5* Assess General Education SLOs.

- **Element #2** – There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.
  - *Action 2.1* Foster dialogue through online resources.
  - *Action 2.2* Embed discussion of the assessment of SLOs in meetings and hold special meetings.
  - *Action 2.3* Completion of Comprehensive SLO Reports (see also *Action 5.1*).
  - *Action 2.4* Integrate SLOs into Program Review (see also *Actions 3.1* and 4.2).

- **Element #3** – Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.
  - *Action 3.1* Integrate SLOs into Program Review (see also *Actions 2.4* and 4.2).
  - *Action 3.2* Develop and assess Institutional Learning Outcomes.

- **Element #4** – Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.
  - *Action 4.2* Integrate SLOs into Program Review (see also *Actions 2.4* and 3.1).
  - *Action 4.3* Provide online resources and training.

- **Element #5** – Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.

- **Element #6** – Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.
  - *Action 6.1* Document alignment of course and program SLOs.
  - *Action 6.2* Document alignment of course SLOs to General Education SLOs.
  - *Action 6.3* Update requirements for Curriculum Committee.

- **Element #7** – Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of course and programs in which they are enrolled.
  - *Action 7.1* Publish program SLOs.
  - *Action 7.2* Pilot means for students to demonstrate awareness.

The workgroup’s progress form provides a detailed description of each activity. One activity important to note is the September 12, 2012 SLO FLEX Day, which included day and evening workshops to ensure maximum participation. This professional development event was kicked
off by a session featuring keynote speaker Bob Pacheco from Mira Costa College. Afternoon sessions included focused time for departments to work on SLOs as well as a number of breakout sessions that carried into the evening. Breakout sessions focused on a variety of topics, including guidance on editing and using departmental SLO web pages, utilizing rubrics, leadership in SLO development and use, and using multiple measures of assessment, to name but only a few.\textsuperscript{24}

Key outcomes are that (1) there is now a draft policy limiting the maximum age of course outlines to six years; (2) a draft timeline is in place to update course outlines that are older than six years; (3) a new process exists for submitting information about course SLO assessment efforts; (4) the College has a centralized web presence for SLO efforts (www.ccsf.edu/slo); (5) SLOs are integrated into Program Review and will serve as one basis for making resource allocation decisions; (6) a drop-in Q&A SLO lab now exists, although it is not funded and is staffed by volunteer faculty; (7) a comprehensive assessment report will be developed each semester; (8) course SLOs will be mapped to program SLOs and to General Education SLOs; (9) students will have better access to course and program SLOs in an effort to raise their awareness of SLOs; and (10) the Academic Senate developed a new College SLO Handbook.

**Recommendation 4 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft policy and timeline for updating course outlines and limiting their age to six years developed and submitted to Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for approval and circulation (Action 1.1)</td>
<td>September 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for submitting program SLOs to the Curriculum Committee completed by each department (Action 1.2)</td>
<td>August 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning phase of documenting course SLO efforts completed with results available online (Action 1.3)</td>
<td>August 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution phase of documenting course SLO efforts initiated (Action 1.3)</td>
<td>August 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOs for all programs developed with results available online (Action 1.4)</td>
<td>By end of Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured approach to documentation of program SLO efforts developed (Action 1.4)</td>
<td>By end of Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department websites with additional SLO information linked to central SLO website (Action 1.4)</td>
<td>October 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information regarding the alignment of course SLOs to General Education SLOs submitted by departments (Action 1.5)</td>
<td>October 1, 2012 and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central SLO website developed at <a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/slo">www.ccsf.edu/slo</a> (Actions 1.4, 2.1)</td>
<td>July 1, 2012 and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue about SLOs embedded in general meetings and meetings with a special focus on SLOs (Action 2.2)</td>
<td>August 13 and September 12, 2012, and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive SLO Reports completed (Action 2.3)</td>
<td>By end of Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOs integrated into Program Review (Actions 2.4, 3.1, 4.2)</td>
<td>By end of Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{24} See also the September 12, 2012 SLO FLEX Day agenda.
Institutional learning outcomes delineated and approved by Board (Action 3.2)

Initial assessment completed for institutional learning outcomes (Action 3.2)

External assessment needs identified (Action 4.1)

Online resources and training regarding SLOs made available (Action 4.3)

Comprehensive Assessment Report completed (Action 5.1; see also Action 2.3)

ACCJC College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes completed (Action 5.2)

Alignment of course and program SLOs documented (Action 6.1)

Alignment of course SLOs to General Education SLOs documented (Action 6.2)

SLO requirements for Curriculum Committee submissions updated (Action 6.3)

Program SLOs published in online catalog

Means for students to demonstrate awareness piloted

Evidence of alignment data available online

Faculty SLO Handbook developed and distributed

**Recommendation 5, Student Support Services**

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

As documented in the response to Eligibility Requirement 5 (Administrative Capacity), Student Support Services now fall under one Vice Chancellor. While the majority of the support service areas responsible for documenting and assessing SLOs fall within the Student Support Services Division, several fall within Academic Affairs, and some cut across both areas, particularly those that are associated with course offerings.

Those within Student Support Services include:

- Admissions and Records (Credit and Non-Credit)
- CalWORKs
- Concert and Lecture Program
- Continuing Student Counseling Department
- Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS)
- Financial Aid Office
- Guardian Scholars
- Homeless at-Risk Transitional Students (HARTS)
- Learning Assistance Center
- Matriculation
- Mentoring and Service Learning
- Multicultural Retention Services Department (MRSD; this department was recently moved from Academic Affairs to Student Services as part of the plan to improve student services). MRSD includes the following retention programs:
  - African American Scholastic Program
  - Asian Pacific American Student Success Program
  - Latino Services Network
  - TULAY
- New Student Counseling
- Outreach and Recruitment
- Student Health Services: Medical and Psychological
- Puente Program
- Scholarship Office
- Single Stop
- Student Activities
- Student Affairs
- Student Support Services
- Students Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities
- Veteran’s Educational Benefits Program

The student service programs and/or classes identified below (a, b, c, d, and e) are integrated with Academic Affairs. These programs conduct some or all of their SLO reporting under Academic Affairs; accordingly, some or all of their progress is therefore included in the response to Recommendation 4 (Student Learning Outcomes) which focuses on SLOs for Academic Affairs/Instruction.

