From its earliest beginnings in 1935, City College has been known for its long standing tradition of excellence and public service. Over the last 75 years it has provided access and opportunity to many students, and in recent years City College has been serving over 100,000 students annually. City College strives to provide superior and affordable educational experiences for all students within a supportive, caring, inclusive, and diverse College culture that fosters student success.

It goes without saying that it has been both challenging and rewarding to pursue re-accreditation and develop our institutional self-study during a period of economic recession. Nonetheless, the process has enabled City College to take stock fully of its accomplishments, challenges, and opportunities. It has also revealed that without condition, it is our focus on students which motivates and drives us to adapt to changing internal and external conditions. Our students and their aspirations move us to improve ourselves as an institution, so that we can ultimately provide the best educational environment.

City College’s academic, career, and technical education programs continue to grow to meet the needs of our students and community. CCSF now offers over 140 credit and noncredit certificate, Award of Achievement, and degree programs to prepare students for today’s changing workplace and to help them achieve their educational and career goals. It has been both inspiring and humbling to witness the multitude of diverse people who have been able to advance their dreams towards gaining meaningful employment, as well as embracing life-long learning opportunities.

City College is continuously evolving and our physical facilities reflect the needs of our community. On the occasion of our 75th Anniversary, our new Multi-Use Building opened in Fall 2010. Taken with our other new and newly renovated campus buildings (such as the Health and Wellness Center, Child Care Center, Mission Campus, John Adams Campus), City College has a revitalized look and feel which has engendered excitement and opportunity for all students. We are also enormously pleased that the Chinatown / North Beach Campus will give the College a permanent home in the northeast part of San Francisco in Spring 2012.

I would like to personally thank the countless number of participants in the self-study. The making of a self-study is never an easy process. The dialog among and between constituent groups was difficult at times, as expected, when the stakes are high. Discussions on student learning outcomes, the achievement gaps, the budget, succession planning, and long-term sustainability continue to be a focus for our institution. The self-study process has helped our institution with the framework to discuss many complex questions and to continue to promote evidence based decision making. Most important, it is with City College of San Francisco’s shared values that we have undertaken this self-study seriously and present an honest reflection of our strengths and weaknesses with the goal of continuous improvement, constantly raising the bar of excellence we strive to achieve.
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review and discuss the eligibility requirements for accreditation. The committee
agrees that City College of San Francisco continues to meet each of the 21
eligibility requirements for accreditation set by the Western Association of
Schools and Colleges.
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for Schools and Colleges.

Dr. Don Q. Griffin, Chancellor
City College of San Francisco

John Rizzo, President, Board of Trustees,
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City College of San Francisco offers classes at 9 campuses, 24 additional principal sites, and nearly 200 other instructional sites.

A. Ocean Campus,
   50 Phelan Ave.

B. Castro Campus,
   450 Church St.

C. Civic Center Campus,
   750 Eddy St.

D. Chinatown/North Beach Campus,
   940 Filbert St.

E. Downtown Campus,
   88 Fourth St.

F. John Adams Campus,
   1860 Hayes St.

G. Evans Campus,
   1400 Evans Ave.

H. Mission Campus,
   1125 Valencia St.

I. Southeast Campus,
   1800 Oakdale Ave.
Identified below are some of CCSF’s larger instructional sites.

1. San Francisco Senior Center
2. Marina Middle School
3. St. Mary’s CH/NB Annex
5. On Lok
6. Jewish Community Center
7. Laurel Hill Nursery School
8. Park Presidio Church
9. S.F. Human Services Department
10. Glide Memorial Church
11. Plumbing Apprentice Union
12. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Community Center
13. Mission High School
14. El Colegio de Mision
15. Mission Language Vocational School
16. Sunset Community Educational Center
17. Stationary Engineers JATC
18. YMCA (Stonestown)
19. Recreation Center for the Handicapped
20. Jewish Home for Aged
21. Visitacion Valley Community Center
22. Ft. Mason Center, Bldg. B
23. Adult Learning and Tutorial Center
24. Airport, Bldg. 928
**Table of Contents**

Prefatory Material ...................................................................................................................... i
Readers’ Guide...........................................................................................................................3
Introduction................................................................................................................................5
  History.....................................................................................................................................5
City and College Data.................................................................................................................10
Responses to CCSF Major Findings (2006 Action Plans).........................................................45
Longitudinal Student Achievement .........................................................................................57
Program Review.......................................................................................................................57
Student Learning Outcomes.................................................................................................59
Off-campus sites (to be supplied later) and Distance Learning.............................................63
External audit and Use of Federal Grant Monies...................................................................64
Abstracts of the Standards .................................................................................................65
Organization for the Self Study ............................................................................................79
Organization of the Institution (org charts to be supplied later)
  Eligibility Requirements .................................................................................................83
  Responses to WASC Recommendations, 2006 ...............................................................87
Standards Reports ..............................................................................................................109
  Standard I.A: Institutional Mission.................................................................................109
  Standard I.B: Institutional Effectiveness .......................................................................121
  Standard II.A: Instructional Services .............................................................................135
  Standard II.B: Student Support Services ......................................................................197
  Standard II.C: Library and Learning Support Services .................................................219
  Standard III.A: Human Resources ................................................................................243
Readers’ Guide

This draft is a work in progress. It is being circulated so that people can suggest revisions, deletions, and additions. The deadline for suggested revisions is Halloween, but early responses in September will be greatly appreciated.

Some sections remain to be written, and some sections, particularly in the introduction, were written late in the process and have not been checked. In particular, no one has yet compared the facts cited in the introduction to determine that they are consistent with the facts cited in the Standards. If you note such a discrepancy, please point it out. Given that references are supplied for virtually all facts in the Standards, it is most likely that the information in the Standards is more accurate.

Our thanks to all who responded over the summer to requests for various pieces of information and reference documents. In some cases, especially in the references, responses to our requests outstripped our ability to incorporate the material received. The process of completing references is continuing.

For suggested additions, deletions, and revisions, the editing criteria will be

Is it accurate?

Is it verifiable?

Is it responsive and relevant to the Standard?

Is it clear?

Is it stylistically and grammatically correct?

To facilitate the editors’ efforts to incorporate your suggested revisions into the text, please start by making a copy of the entire page(s) you want to change. On this separate copy, indicate the page number you copied and use Track Changes to show what you think should be deleted or added. Send the separate copy, with the proposed changes as an e-mail attachment. Address your e-mail to Larry Klein if you are using GroupWise. lklein@ccsf.edu
History of City College of San Francisco

As of 2012, City College of San Francisco has served the educational needs of its city for over 75 years. During that time, the College has evolved into a multicultural, multi-campus community college that is one of the largest in the country. The College was founded in response to a demand from the citizens for a public institution to serve both the academic and the vocational needs of students as an integral part of the San Francisco Unified School District. It was first housed in temporary facilities at the University of California Extension Division building and at Galileo High School. Classes began on September 1,1935 with an enrollment of 1,074 students and 74 faculty members. The enrollment rapidly increased, and, four years later, the College was holding classes in 22 locations. The San Francisco Board of Education approved a building plan for the College in 1937, which included a 56-acre site bordering Balboa Park at Phelan Avenue. The 1937 ground-breaking ceremony, conducted by Mayor Angelo Rossi, led to the 1940 opening of the Science Hall and the North and South Gymnasiums to approximately 3,200 students.

The once steadily growing enrollment was reversed when the United States entered World War II; however, the College provided educational training to the Army and Navy personnel. By 1947, the enrollment was on the rise again as returning veterans joined high school graduates pursuing their college degrees. To provide sufficient classroom space, the College acquired the adjoining U.S. Navy WAVES Separation Center across Phelan Ave., used Excelsior School as an annex, and scheduled its first evening classes.

Federal and State grants and the passage of a school bond issue made funds available for the College to continue its building program. Cloud Hall was completed in 1954, Smith Hall in 1955, the Creative Arts Building and the Track and Field in 1961, Statler Wing in 1964, the Horticulture Center in 1965, and the Visual Arts Building and the Student Union in 1970. In 1970, the College was separated from the San Francisco Unified School District, and a new entity, the San Francisco Community College District, was formed. This new entity included not only the College but also the Adult and occupational Education Division of the unified district. Responding to the expressed community need, the College maintained these neighborhood education programs composed primarily of noncredit courses.

Because of rapid growth, the College subsequently formed two separate divisions: one for credit courses located on the Balboa Park (Ocean) Campus; and one for noncredit courses offered throughout the City, under the umbrella of the San Francisco Community College District. This growth was also accompanied by additional building. The Arts Extension was completed in 1972, Conlan Hall in 1974, and Batmale Hall and the Downtown Campus in 1978.

The two divisions were merged in 1990, and a single City College of San Francisco was created. The College has grown over the last two decades and now offers both credit and
noncredit courses at nine campuses and nearly 200 neighborhood sites. The nine campuses are Castro, Chinatown/North Beach, Civic Center, Downtown, Evans, John Adams, Mission, Ocean, and Southeast. The College now employs almost 800 full-time and slightly more than 1,000 part-time faculty. Ninety-five (95) percent of faculty and administrators hold master’s degrees and approximately 200 hold doctorates. They teach approximately 85,000 credit and noncredit students annually.

Following are updates on changes relating to planning, administration and governance, new facilities, and infrastructure upgrades, and changes promoting student success that have taken place since the last accreditation review in 2006.

Planning

There have been several key accomplishments in the area of strategic planning. Following significant Shared Governance review and input, the most recent version of The Vision and Mission statements were adopted by the Board on April 29, 2010. A new Strategic Plan 2011-16 was drafted and released in August 2010. To formulate the draft the College hosted two Listening Sessions to gather input and information from key community, education, and workforce partners, in addition to holding retreats with the College leadership to delineate strategic priorities. After extensive review over a one-year period, the current document reflects the broadest level of input of any strategic plan the College has produced to date. The Board plans to adopt the 2011-16 Strategic Plan during Fall, 2011.

Administrative & Governance Updates

Administration

Since 2006, there have been several organizational shifts in the administration to make operations more efficient and in response to budgetary constraints. Currently there are six Vice Chancellor positions reporting to the Chancellor, including Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs; Vice Chancellor of Student Development; Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration; Vice Chancellor of Research and Policy (previously was Vice Chancellor of Institutional Advancement); Vice Chancellor of Campuses and Enrollment Services (new position); and Vice Chancellor of Legal Services (new position). Also reporting directly to the Chancellor are the Chief of Police, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor, Dean of Marketing and Public Information, and Chief Information Technology Officer.

Reporting to the Vice Chancellor of Research and Policy are the Associate Vice Chancellor of Government Relations, Assistant Director of Research, Dean of Development, Dean of Grants & Resource Development, and Associate Dean of Contract and Continuing Education. Reporting to the Vice Chancellor of Campuses and Enrollment Services are the Dean of Mission Campus, Dean of Civic Center Campus, Dean of Southeast/Evans Campus,
Dean of Admissions & Records, Dean of Financial Aid. Reporting to the Vice Chancellor of Legal Services is the Director of ADA Compliance/Assistant Legal Counsel.

Technology

In May 2009, the Board adopted the City College Technology Plan. The CCSF Technology Initiative, which had been implemented over the past several years with the help of the 2001 and 2005 bond initiatives, was initiated through prior technology planning and will continue to be guided by this new plan. In January 2010, under the general direction of the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the College posted the Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) position. In July 2010, the CITO was selected and is currently the senior technology administrator of the College providing visionary and operational leadership for strategic planning, implementation and improvement of instructional and administrative technologies.

Internal Audit Committee

Effective August 2009, the Chancellor convened the Chancellor’s Standing Internal Audit Committee (CSIAC) to address various audit findings, as well as other significant management issues that are raised with the Internal Auditor. This committee is comprised of the Chancellor, Acting General Counsel, and the District Internal Auditor. Each week, the Committee requests various administrators or members of the management team to appear before the committee to provide solutions to issues raised, and report on their progress with audit issues. This Committee also addresses complaints that are filed with the District Internal Auditor that relate to the objectives overseen by the Committee.

CCSF Foundation

In April 2010, the Board of Trustees ratified a Master Agreement with the Foundation. The Master Agreement forms the underpinning of the working relationship between the District and the Foundation to meet their fundraising objectives. The passage was timely as the budget for the 2010-11 academic year included a $1.75 million assumption for fundraising, with an overall goal of raising $2 million to $3 million. Beginning in August 2010, the Chancellor held weekly meetings with a fundraising team including the Vice Chancellors, Dean of Development, the Foundation, and others to put a strong collective fundraising effort in place to support the financial future of the College. The Fundraising Team has developed a systematic process to document and formalize the coordination of fundraising efforts by the Foundation and District and developed a set of protocols and guidelines to enhance the opportunities for success in raising charitable dollars for the college.
Facilities & Infrastructure Upgrades

The citizens of San Francisco in 1997, 2001, and 2005 approved bond measures to improve, renovate, expand, and develop buildings and facilities for the San Francisco Community College District throughout the City. With bond funding the new Mission Campus opened in 2007 creating enthusiasm and renewed interest in higher education within the Mission District; renovation of the John Adams Campus has greatly improved our students’ educational experience; completion of the Health & Wellness Center, the Child Care Center, Student Health Center, and the new Multi Use Building have all revitalized the Ocean Campus; completion of the Chinatown/North Beach Campus (expected in Spring 2012) will give citizens in one of the most densely populated areas of the City a permanent campus.

Changes Promoting Student Success

Bridge to Success

In a groundbreaking partnership, the City and County of San Francisco, City College of San Francisco (CCSF), and the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) received a $3 million grant in Fall 2010 from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to be distributed over the next three years to align expectations between high school and college, strengthen data systems, and coordinate student services. The year prior, the San Francisco Post-Secondary Success Partnership (CCSF, SFUSD, and the City and County of San Francisco) received a $250,000 planning grant to bring together mayors and other municipal leaders, K-12 superintendents, and community colleges to devise new ways of helping more students successfully complete an education beyond high school. The Bridge to Success program will enable the College to strengthen partnerships and collaborate closely with SFUSD to double the number of students who are completing their post-secondary degrees. Focusing on student success and completion throughout the whole educational process will promise the next generation a rewarding role in the workplace of the 21st century.

Through this partnership CCSF has piloted increasing access to classes for entering SFUSD students; results have indicated a significant increase in the average number of credits enrolled per student. The pilot project provided priority registration for matriculated San Francisco Unified School District students. It was successful in increasing the total number of enrolled units, particularly in Math and English, and these students performed very well with retention rates over 85 percent.

Student Equity Initiatives

In May 2010, the Chancellor’s Office organized a special task force to strategically work on the planning and assessment of City College’s intervention efforts to address the student achievement gap, and to assist in the implementation of those plans with the various College divisions and departments. The taskforce includes representatives of all College
constituencies (faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators), as well as key leaders of shared governance committees. Initiatives in the following areas are underway: English Course Sequencing, Math Course Sequencing, Financial Aid, Student Placement Testing, Student Registration, Student Employment, International Students, AB540 Students.

*Counseling*

Despite continuing devastating cuts to counseling and other student support services, the counseling faculty at CCSF continues to meet students’ counseling needs and fulfill other areas of their professional responsibilities. Counselors saw 6% more students in fall 2010 than in fall 2009 (20,036 unduplicated students and 26,865 student drop-ins and appointments). In addition to their counseling responsibilities, counselors taught college success, career, and orientation classes. The counseling intern program is entering its fourth year and continues to provide excellent training and practical experience to graduate students interested in becoming community college counselors.

*Financial Aid*

The Financial Aid Office also continues to provide leadership in the partnership between City College of San Francisco and Single Stop USA. Our Single Stop sites at the Mission Campus and Ocean Campus have become a national model for this program. The program helps City College students surmount the financial barriers that stand between them and a college degree. Together, CCSF and Single Stop link students and their families to a wide array of government supports, including food stamps, health insurance, tax refunds, legal advice, financial counseling, and child-care assistance. Single Stop USA sites are currently at the Southeast Campus, Ocean Campus, and the Mission Campus, and the Office of Financial Aid has begun the process of offering income tax preparation services at the John Adams campus. The College’s goal is to open Single Stop sites at all major CCSF campuses.

*Veterans Resource Center*

On October 15, 2010, the College conducted a Grand Opening of the Veteran Educational Transitional Services (VETS) Center and Veterans Resources Center. Nearly 300 people attended the event which was the culmination of efforts begun in Spring 2010 by the Veterans Task Force to create a welcoming all-in-one space for veterans to obtain student services as well as a center for boosting camaraderie. The number of veterans the College serves is increasing (from about 150 veteran students in Spring 2009 to more than 500 veteran students in Spring/Fall 2010). The College has initiated a loan program to help veterans be successful in their educational pursuits and is implementing a Student Veteran Emergency Loan funded by the District ($150,000) and Wells Fargo ($30,000). The Center has drawn much media attention and was featured on Channel 7 News, as well as articles and interviews in magazines such as GI Jobs. The College was honored by a special visit by Congresswoman Jackie Speier so that she could learn more about the program.
City and College Data

I. San Francisco Population

City College of San Francisco is located in the City and County of San Francisco, the fourth largest city in California with a current population of slightly more than 800,000. The California Department of Finance projects that the population will increase 2% by 2016. San Francisco is a diverse city with substantial Asian and Latino/a populations. It is also a graying population that is projected to age even more. By 2016 the percent of the population over 50 will have increased by 6%. The youngest age groups under 20 will also increase. It is the middle age ranges from 20 through 49 that will show a decrease. The school age population also reflects these trends. While the K-8 population is projected to increase, the high school population and graduates are projected to decrease. Legal immigration decreased in the 1990's and is now flat to declining.

San Francisco residents are well paid. Per capita income is 60% higher than the rest of California and slightly more when compared to the U.S as a whole. This is in part due to the educational level of its residents. In 2007 nearly half of residents over 25 held a bachelor's degree or higher. Nonetheless, income disparity exists in the City. 6% of the 142,000 plus households make less than $15,000 per year. 30% make less than $50,000.

CCSF plays in important role in facilitating economic mobility. Nearly 8 in 100 San Francisco residents take classes at CCSF each year. In a survey done in June 2005, over a third of respondents said they had personally taken classes and 72% had friends or family who had taken classes at CCSF.

\[1\] This document represents data beginning in 2000 or 2001 and continuing to 2010-11. Projections from external agencies to 2016 are included to cover the accreditation cycle.

\[2\] CCSF Environmental Scan

Graph 1.1
San Francisco Population Actual and Projected 2001 to 2016

Table 1.1
San Francisco Population Actual and Projected 2001 to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF Residents</td>
<td>786,889</td>
<td>793,564</td>
<td>805,810</td>
<td>818,163</td>
<td>828,670</td>
<td>836,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CA Department of Finance (http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/data/)
Graph 1.2
San Francisco Ethnicity/Race Actual and Projected 2001 to 2016
Table 1.2
San Francisco Ethnicity/Race Actual and Projected 2001 to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>349,761</td>
<td>354,792</td>
<td>362,673</td>
<td>371,040</td>
<td>379,299</td>
<td>386,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>243,704</td>
<td>247,114</td>
<td>251,106</td>
<td>254,228</td>
<td>256,558</td>
<td>257,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>110,892</td>
<td>109,177</td>
<td>109,328</td>
<td>110,072</td>
<td>109,919</td>
<td>109,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>59,282</td>
<td>56,272</td>
<td>54,680</td>
<td>53,759</td>
<td>52,828</td>
<td>51,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CA Department of Finance (http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/data/)

Note: This table does not include the 'Other' category; thus the categories presented here do not add up to the totals in Table 1.1. The percents are calculated based on the totals in Table 1.1.
Graph 1.3

Age Actual and Projected in San Francisco 2001 to 2016

Table 1.3

Age Actual and Projected in San Francisco 2001 to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>99,678</td>
<td>101,375</td>
<td>104,522</td>
<td>110,915</td>
<td>117,217</td>
<td>120,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>25,469</td>
<td>22,894</td>
<td>22,602</td>
<td>20,788</td>
<td>18,788</td>
<td>19,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>50,229</td>
<td>37,167</td>
<td>32,768</td>
<td>31,413</td>
<td>30,265</td>
<td>27,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>93,406</td>
<td>76,310</td>
<td>58,789</td>
<td>50,145</td>
<td>46,147</td>
<td>45,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>290,750</td>
<td>316,329</td>
<td>337,592</td>
<td>344,707</td>
<td>344,680</td>
<td>335,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>227,357</td>
<td>239,489</td>
<td>249,537</td>
<td>260,195</td>
<td>271,573</td>
<td>288,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CA Department of Finance (http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/data/)
Graph 1.4
School Age Population Actual and Projected in San Francisco 2001 to 2016

Table 1.4
School Age Population Actual and Projected in San Francisco 2001 to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total K-8</td>
<td>41,075</td>
<td>38,551</td>
<td>36,791</td>
<td>38,247</td>
<td>41,654</td>
<td>43,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 9-12</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>20,163</td>
<td>20,553</td>
<td>17,422</td>
<td>15,859</td>
<td>16,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduates</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>3,791</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>2,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CA Department of Finance
(http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/projections/k-12/view.php)
Table 1.5
Legal Immigration into San Francisco 1999 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Immigrants</td>
<td>7,024</td>
<td>9,472</td>
<td>7,551</td>
<td>8,879</td>
<td>9,238</td>
<td>7,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CA Department of Finance
(http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/repndat.htm)
II. San Francisco Economy

Graph 2.1
Per Capita Income 1999 to 2009

Table 2.1
Per Capita Income 1999 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$49,230</td>
<td>$56,612</td>
<td>$54,415</td>
<td>$63,119</td>
<td>$70,455</td>
<td>$68,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$30,679</td>
<td>$33,890</td>
<td>$34,977</td>
<td>$38,767</td>
<td>$43,240</td>
<td>$42,395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2

Income Distribution in San Francisco 2005 - 2009 Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>2005-09 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Families</td>
<td>142,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>12.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median family income*</td>
<td>86,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean family income*</td>
<td>122,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census

(http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Products/Profiles/Chg/2003/ACS/Tabular/001/A4000US0033.htm)

---

44 In 2009 Inflation Adjusted Dollars
III. Profile of City College Students

City College of San Francisco has served approximately 100,000 students annually during the past ten years. Recent budget cuts have limited the number of students served. In 2010, the summer session was cut over 90 percent. In fall 2010, sections offered were reduced 6%. The result can be seen in Table 3.2. Academic year enrollment fell over 10,000. Nonetheless, a healthy spring 2011 where fewer students enrolled in more units led to nearly equal Full-time Equivalent student numbers with the prior year (Table 3.3).

In credit the decline in headcount enrollment was seen mostly in Asian and White populations whereas African-American and Hispanic/Latino populations increased. In noncredit, the population decline in enrollment was more uniform across all ethnic/racial groups. Declines were also more uniform in credit and noncredit by age and gender (Table 3.5 and 3.6).

CCSF offers both credit and noncredit classes. Noncredit classes differ from credit in that they are open enrollment and have no grade attached to them. Over the years, there has been considerable cross over by students between the two areas. In credit, 33% of students in 2000-01 had taken a noncredit course previously while 14% of noncredit students had previously taken a credit course. Those percents have been moving in opposite directions. In the most recent year 29% of credit students have previously taken a noncredit course while 16% of noncredit students had taken a credit course (Table 3.7).

The residency of credit students (Table 3.8) shows that the most recent enrollment decline has been of California residents. Foreign and out-of-state enrollment have increased. Also increasing over the past ten years have been the number of students receiving both financial aid and fee waivers. Almost 4,000 more students in the most recent year received either a fee waiver or financial aid than two years ago.

Another interesting trend has been the slowly increasing percent of students in credit courses either placing in or attaining through English and mathematics sequences a collegiate level of ability. In 2000-01 collegiate level students made up about 20% of students (excluding the unknown ability level). Now collegiate level students make up 25% of the population. This may be in part due to the increasing number of collegiate level mathematics placements which now make up slightly more than one-third of all such placements.

---

5 When not otherwise cited, the source of the following tables is the Office of Research and Planning.
### Table 3.1

Participation Rate\(^6\) 2000-01 to 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF PARTICIPATION RATE</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2

Annual Enrollment 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit + Noncredit (unduplicated)</td>
<td>93,850</td>
<td>100,699</td>
<td>90,125</td>
<td>89,348</td>
<td>95,457</td>
<td>84,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,717</td>
<td>54,025</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>49,627</td>
<td>51,701</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>44,414</td>
<td>38,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Programs</td>
<td>6,771</td>
<td>6,313</td>
<td>8,388</td>
<td>7,625</td>
<td>7,344</td>
<td>7,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT/Garment 2000</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College for Teens</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>5,217</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>4,716</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>2,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Ed &amp; Title IV-E</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>3,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Internat'l Students</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual</td>
<td>100,621</td>
<td>107,012</td>
<td>98,513</td>
<td>96,973</td>
<td>102,801</td>
<td>91,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning

\(^6\) The participation rate is the percent of the population of San Francisco that is enrolled at CCSF in any given year.
Graph 3.2
Credit and Noncredit Headcount Enrollment and Total Unduplicated Headcount by Academic Year 2000-01 to 2010-11

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Graph 3.3
FTES 2005-06 to 2010-11

Table 3.3
FTES 2005-06 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>24,541</td>
<td>24,615</td>
<td>26,102</td>
<td>27,490</td>
<td>27,194</td>
<td>28,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>12,176</td>
<td>11,744</td>
<td>11,826</td>
<td>12,218</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>10,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,717</td>
<td>36,359</td>
<td>37,928</td>
<td>39,708</td>
<td>38,944</td>
<td>38,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning

The data source is identical to that used for 320 calculations, with the following clarifications:

1) These FTES totals include non-resident FTES, as well as resident FTES.

2) FTES for the Prior Summer is included for each academic year. For example, 2010-11 data consists of Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011. This differs from the methodology used for the 320 Report, which adjusts summer each year based upon the conditions for that particular year.

3) Data above do not include FTES from State Flex Factor.
Table 3.4
Credit and Noncredit Ethnicities Headcount 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>African American/Non</td>
<td>4,087</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>4,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,783</td>
<td>15,768</td>
<td>13,030</td>
<td>13,119</td>
<td>14,628</td>
<td>12,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>7,058</td>
<td>7,649</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>7,286</td>
<td>8,494</td>
<td>9,119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non White</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouthEast Asian</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non Hispanic</td>
<td>14,683</td>
<td>15,926</td>
<td>13,543</td>
<td>13,549</td>
<td>14,808</td>
<td>13,094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,827</td>
<td>51,701</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>44,441</td>
<td>38,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>African American/Non</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>1,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17,960</td>
<td>18,903</td>
<td>17,291</td>
<td>16,756</td>
<td>15,639</td>
<td>14,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>13,184</td>
<td>14,062</td>
<td>11,576</td>
<td>11,038</td>
<td>11,557</td>
<td>9,926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non White</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouthEast Asian</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>8,198</td>
<td>6,369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non Hispanic</td>
<td>7,475</td>
<td>6,625</td>
<td>5,515</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>4,644</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Graph 3.5
Credit and Noncredit Gender Headcount 2000-01 to 2010-11

Table 3.5
Credit and Noncredit Gender Headcount 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25,810</td>
<td>28,921</td>
<td>26,456</td>
<td>26,607</td>
<td>29,333</td>
<td>25,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20,864</td>
<td>22,430</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>20,870</td>
<td>24,190</td>
<td>22,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25,085</td>
<td>25,648</td>
<td>22,930</td>
<td>23,137</td>
<td>23,639</td>
<td>21,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18,327</td>
<td>18,783</td>
<td>16,160</td>
<td>16,339</td>
<td>16,413</td>
<td>13,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6,415</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>4,871</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>3,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,827</td>
<td>51,701</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>44,411</td>
<td>38,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.6
Credit and Noncredit Age Headcount 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25,810</td>
<td>28,921</td>
<td>26,456</td>
<td>26,607</td>
<td>29,333</td>
<td>25,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20,864</td>
<td>22,430</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>20,870</td>
<td>24,190</td>
<td>22,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25,085</td>
<td>25,648</td>
<td>22,930</td>
<td>23,137</td>
<td>23,639</td>
<td>21,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18,327</td>
<td>18,783</td>
<td>16,160</td>
<td>16,339</td>
<td>16,413</td>
<td>13,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6,415</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>4,871</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>3,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,827</td>
<td>51,701</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>44,441</td>
<td>38,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 3.7
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Table 3.7

Percent of Students Enrolled in Credit Who Have Taken Noncredit, and Students Enrolled in Noncredit Who Have Taken Credit, 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>CR&amp;NC</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit Only</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit Total</td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>CR&amp;NC</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NonCredit Only</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noncredit Total</td>
<td>49,827</td>
<td>51,701</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>44,441</td>
<td>38,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.8

Residency of Credit Students 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Resident</td>
<td>44,973</td>
<td>49,920</td>
<td>45,306</td>
<td>45,157</td>
<td>51,197</td>
<td>45,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Non-Resident</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>1,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9

Board of Governors Grant (BOGG) Fee Waiver Credit Students 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee Waiver</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>9,064</td>
<td>13,019</td>
<td>13,487</td>
<td>15,289</td>
<td>19,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Fee Waiver</td>
<td>39,549</td>
<td>43,434</td>
<td>34,211</td>
<td>34,224</td>
<td>38,770</td>
<td>29,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 3.10

Headcount of Students Receiving Financial Aid in Credit 2000-01 to 2009-10

Table 3.10

Headcount of Students Receiving Financial Aid in Credit 2000-01 to 2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,218</td>
<td>8,824</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>11,886</td>
<td>14,493</td>
<td>17,676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/sfawards.cfm
Graph 3.11a
Receipt of Matriculation Services in Credit 2000-01 to 2010-11

Graph 3.11b
Receipt of Matriculation Services in Noncredit 2000-01 to 2010-11
Table 3.11
Receipt of Matriculation Services in Credit and Noncredit 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>0 Services</td>
<td>22,714</td>
<td>24,940</td>
<td>19,680</td>
<td>21,191</td>
<td>23,715</td>
<td>17,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Service</td>
<td>5,577</td>
<td>6,221</td>
<td>5,136</td>
<td>5,158</td>
<td>7,285</td>
<td>8,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Services</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>5,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Services</td>
<td>17,173</td>
<td>19,314</td>
<td>20,465</td>
<td>19,189</td>
<td>19,760</td>
<td>17,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>0 Services</td>
<td>30,303</td>
<td>28,643</td>
<td>23,700</td>
<td>21,921</td>
<td>21,996</td>
<td>19,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Service</td>
<td>3,122</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>6,236</td>
<td>6,455</td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Services</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>3,366</td>
<td>3,663</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>4,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Services</td>
<td>13,917</td>
<td>17,120</td>
<td>14,215</td>
<td>12,059</td>
<td>10,905</td>
<td>10,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,827</td>
<td>51,701</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>44,441</td>
<td>38,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 3.12
Placed or Attained Level of All Students in Credit\textsuperscript{7}  
2000-01 to 2010-11

Table 3.12
Placed or Attained Level of All Students in Credit 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collegiate</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper precollegiate</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower precollegiate</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credit total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{7} Unknown category removed.
Table 3.13
Placement of Students 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper PreCollegiate</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Precollegiate</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>8,033</td>
<td>10,108</td>
<td>10,140</td>
<td>9,973</td>
<td>11,543</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper PreCollegiate</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Precollegiate</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>14,510</td>
<td>11,824</td>
<td>10,801</td>
<td>13,146</td>
<td>11,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper PreCollegiate</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Precollegiate</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4,798</td>
<td>5,836</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>3,849</td>
<td>3,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Student Opinion of CCSF

Two surveys have been performed that are very similar - enough to compare changes in students' perception of CCSF from 2004 to 2010. Graph 4.1 presents the percentage of students who think they have accomplished their goals at CCSF. This graph shows the positive percentages to have declined slightly. Similarly the percentage of students who would recommend CCSF to a friend has declined. Table 4.3 presents percentage change in ratings from 2004 to 2010 on a host of specific variables. Here the view of CCSF is much more positive. In many counseling departments excellent ratings increased 10% or more while good, fair and poor ratings declined. Similar increases can be seen in child care, food services, parking, student activities, job placement and the student health center.

Graph 4.1

How successful have you been so far achieving at CCSF what you wanted to do at CCSF?

Note: Results are based on 3,071 respondents in 2004 and 4,376 in 2010.

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Graph 4.2

Would you recommend CCSF to a friend?

Note Results based on 3,034 respondents in 2004 and 4,292 in 2010.
Table 4.3

Percent Change in 2010 Student Opinion compared to 2004 on a Scale from 1 to 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Change in Rating 2004 to 2010</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction in your CCSF classes</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of courses</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of courses</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of class scheduling (times available)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of classes</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSF Application Process</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Testing</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Course Time Schedule</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online College Catalog</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Registration &amp; Online Add/Drop</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Counseling (Conlan Hall)</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Student Counseling (MUB, B606, SH106, C207, A201)</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Counseling / Transfer Center (Science Hall)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development &amp; Placement Center (CDPC)</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Center</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services / Cafeteria</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement assistance</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>-13.4</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Center</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondent groups vary by question but overall respondents for entire survey were 3,095 in 2004 and 4,493 in 2010.
V. Student Performance

The tables in section five address not only student course success, but also the variables of units per year and persistence to the following year which underlie long-term goal achievement. For students to achieve their long-term goals they must not only pass their classes, but they must also persist to following semesters and years. Taking higher unit loads reduces the time they must spend in the educational process and since a certain percent of the population drops out with every addition term, shorter time spans to completion increase the likelihood of goal attainment.

Course success at CCSF has been stable to increasing slightly, whether that be overall, or in transfer or basic skills courses. In comparison to statewide averages, CCSF has had somewhat higher course success (Tables 5.1 to 5.3). The number of units taken per year by students has been increasing. From 2008-09 to 2010-11, the average number of units taken has increased by 1 unit. That's a 9% increase. In comparison to 2000-01, the increase has been over 20%. The increase has been at all ability levels. Persistence to the following year has also increased slightly, but that increase has tended to be in the collegiate population.

The rate of students receiving degrees and certificates through 2009-10 has been relatively flat (Table 5.6). This is undoubtedly related to the size of the student population and one would expect that degree and certificate issuance would lag enrollment by perhaps two or three years. Nonetheless, awards have not changed much over the ten year time period. Similarly, transfers have been relatively stable over this time period too. The fall off in 2009-10 was due to the CSU system not accepting mid-year transfers. They made up for that in fall 2010 and consequently the number of CSU transfers increased from 648 in 2009-10 to 1,349 in 2010-11.

These graduation and transfer numbers can be directly related to enrollment, course success, units per term and year and persistence to following terms and years. In the specific case of transfer, the numbers can also be related to the availability of spots at the CSU and UC systems and cost of attendance there.

Once students get to the CSU system where the largest number of transfer students go, their success surpasses that of first year transfer students system-wide. Moreover, their success has increased over the 10 year time period and the gap between CCSF and system-wide GPA has widened (Table 5.8).

Table 5.9 presents the last piece of the achievement picture. The time it takes for a student to get a degree (of those students who got a degree) was 8 fall and spring semesters. That number is rising slightly. For those students who get a certificate, the time it takes is about six semesters.
Table 5.1
Success in all Courses 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF</td>
<td>67.33%</td>
<td>71.08%</td>
<td>69.93%</td>
<td>69.48%</td>
<td>70.51%</td>
<td>70.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>67.10%</td>
<td>67.86%</td>
<td>67.72%</td>
<td>66.96%</td>
<td>66.95%</td>
<td>68.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community Colleges Data Mart

Table 5.2
Success in all Transfer Courses 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF</td>
<td>68.43%</td>
<td>72.23%</td>
<td>70.99%</td>
<td>70.49%</td>
<td>71.67%</td>
<td>71.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>67.49%</td>
<td>67.94%</td>
<td>68.03%</td>
<td>66.91%</td>
<td>66.90%</td>
<td>68.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community Colleges Data Mart

Table 5.3
Success in Basic Skills Courses 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF</td>
<td>52.34%</td>
<td>62.76%</td>
<td>63.77%</td>
<td>63.68%</td>
<td>64.31%</td>
<td>62.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>58.86%</td>
<td>61.01%</td>
<td>60.33%</td>
<td>59.69%</td>
<td>60.36%</td>
<td>62.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community Colleges Data Mart
Table 5.4
Units Taken per Student in each Academic Year 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Pre-Collegiate</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>11.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning

Table 5.5
Persistence to the Following Academic Year 2000-01 to 2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Pre-Collegiate</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Pre-Collegiate</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning

---

8 Note: Persistence for the 2010-11 year is not yet available.
Table 5.6

Degrees and Certificates 2000-01 to 2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community College Data Mart (https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/awards.cfm)

Table 5.7

Transfers 2000-01 to 2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC System</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU System</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>1,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Post Secondary Commission (http://www.cpec.ca.gov/)

Table 5.8

Performance of CCSF Students in their First Year of Transfer to the CSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF</td>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Admission GPA*</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Admission GPA**</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Systemwide</td>
<td>Post-Admission GPA**</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSU Analytic Studies (http://www.asd.calstate.edu/performance/ccc/ccc0001/index.shtml. (up to ccc0910)).

9 Note: No awards are yet available for the 2010-11 year.
10 Note: No GPA data is yet available for the 2010-11 year.
Table 5.9
Semesters to Degree or Certificate 2000-01 to 2009-10\textsuperscript{11}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning

VI. Administrators, Faculty, and Classified Staff

City College of San Francisco employed 2,703 Administrators, Faculty and Classified Staff in fall 2010. This is down from 2,890 in fall 2004 - a decline of 6.5%. This was at the same time when the student headcount enrollment declined from 98,513 to 91,704 (7%) and FTES increased. It is important to note that the decline occurred in all occupational groups except full time faculty. The percentage increase of full time faculty has been 9% since 2004. Table 6.1 compares the demographic changes in the employee population.

\textsuperscript{11} Note: Fall and Spring semesters only. Entry of degrees and certificates have not yet been completed into Banner for the 2010-11 year.
### Table 6.1 - Administrators, Faculty and Classified Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Non Hispanic</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non Hispanic</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/ No Response/ Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Non Hispanic</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non Hispanic</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/ No Response/ Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Non Hispanic</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non Hispanic</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/ No Response/ Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Classified Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Non Hispanic</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non Hispanic</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/ No Response/ Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Human Resources.

NOTE: Data for 2006 and 2008 will be inserted in final version.

---

12 Calculated in Fall Terms Only.
Responses to CCSF Major Findings (2006 Action Plans)

Response to CCSF Action Plan #1

1. Develop an institutional plan through Shared Governance processes to further address the discussion, development, implementation, and assessment of student learning outcomes. (T.2, S.II.A)
   a. Support and train instructional and student development faculty and staff on development and assessment of learning outcomes at the course and program levels, including training of some faculty to act as resources to others, expanding participation and promoting time for dialog. (S.II.A, T.2, T.3, T.5)
   b. Develop human and financial resources to provide programs and services, expertise, and technology support necessary to implement student learning outcomes. (T.2)
   c. Bring students into the student learning outcomes discussions. (S.II.A)
   d. Explore the possible implications such an institutional plan could have for changes in institutional processes such as curriculum development and review, faculty and administrative evaluations, and institutional planning. (T.2, S.II.A)

Please see the response to WASC recommendation #3.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #2

Increase efforts to develop an integrated College curriculum: a. Support the integration of multicultural perspectives into College courses. (S.II.B) b. Promote cross-disciplinary and integrative learning communities. (T.3)

In response to recommendations formalized in the CCSF Student Equity Plan, the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) was developed in 2003. This is a faculty led, year long staff development program with the goal of introducing culturally relevant teaching and learning strategies into the classroom and counseling practices. Each year faculty are selected to participate in a series of workshops and seminars, including a poster session that disseminates those strategies. To date, 165 faculty have participated in the MIP program. The success of this project has translated into its inclusion as a priority in our Basic Skills Initiative Plan along with associated funding.

The College has a graduation requirement in Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Studies. Since 2006, 12 new courses have been approved by the Bipartite Committee and included on the list of courses meeting this requirement. (Appendix E). The creation of these courses, across nine academic departments, reflects broad institutional commitment to the integration of diverse perspectives into the curriculum. Currently within our curriculum, 117 courses meet the Ethnic Studies requirement, 30 courses satisfy the Women’s Studies option, and 32 courses meet the Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual alternative.
The Business Department Paralegal/Legal Studies Program is participating in the Destination Law School Program sponsored by the San Francisco Bar Association and the Diversity Internship Program of the Association of Legal Administrators in San Francisco to promote diversity in the legal profession. Both efforts should lead to introducing culturally relevant teaching and learning strategies in the classroom.

b) Cross disciplinary and integrative learning communities have been promoted and supported in the last two years. In Fall 2008, the Business Department offered the cross-disciplinary course “Women Leaders at Work (SUPV 236).” This course was developed, cross-registered, and offered in partnership with the Women’s Studies Department.

The Metropolitan Health Academy (MHA), initiated in Fall 2008, is a learning community made up of linked courses in each of two semesters, pairing a general education course and a core course in the Health Education and Community Services program. These classes take a carefully scaffolded approach to building specific competencies agreed on by faculty at both the community college and the university. As students proceed through the MHA sequence, they will experience course work that is reinforced from one class to another, and faculty that work with each other closely to share both knowledge of the students and effective pedagogy. Students demonstrate their mastery of competencies and knowledge by creating an electronic portfolio that meets explicit proficiency requirements.

The curriculum of the MHA contextualizes compelling issues in urban health into required general education courses (math, writing, critical thinking, and communication). Students learn by working with real issues in community health. MHA faculty work together in an interdisciplinary learning community. The linked courses share common learning objectives and integrated assignments. This model has been replicated for the Child Development program and plans are underway to secure funding to expand the model to a science discipline.

Elementary Algebra, Math 840, with a Women’s Study Focus is another interdisciplinary studies class that integrates into the standard Elementary Algebra curriculum discussions of gender bias and its intersection with culture, class, race, age, and disability. The course was developed to meet the challenges women continue to experience in mathematics classrooms. Issues of math anxiety, learning styles, and learning differences are addressed through the completion of a math study skills workbook. Students complete a math autobiography which challenges them to examine stereotypes and to explore the origins of their personal attitudes towards math. In addition, students discover the accomplishments of female mathematicians through a short research paper.

The Youth Worker Certificate was developed in partnership with several CCSF departments, including Health Education, Child Development and Family Studies, Administration of Justice, Women's Studies, Learning Assistance, Interdisciplinary Studies, and local employers. There are two Youth Worker Certificates at City College of San Francisco: 1) Youth Worker: Organizing, Advocacy, Counseling and Education and 2) Youth Worker: Child Development. The Organizing, Advocacy, Counseling and Education Certificate is based in the Health Education Department and designed to prepare individuals for positions working with youth ages 13–21 with community health
and social service agencies and programs. Youth Workers provide health education, client-centered counseling, and case management services, and conduct community organizing and advocacy in a wide variety of employment settings. As part of their education, students complete an internship with a local youth serving agency. The second certificate, based in the Child Development and Family Studies Department, focuses on preparing individuals to work in after-school and recreation settings with youth of all ages and also focuses on administration for those already working in the field seeking career advancement. Both certificates require student to take 1 unit (1-2 classes) of the Diversity and Social Justice courses in the Interdisciplinary Studies Department.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #3

Expand the College’s professional development program by establishing a teaching and learning center in support of faculty and staff to help meet the goals and objectives in the College’s Strategic Plan, especially Priority #1 (Basic Skills); Priority #2 (Academic Programs); Priority #3 (Workforce Development); and Priority #5 (Student Development). (S.III.A, T.1, T.3)

The Basic Skills Initiative has promoted campus dialog which has identified the development of a Teaching and Learning Center as a high priority. A committee of over 100 faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators confirmed this need. This included an emphasis on basic skills student success, teaching and learning strategies to reach nontraditional students, workforce development needs and the identification of critical gaps, and the effective delivery of services on behalf of all employees. While budgetary constraints have not allowed us to pursue the Teaching and Learning Center with basic skills funds, Perkins program development funds have been utilized to offer staff development with an emphasis on basic skills for career technical education.

The Student Development Division offers a robust internal professional development program for counseling faculty. Individual counseling departments include a professional development topic as part of their regular monthly department meeting. In 2007, the Dean of Counseling created a professional development seminar series offered to all counseling units across departments and divisions. Three to five topical seminars are offered each semester. In Spring 2011, an additional professional development track for counselors was added through the Bridge 2 Success (Gates) grant. Each semester, a series of three to four seminars are offered conjointly to CCSF counseling faculty and counselors from the SF Unified School District.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #4

Expand innovative methods of delivery of instruction and student services to meet the multiple needs of students. (S.II.B) a. Improve the dissemination of information on instructional pedagogies and evaluation techniques related to students’ diverse learning styles. (S.II.A) b. Expand the use of technologies for the delivery of student services. (S.II.B)
a) The supplemental instruction (SI) model is a new format introduced last year by the Learning Assistance Center. This model is funded jointly by College and grant funds. Group tutoring, linked to a specific course section, is led by a former student who was successful with that course and instructor. Specialized training is offered to the SI leader, who also is responsible for meeting with the content instruction for direction and exchange on student learning. In Fall 2008 fourteen SI groups served approximately 136 students in the disciplines of chemistry and psychology. In Spring 2011, only four SI groups are serving approximately 50 students in chemistry. This reduction is the result of the loss of grant funds; the College is currently seeking a new source of funding for SI groups.

Through the Basic Skills Initiative, College faculty have been able to participate in several statewide meetings and trainings introducing “Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges,” a publication that provides a literature review on basic skills and a description and evaluation of effective learning strategies and best practices. Also, faculty have been introduced to broader topics in teaching and learning by participating in the annual Student Success Conference. Since 2006, 120 CCSF faculty have attended these Student Success Conferences. Likewise, CTE faculty have been able to participate in campus based basic skills workshops piloted in the last year.

The College continues to offer traditional face-to-face classes. On-line class sections have increased from 92 sections in Spring, 2006 to 174 in Spring, 2011, with corresponding enrollments increasing from 2,732 to 5,564. The Educational Technology Department has provided support for on-campus instructors who want to use the learning management system, LMS, to provide web-based tools to enhance their courses. Referred to as technology-enhanced, or tech-enhanced, courses, instructors use the LMS for online discussions, to give students online quizzes, to post and collect assignments, etc. In Fall 2008, there were 79 sections of tech-enhanced courses, serving approximately 3,100 students taught by 48 instructors. In Spring, 2011, ETD supported 253 tech-enhanced sections, an increase of over 100 percent from Fall, 2009.

In addition, numerous faculty are incorporating technology into their instructional methodologies through the use of blogs, websites, wikis, Youtube videos, and the entire array of so-called “Web 2.0” applications. Such incorporation happens both formally, as part of syllabi, and informally, as instructors adjust to the needs of their students and adapt to the most effective means for content delivery.

In Fall, 2011, ETD implemented a searchable database where faculty and students can search by question topic. The database, called Insight FAQ, is linked from the Insight Homepage. The database provides student support on topics related to Insight, CCSFmail (access and forwarding), and registration for online classes. The database also provides faculty with pedagogical information related to distance education. The database is accessible 24/7.

b) Student Services continues to pursue several innovative and technologically advanced methods of delivery of student services in order to meet the diverse and growing needs of
students. Students new to CCSF can access the new student orientation online. Computer placement testing appointments can be scheduled online through a system that will soon expand to include a pilot program to allow for scheduling counseling appointments online. Additional videos may be created to cover such topics as financial aid information and registration.

Currently the Financial Aid Office is implementing a document imaging system which will allow the office to create electronic files, and allow students to submit forms via the web and make the operation paperless. This will support our efforts to decentralize the office and provide services from any one of the more than 200 CCSF instructional sites.

The implementation of a new photo ID card began in Fall 2008.

The Admissions & Records Office implemented an online transcript ordering process in March 2011. This process has helped alleviate a majority of the ordering “log jam” and sped up the processing. This system is available during the normal operating hours of Web4. This system also processes payments, which has reduced the incoming orders and payments through the mail.

The Admissions & Records Office is currently working to develop and implement an online noncredit Web registration and attendance system. There is a team currently in place to create a “Pilot” for Web registration for the Spring 2012 semester. An attendance system has been created and it is in the final phase of testing.

Student Services has increased communication with students through different technological formats. Text message updates are sent to students and email communication has replaced paper mailings. Several CCSF Facebook pages are available to students including the main page maintained by the Office of Outreach and Recruitment which regularly posts informational videos, updates student-related information, and employs student ambassadors to answer student questions posted on the Facebook Wall.

**Response to CCSF Action Plan #5**

*Use appropriate data to establish a level of funding for instructional materials that anticipates the need to acquire core collections and instructional equipment for existing and new campus libraries and learning resources. (S.II.C)*

The College has not been able to do this in the current economic climate.

**Response to CCSF Action Plan #6**

*Develop a coordinated library/learning resources system to provide, maintain, and track the use of broadcast/audio/visual services so that a seamless and user-friendly system serves the instructional needs of faculty, staff, and students. (S.II.C)*

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
Please see the Response to WASC Recommendations in Standard II A Findings and Evidence -- BMS and AV

Response to CCSF Action Plan #7

Continue to improve the College’s planning, budgeting, and evaluation system.

a. Expand the number of College venues throughout the District to conduct dialogs on planning objectives, budget allocations, and assessment reports using current and additional College information and data. (S.I, S.II, T.3)
b. Ensure that the College’s Program Review System is integrated into the College’s Budget, Planning, and Evaluation System. (S.I, T.5)
c. Establish a schedule for the review of all major College business processes to identify improvement objectives that will be integrated into the College Planning and Budgeting System. (S.III.D)

Please see the Response to WASC Recommendation #2 on Planning and Assessment.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #8

8. Establish a regular schedule of review of all curricula and link it with Program Review of all instructional and student services departments. (S.I, S.II.A)

Response needs to be written here. Is this done as part of Program Review?

Response to CCSF Action Plan #9

9. Develop criteria for terminating programs through appropriate institutional processes. (S.I, S.II.A)

The College has not done this.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #10

Continue to promote participation by the classified staff, faculty, administrators, and students within the College’s Shared Governance System. (S.IV)

CCSF has an ongoing policy of involving all constituents of the College (classified staff, faculty, administrators, and students) to the greatest extent possible in Shared Governance activities. The Office of Shared Governance publishes the Annual Report, Handbook, committee reports and minutes, maintains a Shared Governance website, and has a well-respected Shared Governance Coordinator (who is a classified staff member) who also provides online audio recordings for the College Advisory Council and the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council.
There is a concerted effort to review committee memberships for as balanced a representation as possible. One of the major Shared Governance pipelines, the College Advisory Council, chaired by the Chancellor, has equal membership from all of the above-mentioned groups.

The CCSF Academic Senate continues its efforts to promote faculty participation in the Shared Governance System. The Senate tries to ensure that search committees list Shared Governance participation among the examples of duties in faculty position announcements. The Senate notifies the faculty of committee vacancies through the District newsletter *City Currents*, in weekly emails, and by posting up-to-date information on the Academic Senate webpage. Starting in September, 2010, the Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees, the body that nominates faculty to Shared Governance committees, began holding its meetings in public sessions in order to promote openness and understanding of the process and to ensure Brown Act compliance. Academic Senate officers and the members of Shared Governance committees and subcommittees frequently recruit individual faculty members to broaden committee representation. There are currently 248 faculty members serving on 50 Shared Governance bodies.

The participation of students in the Shared Governance System is currently encouraged and supported through the Dean of Student Activities. The District Shared Governance Coordinator also gives an annual presentation to the newly elected Associated Student leadership. There is a position for a Student Governance Coordinator on the Associated Student Council who is responsible for recruiting and encouraging student attendance at Shared Governance meetings. Stipends for student attendees are also provided.

Administrative Shared Governance committee assignments are reviewed by the Executive Council of the Administrator's Association and submitted to the Chancellor for final approval.

The Classified Employees are appointed by the Service Employees International Union, Local 1021. The vacancies are advertised in the District newsletter, *City Currents*, as well as by email sent out to every District classified employee to announce these vacancies.

Data provided by the Office of Shared Governance reflect the following percentage of positions filled on Shared Governance committees by constituent groups; administrators 99 percent, classified 82 percent, faculty 89 percent, and students 68 percent. This reflects a 1 percent increase for the administrator participation and a 9 percent increase for the faculty participation, while the student participation remained the same as at the time of the midterm report. However, the classified employees’ participation reflects a dramatic decline of 12 percent. This could probably be attributed to the large scale of attrition amongst the classified employees due to budget crises the College is facing. The overall percentage of positions filled on Shared Governance committees is ___%.

An evaluation of the Shared Governance System is conducted every two years. The last one was conducted in Fall, 2009. There will be a full evaluation in Fall, 2011.

**Response to CCSF Action Plan #11**
Continue to improve College communication and publicity efforts.

a. Improve the College’s website for clarity, currency, content, and functionality of design. (S.II.A, S.II.B, T.6)

b. Expand EAtv/Channel 27 programming and improve access. (S.II.A, S.II.B, T.6)

c. Improve marketing and information about the campuses. (S.II.A, S.II.B, T.6)

d. Improve dissemination of College policies, especially those on academic freedom and student honesty. (S.II.A)

The website has undergone considerable improvement, and a campus group is continuing to work on website accuracy and functionality. See also the Response to WASC Recommendation in Standard II.A Conclusions -- Academic Freedom Statement

Response to CCSF Action Plan #12

Expand efforts to improve communication and coordination of information among counseling, library/learning resources, and instructional programs. (S.II.C)

The library dean is a participant in the academic deans monthly convening. At this forum, instructional and library presentations are made to keep all informed of new technologies, programs, strategies, services and resources. This forum has also been used by College administrators to communicate important information.

Instructional department chairs are frequent visitors at counseling department meetings. These forums provide an opportunity to exchange instructional information that is important to counselors as they advise students.

In 2009 the Library and Learning Resources Department created the Communication and Outreach Committee whose charge is to communicate and publicize library programs and services and available materials. They accomplish this by participating in the College Career Fair every semester and by publishing articles in the student newspaper, The Guardsman, the College newsletter, City Currents, and different department publications. The library has assigned a librarian to a newly created position to keep the communication and coordination of information among counseling, library/learning resources, and instructional programs available.

The Outreach and Community Librarian participated in Frisco Day along with other librarians to reach out to a citywide audience. All librarians do presentations and lectures at the invitation of department chairs and directors; some of the library presentations have been extended to faculty and counselors with a particular emphasis on content specific electronic resources and Read/Speak technology used for hearing impaired and ESL students.

The Outreach and Community Librarian teach instructional and library presentations to keep the College community informed of new technologies, programs, strategies, services, and resources. The outlying campus libraries are fully integrated with the Rosenberg Library at the Ocean Campus. Students at the campus sites have access to all
books, periodicals, journals and other library resources available at the main library. The satellite campuses are also staffed with full- and part-time counselors who work to improve communication and coordination of information with the credit and noncredit instructional programs offered at the sites. The College continues to expand curricular offerings and services at the satellite sites in an attempt to strengthen the opportunity of a comprehensive experience for students.

Four retention programs in the Academic Affairs Division (Asian Pacific American Student Success, Latino Services Network, African American Scholastic Program and TULAY: Filipino American Success Program), are structured to offer comprehensive services to students enrolled in the programs. Students enroll in designated course sections that have been designed to incorporate a required counseling component. Throughout the year, content faculty work closely with the program directors and counselors in selecting the courses to be offered, the faculty assigned to teach the courses, and the content emphasized, as appropriate.

Likewise, science, math, engineering, learning assistance, and counseling faculty are working on a two-year project to address student outreach, curriculum alignment, and instructional support in an attempt to increase the pipeline and success of students pursuing math based careers. This activity is funded by a Department of Education grant and is integrated with the development of a MESA (Math, Engineering, Science Achievement) program under Academic Affairs.