(a) Programs housed in the Multicultural Retention Services Department
(b) Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS)
   - DSPS provides both Student Services (Academic Accommodations Counseling) and Special DSPS Courses which are an integral part of the program.
(c) Learning Assistance Courses
(d) New Student Counseling Department Courses
(e) Puente Program Courses

These programs utilize SLOs in a variety of ways, ranging from assessing and measuring existing and in-progress programs to expanding upon current services and enhancing their quality. However, no centralized system for capturing SLOs or their use for program improvement existed. While not all Student Support Services areas have previous SLO assessment data, at this time all have developed at least one and up to three SLOs. SLOs are
therefore at various stages of implementation based upon the Accrediting Commission’s SLO rubric.

A particular challenge in this area has been the retirement or reassignment of a number of faculty and department chairs responsible for SLO management.

Through weekly meetings (scheduled to continue through the end of March 2013), the Workgroup 5 has engaged in a number of activities to better document the progress of SLO assessment and improvements based upon the assessment. Three FLEX day workshops kicked off Student Services SLO activities with a focus on identifying and implementing SLOs through Student Services. In addition, beginning September 5, 2012, Student Services administrators have instituted regular professional development meetings focused on SLO progress, program review, and assessment of support services across the District.

The following table reflects the current SLO work by student services area, the number of SLOs currently being assessed, and the level of implementation of each SLO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Department</th>
<th>Number of SLOs</th>
<th>Levels of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Admission and Records (Credit and Non-Credit)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 at Development 2 at Proficiency 1 at Sustainable Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Retention Programs: African-American Scholastic Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific American Student Success Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Services Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TULAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CalWORKs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Concert and Lecture Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 at Sustainable Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Continuing Student Counseling Department</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 at Proficiency 17 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 at Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 at Development 3 at Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Financial Aid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 at Sustainable Quality Improvement 1 at Proficiency 1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Guardian Scholars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Homeless at Risk Transitional Students (HARTS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Learning Assistance Center (Learning Assistance course SLOs—see LAC-SLO website)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 at Sustainable Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A standard template/matrix was developed to ensure that SLO documentation is consistent throughout the various service units and is aligned with the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. This SLO matrix consists of eleven columns, which include:

- **Area**: The program, service, department, or work unit.
- **WASC Rubric SLO Statement**: The knowledge we want students to acquire through workshops, units, class, program, or process. Outcome developed per WASC standards.
- **Success Measurement/Benchmark**: How success is defined (success indicator is qualitative and/or quantitative). Identification of any measuring tools used.
- **Assessment**: Review of data in each Student Service area to determine what the student has learned through analysis of pre- and post-data, and will then develop material, train presenters, and debrief on the process.
- **Changes**: Impact that the assessment result has on the current outcome.
- **Timeline**: Start and end dates of work to be completed.
- **Sustainable Quality Improvement**: How each student service area will keep improving the SLO process by identifying how to make the process better for the next cycle.
- **Lead Person**: Responsible person ensuring completion of work associated with the outcome.
- **Evidence/Documentation**: Supporting information gathered and utilized.
- **Location of Evidence/Documentation**: Archive all supporting documentation that is easily accessible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matriculation</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3 at Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mentoring and Service Learning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 at Sustainable Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New Student Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 at Sustainable Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 at Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Outreach and Recruitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 at Sustainable Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Single Stop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Student Health Services: Medical and Psychological</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 at Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 at Sustainable Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 at Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Puente Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Student Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 at Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Veteran’s Educational Benefit Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 at Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Alignment Reference/s: Reference WASC Standards; Strategic Plan; Department goals, etc.
- Program Review: Alignment of SLO to program review – how the “outcome” fits with the department/unit’s Program Review process.

Workgroup 5 (Student Support Services) also worked collaboratively with Workgroup 4 (Student Learning Outcomes). Both groups coordinated the development of a central, online repository (www.ccsf.edu/slo). That website provides up-to-date and consistent information on SLOs, including those for Student Services. Given that a number of these units have engaged in SLO development and assessment, the workgroup has selected several examples as best practices to be incorporated into a binder that will serve as a resource to others.

A new College SLO Handbook created by the academic senate now includes a section on non-instructional SLOs, which is appropriate for Student Services. This section will guide faculty in developing and implementing Student Services SLOs. The entire handbook will be of particular use to those Student Services program that have both instructional and counseling components.

The workgroup established an SLO Assessment Cycle Calendar for Fall 2012 through Spring 2013 and will review this calendar on an ongoing basis, modifying it as necessary. Activities within this calendar include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and regularly update SLOs to be assessed and develop action plans</td>
<td>August 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop multiple measures (pre/post survey, focus groups, etc.) for assessing SLOs</td>
<td>October 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect SLO data using the multiple measures tool</td>
<td>October 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data and summarize findings in Matrix</td>
<td>November 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit SLO progress to date to dean/chairs</td>
<td>November 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/chairs give feedback to units</td>
<td>December 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underlying these activities is the belief that dialogue about student learning throughout this process must be ongoing, pervasive, and robust.

The workgroup also developed a Master Calendar to guide ongoing development and analysis of SLOs for continuous improvement of student services. The calendar includes Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 SLO assessment cycle activities. Spring 2013 SLO activities include having discussions within the units on the findings from the data collected; revising SLOs based on findings; refining the assessment and developing SLOs for the next academic cycle; and submitting the final SLO Cycle Matrix to deans/chairs, who then submit to SLO Team Leader for data compilation, with deans/chairs giving units feedback on their SLO report. The Master Calendar also includes deadlines to ensure all units complete SLO activities by the established deadlines and includes the Student Support Services SLO Accreditation Response Team activities and dates of meetings.
Finally, as part of the plan to improve effectiveness and delivery of student services, the September 13, 19, and 26, 2012 workgroup meetings 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. 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, 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.