Also, in response to the self assessment conducted under the auspices of the statewide Basic Skills Initiative, the Academic Senate approved the newly created Basic Skills Ad Hoc Coordinating Committee. This committee’s charge will be to coordinate instruction and support services for students in basic skills courses.

Over the past several years the Office of the Dean of Counseling and Student Support, (within the Student Development Division) has implemented many initiatives and activities aimed at improving communication and coordination of information between counseling, library/learning resources, and instructional programs. Activities include:

- Professional Development seminars offered throughout the year to all counseling faculty detailing changes in academic requirements and programs;
- A required meeting for all counselors each semester to ensure accuracy and consistency in the dissemination of the most critical and relevant information impacting students;
- Several departmental Student Learning Outcome projects that create collaborations between instructional and counseling faculty that continually improve the communication and coordination of information between divisions and departments.
- Participation by a mix of faculty from different areas in the Job Placement Task Force which identified an improved tool for students, alumni, employers, and CTE Programs to use to connect our students with jobs and internships, to be implemented in Fall 2011.

In the noncredit sector, counselors are beginning to teach Transitional Studies courses in an effort to integrate classes with existing orientation workshops. Special orientations are
being created for specific academic departments, bringing faculty together through collaboration and sharing communication throughout each campus.

**Response to CCSF Action Plan #13**

*Continue to refine the College hiring procedures. a. Promote faculty recruitment programs and strategies to increase diversity of applicants and finalists. (S.III.A, T.6) b. Review hiring processes to find ways to streamline procedures. (S.III.A)*

**A. Promote faculty recruitment programs and strategies to increase diversity of applicants and finalists.**

The Human Resources Department, in collaboration with College constituents, works toward improving hiring procedures with the concerted effort of improving the diversity of our applicant pools and consequently the diversity of our new hires.

Working within the confines of a limited budget, we continue our goal to recruit diverse applicant pools by focusing efforts on utilizing cost-effective advertising and recruiting methods, i.e. no- or low-cost job advertising websites, attendance at no- or low-cost community job fairs. Advertising efforts continue to support statewide and national outreach efforts to capture candidates from across the state and country.

Various advertising media are utilized: a.) websites, such as monster.com, latinoperspectives.com, career.arizona.edu, career.berkeley.edu, craigslist.com, and higheredjobs.com); b.) discipline/trade journals, as specified by the hiring departments; and c.) local, state, and national newspapers, such as The Chronicle of Higher Education, Black Issues in Higher Education, Asian Week, Hispanic Outlook, Black Issues in Higher Education, Philippine News, Latino Perspectives in Higher Education, San Francisco Sunday Chronicle (including the Chronicle’s website which runs ads for an additional seven days), Community College Times, and San Jose Mercury News. Additionally, we contract with Jobelephant, a recruitment advertising agency that consolidates the placement of recruitment advertising with exceptional customer support without additional costs. The company is recognized worldwide by newspapers, internet job boards and trade journals as an authorized agent for employment advertising. They have placed our job ads in the following no- or low-cost publications: cccregistry.org, CSU East Bay JOBS4U, CSU Sacramento J.O.B., UC Berkeley’s CalJobs, Insidehighered.com, Higheredjobs.com, sfbay.craigslist.org, AsiansinHigherEd.com, IMDiversity.com, BlacksinHigherEd.com, and HispanicsinHigherEd.com. Due to budgetary constraints, the CCSF annual job fair was not held in the 2008 academic year. The staff participated in the California Community College Registry Job Fair held in January 2011.

The partial travel reimbursement and the District’s commitment to partially reimbursing finalists with their incurred relocation expenses, continues to serve as an incentive to recruit candidates from outside of the Bay Area.
B. Review hiring processes to find ways to streamline procedures.

In February 2008, the Human Resources Hiring Units implemented an automated applicant hiring/tracking system with the goal of streamlining the hiring processes and saving hiring managers/supervisors time by permitting them to create and submit job announcement requests online for review and approval using an electronic workflow. This system also allows hiring managers/supervisors to work directly with HR staff to track job announcements as they move through the approval process. Moreover, with this system applicants are provided automated notification both online and via email regarding application status.

For the period January 2010 through August 11, 2011, the Human Resources staff processed 5,295 academic applications and 1,280 classified applications. These numbers certainly reflect a positive response to our recruiting and advertising efforts.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #14

Expand College technology capacity.

a. Update the College technology plan. (S.III.C)

b. Expand training and expertise of technical support staff for the College’s technology infrastructure. (S.II.C, S.III.C)

c. Increase electrical capacity to support College technology needs. (S.III.C)

d. Establish standard replacement cycle for institutional computers and peripherals. (S.II.C)

Please see Response to WASC Recommendation #7 on Technology Planning

Response to CCSF Action Plan #15

Ensure the College’s long-term fiscal stability by developing and implementing a comprehensive plan to match ongoing spending with ongoing revenue. (S.III.D)

Please see Response to WASC Recommendation #4 on Financial Planning and Stability

Response to CCSF Action Plan #16

Conduct a review of the College’s current liabilities for retiree health benefits and develop a long-term plan to address this liability. (S.III.D)

See Response to WASC Recommendation #4 on Financial Planning and Stability

Response to CCSF Action Plan #17

Regularly review and develop, as needed, Board of Trustees policies, particularly policies on permanent maintenance of all student records; ethical behavior of employees; statement of economic interest; and Board self-evaluation. (T.6, S.IV, S.III.A, S.II.B)

In process
Response to CCSF Action Plan #18

Continue to improve the College facilities and College physical infrastructure.

a. Implement long-range planning for total costs of ownership for all new facilities and major equipment initiatives. (S.III.B)

b. Improve the College’s capacity to integrate long-term facilities planning with financial planning. (S.III.B)

See Response to WASC Recommendation #5 on Physical Facilities Maintenance Planning
Longitudinal Student Achievement Data

This section of the introduction is supposed to contain longitudinal student achievement data, including information on course completion, transfer rates, number of degrees and certificates awarded, student program completion, job placement, scores on licensure exams, persistence rates, retention rates, graduation rates, basic skills completion, success after transfer, etc.

Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review and Planning

City College of San Francisco has initiated a full review of and changes to our planning and program review processes. The College has described these in depth in several standards of the self study and also in the introductory section of the report.

The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making. Approximately every six years, the College reviews the Vision and Mission statements as noted above. These statements then drive the development of a Strategic Plan, a large-scale process involving a team of coordinators, listening sessions, presentations, drafting and re-drafting and the search for consensus. The Strategic Plan articulates priorities for the College’s focused improvement and innovation efforts, as well as major objectives associated with these priorities which are designed to move the College toward fulfilling our Vision and Mission. The Strategic Plan is explicitly connected to all other College-wide plans, including the College’s Annual Plan; this is one way by which all plans are continually linked back to the Vision and Mission.

Since 2006, the College has made substantial progress toward creating an integrated process of assessment, planning, and budgeting. The College has nearly completed a new Strategic Plan. It has modified our planning and budgeting system as well as completely revamped the Program Review Integrated Planning and Program Review system.

The Annual Plan was historically derived only from the College’s Strategic Plan. Under the old procedures, institutional leadership would use the Strategic Plan to identify prospective objectives for the new fiscal year. Under the procedures adopted in 2007/08, the leadership draws objectives from the Strategic Plan as well as other college-wide plans including the Technology Plan; the Facilities Master Plan; and the Education Master Plan (which includes plans for personnel augmentations). Other longer-range college-wide plans are also consulted during the annual planning process; these include the Sustainability Plan, Part 1, and the Student Equity Plan and related initiatives.

The College moved toward even deeper integration in 2011, drawing upon the new Program Review system. Both the Annual Plan and Annual Budget for 2011/12 were informed by 2010/11 Program Review results. In order for this to occur, the timeline for annual planning shifted from fall to spring. As Program Review is modified into a biennial system, the timeline will be further revised to optimize levels of integration. For several years the College published a Management and Budget Plan (MBP) that sought to show the relationship between the Annual Plan and the Annual Budget after both were published. This
Our new annual (soon to be biennial) Program Review system is inclusive for all units in the College. This new process was piloted in 2008/09. The pilot year was evaluated and several modifications were made for the 2009/10 cycle. Further improvements were made in 2010/11. The three years of annual implementation garnered nearly 100% participation from all units at the College.

The Program Review reports identify unit needs for new programming, staffing, equipment, supplies and facilities, as well as budget augmentation proposals during the February to May budget development process.

The shared governance Program Review Committee (PRC) coordinates the review of all submitted Program Review reports. Reports are reviewed by PRC subcommittees of college volunteers and by the immediate supervisor. This process serves as the first filter for reviewing unit-level planning objectives and budget requests.

Programs or services showing significant challenges with either operations or productivity levels will be identified and recommended for a special comprehensive program review. To date, no such units have been identified as College constituent groups have agreed that the Program Review process would not be punitive. However, the PRC has identified and suggested areas where units might work more closely together.

Based on the PRC subcommittees’ work, the PRC presents findings to and makes budget recommendations to its parent council, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), chaired by the Chancellor. The PRC clusters its findings under the subheadings of 1) Areas of Commendation, 2) Areas of Challenge, 3) New Resources Needed, and 4) Subcommittee Concerns, to frame the discussion. These broad findings inform the Annual Plan and the Annual Budget. In addition, the Program Review reports have been used by other College resource committees including the Faculty Position Allocation Committee and the Classified Vacancy Review Workgroup. When funding is appropriated, the instructional block grant workgroup will also refer to the reports.

Specific criteria for resource allocation were delineated and proposed by the PRC during the 2010/11 cycle. The College’s Planning and Budgeting Council has completed an initial review of the proposed criteria. The Council is expected to adopt a modified version of the proposed criteria in anticipation of the upcoming cycle.

In preparation for the change to a biennial cycle, a comprehensive evaluation will be undertaken by the PRC during Fall 2011—with guidance and input from the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council—with the goals of shared governance approval in Spring 2012 and implementation of the biennial process in Fall 2012. While some questions may be augmented or refined, it is expected that the biennial system will be comparable to the annual system.
The College’s Planning and Budgeting Council reviews the recommendations from the Program Review Committee. The Council then develops a set of budget recommendations for the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, drawing upon the PRC recommendations. The Board reviews and adopts a tentative budget in June of each year and a final budget in the following fall.

The College PBC and the Office of Research and Planning use the elements of the Strategic Plan and the results of the Program Review reports to prepare the Institutional Annual Plan for the upcoming year. Other college-wide plans that inform the Annual Plan are the Education Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Student Equity Plan, the Sustainability Plan and the Technology Plan. In addition, after each academic year the College PBC and the Office of Research and Planning evaluate the District’s progress on the Annual Plan; they publish the outcomes of this evaluation in an End-of-Year Assessment, which is also used to inform the development of the next Annual Plan.

CCSF’s program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. Also, the institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning. Therefore, CCSF is at the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement (SCQI) level of the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review and Planning.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

During the past three years, City College of San Francisco has been working on implementing an integrated planning process that includes the strategic plan, program review and annual plan. Concurrently, the College had dedicated focused attention and resources to the development and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, degree, and college level.

An SLO workgroup was convened in Spring 2009 to begin to address topics of importance to advancing the SLO assessment process. This included discussion on the preferred model for the College, and the development of professional development workshops for preliminary discussion of general education SLOs. The workgroup consists of nine members; three each from the Department Chairpersons Council, the Academic Senate, and administration. The group meets once a month during the fall and spring semesters.

An effective method for verifying SLOs at the college level is Program Review, a vehicle for department chairs and faculty to report on their progress in assessing student learning outcomes. All departments are required to review and update course outlines at least every six years and to include measurable SLOs. Through the Program Review process, departments assess their SLO progress from year to year and share examples that reflect their departmental dialog and action on SLOs.

All department chairs were provided the student learning outcomes assessment templates for review and discussion with their faculty during Spring 09 Flex Day. In this pilot year, every one of the 61 departments was asked to complete a minimum of one template for a course or
program. During the pilot period, 2008/9, the student learning outcomes assessment templates were reviewed by the work group and revised accordingly. Since then departments have had an opportunity to add courses and/or programs into their student learning outcome assessment process, which is completely integrated into the program review system, which in turn is completely integrated into the annual planning and budgeting system.

The SLO Workgroup continued to convene during the Fall 09 semester to address implementation of the student learning outcomes process. The philosophy generated has been centralized coordination and decentralized (unit) implementation. Three of the Workgroup members have participated in Commission training and the DCC sponsored five Spring 2010 flex workshops related to the student learning outcomes process. Additional workshops have been scheduled since then as part of Flex activities.

In Spring 2010, Program Review asked departments to state their assessment and course outline revision timetable through 2016 and to provide two examples of ongoing SLO assessments: one at the course level and the other at the program level. Departments were also asked to state how they would close the assessment loop, revising instruction or other aspects of the curriculum.

In order to better guide and support the units with the SLO process, we have asked units to identify a six year plan for revising course and program curriculum outlines and a plan to develop, assess and utilize student learning outcomes in all of its courses and/or programs by 2014-2015. This expectation has been incorporated into our Curriculum Guide as well as our Program Review process. Preliminary review of plans indicates that the majority of courses and programs will complete one cycle of their assessment process by 2013.

In the program review report, units provide a summary describing progress to date on assessment plans introduced in prior year program review reports. Through a series of guided questions, units are asked to provide examples of exemplary course and programs student learning outcomes assessment results. Respondents are also asked to identify their comfort level in managing their SLO processes and corresponding staff development needs.

The Curriculum Committee has focused on changing the level of discussion at the Curriculum Committee meetings. The discussions have been more focused on learning outcomes, content, instructional methodology, and the integration of those three areas.

Since our Midterm Report, professional development has begun to significantly enhance our SLO implementation effort. CCSF designated Student Learning Outcomes as the theme of Spring 2009 (Flex) Professional Development Day, raising the profile of learning outcomes throughout the institution, and providing training opportunities in the form of workshops on eight different SLO topics. All faculty and administrators were given the opportunity to participate in any of the workshops, with topics ranging from the development and assessment of course and program outcomes, to the SLO-based revision of a college success course and a general introduction to the process of continuous quality improvement (CQI).
In the last two years, the SLO assessment process has continued to be strengthened at CCSF. The SLO Workgroup has established an SLO website to offer guidance and instruction to faculty [II A-24]. Assessment has become a major component of faculty development days (FLEX days). At FLEX workshops, departments share their most successful assessment methodologies with their peers. These workshops have involved hundreds of faculty and inspired meaningful dialog about how to use SLOs at an institution of this size. Many departments’ use of SLOs is truly exemplary and these workshops have allowed other departments to review successful techniques.

Improvements in assessment have been undertaken. Many departments are exploring the use of more authentic and faculty driven assessment, often with the use of rubrics, to complement traditional forms of assessment of learning outcomes. The results of these explorations have been an ongoing topic of department and/or school meetings and flex activities.

Since we are a very large institution, gathering information about the extent of existing SLO implementation in all of our courses and programs continues to represent an advance. There is much more information and evidence than before. Nonetheless, documentation is an ongoing challenge, so we have discussed ways to continue to expand SLO reporting processes within existing resources. Some departments have chosen to share their SLO activities through video clips available on their website.

A Library SLO Task Force was convened in Fall 2009 to address development of the other SLOs for Library and Learning Resources services and programs. The outcome of their work is six SLOs that reflect all LLR service and resource units. The SLOs have been shared with all staff and discussed at library faculty meetings and the Dean’s Library Advisory Committee meeting. The six program SLOs will be available from the Library’s homepage and will link assessment findings and plans for improvement. This information is now available internally to LLR staff through the Library wiki. Workshop and information competency SLOs are included in the Library website.

A new Library Assessment Committee formed on recommendation of the SLO Task Force developed and refined program-level SLOs in alignment with the LLR Mission Statement and College goals and priorities. It also developed an ongoing assessment plan that includes a timeline and suggested evaluation methods and strategies for the six program-level SLOs. The Assessment Committee also identified measures by service area, documents to guide assessment workgroups; survey instruments; an assessment analysis form; and a tool to track assessments performed, recommendations, and results, and made these available on the Library wiki.

Our Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, a joint committee of the Academic Senate and the Administration, formed a workgroup to identify learning outcomes for each of our eight General Education areas. These outcomes were presented to and approved by the Bipartite Committee in late February 2009 for publication in the 2009-10 College Catalog. One of the challenges we have in establishing the SLO process for our General Education
coursework is the scope of work involved. We have several hundred courses spread across the eight General Education areas.

The Student Development Division continues to make substantial progress in the area of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s). In the summer of 2008 the Division began a series of workshops to better prepare the units in the development and assessment of SLOs. It has grown from one-two units with SLO pilot projects to each of the 10 major units, and many of their sub-units, working on clearly identified SLO’s.

Eighty percent of student development departments have moved beyond assessment into data analysis and department dialogue, evaluating results to drive changes in service delivery and improve contributions to student learning. Additionally, units employed a number of different assessment tools and formats such as Survey Monkey, student narratives, focus groups, evaluation of Banner data, and pre and post questionnaires.

Student Services has continued to include active Student Learning Outcome projects in their unit objectives and priorities. Updates and progress on Student Learning Outcomes are reported annually through the Program Review process. Data collection and analysis is becoming more sophisticated as units progress in their projects. Cycles of continuous improvement are being integrated across additional departments. Reports containing data, analysis and recommendations for programmatic change in several departments are available to other units and serve as models of effective practice in the continuous improvement cycle.

For the past year CCSF has been addressing achievement gaps and their relationship to student equity. This process has been carried out in the best spirit of continuous quality improvement. Reports of current practices throughout the institution, from English and Mathematics course sequencing to financial aid, student employment, registration, student employment, counseling, international student programs, and placement testing were evaluated by the College community [II A-31]. Students offered testimony about their experiences and the discussions that ensued involved everyone from administrators, classified staff and faculty to trustees and elected student officials [II A-22]. The level of awareness of the SLOs model has increased significantly at the leadership level through these various discussions. The results were often an array of institutional modifications.

CCSF has progressed demonstratively and substantially in the institutionalization of student learning outcomes as a core element of college operations. Implementation has broadened and accelerated. Facing extraordinary resource constraints, we have nonetheless identified several strategies for moving forward in a timely fashion.

The leadership at the College has demonstrated a strong commitment to advancing the dialogue on student learning outcomes. The administration, the Department Chair Council and the Academic Senate has each had a strong presence in guiding our discussions, designing our processes and providing staff development opportunities to support this institutional priority.
Through ongoing dialog, CCSF has embraced and begun adopting SLOs and the assessment agenda at an ever increasing pace. SLOs have been identified for all courses and the majority of programs and services, and there is extensive ongoing work towards completing the assessment cycle for all of them.

Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement at CCSF. The College will move towards the proficiency level for SLO assessment of courses, certificates, programs and general education breadth requirements by completing those remaining by Fall 2012.

**Distance Learning Efforts**

Through distance learning the College strives to serve the needs of students who require some level of flexibility in their schedules. Distance education courses are offered by 27 academic departments, in all six schools within Academic Affairs and by Library and Learning Resources. Over 12,000 students enrolled in 338 distance education credit courses for the academic year 2010-11.

A student can complete 100 percent of the requirements for an AA/AS degree by taking distance learning courses. Students can complete approximately 90 percent of the courses required to transfer to CSU or UC through distance learning [II A-12]. City College of San Francisco now enables students to earn --- degrees, --- certificates, and the general education program with more than 50% of credits being earned via distance education. ACCJC approved the College’s Substantive Change in 2008.

The Curriculum Committee conducts a rigorous peer-review process of every course and program proposed [IIA-33]. Faculty members develop online courses following various steps compliant with the standards set by the Curriculum Committee and the Distance Learning Advisory Committee [II A-14 p.53-58]. Courses that are to be taught via distance education require separate review and approval by the Curriculum Committee, which considers factors such as course suitability for distance education, student-instructor contact, and distance evaluation integrity [IIA-14, p.53-58].

The Office of Technology Mediated Instruction, housed within the Educational Technology Department (ETD), works closely with faculty in the migration process of a traditional lecture mode course to online delivery. Faculty participate in extensive training and the newly developed online course is evaluated at various phases of development to ensure that the delivery is meeting the objectives and content of the state-approved course outline, the College’s standards for distance education, and federal ADA regulations. The ETD provides ongoing support to distance learning faculty via online modules, face-to-face workshops and one-to-one meetings.

Faculty members teaching credit courses are given an option to enhance the delivery of their face-to-face courses by delivering the objectives and content of the course using CCSF’s learning management system. These faculty are required to complete seven hours of training by the ETD. Additionally, ETD offers special topic workshops to support faculty in
understanding the technology behind the management system and guides faculty in ways they can improve the deliverability of online classes, thus increasing student success and decreasing attrition. CCSF supported almost 100 tech-enhanced course sections in Fall 2009; this number increased to over 350 tech-enhanced face-to-face sections by the end of 2010-11 [II A-15, p.3].

The College employs several strategies to support the learning of students in distance education. One such strategy was to develop LERN 55 Successful Online Learning, a one-unit course that has been offered since 2008. The California Community Colleges Data Mart report for Fall 2010 showed that CCSF students enrolled in distance education achieved a success rate of 70 percent, slightly higher than the statewide average of 68 percent [II A-13].

Recent results from the survey, Student Satisfaction with Online Learning Courses, were positive. In fall 2005, spring 2006, and fall 2007 students were asked in a survey; “Would you recommend this (online) course to someone else?” Respondents answered “yes” over 77% of the time. One of the results of the increased demand for online courses is the creation of the Education Technology Department, thereby giving a stronger voice to this area.

Online courses attract many students to City College and have won eleven statewide and two national awards for quality of course design [IIB-29]. Additionally, Insight (Moodle) was adopted as the College's new open source learning management system and every online course now uses it. The use of interactive television (IPTV) to deliver educational programming to students at various campuses has been explored, with concerns arising relating to feasibility, costs, and the size of a potential IPTV audience. Every campus has at least some video infrastructure in place.

The College continues to anticipate the needs of its rapidly growing distance education program. Through the integrated program review process, the ETD will continually assess its distance education program to ensure continuous quality improvement and that student needs are being met.

**Information Regarding External Independent Audit and Integrity in the Use of Federal Grant Monies.**

The College contracts with a qualified independent financial audit firm each year to perform all audit work required by state and federal laws and regulations. These audits have confirmed that the College demonstrates integrity with respect to its use of federal grant monies. Recent audit work identified specific improvements the College could make with respect to documenting the time College employees spend working on grant funded activities. The College has fully implemented these improvements and has conducted multiple training sessions for grant managers to ensure that key College employees are aware of the documents they need to maintain.
Abstract: Standard I. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) demonstrates in many ways its deep commitment to a mission that emphasizes learning and to continual institutional improvement.

The College's Mission Statement expresses its commitment to providing educational excellence to students in the areas of transfer preparation, associate degrees, certificates, CTE skills acquisition, lifelong learning, civic engagement/ESL, and adult high school degrees. The College dedicates its resources toward ensuring that students have access to whichever of these educational experiences they choose. Informing the CCSF Mission Statement is a Vision Statement that describes the community the College is helping to build and the environment in which students can thrive.

The College demonstrates its commitment to continuous quality improvement and to the effectiveness of its governance and administrative activities by conducting many self-reflective evaluations of institutional policies, procedures, and practices. Nearly all of this self reflection takes place as dialog within the exceptionally strong Shared Governance System, a web of over forty committees and subcommittees operating under three councils that are empowered to make recommendations through the Chancellor to the Board. Other discussions about institutional effectiveness at CCSF occur within the collective bargaining units (AFT 2121, SEIU 1021, and the Department Chairpersons Council), at management meetings, and at the Board meetings themselves.

CCSF has developed a strong and responsive six-year strategic planning process that is rooted in the Vision and Mission statements. The strategic plans are fulfilled incrementally through Annual Plans and various other institutional plans that are regularly assessed and modified at appropriate intervals. The governing board and the public are kept informed of the District’s progress on these plans. The College’s assessment of this progress is informed by prodigious data resources that provide employees, students, and community members with detailed information on demand, access, retention, success, demographics, and productivity.

The College utilizes many specific assessments of student outcomes and of institutional effectiveness that provide internal constituencies and the general public with strong and useful evidence of student achievement and program performance. In particular, all District units now undergo Program Review regularly, a process that includes reflection on recent activities and achievements and both short- and long-term plans. The current Program Review process is still new and the College is deliberating how best to use the outcomes to make resource allocation decisions.
Abstract: Standard II.A   Student Learning Programs and Services

The College’s Mission and Vision statements provide overall guidance that informs decision making about programs offered by the College. The review/approval, revision, and deletion of academic programs and courses fall largely under the purview of the College’s Curriculum Committee. Using the standards provided by Title 5, the Curriculum Committee approval process ensures that programs are appropriate to the mission of the institution and to higher education and considers factors such as course suitability for distance education, student-instructor contact, and distance evaluation integrity. Once Curriculum Committee approval is attained, the Board of Trustees provides the final District approval of programs and courses.

Another body involved in upholding the integrity of the institution’s program is the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, consisting of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and five administrators. This committee approves courses for inclusion in the various General Education areas and has also approved structural changes to the associate degree.

CCSF offers an extensive array of diverse and flexible learning experiences for credit and noncredit students at 9 campuses. Instructional options include in-class lecture format, laboratory, collaborative group work, computer-assisted instruction, online courses, telecourses, independent study, internships, study abroad programs, cohort programs, community-based courses and onsite courses at various locations in the City of San Francisco.

In the past few years, all instructional departments and programs, including continuing and contract education, study abroad, and programs for international students have been engaged in an annual Program Review cycle. A key element of Program Review is a comprehensive review of courses and programs, including a report on progress in assessing student learning outcomes and plans for program improvement. All units respond to questions that give the opportunity for reflection and planning.

The faculty peer and student evaluation process includes an appraisal of the quality, academic rigor and appropriateness of that professor’s instruction. A component of the evaluation of an individual faculty member is whether the courses are being taught in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline and department. This mechanism allows departments to ensure that departmental and discipline expectations for courses are common across the department and discipline. Since the faculty evaluation process is based on peer review, the process allows faculty within a discipline to have an ongoing dialog about the expectations of their courses and student learning.

City College of San Francisco conducts research to inform its practices leading to student success. Research in its broadest sense utilizes data from program reviews, assessment of success in meeting prior strategic plan objectives, and input from the College community. Information is also obtained through listening sessions, planning retreats, student equity forums, and individual feedback. The data for student outcomes regarding success rates, persistence and retention rates are available through the Program Review process.
In the last two years, the SLO assessment process has been strengthened at CCSF. The SLO Workgroup has established an SLO website to offer guidance and instruction to faculty. Assessment has become a major component of faculty development days (FLEX days). At FLEX workshops departments share their most successful assessment methodologies with their peers. These workshops have involved hundreds of faculty and inspired meaningful dialog about how to use SLOs at an institution of our size. General education student learning outcomes have been identified by the Bipartite Committee. These outcomes were the result of mapping against our institutional criteria and Title 5 requirements for general education.

The College has made significant steps in using the assessment of learning outcomes as a mechanism to evaluate the quality of instruction in its programs. Not only is the assessment of learning outcomes a process that is applied to every one of the College’s programs, but the institutional dialog that has taken place in the last few years about constructing processes by which departments create and then assess learning outcomes has helped to ensure a shared understanding of program quality and level. This shared understanding has then led to the standards published in the College’s Curriculum Handbook.

The College Catalog is the primary venue for communicating the general education goals, rationale, and philosophy to all stakeholders. The general education requirements section of the Catalog begins with a summary of the goals of the requirement areas. Each of the general education areas has a more detailed discussion, including learning outcomes, preceding the list of courses that satisfy that area. These requirements and their descriptions are revised periodically and as needed in a process that usually begins with faculty and is always reviewed by the Academic Senate Executive Council before final approval by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.

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

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) serves one of the largest student populations in the nation and is committed to providing services that are accessible, inclusive, and sensitive to the needs of its diverse student body. CCSF assures equitable access by providing appropriate student support services at its campus locations and some of the other instructional sites throughout San Francisco. In April 2007, *The New York Times* featured CCSF as one of 11 models of success in the country with respect to its instructional and student support practices. Moreover, in June 2008, CCSF was highlighted in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* as an outstanding example of a thriving community college—the only community college in the nation to be so recognized.

Student Support Services is a critical aspect of the College and makes services available to all its students. Part of the governance system is the Student Preparation Success Committee, which helps make critical recommendations in this area. Included in the range of programs and services to enhance student access, retention, and success are the following: New Student Counseling; Continuing Student Counseling; International Student Counseling; Transfer Counseling; Career Development Counseling; Extended Opportunity Programs and Services; Gay, Lesbian, Bi-Sexual and Transgender Counseling; and Multicultural Retention Services (African American Scholastic Programs, Latino Services Network, TULAY Filipino-American Success Program, and the Asian Pacific American Student Success Program).

Additional student support services include the Admissions and Records Office, Financial Aid Office (including Scholarship, CalWORKs, and Single Stop USA), Matriculation Office, Veteran Educational Transition Services, Outreach and Recruitment, Student Activities Office, Homeless At-Risk Transitional Students Program, Student Health Services, the Learning Assistance Center, and the Disabled Students Programs and Services Department.

Consistent with its institutional mission, CCSF provides educational programs and services to meet the needs of its diverse community in transfer, associate degrees, certificate and career skills, civic engagement, citizenship preparation, and English as a Second Language, economic development and lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment. More than 60 student clubs operating on most campuses help students expand their cultural perspectives. Students are further supported through information provided in the Catalog, Time Schedule, Student Handbook, and on the College’s website.

The College's Program Review System has as its goal the promotion of student access, progress, learning, and teaching excellence. This is accomplished by conducting comprehensive reviews by departments of all courses and programs and by reviewing and updating, where appropriate, learning assessments plans and student development programs. Currently, program reviews are conducted annually for all units in all divisions of the College although they will be conducted biennially in the future. These reviews utilize five-year data trends in the areas of enrollments, personnel, annual expenditures, productivity, and student/employee satisfaction, as applicable. All data are gathered by the Office of Research and Planning in conjunction with the Budget Office, Office of Instruction, and Human Resources and populated in the program review form. The form provides reflections on data trends, summarizes progress on prior year planning objectives, and identifies major planning...
objectives for the next fiscal year to describe resources needed to meet planning objectives. The Office of Research and Planning conducts ongoing College wide inquiries regarding student access, progress, learning, and success. For example, the *Overview of 2007 CCSSE Results for CCSF* provides a snapshot of what credit students and faculty had to say about student engagement at CCSF. The overview includes information about the survey, respondent’s academic experience, student learning, support services, barriers to persistence, and more. Additional inquiries surveyed the effectiveness of Division programs and services in relation to the institutional mission and the quality of support provided to enhance student access, progress, learning, and success.
Abstract: Standard II.C    Library and Learning Support Services

Library and learning support services (LLSS) are at the center of the “teaching and learning community” described in the College Vision Statement and support the Mission of the College by providing services, resources, and facilities that meet student needs and promote student success. LLSS include: Library and Learning Resources (LLR), Learning Assistance (LAD), Broadcast Media Services (BMS), and student computer labs. LLR is one Library comprising nine units at six locations: Ocean Campus, Downtown Campus, John Adams Campus, Mission Campus, Southeast Campus and the Gough Street facility. Both an additional library and a learning assistance center will open at the new Chinatown/Northbeach Campus in 2012.

All LLSS units are actively engaged in meeting students’ academic, vocational, and personal goals by providing resources and services to students taking courses on campus and through distance education. To better serve distance learning students and provide 24/7 access, online resources and services continue to expand in breadth and scope, as seen in the Language Center, Learning Assistance Department, and Library websites. Broadcast Media Services and Audiovisual Unit services indirectly support student learning by providing essential technology that instructional faculty use to engage a range of learning styles. Librarians consistently seek input from faculty when building collections, creating services and planning programs and exhibitions to ensure all efforts support curriculum. Additionally, all LLSS faculty and staff frequently collaborate with instructional departments, facilitating the integration of information competency and lifelong learning skills (e.g. technology skills, study strategies, and cultural competency) into the curriculum and the classroom.

All LLSS are fully engaged in the planning process through Program Review and LLSS units have developed, assessed, and evaluated student learning outcomes, establishing continuous cycles of ongoing assessment, utilizing multi-method self-assessment strategies, as well as department and College wide surveys. Examples of inter-departmental assessments also exist. Assessment cycles guide all LLSS units in the continual improvement of strategies and services that benefit student learning. The College recognizes the importance of library and learning support services and strives to provide these services, resources, and facilities equally throughout the District.
Abstract: Standard IIIA  

City College of San Francisco employs faculty, staff, and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The search and hiring process instituted by Human Resources and the work of faculty and administrator search committees promotes diverse and well-qualified hires. The faculty hiring process is rigorous, and nearly all departments require a teaching demonstration and a portfolio of work as a part of the interview process. The College is also committed to having a diverse faculty and staff reflective of the communities the College serves.

The College publishes the annual Employee and Hiring Data Report and uses this information to assess how effective recruiting and hiring practices are related to increasing the diversity of its staff. The College’s diversity level is approximately 45 percent, with more diversity of staff represented in the administrator and classified staff categories.

The institution demonstrates through its Mission, Vision, Strategic Plan, policies and daily practices that equity and diversity for all campus constituents are key to the success of the institution. There are many opportunities for faculty and staff to increase their understanding and awareness of diversity and equity issues.

The College has integrated human resource planning with institutional planning from the Strategic Plan to the Annual Plans and the Program Review process. The number of full-time faculty is sufficient; however, the number of qualified administrators and classified staff has shown greater fluctuations. Given the current economic situation, the College is effectively using the planning and budgeting process to ensure that core staffing needs are addressed in most cases.

The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The criteria for evaluating faculty are defined in the AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement. The process is designed to include dialog with and classroom observation by the department chair and/or the peer evaluation team that reflect on teaching behaviors that directly contribute to student learning. Another component is the findings from student evaluation forms. The dialog between evaluatee and evaluation team and/or department chair allows for a focused discussion of the effectiveness of the instructor’s performance in helping to produce student learning outcomes. District policies and procedures outline criteria for evaluating staff and administrators.

CCSF promotes a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration and improved levels of communication, and policies and procedures are in place that ensure healthy working conditions and foster an environment of respect and trust. In addition, the institution ensures that all state, federal, local and other relevant personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered, and reviewed regularly through the Shared Governance process and, if appropriate, by union staff. The Human Resources Department satisfactorily communicates updates and new personnel policies by disseminating the information to employees through institutional mailings and making the information available via the Department’s website. In addition, security and confidentiality of personnel records are diligently provided, primarily through locked files of paper-copy documents in the Human Resources Department with only authorized personnel allowed viewing rights.
Abstract: Standard IIIB  Resources: Physical Resources

Since the last Institutional Self Study, City College of San Francisco has made dramatic efforts to improve its physical resources, demonstrating the commitment to providing an environment that supports the quality of student learning programs and services.

Several large facility projects have been successfully completed in support of student learning programs, including the Mission Campus, renovation of both buildings at the John Adams Campus, renovations at the Downtown and Evans campuses, and ADA improvements at all college-owned campuses. In addition, on the Ocean Campus, the College’s single largest site, four new facilities have been completed: the Osher Child Development Center, the Student Health Services Building, the Health and Wellness Center, and the Multi-Use Building. Many smaller renovation projects to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment have been completed as well.

The College plans rather comprehensively for upgrading, replacing, and maintaining its facilities and major equipment. A Facilities Master Plan has guided the institution in the planning, building, maintenance, and upgrading and replacing of its physical resources since 2004, when it was adopted by the Board of Trustees. A comprehensive District Facility Condition Assessment Report, which inventoried and assessed the condition of CCSF buildings, was conducted in 2003 and then again in 2010. The report has helped determine the maintenance and renovation projects for the College.

The College’s major facilities planning documents are linked with the Facilities Master Plan, the Annual Plan, and the Strategic Plan. In addition, on an annual basis, all departments and major cost centers state their facilities needs and goals in their Program Review reports. For long-range facilities planning, the College is linking the Program Review process, which gathers feedback directly from the programs and departments, more closely with the Facilities Master Plan.

Since the last Self Study, the College has significantly improved communications related to facilities across departments and offices. The Facilities Review Committee makes recommendations on both long-range and short-range facilities plans for all College campuses based upon the College’s priorities. The Committee meets on a regular basis to solicit ideas from faculty, staff, administrators, and students for major and minor facilities projects and equipment upgrades. In addition, each major facility has a BUG (Building Users Group) that develops needs proposals for departments and building users. Before any facility has major changes implemented, the BUG group must be consulted. This process has promoted more meaningful interactions between the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Facilities and Planning to assure the quality of programs and services as well as the health and safety of students.

In support of institutional goals and cost effectiveness of physical facilities, the College has also dedicated considerable energy to improving its operation of physical resources by approving the Sustainability Plan, which the Board of Trustees adopted in December 2009. Whereas the past efforts of the College to provide for the total cost of ownership have been limited, more recently the College established a user’s group for design review and total cost of ownership in the planning for its next project, the new Performing Arts Education Center.
Abstract: Standard IIIC  Resources: Technology Resources

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) provides technology resources, services and support in order to improve the effectiveness of the institution and meet the needs of the learning and teaching community. The key goals outlined in the 2009-11 Technology plan strive to “promote institutional effectiveness, efficiencies, and learning, to provide guidelines and standards for technology-enhanced curriculum, and to bridge the digital divide, empowering students for mastery of information competency and attainment of their educational goals.” The plan is also evidence-based and addresses the technology needs as articulated by faculty, staff, and students.

The Strategic, Technology, and Annual plans as well as the Vision and Mission statements of CCSF emphasize that technological support should meet the needs of teaching, learning, College wide communications, research, and operations systems. Shared Governance committees provide ongoing input into the fast-changing technology landscape at CCSF. Even with the poor economic situation, the past five years have seen implementation of projects that have provided students, faculty, and staff with many benefits in the most cost-effective manner.

The implementation of the new website design, student email and Google applications has upgraded and expanded the use of technology systems and improved levels of communication, organizational effectiveness, and efficiency at CCSF.

Many units have also developed efficient online systems and enhancements to assist faculty and students with teaching and learning activities, improving communications, student access, information gathering and delivery, and other operational systems.

ITS Staff are responsible for the infrastructure and equipment for 78 computer labs housing around 2,000 computers available for student use. There are also about 3,000 computers in use by faculty and classified staff.

In addition, the institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel. Faculty and staff training and technical assistance needs are provided by several units: the Technology Learning Center (TLC) the Technology Mediated Instruction Office (TMI), and individually by the Service Desk and online documentation and tutorials. Library faculty also train students in online research/information competency skills as well as provide individual training to faculty and students about using online resources and technology applications. Staff in many departments of the Student Services Division also provide group and individual training for students, such as in Career Development and the Learning Assistance Center.

The institution systematically and effectively plans for the technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs. Planning for ongoing maintenance, upgrades and replacements is also systematic. Acquisition of needed technology resources is heavily dependent on funding and although grant and bond funding may be a good source for starting new projects, funding for ongoing operational support and maintenance requires a continuous source that grant and bond funding do not supply.
After an evaluation period of the staffing levels for the technology functions at the College, all classified employees with civil service classifications in the IT and IS categories were reassigned to the ITS department starting in the 2010-11 academic year. The position of Chief Technology Officer was established and the person hired began work in Summer 2010. This reorganization of personnel strives to increase efficiency and productivity by consolidating the technology workforce.
Abstract: Standard III.D  Resources: Financial Resources

Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources’ planning is integrated with institutional planning.

The College has implemented a comprehensive budget planning system that integrates financial planning with institutional planning. The institution clearly defines, widely distributes, and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budgeting on an annual basis. All college cost centers participate in the Program Review process to identify specific resource needs in both personnel and non-personnel areas. The results of the Program Review process are analyzed by the Program Review Committee and presented to the College’s PBC for possible funding.

On a continuing basis the College’s total fund balance has been substantially greater than the five percent guideline recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office. The planning processes employed by the College realistically assess financial resources availability and expenditure requirements, using funding priorities directly connected to student learning and key student services. The institution expects to reach agreement with the labor unions that represent the College’s workforce on measures to address the cost of retiree health benefits by the end of 2011. The College employs a variety of control mechanisms to ensure responsible use of financial resources.

The District received an unqualified audit opinion for fiscal years 2007, 2008, and 2009 in its Annual Financial and Single Audit report. The Board of Trustees Audit Committee monitors progress in addressing audit findings on a regular basis including any material weaknesses. Financial integrity is ensured by control mechanisms, independent external and internal review, transparency of processes, and timely dissemination of information. The College has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. The cash flow needs of the District have been supported through the issuance of TRANS and short term borrowing from the County Treasury. The Board of Trustees has enacted many new policies designed to strengthen controls on finances and contracts and to prevent the misuse of any College funds. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.
Abstract: Standard IV.A   Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The College relies upon well-developed and effective Shared Governance structures to identify its values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve. All members of the College community—classified staff, faculty, administrators, and students—are encouraged to take initiative in improving College practices, programs, and services through multiple avenues. For example, the College widely solicited input for change to the Mission Statement, the Strategic Plan, the College Budget, the Sustainability Plan, the Technology Plan, and the Accreditation Self Study report and members of all constituent groups have participated in shaping these documents.

The Councils, Committees, Subcommittees, and other entities of the College’s Shared Governance System provide appropriate environments for the development of ideas for improvement and the shaping of College wide policies. The Shared Governance System is successful in empowering students and classified staff as well as faculty and administrators to participate fully in decision making at the College. Well over 300 students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators serve every year through the more that 40 standing Shared Governance bodies. Additional members of the College constituent groups participate in ad hoc committees, task forces, workgroups, forums, and other collaborations on College wide issues.

For academic and professional matters including curriculum, the College relies primarily upon the recommendations of faculty through the Academic Senate and its Curriculum Committee. The Shared Governance bodies, the Classified Senate, the Academic Senate, Associated Students, the Administrators Association, and the bargaining units provide vital channels of communication with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. The District prioritizes its responsibilities to comply with Accreditation standards, and works to improve deficiencies identified by the Accrediting Commission or through self-evaluations initiated within the College.
Abstract: Standard IV.B       Board and Administrative Organization

To be written
Organization for the Self Study – Narrative

Chronological Narrative

Prior to August, 2010. The Chancellor appointed the Accreditation Liaison Officer who corresponded with ACCJC/WASC and served as a conduit for information to the Administration and to the College community.

August - September, 2010. The Chancellor asked the Academic Senate President to help provide leadership in our Accreditation efforts, along with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. The Steering Committee was formed, its membership was finalized, and it began meeting. The Steering Committee approved the appointment of Co-Chairs for each of the four standards.

September – November, 2010. All members of the College community were invited to volunteer for work on the Self Study. Three orientation sessions were conducted and one of the orientations was video taped for volunteers who joined later. There were about 100 volunteers who were provided with templates to use in gathering and evaluating information about the college. The volunteers sought information from College documents, interviewed or wrote to others and used their own knowledge to draft initial responses to the sections of the standards.

November, 2010 – January, 2011. The Co-Chairs for each of the standards collected the templates, consulted additional sources, and created a first draft of the Self Study report for each standard. The Steering Committee reviewed and approved a survey instrument that was sent to students taking credit courses to provide information for various aspects of the report.

January – March, 2011. The Steering Committee read the standard drafts, reviewed the text together, and made suggestions to the Co-Chairs for the Standards. The improved, “raw” drafts were posted on the web. The Steering Committee reviewed and approve a survey instrument that was sent to employees to provide information for the report.

March – May, 2011. College constituent groups and individuals were invited to review and comment on the “raw” draft of the Self Study report. The Co-Chairs for the Standards wrote preliminary second drafts based on feedback from constituents and on their own further research. The Steering Committee reviewed the preliminary second drafts. Second drafts were posted online as they were finished. A workgroup was created (“Webcred”) which functioned independently from the Steering Committee to review City College web pages and make improvements. Over the next six months, it provided advice and support to offices and departments and implemented redesigns of numerous web pages.

May – August, 2011. The second drafts of the responses to the standards were turned into final drafts by small teams of faculty and administrators who revised the text, identified and supplied missing or inconsistent information and provided specific evidential references for the standards. The introduction was written and the front matter was compiled. A former administrator was brought in to serve as Accreditation Liaison Officer and editor-in-chief. With an editing team, he provided final revisions, stylistic rewrite, and copy-editing to the Self Study report.
September – October, 2011. The semifinal draft of the Self Study report was posted online and distributed in paper copy to representatives of constituent groups and the Board of Trustees for discussion and approval. Feedback was solicited and revisions made to the report. Layout and typesetting work commenced.

November – December, 2011. Final revisions to the report were completed. Institutional leaders signed the Certification page. The report was printed and a CD-Rom edition was created.

Composition of the Steering Committee

The Accreditation Self Study Steering Committee included the following Institutional leaders or their representatives:

- Academic Senate President
- Accreditation Liaison Officer
- AFT2121 President
- Articulation Officer
- Associated Students Presidents
- Board of Trustees President
- Chancellor
- Classified Senate President
- Department Chairpersons Council President
- Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
- SEIU 1021 President
- Shared Governance Coordinator
- Student Trustee
- Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
- Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration
- Vice Chancellor of Research and Policy
- Vice Chancellor of Student Development

The Steering Committee included additional Faculty, Administrators, Students, and Classified Staff

Composition of the Standards Work Groups

The Co-Chairs for the Standards were selected to include Faculty, Administrators, and Classified Staff. For some of the Standards, the Co-Chairs were assisted in the initial collection of materials and texts by Coordinators for the letter sections, e.g. II B, IV A. The volunteers for the initial phase included Trustees, Faculty, Administrators, Students, and Classified Staff.

Templates used by the volunteers in September–November, 2010

Each template showed a small section of the text of a standard along with the questions from the Guide to Evaluating Institutions. Steps for researching and analyzing the evidence were provided, along with a scoring rubric, and a sample completed template.
Organization for the Self Study -- Chart

***Board of Trustees***
- President John Rizzo
- Vice President Chris Jackson
- Dr. Natalie Berg
- Dr. Anita Grier
- Milton Marks
- Steve Ngo
- Lawrence Wong, Esq.
- Student Trustee Jeffrey Fang

***Chancellor***
- Dr. Don Q. Griffin

***Academic Senate President - Accreditation Liaison Officer***
- Karen Saginor
- Lawrence C. Klein
- Dr. Alice Murillo

***Steering Committee***
- Deanna Abma
- Bobby Arenas
- Beth Cataldo
- Kristin Charles
- Ophelia Clark
- Jeffrey Fang
- Attila Gabor
- David Gallerani
- Gus Goldstein
- Peter Goldstein
- Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer
- Lidia Jenkins
- Larry Klein
- Milton Marks
- Pam Mery
- Phyllis McGuire
- Lindy McKnight
- Gohar Momjian
- Madeline Mueller
- Dr. Alice Murillo
- Andrea Niosi
- John Rizzo
- James Rogers
- Lisa Romano
- Karen Saginor
- Athena Steff
- Fred Teti
- Elizabeth Weinberg
- Suki Wong
- David Yee

***Standard I Institutional Mission & Effectiveness***
- Co-Chairs
  - Kristin Charles
  - Frederick Teti

***Standard II Student Learning & Program Services***
- Co-Chairs
  - Deanna Abma
  - Ophelia Clark
  - Dr. Alice Murillo
- Andrea Niosi

***Standard III Resources***
- Co-Chairs
  - Beth Cataldo
  - Peter Goldstein

***Standard IV Leadership & Governance***
- Co-Chairs
  - Attila Gabor
  - Phyllis McGuire
  - Lisa Romano

***Editing & Finishing Team***
- Lauri Fried-Lee
- Sascha Hutchings
- Mark Albright
Eligibility Requirements

Authority

City College of San Francisco is a public two-year community college operating under the authority of the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District. City College of San Francisco is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community & Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. This organization is recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education. The College also offers programs accredited by the American Culinary Federation Accrediting Commission, the California Board of Registered Nursing, the Commission on Accreditation of the American Dental Association, the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Programs, the Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology.

Mission

The Board of Trustees publicly affirms the College’s educational Mission Statement, and reviews and updates it regularly. The Mission Statement appears in the CCSF Strategic Plan and is published in the official College Catalog. It is also published on the college website.

Governing Board

The seven-member board of trustees of the San Francisco Community College District is an independent policymaking board, which ensures that the District’s educational mission is being implemented. The Board also ensures the quality, integrity, and financial stability of City College of San Francisco. Members are elected for four-year terms, and these terms are staggered. Board members have no employment, family, or personal financial interest in the College or the District.

Chief Executive Officer

City College of San Francisco has a chief executive officer who is appointed by the Board of Trustees and whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who possesses the authority to administer board policies.

Administrative Capacity

The number of administrative staff members at City College of San Francisco supports the services necessary to carry out the institution’s mission and purpose. Their preparation and experience are scrutinized through an open and competitive employment process.
Operational Status

City College of San Francisco is operational, with students actively pursuing programs in noncredit, credit, and not-for-credit programs.

Degrees

Seventy-five percent of all programs and educational offerings lead to associate degrees or certificates of achievement, or prepare students for transfer to a four-year university or college.

Educational Programs

The College Catalog contains a comprehensive statement of educational purpose and objectives for each of the academic programs offered. Degree programs are in line with the College’s mission, are based on recognized fields of study, are of sufficient content and length, are conducted at appropriate levels of quality and rigor, and culminate in identified student outcomes.

Academic Credit

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

Student Learning Achievement

The College Catalog contains a comprehensive statement of educational purpose and objectives for each of the academic programs offered. Additionally, the College is fully engaged in the assessment of course- and program-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to improve student achievement and learning. Every course outline currently includes learning outcomes that are achieved and assessed by a variety of methods. Coordinated by department faculty and administrators, every course, regardless of its location or delivery system, must follow the course outline.

General Education

All degree programs require a minimum of 18 to 24 units of general education to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. Mathematics and writing requirements are also stipulated in the above requirements. The institution’s general education program is scrutinized for rigor and quality by the College Curriculum Committee.
Academic Freedom

The College’s faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as ensured by the Board Policy 6.06 on academic freedom.

Faculty

The College employs almost 800 full-time and slightly more than 1,000 part-time faculty, all of whom are qualified under state-mandated minimum qualifications to conduct the institution’s programs. Faculty duties and responsibilities are clearly outlined in the AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Faculty Handbook.

Student Development

Student Development Services are comprehensive and accessible to all students. The array of services is provided based on the College mission and on the assessment of student needs.

Admissions

City College of San Francisco maintains an “open door” admissions policy. This policy is consistent with the College Mission Statement, the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, and the statewide mission for California Community Colleges.

Information and Learning Resources

The College houses a variety of media collections and is staffed to assist students in their use. Internet access and online computer search capabilities are available without charge to students in the library, in computer labs, and in open media centers. The College is committed to enhancing its learning resources, regardless of location or delivery method.

Financial Resources

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

Financial Accountability

Annual financial audits are conducted by externally contracted certified public accountants. The Board of Trustees reviews these audit reports on an annual basis. The financial audit and management responses to any exceptions are reviewed and discussed in public sessions.
Institutional Planning & Evaluation

The College has continued to foster a culture of evidence that serves as the foundation for the critical and continuous cycle of assessing and improving College programs, services and policies. Institutional planning and program evaluation is systematic for all departments and divisions of the College, including instruction, student development services, and administrative services. The focus in all three areas is to enhance student learning and success.

Public Information

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

- **General Information**: including educational mission; course, program, and degree offerings; academic calendar and program length; academic freedom statement; available student financial aid; available learning resources; names and degrees of administrators and faculty; and names of Board of Trustees members
- **Requirements**: including admissions, student fees and other financial obligations; and degree, certificate, graduation, and transfer requirements
- **Major Policies Affecting Students**

Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The College and the Board of Trustees hereby affirm by signatures of the official representatives above, that City College of San Francisco has consistently adhered to the eligibility requirements, standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community & Junior Colleges. The College describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the commission to carry out accrediting responsibilities. All disclosures by the College are complete, accurate, and honest.
Response to WASC Recommendations

MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2006 TEAM

“Recommendations #2, #3, and #4 are presented as overarching concerns that should receive the college’s focused attention and emphasis. The other recommendations are also important for the college to address in conjunction with its ongoing planning and operational activities.”

Response to Recommendation #1 on Mission Statement

The team recommends that the college regularly review and approve the mission statement in a discrete process to ensure that it is clearly addressed. (Standards I.A.3 and I.A.4).

In 2008, the College initiated an in-depth and inclusive review of the College’s Mission and Vision statements open to the entire student body and all the employees of the institution. In Fall 2008, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC), with assistance from the Office of Research and Planning, developed a survey which was disseminated to the entire College community. The timing of the review process was selected so that revised Vision and Mission statements could set the stage for an upcoming strategic planning initiative.

The initial Fall 2008 survey largely affirmed the content of the Mission and Vision statements, with some modifications recommended. A second survey was conducted in August 2009 to clarify the modifications. Modifications and revisions were discussed with the College Advisory Council (CAC) and the College’s PBC, as well as constituent groups. CAC and the College’s PBC reviewed drafts on multiple occasions. Prior to final approval from CAC and the College’s PBC, the Academic Senate, Administrator’s Association, Associated Students, and Classified Senate all reviewed and approved the final version.

In Summer 2009, the Board’s Policy Implementation Committee identified BP 1200, District Vision and Mission Statement, as a policy which needed to be updated. Modifications were discussed with that Committee on two occasions in Fall 2009, with the final version presented to the Committee on March 3, 2010.

Final approval from CAC and the College’s PBC occurred in February 2010. The Board of Trustees approved the statements on April 29, 2010.

For more information, please go to Resolution P4 on page 140 at this link: http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/BOT/april_resolution.pdf
Response to WASC Recommendation #2 on Planning and Assessment

The team recommends that the college build upon its continuing planning and assessment efforts and develop an integrated process of institutional planning and assessment that combines strategic planning, educational planning, facilities planning, technology planning, and personnel planning in a manner that links these planning processes to annual budgets. Planning should be based upon the findings of instructional and non-instructional program review, which should include clear criteria for resource reallocation and/or program and service development, expansion, or termination. (Standards I.B, II.A.2.e, and II.A.2.f)

Since 2006, CCSF has made substantial progress toward creating an integrated process of assessment, planning, and budgeting. The College has nearly completed a new Strategic Plan, modified the planning and budgeting system, and completely revamped the Program Review System.

Modification of Annual Planning

To address the recommendation regarding integration of College wide plans with annual budgeting, we reviewed the first stage of the process for assembling the Annual Plan. The Annual Plan was historically only derived from the College’s Strategic Plan. Under the old procedures, institutional leadership would use the Strategic Plan to identify prospective objectives for the new fiscal year. Under the procedures adopted in 2007-08, the leadership draws objectives from the Strategic Plan as well as other College wide plans including the Technology Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, and the Education Master Plan (which includes plans for personnel augmentations). Other longer-range College wide plans are also consulted during the annual planning process; these include the Sustainability Plan, Part 1, and the Student Equity Plan and related initiatives.

The College moved toward even deeper integration in 2011, drawing upon the new Program Review System. Both the Annual Plan and Annual Budget for 2011-12 were informed by 2010-11 Program Review results. In order for this to occur, the timeline for annual planning shifted from fall to spring. As Program Review is modified into a biennial system, the timeline will be further revised to optimize levels of integration. For several years the College published a Management and Budget Plan (MBP) which sought to show the relationship between the Annual Plan and the Annual Budget after both were published. This document has been discontinued in favor of more timely and transparent integration whereby planning objectives are referenced within the Annual Budget itself.

Integration has entailed other changes as well. In order to facilitate a deep relationship between annual planning and Program Review, it is important for each Annual Plan to be readily understood and provide sufficient direction to all instructional and non-instructional College units. Past Annual Plans were lengthy, all-inclusive, and broadly stated documents. While these plans reflected the intentions of the institution, objectives were not narrowly focused on the coming year. As a result, the plans provided insufficient direction and were difficult to measure. The 2011-12 Annual Plan attempts to remedy these issues by being more specific and more measurable. This transition from an all-inclusive plan to a more focused plan requires greater levels of consensus within the institution—something that is particularly necessary during these times of fiscal scarcity.
The draft Annual Plan is disseminated for discussion through the Shared Governance System, as well as to department chairs, all administrators, and the Board of Trustees.

**Development of a New Program Review System**

The second stage of our assessment, planning, and budgeting process relies upon our new annual (soon to be biennial) Program Review System, which is inclusive for all units in the College. This new process was piloted in 2008-09. The pilot year was evaluated and several modifications were made for the 2009-10 cycle. Further improvements were made in 2010-11. The three years of annual implementation garnered nearly 100% participation from all units at the College.

Each review cycle begins when units receive five years of data on enrollment, personnel, budget expenditures, student and/or employee satisfaction (as available), and additional productivity measures depending upon whether it is an instructional, student service or administrative unit. Student success and demographic information are also provided. The Program Review report form, sometimes called the template, includes text boxes to be filled out by the unit leader in consultation with the faculty and staff of the unit. These text boxes ask the unit to:

a. Provide reflections on data trends
b. Summarize progress on prior year planning objectives
c. Identify major planning objectives for the next fiscal year
d. Discuss the status of learning assessment for courses and programs
e. Describe resources needed to meet planning objectives

The Program Review reports identify unit needs for new programming, staffing, equipment, supplies, and facilities, as well as budget augmentation proposals during the February to May budget development process.

The Shared Governance Program Review Committee (PRC) coordinates the review of all submitted Program Review reports. The PRC invites volunteers from the College community to assist with reading the reports. In 2010-11 for example, eight subcommittees were established and the program reviews were divided amongst the subcommittees as proportionally as possible. Reviews were clustered by categories to ease the workload. Example categories include Campuses, Schools, Student Development, Chancellor Direct Reports, Instructional Support, and Finance and Administration.

Reports are also reviewed by the immediate supervisor. For example, for instructional units, School Deans read and comment on all departmental reports in their school. Reports for most administrative units are reviewed by the appropriate Vice Chancellor, unless there is an intermediate supervisor. This process serves as the first filter for reviewing unit-level planning objectives and budget requests.

Programs or services showing significant challenges with either operations or productivity levels will be identified and recommended for a special comprehensive program review. Special comprehensive program reviews can use the old standard CCSF program review framework (2006), an alternative method, or an external peer review process. To date, no such units have been identified as College constituent groups have
agreed that the Program Review process would not be punitive. However, the PRC has identified and suggested areas where units might work more closely together. The next iteration of the Program Review template is likely to highlight the desire for increased collaboration and resource-sharing, an objective highlighted in the new Strategic Plan. Moreover, interest in more detailed data and increased focus on assessment is moving the College toward better tracking of budget allocations and related results.

Based on the PRC subcommittees’ work, the PRC presents findings and makes budget recommendations to its parent council, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC), chaired by the Chancellor. The PRC clusters its findings under the subheadings of 1) Areas of Commendation, 2) Areas of Challenge, 3) New Resources Needed, and 4) Subcommittee Concerns, to frame the discussion. These broad findings inform the Annual Plan and the Annual Budget. In addition, the Program Review reports have been used by other College resource committees including the Faculty Position Allocation Committee and the Classified Vacancy Review Workgroup. When funding is appropriated, the instructional block grant workgroup will also refer to the reports.

Specific criteria for resource allocation were delineated and proposed by the PRC during the 2010-11 cycle. The College’s Planning and Budgeting Council has completed an initial review of the proposed criteria. The Council is expected to adopt a modified version of the proposed criteria in anticipation of the upcoming cycle.

Overall, participants have found the annual process to be meaningful. In the first comprehensive evaluation conducted in 2009, 53 percent rated the usefulness to the unit as “excellent” or “above average,” and another 36 percent indicated “average.” However, some necessary changes have been identified. The largest of these changes is a transition from annual to biennial. Department chairs and administrative leaders at the College have determined that a biennial cycle would retain the synergy of all units participating simultaneously, maintain a desired level of timeliness as compared to the old six-year cycle, but also allow for more reflection and greater emphasis on assessment.

In preparation for the change to a biennial cycle, a comprehensive evaluation will be undertaken by the PRC during Fall 2011—with guidance and input from the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council—with the goals of Shared Governance approval in Spring 2012 and implementation of the biennial process in Fall 2012. While some questions may be augmented or refined, it is expected that the biennial system will be comparable to the annual system.

During the third stage of the College assessment, planning, and budgeting process, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council reviews the recommendations from the Program Review Committee. The Council then develops a set of budget recommendations for the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, drawing upon the PRC recommendations. The Board reviews and adopts a tentative budget in June of each year and a final budget in the fall of each year. The objectives for the subsequent Annual Plan are also delineated at this time, reviewed through Shared Governance, and adopted by the Board. Thus both the budget and Annual Plan are informed by more than 120 program reviews reflecting every facet of the institution.
Response to WASC Recommendation #3 on Student Learning Outcomes

The team recommends that the college ensure that student learning outcomes are fully institutionalized as a core element of college operations, with specific focus on curriculum and program development. (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.3, and II.A.6).

Course and Program SLO Progress

In 2007 the Academic Senate established a Student Learning Outcomes Task Force whose charge was to review the WASC recommendation on SLOs, review recent literature on SLO development, address the issue of keeping SLOs both broad in scope and measurable, research recommendations from professional, discipline-specific organizations and examine models of SLO implementation at other California community colleges.

In Fall 2008 the Senate Task Force was replaced with a new workgroup that included three administrators, three representatives from the Academic Senate and three from the Department Chairpersons Council. This was in response to extensive discussions held by the Department Chairpersons Council, Academic Senate and instructional divisions across the College.

A new annual Program Review System was designed concurrently during the Fall 2008 term. The report forms for this system include text boxes to be filled out by the unit leader in consultation with the faculty and staff of the unit. One text box asks the unit, “to discuss the status of learning assessment for courses and programs.”

In light of this, and the WASC recommendation, the SLO Workgroup recommended the integration of the student learning outcomes assessment process with the Program Review process. The Workgroup also agreed upon templates that would be used by academic departments to capture the information necessary for a thorough assessment of learning outcomes for courses and programs. The information from these templates fed into the Program Review text boxes referenced above.

All department chairs were provided the student learning outcomes assessment templates for review and discussion with their faculty during Spring 2009 Flex Day. In this pilot year, every one of the 62 departments was asked to complete a minimum of one template for a course or program. During the pilot period, 2008-09, the student learning outcomes assessment templates were reviewed by the workgroup and revised accordingly. Since then departments have had an opportunity to add courses and/or programs into their student learning outcomes assessment process, which is completely integrated into the Program Review System, which in turn is completely integrated into the annual planning and budgeting system.

Some of the SLO reports received were exemplary, showing a cycle of continuous improvement that was data driven and included the use of student learning outcomes data. Our Program Review Committee reviewed the information submitted in the pilot year. While some reports were outstanding, others did not yield full information on the means of assessment, measurement criteria, or plans for improvement. Some departments
did not find that the timeline gave them sufficient time to make plans for improvement. Also, there were different interpretations of the terminology used in the templates. We now have a general sense of our baseline in terms of the departments which reported in the pilot year.

During the Spring 2009 semester, the evaluation of the pilot Program Review process began and continued through Fall 2009. A 12 question survey was developed by the Office of Research & Planning in consultation with the PRC and distributed to every College employee. Seventy-one survey respondents provided feedback as well as the members of the Department Chairpersons Council (DCC), College’s PBC, and members of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Workgroup. As of Fall 2009, in response to concerns raised in the Spring 2009 pilot implementation and the urgency of continued integration of current and upcoming demands of institutional planning, assessment, and student learning outcomes, the PRC met every two weeks.

The SLO Workgroup continued to convene during the Fall 2009 semester to address implementation of the student learning outcomes process. The philosophy generated has been centralized coordination and decentralized (unit) implementation. Three of the Workgroup members have participated in Commission training and the DCC sponsored five Spring 2010 flex workshops related to the student learning outcomes process. Additional workshops have been scheduled since then as part of Flex activities.

In order to better guide and support the units with the SLO process, we have asked units to identify a six-year plan for revising course and program curriculum outlines and a plan to develop, assess and utilize student learning outcomes in all of their courses and/or programs by 2014-15. This expectation has been incorporated into our Curriculum Guide as well as our Program Review process.

These six-year plans were submitted by the departments to their respective Deans on March 1, 2010 and the PRC and SLO Workgroup have used them to evaluate institutional progress in the SLO assessment process. Departments have been encouraged to give early assessment priority to courses with high enrollments, courses that challenge students or serve as barriers to course progression, programs that capture courses across the curriculum, courses offered with greatest frequency and complete disciplines within a department to ensure broad programmatic review. Preliminary review of plans indicates that the majority of courses and programs will complete one cycle of their assessment process by 2013.

In the Program Review report, units provide a summary describing progress to date on assessment plans introduced in prior year Program Review reports. Through a series of guided questions, units are asked to provide examples of exemplary course and program student learning outcomes assessment results. Respondents are also asked to identify their comfort level in managing their SLO processes and corresponding staff development needs.

The Curriculum Committee chair and Dean of Curriculum hold regular workshops for faculty course developers; student learning outcomes is a large part of these meetings. We have seen that faculty developers have improved in their ability to write measurable,
level-appropriate learning outcomes for their classes. Much of our current effort with faculty developers has been in more explicitly tying together the evaluation of learning outcomes into the instructional methodology section of the course outline of record.

The work that our Curriculum Committee has taken in integrating student learning outcomes has focused on changing the level of discussion at our Curriculum Committee meetings. The discussions at the meetings have been more focused on learning outcomes, content, instructional methodology, and the integration of those three areas.

Our Curriculum Handbook guides departments in the entirety of our curriculum processes. Two chapters of the handbook work with program development: Chapter 4 discusses degree programs, and Chapter 5 discusses certificate programs. A recent revision of this Handbook now guides departments to include a discussion of learning outcomes into the development process of certificate and degree programs. In addition to this guidance, departments who are proposing certificate and degree programs must now identify the learning outcomes as a part of the Catalog text. In addition to this new requirement, we have included guidance about mapping program level learning outcomes to individual courses.

Since our Midterm Report, professional development has begun to significantly enhance our SLO implementation effort. CCSF designated Student Learning Outcomes as the theme of Spring 2009 (Flex) Professional Development Day, raising the profile of learning outcomes throughout the institution, and providing training opportunities in the form of workshops on eight different SLO topics. All faculty and administrators were given the opportunity to participate in any of the workshops, with topics ranging from the development and assessment of course and program outcomes, to the SLO-based revision of a college success course and a general introduction to the process of continuous quality improvement (CQI). Every flex professional development day since then has offered a series of workshops on different SLO topics across different disciplines.

Improvements in assessment have been undertaken. Many departments are exploring the use of more authentic and faculty-driven assessment, often with the use of rubrics, to complement traditional forms of assessment of learning outcomes. The results of these explorations have been an ongoing topic of department and/or school meetings and Flex activities.

Some of our largest departments, including English, Mathematics, and ESL, make some use of common assessment materials for multiple sections of the same course. Some other departments prefer to leave the manner of SLO assessment to the discretion of the individual instructor and our decentralized implementation allows for that flexibility. In many of the career technical, STEM, and basic skills-involved disciplines, implementation of SLOs seems to be particularly well developed. Since we are a very large institution, gathering information about the extent of existing SLO implementation in all of our courses and programs continues to represent an advance. We have much more information and evidence than before. Nonetheless, documentation is an ongoing challenge, so we have discussed ways to continue to expand SLO reporting processes.
within existing resources. Some departments have chosen to share their SLO activities through video clips available on their website.

**Library and Learning Resources SLO Progress**
Library and Learning Resources have developed student learning outcomes and begun assessment activities. Between 2007 and 2009, all research skills/IC workshop course outlines and SLOs were revised and then, before approval by the College Curriculum Committee, further revised into a single noncredit course (LIS 1000), and to conform more closely with Title V of the California Education Code. Content and pedagogical changes to the outlines derived from student survey feedback indicating the need for more practical examples and engaging learning activities. Finally, the workshop outlines and instructional materials were revised and training sessions offered to librarians to introduce the new content and student engagement teaching techniques.

An SLO Task Force convened in Fall 2009 to address development of the other SLOs for Library and Learning Resources services and programs. The outcome of their work is six SLOs that reflect all LLR service and resource units. The SLOs have been shared with all staff and discussed at library faculty meetings and the Dean’s Library Advisory Committee meeting. The six program SLOs will be available from the Library’s homepage and will link assessment findings and plans for improvement. This information is now available internally to LLR staff through the Library wiki. Some individual units, such as the Learning Assistance Center and the Language Center, currently have SLOs and assessments publicly accessible on their websites. Workshop and information competency SLOs are included in the Library website.

A new Library Assessment Committee formed on recommendation of the SLO Task Force developed and refined program-level SLOs in alignment with the LLR Mission Statement and College goals and priorities. It also developed an ongoing assessment plan that includes a timeline and suggested evaluation methods and strategies for the six program-level SLOs. The committee coordinates all assessment activities for LLR through 2018, which include the Instructional Services/Information Competency program SLOs. Research skills/IC workshop outlines and content are scheduled for assessment on a rotating basis and assessments through Spring 2011 have resulted in revisions to assignments or outlines of five workshops. The Assessment Committee also identified measures by service area; documents to guide assessment workgroups; survey instruments; an assessment analysis form; and a tool to track assessments performed, recommendations, and results, and made these available on the Library wiki.

Assessment activities and actions resulting from them include the integration of sections of ENGL 1A and 1B for performance-based assessment of Workshop P, “Citing Sources Responsibly,” which resulted in revisions to citation examples. The Culinary and Hospitality Services Department (CAHS) also revised its CAHS 100 course outline to require online research skills/IC workshops, and the collaboration between CAHS and the subject librarian helped inform efforts to “embed” librarians into online courses. The Language Center identified its SLOs in Spring 2010 and began assessment through student surveys mailed to Foreign Language Department classes, available on the
Language Center website, and in print in the Language Center. To assess students’ application of Learning Assistance Department SLOs and the general usefulness of the SLOs after course completion, the LAD first administered a College Success Survey in Spring 2007 to students who had completed LERN 50 the previous semester with a C or better. The survey has been repeated through 2010 and findings have informed the revision of LERN 50 SLOs and assisted faculty in developing the College Success course.

**General Education SLO Progress**

Our Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, a joint committee of the Academic Senate and the Administration, formed a workgroup to identify learning outcomes for each of our eight General Education areas. These outcomes were presented to and approved by the Bipartite Committee in late February 2009 for publication in the 2009-10 College Catalog.

One of the challenges we have in establishing the SLO process for our General Education coursework is the scope of work involved. We have several hundred courses spread across the eight General Education areas. The workgroup that is identifying the learning outcomes for each of the General Education areas is using the inclusion criteria as a starting point for these learning outcomes. Our goal is to create a unified process that can be used to review courses for inclusion into a General Education area while simultaneously mapping the learning outcomes for that area to specific aspects of the course.

**Student Development/Student Services SLO Progress**

The Student Development Division continues to make substantial progress in the area of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s). As previously reported, prior to the Summer 2008 semester, the Student Development Division had a SLO Workgroup that met regularly to discuss and brainstorm SLO’s, initiated several SLO pilot studies, and began developing a timeline and mapping for SLO’s within the Division.

In Summer 2008, in an effort to move the Student Development Division closer to the WASC standards of sustainability in SLO’s, the Division began a series of workshops for each unit within the Division. These workshops, facilitated by staff trained on SLO’s, provided the following:

- a brief history and description of SLO’s,
- a review of the Student Development Division’s involvement in SLO’s thus far,
- an examination of individual unit goals and mission statements,
- the development of SLO’s for each unit,
- the development of support activities for selected SLO’s, and
- the development of assessments for selected SLO’s.

After these meetings were conducted, a grid with all Divisional SLO information was created and monthly SLO Workgroup meetings, with at least one representative attending from each unit, were initiated. At the Workgroup meetings, units shared SLO’s,
brainstormed goals, and began discussion of divisional SLO’s. In addition to the Workgroup meetings, the Student Development SLO Coordinator met with individual units to keep everyone on task. SLO presentations were made available to departments within the major 10 units as needed. In December 2008, each department provided a Progress Report for their respective areas, outlining what SLO’s they worked on in the fall semester, their progress, and their future plans for each SLO.

The result of the diligent work of the many units within the Student Development Division during this time was substantial. Over these seven months, the Division grew from one to two units with SLO pilot projects to each of the ten major units, and many of their sub-units, working on clearly identified SLO’s. Although the units continued to move forward at different paces, and experienced different issues as they began collection, assessment, and analysis of data, the effort of the Division became unified in their collective approach and commitment to make significant impacts on student learning through the use of SLO’s.

During Spring 2009, the SLO Workgroup continued to meet monthly, focusing on individual department and unit goals in conjunction with Divisional SLOs. At the end of the spring semester, departments submitted reports on the status of their SLOs. The Student Development SLO Coordinator compiled a report documenting units engaged in over thirty Student Learning Outcomes. During this time, many departments moved beyond assessment into data analysis and department dialog, evaluating results to drive changes in service delivery and improve contributions to student learning. Additionally, units employed a number of different assessment tools and formats such as Survey Monkey, student narratives, focus groups, evaluation of Banner data, and pre- and post-questionnaires.

The California fiscal crisis had an immediate impact on student services in Fall 2009 as state funding disproportionately targeted non-academic areas. With services to students cut back and staff and faculty stretched to the limit doing “more with less,” direct services and contact with students became the top priority. Although the SLO Workgroup cut their monthly meetings to one per semester, and assessment and analysis slowed in the face of shrinking resources, the focus on Student Learning Outcomes projects continued for two primary reasons: 1) The Institution integrated and linked student learning outcomes with the annual Program Review process and 2) many units, having reached proficiency in terms of SLO implementation, were therefore engaged and committed to ongoing, continuous quality improvement in student learning. Divisionally, units committed to focusing new SLO’s on developing a higher degree of integration among academic and student support services, a research-proven effective best practice to increase student success and improve student learning.

In 2010, the Board of Trustees led an effort to close the achievement gap when it initiated a number of public student equity hearings. Several widespread listening sessions were held and the College established a Chancellor’s Task Force on the Achievement Gap and Student Equity. Student services personnel are fully engaged in addressing such student equity issues as early registration, financial aid, matriculation testing, counseling services
and student employment and several Student Learning Outcome projects are aligned with achievement gap issues.

As referenced above, over the past two years (2009-11), Student Services has continued to include active Student Learning Outcomes projects in their unit objectives and priorities. Updates and progress on Student Learning Outcomes are reported annually through the Program Review process. Data collection and analysis is becoming more sophisticated as units progress in their projects. Cycles of continuous improvement are being integrated across additional departments. Reports containing data, analysis and recommendations for programmatic change in several departments are available to other units and serve as models of effective practice in the continuous improvement cycle.

Recent examples include curriculum changes in LERN 10 (the tutor training course) and LERN 50 (College Success). In Summer 2010 the College piloted enhanced orientations for new students. Results of this study informed changes to the content of the standard college orientations and led to the critical addition of financial aid workshops connected to the orientation sessions.

Several projects are currently underway pairing counseling and instructional faculty in the classroom. Counseling faculty are partnering with basic skills English instructors to introduce students to counseling services and provide workshops as part of the classroom experience. Data tracking these students’ utilization of counseling and other support services and analysis of the impact on student retention and success is ongoing.

Similar collaborations are underway between career counselors and general business instructors—measuring the impact of easy access to career building tools and skills connected to business job preparation and opportunities.

Several SLO projects are focused on closing the achievement gap and are connected to the CCSF Bridge 2 Success partnership grant (with SF Unified School District and the SF Mayor’s office) which aims to double the number of African American and Latino low income students who complete a certificate, degree or transfer to a four-year institution within six years of entering community college. Already major changes are in place including priority registration for high school students, concentrated high school outreach to expand participation in concurrent enrollment, and establishment of a new summer bridge program.

Student Service units are deeply committed to Student Learning Outcomes and the success of the students attending CCSF. Over the past couple of years these units have positively impacted the overall institutional effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes by continuing to develop new SLO’s, by becoming proficient in the comprehensive assessment of ongoing SLO’s and by sustaining a culture of continuous quality improvement as reflected each year in their program reviews.

All constituent groups, without exception, have been engaged in SLO implementation dialog since we submitted our Focused Midterm Report. The level of awareness of the SLOs model has increased significantly at the leadership level through these various discussions. CCSF has progressed demonstratively and substantially in the
institutionalization of student learning outcomes as a core element of College operations. Implementation has broadened and accelerated. Facing extraordinary resource constraints, we have nonetheless identified several strategies for moving forward in a timely fashion.

The leadership at the College has demonstrated a strong commitment to advancing the dialog on student learning outcomes. The administration, the Department Chairpersons Council and the Academic Senate has each had a strong presence in guiding our discussions, designing our processes, and providing staff development opportunities to support this institutional priority.

Response to WASC Recommendation #4 on Financial Planning and Stability

_The team recommends that the college develop a financial strategy that will: match ongoing expenditures with ongoing revenue; maintain the minimum prudent reserve level; reduce the percentage of its annual budget that is utilized for salaries and benefits; and address funding for retiree health benefits costs._ (Standards III.D.1.b, III.D.2.c, and III.D.2.d)

The College provided an update on progress made in this area in March 2009 and March 2010. This report provides a third update on progress made during the period between April 2010 and July 2011, including the ongoing financial challenges for the College generated by our nation’s continuing economic difficulties.

The College has shown clear movement in the direction of effectiveness and efficiency in the management of its fiscal resources. In addition to previous steps described in the 2010 Follow-Up Report, the administration initiated plans to reorganize its Information Technology resources during 2010, and took advantage of cost savings opportunities created by retirements of administrators, with the end result being a substantially reduced number of administrators for fiscal year 2010-11 and 2011-12. The combined savings from changes in administration and Information Technology resulted in more than $2 million in reduced expenditures.

It should be noted that the College’s independent financial audits for fiscal years 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 have all resulted in unqualified opinions reflecting the accuracy of the College’s financial statements. However, the College’s auditors did note three material weaknesses in their 2009-10 report and the College is working diligently to address those findings. The Board of Trustees Audit Committee closely monitors the progress of these efforts.

The following is a summary of what the College has achieved in the four areas specified: matching on-going expenditures to on-going revenues, maintaining prudent reserve levels, reducing the percentage of the annual budget utilized for salaries/benefits, and addressing retiree health benefits.
Match Ongoing Expenditures to Ongoing Revenue

The ending balance in the College’s unrestricted general fund on June 30, 2010 was estimated at $2 million, an amount that was relatively similar to the previous year. The fact that this was achieved for a second consecutive year supports the fact that the College had successfully matched ongoing spending with ongoing revenue during the fiscal year.

Dramatic reductions in funding for the community college system continued during fiscal year 2010-11, including severe cuts initiated during 2009-10 to both apportionment and categorical programs. Multiple strategies were employed to ensure that the College operated within a balanced budget during this two-year period; strategies that required very high levels of cooperation across all College constituencies including the elected Board of Trustees. Actions taken by the College to reduce spending in accord with reduced resources included termination of consultant contracts, reducing the number of administrators through attrition, reducing the number of classified positions through attrition, reducing other operating expenditures and supplies, and carefully reducing the number of class sections during years in which such action was consistent with the College’s effort to manage enrollment.

Actions taken by the College to increase available revenue have included successful efforts to raise private funds to support instruction, and carefully adding class sections to earn growth funding when available, as was the case during fiscal year 2010-11. It is also important to note that largely as a result of the cooperation of the labor unions that represent most of the College’s workforce, virtually every employee experienced reductions in compensation during either fiscal year 2009-10 or fiscal year 2010-11 or both.

To ensure adequate funds were available to support student services, an area targeted by the state for dramatic reductions, the final budgets for both 2009-10 and 2010-11 included authorization to use up to $2 million of the Board Designated Reserve if necessary. This decision was granted in recognition of the importance of these programs for student success. However, the College’s fiscal strategy was not to spend the $2 million by carefully monitoring all spending and maximizing savings during the course of the year. The College was successful in achieving its goal of not spending any money from its Board Designated Reserve during both of these fiscal years. The College intends to replicate this strategy during fiscal year 2011-12.

The College is once again making conservative revenue assumptions for fiscal year 2011-12 and has adopted a budget based on reductions in state funding that will take place if the statewide $4 billion revenue increase assumed in the state budget as enacted does not occur. With respect to expenditures, the strategies outlined above largely remain in place, and the College’s finance team carefully reviews spending by account each and every pay period. Revenue estimates are also reviewed on a continuing basis and adjusted if data supports such a change. Any such changes are brought to the immediate attention of the Chancellor, and to the Board of Trustees at their regularly scheduled meetings.
Maintain Minimum Prudent Reserve Level

The Community Colleges System Office recommends that colleges maintain a prudent reserve equal to at least five percent of unrestricted general fund expenditures. In a memo issued in October 2005, the State Chancellor’s Office stated that the “Primary Criteria” for the overall assessment of a district’s financial condition would be:

“... General Fund Analysis that will include a review of the current, historical and projected fund balance. The main criteria for assessment will be the percentage of unrestricted general fund balance to all expenditures and other outgo of [the] unrestricted general fund. For purposes of this assessment, all unrestricted expenditures and other outgo will include all uses of unrestricted general funds under expenditure object codes 1000 thru [sic] 7000.

The minimum prudent unrestricted general fund balance is 5 percent. This minimum prudent level is considered necessary to ease cash flow problems, to deal with unexpected cost increases, and other fiscal uncertainties. If a district falls below this minimum prudent level, further review will be performed to determine if any fiscal problems exist. Such review shall take into account identified one-time revenues and expenditures as designated by the affected district.”

As reported in the Annual Financial Budget Reports (CCFS-311) the College’s percentages for this measure have consistently exceeded the recommended minimum amount, totaling more than 10 percent in fiscal years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09. Based on current information, the College expects to exceed the 10 percent level once again at the end of fiscal year 2009-10. The College’s budget strategy for 2011-12 would achieve this goal once again.

An important component of a college’s fund balance is the Board Designated Reserve. On June 30, 2010, City College’s Board designated Reserve remained at $6.65 million, the largest amount in the history of the College. In addition to the designated reserve, the fund balance included more than $2.5 million in the form of a closeout in the unrestricted general fund. These two components totaled more than $9 million or about 4.5 per cent of annual unrestricted general fund spending. The College’s independent external auditors have advised the College that an additional $1 million in restricted funds should be added to the $9 million figure which would create a revised total of $10 million or more than 5% of annual unrestricted general fund spending. This means that even under the narrowest measure of fiscal reserves, the College exceeded the five percent minimum amount recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office.

Reduce Percentage of Annual Budget Utilized for Salaries/Benefits

The College is located in one of the highest cost areas in the country and this is reflected in the cost of the current salary and benefits structure. The ratio of personnel to non-personnel costs remains at a high level with more than 90 percent of unrestricted general fund expenditures going towards employee compensation. Additional funding would be needed to provide increased support for non-personnel items that would change this ratio.
In addition, under historically difficult fiscal conditions, the College has made strategic decisions to maintain as many class sections and student services as possible in the face of significant state cuts in workload funding and severe state cuts to categorical programs. Under current circumstances, these efforts to protect students will contribute to the percentage of the budget going to personnel costs.

**Retiree Health Benefits**

An independent actuary has determined that the College has an unfunded liability of approximately $158 million for the cost of retiree health benefits. This unfunded liability is now included in the College’s financial statements as documented by the annual independent audit report. The College did join the investment consortium sponsored by the Community College League for this issue but has not deposited any money into the fund. Recently San Francisco voters enacted a measure that modifies post retirement health benefits for new hires, lengthening the number of years needed to qualify for the benefit and allowing the College to negotiate with its representative labor unions to charge new hires a percentage of their salary to prefund the future liability. The College cannot implement the charges to new employees without union approval. The College is currently negotiating issues concerning post retirement health benefits with our collective bargaining units and expects to reach an agreement to address this matter by the end of 2011.

**Next Steps**

During the past three years, all parts of the College community have demonstrated the highest possible level of cooperation in a unified effort to protect the College from unprecedented budget gaps. To continue its current level of financial stability during fiscal year 2011-12, the same high level of cooperation will be needed.

In September, 2011, the College’s Board of Trustees and the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council evaluated and offered changes for the administration’s recommended final budget for fiscal year 2011-12. As was the case with the development of the 2010-11 budget, during the spring the Board’s Planning and Budgeting Committee conducted several public hearings on the College’s budget for fiscal year 2011-12. The administration incorporated the ideas and direction it received from the Board of Trustees and the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council to develop the final budget in September 2011.

**Response to Recommendation #5 on Physical Facilities Maintenance Planning**

_The team recommends that the college include the future costs of operating and maintaining new and existing facilities in its planning models and allocate funds in a timely manner to ensure the effective operation of these facilities. (Standard II.B.2.a)._
The College has opened five new facilities as a result of its bond program; Student Health Services, the Mission Campus, the Child Development Center, the Health and Wellness Center, and the Multi-Use Building. While these openings have increased operating costs, three of them, the Mission Campus, the Wellness Center, and the Multi-Use Building have also increased revenue by growing enrollment. While a true “total cost of ownership” methodology was not used during the initial planning stage for these facilities, the College was able to set aside adequate funding to operate each facility upon opening.

The College will occupy its Chinatown/North Beach Campus in April 2012. Classes will begin at the new facility during the Summer 2012 semester. This facility will require a significant amount of operating support. The cost of operating this facility will be significantly offset by the College’s ability to cease paying approximately $700,000 per year in rent and utilities for the existing Chinatown/North Beach Campus currently leased from the SFUSD as well as other smaller sites near the new campus. To ensure a smooth transition, the College has already incorporated the net increased cost of opening the Chinatown/North Beach Campus into the three-year running model of the College’s operating budget.

Construction of the Performing Arts Center on the Ocean Campus is expected to begin by January 2012. The expected additional costs for operating this new facility will also be incorporated into the three-year running model for the College’s operating budget. In time, this facility, which replaces older classrooms, will also lead to increased funding from enrollment growth.

The College is committed to incorporating total cost of ownership into plans at the initial stage for any new facilities that may be built as a result of future bond issues.

**Response to Recommendation #6 on Physical Facilities Contingency Planning**

_The team recommends that the college ensure the development of adequate contingency plans, which should be implemented in a timely manner in order to reduce potential exposure to losses. (Standard III.D.2.c)._
Response to Recommendation #7 on Technology Planning

The team recommends that all unit technology plans be brought up-to-date, and that a unified college-wide technology plan be developed. This plan should be integrated with facilities and budget plans. Funds for technology acquisition and maintenance, including regular replacement of outdated hardware, should be integrated into the institution’s budget. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.6, III.C.1, and III.C.2).

The Technology Plan, developed in 2007-08 by a cross-college team from Academic Affairs, Student Development, Institutional Advancement, and Information Technology Services, was reviewed in Spring 2009 by the College Shared Governance organizations. Once finalized through Shared Governance, the plan went to the Board of Trustees for a final review and adoption in late Spring 2009. The Technology Plan is a unified planning document that integrates technology objectives from all parts of the College including instruction, student development, library, and Information Technology Services. It also identifies funding sources for each planning objective including the replacement of outdated hardware and timelines for seeking resources and implementation. The Plan calls strongly for bringing routine technology expenditures, such as systematic replacement of hardware, under the General Fund.

The plan is currently undergoing review and updating by another cross-college team from Academic Affairs, Student Development, Institutional Advancement, and Information Technology Services. Once finalized through Shared Governance, the plan will go to the Board of Trustees for a final review and adoption anticipated in late Spring 2012. Part of the update will be the identification of new technologies such as zero-client and thin-client technologies as an alternative for the costly refresh cycles of computer replacement. Due to the current economic climate, a computer-for-computer refresh cycle is not cost effective; however, the use of new technologies will provide significant long-term savings for the College. The Plan will continue to call for bringing routine technology expenditures, such as computer replacements and the advancement of cost-effective alternative technologies, under the General Fund.

Response to Recommendation #8 on Board Self-Evaluation

The team recommends that the Board of Trustees establish a method of self evaluation, determine the schedule for this process, and complete self evaluations on a regular basis. (Standard IV.B.1.g).

The Board of Trustees at its November 20, 2008 meeting adopted a comprehensive policy on self evaluation. The Board President, with assistance from the Office of Research and Planning, developed a self-evaluation instrument to be completed by Board members as well as constituent groups. Constituent groups include the Academic Senate, Administrators Association, Associated Students, and Classified Senate, as well as local SEIU and AFT.
The self evaluation was first implemented in April and May 2009 covering the period July 1, 2008 through March 2009. The broadly encompassing instrument contained 52 statements to which respondents rated their level of agreement or disagreement. In addition, the instrument contained five open-ended questions. To facilitate comparisons, the same instrument was used both for Board members and for constituent groups. Results were presented and discussed at the May 2009 Board meeting, as well as the June 2009 Board Meeting.

Just over a year later, in September 2010, the Office of Research and Planning coordinated a review of the survey instrument. The instrument was unchanged for Board members. Constituent groups were asked to identify questions beyond their purview (for example, travel allowance for Board members) and questions which were so nuanced as to be largely redundant. As a result, 14 items out of 52 were removed. The purpose of this reduction was to minimize the burden of responding to the survey thereby facilitating more numerous responses from constituent groups. Responses were collected in Fall 2010, aggregated, and presented to the Board at its meeting on January 27, 2011. Results were presented in three sections including (1) quantitative results comparing constituent ratings and Board member ratings, (2) open-ended comments from constituent group members (3) open-ended comments from Trustees.

It is anticipated that a third self evaluation will be conducted during the 2011-12 academic year.

For more information, please go to this link:


The two support units, audiovisual and broadcast media services, are physically situated at different locations and operationally managed by different administrators. This separation of the two units has not promoted adequate operational integration of these two units, which the college should address along with appropriate levels of staffing.

The BMS and AV departments consistently and successfully collaborate on College wide projects, especially supporting classroom instruction. The Audiovisual Department continues to make presentations to the “New Faculty Orientations” at the beginning of each school year. Both departments work together to provide equipment and staff support to the Ocean Campus as well as six campus sites across San Francisco. They are working together setting up the library and media services for the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus scheduled to open Fall 2012.
To date the two departments continue to update a joint handout that describes available services and materials. This handout continues to be disseminated to the broader community and is included in the new faculty orientation packets. BMS and the AV Departments successfully collaborated on developing an exciting online guide to Media Services available 24/7. The online guide has promoted a successful operational integration of these two units.

Although the pilot project was able to begin, it had to be revised due to the retirement of the employee designated to serve the campus locations. The position has not been filled, but the Ocean Campus AV staff is working with the Campus Deans, Site Supervisor and various staff to meet their AV needs. The AV Supervisor strives to provide adequate support to the campuses in spite of the hiring freeze. The goal to provide improved and consistent services to the smaller campus sites via access to a larger pool of experts has been met.


*The team noted that while publicizing its policies, the college should take steps to ensure that an Academic Freedom statement is included in the college catalog as well as any other appropriate publications (Standard II.B.2.a).*

The Academic Senate approved the College academic freedom statement on November 29, 2006. It is an excerpt from Board Policy 6.06. It first appeared in the 2007-08 College Catalog and is also available on the City College of San Francisco website at http://www.ccsf.edu/Board.

**Response to Recommendation in IIB Conclusions -- Student Records** See bottom p. 30 of 2006 Report

*On a practical note, the college still needs to address the issue of permanent maintenance of all student records.*

City College of San Francisco classifies, maintains and categorizes the final disposition of all student records in strict accordance to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (sections 59020-59029) and the California Education Code (76210-76220). All records are scanned and stored in electronic format and if applicable, hard copies are filed and placed in storage as prescribed by the State Chancellor’s Office. The policy of disposal of applicable records is set in accordance with Title 5 and the California Education Code, which includes submitting to the Board of Trustees, for approval, a list of records to be destroyed.

**Response to Recommendation in II C Conclusions -- Age of Library Book Collection** See p. 32 of 2006 Report
There is great concern about the age of the overall collection, with many books that are outdated by two or more decades. This issue needs to be addressed within the overall campus planning and budgeting process.

The primary source of library funds continues to be a combination of unrestricted general fund dollars and a portion of the state instructional block grant for supplies and library materials.

Since 2009, the library budget has fluctuated between a low of $135,000 in 2009-10 to an even lower $108,414.95 in 2010-11. Additional funds will be needed in 2012 to cover the expenses associated with the anticipated opening of a new Chinatown/North Beach Library.

These funds are used to purchase books, CD ROMs, microforms, periodicals, and videos. The College no longer receives funds from the Telecommunications and Technology Program.

We are now faced with paying for the electronic materials from our insufficient budget. In 2006 we did not have any electronic books (e-books); today we have 17,466 e-books that are available 24/7.

The annual budget for books has been in the $73,000 to $95,000 range. The library department Collection Management Committee continues to concentrate on full text electronic databases and books that are available 24/7 in order to support student success.

Since 2009, library staff has continued to weed the collection of outdated materials. In Summer 2010, there was a major weeding effort done by the entire staff at all campus libraries. As the information age moves into the electronic and cyber world, a portion of the discarded books will be replaced with electronic materials that are available 24/7 on the internet.

One of the efforts taken on by the library to compensate for dwindling funds is to join with the San Francisco Public Library Redistribution Program to obtain materials copyrighted within the last three years to increase our available current materials. This has been successful since the San Francisco Public Library has gone through major renovations but these renovation projects are coming to an end. We cannot depend on the same quantity or quality of material in the future. The Collection Management Committee will work with the Dean of the LLR to investigate other ways to increase our current collection.

---


The team also encourages the college to incorporate examination of appropriate administrative staffing levels in its planning processes as it continues to expand programs and services.
The College’s planning process on administrative staffing has been impacted heavily by the economic crisis which hit beginning in 2007, as well as the large number of administrators who retired during the 2009-10 fiscal year. Working very closely with the Human Resources Department, the District instituted an administrative realignment, including filling key positions in Spring 2010 through Interim appointments, lateral transfers, additional duties/responsibilities added to some deans, or the hiring of new personnel. Two new administrators joined the administrative ranks in July 2010, filling the Associate Dean of Student Activities and the Chief Information Technology Officer positions.

The realignment included the creation of three new administrative positions: Chief Technology Officer, Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs, and Vice Chancellor of Campuses, Financial Aid, Admissions and Records and New Student Counseling. Reporting directly to the Chancellor are the following administrators: Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, Interim Vice Chancellor of Student Development, Interim Vice Chancellor of Policy and Research (formerly Institutional Advancement), Interim Vice Chancellor of Campuses, Financial Aid, Admissions and Records and New Student Counseling, Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs (Vacant), Chief Information Technology Officer, and Chief of Police. Currently, 39 administrators are employed at the College.
Standard I. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

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

Standard I.A: Mission

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

Descriptive Summary

All California community colleges are subject to the System’s mission as described in California Education Code §66010.4(a) [I A-1]. In addition, CCSF has two local statements, a Vision Statement and a Mission Statement, which define the institution’s educational purposes, its intended student population and its commitment to achieving student learning:

Our Vision
City College of San Francisco values and fosters superior levels of educational participation and academic success among all students. Reaching out to and including all populations, we strive to provide an affordable and unparalleled learning experience in a supportive and caring environment that leads students to successfully complete their goals.

A Teaching and Learning Community
Our principal distinction will be the high quality of instruction. The educational experience will feature successful learning in areas as varied as basic skills, academic courses, advanced honors, career and technical courses, retooling of job skills, and preparation for transfer to other educational institutions. Learning opportunities will extend to a broad array of courses and programs to offer any student a pathway to educational and career success.

An Inclusive Community
We will continue to reach out to all people, especially to those communities that encounter barriers to education; develop sustainable campuses and sites to better serve students and neighborhoods; diversify and improve programs and services for the benefit of the community; build partnerships with public, private, and community-based agencies to better respond to educational, economic, environmental, and societal needs; foster the participation of our students and employees in community life; and welcome students from around the world. Committed to lifelong educational opportunities for all, we will exchange expertise
and innovation with colleagues in the state, the nation and the world.

**A Diverse Community**
In our community, respect and trust are common virtues, and all people are enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding. We will maintain a supportive, positive, and productive working environment for our diverse faculty and staff, as well as a responsive environment in which student needs are met in a friendly, timely, and caring manner.

**Mission Statement**
CCSF provides educational programs and services to meet the following needs of our diverse community:

- Preparation for transfer to baccalaureate institutions
- Active engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizenship preparation, and English as a Second Language
- Achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Science
- Completion of requirements for the Adult High School Diploma and GED
- Acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace
  - Lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment
- Promotion of economic development and job growth

To enhance student success, the college provides an array of academic and student development services that support students’ intellectual, cultural, and civic achievements. City College of San Francisco belongs to the community and continually strives to provide an accessible and affordable education as a part of its commitment to serve as a sustainable community resource.

CCSF’s Vision Statement is a narrative that describes the students the College strives to serve and how their education will help improve themselves and their communities. It also describes the learning environment that CCSF wishes to foster. The elements of the Vision Statement (e.g., the benefits of an informed electorate through civic participation) inform the components of the Mission Statement (e.g., citizenship). The Mission Statement’s seven components describe in broad terms the programs CCSF offers: transfer, degree, certificate, workplace skills, civic engagement/citizenship, GED/adult education, and lifelong learning. The State mandates that California community colleges serve state residents who have graduated high school or who are at least 18 and capable of profiting from the instruction offered. Thus, the components of the Mission Statement are intended to meet the needs of a diverse student body including young adults fresh out of high school, re-entry students, older adults, workers needing re-training, and immigrants. Because the College community feels each component is equally important, it often presents the components in two columns to minimize the appearance of a prioritized order [I A-2].
Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF has well-developed Mission and Vision statements. Together, these form a robust articulation of the educational philosophy of the College, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. CCSF’s Vision Statement informs the seven components of the Mission Statement and nearly all decisions can be traced to at least one and often more than one of those components.

Planning Agenda

None

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

Descriptive Summary

CCSF goes to great lengths to align its offerings with its purposes, character, and student needs. The College’s purposes as defined in the Mission Statement are common among the California community colleges. The San Francisco Community College District is a large urban district, serving more than 100,000 students each year in both credit and noncredit modes at many neighborhood campuses (“centers” per Ed Code) and at numerous sites [I A-3]. The “average” students are in their mid-30s, and CCSF serves slightly more women than men [I A-4, I A-5]. Many CCSF students are immigrants or children of immigrants, which helps drive the number of course sections in ESL and citizenship. An entire department, Transitional Studies, eases the way into the collegiate credit curriculum for many precollegiate students. In addition, the College has developed noncredit certificate programs focused on career development and college preparation. These noncredit certificate programs are listed on pages 4-8 of the 2011-12 catalog [I A-6]. Our nearly 15,000 transfer-seeking students take courses that articulate with not only the California State University and the University of California but also with other destination institutions across the country (e.g., the Historically Black Colleges and Universities) [I A-7]. Each year, degree-seeking students choose from among nearly 60 AA and AS options. About half of our credit students choose from among our career and technical education certificates. The College offers more than 100 certificates, both in credit and noncredit modes [I A-6]. The English and Mathematics departments have significantly increased the number of their pre-transfer sections to accommodate an ever-growing constituency of students requiring developmental education [I A-8].

Student demographics and student needs vary among the neighborhoods. The neighborhood campuses usually focus on specific components of the Mission Statement. For example, the Downtown Campus focuses on noncredit business, the Evans Campus on career and
technical education, John Adams on allied health, and Castro on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender studies and foreign languages. The Ocean Avenue Campus, the largest, has the full spectrum of CCSF offerings. Lifelong learners benefit from the College’s continuing education and older adult offerings. Students interested in biotechnology can enter our Bridge-to-Biotech programs at the Mission and Southeast campuses; students interested in college-level biotechnology can take courses at the Mission and the Ocean Avenue campuses. Math Bridge serves a cohort of developmental students who enroll together in Elementary and Intermediate Algebra [I A-8 p.65].

The District’s services are organized so as to be responsive to our students’ diverse needs. The College offers high-school outreach, matriculation, financial aid services, an Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) Department, and a Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) Department [I A-6, I A-9, I A-10, I A-11, I A-12, I A-13]. CCSF also offers five specialized counseling departments (four for new, continuing, transferring, and international students and one for career development and placement), and four retention centers: the African American Scholastic Center, the Latino Services Network, the Asian Pacific American Student Success Center and, new since the last accreditation cycle, the Tulay Center for Filipino-American Student Success. These retention centers establish a cultural context for academic support services; participation is open to all students who believe they can benefit [I A-6 p.39, I A-14, I A-15, I A-16, I A-17, I A-18]. Students wishing to demonstrate academic distinction may enroll in the Honors Program [I A-19]. Furthermore, the College has an entire department, Learning Assistance, to help students achieve college success skills. Learning Assistance offerings include the Writing Success Project, designed specifically to promote students’ composition skills [I A-6, I A-20].

Many specific student populations have access to additional programs and resources, listed below, which are assessed in multiple ways depending on where they are housed and how they are funded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Student Resource</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Betty Shabazz Family Center</td>
<td>Students managing families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian Scholars Program</td>
<td>Emancipated foster youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARTS program</td>
<td>Homeless students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Resource Center</td>
<td>Various student groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project SAFE</td>
<td>Students at risk for HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project SHINE</td>
<td>Elders seeking naturalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project SURVIVE</td>
<td>Domestic violence or sexual assault survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puente Program</td>
<td>Future community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer Resource Center</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning, and intersex students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Formerly incarcerated students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM/MESA Center</td>
<td>Future scientists/engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Educational Transition Services Center</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Resource Center</td>
<td>Female students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prospective students can learn about the College before setting foot on campus through the Outreach and Recruitment Office’s CCSF Facebook page [IA-35]. They can then use the free “CCSF Guest” WiFi at over 50 hot spots, apply for admission online (with CCCApply), register or waitlist themselves online, and monitor their educational progress in their student accounts [IA-36, IA-37]. All incoming credit students now receive CCSF email accounts [IA-38]. CCSF’s online course offerings have more than doubled from 85 sections in Fall 2005 to 174 sections in Spring 2011 [IA-39 p.62], giving our students access to distance learning and scheduling flexibility [IA-40]. See also II.A.1.b and II.A.2.d for further information about CCSF programs and resources designed to meet students’ needs and III.C.1.a for a list of technology-driven developments, almost all of which enhance the College’s service to students [IA-6].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

To fulfill the College’s Mission, CCSF offers a tremendous variety of programs and services, all developed to meet students’ needs and promote their future success.

Planning Agenda

None

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

Descriptive Summary

The Board approved the most recent version of the CCSF Mission and Vision statements on April 29, 2010 (resolution P4, amending Board Policy 1200), as recommended by the Board’s Policy Implementation Committee on March 3, 2010 [IA-41, IA-42, IA-43]. All three Shared Governance councils reviewed the draft statements several times before the committee’s action. This review is part of the College’s regular evaluation and planning cycle, roughly every six years.

The College publishes the Mission and Vision statements in various places. They occur in the front matter of each year’s Catalog (e.g., the 2011-12 Catalog lists them on page iii) and usually between pages 2-5 in each semester’s Class Schedule. Typically, the College mails schedules to nearly all San Francisco households, thus communicating the District’s mission to the primary service area. Various forms of the Mission Statement appear in other places, (for example, on a placard above the Board of Trustees’ meeting table at 33 Gough Street and in the front of the Student Handbook and Planner that is given to new students at orientation). They appear on the College website on the drop-down menu for the “About City College” tab that is part of the standard banner for most College webpages [IA-6, IA-8].
Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The Mission and Vision statements are approved by the governing board and published in a variety of places.

Planning Agenda

None

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

Descriptive Summary

CCSF has a six-year evaluation and strategic planning cycle, driven by the six-year accreditation cycle. The College’s evaluation and planning cycle is steered by the Shared Governance Council now known as the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC). In advance of each Strategic Planning process, the College’s PBC calls for the various Shared Governance and other District groups, such as the collective bargaining agents, to review the Mission and Vision statements and propose appropriate modifications [I A-44]. In the most recent review, the entire College community, including students, was invited in November of 2008 to fill out a two-part survey addressing both the Mission and Vision statements, intended to determine appropriate focus and language for each component. There were 792 responses [I A-45]. This input resulted in significant modifications to the Vision Statement in particular, as well as some modifications to the Mission Statement. These modifications were proposed by the Office of Research and Planning based upon the survey results, discussed within Shared Governance, then verified with the College community via a second survey, before being formally adopted through the final Shared Governance review and Board adoption [I A-42, I A-46, I A-47, I A-48, I A-49, I A-50]. Further explanation on the evaluation and planning cycle can be found in the Standard I.B. and IV responses.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The institution’s governance and decision-making bodies review the Mission and Vision statements on a regular basis and revise them as necessary.

Planning Agenda

None
I.A.4 The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making.

Descriptive Summary

A brief overview of the CCSF planning process will provide context. Approximately every six years, the College reviews the Mission and Vision statements as noted above. These statements then drive the District’s Strategic Planning, a large-scale process involving a team of coordinators, listening sessions, presentations, drafting and re-drafting, and the search for consensus. The Strategic Plan, once complete, articulates priorities for the College’s focused improvement and innovation efforts—as well as major objectives associated with these priorities—designed to move the College toward fulfilling its Mission and Vision. The Strategic Plan is explicitly connected to all other College wide plans, including the College’s Annual Plan; this is one way by which all plans are continually linked back to the Mission and Vision statements. (Hereafter, “Mission” refers to both the Mission and Vision.) [I A-51, I A-52].

Concurrently, each College unit prepares a Program Review (annually from 2009-11, biennially thereafter) that reports on the extent to which it has achieved the goals from the previous year and outlines its future goals. From 2006-09, CCSF suspended its formal Program Review process as areas of the College reviewed the previous format and designed a more appropriate process and templates that would align with annual planning and budgeting while displaying information and measuring success in a more meaningful way. The hiatus in the Program Review process was time well spent, in that the resulting new process is perceived to link up effectively with annual planning and budgeting. The Program Review reports are shorter, more readable and more memorable, and much more focused on the data. With the new templates, units explicitly associate goals with specific references to College wide plans. The College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC), a Shared Governance council, and the Office of Research and Planning use the elements of the Strategic Plan and the results of the Program Review reports to prepare the Institutional Annual Plan for the upcoming year. Other College wide plans that inform the Annual Plan are the Education Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Student Equity Plan, the Sustainability Plan, and the Technology Plan. In addition, after each academic year the College’s PBC and the Office of Research and Planning evaluate the District’s progress on the Annual Plan, publishing the outcomes of this evaluation in an End-of-Year Assessment, which also informs the development of the next Annual Plan.

The role of the Mission is central to this process: All of the most important CCSF plans and various other structural documents that are part of the cycle described above cite the Mission Statement. For example, there are citations in the 2003-08 Strategic Plan (p. 7 and A-12), the draft Strategic Plan, the 2010-11 Institutional Annual Plan (p. 2), the 2009-11 Technology Plan, the Education Master Plan, the Faculty Handbook (p. 5), the 2010 Shared Governance Handbook (p. 36, where committees are urged to read the Mission Statement each year) and the School Plans. In effect, whenever a Program Review item cites a link to an element of any of these plans, that link can be traced to some component of the Mission Statement [I A-
Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The Mission and Vision statements drive the development of the institution’s Strategic Plan. This Plan articulates priorities for the College’s focused improvement and innovation efforts. The Strategic Plan is also connected to all other College wide plans, including the College’s Annual Plan, which is how all plans are continually linked back to the Mission and Vision statements.

The College’s noncredit certificate programs are well known in the San Francisco area and attract many students. However, some noncredit certificate curricula are less well known. If resources permit, the College can promote its noncredit certificate programs more heavily so that students who lack financial resources or academic preparation for credit programs are made aware of these opportunities to prepare for college or increase their employability.

Planning Agenda

None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I A-3</td>
<td>City College Fact Sheet, April 2011</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/content/ccsf/en/about-city-college/marketing_publications/fact_sheet/_jcr_content/left-col-parsys/documentlink/file.res/College%20Fact%20Sheet%20(Front)%20April%202011.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/content/ccsf/en/about-city-college/marketing_publications/fact_sheet/_jcr_content/left-col-parsys/documentlink/file.res/College%20Fact%20Sheet%20(Front)%20April%202011.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A-7</td>
<td>Interview with Dean of Admissions and Records Mary Lou Leyba-Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A-8</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Class Schedule</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Schedule/">http://www.ccsf.edu/Schedule/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A-9</td>
<td>High School Outreach Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/educational-programs/k-12-programs/hsoutreach.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/educational-programs/k-12-programs/hsoutreach.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A-18</td>
<td>Tulay (Bridge) Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/APASS/tulay.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/APASS/tulay.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A-19</td>
<td>City College of San Francisco Honors Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/Honors/">http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/Honors/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A-26</td>
<td>Project SAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/Health_Education_and_Community_Health_Studies/HIV/projectsafe.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/Health_Education_and_Community_Health_Studies/HIV/projectsafe.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A-27</td>
<td>Project SHINE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Mentoring_and_Service_Learning/HTML_Pages/Shine.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Mentoring_and_Service_Learning/HTML_Pages/Shine.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-32</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/APASS/stem/index.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/APASS/stem/index.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-38</td>
<td>CCSF Student Gmail Accounts: What Instructors Need to Know</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/TLC/Google/student-gmail-for-teachers.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/TLC/Google/student-gmail-for-teachers.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-40</td>
<td>2011 Department of Education Technology Program Review</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-41</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Summary of Actions April 2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/BOT/BOT_SummActions_2010/april2010_summaryofactions.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/BOT/BOT_SummActions_2010/april2010_summaryofactions.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-43</td>
<td>Sound Recording of Board of Trustee’s Policy and Implementation Committee meeting, March 3, 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-49</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council Minutes November 11, 2009</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/listofmeetings_f09/ASminutes20091111.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/listofmeetings_f09/ASminutes20091111.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-58</td>
<td>City College of San Francisco Annual Program Review</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-59</td>
<td>Program Review templates</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-60</td>
<td>Program Review Templates</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/prog.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/prog.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard I.B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness:

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

I.B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

Descriptive Summary

See the responses to Standard I.A.4 and Standard IV for summaries of the CCSF evaluation and planning cycle. Also, the CCSF Board of Trustees has its own Institutional Effectiveness Committee. This Committee’s agendas have included a broad range of issues, especially search and hiring procedures [I B-1, I B-2].

Nearly all collegial dialog at CCSF takes place in more than 40 Shared Governance committees [I B-3] that operate under an extensive Board policy called the Shared Governance Agreement, dating back to 1993 [I B-4]. This Agreement creates an extremely robust participatory governance structure headed by three councils. The committees reporting to the Academic Senate Executive Council most closely address students’ learning needs. The committees reporting to the College Advisory Council and the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council primarily concern institutional processes. When the councils’ scopes overlap, issues go before all appropriate groups [I B-4, I B-5]. Each Shared Governance body has a purpose statement that defines its responsibilities for developing policies and initiatives [I B-3, I B-5]. Committees are charged with the search for best practices and the assessment of the District’s effectiveness. Nearly all Shared Governance bodies are quadripartite (i.e., they have representatives from all four campus constituencies: administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students). Each constituency has an appointing agent that tries to ensure broad, democratic representation [I B-4, I B-5]. The CCSF Shared Governance Handbook reveals the breadth of the system: All academic and professional matters, Student Learning Outcomes, sustainability, public relations, and many more. The District maintains a Shared Governance Office with a coordinator charged with facilitating communications to ensure that the committee structure operates smoothly [I B-6]. In the Spring 2011 Employee Survey, the average response to a question about satisfaction with College dialog about data and research on student learning was 2.68 on a scale from 1 to 4 (N = 415), with 3 indicating Good and 2 Below Average [I B-7 p. 4].