**Recommendation 5 Outcomes and Timeline for SLO Tasks:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/ To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services binder containing best practices established</td>
<td>Established August 1, 2012 and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three FLEX Day workshops on identifying and implementing SLOs throughout the Student Services Division</td>
<td>August 14, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous SLO work identified, clarified, and consolidated</td>
<td>August 31, 2012 and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO Assessment Cycle Calendar established for Fiscal Year 2012-13</td>
<td>August 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO Workshops for Student Services Administrators: Status report on SLOs for each area</td>
<td>September 5, 2012 and September 13, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard template/matrix for recording SLOs developed</td>
<td>September 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second series of three FLEX Day workshops – Speaking with one Voice focused on SLO development and program review</td>
<td>September 12, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO manual for Student Support Services developed</td>
<td>September 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO Master Calendar developed</td>
<td>September 17, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central repository for all Student Services SLOs available online</td>
<td>September 30, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Throughout the course of four meetings beginning in July 2012, the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 6 (Human Resources Components of Evaluation) has focused on the following: (1) drafting language for inclusion in job announcements, performance evaluations,
and handbooks for all personnel responsible for student progress toward achieving stated SLOs and (2) initiating conversations and negotiations with employee bargaining units to reach agreement on the inclusion of SLO language in job announcements, performance evaluation instruments, and handbooks. To date, SLO language has been drafted for the following, in consultation with the appropriate bargaining units where required:25

- faculty job announcements
- Faculty Handbook
- classified staff evaluation

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

The Administrators Association Executive Council Co-Chairs and Dean of Human Resources discussed including an evaluation objective that assesses effectiveness in promoting the achievement of SLOs in the area(s) supervised, for administrators who are directly responsible for student progress toward achieving SLOs.

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

**Recommendation 6 Outcomes and Timeline:**

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

---

25 See draft faculty job announcements, draft Faculty Handbook, and draft classified staff evaluation.
Recommendation 7, Human Resources

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

The workgroup responsible for Recommendation 7 (Human Resources) has been at the core of efforts to propose options for more effective and efficient reporting lines and structures by using models of best practice to inform discussions. Discussions have included exploring the optimal number of direct reports to Vice Chancellors as well as how to maximize the number of hands-on administrators while not increasing the number of personnel.

To that end, on September 27, 2012, the Board took action to direct the Chancellor to propose a new instructional administrative structure, congruent with Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings and a list of cost-saving possibilities developed by Workgroup 10. That structure will have academic integrity and includes an increase in the administrative instructional oversight and a reduced number of department chairs that results in significant cost savings (see also response to Recommendation 10).

The workgroup’s analysis has taken into consideration the level of administrative and staff support for centers and sites beyond the Ocean campus. This workgroup has also been investigating the policies, procedures, and practices associated with reassignments (interim appointments, transfers, additional duty assignments), training and professional development, and evaluation for both administrators and classified staff.

With respect to the reassignment of personnel, particularly administrators and classified staff, Workgroup 7 has concluded that the hiring processes for permanent administrators and classified staff members are rigorous and ensure that the individual hired has the requisite experience and expertise to carry out the job duties. However, reassignments, in practice, often have not followed the District’s policies and procedures. Reassignments include interim and acting appointments, transfers, and additional duty assignments. Transparency in these transactions is vital. At the moment, much of this concern regarding administrators has been mitigated by the change in the organizational structure at the Vice Chancellor level (described in the response to Eligibility Requirement 5, Administrative Capacity).

The need for reassignments is largely driven by staffing shortages and the lack of a staffing plan overall for filling positions, whether through internal transfers (by identifying individuals with both the appropriate skills sets and availability) or new hires. Staff allocation must be equitable and take into consideration the under- or over-utilization of staff throughout the District so that an optimal balance can be achieved. Thus, Workgroup 7 has requested that Workgroup 3 (Program Review) emphasize the use of data to inform requests for staffing expansions and reductions on the Program Review template.26

Alongside the concerns identified regarding reassignments is the concern that the District has not been able to support training and professional development at optimum levels. Workgroup 7 has recommended that the District restore orientations and training for deans, department chairs,

---

26 See Program Review template.
program coordinators, and classified staff and expand to others as applicable. In addition, the new Program Review guidelines prompt units to identify any unit-specific staff development needs.

The Interim Chancellor has already instituted a series of Leadership Training activities for the management team (inclusive of administrators and classified managers). Topics to date have included accreditation, enrollment management, Banner usage, Student Learning Outcomes, Shared Governance, and leadership strengths. Workgroup 7 has recommended that these activities continue, with a formal schedule developed annually.

In addition, Workgroup 7 has identified the need to reinstate professional development funding while at the same time 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.

Workgroup 7 has also begun examining evaluation procedures for all staff and is developing recommendations for improvement that would link evaluation outcomes with professional development opportunities to address areas for improvement when necessary. Research to date on best practices for administrative evaluations has raised questions about the effectiveness of the Administrators Evaluation Oversight Committee.

Finally, Workgroup 7 has developed a list of observations regarding barriers to administrative authority that cut across a number of the Recommendations (particularly Recommendation 13) and often impede progress. This work has informed changes in policy and practices and will further guide the needed revisions in the Administrators Handbook.

**Recommendation 7 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/ To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership training implemented</td>
<td>As of July 2012 and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring policies, procedures, and practices reviewed</td>
<td>Completed September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and professional development recommendations developed</td>
<td>Completed September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations regarding barriers to administrative authority documented</td>
<td>Completed September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options for more effective and efficient reporting lines and structures identified</td>
<td>September 27, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation procedures for all personnel assessed, using models of best practice for comparison</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New procedures for hiring interim positions developed</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators Handbook reviewed and revised, including provisions for administrative hiring and evaluation</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

27 See leadership team training agendas and handouts.
28 See also Workgroup 7 “Recap" for further details.
29 See also Workgroup 7 “Recap" for list of barriers to administrative authority.
Recommendation 8, Physical Resources

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

Workgroup 8 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.

A Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model that includes costs associated with the following would allow the College to better estimate and incorporate costs into annual and long-term planning and budgeting:

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

In addition, neglected maintenance is evident in many of the College’s buildings. With data provided by Buildings and Grounds, the workgroup has compiled a list of major building
systems that are in disrepair or in need of replacement now or within the next five years. Among them are items such as elevator maintenance, replacement of HVAC systems, roofing maintenance and many others, all of which require significant budgetary resources that the College must identify.

The College has recently enlisted the Community College Foundation to conduct a facilities assessment which includes a space inventory and assessment of maintenance. This report is expected to be completed in October 2012. As information from this report becomes available, this may inform future workgroup discussions and recommendations.

From the work completed thus far, Workgroup 8 has begun to see emerging themes, including the following:

- The College presently does not have sufficient in-house expertise in the area of facilities, planning, maintenance, or operations.
- Staffing to handle wide-ranging maintenance from plumbing to engineering to grounds keeping is woefully inadequate.
- The College must develop and sustain a budgeting practice of funding deferred maintenance for existing and new buildings.

Future steps are as follows:

- Workgroup 8 will continue to work with the staffing guidelines and develop the TCO model.
- Workgroup 8 will review the Facilities Assessment in October – November 2012.
- Workgroup 8 will share its findings with Workgroup 7 (Human Resources) and Workgroup 15 (Campuses/Sites).

**Recommendation 8 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Ownership Model identified</td>
<td>August 16, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Ownership data gathered</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 9, Technology Resources**

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

Technology at City College of San Francisco falls into two distinct groups:

- Instructional and Program Technology: This category includes technology directly related to academic or program needs and includes student computer labs, projectors, learning management system, library systems, and software for instructional purposes.
• Administrative and Institutional Technology: This category includes the administrative systems necessary to run the college and include Banner (ERP), databases, email, telephones, network, firewalls, employee computers, and student health systems.

The Workgroup 9 (Technology Resources) progress report provides a comprehensive summary of all actions to date, along with plans going forward. The group has met seven times over the course of July, August, and September and has focused on the activities described below.31

**Identify Guiding Principles.** To inform the College’s approach to addressing Recommendation 9, the workgroup began by identifying guiding principles for supporting the overall mission of the College through technology. The guiding principles are contained within the ITS Mission Statement as follows (completed on August 7, 2012):

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

**Guiding Principles:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

31 See Workgroup 9 (Technology Resources) Progress Report for details.
Articulate Relationship with Planning Process. This activity is the key component of Recommendation 9 and overlaps with the activities of the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process). Workgroup 9 has developed a plan which emphasizes a strong relationship with the entire CCSF planning process and incorporates each of the types of technology resources noted above into the annual planning and budgeting process for equipment upgrades, replacement, and maintenance. In previous years, this has occurred on a best-effort basis and has not been part of a well-defined process. Therefore, there is a need for an immediate, temporary “bridge plan” to bring equipment, primarily faculty and staff desktops, up to the appropriate levels of technical performance. The workgroup has also developed a permanent plan for ongoing implementation after the bridging phase, which will utilize Program Review as the mechanism for decision-making.³²

As the institutional planning process continues to develop, more work is in progress to integrate the details of the replacement plan. ITS is developing information and resources to aid departments in meeting technology standards and creating program review priorities. Workgroup 9 will also work with other planning groups to suggest IT-based criteria for prioritizing requests at the institutional level, which will be integrated with criteria from the other resources of Finance, Staffing, and Facilities.

The College will need to revisit the coordination of technology planning with planning overall regularly to ensure that detailed coordination is sustained. In addition to this, the use of the Banner ERP system will be increased and enhanced in order to provide essential decision-making information to the CCSF management team.

Complete Academic Equipment Inventory. In order to determine technology replacement strategies and priorities, Workgroup 9 completed an inventory of existing technology, making note of the age and condition of equipment within computer classrooms and computer rooms and inclusive of classroom projectors. This inventory was completed on October 1, 2012. To ensure that planning activities related to technology are accurate, the College will need to update this inventory regularly.

Develop Models for Replacement. The College will upgrade or replace technology equipment according to a pre-defined schedule using a model that takes into account age, functionality, and other factors. Models for consolidation and sharing of resources across multiple units within the College are also required and will be included in this activity. The workgroup completed development of the replacement model on September 4, 2012.

Identify Sources of Equipment Usage Data. The College is currently tracking how frequently many of its computing assets are used but does not have sufficient information available to make data-driven decisions. This is especially important considering the goal of computer lab consolidation instead of a direct one-for-one replacement. Workgroup 9 has identified two systems at CCSF capable of performing the task of tracking usage: Accutrack and PC Cop.³³ Both of these systems are currently in use and are being expanded to include all academic computing assets.

Determine Cost Requirements for Technology Resources. These items will also be incorporated into the Program Review process described in Workgroup 9’s Progress Report. A

---

³² See also “Program Review Alignment” within Workgroup 9’s Progress Report.
³³ See also section entitled “Technology Resources Utilization” in the Workgroup 9 Progress Report.
financial summary has been prepared which includes both ongoing annual technology-related expenses as well as the expenses required for cyclical replacement of technology equipment. All technology-related staffing requests will be submitted by ITS in the Program Review process to enhance technical services across all organizations.

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

**Identify Constraints of Funding Sources.** The funding sources for technology equipment include General Fund, Bond measures, grants, and donations. Grants are typically limited to funding Academic equipment and the Bond is limited to funding technology infrastructure projects. When new technology is acquired, it is important to identify the differences between the funding sources to make sure that the College utilizes the appropriate funding source depending on the type of technology. Workgroup 9 completed this activity on September 4, 2012.

**Continue to Secure the Technology Infrastructure.** Workgroup 9 evaluated the CCSF information security infrastructure as part of its technology equipment review. The infrastructure is improved on an ongoing basis to incorporate vendor feature enhancements, adapt to new threats, and provide the necessary capacity to meet the needs of Instructional and Administrative programs. Firewalls from two leading security vendors are currently installed and operational, both of which have been recently upgraded. In addition to this, CCSF has a site license for a desktop anti-virus solution that includes automated installation of the latest versions of software. The Workgroup recommends that the security systems continue to be monitored on a daily basis and that new security features and functionality continue to be evaluated and deployed in order to ensure the integrity of the technology infrastructure.

**Recommendation 9 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with College planning process articulated</td>
<td>September 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding principles identified</td>
<td>August 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic equipment inventory completed</td>
<td>October 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement models developed</td>
<td>September 4, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Plan dates redefined</td>
<td>September 4, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and staff requirements for technology resources determined</td>
<td>September 4, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints of funding sources identified</td>
<td>September 4, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of equipment usage data identified</td>
<td>August 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 10, Financial Planning and Stability

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

Only with a fully integrated planning and budgeting system will the College be able to realize the necessary cost savings to achieve financial stability.

On September 11, 2012, the CCSF Trustees adopted a balanced budget for 2012-13 reflecting some adjustments to the tentatively budget approved on June 28, 2012. This budget has taken important first steps: all union partners have agreed to and implemented changes in compensation agreements that achieve immediate savings for the fiscal year, as they have now done each year for several budget years. However, these concessions are one-time only. Other savings have already been and are being further achieved through attrition and by reducing the costs of reassigned time. Other short-term savings continue by delaying or reducing purchases of supplies and equipment.