CCSF also has a strong, productive history of ad hoc workgroups that focus more intensely on specific issues. A particularly salient example is the Student Learning Outcomes Task Force comprising representatives from the Academic Senate, Department Chairpersons...
Council, and Administration. The Student Learning Outcomes Task Force discusses implementation of the Student Learning Outcomes process at the College and has been very productive in implementing SLOs at the College since the last Self Study [I B-8]. Another example is the Accreditation Self Study Steering Committee, the body charged with producing the Self Study drafts, which are then approved for publication by the Shared Governance councils and the Board of Trustees [I B-9].

In addition, the Chancellor convened a Student Equity Task Force so that the District and the Board could examine eight areas (including English and math sequences, placement testing, financial aid, and student employment) in which the College might better serve all students. Proposals from the Student Equity Task Force will go to various committees, tying the ad hoc bodies to the existing Shared Governance structure. The Student Learning Outcomes Task Force meets regularly and has made recommendations to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Program Review Committee, and the Curriculum Committee. Other examples of ad hoc workgroups are the Strategic Planning Team, the Basic Skills Ad Hoc Task Force, and the Cost Savings Group [I B-10, I B-8, I B-11].

In addition to these District wide bodies, there are countless committees, groups, and teams within each department. Each department holds official department meetings on Flex days (cf. III.A.5) and, in some cases, throughout the semester. Career and Technical Education departments have industry advisory groups to ensure that course content matches industry needs and expectations. Curriculum, scholarship, equity, and learning outcome assessment are just some of the many issues that are discussed at the departmental level as well as at the institutional level. It is at the departmental level that collegial dialog most strongly shapes students’ learning. The outcomes of that dialog have included certain math and English offerings in compressed timeframes and the inclusion of major learning outcomes in all course outlines.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Collegial dialog takes place within an expansive participatory governance structure, described in the District’s Shared Governance Agreement and coordinated by a dedicated classified staff member. Administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students all play appropriate roles within that structure.

Planning Agenda

None

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

Descriptive Summary

CCSF has a six-year cycle for strategic planning and a one-year cycle for annual planning. Each Strategic Plan lists a wide variety of long-term goals. The 2011-16 Strategic Plan has six major Strategic Priorities ranging from academic excellence to inclusiveness to facilities planning. Within each Priority are 10 to 15 objectives that CCSF intends to achieve to make substantial and measurable progress over the next six years [I B-11].

The Strategic Planning Team and the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC) both strive to communicate the goals developed to the College community and to solicit as much participation as possible in achieving them. The Strategic Planning Team members bring drafts of the plan to committee meetings to explain the Plan and ask for feedback. Unit managers (administrators and department chairs) also share the drafts with their units (staff and faculty) so that input from all College employees may inform the Plan’s development. The College’s PBC conducts listening sessions to inform its decisions. Initiatives are directed to appropriate Shared Governance bodies for deliberation and possible action. For further exposition of the CCSF evaluation and planning cycle, see II.A.2.f and III.D.1.a [I B-12].

Each year, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council consults the Strategic Plan, the most recent Program Review recommendations, the most recent End-of-Year Assessment and College Performance Indicators Report, the Chancellor’s Objectives, which are found in his evaluation, and the current year’s Annual Plan to select specific goals for the following year’s Annual Plan. The selection process varies and the College’s PBC’s very broad membership ensures input from all College constituencies. The Annual Plan objectives are often separated into “operational” and “developmental” and then prioritized within each subset. Each annual objective has a performance measure that the College uses to determine success. The many unit plans and Program Review reports inform the prioritization of goals. Historically, the End-of-Year Assessments and College Performance Indicators Reports show that, on the whole, the District makes satisfactory progress each year on achieving that year’s goals [I B-13, I B-14, I B-15, I B-16, I B-17, I B-18, I B-19].

The College’s current annual planning process has been in place for more than a decade. The reports concerning assessment, including the End-of-Year Assessment (which measures the Annual Plan) and the College Performance Indicators Report (measuring the Strategic Plan), are being reviewed to determine how to make the documents more useful, particularly through more focused and relevant measures.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF has a six-year cycle for strategic planning and a one-year cycle for annual planning. Each year the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council consults the Strategic Plan, the
current year’s Annual Plans and Program Review recommendations to determine the next year’s objectives. Communication of these objectives and a call to participation goes out to the College community.

The End-of-Year-Assessment (EYA) reports, which have been in place since the inception of the annual planning process, have not adequately met the needs of Board and community members. While the reports have provided a wealth of detail, each year the volume of information proves too difficult to absorb. Approximately 120 Program Review reports, which are posted online, currently provide the level of detail previously published in the EYA reports. As a result, no EYA Report was produced for 2009-10 [I B-20].

While the EYA reports have been replaced with yearly Program Review reports from individual departments and centers, the College still needs to provide yearly evidence of student achievement and institution and program performance. The Office of Research and Planning, in consultation with the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council, is developing a new template which will be refined through Shared Governance and Board review. This template will be similar to reports currently in use at many other community colleges throughout California and nationally. Called performance dashboards, institutional effectiveness reports, key performance indicators reports, or balanced scorecards, these reports are short (one to four pages) and provide a summary of the College’s progress [I B-21]. This summary view will be supplemented by the Program Review reports themselves, by an analysis of the Program Review reports as a whole, and by annual metrics pertinent to objectives for a given year.

**Planning Agenda**

The Office of Research and Planning, in consultation with the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council, will design a new performance dashboard by the end of the 2011-12 school year that will provide a summary of the College’s progress in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed.

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

**Descriptive Summary**

For many years, the College evaluated progress on the Strategic and Annual Plan objectives in the End-of-Year Assessments (EYAs) and College Performance Indicators reports, as discussed in section I.B.2.

The Annual Plan, consisting of a set of institutional objectives for a specified academic year, is drafted based upon a series of inputs and serves as an integration point for implementing
the College’s longer-term plans. In addition, the Chancellor’s Objectives, developed annually with the Board, directly inform the Annual Plan. The Annual Plan also reflects imminent priorities derived from department- and unit-level Program Review reports which, since 2008-09, have been assembled with increased regularity by every unit within the College. The Annual Plan is refined through the Shared Governance and Board approval processes [I B-21].

The Program Review reports are the primary vehicle for linking planning and assessment to budgets. The current fiscal environment does not allow for new allocations, which would be directly linked to planning efforts. To date, planning efforts have not been used to delineate reductions. However, the Program Review reports do provide a body of information that can be used to examine the various units within the College and can inform budget-related activities. Moreover, Program Review is used to locate new opportunities for efficiencies and collaborations that advance a range of College objectives reflected in the various College plans [I B-20].

The approach to College wide assessment, which for the last decade or more has been accomplished primarily through the End-of-Year-Assessment report, is being revisited, as referenced in Section I.B.

The Decision Support System (DSS), a data-mining tool accessed from the Division of Policy and Research webpage, helps assess institutional performance. The DSS provides a broad range of data, including demand for courses, student demographics, productivity, persistence, and success, that can be disaggregated chronologically by department or by campus. Also available at the webpage are the results of student and employee surveys; these are a valuable source of qualitative information about the District’s performance. Furthermore, the institutional researchers are available to department chairs who request special data and analysis needs [I B-22].

For example, in the 2007-08 EYA Report, the first Operational Objective is “O1.1. Provide educational programs and services at each of CCSF’s campuses.” The College assessed progress on this objective with such DSS data as “Headcount enrollment increased in 2007-08: 51,027 credit students, up seven percent from 2006-07. 45,162 noncredit students, up 2 percent from 2006-07. 99,495 total unduplicated headcount includes other programs in addition to credit and noncredit.” The next year, Operational Objective 1.1 was retained in the 2008-09 Annual Plan in the hope of continuing progress [I B-23 p. 7, I B-24 p. 3].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Despite the progress that has been made, more work remains to be done with the Program Review process regarding assessment and links to budgets. Assessment is embedded within each unit’s Program Review report. However, the process of integrating Program Review results with planning and budgeting needs to be refined to promote the degree of integration that is desired.
Although the Program Review process has been redesigned and better integrated into the evaluation and planning cycle, it is difficult to produce evidence that it is having a salutary effect on resource allocation.

Planning Agenda

The next iteration of the Program Review template should prompt more explicit references to collaborations, efficiencies, and reductions.

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

Descriptive Summary

The CCSF evaluation and planning process is exceptionally broad-based; the strategic planning process epitomizes this. The minutes from various Shared Governance groups (all three councils, their standing committees, and many of their subcommittees) will attest to the Strategic Planning Team’s efforts to solicit input from as broad a base as possible. The Team also visited such other venues as the Classified Senate and the Associated Students. The Strategic Planning webpage includes a list of strategic planning sessions to which the entire College community was invited [I B-12, I B-24, I B-25, I B-26].

Perhaps the most significant change in planning since the last accreditation cycle is the newly redesigned Program Review process. At the time of the last accreditation visit, Program Review was not explicitly part of the annual planning system. Each District unit, including offices, departments, and programs, conducted a Program Review on a three-, four-, or six-year cycle. This occurred in a staggered manner; roughly 15 units were undergoing Program Review at any one time. Units tended to see Program Review as an opportunity to assert their needs and generally provided more than was requested. The Program Review templates were open-ended and invited lengthy, diffuse responses [I B-27].

To address this situation, the Shared Governance System overhauled the Program Review process, including the templates. Today, Program Review is driven by specific questions that keep the District units focused on their plans for the coming year. All units participate in Program Review simultaneously. The current format is much more quantitative in nature. District units receive the data needed to assess progress on their goals: revenue, expenditures, more detailed student demographics, and more detailed student success indicators. The new templates include a focus on assessment and improvement, not just allocation requests. The completed templates are publicly available online [I B-27].

Because all units now participate in Program Review concurrently, more opportunities for discussing and comparing responses take place within and across departments. In prior years, Program Review was a more isolated process in which District unit managers, sometimes,
but not always, in collaboration with others, would review data and respond to prompts. The Office of Research and Planning now hosts a series of meetings where District unit representatives can come together to discuss their data and responses. Various deans and department chairs also host similar sessions [I B-27].

As a result of the changes to Program Review, a significantly greater number of departments are in compliance. In the past, it was typical for only two-thirds of the District units scheduled to submit Program Reviews actually to do so. During the 2010-11 academic year, the Office of Research and Planning confirms that 99 percent of all units submitted their Program Review reports [I B-28].

The Shared Governance Program Review Committee and its various workgroups collect the units’ reports. The Committee then makes recommendations to the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council for resource allocation based on the strength of the units’ defense of their needs and goals. For example, the English Department’s record of unmet student demand resulted in the approval of extra expansion positions in 2011. The current process is relatively new and so the College’s PBC is still considering how best to receive and judge the Committee’s recommendations. Recommendations have been made in the Planning Agendas in sections I.B.2 and I.B.3 on how the College should improve the Program Review process to help assess resource allocation at CCSF. During the 2011-12 academic year, the Program Review Committee intends to assess the District’s satisfaction with the new process [I B-27, I B-29].

Self-Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The CCSF evaluation and planning process is exceptionally broad-based; the strategic planning process epitomizes this as does the new Program Review process. However, the College would like to increase student input during the strategic planning process.

Although students participate in the planning and evaluation cycle through representatives on Shared Governance committees, there are no students on the Strategic Planning Team, primarily because the onerous time commitment could affect the students’ academic performance.

If State laws and regulations allow, the College can explore ways to improve student participation in the strategic planning process by compensating them for their time either monetarily or with academic credit. The Strategic Planning Team might also want to expand the scope and frequency of its visits to student governance councils.

Planning Agenda

None
I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Descriptive Summary

The CCSF Office of Research and Planning collects large amounts of documented assessment results. Through the CCSF Banner system, the College continually captures general data on student demographics, student success (grades, persistence, degree and certificate attainment, and transfer), and course demand. The Office also issues frequent surveys, some broad and some narrow in scope, to gather additional data.

Broad, College wide surveys include a student opinion survey, an employee satisfaction survey, and a technology use survey directed toward faculty and staff [I B-30, I B-7, I B-31, I B-32].

Targeted surveys focus on a variety of topics, for example, the College’s Mission and Vision statements (in preparation for the renewal of the Strategic Plan), textbook affordability strategies, and counseling services [I B-33, I B-34, I B-35, I B-36, I B-37]. Traditionally, the Office of Research and Planning has helped design and administer these surveys by request, but individual units are increasingly handling survey activities on their own to gather more thorough information about student learning outcomes. This is made possible through the availability of online tools such as SurveyMonkey™. Examples of units that develop and conduct surveys for program improvement include Library and Learning Resources, the Engineering Department, and the Learning Assistance Center [I B-38, I B-39, I B-40].

The College also gathers qualitative data from the public through strategic planning listening sessions and industry advisory boards. The strategic planning listening sessions include panels comprising individuals from local industry, government, or the community who present their perspectives on the College’s areas of strength and need for improvement. A noteworthy feature of the listening sessions is a group of District personnel who are literally labeled as “Active Listeners” to assure the panelists that CCSF is paying attention [I B-41].

General data on student demographics, student success, and course demand is available through the online Decision Support System (DSS), developed in 2001, also discussed in I.B.3. This online data processing engine provides any member of the College community—and members of the outside community who request access—instant statistical information on a wide variety of student characteristics, demand for and access to courses and sections, and various student success data from Spring 1998 to the present. While the system has limitations, the ability of College faculty, staff, and administrators to have timely access to this information has begun to change profoundly the way the College makes day-to-day decisions. The DSS draws on the CCSF Banner system, which houses all student enrollment, financial aid, and budgeting information [I B-22].

The Office of Research and Planning communicates quality assurance matters by issuing written reports on analyses of the data collected. Annual reports include the High School Report (which documents first-time student placement within the College), the College
Performance Indicators, and the End-of-Year Assessment reports. Reports such as these are available on the Division of Policy and Research website. The High School Report is the most widely disseminated. At one time, representatives from the Office of Research and Planning met individually with selected local high schools to discuss the findings. Today, the College mails out letters, which include the report’s URL link, to all San Francisco high schools, public and private, and San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) administrators. Significant demand for the report has been generated both among local schools and within SFUSD. The Office of Research and Planning receives regular requests for the report [I B-42, I B-17, I B-18].

Program Review reports, as discussed earlier in this document, incorporate a variety of data sets (revenues, expenditures, student success, demographics, and enrollment trends) for each unit and are made public through the CCSF website [I B-27, I B-43].

CCSF also develops and disseminates regular reports, including environmental scans and special topic reports such as the Equity Report issued in 2010. As with all reports, these are available online [I B-44].

In addition to making written reports available through the website, CCSF also circulates reports internally via email to the relevant stakeholders, even College wide when appropriate. The College also responds to state and federal reporting requirements on such programs as Extended Opportunity and Program Services, Disabled Students Programs and Services, CalWORKs, and Puente [I B-45].

Although CCSF does not have in place a formal process to assess the effectiveness of communications about institutional quality to the public, Board of Trustee meetings can serve as a venue in which the public has the opportunity to comment on the quality of communications about data.

The College internally and informally assesses the effectiveness of its communications. The Program Review process serves as an example of how this is done. The College has engaged internal stakeholders in an ongoing dialog regarding the quality of data provided and the meaning and relevance of these data. After the initial pilot of the new Program Review format, the Office of Research and Planning issued a survey that led to changes in the format and content of Program Review [I B-46].

**Self Evaluation**

The College partially meets this standard.

The CCSF Office of Research and Planning collects large amounts of documented assessment results. The Office then communicates quality assurance matters by issuing written reports on analyses of the data collected. The CCSF Office of Research and Planning has been successful in publishing College reports online, especially considering reductions in its office staffing. The Office will continue to make availability of online reports a priority. Although an opinion survey of credit students was conducted in Fall 2010, the College has
not yet found the resources to conduct a more labor intensive broad noncredit student survey, which must be conducted in several languages. The last comprehensive survey of noncredit students was conducted several years ago in 2005-2006. A Technology Survey of employees will be conducted in Fall 2011. The End-of-Year Assessments and their successor reports have not recently been presented to the Board of Trustees.

Planning Agenda

The Board (or one of its committees) will receive presentations on the College Performance Indicators Report at the end of each academic year.

I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Descriptive Summary

At the end of each evaluation cycle, the Program Review Committee, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council and the Board of Trustees consider the merits and effectiveness as well as the results of the current evaluation and planning process. They then propose modifications for improvement. For example, this was how the College improved the Program Review process so that it could be firmly integrated into the evaluation and planning cycle. It is also why the College began the discussion about how to replace the End-of-Year Assessments with a more easily read College Performance Indicators Report [I B-46, I B-47].

The formal mechanism by which CCSF assesses the effectiveness of its collegial dialog is the biennial Shared Governance review, required by the Shared Governance Agreement, item IV.J. The Agreement does not specify the nature of this review so it has taken many forms. For example, in 2006-07, a small workgroup of committee members met with the Shared Governance Coordinator to produce a list of guidelines intended to help improve the effectiveness of the committee chairs. This list, approved by the College Advisory Council, is now included as an addendum to the annually published Shared Governance Handbook [I B-5].

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

CCSF systematically reviews and modifies its planning and resource planning processes to assure their effectiveness.

However, it is time for a District wide, highly coordinated review of the Shared Governance System, complete with listening sessions at the campuses.

Planning Agenda
The Shared Governance Coordinator, in collaboration with the College Advisory Council and the Academic Senate Executive Council, will schedule a District wide review of the Shared Governance System, to include at least two listening sessions at non-Ocean campuses.

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

Descriptive Summary

The most important means by which CCSF assesses its evaluation mechanisms concerning the effectiveness to improve instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services is through the Program Review reports, described earlier in this Standard and elsewhere in this report. Specifically, the new Program Review templates require that each unit with student contact describe its progress on developing, achieving, and assessing student learning outcomes [I B-48].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF’s new Program Review process sets up a systematic review and assessment of the effectiveness in the programs and support and learning services for CCSF students.

Planning Agenda

None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I B-1</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Institutional Effectiveness Committee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_committee_agendas0.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_committee_agendas0.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-2</td>
<td>Audio recordings of meetings of Board of Trustees Institutional Effectiveness Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-3</td>
<td>Shared Governance Committees</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/council.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/council.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-4</td>
<td>Shared Governance Agreement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/shared_governance/bd_resolution.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/shared_governance/bd_resolution.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-9</td>
<td>Accreditation Self Study webpage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/study.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/study.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-10</td>
<td>Student Equity Report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports_success.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports_success.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-17</td>
<td>Office of Research and Planning, Reports webpage, College Performance Indicators Reports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports_success.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports_success.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-19</td>
<td>Office of Research and Planning, Program Review webpage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-20</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Review – Planning Integration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-21</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Review – Annual Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-22</td>
<td>Decision Support System</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><a href="http://advancement.ccsf.edu/">http://advancement.ccsf.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-26</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Presentations and Discussions – 2nd Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-27</td>
<td>Program Review – Interview with Pam Mery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-28</td>
<td>2010-11 Program Reviews</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-33</td>
<td>Mission / Vision Survey, 2008-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-35</td>
<td>Textbook Affordability Online Survey Results For Students</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Textbook_Affordability_Task_Force/StudentSurveyResults.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Textbook_Affordability_Task_Force/StudentSurveyResults.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-36</td>
<td>Textbook Affordability Online Survey Results For Students</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Textbook_Affordability_Task_Force/InstructorSurveyResults.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Textbook_Affordability_Task_Force/InstructorSurveyResults.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-37</td>
<td>2009 Counseling Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-40</td>
<td>Learning Assistance Department SLO Overview Fall 10</td>
<td>Print only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-45</td>
<td>EOPS, DSPS and CALWorks Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-47</td>
<td>2011 Evaluation of the Program Review System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services.

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

Standard II.A: Student Learning Programs and Services.

Instructional Programs

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

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

Descriptive Summary

The College’s Mission and Vision statements provide overall guidance that informs decision making about programs offered by the College. The Vision and Mission statements frame the Program Review process and are reflected in the College’s Strategic Plan, which in turn is one of the bases of the College’s Educational Master Plan. The credit and noncredit instructional programs are developed and reviewed by departmental/program faculty (with input from industry advisory committees and/or professional associations and/or programmatic accreditation agencies), the College Curriculum Committee, and in some cases the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, using the Mission’s seven-part focus on the following:

- Preparation for transfer to baccalaureate institutions
- Achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Sciences
- Acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace
- Active engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizen preparation, and English as a Second Language
- Completion of requirements for the Adult High School Diploma and GED
- Promotion of economic development and job growth and
- Promotion of lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment
The College has a decentralized approach to choosing the fields of study in which it offers programs. Departments review their course and program offerings continually, and make programmatic changes to reflect shifts in student interest and shifts within the discipline. Programs that are career-technical in nature hold regular industry advisory meetings to get feedback about their curriculum. These departments make regular adjustments to course and program offerings to retain currency with the labor market.

For the past few years, all departments have been engaged in an annual Program Review cycle. A key element of the Program Review cycle is a review of courses and programs, including a report on progress in assessing student learning outcomes. Each department has been tasked with developing a six-year timeline in which they will review every one of their courses and programs for currency.

One example of programmatic changes that have taken place over the last few years is the expansion of coursework related to “green” technology. The Engineering, Architecture, and Construction disciplines have all added coursework in this area, not just in response to workforce demands, but also in support of the College’s vision as contributors of innovation in post-secondary education.

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

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

Many of our programs require approval by the State Chancellor’s Office. The application process for State Chancellor’s Office approval addresses five main areas [II A-1]:

- Appropriateness to Mission
- Need
- Curriculum Standards
- Adequate Resources
- Compliance
The multifaceted reviews ensure program quality. Student achievement is noted by the successful completion of degrees and certificates, job placement, and transfer to baccalaureate institutions. In 2009-10, the College awarded 1145 Associate Degrees, 1144 credit certificates, and 52 noncredit certificates [II A-2]. Job placement information from the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act Core Indicator report shows a placement match rate of 87.3 percent for CCSF career technical students [II A-3].

Student transfer to baccalaureate institutions in recent years is summarized below [II A-4]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 CCSF Student Transfer Data</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To CSU</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>1,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To UC</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To CA Private Colleges</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Out-of-State Private Colleges</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>927*</td>
<td>1,775*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include transfers to private colleges.

It should be noted that 2009-10 was an unusual year for transfer. Because of budget concerns, most CSU campuses did not accept spring semester transfer applicants, which resulted in a significant reduction in transfer numbers for CCSF and for community colleges statewide.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.A.1.a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

Descriptive Summary

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

Other student learning needs assessment is based on the City College of San Francisco’s Environmental Scans, both Internal and External Data Trends reports which include data on student demographics, student performance indicators, and community and labor market information [II A-5, II A-6]. The Internal and External Scans inform the Strategic Plan and support the development of specific strategic priorities. They also inform the Educational Master Plan and support the program planning priorities.

More in-depth analysis of needs is also conducted through student focus groups, surveys, and feedback from students and staff. Program reviews also address developmental needs for more or fewer course offerings. Through CCSF’s Decision Support System, an online database that provides student enrollment, completion and related data, staff can assess a wide range of factors that inform the planning process, including the demand for enrollment into courses, enrollment productivity, student characteristics and student success. The data is reviewed with Academic Deans and the College Council, and is available to departments for their use in Program Review.

Joint efforts with the San Francisco Unified School District enable the research office to prepare an annual high school report, outlining the readiness of incoming students in the areas of math and English [II A-7]. Additionally, the Gates Foundation recently funded a data-driven initiative to assess the preparedness of incoming high school graduates. The initiative convenes Math and English faculty at CCSF with their respective counterparts in the San Francisco Unified School District to discuss any gaps in educational preparedness among high school graduates.

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

CCSF systematically incorporates a series of annual performance indicators tied to its strategic plan [II A-8]. Every other year, the College issues report briefs, which provide further analysis on topics such as movement of noncredit students to credit, basic skills, and transfer rates [II A-9]. According to data from the February 2010 Internal Scan, 20 percent of credit students originated from noncredit and approximately 30 percent of credit students have enrolled in a noncredit class [II A-5]. Noncredit courses in English as a Second Language, adult education, and skills in business and the trades provide tuition-free, open-entry options for students seeking affordable and flexible educational opportunities.
As part of the Matriculation process preceding enrollment in credit and noncredit courses, students participate in Math, English or ESL placement assessment. Determination of the appropriate levels of courses to take is a “multiple measures” process, which is based on a number of factors, including CCSF Math and English/ESL placement testing, standardized test scores (e.g., SAT, AP), other college coursework completed, and counselor assessment of relevant indicators during individual interviews. Student course placement data is also useful to basic skills departments in their planning of course offerings to meet student needs.

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

The data for student outcomes regarding success rates, persistence and retention rates are available through the Program Review process and vary by program. All College units participate in this Program Review process which requires assessment of student learning needs, progress in reviewing all courses, programs, projects, and services and plans for program improvement.

In the Program Review documents, programs were asked to describe the assessment of their student learning outcomes for courses and programs. It was found that different programs assess student learning using different instruments and using more than one assessment. In particular, it was found that locally developed exams and standardized content exams are used extensively. Health related programs such as Nursing, Radiology Technician, Emergency Medical Technician, and others utilize results from licensure exams, and the Aeronautics Program utilizes Federal Aviation Administration certification results. Employer surveys and/or advisory board feedback provide assessment information to career and technical education programs. Capstone courses or portfolio assessment are frequent in liberal arts programs such as Art, Multimedia, Photography, and Graphics. Culminating projects, demonstrations or performances are the assessment of choice for programs such as Speech, Theatre, Music, Physical Education & Dance, Architecture, and AutoCad.

In 2009, the Board of Trustees directed the College to prepare an educational equity report, detailing the outcomes for specific groups, so as to eliminate disparities [II A-10]. As a result, the Math and English departments have initiated pilot projects that accelerate the completion of course sequences by scheduling short-term classes and/or by consolidating sequential courses. Students beginning in the first level of basic skills English are now able to complete the English sequence in four courses rather than six [II A-11].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.
Underlying CCSF’s broad based efforts to improve student learning are data findings that inform policy and practices on student equity and narrowing the achievement gap. Departments armed with evidence on differential impact have restructured their services. For example, the Office of Financial Aid has reorganized its unit into three dedicated units with separate offices to serve CCSF students more effectively. Both the English and Math departments have initiated course consolidations to enhance the likelihood of student success.

Degree audit information is available to counselors and evaluators. However, the College would like to be more proactive in providing students this and other information to enable them to monitor their own progress towards achieving goals and learning outcomes.

Planning Agenda

1. The College will move toward providing certificate and degree audit/evaluation capabilities to students so that they may monitor their progress towards program completion. It will also continue its assessment cycle to include all courses and programs.

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

Descriptive Summary

CCSF offers an extensive array of diverse and flexible learning experiences for credit and noncredit students. Instructional options include in-class lecture format, laboratory, collaborative group work, computer-assisted instruction, online courses, telecourses, independent study, internships, study abroad programs, cohort programs, community-based courses, and onsite courses at various locations in the City of San Francisco.

The College offers courses at nine campuses and numerous other locations throughout the City of San Francisco, making CCSF easily accessible to students with diverse needs and goals. In addition to various modes of instruction, CCSF offers a variety of time scheduling options including short-term classes, weekend classes, classes that meet one to five times a week and flexible early morning and evening classes. The College continues to adapt its delivery modes to best address learning style differences and meet the changing needs of the various communities it serves. The following are examples of the variety of modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of students.

Distance Learning: Distance education courses are offered by 27 academic departments, in all six schools within Academic Affairs and by Library and Learning Resources. Over 12,000 students enrolled in 338 distance education credit courses for the academic year 2010-11. A student can complete 100 percent of the requirements for an AA/AS degree by taking distance learning courses. Students can complete approximately 95 percent of the courses required to transfer to the CSU through distance learning [II A-12].
The College employs several strategies to support the learning of students in distance education. One such strategy was to develop LERN 55 Successful Online Learning, a one-unit course that has been offered since 2008. The California Community Colleges Data Mart report for Fall 2010 showed that CCSF students enrolled in distance education achieved a success rate of 70 percent, slightly higher than the statewide average of 68 percent [II A-13].

Faculty members at CCSF develop online courses following various steps compliant with the standards set by the College’s Curriculum Committee and the Distance Learning Advisory Committee [II A-14 p.53-58]. The Office of Technology Mediated Instruction, housed within the Educational Technology Department (ETD), works closely with faculty in the migration process of a traditional lecture mode course to online delivery. Faculty participate in extensive training and the newly developed online course is evaluated at various phases of development to ensure that the delivery is meeting the objectives and content of the state-approved course outline, the College’s standards for distance education, and federal ADA regulations. The ETD provides ongoing support to distance learning faculty via online modules, face-to-face workshops and one-to-one meetings.

Faculty members teaching credit courses are given an option to enhance the delivery of their face-to-face courses by delivering the objectives and content of the course using CCSF’s learning management system. These faculty are required to complete seven hours of training by the ETD. Additionally, ETD offers special topic workshops to support faculty in understanding the technology behind the management system and guides faculty in ways they can improve the deliverability of online classes, thus increasing student success and decreasing attrition. CCSF supported almost 100 tech-enhanced course sections in Fall 2009; this number increased to over 350 tech-enhanced face-to-face sections by the end of 2010-11 [II A-15, p.3].

**Study Abroad:** Since 1985, CCSF has been a leader in Study Abroad education. Thousands of CCSF students, faculty and staff, students from other colleges and universities, and citizens of the greater Bay Area community have participated in CCSF Study Abroad programs in such diverse locations as Australia, Cambodia, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, England, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Laos, Mexico, Mongolia, Spain, Russia, and Vietnam. While studying abroad, participants are enrolled in regularly approved courses which grant college credit toward graduation at CCSF or for transfer credit to a variety of four-year universities, particularly those in the California State University or University of California systems.

**Internships and Work Experience Courses:** Internships and work experience courses are offered in both occupational and transfer-oriented disciplines. Work Experience courses provide students with on-the-job learning experiences that provide them with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes to prepare them to function successfully in a variety of jobs.

**Short-Term Classes:** These are designed to help students progress toward their educational goals more quickly. Short-term courses use an accelerated format to allow students to focus
upon a particular class or set of classes more intensively and over a shorter period of time than usual. These have been traditionally offered during the summer session and now the College is offering this option more frequently during the regular academic year.

**Cohort Pathways:** These are designed to allow students to progress as a single group through a certificate program. Examples of cohort programs include the Metro Child Development, Metro Health Academy, and Youth Worker certificate programs. Students receive cohort instruction, tutoring, content-focused student mentoring, designated counseling, and linked class scheduling.

**Honors Program:** This program is designed to offer students an enhanced educational experience along with potential transfer and scholarship benefits. Honors courses provide students with an enriched curriculum either in specific sections of core transfer courses or through honors contracts where students agree to complete Honors work in addition to the regular coursework. Students also have the opportunity to compete in the Annual Honors Student Research Symposium, which in recent years has been sponsored by UC Berkeley and Stanford University. CCSF Honors students were successful in transfer to the University of California, particularly to UCLA through its Transfer Alliance Program (TAP) which gives priority consideration for admissions to Honors students. According to a UCLA California Community College Admissions report between 2006 and 2009, 81 percent of CCSF TAP Students who applied to UCLA were admitted [II A-16]. In comparison, during that same period, 48 percent of CCSF students applying to UCLA overall were admitted.

**Dual/Concurrent Enrollment Programs:** These are designed to provide high school students with learning opportunities that better prepare them for successful completion of CCSF certificate and degree programs leading to employment and courses leading to transfer. CCSF has over 30 K-12 partnership programs, many of which include a component of dual enrollment. One such program offers numerous courses to San Francisco Unified high school students in career and technical fields of study, such as business, computers, health, and engineering technology. Another example is the School to Career High School Teachers Pathway program, offered in partnership with San Francisco Unified School District. In 2009-10, 982 students participated in concurrent enrollment. Over 80 percent of these students successfully completed their coursework and achieved a mean grade point average of 2.95 in Fall 2009 and 3.07 in Spring 2010 [II A-17].

One way the College evaluates delivery methods is through student feedback solicited in the faculty evaluation and tenure review process conducted by the Office of Faculty Evaluation, Tenure Review and Curriculum [II A-18, II A-19, II A-20, II A-21]. The College has also conducted student equity forums at various campuses as a means to solicit student feedback and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs and services [II A-22].

The College has open lines of communication internally (i.e. Curriculum Committee, Distance Learning Advisory Subcommittee, Office of Technology Mediated Instruction, Department Chair Council, School and Campus Deans) and has attempted to integrate its offerings by recognizing community input (Equity Hearings, Community Listening Sessions)
when assessing needs. Overall, CCSF has a delivery system that is open to and capable of exploring new delivery modes to better meet the needs of its students

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF has developed an instructional delivery system that provides easy accessibility to students. Departments use various methods to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in meeting student needs and incorporate changes as appropriate.

Planning Agenda

1. Explore methods that are more systematic for evaluating effectiveness of all programs.

II.A.1.c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

Descriptive Summary

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

Course outlines are written by faculty and in some cases reviewed by a department-specific curriculum group. Further review occurs by the respective department chairs and school deans prior to submission to the Curriculum Committee (CC). Majors, programs, certificates, and degrees also have learning outcomes identified on their respective documentation that is submitted to the CC. Accredited programs in the Career and Technical Education area are mandated to hold industry advisory meetings. Programs that receive Perkins funding are also required to hold meetings with their advisory group to assure that curriculum reflects current industry needs.

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

An SLO workgroup was convened in Spring 2009 to begin to address topics of importance to advancing the SLO assessment process. This included discussion on the preferred model for the College, and the development of professional development workshops for preliminary discussion of general education SLOs. The workgroup consists of nine members; three each from the Department Chairpersons Council, the Academic Senate, and administration. The group meets once a month during the fall and spring semesters.

An effective method for verifying SLOs at the college level is Program Review, a vehicle for department chairs and faculty to report on their progress in assessing student learning outcomes. All departments are required to review and update course outlines at least every six years and to include measurable SLOs. Through the Program Review process, departments assess their SLO progress from year to year and share examples that reflect their departmental dialog and action on SLOs. In Spring 2010, Program Review asked departments to state their assessment and course outline revision timetable through 2016 and to provide two examples of ongoing SLO assessments: one at the course level and the other at the program level. Departments were also asked to state how they would close the assessment loop, revising instruction or other aspects of the curriculum.

Departments also complete a survey in which they identify the percent of courses with SLOs and completed assessments as requested in the Accreditation Annual Report. As noted in the 2011 Annual Report, survey results indicate that 100 percent of courses and 85 percent of programs had identified SLOs with 75 percent of the courses and 73 percent of the programs engaged in an ongoing assessment process [II A-23].

In the last two years, the SLO assessment process has been strengthened at CCSF. The SLO Workgroup has established an SLO website to offer guidance and instruction to faculty [II A-24]. Assessment has become a major component of faculty development days (FLEX days). At FLEX workshops, departments share their most successful assessment methodologies with their peers. These workshops have involved hundreds of faculty and inspired meaningful dialog about how to use SLOs at an institution of this size. Many departments’ use of SLOs is truly exemplary and these workshops have allowed other departments to review successful techniques. There were presentations from such diverse departments as Business, Earth Sciences, Learning Assistance, and Radiation Technology. For example, in Earth Sciences, all instructors regularly review their course outlines and in-class methodology and make changes based on a variety of assessment tools, such as common exams, student feedback questionnaires, concept quizzes, and in-class participation and activities. Changes included course content additions, refocusing of content (addressing areas of weakness as determined by previous SLO assessments), different instructional techniques, and diagnostic testing. Instructors evaluated these changes and reported better student retention and more student engagement, interest, and satisfaction with the courses [II A-25].
The 2010-11 Program Review gave the College community an opportunity to review other stellar examples from Architecture, Art, English, Health Education, and Mathematics [II A-26, II A-27, II A-28, II A-29, II A-30]. For example, for several years the English Department has been analyzing data on student retention and success. Workgroups dealing with assessment, multicultural and multilingual concerns, affective issues and pedagogy, student surveys and focus groups, and site visits wrapped up the bulk of their work at the end of 2010, and all of their recommendations were integrated into the design of the two intensive courses, English 95X and English 961A. English faculty also revised their entire sequence of reading/composition courses to reflect updated requirements for Instructional Methodologies and Student Learning Outcomes. The department has accelerated and intensified its assessment process of courses. Preliminary results of Spring 2011 data indicate that initial and end of term retention was substantially higher for the accelerated courses than the traditional ones. Also, student writing was assessed to be stronger using different measures. Finally, the number of students receiving ratings of “Accomplished” or Satisfactory” was higher in the Accelerated class than in the traditional transfer-level class for every domain being assessed: Critical thinking, audience awareness and rhetorical strategies, organization and development, incorporating sources of research materials, and grammar/syntax/etc [II A-28].

For the past year CCSF has been addressing achievement gaps and their relationship to student equity. This process has been carried out in the best spirit of continuous quality improvement. Reports of current practices throughout the institution, from English and Mathematics course sequencing to financial aid, student employment, registration, counseling, international student programs, and placement testing were evaluated by the College community [II A-31]. Students offered testimony about their experiences and the discussions that ensued involved everyone from administrators and faculty to trustees and elected student officials [II A-22]. The results were often an array of institutional modifications with the often-stated intention of reassessing those changes after a pilot semester or year.

**Self Evaluation**

The College partially meets this standard.

Through ongoing dialog, CCSF has gradually embraced and begun adopting SLOs and the assessment agenda at an ever increasing pace. SLOs have been identified for all courses and the majority of programs, and there is extensive ongoing work towards completing the assessment cycle for all of them.

**Planning Agenda**

1. The College will move towards the proficiency level for SLO assessment of courses, certificates, programs and general education breadth requirements by Fall 2012.
II.A.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.

Descriptive Summary

The College offers courses in developmental, pre-collegiate, collegiate, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training, programs for international students, and contract education programs. Courses include developmental courses in noncredit ESL and Transitional Studies, pre-collegiate or basic skills courses in English, Math, and ESL, degree applicable and transfer level courses, short-term training in numerous career-technical fields, and contract education training/courses serving the need of local business and industry.

The College ensures that its courses and programs are of high quality through its Program Review System that applies to all instructional departments and programs including continuing and contract education, study abroad, and programs for international students. All units respond to questions that give the opportunity for reflection and planning. Immediate supervisors as well as subcommittees of the Program Review Committee review the Program Review documents.

Before a department can offer a new course or program, it must be reviewed and approved by the College’s Curriculum Committee and by the Board of Trustees. All new noncredit courses and some credit courses and programs must also be approved by the State Chancellor's Office. When departments wish to make changes to courses or programs, the Curriculum Committee also vets those changes.

The Curriculum Committee ensures that all courses and programs meet the standards of Title 5, (California Code of Regulations) for credit and noncredit courses and programs [II A-14 p.51]. Curriculum Committee reviews of proposed Course Outlines of Record include careful consideration of the number and type of hours (lecture, lab, conference) and the instructional methodologies specified. In addition, courses that are to be taught via distance education require separate review and approval by the Curriculum Committee, which considers factors such as course suitability for distance education, student-instructor contact, and distance evaluation integrity [II Â-14 p.53-58].

The evaluation of courses and programs is largely completed at the departmental level. Individual departments have used Program Review to improve their courses and programs. A timely example is the recent curriculum work that the English and Math departments have done to address the achievement gap. These departments have been revising the Course Outlines of Record for their developmental courses on an ongoing basis, ensuring that the expected learning outcomes are well defined and shared among departmental faculty. These
departments are experimenting with shorter sequences of developmental courses, and have established assessment methods that will allow them to determine the effectiveness of these sequences in achieving the desired learning outcomes [II A-32].

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

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

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

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

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

Academic Center Directors overseas continually evaluate academic courses overseas based on both student feedback and their own observations. As course syllabi are revised here at CCSF, they are forwarded to the faculty/Academic Directors overseas to review, discuss, and implement the changes in that location.

The institution has been making a concerted effort to expand the general education course options available at campuses other than Ocean. For example, the rebuilding of the Mission Campus included the creation of laboratory space to support science lab classes, and general education courses in biological sciences, chemistry, and physics are now offered. In addition,
STANDARD II.A

this lab space has allowed the Mission Campus to become a center of some of the Biotechnology programs. Similar plans are in place for the construction of the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus. Expanding the campuses other than Ocean to become more full-service campuses has been the product of the College’s Vision and Mission statements and the College’s Strategic Plan.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

It has well-established means for ensuring the quality of all courses, regardless of course type, delivery mode, or location.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

The role of the faculty is paramount in the review and improvement of the quality of CCSF courses and programs. Faculty are involved at every level of the assessment process from development of learning outcomes to their applications and evaluation. Faculty in each department are responsible for creating, reviewing and assessing course and program outcomes within its offerings. Delivery and assessment are the responsibilities of classroom faculty, who are supervised by their department chair. Student learning outcomes are spelled out in the course outlines and program learning outcomes are published in the College Catalog.

Detailed guidelines in the Curriculum Committee Handbook relevant to the development process include recommendations for mapping courses and program outcomes [II A-14]. There is a refined set of protocols for assessment and evaluation of learning outcomes in the Program Review process. Also, thanks to the efforts of the SLO Workgroup and faculty departmental leadership, there is now a wide and shared understanding of how the assessment of SLOs can provide a framework for course and program creation and improvement.

The concept of a course and/or program starts with faculty in their respective departments and is based on factors such as labor market information, student demand, transfer trends,
and/or advisory committee recommendations. Courses are developed in consultation with colleagues and always with the department chair. Implementation requires Curriculum Committee (CC) approval and often consultation with the CC chair, who is always a faculty member, and the Dean of Instruction. The CC chair acts as a resource to assist the faculty member and department chair in course and program development.

The Curriculum Committee conducts a rigorous peer-review process of every course and program proposed [II A-33]. The Committee consists of 18 faculty, 6 administrators, 1 classified staff and 2 students. After a course and/or program has CC approval, it is referred to the Board of Trustees for their approval and in certain cases (programs with 18 or more units, noncredit courses, noncredit programs, etc.) the State Chancellor’s Office as well.

At CCSF the faculty peer and student evaluation process includes an appraisal of the quality, academic rigor and appropriateness of that professor’s instruction [II A-34, II A-35]. A component of the evaluation of an individual faculty member is whether the courses are being taught in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline and department. This mechanism allows departments to ensure that departmental and discipline expectations for courses are common across the department and discipline. Since the faculty evaluation process is based on peer review, the process allows faculty within a discipline to have an ongoing dialog about the expectations of their courses.

Additionally, each department submits a Program Review in which all offerings can be evaluated and goals for improvement discussed. In 2008-09 CCSF piloted a revised Program Review process in which the units were required to identify the means of assessment, measurement criteria, analysis and plans for improvement of one course and one program SLO. After the first year the template was modified and this procedure is now integral to the Program Review process with departments expected to discuss the assessment process in depth. The decentralized nature of implementation of the SLO process at CCSF ensures that discipline-specific faculty are responsible for the quality of their courses and programs.

The Program Review process has engaged departments in the review of their student success data which in 2010-11 generated the development of 76 new courses, revisions to 314 courses and the deletion of 64 outdated courses. In addition, departments created 7 new majors for the associate degree and 19 new certificate programs, updated 22 majors and 76 certificates, and deleted 5 certificates [II A-36].

There are two functioning bodies coordinating these activities, the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the SLO Workgroup. The PRC reviews unit progress in course and program assessment. The SLO Workgroup, along with the Department Chairpersons Council, provides staff development opportunities and coaching. Included in the PRC’s 2009-10 overview of Program Review was the comment that, “each department needs to establish and maintain an ongoing cycle of planning, assessment, review, and revision of curriculum” [II A-37].

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets this standard.

It has well-established procedures for course and program design, delivery, and evaluation. Faculty have the central role in establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

Student learning outcomes and competency levels are measured by the ability of students to successfully complete a course, complete higher levels of academic study, enter a licensed profession, advance in a current profession, transfer to baccalaureate institutions, or move from noncredit coursework to credit coursework.

General education student learning outcomes have been identified by the Bipartite Committee, which includes faculty and administrators [II A-65 p.46-50]. These outcomes were the result of mapping against College institutional criteria and Title 5 requirements for general education. Departments are undertaking a continuous review of program learning outcomes. They are introduced at the Curriculum Committee and revised within the department through unit dialog. As noted in the College’s 2011 Accreditation Annual Report to WASC, 73 percent of programs have an ongoing process of assessing program learning outcomes; however the institution continues to regularly assess student progress towards achieving these outcomes and expects to be at the proficiency level by Fall 2012 [II A-23].

All career-technical education departments are required to collaborate with an advisory committee when identifying those competencies that graduates need to have in order to enter the labor market. Many also use these committees to help determine how student learning outcomes should be assessed. This partnership between the faculty and an advisory committee is also required for those programs accredited by an external agency.

For example, the Diagnostic Medical Imaging Program uses an advisory committee to measure success in areas such as on-the-job competency and the professionalism of its graduates [II A-39]. Industry advisory groups are also tapped by the Business Department to ensure relevancy of curriculum in preparing students for the workforce, and the Drug &
Alcohol Studies program relies on its advisory group to develop certificate options that respond to the research in the field. Last year the Culinary Arts Program underwent a review of its curriculum under the guidance of the American Culinary Federation (ACF) [II A-39 a]. Moreover, some vocational programs have undergone the DACUM (Developing A Curriculum) process in order to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes in their curriculum and align them with current industry and workforce practices [II A-40]. The Office of CTE conducted a DACUM for the Fashion Department (knitwear) and provided an estimate for a three phase DACUM for alternative fuel vehicles. Another example is Automotive Technology, which worked with industry advisors to develop course and program learning outcomes that are in line with national standards. As a result, this program recently received National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF) certification [II A-41]. Finally, the Aeronautics program recently revised its Curriculum Manual to reflect specifications and certification requirements set by the Federal Aviation Administration [II A-41a].

For years, CCSF CTE departments have worked to interpret Perkins core indicator reports in order to use this data for meaningful program improvement [II A-42]. Simultaneously, the College has increasingly pushed these same occupational departments to think differently about how to use Perkins funds for true program improvement (not just equipment and technology), with a particular focus on grounding grant requests in evidence that clearly identifies specific student success challenges.

CCSF’s Office of CTE launched a new SLO initiative to support faculty who had an interest in collecting and analyzing data to make changes in course and program delivery, called the “CTE Student Success Initiative” [II A-42a]. Through this initiative Research and Planning staff and CTE administrators worked together with the Architecture and Child Development departments to gather evidence and develop action plans based on data. During the process, CCSF developed and is currently implementing a set of assessment tools—including student surveys, student and faculty focus groups and student data analysis—to assess student outcomes. This SLO model will be replicated across occupational disciplines to evaluate program success, strategize changes and help direct dialog with industry partners. This approach helps programs both meet outcome mandates for Perkins as well as address institutional goals focused on continuous quality improvement. For example, the research results for Architecture indicated the need for better course alignment and more lab space with access to computers. Based on these findings, the Architecture Department immediately began making changes to the program through Perkins requests; new course outlines were developed and additional lab space is being researched [II A-26].

A number of departments (as identified in Standard II.A.2.g) have developed common exams as a means to better assess student performance. These exams are not necessarily required to pass the class, but are used by faculty to serve as a reference point to judge student competency regarding course-level learning outcomes. Some departments, such as Math, identify common questions that are used in final exams to assess particular skills.

**Self Evaluation**
The College partially meets this standard.

The College has identified multiple valid sources of data that assist in the regular assessment of student progress towards achieving student learning outcomes. It is at the developmental level in the assessment of courses, certificates and programs and moving progressively to the proficiency level. General education SLOs have been established and they are assessed within the context of the general education discipline in which they are included. The College is researching the most effective and valid way to assess general education SLOs in a cross disciplinary approach.

Planning Agenda

1. The College will move towards the proficiency level for SLO assessment of courses, certificates and programs by Fall 2012. The College will identify the method for assessing GE SLOs in a cross disciplinary approach and complete such assessment.

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

Descriptive Summary

All certificate and degree programs offered by the College undergo a rigorous approval process that ensures proper planning and high-quality instruction. Once approved, separate review processes are used to ensure continued program success. Faculty play a central role in these approval and review processes.

All certificate and degree programs are developed by faculty and presented by departments to the College’s Curriculum Committee for approval using the Committee’s formal review process, as detailed in Standard II.A.2.a. Program proposals are prepared in accordance with the standards published in the College’s Curriculum Handbook, which includes identification of the proposed program’s overall learning outcomes and an identification of whether the program is credit or noncredit [II A-14]. The College’s Curriculum Committee reviews program proposals against these standards, ensuring that all instructional programs meet the standards of high-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The Office of Matriculation works closely with department faculty to ensure that all course and program prerequisites and co-requisites are in compliance with applicable Title 5 requirements [II A-32]. These prerequisites and co-requisites are then reviewed and are approved by the Curriculum Committee. Approved programs are forwarded to the College’s Board of Trustees for final local approval.

External approval by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office is required of all of the College’s degree programs, all of its noncredit certificate programs, and many of its credit certificate programs. The California Community College Program and Course
Approval Handbook establishes the criteria for State Chancellor’s Office approval of programs [II A-43]. To gain approval, the College must demonstrate that the proposed program meets curriculum standards that show the integration of courses in the program, so that students fulfilling program requirements will meet program goals and objectives.

The College has several ways in which it can demonstrate the quality of instruction of its programs. It uses data generated by the Office of Research and Planning to determine the efficacy of instructional programs. For example, a yearly cycle of research tracks the performance of all students who enter CCSF from the San Francisco Unified School District [II A-7]. The institution also tracks transfer, job placement, student enrollment, and persistence and success rates by consulting with UC and CSU campuses and using information from sources like UC Statfinder, the CSU Academic Performance website, and the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. Figures available on these sites demonstrate that students who transfer from CCSF graduate from UC and CSU campuses at rates as high as or higher than students from other public and private high schools and colleges around the state [II A-44]. The Office of Career Tech-Ed (CTE) receives data from the State Chancellor’s Office about student employment, and a number of CTE departments track job placement data of their graduates.

Other data generated by the Office of Research and Planning to determine the quality of instructional programs come from students themselves. In the 2010-11 Credit Student Opinion Survey, students rated both the quality of instruction in CCSF classes and the content of courses as indicated in the table below [II A-45].

### Table 2: Credit Student Survey Results

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

As noted in Standard II.A.5., CTE programs are required to meet with Industry Advisory Boards to ensure continued relevance of their programs to industry needs. Several programs, most notably in allied health, have external accreditation processes that serve to ensure quality of instruction. The College also tracks pass rates for students on external licensing examinations. As noted in Standard II.A.5., students completing College programs have a strong record in passing those licensing exams.

The College has made significant steps in using the assessment of learning outcomes as a mechanism to evaluate the quality of instruction in its programs. Not only is the assessment of learning outcomes a process that is applied to every one of the College’s programs, but the institutional dialogue that has taken place in the last few years about constructing processes by which departments create and then assess learning outcomes has helped to ensure a shared understanding of program quality and level. This shared understanding has then led to the standards published in the College’s Curriculum Handbook [II A-14].
In addition to the processes used to ensure high-quality instruction, the College has several services to support students’ progress through all of the College’s programs. The College has also made several curricular changes to assist students in their progression through the English and Math sequences, in support of the associate degree and transfer [II A-31].

A number of services, programs, and courses are designed to help students complete higher-quality work and reduce their time to graduation. These include a full range of tutoring (lab-based and in-class) services, learning communities, internships, and work experience courses, which are available to students in many departments. They also include collaborative courses formed by CTE and ESL (Bridge to Biotech, ESL for Health Professionals, ESL for Child Development); Metropolitan Health Academy (MHA); Mathematics, Engineering & Science Achievement (MESA) Program; and retention programs like Tulay Filipino-American Student Success Program, Asian Pacific American Student Success (APASS), African American Achievement Program (AAAP), Latino Services Network (LSN), Puente Program, The Math Bridge Program, Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), ESL Partnerships Project, VESL Pathways Project, and others. These programs represent CCSF’s commitment to high-quality instruction both in and out of the classroom.

Recently, the Office of Research and Planning compiled data on student time to completion in CTE certificate programs. The data indicated that the majority of students completed 6 to 29.5 unit certificates within two years and 30-60 unit certificates within 2.5 years [II A-46]. Given the large number of part-time students enrolled at CCSF, this completion rate meets expectations built into program design.

Sequencing has been addressed by enlisting the help of students, faculty, counselors, the Board of Trustees, and the College administration. A series of Student Equity forums, co-hosted by the Academic Senate, Associated Students and Board of Trustees, explored the issue of sequencing in relation to student completion and transfer rates. Departments with longer sequences and required transferable courses, like Mathematics and English, have addressed concerns about sequencing by increasing the number of ways students can progress to graduation or university transfer [II A-31].

English faculty have created two new intensive courses, English 95X and English 961A, 6-unit courses that provide an alternative pathway through the English course sequence in response to the dialog generated at the equity forums. Institutional research studies indicated that certain populations of students were obtaining lower grades and dropping out before completing the required degree or transfer sequence. This new option provides students an opportunity to complete the English sequence in up to two fewer semesters. Five sections of the former and ten of the latter were offered in Spring 2011 [II A-47].

Mathematics offered four sets of intensive short-term sections of Math 840 and Math 860 in Spring 2011 so that a qualified student could take both 840 and 860 in the same semester. In Fall 2011, it will offer a new 5-unit course, Math 45X, which integrates Math 840 and 860 (4 units each) and prepares students to enter a transfer-level statistics course. In ESL, in the credit integrated skills sequence, reading and vocabulary are integrated with grammar and
writing skills in ESL 110-170; the noncredit division offers pathways to vocational programs and to credit ESL courses.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, and rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning are elements used in program approval. The College has evidence of high-quality instruction and processes in place to ensure continued quality. In addition, the College has established services to support student completion, and is addressing sequencing in English and Math in support of students pursuing the associate degree and/or transfer.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

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

**Descriptive Summary**

The institution uses diverse delivery modes that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students. A number of these have already been detailed in Standard II.A.1.b.

Course outlines include references to the methodologies employed. Methodologies take multiple forms: lectures, laboratory activities, demonstrations, case studies, individual research, group discussion, group projects, presentations, research papers, and independent studies. Instructors are encouraged to incorporate multiple methodologies in all of their courses. Instructors in Earth Sciences, ESL, Foreign Language, and Mathematics who were interviewed confirmed that they vary their approaches during their class (using the board or visual aids to appeal to visual learners or hands-on activities for kinesthetic learners, for instance). Instructors assess student learning through the use of written exams, portfolios, performances, research-based projects, and essays.

Students’ learning styles are generally investigated in class under the form of a short survey or through discussion with the instructor. Placement tests also indicate to the instructors what kind of help the students specifically require (for instance, in ESL, these placement tests clearly pinpoint students’ strengths or weaknesses in their speaking or writing ability).

Faculty professional development (Flex Day) sessions always include activities referring to diversity topics thus improving faculty knowledge and skills in certain areas (e.g., the following topic was discussed in 2010: Does a Learning Problem Always Mean a Learning Disability?). These sessions also allow the instructors to meet and discuss student learning.
challenges. In the Foreign Language Department, faculty devote part of their Flex Day to SLO assessment by meeting each semester to discuss teaching strategies and the diversity of the student body. During the semester, faculty also meet to discuss and reflect on their teaching methods and textbooks (whether informally or during Curriculum Committee meetings).