Reorganization, as outlined in the response to Eligibility Requirement 5 (Administrative Capacity), will yield additional savings in 2013-14.

There is significant analysis, planning, and work left to do both with respect to implementing permanent cost-saving measures and finding resources to raise financial reserves to a minimum 5% of overall budget, contribute to retiree health plans, fund a technology replacement plan, and fill key vacancies in classified and administrative positions.

To identify more sustainable measures for cost savings in both the near and long term, prior to receiving the ACCJC determination letter dated July 2, 2012, CCSF Trustees approved a request to the State Chancellor of California Community Colleges for the assistance of the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) on May 31, 2012. FCMAT is assisting CCSF in the development of a multi-year financial plan, with specific recommendations on revenues, expenditures, and overall strategies for achieving financial stability. These findings are contained within the September 18, 2012 FCMAT report, which includes 45 recommendations.34

In addition to FCMAT, the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 10 (Financial Planning and Stability), which began meeting in July, has developed a broad list of more than 50 possible options for reducing costs on an ongoing basis for presentation to the Board of Trustees. This list was released on September 7, 2012, and presented to the Board during the September 27, 2012, meeting. At that meeting, the Board took action to direct the Chancellor to further study the list of cost-saving options and refer the appropriate items to the collective bargaining process. Workgroup 10 also developed calculations to determine that the possibilities presented would yield actual savings.35

The District will need to implement dramatic systemic changes. CCSF has been spending as much as 92 percent of its budget on personnel costs, placing it at the very highest end of the

34 See FCMAT Report and document entitled, "Excerpts from FCMAT Report RECOMMENDATIONS Only."
35 See list entitled, "Options for Reducing Expenditures."
state’s community colleges. Reducing this number, to allow funding of the other critical needs identified in the Accreditation Report and achieving fiscal stability, is central to a meaningful resolution of the College’s fiscal crisis.

Even if Proposition 30 passes in November, CCSF will face a projected deficit of more than $14 million in FY 2013-14 if no action is taken to reduce costs. If it fails, automatic trigger cuts would once again be levied against community colleges. For CCSF, that would mean additional cuts this year of over $10 million. Therefore, the College knows that it must make plans, as many other Community Colleges have already done or are doing, for this possible outcome.

A potential revenue source is the local parcel tax, Proposition A, which is also in the November ballot. It would provide the College with an additional $14 million annually for the next eight years. If approved by San Francisco voters, this would mitigate many of the College’s most immediate fiscal needs. However, it is not sufficient to address the College’s full financial issues for the long term. The College is not counting on its successful passage in its fiscal planning.

The College recognizes that clear, difficult choices must be made, immediately, and at a number of levels, to fully address this Recommendation and its related Eligibility Requirement (17, Financial Resources) and the underlying Standards. The FCMAT report and the list of cost-saving measures identified by the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 10 are guiding these decisions. Several have already been made. These include a $1.5 million reduction in reassigned non-instructional faculty costs, a reduction in part-time counselors, and the closer of four rented sites for Spring 2013. Going forward, greater integration between planning and budgeting that utilizes annual Program Review as a driver for both budget increases and reductions will also be critical for sound decision-making.

**Recommendation 10 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation concessions agreed to by bargaining units/constituencies</td>
<td>June 28, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor reorganization implemented</td>
<td>August 27, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCMAT report issued</td>
<td>September 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of cost-saving ideas developed</td>
<td>September 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation methodology for quantifying cost savings developed</td>
<td>September 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-bargainable cost-saving measures selected by Trustees utilizing FCMAT findings and list of cost-saving ideas prepared by Workgroup 10</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargainable cost-saving measures selected by Trustees utilizing FCMAT findings and list of cost-saving ideas prepared by Workgroup 10</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-saving measures implemented</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 11, Financial Integrity and Reporting

To meet Standard III.D Financial Resources, the team recommends the college use the resources necessary to provide accurate and timely reporting of financial information; and to report this information to internal users so they may effectively participated in the annual and long-term planning and budgeting processes (III.D.1.d, III.D.2.g).

To remedy this issue in the coming year, the District already has taken one-time measures to increase staffing levels within the accounting department to meet deadlines for critical reports (Annual Financial Audit and Annual 311 Report). These measures have included the return of one retiree who has historical and in-depth knowledge of District operations and contracting with a private firm for part-time consulting services. The District also has sought to reassign current classified staff on a short-term basis from other departments whose expertise will be particularly useful during audit preparation. To date, this last strategy has had very limited success.

These measures are only intended to address the 2012 Annual Financial Audit and the 2012 Annual 311 Report. An ongoing solution is essential, and Workgroup 11 (Financial Integrity and Reporting) is discussing options to address these issues in the mid to longer term. In line with the staffing plan, funding to fill three vacant positions in the accounting/budget department and two in the payroll department are included in the fiscal year 2012-13 budget.36

Recommendation 11 Outcomes and Timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-time, temporary measures taken to increase human resource capacity within accounting</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Annual Financial Audit Report distributed</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Annual 311 Report completed</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Annual 311 Report distributed</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll developed</td>
<td>August 29, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll executed</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations 12 and 13, Leadership, Governance and Decision-making

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

To fully meet Standard IV.A Decision-making Roles and Processes, the team recommends that college leaders from all constituencies evaluate and improve the college’s governance structure.

36 See Accounting, Budget, and Payroll Staffing Plan.
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).

Workgroups 12 and 13 began by analyzing the College’s current Shared Governance system. Through their own observations and the results of the 2011-12 Shared Governance evaluation, workgroup participants acknowledged the merits of the College’s Shared Governance system while also identifying a number of shortcomings and barriers inherent in the system that impede decision-making. The workgroup also discussed the value of using the term “Participatory Governance” versus “Shared Governance” in that it more accurately reflects the advisory nature of college councils and committees.

Concurrent with the initial information-gathering stages, the Board of Trustees and other constituents (administrators, classified managers, and faculty) participated in training sessions to better understand roles and responsibilities within a Shared Governance environment. Trainings and discussion also helped all constituents to gain a better understanding of Shared Governance as a participatory governance process in which committees serve an advisory function rather than a decision-making function. Trainings included those provided by ACCJC regarding accreditation (which included a discussion on the roles and responsibilities of trustees facilitated by Dr. Barbara Beno and Trustee William McGinnis of Butte-Glenn Community College District), the Community College League of California (facilitated by CCLC President, Scott Lay, and Academic Senate for California Community Colleges President, Michelle Pilati), and the Association of Community Colleges Trustees (facilitated by Dr. Narcisa Polonio).