Faculty also address the diverse needs of the students in light of the recent student equity forums which have spotlighted the concerns of various groups such as students with basic skills requirements, international students, and students with limited English proficiency. In addition, instructors participate in professional developmental conferences and workshops offered on or off campus (i.e. California Community College Foreign Language Council meeting).

Also, every year the Multicultural Infusion Project helps selected instructors modify their teaching methods to increase their focus on culturally relevant pedagogy. They share these concepts within their departments to encourage other faculty to do the same. To date, 165 faculty have been trained and 24 faculty have received mini grants to implement project ideas [II A-48]. One project idea was to create a portfolio of activities, assignments, projects, readings, and teaching strategies that is relevant to the Speech and Communication curriculum and that is informed by multi-cultural pedagogy and includes the voices of diverse cultural groups.

CCSF provides an exceptionally wide range of programs and services addressing students’ diversity as well as their needs and learning styles, such as the Asian Pacific American Student Success Center (APASS), the African American Scholastic Program (AASP), the Tulay Filipino-American Student Success Program, and the Latino Services Network (LSN). The foregoing programs are open to all students who are interested in learning within a cultural context. Most of the programs offer a variety of classes (some pertaining to learning strategies), group sessions, peer-support study groups, mentoring, computer stations, and further counseling. Students with special needs can turn to the Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) that provides similar help in addition to equipment (hearing aids, note takers, scooters, etc.).

Some programs address the learning styles of specific populations. Examples include Veteran Educational Transition Services (VETS), Second Chance (which supports formally incarcerated students), Guardian Scholars (which assists foster and emancipated youth), Project SHINE (which benefits immigrant and refugee students), PUENTE (which helps prepare educationally disadvantaged students for college), and Mathematics, Engineering & Science Achievement (MESA) Program (which assists educationally disadvantaged students pursuing a math-based career). Students enrolled in these programs receive supplemental support that can include tutoring, community-based learning, mentoring, and counseling.

CCSF also has a large Learning Assistance Center (including the Tutorial Center, Reading Lab, Writing Lab, and Computer Lab) that, together with other designated learning centers, serves an average of 9,500 students for a total of 125,000 hours of tutoring per semester [II A-49]. Tutor training includes topics such as how to determine a student’s learning style.
Students who are tutored respond on an SLO survey regarding their tutor’s ability to recognize and respond to their learning styles [II A-50]. The Learning Assistance Center also provides Introduction to Tutoring and Advanced Tutoring classes to increase the effectiveness of the tutoring staff.

Other designated departmental learning centers include the Math Lab, English Cyberia Labs, ESL Center for Language and Academic Development (CLAD), Biology Resource Center, Graphic Communication/Photography Lab, and Speech Lab. A number of departments support instruction through student-to-student mentoring offered in conjunction with the Office of Mentoring and Service-Learning. Some of the departments with mentoring projects include Astronomy, Business, Child Development, and Transitional Studies.

The library supports instructional delivery in a number of ways, such as through its exhibition program, which explores issues and themes across departmental curricula and gathers resources across disciplines [II A-51]. Each exhibition is cosponsored by at least one academic department in order to support that department’s information needs. During the course of a semester more than 200 students complete a library exhibition assignment developed in collaboration with faculty from the Learning Assistance Department. Students use their powers of observation and skills in critical analysis to complete an assignment related to the exhibition. The assignment invites personal introspection and response, offering a way to connect their life experience to their academic life and to library resources.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Faculty employ multiple pedagogical approaches to meet the diverse needs and learning styles of students. The pedagogical approaches used are determined by discipline faculty. The College has a strong commitment to student services, which support the learning needs of the College’s diverse student body.

Planning Agenda

1. Within existing budget constraints, expand existing options and devise additional ones for faculty to share effective practices that meet diverse student learning needs.

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

Descriptive Summary

In the previous WASC Evaluation Report, the visiting team recommended, “… the College ensure the institutionalization of their program review process by requiring that all units complete their program reviews in a timely and thorough fashion” [II A-52]. In response to
this recommendation, the College inaugurated a new Program Review process in 2008-09. This system was designed to include all units in the College and is completely integrated into the annual planning and budgeting cycle. The Program Review Committee was convened and it included three of the College’s Vice Chancellors, four faculty, two classified staff, and two student representatives.

In 2008-09, a total of 105 out of 121 units completed program reviews using a revised Program Review template developed by the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the Office of Research and Planning [II A-53]. (All 121 units completed Program Review in 2010-11.) Each College unit received an electronic template that included five years of data on enrollment, personnel, budgetary responsibilities, student and/or employee satisfaction and a productivity measure depending upon whether it was an instructional, student service, or administrative unit. The template also included text boxes designed to elicit information on:

Reflections on data trends
- Progress on prior planning objectives
- Major planning objectives for next fiscal year
- Status of learning assessment for courses and programs
- Resources needed to meet planning objectives

During the pilot period in 2008-09, all Program Review templates were reviewed by the appropriate senior administrators and then forwarded to the PRC for discussion and action. Since then, the members of the PRC have taken on the responsibility of reviewing all program reviews with assistance from additional volunteers. The program reviews are organized into 7 related clusters of manageable size and then reviewed by a subcommittee. Subcommittees present both written and verbal reports to the full PRC. The PRC prepares a final report summarizing the review process and presents it to the College’s Planning and Budgeting Committee [II A-54]. All reports are posted on the Division of Policy and Research website for college wide review.

The PRC is the heart of the College’s Program Review System. It is, in effect, the first filter for reviewing all annual planning objectives and budget requests. The new Program Review plan detailed that the PRC would [II A-55]:

- Review all Program Review reports and make recommendations directly to the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC) for budget modifications.
- Review Program Review reports for alignment of District unit planning objectives with College planning objectives.
- Review the status of student learning outcomes.
- Be responsible for the periodic evaluation of the College Program Review System and submit a final report with recommendations for improvements to the Chancellor.
- Review special Program Review reports and evaluations where the Chancellor requests a special review.
In the 2008-09 pilot year, units were asked to provide documentation about the assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs). Required information included means of assessment, measurement criteria, analysis, and plans for improvement. The goal was to begin the systematic and explicit integration of SLOs into the annual Program Review System, and to prompt a shared college wide understanding of the SLO process. The Program Review template now asks units to identify a six-year plan for revising course curriculum and programs [II A-56].

The pilot process was evaluated in Spring 2009 and Fall 2009 [II A-57]. Results from this evaluation were used to reshape the second round of the Program Review process which was completed in 2009-10. This round now included student achievement data and also focused on providing more detailed data on program expenditures to strengthen connections to budgetary planning. The third round in 2010-11 expanded the data on revenue sources to provide a more accurate picture of unit budgets.

Program Review information, comments from School Deans, Program Review subcommittee comments, and discussions with department chairs informed the development of the Educational Master Plan components. These will, in turn, be incorporated into the overall College Annual Plan and future planning documents.

The Program Review process has increased activity in the development and revision of course outlines and SLOs, has promoted focused dialog at the departmental level and has motivated increased planning to support institutional effectiveness. This is evident in the PRC’s annual report to the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council [II A-54].

The new Program Review process is now a living process which will continually evolve. Over a period of years, this process will map the evolution of each unit and the SLOs associated with courses and programs.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The College has made robust progress. It has developed a framework and model which can be adjusted but allows for administrative oversight and leadership. It is a model which is faculty driven yet dependent on guidance from department chairs, College deans and the Program Review Committee.

**Planning Agenda**

1. The College will continue to gather revenue data for inclusion in the program review process. The PRC will conduct a summative evaluation of the process which will include a review of timelines, frequency, content, and template format.
II.A.2.f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

In 2004, the College modified its planning and evaluation cycle to formally include these five major components: 1) Strategic Planning; 2) Annual Planning; 3) District Unit Planning; 4) Budget Planning, and 5) Assessment [II A-58].

The Strategic Plan is the College’s longest-range plan [II A-59]. It is supported by the College Education Master Plan, Technology Plan, and Institutional Annual Plan [II A-60, II A-61, II A-62]. These plans are developed in a collaborative manner through the College’s Shared Governance System. The College’s mission, goals, and objectives stated in the Strategic Plan are the basis for continuous planning, thereby facilitating consistency and continuity in educational and fiscal planning. This process also allows for the monitoring and review of program implementation and results. The Strategic Plan is the foundation on which the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC) reviews cost and makes recommendations to the Chancellor. It should be noted that the College’s PBC represents all major constituencies at the College: Faculty, administration, staff, and students.

The Annual Plan reflects annual institutional objectives [II A-62]. Institutional objectives are developed based on the Strategic Plan Implementation Schedule and reflect institutional priorities. Again, the Annual Plan reflects the collective thinking from the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and the College’s PBC. The Annual Plan represents core educational and administrative activities, which focus on the improvement and expansion of the programmatic direction at the College.

Departments, schools, programs, and administrative offices are classified as District units for the purpose of aligning programmatic and budget planning. The District unit objectives are then aligned to institutional objectives through the completion of a Cost Plan and Budget Form. This District Unit Planning process ensures the linkage between individual objectives generated by the District units and the annual institutional objectives. The District unit budgets are then reviewed by the College’s PBC which recommends budget allocation to the Chancellor, who in turn forwards his recommended budget to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees through its Planning and Budgeting Committee holds several public hearings on the budget and may make modifications to the proposed budget if it chooses to do so at these hearings or at a meeting of the full board [II A-58].

The End-of-Year Assessment addresses the progress of District unit and institutional objectives. This enables College constituencies to identify needs and areas of improvement. In 2009-10 the Program Review process somewhat replicated the End-of-Year Assessment process.

To monitor its strategic objectives, CCSF produces an annual report on its progress and achievements. This report, called “The College Performance Indicators Report,” is
distributed to and discussed with faculty, staff, and administrators [II A-8]. This report is included as part of the College’s Annual Progress Report to the people of San Francisco. It is available on the College’s website. This data serves as the basis of educational planning since it evaluates student outcomes in the areas of retention, persistence, and graduation rates. Further, the findings of this report become the basis for the development of goals as articulated in the Strategic and Annual Plans for the College.

The systematic review of instructional programs primarily occurs through the Program Review process which was detailed in Section II.A.2.e, and is supplemented by the College Curriculum Committee. Program Review is designed to provide faculty the opportunity to engage in a self study that encompasses several aspects of their program including a review of student learning outcomes and program improvement. Once reviews are evaluated by the PRC and a report is submitted to and accepted by the PBC, all Program Review documentation is posted online for review by the College community at large. Departments also share SLO assessment results at departmental and interdepartmental meetings, on their websites, and at Flex workshops.

Another vehicle to support program improvement is tied to the allocation process for Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA) of 2006 [II A-63]. Proposals for funding must fulfill CTE departmental needs and meet the criteria established under Federal legislation. They must demonstrate how departmental needs were evaluated (e.g., use of focus groups, advisory committee recommendations, or institutional data) and how they will support program quality and improvement. Proposals must meet the permissible uses of funds, as authorized by Perkins, and also demonstrate the use of Core Performance Indicators data in the proposal planning process and in the assessment of performance outcomes.

There are also faculty-initiated efforts to evaluate instructional programs. For example, faculty from the Health Education Department obtained grant funding to develop, implement, evaluate and disseminate a new course of academic study that prepares students to transfer to CSU campuses for further study in health education and related fields. This funding supports implementation of the Metro Academy, a model which restructures how educational programs are delivered (as a school within a school) and intends to help first-generation, low-income, and under-represented students persist in their studies and complete their educational program in a timely manner. Initial studies of student success in the CCSF Metro Academy of Health show the pilot cohort had a retention rate of 80 percent after four semesters, and after the first year in Metro, the next cohort had a retention rate of 78 percent [II A-64].

Another example is the Bridge to Bio-Tech Program originally funded through the National Science Foundation. The program faculty, guided by the national Synergy project, reviewed and evaluated the low retention and success rate of the one semester cohort of students enrolled in the courses that integrated math, reading/writing, and science laboratory skills. Through this review, it was determined that prerequisites were not appropriately advertised and applied and that weaker students should be provided an opportunity to repeat the semester long program. As a result of this evaluation, the program was granted repeatability
status and the certificate, Biotechnology Lab Assistant, was authorized for students completing the sequence of three courses.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The College is committed to ongoing planning. As evidenced, the College utilizes a cyclical approach to review the planning and evaluation process, monitor progress, and align funding resources. Currently, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC) is reevaluating the continuation of the End-of-Year Assessment in its present form, as much of the information has been replicated in Program Review.

Institutional data are available to the College community on the website and efforts are continuously made to summarize and synthesize information in a readily understood format. For example, the Chancellor has instituted a series of ongoing presentations made by various programs and departments to address achievement gaps. The Board of Trustees has also conducted hearings for the same purpose. It should be noted that the College has been severely impacted by the reduction in state funding. Nonetheless, CCSF continues to show constant progress and growth in measuring achievement through systematic, cyclical, and data driven methods.

**Planning Agenda**

1. The College’s PBC will review alternative formats for the End-of-Year Assessment, such as scorecards, dashboards, or key performance indicator reports, which are used by other colleges.

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

**Descriptive Summary**

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

- Broadcasting 119, 120
- Chemistry 101A, 101B
- Fire Science 111
- English 90, 91, 93, 95X, 96, 961A
- English as a Second Language 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, 160, 170; Noncredit Levels 2, 4, 6
- Spanish 1, 1A and French 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 2B
Departments making use of cross-section assessments were asked how the validity of these measures had been established, and how cultural and linguistic biases were avoided in the creation and administration of the tests.

Departments have approached these questions in different ways. Broadcast Electronic Media Arts, for example, uses not only common midterm and final exams, but also common lab projects. Examination questions are continually vetted and refined during faculty meetings, and lab projects are all graded using a common rubric. Fire Science uses a common test bank for FSC 111, with computerized randomization of questions from a database.

The CCSF ESL Department maintains a promotion test program that is administered to noncredit students in Levels 2, 4, and 6 (matching the California State Department of Education's Model Standards levels) to determine readiness for advancement. The exams utilized in the program were developed by CCSF faculty and are both valid and reliable. Testing is standardized and carefully monitored, and records kept of student results.

In credit English as a Second Language courses, students take common final examinations at each level assessing reading, grammar, and writing. Predictive validity for reading and grammar questions was demonstrated through significant correlations between test scores and subsequent success in general courses. The writing components, graded holistically, are grounded by the use of rubrics and anchor papers. All questions are panel-written by diverse faculty to avoid cultural and linguistic biases, and revised during a final editing process.

The English Department uses a variety of common assessments in its courses. English 90 and 91 require a common portfolio for promotion into subsequent courses. These portfolios, based on essays, annotated readings, and a cover letter, make use of one essay and one reading common to all sections. The English faculty use a common rubric for grading, and grade portfolios as a group, using two raters to minimize differences between instructors, and a third reader in the event of discrepancies. English 92, 93, 96, 1A, 1B, and 1C go through cycles of evaluation for assessment purposes and to guide the three-year course revision process. These may be common summaries, common essays, specific targeted strategies, reading, testing, et cetera. The new accelerated/intensive courses, English 95X and English 961A, will be going through a 3-year assessment process using many of the above-mentioned practices from Spring 2011 to Spring 2013.

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

Chemistry 101A sections use common, team-written questions for the midterm examination, and all students in these courses take the same final. Chemistry 101B sections share common portions of the final examination. These common materials have been developed by faculty consensus over time, and faculty conduct regular revision, taking into account how different student populations are performing, and looking for common mistakes indicating flawed or biased items.
Many departments responding indicated some reliance upon nationally-vetted textbook question banks written by experts in the respective fields, or norming to criteria of professional organizations, as ways to help minimize bias in tests. There is, however, recognition that these materials, though they minimize differences between college instructors, have inherent biases. Departments therefore take full advantage of CCSF’s diverse faculty to attenuate these problems. Faculty indicate that when an exam item is deemed to demonstrate bias, it is removed from examinations through faculty consensus.

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

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

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

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

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**II.A.2.h. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.**
CCSF follows Title 5 standards for awarding credit for student work [II A-14, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.4]. Each course has student learning outcomes, called major learning outcomes in the official course outline, and all courses use these SLOs as the basis for awarding credit. In Spring 2011, the Academic Policies Committee approved a policy statement confirming compliance with federal guidelines established Fall 2010.

The ratio of hours of student work to units is verified by the Curriculum Committee during its review. The Curriculum Committee also reviews the Course Outlines of Record to ensure that the content of the course supports the learning outcomes of the course, and that the content justifies the units awarded [II A-14, Chapter 9, Section 9.1.1].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard. It is in compliance with both Title 5 and federal guidelines.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.

Descriptive Summary

As listed in the 2011-12 College Catalog, the College offers 62 majors for the associate degree, 3 awards of achievement, 73 credit certificates of achievement, 88 credit certificates of accomplishment, 79 noncredit CDCP (Career development college preparation) certificates, and 5 noncredit certificates [II A-65 p.4-8]. In 2009-10, the college awarded 1,145 associate degrees, 1,144 credit certificates, and 52 noncredit certificates [II A-2]. In response to State Bill 1440 the College created transfer degrees in psychology, speech communication, and physics. These degrees were developed in line with the statewide approved Transfer Model Curricula, intended to better prepare students for transfer to California State University [II A-66]. As more statewide Transfer Model Curricula are approved, the College will be reviewing them and developing more degrees [II A-67, 9.12].

The College Catalog contains detailed descriptions for all degree and certificate programs. The College awards degrees and certificates based upon completion of coursework from a program’s required core and elective courses. These program requirements are based on major learning outcomes established by faculty.

Successful completion of courses is based on student demonstration of proficiency of the stated major learning outcomes. All course outlines include multiple measures of assessment to ensure that students have indeed achieved the learning outcomes. These formats include essays, quizzes, exams, presentations, oral reports, demonstrations, and performances. Some
programs in the arts and in career and technical education areas require the completion of capstone courses, portfolios, internships or clinical practice. In some programs students demonstrate proficiency of the stated major learning outcomes through passing state licensure exams.

All degree programs and many certificate programs require a minimum grade point average of 2.0. These programs and certificates are consistent with Title 5 requirements and are approved by the Curriculum Committee, the Board of Trustees and, as necessary, the State Chancellor’s Office. They are scheduled for review and update at the department level every five years, although some are updated more often in response to labor market changes.

The College is currently formalizing and aligning the development of SLOs for all programs through the Curriculum Committee. Currently, the career technical education departments are identifying and assessing program SLOs, as are a number of transfer-oriented programs. The College’s Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, composed of administrators and members of the Academic Senate Executive Council, approved SLOs for the general education program.

The SLOs are regularly reviewed and evaluated at the department level which in turn can generate changes in portions of the Course Outline of Record and/or the creation of new courses to address student learning. The Math and English departments recently completed assessments of their curriculum based on faculty dialog and feedback from Board- and College-sponsored Equity Hearings. Based on assessment results, a new intensive English course was designed and English and Math courses were also scheduled in an intensive 9-week format [II A-31]. Departments have also been asked to assess their progress in using SLOs to enhance student learning via the Program Review process.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the standard.

The College curriculum includes about 3000 courses and 300 programs. SLOs have been identified for all courses offered. While a concerted effort has been made to identify SLOs for all programs and complete the assessment cycle for all courses and programs, it is still a work in progress. Through a process of dialog throughout the District, the College has focused on general education and program SLOs to address student capacity to pursue continued higher education; basic skills curriculum to ensure student progress from noncredit to credit and basic skills to college level in areas of math, English and English as a Second Language; and CTE SLOs to ensure students’ competency to enter the workforce as identified by the field experts. The College needs to further its work to continue to identify and assess SLOs for all programs.

The College awards a significant number of credit certificates and degrees. The College has barriers in policy and in processes that impede its ability to award noncredit certificates. Noncredit courses are open-entry/open-exit, and many do not culminate in a formally recorded grade, so the process of evaluation for certificate completion is difficult. In addition,
the numbers reported do not include students who qualify for a certificate but who fail to file
the appropriate paperwork. It is suspected that this represents a significant number of
students.

Planning Agenda

1. The College will assess its general education SLOs, identify SLOs for certificates and
   programs that do not have any, and complete a corresponding assessment. The College
   will ensure that all active courses are continually assessed. The College will create a plan
to formalize this assessment cycle to ensure it is at the proficiency level by Fall 2012.

2. The College will continue working to update business practices to streamline the process
   of petitioning for certificates and degrees, and to encourage students to file for certificates
   for which they qualify. The College will continue to engage in discussions with Shared
   Governance bodies and the faculty union about the policy issues that make the awarding
   of noncredit certificates difficult.

II.A.3 The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a
component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is
clearly stated in its catalogue. The institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty,
determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education
curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.

Descriptive Summary

Students pursuing degree programs are required to pursue one of two different general
education patterns. Nearly all of the College’s degree programs require completion of the
College’s local general education requirements, which includes coursework in the following
areas [II A-65]:

- Communication and Analytical Thinking (Area A)
- Written Composition (Area B)
- Natural Sciences (Area C)
- Social and Behavioral Sciences (Area D)
- Humanities (Area E)
- United States History and Government (Area F)
- Health Knowledge and Physical Skills (Area G)
- Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender
  Studies (Area H)

The College has a small number of degree programs designed to support transfer, as required
by Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act (SB 1440). As required by this legislation,
students pursuing these degree programs must complete either the California State University
General Education (CSU GE) or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum
The College Catalog is the primary venue for communicating the general education goals, rationale, and philosophy to all stakeholders. The general education requirements section of the Catalog begins with a summary of the goals of the requirement areas. Each of the general education areas has a more detailed discussion, including learning outcomes, preceding the list of courses that satisfy that area [II A-65]. These requirements and their descriptions are revised periodically and as needed in a process that usually begins with faculty and is always reviewed by the Academic Senate Executive Council before final approval by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, which includes both faculty and administrators.

As stated in the Catalog, the primary reason for the general education program is to foster in students a lifelong interest in their own learning. The major areas covered include proficiencies in written and spoken communication as well as critical thinking, an introduction to the humanities and to the social, natural, and behavioral sciences, a basic understanding of U.S. history and government, general study in health and physical wellness, and an appreciation of ethnic and gender studies [II A-65]. The latter areas further affirm the College’s commitment to graduating students who are prepared to participate in a diverse and democratic society.

Each course included in the list of courses for any of the general education requirements has been approved by the Curriculum Committee and then undergoes a rigorous review, comparing its course outline to the criteria for inclusion in the area that is proposed, to ensure that the learning outcomes for each course within the area mirror the learning outcomes for the requested general education area and the mission of the general education program as a whole [II A-14, 7.2]. Successful proposals detail how the course meets those criteria, with specific reference to the course’s stated learning outcomes and their integration into the content and instructional methodology of the course. Faculty on the Academic Senate Executive Council (a 29-member body elected by the entire faculty), examine each proposal closely, looking for evidence in both the major learning outcomes and the course content that the course meets the criteria. To receive final approval for inclusion in a general education area, a course must be unanimously approved by all 34 members of the Bipartite Committee or by at least a two-thirds majority of the faculty and, separately, two-thirds of the administrators on the Committee. The process to add a new course to the general education requirements is a thoughtful, rigorous one that has resulted in a wide range of choices for students that ensure them a diverse, enriching education.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The general education program goals and philosophy are explicit, well-articulated, and carefully used to ensure that students receive the best education possible and to prepare them for full civic and workforce participation. Faculty and administrators take the decision about
inclusion of a course in a general education area very seriously. City College of San Francisco continues to meet and exceed the standard in this area.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.A.3.a. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including the following: An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

Descriptive Summary

Title 5 Section 55063 establishes minimum requirements of the associate degree, including some basic parameters about the College’s general education program [II A-71]. Specifically, this section requires courses in natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, English composition, and communication and analytical thinking. The following areas in the College’s general education program have been established to meet those requirements [II A-65 p.48-50]:

- Communication and Analytical Thinking (Area A)
- Written Composition (Area B)
- Natural Sciences (Area C)
- Social and Behavioral Sciences (Area D)
- Humanities (Area E)

Title 5 Section 55063 also allows us the ability to establish local general education requirements. The following areas have been established as local requirements of the College’s general education program [II A-65 p.50-51]:

- United States History and Government (Area F)
- Health Knowledge and Physical Skills (Area G)
- Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies (Area H)

The Academic Senate established a philosophy and broad goals of the general education program in 1982, and established criteria that courses must meet in order to be included in the various general education areas. The most recent charge to the College’s general education program came in Spring 1989, with the addition of Area H.

While there have been no major structural changes to the College’s general education program since 1989, there have been some changes to the standards and criteria for several of the areas. Specifically, the Written Composition requirement was updated effective with the 2006-07 College Catalog to include information competency [II A-72 p.71], and was further adjusted effective with the 2009-10 College Catalog to reflect a more stringent requirement
While not a general education area, the Mathematics graduation requirement was also updated effective with the 2009-10 College Catalog to reflect a more stringent requirement.

In the 2008-09 academic year, members of the Academic Senate met to establish learning outcomes for each of the general education areas. The learning outcomes that were established are closely tied to the inclusion criteria for the various areas, to ensure that any course included in an area include the learning outcomes that have been identified for that area. These were adopted by the Academic Senate and the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements in the Spring 2009 semester, and were first published in the 2009-10 College Catalog.

As noted in II.A.3, the College has a rigorous process for evaluating inclusion of courses into the various general education areas. Courses are reviewed to ensure that the learning outcomes of the course are aligned with the learning outcomes of the proposed general education area, thus assuring that the learning outcomes of the general education areas are reflected in the course outlines of applicable courses.

The College’s work to date in assessing the achievement of learning outcomes in the College’s general education areas has been at the department/discipline level. This is in keeping with the overall decentralized implementation strategy the College has taken in the assessment of learning outcomes. The sheer number of the College’s general education course options for students makes cross-disciplinary work on the assessment of learning outcomes challenging. For example, students can satisfy the College’s Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement (Area D) by taking one of over 175 courses across 27 disciplines. It has been challenging to conceive of a process by which the faculty in those disciplines can collaborate on the assessment of learning outcomes.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

The College has a well-defined philosophy for its general education program, which includes the basic content of the major areas of knowledge. It has a rigorous process that ensures that the learning outcomes that have been established for the various general education areas are reflected in the course outlines of courses required for those areas. The College has begun a decentralized implementation to assess the learning outcomes of the general education areas. Work remains on having a cross-disciplinary approach to this assessment, but is complicated by the breadth of offerings in most of these areas. The College has not yet established mechanisms by which it systematically assesses how well students use the knowledge gained in its general education program when they are enrolled in subsequent courses, employed, or involved in other endeavors.

Planning Agenda

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
1. Despite the challenges faced, the College will pursue the assessment of learning outcomes across the disciplines represented in the College’s general education areas, to include the application of knowledge gained in the general education program to subsequent courses.

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

Descriptive Summary

Several of the College’s graduation requirements directly apply to students’ abilities to be a productive individual and lifelong learner:

- Written Composition (Area B) encompasses both written communication and information competency. Students must take English 1A to meet this requirement, and will complete five hours of workshops offered by the Library in information competency as a part of that course.

- Scientific and quantitative reasoning are assessed in both the College’s Natural Sciences (Area C) general education area and in the College’s separate Mathematics graduation requirement.

- Critical analysis and logical thinking are covered in detail in courses used to meet the Communication and Analytical Thinking (Area A) general education requirement.

- Courses selected for inclusion in Written Composition (Area B) must show that students will be able to communicate clearly both in writing and orally.

More broadly, courses offered by the College that are deemed to be applicable to the associate degree have been evaluated by the College’s Curriculum Committee against the requirements of Title 5 Section 55002(a) [II A-14 p.18-19]. This ensures that students have a number of experiences in courses that require critical thinking and the understanding and application of concepts at the college level. Further, these courses have required students to study independently outside of class time. The College’s Curriculum Committee reviews all proposed degree-applicable courses, and uses the proposed course outline of record as the basis of its approval. Finally, many of the courses that a student takes while pursuing an associate degree require written and/or oral expression, so students will get practice with these skills in contextualized settings.

As noted in the College’s response to II.A.3.a, the College’s work to date in assessing the achievement of these learning outcomes has been at the department/discipline level. Again, this is in keeping with the overall decentralized implementation strategy the College has taken in the assessment of learning outcomes. The College has yet to implement broad cross-disciplinary strategies to the assessment of learning outcomes, or to the ability of students to apply this learning to subsequent coursework.
Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

The College has a well-constructed approach to lifelong learning in the College’s general education program. The College has a rigorous process of review of all courses deemed appropriate to the associate degree, ensuring that students have a variety of experiences in courses requiring collegiate-level critical thinking. The College has a decentralized approach to the assessment of learning outcomes related to lifelong learning. Work remains on having a cross-disciplinary approach to this assessment, but is complicated by the breadth of offerings in most of these areas.

Planning Agenda

1. The College will pursue the assessment of learning outcomes across the disciplines and general education areas related to lifelong learning.

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

Descriptive Summary

The general education program has several requirements related to ethics and effective citizenship [II A-65 p.50-51]:

Students develop an appreciation and understanding of the ways in which people throughout the ages and in different cultures have responded to themselves and to the world around them through artistic and cultural creation, and have developed aesthetic sensitivity and skills as well as an ability to make informed value judgments in courses related to the College’s Humanities (Area E) requirement.

- Students examine and understand the importance of participating in civic duties and responsibilities based on historical and political precedent in courses related to the College’s United States History and Government (Area F) requirement.
- Students develop an appreciation and understanding of the history, culture, and perspective of diverse ethnic groups, women, and people of diverse sexual orientations and identities through courses satisfying the College’s Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies (Area H) requirement.

As noted in the College’s response to II.A.3, broad goals related to ethics and effective citizenship were established by the Academic Senate, and learning outcomes for each of these areas were established in Spring 2008 [II A-73 p.51].
In addition, the College offers a variety of opportunities for students to further their experiences related to ethics and citizenship. Citizenship within the College is fostered through the Office of Outreach and Recruitment’s Ambassadors’ program. A cadre of current students helps to orient incoming freshman to the campus and college culture. During the year, the Ambassadors visit high schools and community-based agencies to recruit prospective students.

The Associated Students collaborates with CCSF student development services to facilitate students’ engagement with the College and wider community. Through the Office of Student Activities, students may get more involved in CCSF through the student clubs, student government, or any one of the ten Associated Students supported Resource Centers: Bookloan Program, Family Resource Center, Guardians Scholars, Homeless At-Risk Transitional Students (HARTS) program, Multicultural Resource Center, Students Supporting Students, Queer Resource Center, Veteran's Resource Center, and Immigrant Resource Center. Student government is composed of a student body president and sixteen students elected to the student senate [II A-74]. Members of student government are required to enroll in Student Leadership 12. Other options for student engagement include 80 student clubs on campus [II A-75]. Each club sends a representative to form the membership for the Interclub Council. Additionally, students at other campuses have an opportunity to engage in student leadership, with six campuses plus the Adult Learning and Tutorial Center at Gough Street having active Associated Student Councils. The six campuses are: Civic Center, Downtown, Evans, John Adams, Mission, and Southeast.

The Office of Mentoring and Service-Learning oversees the collaborative efforts of instructors and community partners to instill a sense of civic engagement. For example, in Project Shine, students enrolled in various credit courses volunteer in CCSF’s noncredit citizenship and ESL classes to coach elders in learning content to pass the citizenship exam or improve their English skills [II A-76].

In addition, there are approximately 15 projects designed for students to provide service both to communities outside of the College and within the College, enabling students to develop leadership skills. Many of the projects are not tied to a specific course, but are associated with the following departments: Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Studies, Health Education, Child Development, Astronomy, and Student Health Services. Courses which have sections linked to the projects include: WOMN 25, ENGL 93 and 96, BIO 26, LALS 15, SOC 1, 2, and 30, LBCS 93D, CNIT 197, FASH 45A and MUS. In Fall 2010, credit courses that offered Project SHINE as a service learning option included: ASAM 20, 30, and 35; IDST 50; SPAN 3A; ESL 79, 150, and 160; POLS 1, 2, and 3; LALS 10, HLTH 10; and ENGL 93.

Faculty members at CCSF have access to the Multicultural Infusion Project, which supports selected faculty in transforming curriculum to infuse multicultural content and practice. Monthly meetings are held to develop an appreciation of cultural diversity through pedagogy and content. Annual meetings enable participants to reflect on ways in which the institution can better serve underrepresented students.
The College is privileged to be the steward of Mexican muralist Diego Rivera’s 1940 work depicting Pan American unity. It exemplifies the use of art to create a cultural awareness of a historical movement addressing relevant social and political issues. The mural, staffed with trained student docents, is accessible to the public and included by student ambassadors in their campus tours presentations. To incorporate a cultural perspective into their courses, faculty members in many departments (English as a Second Language, Social Sciences, Art, Foreign Languages, English, etc.) integrate all or parts of Rivera’s mural into their courses. Under Latin American & Latino Studies 14 (LALS 14), students participate in a unique, full semester credit course, with ongoing research about Diego Rivera, his life, his work, and the mural, and contribute their work to the Rivera Collection, a special library collection housed in the Rosenberg Library/LRC.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

All students pursuing the Associate Degree take courses related to ethics and effective citizenship. The College has a rigorous process to evaluate courses for inclusion in the related general education areas, ensuring that the learning outcomes for these areas are reflected in the course outlines of the courses students take to meet these areas.

Additionally, existing extracurricular programs provide excellent vehicles for students to engage in activities and practices to grow as ethical human beings and effective citizens.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

CCSF offers associate degrees in compliance with Title 5 Section 55063. The Associate in Science (AS), Associate in Arts (AA), Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T), and Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T) degrees are awarded by CCSF based on the satisfaction of several different requirements, as noted in the Associate Degree Graduation Requirements section of the Catalog [II A-65 p.45-53]. Among the listed requirements is the major requirement, which students can satisfy in one of several ways:

They can follow a specific major that has been developed by an instructional department at CCSF and approved by the State Chancellor's Office;
• They can follow one of four Areas of Emphasis in the Liberal Arts and Sciences program: Arts and Humanities, Communication, Science and Mathematics, and Social and Behavioral Sciences (AA and AS only);
• They can complete 18 units in a particular field of study if a major curriculum has not been specified by the department (AA and AS only).

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF continues to make it a priority that the education offered in its degree programs is not only consistently broad and current, but also comprehensive and elective—reflecting the interests of the student earning the degree. CCSF’s priorities as an institution are to provide broad perspective as well as specialization within all of its degree programs.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco offers 25 general areas of career and technical study, which include 178 credit and noncredit certificates, degrees or Awards of Achievement. Of these programs, at least 28 prepare students for passing external licensing or certifying exams. Any new certificate (of 18 units or higher) or degree program must complete a rigorous review process established by the Education Code. The process involves obtaining Labor Market Research, input from Advisory Boards, and approval from the College Curriculum Committee, as well as the endorsement of the Bay Area Community College Occupational Planning Committee. These activities, along with the Program Review conducted by each career and technical education program, contribute to the standards demanded by employers and external licensing agencies [II A-77].

The Office of Research and Planning collects data for licensure pass rates for individual CCSF departments. The Office must rely upon licensing agencies for the data and in some instances is experiencing difficulty retrieving it. However, the Office was able to obtain licensure exam data for 2009-10 and found the following pass rates for CCSF students: Radiation Therapy Technology (86 percent), Diagnostic Medical Imaging (100 percent), Licensed Vocational Nursing (94 percent), Registered Nursing (89 percent), Cardiovascular Tech/Echocardiography (100 percent), Emergency Medical Technician (81 percent), Pharmacy Technician (100 percent), Health Information Technology (92 percent), Medical
Assisting (100 percent), Paramedic (100 percent), and Phlebotomy (92 percent) [II A-78]. Students completing the Real Estate program are eligible to sit for the Real Estate Salesperson and Broker exams. Students who complete the Aeronautics program are eligible to sit for the Federal Aviation Administration’s exams in Powerplant and Airframe.

To promote the goal of meeting employment standards, occupational programs are required to meet with Industry Advisory Boards. Members include industry professionals who provide feedback that assists departments in the curricular changes to maintain programmatic currency. For example: Business Advisory Board provided input into Green and Sustainable Business program development and the use of social media in business [II A-79]; Real Estate Advisory Board gave curriculum development input for Real Estate Marketing and Commercial Real Estate courses, and updates on local commercial leasing and mortgage lending changes [II A-80]; Trauma Prevention and Recovery Advisory Board reviewed student learning outcomes and provided input for certificate modifications [II A-81]; Drug and Alcohol Studies Board provided input on the collaboration between the Drug and Alcohol Studies program and the new CCSF Community Mental Health Certificate program and the development of an internship preparation workshop [II A-82]. (Calif. Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sect. 55601; Calif. Gov. Code, Sect. 15370.24)

Many programs rely on their pool of part-time faculty who concurrently hold jobs in private industry. These individuals bring to the College their direct, relevant and current experience in the field, which results in ongoing dialog with full-time faculty and the revision of curriculum to reflect industry practices and standards. Additionally, many faculty are active members, or even board members, of industry or professional associations, such as the American Association for Paralegal Education, the California Association of Realtors, California Association of Drug and Alcohol Educators, and several professional health associations, which also strengthens industry connections that lead to ongoing curricular updates and increased standards. Child Development faculty are members of a total of 15 local advisory and policy boards in San Francisco [II A-83].

CCSF’s Office of Workforce and Economic Development oversees the California Resource Center for Occupational Program Design and Evaluation. Its function is to provide service to business, education and industry by conducting DACUM (Developing a Curriculum) job analyses. Trained CCSF faculty working for this Center help CCSF departments and other colleges create or update an ideal education or training program for specific industry needs. Several career and technical programs have completed DACUMs, most recently Fashion and Design and Hybrid Technology in Automotive Technology.

The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office furnishes annual reports that reflect Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA) Core Indicator data uploaded from the College to the State MIS. Core Indicator #4 measures placement by matching the number of student completers to the California Employment Development Department Unemployment Insurance wage database. The most recent data available, 2008-09, reports the College aggregate match rate of 87.3 percent. [II A-3] This reflects an increase of almost 9 percent from the last report. This data, however, is not entirely conclusive in that it does not capture
all student placement data, such as the number of graduates who become successfully self-employed or move out of state for employment [II A-83].

Job placement data is also obtained through Career Connection, a grant-funded online job placement tool free to all CCSF students and alumni, which includes an employer follow-up tracking survey. In 2010-11, the College formed a working group to explore new technologies that would increase the effectiveness of job placement tracking and assessment of student technical and professional competencies. The group completed its assessment and identified an online tool (also used by other colleges) that will better facilitate and track student internships and employment and assess student preparation for the job [II A-84].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Many career and technical programs are outstanding in preparing students for employment competencies. They stay abreast of current needs of industry, work closely with advisory boards and regularly revise curriculum to maintain relevance to the workforce. They also have implemented tracking systems to measure student success rates and regularly produce the highly skilled graduates the local economy demands.

Program success is also exemplified through national and statewide recognition. In Fall 2010, the Diagnostic Medical Imaging program received the Minnies’ Award as one of the top two institutions in the nation for learning diagnostic radiology, second only to Johns Hopkins University Medical Center [II A-85]. In Spring 2011, CCSF Journalism students won a combined 20 awards in the Journalism Association of Community Colleges competition. General excellence awards were also won by student publications, The Guardsman newspaper and Etc. magazine [II A-86].

Overall, CCSF has done a satisfactory job in developing processes to acquire information about students’ ability to meet employer standards and pass external exams. Since the previous Self Study report was completed, the College has been looking at this area more carefully. As a result, a working group has been developed which is taking serious steps to adopt a comprehensive job development and placement tracking tool [II A-84]. More advanced technological resources are now available that didn’t exist previously, making this a more feasible option.

Planning Agenda

1. By the end of 2011, the College will implement the technologically sophisticated, comprehensive online job development and placement tracking system that is in use by other colleges.
II.A.6 The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution’s officially approved course outline.

Descriptive Summary

The Catalog is available in print and online, and includes clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. Courses and programs are reviewed for catalog inclusion by department chairs at least once a year and are further reviewed by the Dean of Instruction before inclusion in the Catalog.

New courses and programs are developed according to standards outlined in the Curriculum Committee Handbook, which includes student learning outcomes [II A-14, Chapters, 2, 4 & 5]. Courses and programs are reviewed by Department Chairs, the Curriculum Committee and Dean of Instruction. In accordance with Program Review requirements, all courses are updated and reviewed within a six-year cycle. Student Learning Outcomes for programs are increasingly being developed and added to the Catalog and program brochures.

As stated in the CCSF Faculty Handbook, all credit instructors are mandated to distribute thorough syllabi, which include course expectations and student learning outcomes [II A-87, p 52]. In the 2010-11 Credit Student Opinion Survey, 93 percent of students responded favorably when asked if they had received a syllabus that specified what they would learn in the class [II A-88]. Additionally, all faculty are subject to evaluation every three years, which includes reviewing course syllabi and their relation to the official course outline of record.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF is undergoing a systematic effort to ensure that all new courses and programs meet the requirements for clarity and stated learning outcomes. Instructors, Department Chairs, School Deans and the Dean of Instruction all review courses and/or program descriptions for clarity and stated outcomes and objectives. Course and program descriptions are based on the rubric as stated in the Curriculum Committee Handbook. The College verifies that individual courses adhere to the course objectives/learning outcomes through peer, student, and tenure review of faculty and though departmental review of courses and program requirements.

Planning Agenda

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

The 2011-12 College Catalog includes a clear policy of how coursework transferred in from other institutions is evaluated [II A-65 p.416]. Students may use coursework completed at other institutions to fulfill program, general education, and/or elective unit requirements for the associate degree or certificate programs at City College of San Francisco. Specifically, students may use lower and/or upper division transfer coursework to fulfill any or all of the following:

- specific program requirements for a certificate, major, or award of achievement
- general education graduation requirements
- unit requirement for graduation (minimum of 60 semester units)

The unit requirement may be met with courses from regionally accredited (e.g., accredited by Western Association of Schools and Colleges) colleges or universities. Students are subject to the residence requirement for the associate degree, regardless of the number of units transferred into the College.

Program and general education requirements must be evaluated through the course equivalency process. Course equivalency is determined by the chair(s) of the department(s) offering comparable courses, and is communicated by them to the Office of Admissions and Records (A&R) via the “Evaluation of Course Equivalency” form [II A-89]. Student inquiries with either a specific department or with A&R should occur prior to petitioning for graduation. Counselors often assist students in identifying possible course equivalencies.

The policy and procedures for accepting incoming courses are reviewed periodically by the Academic Policies Committee. The College is currently working to streamline its course equivalency process to better serve students and faculty.

Transfer of coursework from CCSF to other institutions is spelled out in the thousands of detailed articulation agreements the College has with University of California, California State University, California Independent Colleges and Universities, and Out-of-State Public and Private Colleges. These agreements are continually expanded and updated as curriculum information and student needs and interests change. Articulation information is available in the print and online catalog, general education worksheets for students, time schedule transfer information pages, statewide ASSIST website, college articulation website, and a student transcript report generated from the Banner database [II A-90]. Updates are presented through meeting presentations, end-of-year mailings, workshops and emails. Course listings in the CCSF Catalog routinely and consistently indicate whether they articulate to UC or CSU.
The College supports an Office of Articulation with a full-time articulation officer and a half-time clerical assistant. The Office is responsible for the development and maintenance of articulation agreements and the dissemination of all information related to articulation.

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

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

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

Articulation information is extensive and frequently updated. Policies are clear and updated in response to student needs.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

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

**Descriptive Summary**

According to California Education Code Section 70902 /Title 5, CCR, Sections 55230 et seq. and 53203, ultimate approval for program revision (major changes) rests with the Chancellor of the College [II A-91]. Guidance for program revision is covered in the Curriculum Committee Handbook: 4.3 Revising a Major [II A-14]. Revisions themselves originate and
develop at the Departmental level with final forms being submitted to the Curriculum Committee for further processing and approval.

For non-academic programs, California Education Code, Section 78016 provides for the review of and termination of vocational programs that do not meet established criteria and Board Policy 6.14 establishes that the institution will terminate vocational programs in accordance with applicable law [II A-92, II A-93]. Interviews with department heads, school Deans, and program chairs have revealed the following: in general, departments assess the needs for their programs according to internal and external criteria and revise accordingly.

There is no College wide policy for departments to follow in evaluating their individual programs for termination or modification. Students are informed and supported by faculty, department heads, and counselors/advisers when programs are modified or terminated. The CCSF 2011-12 Catalog explains protection against changes in programs (catalog rights). The stated policy basically ensures that if programs are changed during the time a student has been continuously enrolled, the student has a right to follow the program as originally stated in the catalog which was in effect at the onset of his or her study. If a course is no longer offered, the department makes accommodations for that student by accepting a replacement course, waiving a course requirement, etc. [II A-65 p.46].

In practice, when a program is deemed terminable, the usual procedure (phasing out) is to allow current students to finish out the program while no new students are taken in. All efforts are made to ensure students achieve their educational goals. When revisions are finalized, the College’s Counseling Department is notified and the appropriate campus counselors are informed and advised on how to help affected students realize their educational goals.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

Program eliminations and modifications are successfully handled at the departmental level with appropriate approvals received higher up. Special care is taken to ensure students’ progression toward their educational goals; students’ educational progress is protected via the College Catalog rights policy.

Although the College has employed a successful process for program elimination, there is no College wide policy that establishes formalized procedures to follow regarding program modification and elimination, other than the information found in the Curriculum Committee Handbook. However, each department has successfully handled needed program adjustments to ensure its viability and supported affected students to ensure their educational success.

**Planning Agenda**

None.
II.A.6.c. The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.

Descriptive Summary

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

Other sections of the Catalog (e.g., Library and Learning Resources, Academic Policies) are reviewed by the owners of that section. The Office of Instruction asks for such updates each year in the late fall/early spring, and incorporates all reported changes into the next printed version of the Catalog. Additionally, when policies are updated via the Shared Governance process, changes are made to the appropriate sections of the Catalog. These changes are highlighted in a Policy Update document on the online Catalog [II A-94].

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

When the Office of Instruction receives notification of approval of new certificate or degree programs after the Catalog has been published, it includes this information in an online Catalog addendum [II A-95]. Such programs are typically listed as "pending state approval" in the printed version of the Catalog, and the addendum gives details of these programs once approval has been gained.

The College’s class schedule is printed thrice-yearly and, when budget allows, is mailed to all San Francisco residents and public libraries, and is available through the CCSF Bookstore and on all campuses. This schedule provides detailed information about each semester’s course offerings, campus maps and information about programs and services the College offers. With each publication, the schedule is reviewed for accuracy, currency and completeness by the Office of Marketing and Public Information and the Chancellor.
The Office of Marketing and Public Information oversees the accuracy of all publications by individual departments, campuses, and sites and responds to all press inquiries and requests for public records. The Office publishes the weekly in-house newspaper *City Currents*, which features faculty accomplishments, Board news, individual student’s achievements and current events at the College.

In order to save on printing costs, the Office of Marketing and Public Information recently shifted from a print to an electronic format for *City Currents*, which is now posted weekly on the College’s website and distributed electronically to all personnel via the College’s email system. The Office also serves as a point of entry for all outside inquiries about the College’s policies and procedures, referring requests for public records to the College’s Legal Counsel, and directing all press inquiries to the appropriate vice-chancellor, dean or department chair. Finally, the Office communicates the College’s mission and programs to the community via outreach such as advertisements in all San Francisco neighborhood and ethnic newspapers, and at least one national publication (Southwest Spirit, the in-flight magazine of Southwest Air).

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

Policies are reviewed in response to identified issues and opportunities, Title 5 changes, and legislative or regulatory changes. They are revised through the Shared Governance System. Major changes to programs and policies are disseminated via shared governance committee meetings, trainings, email dissemination, College publications and the College website. The Board of Trustees, through its Policy Implementation Committee, is currently updating its policies. These are also available on the College website [II A-96].

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

Most recently, the Outreach Office started a City College Facebook page offering information about upcoming scholarship applications, registration deadlines, job opportunities, and campus events, as well as links to in-house videos about the College counseling programs, student achievements, and international student assistance programs. As of May, 2011, the Facebook page had 5,832 registered “fans.”
The Policy and Research webpage found under Employee Services presents information on student achievement, both recent and archival reports. It posts Program Review reports, which contain current student achievement data for each academic department. Other posted reports include Accountability Reporting for the California Community College (ARCC), College Performance Indicators, Basic Skills Accountability, The High School Report, and additional focused reports on student performance.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

CCSF reviews and updates its published materials thoroughly and regularly, and communicates its mission, policies and procedures in a clear, consistent manner to students, personnel and the public. The College has taken steps to address the problems with its website mentioned in its 2006 WASC review, and continues to work on the currency and accessibility of information.

**Planning Agenda**

1. CCSF will continue making its website more easily navigable and keeping its content up to date.

**II.A.7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or world views. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.**

**Descriptive Summary**

There is print and online access to the SFCCD Policy Manual that includes Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Freedom” [II A-97]. This policy clearly defines academic freedom with its rights and responsibilities. In addition, the policy also contains guidelines for textbook, library selections and public forums. The Faculty Handbook of February 2010 references the AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement 10/22/09-6/30/12 that includes Article 8, “Academic Freedom, Duties, and Responsibilities,” and Article 30, “Intellectual Property” [II A-87, II A-98].

The “Student Rights and Responsibilities” section of the CCSF College Catalog (“College Rules and Regulations”) contains Board-approved policy on student academic honesty [II A-65 p.377). This document is available on line and in hard copy at the CCSF Bookstore. The policy is also in the Student Handbook, distributed at the start of each semester [II A-99].

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets this standard.

The College has always been committed to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and has in place policies that support these commitments. The policy on student academic policy is readily available to students and staff. The website has been expanded so all materials are readily available online.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Academic”, clearly defines academic freedom with its rights and responsibilities. It demonstrates institutional commitment to free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge [II A-100].

The College communicates its expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views through many references in Article 8 of the AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement. For example, section C.4 states, “Faculty cannot, however, expect academic freedom to be unlimited, for the right to exercise any liberty implies a duty to use it responsibly. Academic freedom does not give faculty freedom to engage in indoctrination. Nor can faculty invoke the principle of academic freedom to justify non-professional conduct” [II A-98 p.20].

A component of faculty evaluation (including tenure review) is an anonymous survey of students in one or more classes taught by the instructor being evaluated. Different surveys are used for credit, noncredit, ESL, and library courses. In each of these surveys, a question about instructor’s biases is asked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Does the instructor seem to be free of racial, sexual, religious and political prejudices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>Shows respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>The teacher respects the students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students are asked to rate faculty on a 5-point scale, with 1 representing Never, and 5 representing Always. A review of the results over the last few semesters shows that, on average, faculty score very well on these questions, both in an absolute sense, and in comparison to the other questions on the survey. Generally, faculty scored between 4.8 and 4.9, which is higher than average scores of the other questions, and indicative of faculty’s
ability to create a bias-free learning environment and to distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline [II A-19, II A-20, II A-21, II A-22].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

The SFCCD Policy Manual states, “The College requires certain standards of conduct of all its students. The College shall adopt rules and regulations governing student behavior along with appropriate penalties for student misconduct consistent with applicable law” [II A-101]. With reference to academic honesty, it has adopted and published policies to address this issue, so that faculty, students, and the public are kept informed.

Academic or intellectual dishonesty is outlined in Rules of Student Conduct (p. 401) under College Rules and Regulations in the 2011-12 CCSF Catalog as well as the “Types of Discipline” to be administered [II A-65]. Also, academic or intellectual dishonesty, such as cheating or plagiarism, is the first item discussed in the section on Grounds for Disciplinary Action under the heading, Student Conduct (P.58) in the CCSF Student Handbook [II A-99].

The types of disciplinary action are also clearly identified in the handbook. Furthermore, some departments such as the English and ESL Departments have specific policy documents addressing plagiarism [II A-102, II A-103]. These documents are given to students during the first week of class and are available at the departmental offices throughout the year. The Chair of the Behavioral Sciences Department also plans to draw up a policy document on plagiarism for students.

The College has been very thorough in establishing and publishing clear expectations regarding student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty. The CCSF Catalog clearly states the disciplinary sanctions for academic or intellectual dishonesty and the process [II A-65 p.401-402]. Moreover, the Catalog clearly specifies that students have a right to due process and it is the responsibility of the Office of Student Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities to assure the implementation of this due process.
The Library & Learning Resources Spring 2008 Assessment of Research Skills Workshop confirmed the need to address responsible use of information and to support curricular opportunities to learn about plagiarism [II A-104]. Information about proper citation format was added to all the library skills workshops. Moreover, the Library’s Information Competency & Curriculum (IC&C) committee developed a separate workshop to teach citation format and how to avoid plagiarism in Fall 2008. Content and activities in Workshop P: Citing Sources Responsibly address these two SLOs: 1) Students prepare in-text citations and citations for the “Works Cited” list/bibliography using an appropriate style manual such as MLA or APA; and 2) Students demonstrate understanding of CCSF computer-use policies and legal-ethical practices regarding access and use of the Internet, plagiarism and copyright. Workshop P has been well received by all instructors who are aware of it, many of whom require students to complete it as part of their coursework.

In its Mission and Vision statements which are posted at every campus, on various publications, and on the CCSF website, the College emphasizes that “In our community, respect and trust are common virtues….” At an institutional level, these high ideals set a standard of conduct that fosters academic honesty. These ideals are reinforced in the classroom – many faculty members include explicit policy language about academic honesty in the course syllabi.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The College makes its policies on academic honesty readily available to both students and faculty through the CCSF Catalog and the CCSF Student Handbook and Planner. The Catalog is available both in printed hard copy and online. The Student Handbook is published in hard copy (a small, spiral bound booklet) and available to students at the various CCSF campuses primarily through the new student orientation process.

In addition, the fact that various departments have also developed specific policy documents further serves to inform both students and faculty that policies on academic honesty do exist and that there are formal procedures and a process in place when breaches occur.

The College has made a conscious effort to make all public documents available on its website. With the CCSF Catalog readily accessible online, students and faculty can directly access the College’s policies on academic honesty, the consequences of academic dishonesty and the disciplinary sanctions to be imposed for such misconduct.