Additionally the workgroup reviewed sample policies on Shared Governance from other districts (Yosemite, San Mateo, Contra Costa, and Santa Rosa).

Based on this review, workgroup members developed a list of criteria that served as the basis for discussion of a new Participatory Governance system. Those criteria and desirable attributes are summarized below.

**Criteria for New Participatory Governance System**

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

---

[46]-
Of particular concern was the fact that students have not been participating in Shared Governance at an optimal level. At one time, students received stipends for their participation from Associated Students, but that was stopped a few years ago. The workgroup believes that this is a major contributor to the lower participation rates and recommended reinstating this practice of providing students with stipends to boost participation. The Associated Students have reinstated the stipends as of Fall 2012 and will discuss further ways to enhance student contributions to Shared Governance.

These activities occurred throughout July and August 2012 and resulted in a draft new model of Participatory Governance and accompanying policy. This model reflects the advisory nature of a college council and committees. It calls for a single new Governance Council that will provide recommendations directly to the Chancellor on matters pertaining to institutional priorities, policies, planning, and budget development and replaces the former College Advisory Council and Planning and Budgeting Council. The Board will conduct a first reading of the new policy in October; hopefully the new policy will be approved and implemented in November. Additionally, a revised policy on the role of the Academic Senate and its relationship to the Board of Trustees has been developed and is currently under review. Once approved, the Chancellor will work with constituency presidents to develop procedures to accompany these policies.

**Recommendation 12 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/ To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merits and shortcomings of current Participatory Governance system identified along with best practices from other institutions</td>
<td>August 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal criteria for Participatory Governance system developed</td>
<td>August 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Participatory Governance model drafted</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Participatory Governance policy drafted</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Manual 2.07, City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System revisions reviewed by Board</td>
<td>October 2012 (first reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Manual 2.07, City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System revisions approved by Board</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Participatory Governance model and policy implemented</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee structure and guidelines developed</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 14, Effective Board Organization**

*To fully meet Standard IV.B Board and Administrative Organization, the team recommends that the board act in a manner consistent with its policies and by-laws, assess and develop operating*

---

37 See draft Participatory Governance policy and draft administrative procedures.
procedures, develop and implement a plan for board development, and regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its policies and practices (IV.B.1.a, e-h).

Given the focus of this Recommendation on the Board of Trustees, the workgroup addressing this Recommendation is composed of all Board members and is facilitated by the Chancellor. The first measures taken to address this Recommendation included several training and retreat sessions. Dr. Barbara Beno, ACCJC President, and William McGinnis, Butte-Glenn Community College District Trustee, facilitated a three-hour workshop on July 10, 2012 on the topic of accreditation, covering its purposes, processes, and standards; the roles and responsibilities of trustees; advice for board excellence; and examples.

Subsequently, on August 6 and 7, 2012, Dr. Narcisa Polonio, President of the Association of Community Colleges 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. 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 Shared Governance.
5. Implement a professional development plan for the Board of Trustees that leads to increased board effectiveness and a cohesive and collegial team.
6. Do whatever it takes to save City College and best serve our students and community!

The Board also reviewed its bylaws and policies related to Policy Manual (PM) Section 1, “The Governing Board, The Community, The Chancellor.” The Chancellor and consultants reviewed the policies within Section 1 and shared proposed changes with the Board Policy Committee Chair. The Board conducted a first reading on September 27, 2012 of the updated policies and made no changes. A second reading and approval is expected on October 25, 2012.

Of special note is PM Section 1.01, “Election and Membership,” which includes Board compensation. The Board revised this policy to prorate the compensation paid to Board members according to the number of meetings attended. The first reading of the policy was conducted on July 26, 2012. At its second reading on August 23, 2012, the Board adopted the revised policy.

The Board also has reviewed the following policies, the need for which arose through the work of other workgroups responsible for Recommendation 1 (Mission Statement), 12 (Leadership, Governance and Decision-making), and 13 (Governance Structures).

**Board Policy 1200, Mission Statement.** As noted in the response to Recommendation 1 (Mission Statement), the Board reviewed a proposed statement and provided additional direction for revisions at a special meeting (completed August 14, 2012). The first reading of the revised statement occurred on August 23, 2012, and the second reading and adoption of

---

38 See “San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual Board Governance Policies.”
the revised mission statement took place on September 11, 2012 (note that the policy numbering is in transition; this will become BP 1.00).

**Policy Manual 2.07, City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System.** The response to Recommendations 12 and 13 describes the need for changing current policy regarding Shared Governance. The Board will conduct a first reading of the new policy in October. A new policy focusing on the role of the Academic Senate and its relationship to the Board of Trustees as a separate policy (10+1) is being developed.

To assist the Board in gaining a full and clear understanding of Shared Governance, particularly as it considers changes to this policy, Scott Lay, California Community College League President, and Michelle Pilati, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges President, presented a workshop on “Participating Effectively in District and College Governance: the Law, Regulations, and Guidelines” on August 23, 2012. The workshop was attended by three Trustees and further professional development on the topic will be considered as part of the Board’s professional development plan.

To assist in its deliberations and to further enhance Board effectiveness, on September 11, 2012, the Board approved a voluntary request for the appointment of a Special Trustee by the State Chancellor for California Community Colleges. This decision is consistent with recommendations made by ACCJC and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.