**Planning Agenda**

1. The College will work to ensure that printed matter such as the CCSF Student Handbook and Planner is readily available online and at all campus locations and that there are enough copies printed for the student population. This would further insure students’ awareness of the College’s code of conduct; in particular, those pertaining to academic honesty as covered in this standard.
II.A.7.c. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIA-3</td>
<td>Perkins Career and Technical Education Act Core Indicator Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>IIA-3_Perkins_361.xls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-12</td>
<td>Education Technology Department Program Review, 2010-11, p.3</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/EducationTechnologyOffice_main_20110317_092105.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-13</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Office Data Mart – Program/Retention Success Rates By Distance Education Status, San Francisco CCD, Fall 2010, Success Rate</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/Divisions/TechResearchInfo/MIS/DataMartandReports/tabid/282/Default.aspx">http://www.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/Divisions/TechResearchInfo/MIS/DataMartandReports/tabid/282/Default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-16</td>
<td>UCLA California Community College Admissions, Fall 2006 – Fall 2009, City College of San Francisco</td>
<td>“City College of San Francisco Self Review for University of California, Los Angeles Transfer Alliance Program, October 15, 2010” Honors Program report, document entitled “Appendix 6 Adm StatsF06-F09_CCSF)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-17</td>
<td>Data from CCSF’s Banner system (MIS data), for Fall 2009 and Spring 2010</td>
<td>X Document entitled “Concurrent Enrollment Banner Report 2009-10”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-23</td>
<td>WASC Annual Report, Final Submission June 10, 2011</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-27</td>
<td>Art Department Program Review, 2010-11</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/Art_main_20110225_103515.doc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-28</td>
<td>English Department Program Review, 2010-11</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/English_main_20110304_114221.doc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-30</td>
<td>Mathematics Department Program Review, 2010-11</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/Mathematics_main_20110307_102235.doc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IIA-36 | College Curriculum Committee Actions, summaries for Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 | X  
    |  
    | Documents entitled “ACTIONS OF CURRCOMM FA2010” and “ACTIONS OF CURRCOMM SP2011” |
| IIA-37 | PRC Subcommittee Worksheet for Annual Program Reviews, 2009-2010 - Overview for All Schools | ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2010/(1)%20PRC%20Subcommittee%20Overview%20for%20Instructional%20Departments%20(All%20Schools).doc |
| IIA-38 | Diagnostic Imaging Program Review 2010-11 | ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/DiagnosticMedicalImaging_main_20110225_103247.doc |
| IIA-39 | Recent example of dept. using Dacum? | NEED SOURCE & URL  
    |  
    | Suzanne Korey can provide documents, if needed |
| IIA-40 | Evans Campus Program Review, 2010-11 | ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/Evans_main_20110405_095600.doc |
| IIA-41 | Perkins IV Core Indicator Reports Web Site | https://misweb.cccco.edu/perkins/main.aspx |
| IIA-42 | Findings from CTE Student Success Initiative | X  
    |  
    | |
| IIA-44 | UC Statfinder, School Summary Reports, CA Community Colleges, various years, Persistence, Graduation, Time-to-Degree data | [http://statfinder.ucop.edu/reports/school reports/summary_reports.aspx](http://statfinder.ucop.edu/reports/school reports/summary_reports.aspx) |
| IIA-46 | Interoffice Memorandum: Years to Completion of State Approved Title IV Certificates, July 10, 2011 | X |
| IIA-47 | "Chutes and Ladders" and Acceleration Powerpoint Presentation | X |
| IIA-48 | Email from Christine T. Francisco to V.C. of Academic Affairs, Alice Murillo, June 22, 2011 | X |
| IIA-49 | Learning Assistance Department Program Review 2010-11 | [ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews 2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/Learning AssistanceProgram_main_20110225_091415.doc](ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews 2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/Learning AssistanceProgram_main_20110225_091415.doc) |
| IIA-51 | Library & Learning Resources Exhibitions Blog | [http://ccsfexhib.wordpress.com/](http://ccsfexhib.wordpress.com/) |
| IIA-53 | 2008-09 Program Reviews Received | [ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews 2009/2008-09_PilotPR_Received_Assigned_4-28.xls](ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews 2009/2008-09_PilotPR_Received_Assigned_4-28.xls) |
| IIA-55 | Focused Midterm Progress Report  
March 19, 2009 - Appendix A: CCSF  
Program Review System, p.29-30 | http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_  
Planning/pdf/AccreditationMidtermRep  
port2009.pdf |
| IIA-56 | Blank Annual Program Review Form  
2010-11 | http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_  
Planning/pdf/APRF2010-11Blank.pdf |
| IIA-57 | Accreditation Followup Report, March  
15, 2010 - Appendix: Program Review  
Planning/pdf/AccreditationFollowUpRe  
port2010.pdf |
| IIA-58 | Comprehensive Guide to Planning,  
Budgeting and Assessment, April 2004 | http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_  
Planning/pdf/planning%20guide.pdf |
| IIA-59 | Strategic Plan 2011-2016, May 19,  
2011 DRAFT | http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_  
Planning/pdf/SP_Draft_2X.pdf |
| IIA-60 | Educational Master Plan 2006 | http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_  
Planning/pdf/edplan06.pdf |
| IIA-61 | Technology Plan, 2009-11 | http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/ETO/Techn  
ologyPlanUpdateApril2010.pdf |
| IIA-63 | Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical  
Education Improvement Act of 2006 | http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-  
bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=109_cong_bills  
&docid=f:s250enr.txt.pdf |
| IIA-64 | Metro Academies Overview | X | MetroAcademiesAccreditation.doc |
| IIA-65 | 2011-12 College Catalog | http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/educati  
onal-programs/ccsf-catalog.html |
| IIA-66 | General TMC Overview, January 22,  
2011 | http://www.c-  
id.net/docs/General_TMC_Overview.pd  
ff |
| IIA-67 | 43rd Spring Session Resolutions  
Adopted by Academic Senate for  
California Community Colleges, April  
11, 2011 | http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Aca  
demic_Senate/ASCCC_ApprovedResol  
utions.pdf |
| IIA-68 | Memo from Chancellor to Board of  
Trustees, Feb. 24, 2011 : SPECIAL:  
Approval of modification of the  
Associate Degree Graduation  
Requirements, as recommended by the  
Curriculum Committee and Bipartite  
Committee on Graduation  
Requirements (Resolution No. 110224- 
S1) | http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2011/PDF_F  
ebruary_24_2011/S1.pdf |
| IIA-69 | 2011-12 CSU GE Worksheet | http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/  
Organizational_Assets/Department/CCS  
F_Articulation/CSU/General_Ed_Work  
sheet/2011-12_csu_ge_worksheet.pdf |
| IIA-70 | 2011-12 IGETC Worksheet | http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/  
Organizational_Assets/Department/CCS  
F_Articulation/UC/IGETC_Worksheet/I  
GETC_Handout_11-12.pdf |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IIA-71</th>
<th>Title 5: 55063</th>
<th><a href="http://www.deltacollege.edu/dept/articulation/documents/Title5_55063_MinimumRequirementsfortheAssociateDegree.pdf">http://www.deltacollege.edu/dept/articulation/documents/Title5_55063_MinimumRequirementsfortheAssociateDegree.pdf</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIA-76</td>
<td>The OMSL, SL Guide</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Mentoring_and_Service_Learning/Forms_Printable/IntroOMSL.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Mentoring_and_Service_Learning/Forms_Printable/IntroOMSL.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-78</td>
<td>External licensing exam pass rates provided by State certifying agencies.</td>
<td>X Email Communication from Research Office – data solicitation of certifying agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-79</td>
<td>Business Advisory Board Meeting Minutes, Oct. 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-80</td>
<td>Real Estate Advisory Board Meeting Minutes, Oct. 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-81</td>
<td>Trauma Prevention and Recovery Advisory Board Minutes, Mar. &amp; Nov. 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-82</td>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Studies Board Minutes, Oct. 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-83</td>
<td>Interview with Chair Kathleen White, Child Development Dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-84</td>
<td>Interview with Beth Cataldo, CTE Job Development and Placement Work Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-86</td>
<td>Resolution 2011.05.18.03 Commendation of CCSF Journalism</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Resolutions/F2010_S2011/2011051803_Commendation_CCSF_Journalism.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Resolutions/F2010_S2011/2011051803_Commendation_CCSF_Journalism.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-89</td>
<td>Evaluation of Course Equivalency Form</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/admissions/forms/course-equiv.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/admissions/forms/course-equiv.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-90</td>
<td>CCSF Articulation Web Site (includes Student General Education handouts (i.e., IGETC, CSU GE, CCSF GE/Grad handouts); link to ASSIST.org)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/employee-services/office-of-instruction/ccsf_articulation.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/employee-services/office-of-instruction/ccsf_articulation.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-91</td>
<td>Instructional and Organizational Standards, Number 6.02, San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_02.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_02.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-92</td>
<td>California Education Code, Section 78016</td>
<td><a href="http://law.onecle.com/california/education/78016.html">http://law.onecle.com/california/education/78016.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-93</td>
<td>Board Policy 6.14, Vocational and Occupational Training Programs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_14.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_14.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-96</td>
<td>Board of Trustees, Public Records &amp; Policy Manuals Web Site</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/NEW.shtml">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/NEW.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-97</td>
<td>SFCCD Policy Manual, Board Policy 6.06 &quot;Intellectual Freedom&quot;</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_06.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_06.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-100</td>
<td>Board Policy 6.06, Academic Freedom</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_06.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_06.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-101</td>
<td>Board Policy 5.02, Student Governance and Student Conduct</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/5/pm5_02.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/5/pm5_02.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-102</td>
<td>English Dept. Plagiarism Policy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA-103</td>
<td>ESL Dept. Plagiarism Policy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard II.B: Student Learning Programs and Services.

Student Support Services

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

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) serves one of the largest student populations in the nation and is committed to providing services that are accessible, inclusive, and sensitive to the needs of its diverse student body. CCSF assures equitable access by providing appropriate student support services at its campus locations and some of the other instructional sites throughout San Francisco. In April 2007, The New York Times featured CCSF as one of 11 models of success in the country with respect to its instructional and student support practices [II B-1]. Moreover, in June 2008, CCSF was highlighted in The Chronicle of Higher Education as an outstanding example of a thriving community college—the only community college in the nation to be so recognized [II B-2].

To enhance student success, the College provides an array of academic and student development services that support students' intellectual, cultural, and civic achievements. Student Services begins with the Office of Outreach and Recruitment as high-quality comprehensive college readiness services are provided to prospective students, high school and middle school students, K-12 faculty, staff and administrators from both public and private sectors, and community-based organizations. The Office of Outreach and Recruitment provides early-outreach services to ensure prospective students are knowledgeable and prepared for the college experience at CCSF. A focus of the Office is to strengthen partnerships with K-12 schools, community-based organizations, and government agencies in order to ensure students are adequately informed of the comprehensive support services offered by the campus community.

Student Support Services is a critical aspect of the College and makes services available to all its students. Part of the governance system is the Student Preparation Success Committee, which helps make critical recommendations in this area. Included in the range of programs and services to enhance student access, retention, and success are the following: New Student Counseling; Continuing Student Counseling; International Student Counseling; Transfer Counseling; Career Development Counseling; Extended Opportunity Programs and Services; Gay, Lesbian, Bi-Sexual and Transgender Counseling; and Multicultural Retention Services (African American Scholastic Programs, Latino Services Network, Tulay Filipino-American Student Success Program, and the Asian Pacific American Student Success Program). Additional student support services include the Admissions and Records Office, Financial...
Aid Office (including Scholarships, CalWORKs, and Single Stop USA [II B-2a]),
Matriculation Office, Veteran Educational Transition Services, Outreach and Recruitment,
Student Activities Office, Homeless At-Risk Transitional Students Program, Student Health
Services, the Learning Assistance Center and the Disabled Students Programs and Services
Department.

Grants augment these services by offering specialized programs such as Gateway to College,
Guardian Scholars, Foster Youth Initiative, and the Bridge 2 Success Collaborative
Partnership Program with SF Unified School District and the SF Mayor’s Office. In Fall
2010, the new Veteran Educational Transition Services Center opened. The Center was a
collaborative effort by CCSF and key labor unions to respond to the unique needs of veterans
on campus. Over 600 veterans are being provided academic counseling and certification
services providing them assistance to access their federal financial benefits. In addition, VA
psychologists and personnel from community agencies focused on serving veterans regularly
hold office hours in the CCSF Veteran Educational Transition Services Center [II B-3].

All Student Support Service units and departments have developed Student Learning
Outcomes and eighty percent of the units and departments have engaged in assessment of
those outcomes. Several departments completed evaluation cycles and implemented
programs of continuous quality improvement as a result of the project outcomes. For
example, high school students now get early registration. All departments are committed to
teaching students how to navigate a complex system such as ours. The system now
accommodates different language skills by providing bilingual services. Classes taught by the
Student Support Service Units assist students in learning about important services and
methods to support them in achieving their educational and lifetime goals.

The Office of Research and Planning conducts ongoing College wide inquiries regarding
student access, progress, learning, and success. For example, the Overview of 2007 CCSSE
Results for CCF provides a snapshot of what credit students and faculty had to say about
student engagement at CCSF [II B-4]. The overview includes information about the survey,
respondents’ academic experiences, student learning, support services, barriers to
peristence, and more. Additional inquiries surveyed the effectiveness of Division programs
and services in relation to the institutional mission and the quality of support provided to
enhance student access, progress, learning, and success.

Our Program Review System has as its goal the promotion of student access, progress,
learning, and teaching excellence. This is accomplished by conducting comprehensive
reviews by departments of all courses and programs and by reviewing and updating, where
appropriate, learning assessments plans and student development programs. Currently,
program reviews are conducted annually for all units in all divisions of the College. They are
scheduled to become biennial beginning 2012-13. These reviews utilize five-year data trends
in the areas of enrollments, personnel, annual expenditures, productivity, and
student/employee satisfaction, as applicable. All data are gathered by the Office of Research
and Planning in conjunction with the Budget Office, Office of Instruction, and Human
Resources and populated in the program review form. The form provides reflections on data
trends, summarizes progress on prior year planning objectives, and identifies major planning
objectives for the next fiscal year to describe resources needed to meet planning objectives [II B-5].

Also, College wide discussions hosted by the Strategic Planning Team in Spring and Fall 2010 were conducted through a series of interactive listening sessions to get feedback about CCSF programs and services, and discuss a new draft of the Strategic Priorities and Major Objectives [II B-6, II B-7]. The draft Strategic Plan 2011-16 was first made available online in November 2010, and was refined to reflect the extensive input collected and sent to the Team [II B-8]. The final draft was passed by the College Advisory Committee (CAC) and the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC) [II B-9]. It is scheduled to go before the Board for action in Fall 2011.

Additionally, the CCSF College Performance Indicators Report (CPI), organized according to strategic priorities, was a key tool the College used to evaluate its progress with the eight priorities of its Strategic Plan (2003-08) [II B-10]. From September 2008 to January 2009, seven research briefs evaluated Basic Skills, Academic Programs, Education for the Workforce, Outreach and Recruitment, Student Development, Fiscal Resources, and Technology [II B-11, II B-12, II B-13, II B-14, II B-15, II B-16, II B-17]. For example, the fifth strategic priority of the CCSF Strategic Plan relates to student development. This priority increases “the quality and accessibility of student development services to positively impact student outcomes related to student learning, retention, course completion, graduation and job placement” [II B-18]. One area in the research brief examined student development in terms of student satisfaction. The questions were asked at CCSF in Spring 2007 through the national Community College Survey of Student Development. “Computer lab” had the highest reported frequency of use, the highest level of satisfaction reported, and was viewed as among the most important (2.67 on a scale of 1-3). Academic Advising/Planning, Transfer Credit assistance, Financial Aid advising, and Career Counseling were also scored as among the most important services, but the satisfaction rating for those services was closer to “somewhat” (2.0), ranging from 1.98-2.09 [II B-15].

In 2010 an updated CPI was used to inform the current strategic planning team. The Plan has not yet gone to the Board of Trustees, but is scheduled for action in Fall 2011.

In 2010-11, CCSF conducted an opinion survey asking credit students to rate their experience with various student support services at the College. Typically, over 70 percent of students rated services as “excellent” or “good.” When compared to results of the 2004-05 survey, most services received a somewhat higher rating in 2010-11 [II B-19].

Table 1: Sampling Comparison of Surveys from 2010-2011 and 2004-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Labs</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development &amp; Placement</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Counseling</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Overall, the College uses information from the Office of Research and Planning and College wide discussions to insure that student programs and support services remain effective and are in line with annual planning and our institutional mission.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

Student Support Service units are leaders in the Institution’s Student Learning Outcomes efforts to assess the quality of student learning and use these results to provide continuing quality improvement. In addition to the individual student learning outcomes projects conducted within each unit, the Office of Research and Planning distributes both credit and noncredit student surveys and employee satisfaction surveys, which provide valuable information in a variety of critical areas that departments use in Program Review and in the implementation of new student learning outcomes projects.

The College's culture of continuous evaluation to ensure the support and improvement of student learning is supported by the evaluation of data gathered through the SARS Grid electronic appointment system, local surveys distributed to employees and students seeking assessment of specific support services, student equity hearings focusing on counseling and other support services, pilot programs initiated to experiment with new deliveries of services to students, and special faculty committees that focus on analysis of data, surveys, and new services.

The Program Review cycle allows each student support unit the opportunity to reflect on its accomplishments and challenges. The following are some of the accomplishments/changes made as a result of student learning outcomes assessment, Program Review, and feedback from the Basic Skills Initiative recommendations and the student equity hearings:

- The newly implemented Veteran Educational Transition Services Center is a place where veterans returning to school can study and obtain services, including mental health counseling.
- LERN 1000 improved the method used to train tutors making them more effective in their interactions with those tutored.
- The Transfer Center tripled the number of transfer admissions guarantees between CCSF and the UC system.
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• In response to student feedback and need, the testing policy was revised to allow students to retest more frequently.
• Student Support Service units developed and implemented a comprehensive space proposal resulting in the creation of a new student service hub and centralization of critical services for students.
• Early registration for San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) graduates has increased enrollment and retention of graduating high school seniors.
• New enhanced orientations are offered to incoming students as part of a summer initiative to increase student access and close the achievement gap for underserved communities.
• The Financial Aid Office is implementing a document imaging system that will allow students to submit documents online and create a paperless student file system for its 30,000 students. Financial Aid employees will be able to access students’ files at any of our educational centers.
• Financial Aid has begun to decentralize by establishing full service offices at Mission and Evans campuses.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Student Support Service units have actively gathered data to analyze and improve the quality of their programs and services for students.

Planning Agenda

1. Work with the few remaining Student Support Service units that have yet to assess SLOs.

II.B.2.a-d: The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: (a) general information, (b) requirements, (c) major policies affecting students, and (d) locations and/or publications where other policies may be found.

Descriptive Summary

The College produces an annual, academic year Catalog that includes general information, program requirements, and major policies affecting students. The Catalog is clear, concise, and well organized. In the 2010-11 credit student opinion survey, close to 80 percent of students rated the online Catalog and Time Schedule as either “good” or “excellent” [II B-19]. Students may obtain hard copies of the Catalog at the CCSF Bookstore, may view copies in College Libraries and all departmental offices, or may view an electronic copy online. Hard copies of the Catalog are provided to certain District personnel, including counselors.

The Catalog is a product of the Office of Instruction, in conjunction with the Catalog workgroup. Catalog information is reviewed for accuracy and relevancy annually. Sections
of the Catalog are sent to stakeholders for review and updating. In addition, agenda items approved by the Curriculum Committee form the basis for updates to the Programs and Courses section of the Catalog.

The requirements for admission and enrollment fees (p.14-20), graduation (46-53), and transfer (56-63) are easily accessible [II B-20]. Degrees and certificate programs are listed alphabetically by department/discipline in the Programs and Courses section of the Catalog (66-391). Students are informed of additional financial obligations or optional fees at the time of registration, at program orientation, on the website, or on the first day of class by the instructor.

Major policies affecting students can be found in several sections of the Catalog [II B-20]. College Rules and Regulations address academic regulation, including Academic Honesty (401), Grievances and Complaint Procedures (402-404), and Sexual Harassment (406-407). The Admission to the College section addresses the fee refund policy and procedures (17-18). Acceptance of Transfer Credits (426) was recently updated to reflect statewide changes to the interpretation of Title 5, particularly in relation to acceptance of upper division credit. The Equal Opportunity Statement (XIV-XV) is written in English and five other languages commonly used by our students.

The other major College publication from the Office of Instruction is the Time Schedule of Classes [II B-21]. In addition to detailed information about course offerings, the Time Schedule contains important information about admissions, registration, course fees, and materials fees. It also includes telephone numbers, web addresses, and maps to guide students to additional sources of policies and other information. Time Schedules are produced in both hard copy and online. The online Time Schedule has sidebar links for further information. When College finances permit, the Time Schedule is mailed to residents of San Francisco. If copies are not mailed, postcards are sent to San Francisco residents as a reminder that the Time Schedule is available online and free printed schedules are available at all campus locations.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Both the Catalog and Time Schedule contain precise, accurate, current, comprehensive, and essential information.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.B.3. The institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.
Descriptive Summary

The institution assesses student learning support needs by inference from College research on student enrollment, performance, persistence, and achievement. This research is presented in several reports including periodic Environmental Scans, annual College Performance Indicators reports, and various other research reports and briefs [II B-22, II B-23, II B-24]. For example, research has pointed to differences in persistence, performance, and achievement by ethnicity and has been commented on College wide in student equity hearings [II B-25, II B-26]. In part, this has led to a strengthening in Asian, African American, Latino, and Filipino retention programs that provide counseling and tutoring support. Research has also pointed to the negative effect of long remediation sequences, resulting in the College experimenting with shortened sequences. The large number of students placing in remedial levels has led to increasing these offerings. The effort to raise the success level of students of color in mathematics has led to a cohort-oriented “math bridge” sequence that ties multi-term math courses together with integrated counseling and tutoring support. The African American Scholastic Program (AASP) has collaborated with Library and Learning Resources for over a decade to offer a one-unit credit course to teach information competency to AASP students.

Another way that CCSF determines the support needs of its students is through program reviews for each department and unit. Each department reports on approximately ten areas ranging from comparing the population the program serves to the general CCSF population to measuring how the department met the previous year’s goals. One particular benefit of the reviews is the feedback system it provides in such a large institution. All departments are asked to review various institutional planning documents such as the Educational Master Plan, the 2009 Environmental Scan, the Annual Plan, etc. and to consider information from Advisory Boards, field activities, and other appropriate sources in order to project where they would like to be in five to six years. They are also asked to indicate what environmental factors informed their projections. The information the departments provided to Student Support Services was used to help develop the Strategic priorities.

Student learning outcomes assessments across Divisions continually identify student needs and evaluate new data sets as information is collected from students and participants. Some departments conduct individual surveys in order to determine more effective directions for their teaching or services. For example, based on survey results, the Learning Assistance Center (LAC) altered the way in which they presented learning strategies to their students. This change increased student utilization of the strategies after they completed the study skills course [II B-27].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.
II.B.3.a. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco has been committed to expanding, improving, and promoting greater access to services for its students, regardless of the service location and delivery method. The assessment of student needs and how the current level of services is meeting the needs is evident when reviewing multiple data available on the College’s website.

Some of the information pertinent to the assessment process was gathered by the Office of Research and Planning when it polled student satisfaction in its credit and noncredit student surveys. In Spring 2011, 4,493 students responded to the Credit Student Opinion Survey which asked questions about their experience with instruction, services, and resources, as well as their overall experience. The majority of students responded favorably to all questions, and when asked “Would you recommend CCSF to a friend?” 85.9 percent said “Yes,” 10.2 percent said “Unsure,” and only 3.9 percent said “No” [II B-19, Q2]. The 2005-06 Noncredit Student Survey asked students to indicate their experience in noncredit overall and at the particular campus they attend and to rate various noncredit services and instruction. Responses from 3,273 noncredit students were overwhelmingly positive regarding their experiences with instruction, student services, and campus climate overall [II B-28]. For instance, 89 to 95 percent rated the quality of noncredit instruction as “good” or “excellent,” 81 to 92 percent rated Admissions & Enrollment as “good” or “excellent,” and 91 to 97 percent said they felt accepted at the campus they attended.

Another form of needs assessment is the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). The survey results help institutions assess quality in community college education, focus on good educational practice, and identify areas in which they can improve programs and services for students. In 2007, CCSF was able to collect 1,179 usable student CCSSE survey responses from both day and evening students from all campuses. (Most of the students polled were credit students.) The Office of Research and Planning produced a document titled Community College Student Report, which outlines the survey findings. Included in their report is a chart that displays the average (mean) importance students ascribe to various services, as well as their satisfaction with those services [II B-4, p6]. Overall, students expressed a large degree of satisfaction with their entire educational experience at CCSF with 82 percent rating it as either “excellent” or “good” [II B-4, p7].

In January 2009 online services were evaluated throughout the District. The resulting January 2009 Brief 7CPI report focused on Technology [II B-17]. The report noted that in the last seven years from Fall 2000 to Fall 2007, the number of online sections offered at CCSF rose from 9 to 137, a dramatic, fifteen-fold increase of 1422 percent. The average enrollment per online section stayed in the range of 28-33 for the entire period. Over the same period, total enrollment in online sections increased from 248 to 4,053, a 1534 percent increase. Student
satisfaction with online learning courses was positive. In Fall 2005, Spring 2006, and Fall 2007 students were asked in a survey; “Would you recommend this (online) course to someone else?” Respondents answered “yes” over 77 percent of the time. One of the results of the increased demand for online courses is the creation of the Education Technology Department, thereby giving a stronger voice to this area.

In 2009-10, online instruction and hybrid courses were increased. In the Spring 2010 semester almost 6,000 students were enrolled in online education (in over 150 sections spread over 115 different courses). Additionally, TMI (Technology Mediated Instruction) supported 141 tech-enhanced course sections in the Spring 2010 semester. Currently, a student can complete all of the requirements for an AA/AS degree through a combination of online classes, technology mediated classes, and telecourses. Students can complete approximately 90 percent of the courses required to fulfill the CSU GE or IGETC transfer pattern by taking online classes or telecourses. Online courses attract many students to the College and have won eleven statewide and two national awards for quality of course design [II B-29]. Additionally, Insight (Moodle) was adopted as the College’s new open source learning management system and every online course now uses it. The use of interactive television (IPTV) to deliver educational programming to students at various campuses has been explored, with concerns arising relating to feasibility, costs, and the size of a potential IPTV audience. Every campus has at least some video infrastructure in place.

Since the last accreditation report, services have increased at campuses outside the main campus. While the College recognized a need to offer services at different locations, it was limited by a lack of space. Because facilities have been remodeled and new ones built, better services can be offered. The College determined which services were to be offered and at which locations, based on feedback from student equity hearings, listening sessions, and basic skills meetings. Table 2 outlines services offered and the campus at which they are offered.

Table 2: Services Offered by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Services offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castro</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown/North Beach</td>
<td>Counseling, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing, Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>Counseling, Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Career Services, Counseling, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing, Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Counseling, Financial Aid, Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>Career Services, Counseling, Registration, Testing, Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Counseling, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean (Main)</td>
<td>Career Services, Counseling, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing, Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Counseling, Registration, Testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.
The College aspires to offer comprehensive services to all locations. However, financial and space constraints limit our ability to provide all that is needed.

Planning Agenda

1. Continue to evaluate campus needs and provide for them when appropriate. Conduct the Noncredit Student Survey in 2012.

II.B.3.b. The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

Descriptive Summary

Several initiatives at the College create an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

First, several programs provide learning environments that promote these attributes. The Office of Mentoring and Service-Learning provides support for academic and vocational peer-mentor programs and service-learning projects. The Student Ambassador Program utilizes current students as the avenue for connecting with prospective students in helping them realize that they are college material and their life dreams can be fulfilled through a community college pathway. Student Ambassadors do this by conducting outreach at middle and high schools and community-based organizations throughout the year, serving over 10,000 prospective students annually. The Puente Program also encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students as evidenced by the program’s mission to increase the number of students transferring to four-year institutions and returning to the community as mentors and leaders to future generations.

The College supports a College voter registration drive effort led by an instructor in the social science area and augmented by the Office of Governmental Affairs. Furthermore, the retention programs all foster a culturally sensitive environment that promotes students’ intellectual and personal development and students’ personal and civic responsibility. Moreover, the Student Activities office facilitates empowerment, leadership, and advocacy by strengthening student participation in the life, governance, and success of the College. The Student Activities Office provides resources, support, and training to eight Associated Student Councils at different campuses and more than 60 clubs, student organizations, and centers. Associated Students are actively involved in the annual March on Sacramento, a political event where students help lead demonstrations at the state capitol to voice their opinion on issues such as the budget crisis. Also, events organized by Concert/Lecture Series and music and theatrical performances inform students of civic responsibility and diversity. Public works of art, library exhibits, and campus walking tours add to the activities.
Secondly, the College offers a wide range of opportunities for students to develop their personal and civic responsibility through participation as members of Shared Governance Committees including Academic Policies, Basic Skills, Communications, Concert/Lecture Series, Diversity, K-12 Partnerships, Planning and Budgeting, Student Prep/Success, and more. Recently, students have actively participated in the Student Equity Hearings by voicing their opinions in a series of public forums in several areas including financial aid, student services, counseling, registration priority, English and Math Department sequencing, etc. Students were afforded the opportunity to express their support in each of these areas and/or express suggested areas of improvement directly to our Board of Trustees. These dialogs have resulted in space allocations for student study and reorganization of some units in order to provide services in a single location. Another form of dialog occurred with the basic skills initiatives. Recommendations resulted in the proposed creation of a first year experience program and in learning communities for students with basic skills needs [II B-30].

Thirdly, the institution has constructed new buildings and updated others to help improve the learning environment. For example, the new Multi-Use Building is a state-of-the-art green building with temperature control, natural lighting, and smart classrooms. The newly constructed Wellness Center, Student Health Center, and Childcare Center on the Ocean Campus add to the overall environment of the campus. The newly remodeled and renovated Mission Campus and the seismically upgraded John Adams Campus help to instill student pride and improve employee morale. All of these add to the learning environment and remind students and employees of their personal and civic responsibility to the institution.

Finally, several evaluative efforts have been designed to ensure that students are benefiting from the College’s effort to provide an environment conducive to learning. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been successfully developed across the entire Student Support Service units and significant progress has been made toward development of SLO’s in the Academic Affairs Division. Additionally, each department submits a Program Review indicating its specific areas of success and growth related to progress made towards meeting measurable departmental objectives, another indicator that the College is focused on meeting students’ academic and support needs.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**II.B.3.c. The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.**

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
Descriptive Summary

CCSF counseling departments have been intensively exploring their impact on student learning since 2002 when the first student learning outcomes initiatives were defined by several departments. Currently, a continuous cycle of analysis leads to regular evaluation and improvement in the delivery of counseling services. A regular Program Review process also offers a forum for departmental self-reflection. Beginning in 2010 counselors from various counseling areas joined together to form two workgroups to evaluate the counseling response to the achievement gap and to create an annual evaluation cycle using employee and student questionnaires on a wide variety of issues impacting the organization and delivery of student services. Recommendations from these two workgroups will be critical to the implementation of new student learning outcomes projects among the different counseling units.

City College of San Francisco counselors and other units engage in a multitude of activities that promote professional development. Each semester counselors are required to attend a Flex Day counseling meeting where topics such as curriculum changes, graduation requirement updates, and new/revised policy initiatives are covered. In addition, counselors are offered an array of professional development seminars during the semester including an “All Counselors” meeting (in which attendance is strongly recommended by all department chairs.) Topics such as catalog rights, graduation, degree changes, and new programs are covered. The Dean’s Professional Development Seminar Series is held two to four times a semester and is available to all counseling faculty. Individual departments also hold separate trainings for their faculty and staff focusing on issues unique to each department or in areas directly affecting students accessing their services. Outside conference attendance is encouraged, although participation has diminished over the past several years as a result of the state budget crisis. The Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) offers a small number of faculty stipends each semester to engage in specialized projects and then share the results in a professional development activity. MIP-sponsored guest speakers and seminars are also offered to all faculty, administrators, and staff.

Beginning in Fall 2010, through the Bridge 2 Success Partnership grant, a new counseling professional development seminar series was developed and is offered each semester conjointly to CCSF and SFUSD counselors.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco is privileged to serve a highly diverse student population. The College Outreach Program recruits students from the many diverse communities of the greater Bay Area and the International Education Center attracts students from around the world. These students, by their very presence, contribute to and strengthen the College culture.

CCSF has developed and supported a number of programs that specifically support the College’s diverse student body and help educate the College community. For example, the Latino Services Network, part of the Multicultural Retention Services Department, promotes College wide activities highlighting Latin American cultures through food, music, dance, and a guest speaker series. Celebrations of specific holidays such as Cinco de Mayo and Dia de los Muertos enrich the diverse community of San Francisco, and CCSF incorporates these aspects into the curriculum at every opportunity.

The African American Scholastic Program sponsors special events during Black History Month to acknowledge and celebrate the achievements of African Americans and individuals of African descent. Annually, the department holds a program wide ceremony to welcome students. Faculty, students, and administrators address participants to set the tone for success, outline expectations, and discuss the support they can expect throughout the year. An induction ceremony, where dance and poetry are incorporated along with presentations by successful alumni and individuals who have contributed to the success of the program through the years, is held annually.

The College was recently awarded a grant from the US Department of Education under the Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institutions Program to assist a cohort of approximately 300 students with an emphasis on the participation of Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and low-income students [II B-31]. The program will include activities designed to recognize and support the cultures of Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander students. Students participate in a range of activities to celebrate special holidays and events.

Recently, the Tulay Filipino-American Student Success opened its new center at CCSF. It will continue serving as a learning community with a Filipino-American experience and student success theme. Similar to other Retention Programs, Tulay provides counseling and mentoring services, and offers linked courses in English, Math, College Success, and Philippine Studies.

International Education's Study Abroad office made arrangements for CCSF to host the Lessons from Abroad Study Abroad Returnee Conference on March 5, 2011. This was the first time that this conference has been hosted by a community college. Since the experiences and therefore the transferable skills of U.S. students who study abroad are virtually the same as international students who study here in the U.S., the focus of the conference was shifted to include international students as well.
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The Institute for International Students affirms its commitment to the College Mission Statement and is dedicated to providing high quality English language programs that meet the educational needs of students from diverse backgrounds and cultures. The Institute is committed to supporting and assisting all students in successfully achieving their educational goals by providing affordable, high quality academic ESL programs preparing students for study in an academic setting.

Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) has a high tech center and learning strategies labs to address the learning styles and needs of students with various disabilities.

The mission of the City College of San Francisco Veteran Educational Transition Services (VETS) center is to serve veteran students with the highest level of efficiency and dedication in order to enhance the success of transition from military life into careers through education.

The Multicultural Infusion Project is a professional development program that provides faculty with the incentives, time, and resources to revamp their curricula and teaching methods to increase their focus on multicultural issues. The project focuses on helping faculty not only to infuse multicultural content and perspectives into the curriculum, but also to expand teaching strategies to meet the needs of a diverse student population.

The diverse interests of CCSF students are embraced in the variety of clubs that unite around issues relating to academics, art, culture, social causes, sports, hobbies, etc. [II B-32]. Clubs provide cross-cultural opportunities for students to meet people and build community to help each other be successful. Faculty advisors promote these clubs by providing resources both directly and indirectly. These events bring together students with diverse experiences and backgrounds but with one commonality—their success at having achieved their personal academic goals whether those goals are degree or certificate completion, transfer, or the acquisition of new job skills.

Some faculty members are involved in national organizations that support diversity through their activities. One such example is the Joint Special Populations Advisory Committee (JSPAC), a committee comprised of representatives from K-12, adult education, and community colleges, as well as business, industry, and the trades. JSPAC is committed to enhancing the career and technical education field as well as encouraging girls and women to explore and enter into training programs for high-wage and high-demand careers that are non-traditional by gender as well as high-wage and high-demand [II B-33].

In addition to the aforementioned programs, the College works to ensure that its students are engaged in exploring and understanding diversity by including it throughout the curriculum. It is also a general education requirement for the completion of the associate degree under Area H: Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies. The College offers a multitude of courses approved for this Area, including a “diversity series” offered under Interdisciplinary Studies (IDST 80A-G and 81A-B).

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
Planning Agenda

1. Continue to bring a diverse program of activities to the College community.

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

Descriptive Summary

The College began using the California Community College statewide web-based admissions application (CCCApply) for the Spring 2009 semester. The Admissions and Records Office (A&R) identified a student learning outcome (SLO) which is focused on improving students’ technological skills in locating the application through navigating the CCCApply system and successfully completing the admission application process [II B-34]. Currently, the Dean of Admissions and Records sits on the Statewide CCCApply Steering Committee to recommend and discuss ways to improve the CCCApply application for students. The Spanish version of the credit admission application has also been implemented. The Noncredit admission application is multi-lingual in English, Spanish, and Chinese both on paper and web based.

As mandated by the California Community Colleges, assessment instruments used for placement assessment have been evaluated and approved by the State Chancellor’s Office prior to their use. CCSF currently administers to its students locally-written placement tests in English and ESL as well as College Board published assessment instruments in mathematics. The requisite validation studies were submitted in compliance with CCCCO requirements, which have resulted in full approval for our placement tests [II B-35].

Part of the assessment validation process examines and evaluates bias. During the research process, cultural and linguistic biases are assessed by faculty and staff who represent various cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Their role is to identify and remove test items that may negatively impact various populations by preventing them from understanding and performing well on the assessment instrument and that would present hardships for students from diverse backgrounds.

More recently, the College community (students, faculty, staff, administration, and trustees) has participated in a series of College wide equity hearings. Participants had opportunities to offer comments related to their experiences with the placement assessment process. Resulting from these conversations, an evaluation of the Placement Testing Re-Take Policy was reviewed and revised, ultimately lessening the wait period between subsequent tests [II B-36]. The revision allows students who are poor test takers and students who need a refresher to retake the test, possibly allowing them to complete their sequence in less time [II B-37]. (See Table 2)

Table 3: Placement Testing Retests
Spring 2011 Testing Cycle (October 2010 – January 2011)
Historically, assessment instruments received approval in six-year cycles. CCSF is fully approved and is on the approved list. However, recent legislative changes in categorical program mandates now include categorical flexibility until 2013 and allow for the suspension of further validation. Although CCSF has not had to use the flexibility clause, it will accept the benefits available through mandates. CCSF placement tests remain on the Approved Assessment Instruments List as approved by the CCCCO [II B-37a].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.B.3.f. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

Descriptive Summary

The College annually and periodically publishes in the College Catalog, College Class Schedule, and on the College website the policy about how student records are kept [II B-20, II B-21, II B-38].

The security of student records in A&R and other departments at the College is paramount. Historically, the Office of Admissions and Records stored student records as hard copies in boxes in various storage areas throughout the College campus. Maintaining such records required an extraordinary amount of physical space and required the attention of multiple individuals responsible for the collection, storage, and security of documents. Additional staff was required to search and retrieve the records. In addition, these records were susceptible to damage and loss from mishandling, misplacement, and environmental conditions.

In 2007, administrators alerted the public of a breach of security when it revealed that a computer file containing sensitive identity information was potentially viewable via the
Internet [II B-39]. There was never evidence that information from files was actually taken or abused in this breach.

Security of all College information is a priority and is steadily improving. The existing firewall has been improved and a second firewall was installed in July 2010. A security penetration and audit were run in November 2010. Additionally, all administrators have received security training. An internal security investigation was completed to determine who had authority to access files, which caused the College to eliminate access to some. Access is now limited to only those people who absolutely need it.

A&R began storing student records electronically in response to the need for better student service and to support a move toward an increasing online system. Student records are scanned in PDF format and scanned records are incorporated into the existing Student Record System (Banner). Although scanning of existing paper records is ongoing, a considerable number of records still must be converted. It is estimated about one-third of the existing records have been converted electronically. Scanning priority is given to the most recent records, working back over time. All scanned records are stored digitally and indefinitely in our secured computer network system and can be transferred easily from one platform to another. A&R’s redundant backup system allows retrieval of all its records in the event one system should fail.

The College follows the guidelines mandated by FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) when it comes to the release of student information and records. Any necessary training is given and precaution is taken when filling requests for records. Moreover, a privacy statement is included in the College Catalog [II B-20, p.296]. Staff consultation with legal counsel is commonplace prior to releasing records.

Other departments such as DSPS, Student Health, and Financial Aid are also undergoing record conversion. Since the implementation of the scanning system in A&R, work efficiency and turnaround has improved dramatically now that many records can be located effortlessly on the student database system.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College is committed to protecting the privacy of the public. When a breach of security was discovered, the College notified the public immediately and provided the necessary steps that should be taken to protect privacy.

Planning Agenda

1. The College will continue to work to maintain and better secure student records. It will also continue the electronic conversion of student records to save space, provide a central location, allow easier retrieval of records, and prevent loss of records.
II.B.4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as a basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

The College provides for systematic review of its student support services through a Program Review process and through solicitation of input derived from the strategic planning process, as well as the input from various student equity and basic skills evaluations, hearings and committee reports. Evaluation of student support services’ student learning outcomes provides another important avenue of review. Such input is analyzed and discussed within the various student support services administrative units and incorporated into each unit’s goals and future plans.

Under Program Review, all departments including Student Support Service units and programs undertake a comprehensive review and issue a report. The Strategic Plan, statistics on student demographics, student success, student satisfaction and numbers of students served, progress on previous objectives, input from advisory boards, and Student Learning Outcomes are reviewed. Faculty and staff are actively involved in the review process and bring in information from various Shared Governance committees on which they serve. All this information is used to assess progress and develop new objectives and a report is issued. The reports are used as strong evidence in making funding decisions.

Additionally, the College has undertaken a comprehensive review of student equity in terms of achievement gaps and access. A Student Equity Plan was issued on February 28, 2005, which included an analysis of gaps in student equity as well as goals and objectives for Student Support Service units such as the Office of Outreach and Recruitment, the Disabled Students Programs and Services, the various counseling departments, and the various retention programs [II B-40].

In 2010, the Board of Trustees led an effort to close the achievement gap when it initiated a number of public student equity hearings. Listening sessions were also held in 2009-10 and the College established a Chancellor’s Task Force on the Achievement Gap and Student Equity. Student services personnel are fully engaged in addressing such student equity issues as early registration, financial aid, matriculation testing, counseling services, and student employment.

Updates and progress on student learning outcomes are now reported through the Program Review process. Data collection and analysis is becoming more sophisticated as units progress in their projects. Cycles of continuous improvement are being instituted across departments. Recent examples include curriculum changes in LERN 1000 (the tutor training course) and the implementation during the summer of enhanced orientations for new students. Additionally, several projects are underway pairing counseling and instructional faculty in the classroom—taking advantage of the proven best practice of integrating the
academic with student support services. A recent change in registration priority affecting graduating seniors from San Francisco Unified has resulted in increased student retention and success (progression, units taken and GPA). These are only a few examples of the innovations and positive impact on student learning resulting from the implementation and analysis of student learning outcomes across the Student Support Service Units over the past decade.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

**Planning Agenda**

1. Create a feedback system whereby comments can be made about needs and questions can be asked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIB-9</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Core Performance Indicators available on the Student Success Reports Web Site</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports_success.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports_success.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB-17</td>
<td>Strategic Plan #5</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/SP5Acc.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/SP5Acc.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB-18</td>
<td>2010-11 Credit Student Opinion Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB-19</td>
<td>College Catalog 2011-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB-20</td>
<td>College Time Schedule</td>
<td>X</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Schedule/">http://www.ccsf.edu/Schedule/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB-26</td>
<td>Learning Assistance Program, Program Review, 2010-11</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/LearningAssistanceProgram_main_20110225_091415.doc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB-29</td>
<td>Addendum #3, CCSF BSI Workgroup Proposals</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/BSI/PDF/BSIPlanAddendum3.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/BSI/PDF/BSIPlanAddendum3.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB-30</td>
<td>CCCC Placement testing Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB-31</td>
<td>Test Retake Policy</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/future-students/future-credit-students/take_a_placementtest/test_retake_policy.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/future-students/future-credit-students/take_a_placementtest/test_retake_policy.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB-34</td>
<td>Student Records Policy (online)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard II.C: Student Learning Programs and Services.

Library and Learning Support Services

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

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

II.C.1.a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

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

Library and Learning Resources (LLR)

LLR consists of one Library comprising nine units at six locations: Ocean Campus, Downtown Campus, John Adams Campus, Mission Campus, Southeast Campus, and the Gough Street facility. Planning is underway for a new library and learning resource center at the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus. Since the Rosenberg Library and Learning Resource Center opened in November 1995, LLR has grown to receive over a million visits each year.
LLR’s presence on the Ocean Campus is the largest, with five units: Rosenberg Library, Media Center, Language Center, Audiovisual Unit, and Alice Statler Library, which serves primarily the Culinary Arts and Hospitality Studies Department. Collections and services specific to the Rosenberg Library are the Diego Rivera Collection and the CCSF Archive [II C-1].

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

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

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

Subject liaison librarians manage library collections with the guidance of the Collection Development Policy, course outlines, student learning outcomes, and input from faculty, to ensure collections meet teaching and learning needs of the CCSF community [II C-2]. Professional selection tools aid selection of specific books, periodicals, subscription databases, audiovisual materials, e-books, and websites. The new position of Outreach and Community Librarian facilitates collaboration throughout the District, and subject liaison librarians reach out to subject-area faculty. These efforts have improved service, as with the close communication forged by the Mission Campus Librarian with Castro Campus faculty and staff and Audiovisual Unit collaboration with Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) to caption or replace non-captioned videos. In a Fall 2010 Library survey of College faculty (LLR Faculty Survey), 81 percent of the 175 respondents were satisfied with their communication with subject liaisons [II C-3].

The continued decline in the Library’s materials budget since 2006 has directly affected the quantity, variety, and currency of library collections. Total budget available for print
materials decreased 48 percent between 2005-06 and 2009-10 [II C-4], while supporting more locations (e.g. the new Mission Campus Library, which was subsequently featured in a Guardsman article on September 10, 2008, about shortage of materials). Additionally, funds have not yet been identified for building the Chinatown/North Beach Library opening day collection. The increasing cost of all materials further jeopardizes the effectiveness of library collections in supporting the curriculum and student success. This risk is especially significant to subject areas where currency of materials is essential, notably for programs accredited by outside agencies, such as many of the vocational programs [II C-5].

In response to budget reductions, Library faculty have undertaken several measures to continue to ensure a current, quality collection. These measures include expanding the e-book collection (at a lower per-title cost than print), implementing a project to increase the number of textbooks on reserve and, most significantly, joining the San Francisco Public Library’s (SFPL) Community Redistribution Program, in which CCSF subject librarians obtain current, quality withdrawn materials at no charge. Since 2007, this program has added over 6,319 titles to the collection with an estimated cost savings over $150,000 [II C-1 p. 7]. The majority of items is copyrighted within the last three years and includes materials in languages other than English, as well as general and subject-specific encyclopedia sets. It is uncertain, however, how long LLR can depend on the continued high quality of materials available from SFPL, since many of the withdrawals have resulted from SFPL branch renovations, which will soon be completed.

The inclusion of increasingly expensive periodical and research database subscriptions in the Library materials budget diminishes the budget even further. The loss of Telecommunication and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) funds has made continuing database subscriptions uncertain each year. In 2009-10, in order to retain databases, subject librarians chose to withhold portions of their print materials allocations for application toward database costs. Article databases are essential to academic research. A stable funding source is crucial and becomes even more so as the District implements Strategic Priority #7 to offer more distance learning opportunities.

The Library assesses the effectiveness of its collections in a variety of ways: with comparative data about the quantity, variety, and currency of the collections in relation to the curricula; survey data from students and faculty; and collection analysis reports prepared for in-house assessment and professional association accreditation studies. In 2010, department and program faculty on average rated the library's online and on-site services and resources 3.6 out of 5 (N = 175) for meeting student learning needs [II C-3]. The 2011 LLR Student Survey revealed that 71 percent of students (N = 2,075) have two or more courses requiring use of library collections and equipment [II C-6 Question 7]. For each of the following LLR program student learning outcomes, the majority of students found that as a result of using library collections, services, and facilities, they were better able to 1) acquire, evaluate, and use information; 2) understand and appreciate diverse peoples; and 3) effectively use computers and information technology [II C-6 Question 11]. Furthermore, student perception of the importance of library services and resources, whether on-site or online, to academic success is very high; of the 2,021 respondents, 87 percent marked either Very Important (66.7 percent) or Important (19.8 percent) [II C-6 Question 12].
Library Exhibitions and Programs support CCSF’s mission by creating opportunities for all styles of learning, engaging students in curricular and co-curricular subjects, increasing understanding of diversity and differing perspectives, and bringing students together with faculty, staff, and the broader San Francisco community. Events and exhibitions, such as rich visual displays, exhibits, films, book readings, and panel discussions, are open to the entire community and co-sponsored with District departments and programs as well as community organizations. To enhance the curriculum, each program and exhibition has specific student learning outcomes and emphasizes the scope, breadth, and depth of related library resources. Of students who had attended a program or exhibition (N = 549), over 72 percent rated exhibitions and programs “Important” or “Very Important” to their studies or coursework [II C-6 Question 9].

The Language Center supports the curriculum for all languages taught by the Foreign Language Department with a Language Lab at the Ocean Campus and a Language Lab/Media Center at the Mission Campus, each equipped with audio and video workstations and, at the Ocean Campus, a classroom with 34 workstations. Language Center materials and online language-learning and culture resources are selected, reviewed, and assessed by Foreign Languages faculty and made available in the open lab, via the Electronic Classroom, and online. Textbook audio is digitized to allow word and phrase isolation and speed adjustment, especially important to beginning learners, enhancing student engagement and thereby student success and retention. Use of the Online Language Lab continues to increase. In 2005-06, the total number of Language Center website views was approximately 104,000. By 2008-09, the number reached 550,000 [II C-7].

The Media Center provides audio, visual, and multimedia materials and equipment for academic and vocational programs on the Ocean Campus. The Media Center Librarian depends on faculty to assist with collection development. With a collection of over 9,400 audio and video cassettes, CDs, and DVDs, the Media Center receives a high rating from faculty for providing material supporting the curriculum and supplementing coursework and programs [II C-4, II C-3]. The Ocean Campus Media Center also houses a lab with 50 computers.

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

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

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

LAD faculty stay current with professional literature and practices in the field of student success through conferences, workshops, staff meetings, and reflective dialogs on student needs. College Success faculty teach using student-centered, outcomes-based strategies and measure student learning outcomes with practical examinations, portfolio development, and pre- and post-testing. LAD recognizes the importance of variety and means of delivery to address diverse learning styles and provide more equitable access for students. Following an extensive SLO assessment research process, LAD implemented a new Successful Online Learning course and a new Supplemental Instruction small group program. LERN 50 College Success course students persisted to the next term at a rate on average of seven percent more than other students over the period 1998-2010 [II C-8].

LAD collaborates with many departments and programs to provide comprehensive learning support services across the District. Collaborative efforts (e.g. Writing and Reading labs) involve the English, Math, and Biology departments, to name a few; EOPS; the Basic Skills Ad Hoc Committee; and many student retention programs [II C-9]. Additionally, the Transitional Studies Department offers professional and peer tutoring for students taking noncredit courses in literacy, reading, math, and GED preparation at four campuses: John Adams, Mission, Southeast, and the Adult Learning and Tutorial Center (ALTC) at Gough Street.

LAC on the Ocean Campus offers a large open-access computer lab with 83 student workstations, 3 scanners, and a printer for student access 53 hours per week. The LAC Computer Lab provides Internet access and more than 50 software programs supporting academic courses. Between 400 and 600 students visit the LAC Computer Lab every day, approximately 50,000 hours per semester. Student hours logged in the LAC increased considerably in the last six years, from 92,488 hours during Spring 2006, to 132,038 hours during Spring 2010 [II C-10].

**Broadcast Media Services (BMS) and Audiovisual Unit (AV)**

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

**Computer Labs**

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

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

All library and learning support service locations support a variety of equipment needs to facilitate student learning. BMS and AV on the Ocean Campus meet the projection, video, and broadcasting needs of faculty. Campus libraries provide equipment checkout for classroom instruction.

The CCSF Technology Plan assesses and plans for LLSS equipment needs. LLSS faculty work with ITS to anticipate future upgrades and enhancements. Individual departments like BMS, LLR, and LAD prioritize annual equipment needs through the Program Review process. All campus library labs need to replace old student computers. Comments in the Fall 2010 LLR Faculty Survey expressed the need for updated equipment at the Downtown Campus and for AV in general [II C-3]. In the Spring 2011 LLR Student Survey, numerous comments expressed dissatisfaction with the number of computers available and many students find the computers old and slow [II C-6 Question 16].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

LLSS faculty and staff continue to find creative ways to address student learning needs and have made some progress despite the countless ways in which the budget crisis has adversely affected the Library. However, without increased allocations, there is the risk of the
collections losing currency and failing to meet student learning needs, and access to vital article databases may be eliminated from Library online collections.

Planning Agenda

1. Secure separate general fund budget for online database subscriptions in absence of TTIP funding.
2. Continue to collect and prepare materials and equipment for the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus Library and Learning Resource Center scheduled to open in Fall 2012 (Education Master Plan).

II.C.1.b. The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco is committed to providing students with opportunities to develop information competency (IC) skills, which support lifelong learning. Both the Library and Learning Resources (LLR) Mission Statement and program-level student learning outcomes include this goal and support the teaching and learning of these critical skills in accordance with the general education goals of the College. IC instruction is in alignment with the Association of College and Research Libraries Information Literacy/Competency Standards for Higher Education [II C-12]. Librarians and department instructors share responsibility for providing opportunities for students to learn and practice IC skills.

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

The Library’s instructional services/information competency plan consists of three components: drop-in and online library/information competency workshops, course-related workshops, and the one-credit course LIS 10: Use of Information Resources. Since Fall 2006 all students completing a degree and/or who plan to transfer to the UC or CSU systems are required to satisfy the IC requirement by successfully completing the Area B Written Composition requirement, which states: “The College intends to graduate students who have developed English language and information competency skills so that they can communicate clearly, both orally and in writing; can evaluate what they hear and read; and can acquire, interpret and use information appropriately” [II C-13 p. 44]. Successful completion of English 1A, which includes a minimum of five hours of library/information competency skills workshops and assignments covering such topics as evaluating source reliability, creating an annotated bibliography, and completing essay/research paper assignments, accomplishes this requirement. A Self-Guided Walking Tour and Workshop G:
Introduction to Library Services and Resources, address the needs of new and Basic Skills students by providing orientation to the library collections, facilities, and services.

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

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

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

Since 2008, Library faculty have conducted two pilot programs to extend services and resources to more online students. As a result, all District online courses now include links to library resources; increasing numbers of online faculty are utilizing online library skills workshops; and several online courses now include an “embedded librarian.” An embedded librarian is a department’s subject librarian actively participating in an online or hybrid course, assisting students with topic formulation, research strategy, and citations, as well as helping develop assignments that promote information competency. The embedded librarian project’s goal, to reach over 50 percent of online courses within the next two years, supports Strategic Priority #7 [II C-1].

Opportunities to teach information competency continue to increase in both individual reference sessions and classroom settings. The increase in opportunities at the reference desks is due in part to the huge number of workshop assignments students bring for review. The number of students completing these workshops has increased significantly with the creation of more online versions, as well as the addition of Workshop G: Orientation to Library Resources & Services and Workshop P: Citing Sources to Responsibly Use Information. The change in the ENGL 1A course outline has also increased workshop enrollment. The number of course-related instructional sessions supporting specific courses and assignments continues to rise: 2009-10 data records 298 workshops and orientations reaching 6,677 students in more than 25 academic and vocational programs [II C-15].

Competencies are assessed with an ongoing and multi-method approach. As part of a continuous feedback loop, student surveys, typically administered every two years, guide the revision of the drop-in and online basic IC workshop outlines and instructional materials.
Survey results from 2008-09 indicated the need for more practical examples and engaging learning activities, and prompted training sessions for librarians on new workshop content and techniques to promote active learning.

A Spring 2008 analysis of students’ research process from three ENG 1A sections culminated in the English Department’s revision of the ENG 1A course outline, requiring five IC workshops with a minimum of five hours, thus increasing student preparation and experience with online research tools [II C-16]. Also as a result, the Library created Workshop P, which is now offered in the classroom and online.

Library liaison faculty for Culinary Arts and Hospitality Studies (CAHS), Health Education and Sociology, working with department faculty, have designed and administered a variety of assessments since 2006. Survey and pre- and post-test assessment results guided revisions to research-based assignments and workshop presentations [II C-17]. The CAHS librarian also identified the need for CAHS students to complete IC workshops on database searching and citing sources earlier in the program, rather than in the third or fourth semester, when CAHS students typically complete the General Education English requirement. As a result of librarian/instructor collaboration, the 2011 revision of the introductory CAHS 100 course outline now requires two IC workshops [II C-18].

The Library CD/IC Committee planned three assessments for Workshop P: Citing Sources to Responsibly Use Information, to determine student satisfaction and performance: student surveys, workshop assignments, and a pre- and post-test. Assessment revealed both the importance of instruction provided when a librarian corrects a student’s workshop assignment and the need to revise the MLA/APA citation guides [II C-19]. The C and D workshops were evaluated in Fall 2010, using student feedback forms and input from workshop instructors; minor changes resulted.