**Recommendation 14 Outcomes and Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCJC President, Dr. Barbara Beno, with Trustee William “Bill” McGinnis of Butte-Glenn Community College District, conducted Board training on accreditation’s purposes, processes, standards, and the roles and responsibilities of Trustees in accreditation</td>
<td>July 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Narcisa Polonio, President of the Association of Community Colleges Trustees, facilitated a two-part retreat focused on roles and responsibilities of the Board, a Board Self-Assessment, and the drafting of Board goals</td>
<td>August 6 and 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board self-assessment completed</td>
<td>August 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board goals for 2012-13 drafted</td>
<td>August 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board goals for 2012-13 adopted</td>
<td>August 23, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Lay, California Community College League President, and Michelle Pilati, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges President, presented a workshop on Participating Effectively in District and College Governance: the Law, Regulations, and Guidelines</td>
<td>August 23, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for appointment of Special Trustee approved by Board</td>
<td>September 11, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Policy 1200, Mission Statement revisions approved by Board</td>
<td>September 11, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board’s first reading of revised PM Section 1 completed</td>
<td>September 27, 2012 (first reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Section 1 revisions approved by Board</td>
<td>October 25, 2012 (second reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Manual 2.07, City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System revisions reviewed by Board</td>
<td>October 2012 (first reading)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First annual professional development plan created | September 27, 2012
Policy Manual 2.07, City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System revisions approved by Board | November 2012

**Special Focus: Centers and Sites (Workgroup 15)**

Given the references to centers and sites throughout the ACCJC Recommendations, the Chancellor formed a “special focus” workgroup dedicated to this topic. The charge to this workgroup is to analyze and assess the issues regarding centers and sites and identifying and collecting the data necessary to conduct a fiscal and programmatic analysis.

Centers and sites fall into the following categories:

- **Category A:** College and centers that receive a Foundation Grant from the State (pursuant to SB 361)
- **Category B:** leased sites that receive no Foundation Grant and pay significant rent
- **Category C:** leased sites that receive no Foundation Grant and pay very little rent
- **Category D:** owned sites

The workgroup is reviewing data and information necessary to conduct a fiscal and programmatic analysis of centers and sites, in order to more cost effectively and efficiently serve students.

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 and will be completed fully after October 15. The ultimate outcome of this will be recommendations for a comprehensive set of options for serving students as cost-effectively and efficiently as possible. The workgroup has discussed possibilities that include the consolidation of non-Foundation Grant sites, as well as the possible consolidation of others.

Based on the Chancellor’s recommendation, the Board approved three recommendations related to site closures on September 27, 2012. The first is to consolidate the course offerings currently offered at the Castro site (approximately 20-25 sections) to other centers throughout the city. The Castro site is located at a junior high school that operates as a College site in the evening. This move will allow the classes to be offered in a more appropriate facility for higher education and provide cost savings from cancelation of rent and reduction of staff time needed to oversee the facility.

Coincidently, these classrooms contain adult furniture that is desperately needed at other sites in order to increase classroom capacity and thus 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 Park Presidio site to other centers.

The third recommendation that the Board of Trustees approved on September 27, 2012 was to immediately begin the process of placing the property at 33 Gough Street on the market for a long-term lease. 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 plan is to relocate those staff to other District-owned property.

### Special Focus Outcomes and Timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/To Be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers/Sites defined</td>
<td>August 17, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Operation model completed</td>
<td>Being Completed by Workgroup 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Grants reviewed</td>
<td>August 17, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data regarding program and course offerings/sections per center collected</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources allocation examined</td>
<td>(TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to alternative locations/transportation reviewed</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate value assessed</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on site utilization and productivity collected</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on site utilization and productivity analyzed</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of options for more cost-effectively and efficiently serving students generated (consolidation, elimination, property sales, property leases, etc.) and presented to Board of Trustees</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Actions Addressing the Material Weaknesses and Significant Deficiencies Identified in the 2011 Auditors Report

On September 12, 2012, the College received a letter from ACCJC concerning ACCJC’s review and analysis of CCSF’s Audit Reports. In that letter, ACCJC directed the College to describe within the October 15 Special Report the actions the institution intends to take to address the material weaknesses and significant deficiencies identified in the 2011 Audit Report.39


**Audit Condition:** The District’s capital assets balance net of accumulated depreciation was understated by $3,688,489. During 2011, it was determined the District began depreciating an asset which had not been placed into service at June 30, 2010. As a result, accumulated depreciation related to this asset was overstated.

The District did not record a balance for banked overload at June 30, 2010. It was determined the balance liable by the District for banked overload completed was $2,906,057 at June 30, 2010. As a result, liabilities of the District were understated at June 30, 2010.

**Audit Recommendation:** The District should not depreciate any capital assets until they have been placed into service by the District. Further, the District should ensure all liabilities of the District are included in the Statement of Net Assets.

**District Response to 2011-01:** The Chief Financial Officer has directed staff that no capital asset entries will be entered or approved in the system without at least two qualified personnel reviews.

Adequate training will be provided to staff responsible for capital assets to ensure depreciation begins only after the assets have been placed into service by the District. The College Controller will be responsible for training and supervising those staff.

Capital asset inventory will be supervised by the Purchasing manager with direction from the capital asset accountants. The District has provided one more FTE in purchasing and the capital asset accounting group has the FTE resources to maintain a balanced fixed asset ledger.

The College’s Office of Instruction now annually provides the amounts of banked overload as of June 30th of each fiscal year. These amounts are quantified and presented in the annual financial statements just like other leave balances for classified and administrative employees so as to accurately represent the financial position of the District.

---


Audit Condition: The Annual Financial and Budget Report (CCSF-311) financial statements and the GASB 35 Conversion entries presented to the auditors to begin the audit omitted several significant transactions and contained numerous errors. 40

Audit Recommendation: The District should:

- Ensure all bank reconciliations are performed accurately and reviewed by an individual independent of the reconciliation preparation.
- Recognize revenue and related receivable balances only when the funds have been earned.
- Design a system of internal controls to prevent or detect financial statement misstatements on a timely basis.
- Ensure all liability balances have been properly reported at year-end, and ensure the District’s asset and liability position are not overstated by accruals and deferrals for the following fiscal year.

District Response to 2011-02: The District has put together an audit close-out calendar and disseminated the calendar to all personnel throughout the District including the accounting staff, campus deans, program directors, human resources, payroll and all other parties involved in the audit process.

District will have to review its system of internal controls to ensure the bank reconciliations and the revenue recognition processes are taking place at the appropriate times.

Financial Statement Finding 2011-03 – Material Weakness – Other Postemployment Benefits Liability

Audit Condition: The District has not implemented procedures or policy to adequately monitor the funding of the liability under GASB Statement No. 45, which is continuing to increase. The Annual OPEB cost for year ended June 30, 2011 was $16,524,760, however the amount contributed was $6,340,581, increasing the liability by $10,184,179. The OPEB liability of $35,703,065 as of June 30, 2011 contributed significantly to the negative unrestricted net asset balance of ($25,056,628) as of June 30, 2011.

Audit Recommendation: The District should review the effect of the implementation of GASB No. 45 on the District’s financial statements. The District should consider various options in an effort to lower their liability and/or mitigate the negative impact on the financial statement on a go-forward basis.