The LIS 10 course was substantially revised to better support SLOs, define project SLOs, and add a grading rubric, all based on student performance and several years’ results of pre- and post-assessments [II C-20].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The assessment cycle outlined in the LLR Program Review has been successful in developing, implementing, assessing, and revising the Instructional Service Plan of Library and Learning Resources.

Planning Agenda

None.
II.C.1.c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.

Descriptive Summary

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

Library Hours
As of Spring 2011, the Rosenberg Library on the Ocean Campus is open 58.75 hours per week, 7:45 a.m. to 7:45 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 7:45 a.m. to 2:45 p.m. on Friday, and 10 a.m. to 1:45 p.m. on Saturday, a decrease of 24% from 77.5 hours in 1999-2000. With some exceptions, hours at campus libraries have remained stable since 2007; the Mission Campus Library is currently open 43 hours per week, John Adams is open 42 hours, Southeast and Downtown are open 36 hours, and Statler Library is open 30 hours per week. Mission Campus Library hours have decreased from a high of 61.5 hours for Fall 2007 to 43 hours for Fall 2008 [II C-4, II C-21, II C-22].

Decreased hours have been an issue for students and faculty. In February 2010, as a way to increase awareness of how budget cuts have affected students, a grassroots group called General Assembly of CCSF staged an event in which approximately 80 students, faculty, and staff occupied Rosenberg Library to keep it open to its previous closing time of 8:45 p.m. [II C-23]. Faculty write-in comments in the Fall 2010 Library Survey included requests for more hours of access to Audiovisual equipment, that District faculty have input into the question of whether to reduce library hours, and, more directly, for “longer open hours.” Responses also included the need for increased evening and weekend hours to serve evening classes and working students [II C-3: Appendix 1]. In the Spring 2011 LLR Student Survey, 75 percent of 2,013 respondents indicated either 1) the library opens too late; 2) closes too early; or 3) needs additional hours on Saturday [II C-6 Question 5]. These comments came after library hours had been increased for Spring 2011—one hour in the evening and 15 minutes each weekday morning (with time donated by faculty and staff so students could have some access before 8 a.m. classes, especially for printing and reserves).

Reference and circulation services facilitate access to library collections and are available at each library location during all open hours. In spite of reduced hours, use of services and collections has increased. The number of reference questions has risen from 48,741 in the 2005-06 academic year to 93,487 in 2009-10, and the number of circulated items, both reserve and non-reserve has increased over seven percent in the last five years [II C-4]. Collaboration is ongoing between Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) and the Library, Language Center, Media Center, and LAC/D to provide better access to disabled students. A superior level of service may be one of the reasons all library and learning support services receive some of the highest ratings in College-wide surveys year after year; furthermore, 92 percent of 2,877 respondents in the Fall 2010 CCSF Student Survey found librarians to be supportive [II C-24 Question 8].
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Electronic Access
The Library website provides 24/7 access to the online catalog and electronic collections, including article databases and electronic books, as well as research, writing, and subject guides, tutorials and more. Six of the seven library workshops are available to be taken and graded online. Remote access to article databases and electronic books has been improved for end-users with the implementation of EZProxy®, which enables users to log in with their CCSF ID barcode only once per session. During 2009-10 alone, there were 4,703,399 article database searches, as compared to 297,122 in 2005-06 [II C-25]. Electronic course reserves were piloted over 2009-10, with full implementation during Spring 2011.

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

Since the new website debuted in January 2010, Library website hits increased almost 70 percent from the year before (621,637 in 2009 as compared to 1,056,457 in 2010) [II C-25]. ERef use has remained limited, but instant-message reference, now available on most Library web pages, rapidly increased after the redesign [II C-27].

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

Equitable Access
The Library continues to work with faculty and students of online courses and those at campuses without libraries. LLR provides six of its seven workshops online; no plans exist to make an online version of Workshop D: The Research Process. The intercampus delivery service continues twice a week between campus libraries, and requests from Rosenberg Library alone numbered 2,486 [II C-28, II C-27]. In the Spring 2011 LLR Student Survey, over 27 percent of 1,983 respondents had requested delivery of books from other CCSF campuses [II C-6]. However, the service has not received an anticipated staff allocation to expand the delivery schedule and serve District sites without libraries.
The renovation of the John Adams Campus, completed in 2009-10, increased library space for collections and study and added a group study room. The Fall 2007 grand opening of the Mission Campus Library increased access to physical collections and to Language, Learning Assistance and Media center services to Mission, as well as Castro campus students, through the outreach efforts of the Mission Campus Librarian [II C-1]. A new library, with a Learning Assistance Center, is now under construction at the Chinatown/North Beach Campus, anticipated to open Fall 2012, and the 2011 District Five-Year Capital-Outlay Construction Plan includes among its top ten priorities a new campus with a library and learning assistance center in the Bayview/Hunter’s Point neighborhood [II C-29].

LLR also serves CCSF sites without libraries, offering workshops at the Castro, Civic Center (formerly Alemany) and Chinatown/North Beach campuses. Campus librarians serve as liaisons to the faculty and courses offered at their campus and nearby satellite locations. The newly created Outreach and Community Librarian position is increasing outreach to all CCSF locations. In Fall 2009, Library faculty and staff assisted the Civic Center Campus in setting up a reading room and lending collection for ESL students. Similarly, the Evans Campus has developed its own lending collection while it advocates for a campus library. Comments by Evans Campus faculty from the Fall 2010 LLR Faculty Survey expressed an increasing need for an on-site library as programs at the campus evolve [II C-3 Evans worksheet].

The Distance Learning and Electronic Services Librarian provides dedicated service to distance learning faculty and students, including grading of online library skills workshops. Subject librarians and the Distance Learning and Electronic Services Librarian help online faculty develop assignments that use library resources. Two examples of LLSS dedication to increasing access are the embedded librarian service, providing direct support in online courses, and the use of Rosenberg Grant funds as awards to four online faculty to incorporate information competency in their courses.

To increase access to course materials, Library faculty piloted a course reserves project in Fall 2010. Librarians and circulation staff recorded unfilled requests for course reserve materials. Of 140 instructors contacted in the first semester, 20 percent submitted materials. Library faculty voted to formalize this project as an ongoing practice.

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

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

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
**Media Center**

With the exception of Spring 2011, Media Center hours parallel those of Rosenberg Library. Multimedia materials at other library locations are available whenever the library is open. All registered students, faculty, and staff may use Media Center materials and facilities. Ten percent of the media carrels are wheelchair accessible and a special reader that slows down books on tape is available. Departments that consistently utilize Media Center services include Music, ESL, English, Health Education, Physical Education, and telecourses. Since the AV unit serves only faculty, the Media Center now takes student requests for AV materials to use in the Media Center.

**Audiovisual Unit and Broadcast Media Services**

Broadcast Media Services and Audiovisual have coordinated to provide clear information. Each department’s hours, services, equipment, deliveries, and process for making service requests can be found on a one-stop shared media services webpage, in the Faculty Handbook, and at other locations [II C-30, II C-31 p. 160].

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

The Mission, Downtown, and John Adams libraries handle AV equipment requests at those campuses. The Southeast Campus has a designated audiovisual room. The Rosenberg AV Unit provides equipment and materials to campuses without their own AV resources by arrangement with instructors and departments.

**Language Center**

The Language Center on the Ocean Campus provides access to all students enrolled in foreign language courses at CCSF during library hours, with additional labs at the Downtown and Mission campuses, all of which have stations for disabled users. The Rosenberg Language Center offers assistance from faculty monitors and student workers, as well as general orientations both days and evenings, on-site, or in classrooms at any campus. Workshops introduce students to various textbooks and ancillary materials, increasing their use. The Online Language Lab provides remote access to textbook audio and video materials and supplemental resources 24/7. The Language Center also increases access to collections and services by providing space and equipment for instructors to create ancillary materials and allow students to submit oral assignments electronically.

**Learning Assistance Department (LAD)**

The Learning Assistance Center is open 53 hours per week, including evening and Saturday hours. LAC gained a location with the new Mission Campus Library and will gain another, smaller location at the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus. The Learning Assistance
Center increases access via collaborations with other departments and programs, such as academic department labs like the Writing Lab and the ESL Center for Learning and Academic Development, retention programs, and EOPS. Online courses and the new LAD website provide alternative access to services if location or time is a barrier to physical access [II C-32].

An inventory and tracking system for instructional equipment throughout the District was recommended in the last Self Study, but it has not been created. The recent reorganization of the Information Technology Services Department, and the hiring of a Chief Technology Officer, may create the opportunity as District computer equipment is brought under the auspices of ITS.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

CCSF provides satisfactory access to library and learning support services. Access to services has increased across LLSS. The greatest strides have been made in access to online services, with the expanded online workshop offerings, redesigned websites, expanded Online Language Lab, and innovations such as the electronic course reserves and embedded librarian pilots. Use of online resources and services continues to increase, and survey feedback indicates a high level of satisfaction with online services and resources [II C-6 Questions 10 & 15, II C-24 Question 8].

While the District has made significant strides in increasing access, regardless of ability or location and under worsening economic constraints, some areas of improvement identified in the last Self Study have remained stagnant or declined. The 2006 Self Study indicated a need to reinstate Sunday hours; instead, hours have further decreased, leaving an entire segment of students—those in evening classes or weekend classes that span the 3.75 hours on Saturday—without access to physical collections, services, librarians and the library itself.

Faculty and student input through surveys and action indicate library hours must be increased to satisfactorily support student learning. Recommendations made in the 2006 Self Study, but which have not come to fruition, included dedicated staffing and expansion of the intercampus delivery service to include CCSF sites without libraries [II C-33 Standard II C]. The delivery service is essential to maximize access in light of declining materials budgets and demand for materials. Expansion of the service has been discussed among campus deans, but cannot take place without resources for an additional driver. The service will have to expand to include the Chinatown/North Beach Campus Library when that campus opens.

Access to services has increased across LLSS. The greatest strides have been made in access to online services, with the expanded online workshop offerings, redesigned websites, expanded Online Language Lab, and innovations such as the electronic course reserves and embedded librarian pilots. Use of online resources and services continues to increase, and survey feedback indicates a high level of satisfaction with online services and resources [II C-6 Questions 10 & 15, II C-24 Question 8].
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Planning Agenda

1. Explore additional avenues to serve vocational and technical students and student populations not currently utilizing library resources.
2. Develop plans for opening the Chinatown/North Beach Library and Learning Assistance Center and advocate for sufficient staffing and opening day collection funding.
3. Conduct needs assessment and feasibility study for a library at the Evans Campus.

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

Descriptive Summary

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

All LLSS locations rely upon District maintenance and janitorial services. The Buildings and Grounds Department makes general repairs, while Pinnacle contracts with the District to provide printer and photocopier maintenance. Rosenberg Library carpeting is heavily stained, with multiple patches and worn areas, and many chairs are threadbare. Rosenberg Grant funds have been earmarked for replacement chairs and possible other improvements to the facility, but these projects are still in the proposal phase [II C-34]. Librarians are responsible for maintaining subject areas within the physical collection; duties include weeding, updating, and filling gaps in the collection to ensure quality.

Library Automation Services (LAS) is responsible for the integrated library system, including maintenance and upgrades. Information Technology Services (ITS) provide an excellent level of maintenance and security for library equipment and computer systems throughout the District. In 2009, ITS was restructured and members of LAS were reassigned to ITS; the effects of this change have yet to be determined.

ITS supports all open access labs and some department and program multi-purpose labs District wide. The computers, printers, scanners, peripherals and other technology in the labs are operational and ITS strives to maintain all technology at an “as new” level. The Windows® System, hardware, network, applications and antivirus software are up to date with the latest security and other patches. Software applications are updated as of the beginning of the Spring 2011 semester, and antivirus software virus definitions are updated weekly. The LAC print server and printer are fully operational during all hours the lab is open, with up-to-date patches, drivers and firmware. The lab staff maintains spare hardware...
and an up-to-date Ghost image so maintenance and repairs can be performed with minimal
downtime. In addition, the lab staff keeps an up-to-date inventory, including verified and
documented software licenses. All this is accomplished by a classified staff that has been
reduced fifty percent over the past ten years. Because funding for equipment replacement is
often difficult to secure, a need to establish standard replacement cycles for computers exists.
All LLSS units expressed the need for a General Fund media services equipment budget.

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

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College effectively maintains and secures its library and other learning support services,
although there are areas where improvement is possible. Strengths include the collaborative
relationship with Campus Police in support of a safe and secure learning environment and the
responsiveness of LAS and ITS in keeping student computers operational and available.
However, all LLSS units would benefit from a planned replacement cycles for equipment
(especially computer equipment) and furnishings.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

None of the library and learning support services are formally contracted out to external
entities, but formalized agreements with outside organizations do exist. The Library, as a
participant in OCLC®, in addition to cataloging agreements, maintains an agreement through
its Interlibrary Loan program (ILL) to borrow and lend materials. An agreement also exists
with Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (III) for the provision of services and maintenance of the
integrated library system. Standard licensing agreements are in place with software vendors
and online databases such as EBSCOhost®, NetLibrary® and Gale®. The District contracts
with Pinnacle for copier and printer service and maintenance.
Services provided by III, EBSCO, Gale and Pinnacle are all integral to library use. Usage statistics for searches in both the library catalog and article databases are recorded, and the number of database searches has more than doubled in the last five years [II C-1 p. 6]. Student surveys assess user satisfaction with the computers and photocopy machines; the purchase of PC-Cop, the computer access management system currently used by the Library, was a direct response to survey results that showed students were dissatisfied with their ability to find an open computer in the library [II C-35].

Database licensing agreements are reviewed annually prior to renewal by the Acquisitions Librarian, and product changes are reviewed by subject liaisons, with input from their subject area departments, before approval by Library faculty and administration. In 2007 the Library conducted a thorough comparison of databases from EBSCO and Gale, including full-text title review and assessment of student preference and usability of both vendors, resulting in a license agreement with EBSCO. Use of EBSCOhost quickly increased, from 562,039 searches in 2007-08 to 1,680,650 in 2009-10 [II C-25], and satisfaction has been high [II C-6].

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

Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

There are no formal or contractual agreements with outside vendors to directly provide library or learning support services. However, for the agreements which do exist with library and learning support service units, there are adequate evaluation and oversight mechanisms.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.C.2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Description

Annual program reviews are evaluated to ensure that all LLSS are sufficient in meeting student learning needs. Assessment cycles evaluate SLOs, services, resources, and facilities. Assessments include: statistical data analysis, student and faculty surveys, focus groups,
faculty and student evaluation of workshops, pre- and post-testing within specific programs, and informal anecdotal feedback from the College community. College wide surveys also assess overall satisfaction with all of the library and learning support service units.

**Library & Learning Resources**

LLR monitors the quality of its services and resources via data collection and assessment activities to improve programs and services, and to prepare reports for state, regional, and national professional and accreditation associations. In the past eight years, the Library Instructional Services program has led research skills workshop assessment, since the Library’s role in teaching information competency directly supports the College’s general education learning goals and many of the academic programs’ student learning outcomes [II C-36]. The workshops have had student learning outcomes and assessment strategies since 2004.

In response to changes in District Program Review requirements and regional accreditation standards, LLR centralized and streamlined statistical data collection for resources, services, and facilities usage, as well as developed program SLOs and a comprehensive assessment plan addressing non-instructional services and facilities. The Assessment page on the Library wiki provides a central location for all LLR assessment information, including: a seven-year timeline of assessments to conduct each year, measurements by Library service area, process documents to guide assessment work groups, survey instruments, an assessment analysis form, and a chart to identify assessments performed, with recommendations and results [II C-37].

Assessment results are the foundation of continued improvements in meeting student needs. Recommendations identified through assessments are brought to the appropriate LLR committee for planning and implementation. For example, the 2009 LLR Morale Survey identified the need for an LLR Communication Plan, and the Library’s Communication and Outreach Committee developed it [II C-38]. Other recent examples of assessment follow-through include: the Library website redesign, the electronic reserves pilot project, and ongoing advocacy for increased library hours.

Ongoing, informal faculty dialogue between librarians and the College community helps shape library services and collections and focus on specific student learning and curricular needs. Each year when the Library assesses article database and print subscriptions, librarians solicit feedback from department faculty on titles essential to support curricular needs. Library programs and exhibitions receive faculty and student reactions via blog entries, evaluation forms, contact with event organizers, and Concert & Lectures. A department chair stated, “Rosenberg Library exhibitions are vital, expansive, intimate. They give our campus the feel of an intellectual community, in the positive, rich sense of the phrase” [II C-39].

**Language Center**

The Language Center identified student learning outcomes in Spring 2010 [II C-39]. Assessment includes surveys emailed directly to a representative sampling of Foreign Language Department classes at the end of each semester. The survey is also available online via the Language Center homepage and in print at the Center itself. Of responses received in
Spring 2011 ($N = 247$), more than 97% of respondents felt the Language Center helped them to do better in their foreign language courses. Seventy-eight percent indicated that the Language Center helped them to identify the language-learning resources that are most effective for them personally. More than 33% felt their computer skills increased by using the Language Center. Eighty-four percent indicated their study habits and focus improved, and 68% felt they developed a better understanding of other cultures and people by using the Language Center [II C-41].

Learning Assistance Department

LAD first developed student learning outcomes, activities, tutor reflections, and faculty assessments specific to its tutor training course in Fall 2007. LAD developed two surveys to assess the student learning outcomes in this course with the intent to understand 1) how the course SLOs were used by tutors who completed the tutor training course; and 2) if students who were tutored believed they were recipients of the same outcomes. The two surveys have been used for six semesters and the LAD has learned which tutoring strategies are most used, least used, most valued, and require changes. The assessment has led to a number of changes in the course curriculum to improve student learning [II C-42].

During Fall 2006, College Success faculty engaged in an extensive dialogue to develop SLOs and teaching “best practices” for the LERN 50 course. As a result, the course was redesigned with redefined SLOs, content, and assessment activities, including an SLO rubric. During Spring 2007, a College Success Survey was developed and administered to students who had completed LERN 50 in Fall 2006 with an A, B, or C grade, enrolled in a subsequent term, and had an email address in Banner. The survey was also administered Spring semesters 2008-10 [II C-43]. The purpose of the survey was to assess the students’ application of SLOs in current classes in addition to assessing the overall usefulness of SLOs for the course. The data from this survey has been used to redesign the SLOs for LERN 50. LAD faculty are beginning to understand which SLOs for LERN 50 are being applied to other courses and which SLOs students apply more/less frequently. This data assists faculty in the development of the College Success course.

In Fall 2010, all LAD assessment surveys were reformatted following the purchase of a Survey Monkey® license. The following SLO assessment surveys continue to be utilized: 1) LAC Tutor Survey assesses tutors’ ability to use tutoring techniques taught in the course; 2) LAC Student Survey assesses (a) students’ review of tutors’ abilities and (b) students’ own learning while tutoring; 3) LAC College Success Survey assesses students’ use of college success skills one semester after completing their College Success course; and 4) LAC Computer Lab Survey assesses (a) students’ review of computer lab and its staff and (b) students’ own learning while using the LAC computers [II C-44].

Broadcast Media Services, Audiovisual Unit, and Computer Labs

Assessment of media and audiovisual services for faculty is conducted through employee surveys administered College wide and through LLR surveys. Formal assessment of the multi-use computer labs throughout the District is infrequent. Periodically, the College conducts a technology-focused College wide survey to determine the overall satisfaction of instructional technology services to the College community. In a College wide student survey
administered in Fall 2010, credit students ratings for computer labs were 81 percent good or excellent [44 percent good and 37 percent excellent \((N = 4,493)\)] and ratings of their ability to use software applications (e.g. word processing) to be successful in their courses were 88 percent good or excellent (47 percent excellent and 41 percent good) [II C-24]. Informally, the Information Technology Services lab managers work closely with the departmental liaisons to address concerns relating to each lab’s day-to-day and long-term operation. However, at present, aside from user satisfaction survey questions, no formal process exists to evaluate the computer services supporting student learning.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

Library and learning support services evaluate services, resources and facilities in a variety of ways to meet student learning needs. In addition to survey data, LLSS units generate and analyze usage statistics that assist in the planning processes. Annual Program Review reports provide an overall assessment and effective means for planning and requests for institutional support. Both LAD and LLR use multi-method approaches to assessment and consistently meet student learning needs. District computer labs unaffiliated with LLR and LAD are not fully assessed. Usage statistics from ITS have not been available to help fully understand how District computer labs unaffiliated with LLR and LAD are used and whether they meet the needs of students.

**Planning Agenda**

1. Formalize a process to assess computer labs across the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II C-1</td>
<td>2011 LLR Program Review</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/LibraryServices_main_20110225_150637.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-3</td>
<td>2010 LLR Faculty Survey</td>
<td><a href="http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/ASS_Faculty_survey_2010.pdf">http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/ASS_Faculty_survey_2010.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-9</td>
<td>2011 LAD Program Review</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/ProReviews2011/Unit_Program_Reviews/LearningAssistanceProgram_main_20110225_091415.doc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-10</td>
<td>LAD WSCH History, SWRMC22 Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-13</td>
<td>2010-11 College Catalog</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/OfficeOfInstruction/Catalog/LearningResourcesandStudentServices_2011-12.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/OfficeOfInstruction/Catalog/LearningResourcesandStudentServices_2011-12.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-15</td>
<td>2009-10 Bibliographic Instruction statistics</td>
<td>2009-2010 Instruc Master.xls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-16</td>
<td>Results of Spring 2008 Assessment of Research Skills Workshops, Rosenberg Library</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/assess08.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/assess08.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-17</td>
<td>Spring 2010 Assessment of Sociology 1</td>
<td><a href="http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/ICC_soci1assmentreport.docx">http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/ICC_soci1assmentreport.docx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-18</td>
<td>2011 CAHS 100 Course Outline</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Office_of_Curriculum_and_Catalog/Outlines/Cahs">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Office_of_Curriculum_and_Catalog/Outlines/Cahs</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-21</td>
<td>Spring 2011 Library Location Hours</td>
<td><a href="http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/LibraryLocationHours_SpringFall2011.pdf">http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/LibraryLocationHours_SpringFall2011.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-23</td>
<td>“Students Occupy Library to Protest Cuts.” <em>The Guardsman</em></td>
<td><a href="http://theguardsman.com/students-occupy-library-to-protest-cuts">http://theguardsman.com/students-occupy-library-to-protest-cuts</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-24</td>
<td>Fall 2010 CCSF Credit Student Survey</td>
<td>ftp://advancement.ccsf.edu/Accreditation/Credit_Student_Opinion_2010v2004.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-25</td>
<td>Distance Learning Statistics</td>
<td><a href="http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/Distance-Learning-Statistics">http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/Distance-Learning-Statistics</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-26</td>
<td>Fall 2008 Library Website Survey</td>
<td><a href="http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/WEB_Survey121908_condensed.xls">http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/WEB_Survey121908_condensed.xls</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-29</td>
<td>Five-Year Capital Outlay Construction Plan for 2013-16</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/PDF's%202011/PDF_may_26_2011/B7_Attachment%20A.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/PDF's%202011/PDF_may_26_2011/B7_Attachment%20A.pdf</a>; <a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/PDF's%202011/PDF_may_26_2011/B7_Attachment%20B.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/PDF's%202011/PDF_may_26_2011/B7_Attachment%20B.pdf</a> (5/26/11 vers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-30</td>
<td>Media Services Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/employee-services/media-services.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/employee-services/media-services.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-34</td>
<td>Rosenberg Funding Request</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-35</td>
<td>Student Survey (2006-2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-36</td>
<td>LLR Program SLO Alignment with LLR Mission and District GE Goals</td>
<td><a href="http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/ASS_ProgramSLOs_alignment.xlsx">http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/f/ASS_ProgramSLOs_alignment.xlsx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-37</td>
<td>LLR Assessment Plan</td>
<td><a href="http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/w/page/25485904/Assessment-Committee">http://ccsfllrc.pbworks.com/w/page/25485904/Assessment-Committee</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-39</td>
<td>2010 LLR Exhibitions Program Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-40</td>
<td>Language Center Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/Language_Center/slos.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/Language_Center/slos.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-41</td>
<td>Language Center User Feedback Survey 2011</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/Language_Center/slos.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/Language_Center/slos.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-42</td>
<td>LAD – LERN 10 Assessment Rubric Fall 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Learning_Assistance_Center/LAC_Main/slo_assessment_abstract_lern10.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Learning_Assistance_Center/LAC_Main/slo_assessment_abstract_lern10.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C-43</td>
<td>LAD – LERN 50 College Success Assessment Spring 2010 PowerPoint</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Learning_Assistance_Center/LAC_Main/slo_assessment_lern50.ppt">http://www.ccsf.edu/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Learning_Assistance_Center/LAC_Main/slo_assessment_lern50.ppt</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard III: Resources:
The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

Standard III.A: Resources:

Human Resources:
The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

III.A.1.a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for the selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco has a clear hiring policy and process that meets the requirements of Title 5 regulations of the California Education Code concerning equal employment opportunity and the State Minimum Qualifications. The District assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support the College’s programs and services. The Human Resources Department oversees the hiring processes for all District personnel, ensuring that the established hiring procedures are equitably and fairly administered. To ensure a large number of applicants, job announcements are advertised in the Chronicle of Higher Education, at job fairs, on employment websites, and on the CCSF website.
The College has established and published inclusive procedures for administrative, faculty, and classified employee hiring. For each category of employee, hiring criteria, including job announcements, paper screening criteria, and interview questions, are established by the hiring departments, reviewed by key personnel, and approved by the Human Resources Department and Affirmative Action Office to ensure that results yield effective hiring of knowledgeable personnel. Job announcements list the required employment qualifications, the state-mandated minimum qualifications, and the desirable qualifications established by the hiring search committee.

The Search Committee or Department Chair, Associate Director of Affirmative Action, Academic Senate, and appropriate Dean or Vice Chancellor or Chancellor review job announcement drafts. The Human Resources Academic Hiring Unit is responsible for ensuring that applicants meet the state-mandated minimum qualifications, including verification of degrees from accredited institutions, and relevant work experience. Procedures are in place for determining equivalency through the Academic Senate Equivalency Committee and for evaluating foreign degrees where applicable.

To assure inclusive, expedient, and successful recruitment processes, the District utilizes when applicable broad recruitment strategies, including advertising with local advertising agencies and using electronic media, such as Monster.com and Craigslist.org, as well as advertising in HigherEdJobs.com and Insidehighered.com.

Prospective candidates for faculty positions are required to provide evidence of effective teaching and show their potential for contributing to the institution’s mission by providing such evidence in their application materials, including letters of interest and the diversity statement, and during the interview and teaching demonstration. The hiring process is rigorous, and nearly all departments require a teaching demonstration and a portfolio of work as a part of the interview process. District procedures call for an Equal Employment Opportunity monitor to attend every hiring search committee meeting during the interviewing process to ensure compliance with all state and federal labor rules, regulations, and laws. Due to lack of availability of trained monitors and funding to pay them, the administration sometimes directs a committee to conduct its work without a monitor.

The institution serves a great diversity of students in a wide variety of programs, including credit, noncredit, contract education, and continuing education. This variety requires that greater emphasis be placed on understanding current issues pertaining to equity and diversity when hiring. For this reason, CCSF provides guidelines to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse backgrounds related to their ethnicity, culture, socioeconomic status, educational achievement, sexual orientation, or disability.

In accordance with faculty hiring procedures, the background of search committee members should reflect the diversity, range of interests, philosophies, and programs in the department. The composition of each hiring committee is consistent with federal and state guidelines on race and sex. The Human Resources Academic Hiring Unit, along with the Affirmative Action Office, works to ensure that search committee members are oriented on the hiring
procedures, employment regulations, and on the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 12 – Upgrading provisions [III A-1, III A-2 p. 51].

These processes yield faculty and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The College employs almost 800 full-time faculty and slightly more than 1,000 part-time faculty. Ninety-five percent of faculty and administrators hold master’s degrees and approximately 250 hold doctorates. They bring to the students extensive backgrounds gained through years of study, research, and extensive experience in business, industry, education, the arts, and government service. Many are prominent in a variety of communities. Others are officers and policy makers in professional organizations. Some are authors of nationally and internationally published texts in their fields, and a large number have done pioneer work in developing special courses and curricula [III A-3].

In 2010, 27 percent of the College’s administrators retired. CCSF hired interim administrators to fill the positions while the process to hire more than ten permanent administrators continues through the 2010-11 academic year [III A-4].

Pursuant to California Education Code § 88137, the City and County of San Francisco’s merit system, overseen by the Civil Service Commission, governs the District’s employment of classified employees. All permanent and provisional positions, with the exception of positions exempted from the merit system process, have been classified by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR) according to their duties and responsibilities. Exempt employees serve at the pleasure of the appointing officer and are exempted from the Civil Service process by the San Francisco Charter. All non-exempt District classified positions have been reviewed and classified by the DHR according to their duties and responsibilities. If a classified position is new or an additional position is to be added to a College department, a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) or Express Classification form (EXP) must be completed. The JAQ or EXP serves as the survey instrument designed to elicit complete and thorough information for a specific position, such as major functions, essential duties, and responsibilities [III A-5].

In September 2008, the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District (SFCCD) adopted Resolution No. 080926-S4 requiring SFCCD to consider certain job applicant finalists who have been convicted of a felony involving controlled substances. Under this resolution, finalists who submit evidence of at least five years of rehabilitation would be referred to a Committee on Rehabilitation. The Committee would then review the rehabilitation evidence and make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding whether or not the finalist is sufficiently rehabilitated. A Committee on Rehabilitation has been formed composed of faculty and administrators. Employee handbooks, employment applications, and employment websites have also been updated to reflect this new policy [III A-6, p. 2].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.
City College of San Francisco employs faculty, staff, and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The overall search and hiring process instituted by Human Resources and the work of faculty and administrator search committees promote diverse and well qualified hires. The faculty hiring process is rigorous, and nearly all departments require a teaching demonstration and a portfolio of work as a part of the interview process. In light of the College commitment to having a diverse faculty and staff reflective of the communities the College serves, the HR department will continue to focus on strategies for increasing diversity in applicant pools and in hiring. Faculty hiring processes have sometimes proceeded without Equal Employment Opportunity monitors because of the shortage of trained monitors and funds to pay them.

Planning Agenda

The College should recruit and provide training for more Equal Employment Opportunity monitors and identify funding for them.

III.A.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Descriptive Summary

The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The criteria for evaluating faculty are defined in the AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement (AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA). District policies and procedures outline criteria for evaluating staff and administrators.

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

The faculty evaluation process is administered by the Office of the Dean of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation, and Tenure Review in accordance with AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 9. In general, classroom faculty are evaluated every three years on: 1) professional qualities, including keeping current in their discipline; 2) performance—classroom instruction; and 3) classroom presentation, including demonstrating sensitivity to the learning difficulties of students. Student evaluations, taken via an in-class survey, are a crucial component of every classroom instructor’s evaluation. Survey responses are weighed seriously, and may serve as
a revealing indicator of potential areas of concern.

The “job performance” component of an evaluation for classroom faculty consists of an in-depth evaluation of course content, subject knowledge, and classroom presentation. For librarians, job performance is evaluated in areas such as promoting student access to and use of the library, providing students with materials that are appropriate to their needs, and striving to maintain an environment conducive to study, research, reading, and learning. Counselors’ job performance is evaluated according to how they help students define problems, support students in seeking solutions to problems, and provide opportunities for students to express concerns. Resource instructors’ job performance is evaluated on how effectively they develop instructional resources.

To further improve the evaluation process and provide feedback for improvement to faculty members, an additional category was added to the ratings component of the evaluation. The category of “Satisfactory but needs improvement” addresses issues prior to a faculty member falling into the “Unsatisfactory” category. The process also includes a provision that addresses the matter through an Improvement Plan. More specific evaluation components, which clearly describe the formal and timely processes that produce documented actions following evaluations, are outlined in the Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review document available from the Office of the Dean of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation, and Tenure Review [III A-7, III A-2 p. 27].

Department chairs are evaluated with regard to the performance of their supervisory duties and responsibilities in accordance with Article 8: Evaluation, of the Department Chairperson Council/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement (DCC/SFCCD CBA). This article specifies that each department chairperson should be evaluated by the academic and classified members of the department during February or March of each year of his or her term of office as department chair, except for the third or last year of the term. The department chairperson and the administrator to whom he or she reports examine and discuss the feedback submitted by faculty and staff in the Faculty and Classified Staff Review Form for Department Chairperson. The administrator then summarizes the review results, which are placed in the evaluatee’s personnel file [III A-8].

The classified employee evaluation currently follows the Performance Appraisal System of the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR). The purposes of the performance plan and appraisal are to: 1) evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the employee’s work; 2) communicate these to the employee; and 3) set goals for performance, improvement, and career development. New permanent classified staff are evaluated after three months and on the anniversary date of employment. The current appraisal/evaluation process does not provide for a specific rating on dedication to professional growth as made evident by an employee’s participation in District wide committees, organizations, and projects (for example, Classified Senate or Accreditation workgroups) [III A-9].

During the previous Accreditation Self Study, the Human Resources Department (HR) reviewed and developed its own classified evaluation process for all classified employees.
This new structure has served as a means of dialog between supervisor and evaluatee, and as a way to create progressive work plans. To further improve the ease and timeliness of evaluations for classified staff, HR has put the evaluation forms online. One of the staff from HR sends an email notice about the need for an evaluation, and then a reminder to the employee’s department head, prior to the due date. The Department also sends a reminder after the due date if necessary. An HR staff member monitors the process. Prior to Fall 2010 only permanent classified employees were evaluated, but now all classified employees are evaluated [III A-9].

Administrators are evaluated on their performance relating to program planning, problem solving, professional relationships, job knowledge and application, human resources skills, communication skills, organizational leadership skills, personal leadership skills, and teamwork. The current Administrative Evaluation and Contract Renewal Procedures were implemented during the fiscal year 2003-04. The Administrative Evaluation process was revamped to ensure a more direct relationship between the evaluatee and his or her direct supervisor.

To further improve and provide executive-level oversight of the administrator evaluation process, the program was moved from HR to the Office of the Chancellor in 2000. The current procedures require that early in the evaluation process, in addition to identifying their day-to-day activities, administrators set a minimum of five performance objectives that are in line with the Chancellor’s objectives. The Chancellor’s objectives are derived from key institutional planning documents, such as the Strategic Plan and the College’s Annual Plan. These administrators’ objectives are reviewed and approved by the Chancellor’s Office. The current process also identifies measurable outcomes for evaluation of the administrators’ objectives and an increase of the weight of the supervisor’s review, which is now 25 percent of the overall evaluation [III A-10 p. 17].

For information on how the College evaluates the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, please see Standard IV.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

**Planning Agenda**

None

III.A.1.c. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student-learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. The evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student-learning outcomes does include effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.
Descriptive Summary

All faculty who teach courses are evaluated regularly in accordance with Article 9 of the AFT 2121/SFCCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). During the evaluation of classroom faculty, evaluators review course materials to make sure that faculty are following the course outlines. The dialog that ensues between the evaluation committee and the evaluatee includes a review of his or her syllabus, teaching materials, teaching methodology, and grade books. All relevant findings are incorporated into the evaluation. Several components that contribute to the evaluation of the effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes are rated and discussed by the evaluation team, including the following areas that contribute to student learning outcomes:

- The course content is up to date and appropriate.
- The materials used are pertinent to the course outline.
- The class is taught at an appropriate level.
- Instructor establishes a student-instructor relationship conducive to learning.
- The pacing of the class is appropriate to the level and the material presented.
- Instructor stimulates students’ interest in the field and their desire to learn.
- Instructor demonstrates sensitivity to the learning difficulties of the student.

CCSF course outlines identify student learning outcomes in relation to course content, teaching methodology, and student evaluation criteria. As a result, the estimation of these during a faculty evaluation demonstrates a link to the significant role faculty play in the integration of student learning outcomes into their curriculum and teaching practices. Dialog about student learning outcomes and teaching methodology begins at the departmental level, coordinated by the chairs. Faculty involved in course outline development engage in a technical review process, whose primary goal is to ensure that the learning outcomes, course content, instructional methodology, and student evaluation criteria reinforce and support one another. All proposed course outlines are subsequently subject to the review and approval of the College Curriculum Committee, with these measures in mind.

The evaluation process also includes a student evaluation component for all classroom instructors, and, if applicable, for non-classroom faculty as well. Classroom and/or formal worksite visitations and observations are also conducted. Students are asked to evaluate instructors with a series of questions, including:

- Are the methods of testing (examinations, papers, etc.) a valid evaluation of the knowledge and or skills you have gained from this course?
- Are assignments relevant and helpful in understanding the subject area?
- Does the instructor try to interest you in the subject and encourage you to learn more about it?

The student evaluations are considered an important piece of evidence of faculty success during the evaluation process [III A-7].

Self Evaluation
The College meets this standard.

The faculty evaluation process is well documented in Article 9 of the AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement. The process is designed to include dialog with and classroom observation by the department chair and/or the peer evaluation team, as well as findings from student evaluation forms. While the official evaluation forms used by students and peer evaluation team colleagues do not contain language that refers specifically to the student learning outcomes on the course outline, there are several components of these evaluation forms that do reflect teaching behaviors that directly contribute to student learning. Student evaluations across the curriculum typically range in the 4.4 to 4.8 range (where 5 equals “always”) for specific teaching behaviors, such as “Does the instructor try to interest you in the subject and encourage you to learn more about it?” The dialog between evaluatee and evaluation team and/or department chair allows for a focused discussion of the effectiveness of the instructor’s performance in helping to produce these student learning outcomes.

**Planning Agenda**

Review the faculty and student evaluation forms to determine if more explicit language should be included about how the syllabus, course content, teaching methodology, instructional materials, and assessment activities contribute to student learning outcomes. If so, it will be necessary to negotiate changes in the forms.

**III.A.1.d. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel.**

**Descriptive Summary**

While City College of San Francisco does not have one single institutional code of professional ethics for administrators, faculty, and staff, expectations for ethical behavior by employees of the District are covered in various District policies, employee handbooks, and collective bargaining agreements.

District policies concerning instructors’ responsibilities in classrooms and laboratories are published in the Faculty Handbook, p. 16-24 [III A-11]. Additionally, Article 8 of the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA speaks to Academic Freedom, Duties, and Responsibilities. Article 8.D. specifically addresses faculty-student relationships. The Classified Handbook, p. 16-17, outlines the requirements of classified employees at the time of hire, such as fingerprinting, misrepresentation or falsification of information, the arrest and conviction policy, and security clearance [III A-12]. District Policy 4.09 – Use of Slurs is included in the handbook on p. 12 and as Appendix B [III A-13]. All new employees are provided with a handbook at the time of their new-hire processing. The handbooks are updated regularly and are distributed via an interoffice mailing to all employees, as well as made available on the Human Resources website.
Other relevant policies and articles that define professional ethics expectations at CCSF include:

SEIU 1021/SFCCD CBA Article 9 – Discipline covers the discipline process for represented SEIU classified employees. Article 9.C. – Causes for Discipline outlines circumstances under which unit members may be disciplined for cause [III A-14].

The Board of Trustees adopted the Workplace Violence Policy on June 10, 2004. A Workplace Violence Policy and Procedure Brochure for distribution to all employees was developed and reviewed through the Shared Governance procedure during the Fall 2005 semester. The policy is included in the latest versions of the faculty and classified employee handbooks.

The Affirmative Action Office disseminates information to all employees pertaining to the District’s Sexual Harassment and Unlawful Discrimination policies and procedures for filing complaints. Additional information is available on their website [III A-15].

On July 29, 2010, the Board of Trustees passed Board Policy 3052–Conflict of Interest. This policy stated that no trustee, officer, or employee of the District shall make, or in any way attempt to use his or her official position to influence a District decision in which he or she has an economic interest [III A-16].

District policies and procedures may be found in the College Catalog, as well as the College’s website at http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

CCSF promotes a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration and improved levels of communication, and policies and procedures are in place that ensure healthy working conditions and foster an environment of respect and trust. However, during the last accreditation cycle, the Self Study recommended the development of a code of ethics for all employees. This is still pending, and completion of this process should be a priority during 2011-12.

Planning Agenda

Develop a code of professional ethics for all employees.

III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.
**Descriptive Summary**

In normal budget years, the District has been able to maintain a sufficient number of qualified employees to maintain the integrity of its services and programs. In recent years, the College has suffered from the effects of budget reductions resulting from a major economic downturn that required the College to implement strategic spending reductions throughout the institution, including a severe restriction on hiring in the classified unit. Despite the economic downturn, the College exceeded its full-time faculty obligation for Fall 2009 by 127 FTE, the largest margin in the state (see Standard III.D.2.a).

Despite difficult setbacks, the reduction in spending has focused on ensuring the continuance of core educational programs and student services. Increased efforts by faculty and staff have preserved the continued delivery of efficient and effective programs and services. This is a direct reflection of the quality of District employees. Additionally, the College, with respect to the “seventy-five percent rule,” has exceeded state requirements since 2005 [III A-17].

As noted in III.A.1, the faculty and administrators of City College of San Francisco are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. (Please refer to III.A.1. for more details about the types of degrees held by faculty and administrators and their breadth of experience.) The Chancellor’s administrative structure is highly efficient, with one of the smallest administrator to employee ratios within the California Community College system. Approximately 43 administrators are responsible for overseeing the more than 2,700 employees (active adjunct faculty fluctuate from one semester to the next) and approximately 100,000 students served throughout the College’s campuses [III A-18].

Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. The College's Planning and Budgeting Council (College's PBC) reviews the Program Review reports and respective budget requests. As a component of planning, administrators and supervisory personnel are required to indicate resources needed for completion of their objectives, including staffing. Faculty and administrative position allocation is a Shared Governance process aligned with College goals, strategic priorities, and financial resources.

As an example, the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) plays the key role in setting the priorities for the hiring of new full-time faculty. FPAC is a Shared Governance committee composed of three administrators and three faculty. Departments submit their FPAC requests (FPAC request form) as per the criteria and procedures established by the Committee [III A-19]. The Committee utilizes data from the Decision Support System (DSS), such as data about supply and demand for courses/subjects, to assess faculty position requests. Program Review reports should also be used more explicitly by FPAC in formulating its recommendations. FPAC prioritizes the requests using the DSS data as indicators of supply and demand for a particular course/subject and presents the list to the College’s PBC, which determines the total number of full-time positions to be filled College wide. The College’s PBC recommendations are subject to the Chancellor’s approval.

As noted in III.A.1.a, in 2010 a significant percentage of the College’s administrators retired.
CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

CCSF hired interim administrators to fill the positions while the process to hire more than ten permanent administrators continued through the 2010-11 academic year [III A-4].

The Chancellor has primary responsibility for the allocation of the Administrative structure. If it is determined that an administrative position is needed to ensure the effective operation of College services, top administration consults with the Academic Senate. If the position is new, the Human Resources Department will be called in to conduct a job analysis survey, determining in consultation with the Chancellor and the appropriate Vice Chancellor the accurate job duties and responsibilities, as well as the respective salary and benefits. After the availability of funds is determined, a request accompanied by a justification and a job description is sent to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate for review. The Executive Council is empowered to make its own recommendations on the request and job description. If the Senate and Administration cannot agree on the job description, the final determination falls to the Chancellor. Recommendations for amendments to the hiring procedures are made by the Chancellor in consultation with the Academic Senate and taken before the Board of Trustees for review and adoption.

The number of classified staff has fluctuated. With a slow state recovery and impending budget restrictions, the District has imposed severe restrictions on hiring in the classified unit and generally does not fill replacement positions of those who retire or leave for other reasons. The Vacancy Review Group (VRG), comprising administrators, classified staff, and SEIU representatives, became effective October 2004. Since then, the VRG has been assigned the duty of discussing requests for new and replacement classified positions. VRG approval of requests for new positions is rare. While the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) forwards its recommendations to the College’s PBC, the VRG for classified staff does not send its recommendations to the College’s PBC for review and final decision making. Moreover, the VRG operates outside of the Shared Governance structure. The membership of the VRG is not publicly listed, meetings are not regularly scheduled, and meeting dates and times are never posted. Although many classified positions contribute directly to the areas listed among the academic and professional matters for which the College relies primarily on the recommendations of the Academic Senate, the VRG includes no Academic Senate representatives. It has been suggested that this process be changed so that there is faculty input regarding classified positions in academic areas and the VRG is required to send their respective budget requests to the College’s PBC before a final decision is made on position allocations.

In November 2009, approximately 34 classified staff laid off by other San Francisco Civil Service agencies “bumped” the College’s existing classified staff. This is this highest number of classified staff to get bumped out of their positions at one time in the past 20 years. This wide-scale bumping created anxiety and inefficiencies for those getting bumped and their supervisors. It also generated an atmosphere of uncertainty within the College community, which is not conducive to running high-functioning teams within departments and programs that rely on classified staff.

The classified bumping process is governed by the City and County of San Francisco rules, not by the District’s collective bargaining agreement. Classified bumping and displacement
are facilitated by the City’s Department of Human Resources (DHR) and are identified on a job seniority basis. While there is little that anyone at CCSF can do to control the bumping process, it has been a struggle, nonetheless, to manage during the ongoing economic crisis in San Francisco and California.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The number of full-time faculty is sufficient; however, the number of qualified administrators and classified staff has shown greater fluctuations. Given the current economic situation, the College is effectively using the planning and budgeting process to ensure that core staffing needs are addressed in most cases. The relationship between position allocations and the planning and budgeting process is integral to decision making about new and replacement positions. While the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) forwards their recommendations to the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC), the Vacancy Review Group (VRG) for classified staff does not send their recommendations to the College’s PBC for review and final decision making. Moreover, the VRG operates outside of the Shared Governance structure. The membership of the VRG is not publicly listed, meetings are not regularly scheduled, and meeting dates and times are never posted. The College should discuss this process and consider changing it so that it is part of the Shared Governance System.

Planning Agenda

The College should discuss making the Vacancy Review Group for classified staff a part of the Shared Governance System, thereby making the process more transparent, involving faculty, and aligning it with the processes of the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council.

III.A.3. The institution systematically develops personnel polices and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

III.A.3.a. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

Descriptive Summary

Personnel policies are governed by District policy and procedures, the California Education Code and Title 5, union contracts, and state, federal, and local labor laws. For example, Education Code § 87359 and Title 5 § 53430 regulations specify minimum qualifications for faculty and administrative hiring. The employment of classified employees is governed by the City and County of San Francisco’s Civil Service Commission.

Personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered and reviewed regularly through the Shared Governance process and, if appropriate, by the unions.
Employee needs and concerns are voiced and addressed via the Joint Labor Management Council, the College Diversity Committee, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the Academic Senate, and the unions. AFT 2121 has a Grievance Committee that meets on a regular basis with the head of Employee Relations to work out any perceived problems between the District and faculty. Additionally, the Human Resources Committee meets every other week to address pertinent personnel issues, employee concerns, new and updated employment laws, and personnel policies. The Human Resources Committee is composed of the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, Legal Counsel, the Employee Relations Officer, the Director and Associate Director of Human Resources, the Affirmative Action Officer, and the Human Resources Supervisors. Recommendations for adoption of new and/or amended personnel policies are taken before the Board of Trustees. All policy manual amendments and additions go through two readings before the Board of Trustees prior to adoption.

The Human Resources Department communicates updates and new personnel policies, procedures, and/or laws by disseminating the information to employees through institutional mailings and making the information available via the Department’s website. Moreover, employment policies and procedures are stated in the Policy Manual (P.M.3.02), the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA, the SEIU 1021/SFCCD CBA, contracts with other recognized bargaining units, and in the Faculty and Classified handbooks, as well as posted on job announcements and on the Department website. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies that ensure informational brochures pertaining to unlawful discrimination are distributed to all employees. Employee handbooks contain an appendix the San Francisco Community College District Policy and Procedures for Handling Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination under Title 5 § 59300 et. seq [III A-20, III A-2, III A-14, III A-11, III A-12].

It is the responsibility of the Human Resources Department and the Affirmative Action Office to orient faculty and administrative hiring committees on the hiring procedures, employment regulations, and the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 12–Upgrading provisions [III A-2]. The process has been improved to include samples and forms on paper screening criteria, interview questions, and teaching demonstrations.

The Human Resources Department and the Office of Instruction hold new employee orientations once yearly to educate all incoming employees on the District’s policies and to inform employees about their responsibilities. The Employee Relations Officer is responsible for ensuring that College constituents are educated on new contract language.

The Human Resources Department is responsible for developing and distributing employee handbooks that inform employees of the principal rules, regulations, practices, and procedures essential to their role in the District. The handbooks are updated every two years. Current handbooks for Classified, Faculty, and Administrators can be found on the Human Resources website [III A-11, III A-12, III A-10].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.
The institution does a good job of ensuring that all state, federal, local, and other relevant personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered and reviewed regularly through the Shared Governance process and by union staff, if appropriate. The Human Resources Department satisfactorily communicates updates and new personnel policies, procedures, and/or laws by disseminating the information to employees through institutional mailings and making the information available via the Department’s website.

Planning Agenda

None

III.A.3.b. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

Descriptive Summary

The institution makes provisions for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Classified and academic files are kept in secure and locked areas in the Human Resources Department. Personnel records are confidential and may only be viewed by authorized personnel. Academic employees may view their personnel file by appointment with authorized Human Resources personnel as described in the provisions of the AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) during regular business hours. Classified employees may also view their personnel file upon written notice in accordance with the SEIU 1021/SFCCD CBA. Additionally, an employee may authorize/designate a union or other representative to review their file upon written authorization as described by both AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021 collective bargaining agreements [III A-2, III A-14]. Administrators and classified employees not represented by SEIU 1021 have equivalent rights to inspect their personnel files, as outlined in their respective employee handbooks. For all employees, Education Code and Labor Code provisions are assured.

In accordance with the SEIU 1021/SFCCD CBA, the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA, and District policy, there must be only one official District personnel file for each academic and classified employee. Each personnel file consists of District employment records, educational advancement records, and other work experience that relates to employee service. The following items are considered part of a classified and academic personnel file but are maintained separately: time rolls, attendance records, payroll records, work orders, TB records, history cards, salary cards, credential records, schedule files, and assignment files. The District may add similar categories of routine personnel recordkeeping as long as both AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021 Unions are notified respectively as described in the contracts. Medical records and investigative reports are not filed in an employee’s personnel file. Medical records are kept in a locked benefits cabinet with access restricted to designated Human Resources staff only [III A-2, III A-14].

An online, password-protected database called Web4 allows employee access to certain types of information. Employees are able to access and update some of their personal information,
such as payroll information, benefits and deductions, sick days credited and used, and tax withholding, via their online account on Web4.

Additionally, the ITS Department takes great measures within its technical infrastructure to secure employment records in the CCSF Banner information system. Each user has a unique Oracle logon and password. Within CCSF Banner, each user is given permissions only to view or update areas appropriate for his or her job duties. Moreover, only select staff members in the administrative area of the College are granted access to the CCSF Banner information system.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Security and confidentiality of personnel records are diligently provided, primarily through locked files of paper-copy documents in the Human Resources Department with only authorized personnel allowed viewing rights. Employee access is provided by appointment, and some information is available online via passwords.

Planning Agenda

None

III.A.4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.

III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.

Descriptive Summary

CCSF demonstrates through major planning documents, policies, and daily practice, an understanding that equity and diversity are key to the success of the institution. The Vision Statement summarizes CCSF’s perspective on diversity as: “In our community, respect and trust are common virtues, and all people are enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding. We will maintain a supportive, positive, and productive working environment for our diverse faculty and staff, as well as a responsive environment in which student needs are met in a friendly, timely, and caring manner.” [III A-21].

In the 2011-16 Strategic Plan, one of six identified strategic priorities is dedicated to diversity and inclusiveness. The goal of this priority is to “Promote diversity and inclusiveness at all levels of the College.” Many objectives are outlined to advance this priority, from the broader goal of fostering a supportive, positive, and productive environment for our diverse employees and students to specific implementation strategies, such as providing more access to educational technology, providing better support for and
expanding the success of underrepresented students in meeting transfer goals, and improving the registration process to enable students to better access all pre-collegiate courses in a manner that promotes persistence [III A-22].

Other groundwork for promoting equity and supporting diversity is reflected in an April 2009 CCSF Board of Trustees “Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution,” which acknowledged that CCSF is committed to ensuring equal opportunity treatment for all students. This resolution, crafted by the Board and the College community, originated with students’ concerns about the number of students, especially students of color, who don’t make it through the basic skills sequences into transfer-level courses and beyond to graduate and transfer. It called for the Chancellor, in collaboration with the Office of Research and Planning, to produce an annual report regarding educational equity, which would discuss the College’s progress toward equity for all students [III A-23].

In October 2009, the Chancellor published the “Preliminary Report on the Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution.” As the report was reviewed through the Shared Governance process, it helped drive discussions in all constituencies of the College about what can be done by our faculty, classified staff, and administration to better serve our diverse student body. CCSF has been sponsoring Student Equity Hearings, which began in early 2010 and are continuing through 2011. These have brought the community of faculty, students, and administrators together to discuss salient issues and solutions concerning equity, diversity, and student success. In these hearings, the CCSF community identified programmatic changes that would benefit students and faculty. For example: increase math sections to relieve faculty teaching in crowded math classes and identify professional development needs, such as mandatory two-day retreats for English Department faculty to focus on pedagogy, student learning, assessment, and learning outcomes [III A-24].

Although the Chancellor initially planned on providing a revised Equity Resolution for the Board’s consideration in April 2010, he decided instead to create a special task force to work strategically on the planning and assessment of CCSF intervention efforts, and to assist in the implementation of those plans with the various College divisions and departments. This task force has been providing regular reports to Board committees and the full Board since June 2010. CCSF is also planning a review and update to the College’s State Equity Plan, which was last submitted in March 2005 [III A-25].

CCSF offers a large variety of diversity-related and other programs and services that support its personnel. The “Grow Your Own Program” was designed to encourage and help prepare City College of San Francisco graduates to return as teaching, counseling, or library faculty at CCSF after they have completed their upper division and graduate education. The students participate in a special support program, receive scholarships to pursue advanced degrees, and serve as teaching interns at the College. This initiative is crucial toward the goal of increasing the extent to which faculty are representative of our student populations [III A-26].

Faculty and staff who work in the retention and success programs and centers throughout the College bring special expertise and knowledge that they share with their colleagues through
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interactions related to student learning in specific courses, curriculum development, and other academic governance issues that support diversity and equity. These programs/centers include the African American Scholastic Programs, the Disabled Students Programs and Services, the Extended Opportunity Programs, the Latino Services Network, the Writing Success Project, the Asian Pacific Islander Student Success program, TULAY: Filipino American Success Program, Puente, Math Bridge, Bridge to Biotech and MESA/STEM Center (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math). The programs, which are open to students without regard to their ethnicity, reach out to the students who are at the highest risk of not succeeding and provide them with supplementary instruction, academic counseling, mentoring, and scholarship and career counseling. Employee perception of these programs is rated as good, with a 3 mean rating on a four-point scale on the 2011 Employee Survey [III A-27].

The College also has an active College Diversity Committee. This Shared Governance committee meets regularly to ensure that diversity remains at the top of the College’s agenda for discussion. Its members have been very effective in recommending and facilitating the adoption of practices to increase knowledge and understanding of diversity. For example, some areas the Committee has focused on include:

- strengthening the retention programs, such as the newest TULAY: Filipino American Success Program, part of the Asian Pacific American Student Success Center, which is a learning community that integrates Filipino curriculum, counseling services, basic English and math skills support, and peer mentoring for Filipino-American students
- working with the Office of Research and Planning staff to disaggregate data by race, ethnicity, gender, etc. to track student success and progress
- taking a leadership role in the Achievement Gap/Equity dialogs
- promoting wireless access for students
- discussing the feasibility of a local parcel tax
- identifying the need for a higher registration priority for recent high school graduates
- advocating for community colleges at the state and local level [III A-28]

Another very important program for faculty that promotes the understanding of equity and diversity issues is the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP), a professional development program that provides faculty with the incentives, time, and resources to revamp their curricula and teaching methods to increase their focus on multicultural issues. The project focuses on helping faculty not only to infuse multicultural content and perspectives into the curriculum, but also to expand teaching strategies to meet the needs of a diverse student population. MIP supports the expansion of strategies that seek to meet the needs of CCSF’s diverse student population and increase equity throughout the College. MIP has been developing a group of “resource” faculty who can serve faculty at-large who are interested in increasing multicultural awareness through theory and practice. MIP also provides professional development activities throughout the year and a Summer Institute to help address current issues in teaching and learning [III A-29].