District Response to 2011-03: The District needs to negotiate cost and funding structure to address OPEB benefits to District employees. The District began funding its OPEB obligation through an irrevocable Trust fund in 2011-12 contributing $500,000. The District’s multiyear budget forecast includes funding in the amount of $500,000 for Fiscal Year 2012-13, $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2013-14, and $4,000,000 in fiscal year 2014-15.

40 See p. 69 of the 2011 Audit for a listing of errors.

Audit Condition: The District maintains a Self-Insurance Fund for employee workers’ compensation benefits. The District increased its assessment to the funds to recover funding for the prior years and had posted a liability within the self-insurance funding in the amount of $4.3 million. The self-insurance fund does not have sufficient assets to cover this liability which has resulted in a negative fund balance of $2.3 million. This liability would ultimately become the responsibility of the various funds which record payroll expense – specifically the District’s Unrestricted General Fund. This has the possibility of negatively impacting the financial activity of the District.

The most recent workers’ compensation actuarial report is from October 2009. The District should have an actuarial performed at least every other year. For the years the actuarial report is not obtained, an internal model is not being prepared and reviewed to capture any significant activity.

Audit Recommendation: The District should determine the funding level to provide sufficient reserves for this fund to target a date to return the fund to a balanced position.

The District should have an actuarial study performed at least every other year. For the years the actuarial report is not obtained, an internal model should be prepared and reviewed to capture any significant changes in activity.

District Response to 2011-04: During fiscal year 2011-12 the District obtained an updated actuarial study for its workers compensation liability. Based on the study and the actuary’s recommendations, the District revised and recorded the most recent liability and revised the factor it charges per dollar of payroll to meet the actuaries recommended funding stream. Based on these changes the District worker’s compensation funds are now “balanced” relative to its ongoing actuarial claim.


Audit Condition: Purchases, disposals and other changes in capital assets are not analyzed during the year. The capital asset roll-forward provided did not include all asset activity that occurred during the year.

Audit Recommendation: The District should analyze additions and disposals of capital assets during the year, to ensure the roll forward at year-end is correct.

District Response to 2011-05: The analysis and adjustment in the fixed asset ledgers of purchases and disposals can occur on a semi-annual basis now that the District has standardized the coding under the supervision of the purchasing manager with direction from the capital asset accountants.

Financial Statement Finding 2011-06 – Significant Deficiency – Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests

Audit Condition: Form 700 was not completed and maintained for all of the required individuals, and several employees designated for completion of the disclosure did not complete the forms within the required timeframe. Current policy requires certain management level employees to complete and sign the Statement of Economic Interest annually. This policy has
not been updated to include others within the District that may have the ability to contract with vendors on behalf of the District, or may be in a position to influence contracts with vendors.

**Audit Recommendation:** The District should implement procedures and assign a responsible individual to ensure that Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests is turned in by all necessary personnel within the required timeframe. Additionally, a review of the current policy regarding employees required to disclose potential conflicts of interest on the Form 700 should be conducted with the policy being updated to reflect all positions where a conflict could impact the District.

**District Response to 2011-06:** Both the Board of Trustees and the senior management staff who are designated by policy must adhere to the requirements of Form 700, Statement of Economic Interests. The District Internal Auditor and College’s General Counsel will review the list of employees on April 2\(^{nd}\) of each year to ensure those employees designated by the District and all Board members have submitted their form on time. Exceptions will be reported to the Board of Trustees and the public.

**Financial Statement Finding 2011-05 – Significant Deficiency – Attendance**

**Audit Condition:** The District overstated the contact hours for courses which require the supervision of multiple instructors. The issue impacted 45 courses in the Registered Nursing, Licensed Vocational Nursing and Health Care Technology departments resulting in an overstatement of 361.87 FTES.

The District did not schedule the appropriate break time for three courses resulting in an overstatement of 0.15 FTES.

The District included additional break time in their calculation of contact hours for 50 courses resulting in an understatement of 8.59 FTES.

**Audit Recommendation:** The District should develop procedures to ensure all contact hours are calculated in accordance with compliance requirements.

**District Response to 2011-12:** District staff who are responsible for attendance have received a comprehensive class from an expert as to how they must account for FTES that are reported to the State. The District will continue to monitor the reporting process and will seek advice, when necessary, either from the State Chancellor’s Office or its external auditors. Moreover, the District will re-evaluate each class and associated break schedule and will verify that the correct numbers are reported in the attendance system.
D. Response to the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team Report

On September 14, 2012, CCSF received the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team report, prepared at the District’s request (see also the responses to Eligibility Requirement 17 and Recommendation 10). This report contained recommendations within the following categories: Fiscal Health Analysis, Multiyear Financial Projection, Staffing and Operational Costs, Enrollment Management, Administrative Structure, and Barriers to Fiscal Solvency.

The College is committed to following the next steps as proposed by FCMAT, with some minor adjustments to the timing of items C, D, and E, as contained within the table below.

**Implementation Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>District receives report and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Late September 2012</td>
<td>It is anticipated that the recommendations will affect a number of areas. Some will be easier to implement than others. Some may not be accepted or acted upon by CCSF. Given differing levels of complexity, the recommendations should be categorized into those that can be acted upon quickly and those needing more time to develop. An action plan should be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Late October 2012</td>
<td>Each recommendation should have an approximate value assigned (where appropriate) as estimated by CCSF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Early November 2012</td>
<td>Once steps B and C are completed, CCSF should organize the list of recommendations in order of priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Early November 2012</td>
<td>At this point CCSF must be prepared to take action sufficient to sustain itself fiscally. Formal board action may be warranted to establish a clear understanding of CCSF’s intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>November 2012 to March 2013</td>
<td>Organizational and operational recommendations included in steps C, D, and E above should be considered at the same time, if possible, especially if they have fiscal implications. Those that do not can be dealt with over a longer period of time. A number of the recommendations regarding organization and operations are vital to CCSF’s long-term fiscal health. CCSF has both immediate fiscal circumstances and long-term structural issues to address. Trying to tackle all of them in a short time makes it very difficult to succeed. That is why organizing and understanding the recommendations is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>November 2012 to June 2013</td>
<td>Staff should complete and present a follow-up report to CCSF, community and board after the results of the November election are known, as well as subsequent periodic reports on the status of open items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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