Other faculty professional development activities include the Basic Skills Faculty Colloquium,
Department Chairpersons Council-sponsored Student Learning Outcomes Workshops, ESL Colloquia, and Flex programs. Flex Day continues to be an integral part of the institution’s support of faculty. While funding for staff development programs has been discontinued on a state level, the institution, in consultation with the Human Resources Department, continues to fund this effort. Classified Flex Day was established in 2001-02 for all classified employees to ensure that the more specific needs of support staff, which may be significantly different from academic staff, are addressed (see also III.A.5.a). The programs provide a very effective forum to invite outstanding speakers and lecturers on campus to address current institutional needs, such as diversity training [III A-30].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The institution demonstrates through its Mission and Vision statements, Strategic Plan, policies, and daily practices, that equity and diversity for all campus constituents are key to the success of the institution. There are many opportunities for faculty and staff to increase their understanding and awareness of diversity and equity issues. Although the understanding of and concern for diversity at CCSF have been at the forefront of instructional and student services for many years, recent discussions at the campus, state, and federal levels about the challenges of student academic achievement and completion rates have helped drive deliberations about additional solutions to meet local challenges. The actions taken thus far seem appropriate, but annual review and analysis of data are important to both continuing the dialog and implementing effective changes to increase completion rates. Given that student achievement gaps exist nationally, statewide, and locally, CCSF should continue to find new ways to address the issue while maintaining the successful methods in which the institution is already engaged.

**Planning Agenda**

None

**III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.**

**Descriptive Summary**

In compliance with Title 5 and at the request of the Board of Trustees, the Human Resources Department prepares an annual Employee and Hiring Data Report (see also III.A.2.). This document provides an extensive summary of the institution’s hiring record and is used as a reference and educational tool for the institution’s hiring needs and goals. The historical data in these reports show that the institution is committed to hiring people with varied backgrounds and experiences. This is reflected across the District, and, as a result, the College’s diversity statistics remain at or near the 40 percent level [III A-4].

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

The Human Resources Employee and Hiring Data Report Fall 2010-Spring 2011 shows the demographic make up of administrators, faculty, and classified staff as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators (Fall 2010)</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty (Fall 2010)</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty (Fall 2010)</th>
<th>Full-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2010)</th>
<th>Part-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number:</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty and staff are also diverse with respect to their age [III A-4].

The recruitment of classified employees for the San Francisco Community College District (SFCCD) is governed by the SEIU 1021/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and the City and County of San Francisco Civil Service System, also known as the “merit system.”

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The College publishes the annual Employee and Hiring Data Report and uses this information to assess how effective recruiting and hiring practices are related to increasing the diversity of its staff. As the data in the chart indicate, the College’s diversity statistics are at about the 45 percent level, with more diversity of staff represented in the administrator and classified staff categories.

**Planning Agenda**
III.A.4.c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.

Descriptive Summary

CCSF maintains integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff, and students by adhering to a number of regulatory policies and laws, including union contracts, the State Education Code and Title 5, the City and County of San Francisco’s Civil Service Charter, District personnel polices and practices, and federal, state, and local labor laws. The institution has also established procedures and guidelines to enable it to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds, sexual orientation, or disability.

In addition, the institution has an Equal Opportunity Statement that addresses CCSF’s policy on equal employment and educational opportunities. The compliance officer for this policy is the District Affirmative Action Officer. The Affirmative Action Officer is also responsible for disseminating informational brochures to all students and employees regarding District policies and procedures pertaining to sexual harassment and unlawful discrimination. This information may also be found in the Affirmative Action website and employee handbooks. As required by law, sexual harassment training for employees serving in management and supervisory ranks has been ongoing since 2005 [III A-15].

The District has identified the Associate Dean of the Office of Affirmative Action to the State Chancellor’s Office and to the public as the single District officer responsible for receiving all unlawful discrimination complaints filed pursuant to Title 5 § 59328, and for coordinating any investigation [III A-31].

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

As stated in III.A.4.a, Flex Day events have served as a forum for presenting informational workshops and trainings about the institution’s policies and practices related to respectful treatment of employees and students.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has demonstrated integrity in the treatment of its staff and students through policies, programs, and appeal processes.
Planning Agenda

None

III.A.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.

Descriptive Summary

Faculty, classified staff, and administrators are provided varied opportunities for professional development through Flex Day activities and workshops, conferences and conventions (funding permitting), sabbatical leave awards, and individual professional development opportunities.

Professional development requirements for faculty are outlined in the Faculty Handbook on page 16, on the Office of Professional Development’s website, and in the Flex Day programs. The Office of Professional Development plans annual Flex activity programs for faculty and staff. The Flex Day programs are based on polling faculty and staff about their teaching and learning needs and are consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs. Examples of programs offered include teaching with technology, methods to motivate and aid student learning, diversity, and multicultural topics [III A-30].

With the discontinuation of state funding, AB1725 travel funds were eliminated and the quality of Flex Day events was directly affected because funding is not currently available for guest keynote speakers, diversity workshop presenters, and agencies. However, through the efforts of the Chancellor, the Office of Professional Development, and the Staff Development Committee, the College has continued to offer a limited program.

Another issue related to offering a more extensive array of Flex Day programs is the reduction in the number of days devoted to Flex. Prior to 2003, the fall semester Flex event was held over three days, and the spring semester events were two days. This allowed for a varied and quality offering of workshops. Negotiations reduced the programmed Flex Days down to one each semester. The other four days are given as independent Flex Days for the faculty to attend conferences or pursue individual developmental activities, but with severely limited travel budgets, it is increasingly difficult for faculty to attend conferences or off-site workshops.

These changes have directly affected the Flex events by reducing attendance, causing difficulties in contracting and soliciting presenters, and limiting the number of quality
workshops that could be offered. Negotiations are underway to restore one of the programmed Flex Days to the fall semester.

Other outlets available for faculty professional development include the Basic Skills Faculty Colloquia, the Technology Learning Center’s (TLC) technology training sessions. Department Chairpersons Council-sponsored Student Learning Outcomes Workshops, Multicultural Infusion Project activities, and individual department workshops.

The TLC, an office within the Education Technology Office (ETO), provides technology training programs to faculty and staff through regularly scheduled and Flex workshops. Training is delivered in a variety of modes that meet employee needs. The TLC offers workshops, online training, and tutorials and sessions created specifically for a department’s needs. Additionally, the TLC website contains information on accessing CCSF networks, email and web accounts, and information on current projects and educational technology resources [III A-32].

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

Individual professional development targeted to specific faculty teaching/learning needs has been enhanced by the Union-District program to reward ongoing education and training with salary column movement. Since Fall 1999 AFT 2121 and the District have agreed to grant salary column movement to non-Ph.D. faculty. Faculty wishing to take college courses to accumulate units for salary column movement may: 1) take undergraduate courses, requiring prior approval from their respective School Dean and Vice Chancellor; 2) take graduate courses; or 3) develop a long-term professional development plan (AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 20, Attachment 3–Professional Development Plan). The Human Resources Department administers the evaluation of faculty coursework [III A-2].

Administrative sabbatical awards are granted at the Chancellor’s discretion. In accord with the Sabbatical Leave Policy for Administrators, up to two sabbatical leaves may be granted per academic year and the award may be for one semester, one year, or a split (two non-consecutive semesters). Approval is based on seniority, benefit to the institution, and benefit to the individual, and consideration is given to the timing of the leave and its consistency with institutional priorities. Administrators may also be granted a short-term paid or unpaid leave for professional development. Due to the reduction in the number of administrators, no administrator has received a sabbatical in recent years [III A-10 p. 28].

In cooperation with the leadership of the classified employees (SEIU 1021 and the Classified Senate), the Office of Professional Development and the Chancellor’s Office sponsor a classified employee Flex Day once a year, as noted in III.A.4.a. The District provides release time for training and/or presenting during Flex Days. The Classified Senate established the Joan McClain (founding member of the Classified Senate) scholarship to aid classified
employees pursuing academic goals.

The following educational opportunities are also available to classified SEIU 1021 members: 1) enrollment fee waiver program; 2) Book Loan Program; and 3) the SEIU 1021 Enrollment Fee Reimbursement Grant and 4) the Lifelong Learning Accounts (Lila). Specific information about each of the aforementioned programs is available in the Classified Handbook and in Article 13–Staff Development of the SEIU 1021/SFCCD CBA [III A-14].

The results of the 2010 Employee Survey indicate dissatisfaction among employees with Professional Development (Travel, Conferences) at CCSF and a near good rating for Professional Development (Flex). The 305 employees who answered the question about Professional Development (Travel, Conferences) rated the services 1.98 out of 5, with 2 being below average and 1 being poor. This low rating can be attributed to the lack of funding for any type of travel or conference now that faculty travel funds have been cut from the budget. The 522 employees who rated Professional Development (Flex) rated it 2.89, with 3 being good [III A-27].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

Negotiations reduced the Flex Days down to one each semester. After this change was made, it became clear that only one Flex Day creates scheduling conflicts that directly affect the Flex events by reducing attendance, causing difficulties in contracting and soliciting presenters, and limiting the number of quality workshops that can be offered. Especially because student achievement and completion rates are important issues of concern, the College would benefit from directing more attention to improving professional development opportunities for all levels of staff. The institution should focus on improving Flex Day policies, particularly those devoted to improving student achievement/success and basic skills.

Identifying and securing sources of income, such as the Basic Skills Initiative and Communities Learning in Partnership (CLIP) funding, will assist the College in achieving student success goals without taxing the already stretched budget.

**Planning Agenda**

When State funding improves, CCSF should increase support for professional development activities concerning student success and completion.

**III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.**
Descriptive Summary

The Flex Workshop Evaluation form is distributed to participants during Flex Day seminars. While attendance at Flex Day is mandatory, faculty may select which events they attend and participate in. Due to elimination of state funding, the event is limited to one day per semester, some of which is devoted to departmental meetings. The reduced schedule makes it difficult to schedule a wide range of varied offerings of workshops.

The primary ways that Flex Day sessions and other professional development opportunities are evaluated is through the employee survey, administered at regular intervals, the Flex workshop evaluation forms, and evaluation forms completed by faculty and staff related to TLC (Technology Learning Center) and online course training sessions offered by staff in the Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) area. In addition, the TMI staff work with faculty who have the benefit of online and hybrid course evaluation findings, so that course improvements can be made based on student feedback. Professional Development staff use the suggestions made on the Flex evaluation forms to plan future Flex Day sessions. They share the evaluations with the presenters so that any comments can be addressed by the presenter before offering that training session again. They also use informal feedback and suggestions from faculty to plan future professional development sessions.

The results of the 2010 Employee Survey show a near good rating for Flex workshops and slightly higher than good for the TMI training programs and the TLC’s distance learning training and support. The 522 employees who rated Professional Development (Flex) rated it 2.89, with 3 being good; of the 361 who rated the TLC’s training sessions, the mean score was 3.12 [III A-27].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The Flex sessions are limited to one day per semester, some of which is devoted to departmental meetings. The reduced schedule makes it difficult to schedule a wide range of varied offerings of workshops. Because of this, the value of assessing workshops and using the findings for improvement are limited. Nonetheless, Flex workshop evaluations will continue. Staff in the Professional Development Office, in partnership with the Staff Development Committee, should consider publishing on their website results from semester Flex Day workshops with an online “Suggestion” mechanism for faculty and staff to suggest needed or desired training sessions.

Planning Agenda

Inventory the types of evaluation practices currently being used across all College professional development venues to determine how the findings are utilized and the potential need for coordination or revision. Use the results of this inventory to publicize and promote how training is benefiting student learning and faculty staff performance.
III.A.6. Human resources planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco includes human resources planning in institutional planning. Results from recent long-term assessment and planning activities demonstrate how human resources planning has been included in these institutional dialogs.

In the first example, the 2011-16 Strategic Plan’s Objective Six describes goals of Human Resources and Staffing. The overall objective is to “Support workforce practices that are economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable for the College and its employees.” The ten goals in this section help define priorities during the next cycle, which include such objectives as “expanding the recruitment and hiring of a diverse faculty, staff, and administration and ensuring that professional development opportunities are available to all CCSF employees” [III A-22].

Another example can be found in the 2010-11 Annual Plan, where Section 8.1 outlines the need to “Improve efforts to recruit and hire a diverse faculty and staff, and continue to evaluate processes to ensure that the College workforce reflects the diverse communities the College serves, all as permitted by applicable law” [III A-33].

In addition to the long-term plans, the yearly Program Review process integrates human resources needs into long-term planning. As discussed earlier (Section III.2.), Program Review reports and respective budget requests are reviewed by the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC). As a component of planning, departments, administrators, and supervisory personnel are required to indicate resources needed for completion of their objectives. Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. The relationship between the planning and budgeting process and position allocations is integral to decision making about new and replacement positions. For a new or replacement administrative position, the administration consults with the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and Classified representatives [III A-10]. The Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) reviews all requests for new or replacement faculty positions and makes recommendations to the College’s PBC For classified positions, decisions are made by the Vacancy Review Group (VRG), composed of administrators and SEIU 2121 officers, and not referred to the College’s PBC for their approval. In the end, position allocation for all faculty and administrators is a Shared Governance process aligned with College goals, strategic priorities, and financial resources [III A-19].

Reduced state funding has forced the District to be cautious about hiring new faculty and classified staff. However, departments and programs are still requesting staff through either the FPAC or the VRG.
In Fall 2010, a plan to temporarily upgrade part-time, temporary faculty to full-time status was negotiated in order to fill emergency vacancies and most effectively use the expertise of our current, experienced part-time, temporary faculty, allowing them opportunities to more fully develop their professional skills.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The College has integrated human resource planning with institutional planning from the Strategic Plan to the Annual Plans and the Program Review process.

**Planning Agenda**

None

**IV. References**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III A-5</td>
<td>Classified Employee Hiring Procedures, date?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III A-9</td>
<td>Classified Performance Evaluation &amp; Plan, date?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III A-16</td>
<td>Board Policy 3052 Conflict of Interest, July 29, 2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/bp3052.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/bp3052.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III A-17</td>
<td>75-25 Calculation, 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III A-19</td>
<td>FPAC Request for Replacement Positions forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III A-26</td>
<td>Grow Your Own brochure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/News/gyo.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/News/gyo.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III A-28</td>
<td>College Diversity Committee minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/divers.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/divers.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II A-29</td>
<td>Multicultural Infusion Project website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Multicultural_Infusion_Project/">http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Multicultural_Infusion_Project/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II A-30</td>
<td>Flex Workshop brochure</td>
<td>Yes Fall 2011 <a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Staff_Development/Flex/program.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Services/Staff_Development/Flex/program.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard III.B: Physical Resources

Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

III.B.1.a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco provides safe and sufficient physical resources at nine owned and more than 100 rented sites throughout the City and County of San Francisco. The District owns the facilities on the Ocean Avenue, John Adams, Downtown, Civic Center and Evans campuses and the District Offices at Gough Street. The Airport Campus building is owned by the District, but is on leased land. The Mission Campus is on a site owned by the San Francisco Unified School District via a 75-year ground lease with an option for a 24-year extension beyond that time period. The Chinatown/North Beach Campus currently under construction on a site that the District owns will be a District-owned campus. The current Chinatown/North Beach, Southeast, Fort Mason, and Castro/Valencia facilities are all leased. Since the last accreditation, facility improvement work that ensures the integrity and quality of College programs and services has been undertaken at every site owned by the District [III B-1].

A successful bond initiative earned the approval of more than sixty percent of San Francisco voters in 2005, providing $246 million for facilities over the next several years. Prior to the 2005 bond initiative, the District’s only significant financial resources for improving its physical resources were $50 million from a local bond passed in 1997 and $195 million from a local bond passed in 2001. The District leveraged the $491 million obtained from these three local bonds to apply for and receive $185 million in state matching funds, bringing total resources from these sources to $696 million. The District is also seeking to raise private funding to support the construction of new facilities and renovation of others [III B-2, III B-3, III B-4].

A Facilities Master Plan has guided the institution in the planning, construction, maintenance, and upgrades and replacement of District physical resources since 2004, when it was adopted by the Board of Trustees. While a variety of factors helped drive the need for a systematic analysis and planning approach, the City and County of San Francisco also requires a Facilities Master Plan every ten years. The CCSF Master Plan, developed with the assistance of a facilities planning firm experienced in college master plan development, provides a comprehensive strategy for the development of grounds and facilities to meet the
College’s needs for enrollment growth, access and traffic concerns, and improving aging facilities, through the year 2015. The plan evaluated existing campus conditions relative to institutional needs, and recommended ways to organize and phase short- to long-term campus development to meet those needs. This Master Plan focused on the Ocean Avenue Campus, and also discussed planned changes at all CCSF sites and projects. The Plan has guided decision making regarding the location and timing of facilities and supporting infrastructure. It also includes guidelines for site, building, and landscape design that provide a tool for steering and evaluating the preparation of facility proposals. The combination of local support for the 1997, 2001, and 2005 initiatives, along with state funding enabled the College to make significant progress in the implementation of this Master Plan [III B-1].

Since the last Self Study, several large facility projects have been successfully completed in support of student learning programs, including the Mission Campus, renovation of both buildings at the John Adams Campus, renovations at the Downtown and Evans campuses, and ADA improvements at all College-owned campuses. In addition, on the Ocean Campus, the College’s single largest site, four new facilities have been completed: the Osher Child Development Center, the Student Health Services Building, the Health and Wellness Center, and the Multi-Use Building. Many smaller renovation projects have been completed at the Ocean Campus as well.

Construction began on the permanent Chinatown/North Beach Campus during 2010 and will be completed during Spring 2012. One of the future projects the College intends to construct is a new Performing Arts Center (PAC). The College has secured its share of funds for this project from a local bond measure, and the state recently committed to funding the project in the 2011-12 California State Budget.

While bond funding and additional state dollars leveraged as a result of the local bond made it easier for the College to address the problems associated with many of the aging facilities, additional resources are needed to cover the costs of upgrades and repairs that have not yet occurred. At this time, the District plans to leverage additional state support through a future local bond. A date for a future local bond measure has not been determined but is expected within the next few years.

In cooperation with the State Chancellor’s Office, the College undertook a major effort to inventory and assess the condition of all of its buildings during the 2003 fiscal year, and then again in 2010. The result is a comprehensive report on the physical state of all existing facilities, the District Facility Condition Assessment Report. This report is the basis from which the College submits applications to the state for funding maintenance and renovation projects. The College has begun to undertake maintenance and renovation projects cited in the report [III B-5].

The data in the 2010 District Facility Condition Assessment Report include a Facilities Conditions Index (FCI), for each facility. The FCI is the ratio of the repair cost to the replacement value of the facility. An assessment of ten percent or greater is considered poor and a score of five percent or lower is considered good. It is recommended that facilities with an FCI rating of 60 to 70 be replaced instead of repaired. As a result of these findings, the
District set a higher priority on plans for renovating and replacing facilities with the worst conditions. Forty bungalows that exceeded an FCI rating of 60 percent have been slated for replacement and 17 of those have already been removed.

The Report showed many of the District’s older facilities are in poor condition and stated an overall FCI of 37.4 percent. Given that 20 of the 32 buildings assessed were constructed prior to 1975, and in need of repairs, a somewhat low rating is to be expected. Some older facilities, such as the John Adams Campus main building, have been renovated since the last Self Study [III B-5].

While the 2005 bond provided some of the needed funds for modernization projects, another local bond issue will be needed to complete this effort. This is certainly the case for the Science Building, which has an FCI of 74 percent, and where more than $50 million is required for renovation work to replace elevator, mechanical, and electrical systems and interior finishes and furnishings that have exceeded their useful service life and are failing. Similarly, additional funds of at least $40.5 million will be needed to modernize the Horticulture, Creative Arts, Arts Extension, and Visual Arts buildings, which were constructed between 1960 and 1972. Now many of the remaining original building system components are at least 40 years old and in need of repair or replacement.

The District Facility Condition Assessment Report suggests that in a ten-year period from 2010 through 2020, the District could expend more than $180 million to maintain or replace existing facilities to provide a reasonable FCI rating of less than ten percent for District-owned facilities [III B-5].

It can be concluded that renovation of the District’s older buildings, such as Science Hall and Civic Center Campus, would be significant expenditures. These buildings have not had any extensive renovation or refurbishing similar in scope to the 2008-09 John Adams Campus modernization. Any necessary replacement of the original building systems in these aged buildings would be a costly capital improvement, and any limited state funding may also require supplementation by other funding sources. Because of limited funds, it may be worthwhile to evaluate which aged facilities should be selected for modernization, and which may be taken offline after the construction of the 2005 bond-funded new facilities has been completed.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this Standard.

City College of San Francisco provides safe and sufficient physical resources. The District has developed major new facilities and improved existing facilities that promote student learning and achievement. There has been significant participation in the facilities-planning processes through regular Shared Governance activities as well as user groups for design and remodeling of specific facilities. The College has successfully secured state funding for one additional project and another bond initiative is planned to secure funding to meet the objectives of the Facilities Master Plan.
The physical resources at all locations where the College offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluations as the basis for improvement. Additional funding will be needed to upgrade some of the District’s older buildings, such as Science Hall and the Civic Center Campus, or these facilities will continue to deteriorate. In addition, projects that have been put on hold from previous bond issues will need to be completed before new ones are attempted, such as the Environmental Horticulture/Floristry Center and the Broadcasting and Visual Arts buildings.

A Facilities Master Plan has guided the institution in the planning, building, maintenance, and upgrading and replacing of its physical resources since 2004, when it was adopted by the Board of Trustees. In cooperation with the State Chancellor’s Office, the College undertook a major effort to inventory and assess the condition of all of its buildings during fiscal year 2003 and then again in 2010. The result is the comprehensive District Facility Condition Assessment Report, which showed that many of the District’s older facilities are in poor condition. The report stated the overall FCI was 37.4 percent. The College has begun to undertake maintenance and renovation projects cited in the report. While bond funding and additional state dollars leveraged as a result of the local bond made it easier for the College to address the problems associated with many of the aging facilities, additional resources are needed to cover the costs of upgrades and repairs that have not yet occurred.

Planning Agenda

1. Implement the recommendations of the 2010 District Facility Condition Assessment Report.
2. Plan for an upcoming local bond issue for upgrades and repairs and replacement or new facilities.

III.B.1.b. The institution assures that the physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

Descriptive Summary

The dramatic efforts the College has made to improve physical resources demonstrates its commitment to providing a state-of-the-art environment for student learning programs and services, in addition to improving access, safety, and security, and creating a healthful learning and working environment. Completed projects and those, such as the Performing Arts Center, that have not yet begun, are developed to support and advance student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.

In addition to constructing new facilities, major renovation and maintenance projects are undertaken every year on District campuses to support academic programs. During 2008-10,
more than $18 million was expended to improve access for students with mobility disabilities. In addition to the ADA work, other renovation projects have included the creation of dedicated spaces for the Asian Pacific American Student Success (APASS), Math Engineering Science Achievement (MESA) and TULAY Filipino-American programs as well as a Veterans Educational Transition Services (VETS) center. The Multi-Use Building, completed in 2010, includes two new parking lots and crosswalks with traffic lights to ensure better traffic flow and pedestrian safety.

Finally, work is undertaken on an ongoing basis to maintain the quality, safety, and function of the buildings. These efforts are conducted both by District employees in the Department of Buildings and Grounds as well as on a work-order basis with the City’s Department of Public Works.

The Facilities Construction and Planning Office is responsible for directing and coordinating all projects concerning physical resources; this includes planning new facilities as well as undertaking major maintenance and renovation projects each year. This office closely coordinates efforts with the College’s Buildings and Grounds Department, which is responsible for maintaining facilities and undertaking minor repair projects. The Buildings and Grounds Department includes Custodial Services, which is responsible for keeping the facilities clean. These functions are all a part of the organization overseen by the College’s Vice-Chancellor for Finance and Administration. Security is provided by the Campus Police Department, which reports directly to the Chancellor’s Office.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this Standard.

The dramatic efforts the College has made to improve physical resources demonstrate its commitment to providing a state-of-the-art environment for student learning programs and services, in addition to improving access, safety, and security and creating a healthful learning and working environment. Projects completed to date and projects such as the Performing Arts Center, that have not yet been started, are developed to support and advance student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.

Planning Agenda

None.

III.B.2. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

III.B.2.a. Long-range capital plans support institutional goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.
Description Summary

The College’s major facilities planning documents are linked with the Facilities Master Plan, the Annual Plan and the Strategic Plan. In addition, on an annual basis all departments and major cost centers state their facilities needs and goals in their Program Review reports. For long-range facilities planning, the College is linking the Program Review process, which gathers feedback directly from the programs and departments, more closely with the Facilities Master Plan. Departments are asked to develop clear statements about the need for and the impact of new facilities, major renovations, and new equipment on their departments and programs. All requests require supporting utilization and other data that substantiate need. As all College programs and departments continue to participate in the annual Program Review process, the planning and assessment “feedback loop” will be more streamlined, which will ensure evaluation of the facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account in how the College supports academic programs and student support services [III B-1, III B-6, III B-7, III B-8, III B-9].

The Facilities Review Committee (FRC) makes recommendations on both long-range and short-range facilities plans for all College campuses based upon the College’s priorities. The Committee meets on a regular basis to solicit ideas from faculty, staff, administrators, and students for major and minor facilities projects and equipment upgrades [III B-10].

In the past, the College’s efforts to provide for the total cost of ownership, a concept that seeks to measure not just the cost of planning and construction but also the cost of operating a facility over its expected lifetime, have been limited. More recently, the College established a users’ group for design review and total cost of ownership in the planning for the College’s next project, the new Performing Arts Education Center [III B-11].

In support of institutional goals and cost effectiveness of physical facilities, the College has dedicated considerable energy to improving its operation of physical resources by developing the physical facilities component of a Sustainability Plan that the Board of Trustees adopted in December 2009. The College has become more proactive with respect to environmental issues surrounding new construction while trying to drive long-term energy cost savings. In all of its current projects, the College has directed its architectural teams to incorporate conservation of resources in their final designs to the extent that construction budgets allow. Sustainable design, planning, architecture, indoor/outdoor environment, and Leadership in Energy and Building Design (LEED) Green Building standards are addressed in the 2004 Facilities Master Plan approved by the Board. The College is proud that the Multi-Use Building, completed in July 2010, is expected to receive a LEED Gold rating. The Chinatown/North Beach Campus when completed in 2012 is expected to receive a LEED Gold rating as well [III B-12].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this Standard.

The College plans rather comprehensively for upgrading, replacing, and maintaining its
facilities and major equipment. Moreover, it has developed part of a Sustainability Plan. However, the College’s past efforts to provide for the total cost of ownership have been limited. More recently, the College established a users’ group for design review and total cost of ownership in the planning for its next project, the new Performing Arts Education Center.

Planning Agenda

1. Focus efforts on determining total cost of ownership for all upcoming building projects.

III.B.2.b. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

The College has integrated facilities planning into its institutional planning process while systematically assessing the effective use of physical resources and using those results as a basis for improvement. Fostering a strategic approach to addressing the physical resource needs of its students, faculty, and staff, this process makes effective use of the College’s Shared Governance System, including the planning and budgeting process, to evaluate and, when possible, to dedicate resources to these needs.

The College’s Shared Governance Facilities Review Committee actively participated in the development of the Facilities Master Plan. Adopted in 2004, this ten-year plan for building, replacing, and renovating College facilities was developed with the assistance of a facilities planning firm experienced in college master plan development. The District has other assessment mechanisms for evaluating the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services. For example, the District Facility Condition Assessment Report, which was discussed earlier in this Standard, provides a periodic inventory and assessment of the physical condition of all buildings [III B-1, III B-5, III B-10].

The College also has an extensive strategic planning process for the construction of new facilities and the upgrading and maintenance of existing facilities. Each year the Shared Governance Facilities Review Committee recommends to the Board of Trustees projects to be submitted to the California State Chancellor’s Office in priority order for capital project funding. This list, commonly known as the Five-Year Construction Plan, is submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval early in the spring of each year. Upon approval by the Board of Trustees, the plan is then submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office [III B-13].

Physical resource planning is also fully integrated into the College’s yearly institutional planning process. Shared Governance committees meet at regular intervals throughout the semester to discuss and evaluate facilities needs. The committees involved in this discussion include: the Facilities Review Committee (FRC); the Sustainability Subcommittee; the Campus Projects Subcommittee; the Parking and Traffic Subcommittee; the Works of Art
Subcommittee; and the Health and Safety Subcommittee. There are also regular reviews, such as the bi-annual insurance safety inspection report, and special reports, such as the annual space inventory and facilities condition reports, that assess the use of College facilities. As discussed earlier in this report, the annual Program Review reports from departments and major cost centers also describe their facilities needs and goals. Recommendations from the annual Program Review for facilities upgrade and maintenance are usually based on faculty and staff input related to improving the physical environment for student learning.

For example, the Works of Arts Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, operates in conjunction with other facilities-related committees to obtain, maintain, and enhance the many works of art associated with the College. Since the last Self Study-, CCSF has acquired several new pieces of art, including the Whale Fountain on the main Ocean Campus, the “Our Work Our Life” mural at the Evans Campus, the large Aztec Calendar on the front of the new Mission Campus, as well as other murals, lithographs, and even some dinosaur skeletons. Restorations of mosaics, murals, sculptures, and busts have been completed. A critically needed physical assessment of the Diego Rivera mural is planned. Other projects to bring more art to District campuses are also in progress. Some of these works of art, such as the Diego Rivera mural, are integrated into the curriculum [III B-14].

Integrated planning is also accomplished through the planning, budgeting, and assessment system that is led by the shared governance College Planning and Budget Council [III B-15]. The planning process begins with the Strategic Plan, which is supplemented by the Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan, and Sustainability Plan. From the Strategic Plan, other more detailed plans are developed, such as the Annual Plan, Annual Budget, and Assessment Reports. This system wide evaluation, planning, and implementation process fully integrates physical resources as a component. This process assures that physical resources are designed and used to meet the College’s educational mission.

The College actively seeks input from the general public on major facilities projects. The College specifically sought public input and support for the District Facilities Master Plan by conducting multiple public hearings as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and by offering multiple community-outreach meetings that were not required by CEQA. The College works with many neighborhood groups and city agencies to integrate its facilities plans with the City’s General Plan and neighborhood planning goals [III B-16].

Since the last Self Study, the College has significantly improved communications related to facilities across departments and offices. The Facilities Review Committee and its Campus Projects Subcommittee review all plans and proposals for both renovations and new construction. In addition, each major facility has a Building Users Group (BUG) that develops needs proposals for departments and building users. Before any facility has major changes implemented, the BUG group must be consulted. This process has promoted more meaningful interactions between the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Facilities and Planning to assure the quality of programs and services as well as the health and safety of students.
Self Evaluation

The College meets this Standard.

The College has integrated facilities planning into its institutional planning process while assessing the effective use of physical resources and using the results obtained from a variety of sources (e.g., BUG groups, Program Review, the District Facility Condition Assessment Report, and strategic planning processes) as a basis for improvement.

Planning Agenda

1. Review the need for a more formal evaluation process for systematically assessing the effective use of physical resources and using those results as a basis for improvement.
2. Complete the physical assessment of the Diego Rivera mural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III B-1</td>
<td>District Facilities Master Plan, June 10, 2004</td>
<td>X</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/M?/main.shtml">http://www.ccsf.edu/M?/main.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III B-2</td>
<td>11/97 General Obligation Bond Election Book list of projects, project schedules and current Controller’s report on budgets, encumbrances &amp; expenditures, August 2004</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III B-3</td>
<td>11/01 General Obligation Bond Election Book list of projects, project schedules and current Controller’s report on budgets, encumbrances &amp; expenditures, August 2004</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III B-4</td>
<td>11/05 General Obligation Bond Election Book list of projects, project schedules and current Controller’s report on budgets, encumbrances &amp; expenditures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III B-5</td>
<td>District Facility Condition Assessment Report, August 29, 2010</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III B-11</td>
<td>Users’ Group Design Review of Performing Arts Education Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard III.C: Technology Resources

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.C.1. The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.

III.C.1.a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco provides technology resources, services, and support in order to improve the effectiveness of the institution and meet the needs of the learning and teaching community. Technology is crucial to the support of CCSF’s Mission and Vision, and discussions and decisions concerning technology are made through multiple shared-governance and institutional-planning processes.

Technology resources and services are provided by Information Technology Services, which includes four units: Technical Services, Technical Operations, Project Management and Consulting, and Administration, that provide service and support such as the Service Desk, desktop services, networking and infrastructure, computer lab management, enterprise computing resources, programming, administrative support, and telephony services.

The Educational Technology Department (ETD) includes the Technology Learning Center (TLC) and the Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) unit. ETD oversees the development, delivery, and support of all online classes using Insight (CCSF’s learning management system); trains and supports faculty to use technology to enhance face-to-face classes with Insight; manages the TLC laboratory, which serves as an open computer lab for faculty and staff as well as an area for training faculty; and oversees and implements the Educational Technology component of the College’s Technology Plan. Other units providing technology services and covered by the Technology Plan are Broadcast Media Services (BMS), which provides instructional video production, editing, and duplication services for the College; Educational Access Television (EATV); Student Development departments; and Library and Learning Resources (LLR), whose services are described in II.B and II.C.

Technical Services staff are responsible for the infrastructure and equipment for 78 computer labs housing around 2,000 computers available for student use. There are also about 3,000 computers in use by faculty and classified staff. Budget constraints limit hours of access for students, as no lab is open later than 9:00 p.m. on weekdays or 3:00 p.m. on Saturdays. There is currently no access to computer labs on Sundays.

The College uses an integrated planning process to develop the Technology Plan, which
ensures that its various types of technology needs are identified. The CCSF Vision, Mission, Strategic Plan, and Annual Plan drive the Technology Plan’s conceptual framework and implementation [III C-1, III C-2, III C-3, III C-4, III C-5]. The 2009-11 Technology Plan is evidence based and addresses the technology needs as articulated by faculty, staff, and students. These constituents provide input by means of the Shared Governance process (e.g., the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable), departmental committees (e.g. the Library Technology Committee), from requests/problems logged by Service Desk and other technology staff, and from comments and suggestions provided in surveys and suggestions coming from employees and students who use technology for a variety of purposes.

Using the Technology Plan as a road map, the College selects projects that provide students and the District with the maximum benefits in the most cost-effective manner. The key goals outlined in the current plan strive to “promote institutional effectiveness, efficiencies, and learning, to provide guidelines and standards for technology-enhanced curriculum, and to bridge the digital divide, empowering students for mastery of information competency and attainment of their educational goals” [III C-1].

The following is a list of the most important technology-driven developments designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, College wide communications, research, and operational effectiveness since the last Self Study.

**Teaching and Learning**

- The College has expanded its online course offerings from 85 sections in Fall 2005 to 174 sections in Spring 2011.
- Distance-learning courses are offered in 27 academic departments, all six schools within Academic Affairs, and in Library and Learning Resources.
- In some departments, a student can complete all of the requirements for a certificate by taking online classes or telecourses.
- Students can complete approximately 90 percent of the courses required to fulfill the CSU GE or IGETC pattern by taking online classes or telecourses.
- By the end of 2010-11, 253 face-to-face sections were tech-enhanced, an increase of over 100 percent from the Fall 2006 semester.
- Nine percent of students taking an academic class at CCSF have taken a distance-learning course.
- As of Fall 2010, CCSF converted all online academic courses from the learning management system WebCT to Insight (Moodle™). When the College contracted with a vendor to host the learning management system, provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security were all negotiated within the contract between the vendor and CCSF.
- CCSF’s Educational Technology Department partnered with EduStream to offer faculty access to a centralized library of on-demand videos that can be streamed for a face-to-face class, referenced in a tech-enhanced course, or required as part of an online class.
- Multimedia equipment was installed in 50 classrooms, the highest concentration being at the Mission Campus and the Ocean Campus Multi-Use Building (MUB).
• EATV upgraded its equipment to automate the workflow supporting the City and County of San Francisco’s two educational access television channels, which are operated by the College to provide educational programming and courses for college credit 24/7.

• Two distance-learning rooms with control room are designated in the new MUB. Faculty and staff met to plan deployment of these rooms in Spring 2011. Equipment has been ordered, and further meetings are planned for Fall 2011.

**College Wide Communications**

• In 2009 the College launched a redesigned website with a more user-friendly interface and standardized appearance as provided by a new Content Management System (CMS) that also allows CCSF content developers to work from any computer with Internet access. The redesigned site includes Google search, an enhanced online Library catalog, and improved back-end web technology.

• ITS implemented CCSF email accounts, via Google gmail, for all credit and noncredit students, thus improving communication with faculty and student services staff.

• ITS implemented the wireless LAN network with 78 access points available across the College, covering approximately 20 percent of the District.

• ITS implemented text messaging as an option for students to receive communications.

• ITS implemented Google applications such as document creation to improve communications.

• ITS posted an online Access Guide with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mobility information about renovation and construction updates, accessible paths, disabled-only parking, ramps, elevators, and other disability-related features.

• The Office of Outreach and Recruitment began use of social media such as Facebook to communicate with students. Other departments and divisions are also using social media to network with students and alumni.

• Student Health Services implemented Medicat®, an electronic healthcare information system.

**Facilitating Student Access and Success**

• Admissions and Records staff implemented CCCApply, the online application to California Community Colleges.

• The Scheduling Office, in conjunction with ITS, has greatly enhanced the online version of the Class Schedule, such as providing links to textbook information from each course section listing. Admissions and Records staff provided dedicated online credit and noncredit application workstations at all principal campuses.

• Admissions and Records staff formalized electronic transcript data exchange agreements with local universities.

• The College implemented photo-identification cards, including a unique, scannable barcode number for all credit and noncredit students and employees.

• Counselors use the automated Academic and Progress Review to monitor student progress.
• Matriculation staff use computerized enforcement of prerequisites to facilitate the registration process.
• The Matriculation staff with the help of ITS installed computerized testing centers in the Downtown and Mission campuses.
• The Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) computer labs on the Ocean and John Adams campuses were updated and remodeled to allow for better wheelchair access.

**Improving Operational Effectiveness**

• Several online and database systems have been developed by a partnership between ITS staff and staff in the Office of Instruction to streamline faculty evaluations, tenure review, Program Review, Curriculum Committee agendas and minutes, non-class-related room reservations, and sabbatical leaves.
• EATV, Broadcast Media Services, and Technical Services have collaborated to implement live streaming, closed-captioned webcasts of Board of Trustee meetings, which will be archived and indexed for easy public access. The system’s potential for distance learning is being explored.
• Developments in IT infrastructure and support include:
  o implementing a Storage Area Network (SAN) solution to provide a more reliable data-storage environment and an enterprise-wide data backup solution to assist in data recovery;
  o completing the connection of all sites to the fiber ring, with the exception of the Chinatown/North Beach Campus;
  o implementing the Banner Document Management System, which provides imaging of student records formerly held in hard copy;
  o implementing AccuTrack access management software in select computer labs for more efficient, accurate accounting of student lab use;
  o completing an upgrade to Banner 8;
  o establishing a documentation advisory workgroup to collect and standardize IT documentation;
  o implementing a self-service ticketing system in Spring 2011 to allow end users to monitor progress of their service request and to allow for better utilization and evaluation of IT staff resources; and
  o increasing the hours of the Help Desk to cover lunch hours.

**Student and employee surveys** from 2010 and 2011 provide data that support the effectiveness and satisfaction with certain technology applications and facilities. For example:

• The 2010 Credit Student Survey Report included several technology-related items for which students rated their satisfaction. For computer labs, 81% of 2,711 students rated the labs as “good” or “excellent” compared to 78 percent who gave the same ratings in the 2004 survey. Most notable in 2010 is the 37 percent who rated the labs “excellent” compared to 29 percent in 2004 [III C-6].
• In addition, for the CCSF website, CCSF email, and the student portal Web4, 73 percent to a high of 80 percent rated these online services as “good” or “excellent”
(These items were not on the 2004 student survey.) [III C-6].

- Relevant survey items from the 2011 Employee Survey Report reflect overall mean ratings of “good” for service provided at the Help (Service) Desk (3.2 rating with 462 respondents) and the Instructional Computing Lab (3.2 rating with 171 respondents) [III C-7].

- Distance learning student surveys were used to assess online learning through Fall 2008. The findings were shared with online course instructors who used the information to improve their courses. In Spring 2009 the College began migrating courses from the WebCT learning management system to Moodle. In addition to the issues related to determining that the host for College online courses would be stable and reliable, the state Chancellor’s Office began conducting surveys of distance education students. During 2009-10 ETD suspended conducting surveys of students enrolled in telecourses because of budget issues. ETD staff collect, analyze, and use the feedback from the online student help tickets to update and modify the online FAQ information and other documentation for online students [III C-8].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Even with the poor economic environment and some staff shortages, technology resources have been effectively harnessed to support the needs of learning and teaching, College wide communications, research, student access, and operational systems.

The implementation of the new website, student email, and Google applications has upgraded and expanded the use of technology systems and improved levels of communication, organizational effectiveness, and efficiency at CCSF. However, improvements are still needed. CCSF needs to encourage and provide more support and training to departments to migrate content from the former website to the new website. In addition, to maximize the productivity of the College website, the vacant website content manager position in the Office of Marketing and Public Information should be filled when funds become available.

While many units have developed efficient online systems and enhancements to assist faculty and students with teaching and learning activities, improving communications, student access, information gathering, and delivery, and other operational systems, there are still paper-based systems which could be automated to increase productivity.

Concern continues about insufficient electrical power in the data and computer center in Batman Hall, which hampers the College’s use of technology on the Ocean Campus. Thankfully, a resolution was approved at the October 2010 Board of Trustees meeting authorizing an engineering study to determine the exact needs and scope of the project [III C-9].

Wireless connectivity is not reliably available in some facility areas where it is needed. An RFP seeking replacement of the current wireless LAN equipment has been developed and
proposals are currently being reviewed.

CCSF students continue to experience a “digital divide.” While economically advantaged students can access a wide range of instructional and academic support materials online on their own equipment at any time, other students must come in person to labs where, during peak hours, they must compete for insufficient resources. Economically disadvantaged students who lack computers and/or Internet access at home have no access to online resources and equipment when campus computer labs close relatively early in the evenings, or on Sundays when all labs are closed.

**Planning Agenda**

1. Plan for the implementation of the results of the engineering study related to insufficient electrical power in the data and computer center in Batmale Hall.
2. Assess the causes related to unreliable wireless connectivity in affected facilities to determine if solutions are possible to implement.
3. Encourage migration of content to current website, increase training and support to departments and offices that have not yet migrated content from the former website.
4. When funding becomes available, fill the vacant website content manager position in the Office of Marketing and Public Information.

**III.C.1.b. The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Faculty and staff training and technical assistance needs are provided by the Technology Learning Center (TLC), the Technology Mediated Instruction Office (TMI), and individually by the staff as well as by online documentation and tutorials provided on the website. The TLC staff works with faculty and ITS staff to decide on the most appropriate training to conduct each semester given the budget allowance. Discussions and suggestions concerning the needs for educational technology and training also emerge from the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable (TLTR), whose purpose is to recommend policies for the use of technology for instructional support and student services. Training in all these areas has decreased with the recent and ongoing budget cutbacks.

The TLC organizes the Technology Professional Development Training Program, which provides training for faculty and staff on a variety of educational and applications software through a schedule of ongoing workshops and Flex Day activities each semester. Training is delivered in a variety of modes to meet the needs of CCSF faculty and staff. From hands-on workshops, to online training and sessions created specifically for departments’ needs, TLC staff provide tools that educators in the 21st Century need to be effective teachers.

When the College implemented the new website technology, the TLC worked to develop Content Management System training and assisted ITS staff with training, outreach, and
documentation. The TLC, in conjunction with ITS trainers, is also developing and delivering training on CCSF email and Google applications for employees. During the 2010-11 academic year, TLC staff provided 111 workshops in the TLC Lab for 677 faculty, classified staff, and administrators. Individual consultations numbered 287, equating to 98 hours of training time during the same year. In order to gauge the success of the training workshops by TLC staff, evaluation forms are provided to all participants. The 2010-11 workshop evaluations show that 83 percent of attendees who filled out the forms (N=126) rated the workshops as excellent and 17 percent who filled out the forms (N=25) rated them as good [III C-10].

TMI staff supports the online, technology-enhanced, and telecourse curriculum TMI provides training for faculty converting a class from a face-to-face mode to online delivery. With budget cuts in Fall 2009, TMI sustained a 50 percent cut to its training budget, resulting in funding only 24 units of online credit course development per academic year. In Spring 2010, TMI began providing training for faculty wanting to use Insight, the College’s learning management system, to technologically enhance a face-to-face course. That semester TMI staff trained credit and noncredit faculty at the Evans Campus on how to tech-enhance their courses. That was the first such training at another campus and the first to include noncredit faculty.

Evidence for the effectiveness of ETD training activities comes from the 2011 Employee Survey Report [III C-7], where the mean rating of the 361 respondents was a 3.12 (“good”) for training on educational and applications software and, for the item related to distance learning training and support, the 220 respondents assigned a rating of 3.1. The 2011 Credit Student Survey Report had no specific question asking students to rate technology training but the Spring 2011 Library survey had three related items: Of the 968 student respondents who had completed one or more of the online or in-class research information competency skills workshops, 97.2 percent (N = 935) were satisfied or very satisfied with the training they received in the workshops. In response to the statement “Due to the library facilities, services, and programs, I am better able to effectively use computers and information technology” 40 percent of the 1,862 respondents marked “usually” and 31 percent marked “often” [III C-11].

In Fall 2010, when TMI began providing faculty and students with more advanced topic-specific workshops focused on Insight, the following three projects were implemented:

- The front page of Insight was redesigned in order to provide more focused training to students and faculty.
- An online searchable knowledge base was activated for faculty and students to continue training on Insight using a self-paced format.
- TMI began working directly with departments to provide tech-enhanced trainings to meet more specific student needs. For example, TMI provides support for the English Department, which has a new accelerated pathway for students and is planning to use a tech-enhanced model to deliver the English 96/1A coursework.

Faculty and staff also receive technical assistance from the Service Desk in the following areas: desktop (hardware and software), printer, and equipment support; phone support; and
support for College wide applications such as Banner, GroupWise, and Web4. Due to the increasing use of technology by faculty and staff, the Service Desk is faced with an escalating demand to deliver technology support to users across all of the campuses. ETD and IT staff have developed online tutorials and other documentation to help address some of the demand for individual assistance [III C-11].

Technology training for students occurs within certain courses as well as outside the classroom. In addition to classroom activities, students use and improve their technology skills in a number of ways at CCSF, including the use of the wireless LAN network, Web4 online registration, accessing student account information, using Insight, CCSF student email, financial aid software, and Google applications. Staff in the Student Services Division, the Library, and in public computer labs train and provide individual assistance for students using many of these applications. For example, counselors in the Career Development Counseling Department train students to use the Eureka career-assessment software. Another example is the staff in the various public computer labs, such as the Academic Computing Resource Center, the DSPS High-Tech Center, and retention program computer labs, who assist and train students in the use of applications software.

Curriculum-related training occurs in many courses that have computer labs, such as accounting, biology, English, and graphic design. Staff in these departmental computer labs help students learn to master the required courseware and software applications. Two examples are 1) the TMI, in partnership with the Learning Assistance Center, where staff created a one-unit online course, “Successful Online Learning,” to train students how to effectively navigate a distance education course; and 2) the Library staff who provide students training in research and information competency skills via on-site and online workshops required by many courses, such as English 1A.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel. Faculty and staff training and technical assistance needs are provided by several units: the Technology Learning Center (TLC), the Technology Mediated Instruction Office (TMI), and individually by the Service Desk and online documentation and tutorials. In addition, library faculty train students in online research/information competency skills as well as provide individual training to faculty and students about using online resources and technology applications. Staff in many departments of the Student Services Division also provide group and individual training for students, such as in Career Development and the Learning Assistance Center. Overall, students and faculty rate technology training as good.

Although CCSF provides training for employees, the budget constraints have made the Technology Learning Center cut back on much of the non-essential training. In order to better provide the necessary knowledge to improve teaching and learning at CCSF, a number of actions are recommended to increase professional development. First, the ETD office
should identify and establish teams of trainers from different departments to help expand training in education technology and operational software across the College. In addition, it should increase the use of training through grants, or an incentive program for further professional development and drive collaboration to learn about state-of-the-art training tools with other community colleges and universities. It should also explore and establish best technology practices for noncredit classes, identify and use noncredit faculty to test and establish these best practices, and develop department-specific trainings across the campuses as the budget allows.

The ETD training budget for faculty to develop online courses has been significantly cut. ETD will not be able to expand the number of online classes without a budget to train new instructors. In addition, the lab spaces used to train instructors and for faculty to use for on-campus meetings were reassigned. Currently, facilities for these activities are not available. Expansion of online programs cannot occur without adequate support from the College, including funding for equipment and maintenance of hardware and software, and the replacement of staff who retire from or leave CCSF. Recruitment is currently underway to fill the full-time instructional designer position.

Planning Agenda

1. Align budget priorities to support the training needs of instructors who want to learn to teach online or use technology to enhance their teaching.
2. Restore the lab space formerly assigned to ETD so that adequate facilities are available for technology training to faculty and staff.

III.C.1.c. The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.

Descriptive Summary

The 2009-11 Technology Plan details goals for institutional needs at CCSF. Each Annual Plan guides near-term implementation of the Technology Plan and reflects any necessary adjustments revealed through Program Review. Departments write an annual Program Review report, which describes their budget and technical needs, among other things. The College’s Budget and Planning Council (College’s PBC) is responsible for developing and reviewing all College wide plans and also, via its Program Review Committee, reviewing findings from the Program Review process. Through the College’s PBC, the College decides in a centralized manner how to upgrade and replace technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs. The institutional planning process is also discussed in more detail in III.C.2 below [III C-1, III C-5, III C-12, III C-13].

In crafting the most recent Technology Plan, the College considered that technology decisions tend to be high-stakes decisions involving large amounts of resources and having consequences lasting many years. Cost and performance were main considerations. Dealing with challenging state cutbacks, the College planned to be efficient and effective in its use of
resources, setting priorities despite severely constrained departmental budgets. Fortunately, effective implementation of technology may also provide demonstrable cost efficiencies throughout the College. In addition, grant funding or bond funding may be successfully pursued for many projects. A great deal of the current technology implementation at the College has been financed by bond proceeds from the 2001 and 2005 CCSF bond initiatives. However, expenditures of bond funds for technology have been suspended until the College can be sure that the technology needs of new buildings will be funded. Although the possibility of a Phase 3 bond has been discussed, the Board of Trustees has not voted to pursue such a bond, and the economic climate may make passage difficult.

Although grant and bond funding may be good sources for starting new projects, funding for ongoing operational support and maintenance requires a continuous source that grant and bond funding do not supply. Funding for ongoing operational support needs to be identified for existing as well as new technology projects.

The Service Desk has been one of the primary avenues to report technology problems, whether related to training, maintenance, or replacement issues. In order to streamline the IT support process at CCSF, a new ticketing system was implemented in Spring 2011 that tracks IT issues and evaluates response time and service.

Technical support staff make recommendations to management about the type and frequency of preventative maintenance. An estimate of the remaining useful life of equipment is made throughout the year in order to help plan for replacement of servers [III C-6].

System reliability has been achieved through a combination of proactive preventive maintenance, replacement of aging infrastructure, and software upgrades. Currently only a limited number of systems have an emergency backup; however, a project has recently been started that will provide emergency backup of mission-critical systems through the use of virtualization technologies.

Even though a limited amount of hardware has backup, it should be noted that all critical data, such as email, website content, and Banner information, is routinely backed up and stored at an off-site, geographically separated data-storage facility. A plan for full redundancy of all mission-critical systems is expected to be in place by the end of 2012 [III C-6].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The institution systematically and effectively plans for the technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs. Planning for ongoing maintenance, upgrades, and replacements is also systematic. Acquisition of needed technology resources is heavily dependent on funding and although grant and bond funding may be good sources for starting new projects, funding for ongoing operational support and maintenance requires a continuous source that grant and bond funding do not supply.

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
Planning Agenda

1. Identify funding for ongoing operational support needs for existing as well as new technology projects.
2. Complete plan for full redundancy of back-up systems for all mission-critical systems.

III.C.1.d. The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

The institutional processes that determine the use and distribution of technology resources at CCSF are also discussed in sections III.C.1 and III.C.2. The allocation of funds for technology projects follows the Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, Annual Plan, and Program Review reports and is reviewed by the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council. Capital equipment requests are made as part of the annual budgeting process [III C-1, III C-3, III C-5, III C-14].

In addition to these processes, several Shared Governance committees are responsible for recommending policy and driving details of the discussion about utilization of technology resources. The Information Technology Policy Committee (ITPC) recommends policy regarding technology usage. The Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable (TLTR) provides a monthly forum for faculty to discuss their technology needs, and the Communications Committee manages policies concerning website design and content. The Distance Learning Advisory Committee (DLAC) oversees the policies concerning distance education at CCSF, including online and telecourses [III C-15, III C-16, III C-17, III C-18].

Rapidly evolving technological innovations have a significant impact on how CCSF delivers services to students and the educational community. While many organizations move to deliver more and more information on the Web and other devices rather than in print, CCSF has also enhanced the way it delivers information. The mobility of content, accessible via ever-smaller and more powerful mobile devices, is also a trend that drives technology priorities. The College has responded to changing lifestyles and demands by implementing more efficient ways to provide information and services to students and faculty. These efforts, such as mass emailings to students that save the cost of paper, ink, stamps, envelopes, and staff hours preparing the mailing, also help create more sustainable practices.

The College provides for a robust and secure technical infrastructure via a firewall, the physical separation of the network infrastructure into an administrative side and an instructional side, account passwords, use of switch ports, use of standardized anti-virus and anti-spam software, and secure logon and passwords into the enterprise information system. In addition, all enterprise servers are backed up on a regular basis. Enterprise-level software is kept up to date to ensure vendor support.
The College keeps its infrastructure up to date by establishing standards for its cabling infrastructure to be applied to all new construction, by purchasing technology products early in the product life cycle to ensure that equipment will have a maximum lifespan of use before becoming obsolete, and by making cost-effective design decisions. Infrastructure is periodically reviewed in order to determine its level of usability and an estimate is made on its remaining useful life. Equipment is replaced as it becomes out of date or fails, resources permitting.

Although these operational reviews are ongoing, CCSF relies on manufacturer’s maintenance and service advice codes to extend equipment’s serviceable life. A priority during this next technology review cycle is to put a plan in place so that the IT department can be proactive instead of reactive concerning replacement of key operational systems.

The 2011 Strategic Plan and 2009-11 Technology Plan both outline the priorities for distance learning. The Technology Mediated Instruction Office, which is part of the Educational Technology Department, continues to successfully support online courses, tech-enhanced classes, and telecourses. Staff in this office develop College wide guidelines and standards regarding educational technology, overseeing and implementing the Education Technology Plan section of the Technology Plan [III C-1, III C-3].

Two other Shared Governance committees also provide input to the ETD to further strengthen distance-learning programs and courses. As discussed earlier, the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable is a Shared Governance committee whose purpose is to recommend policies for the use of technology in instructional support and student services. Much of the discussion at monthly meetings concerns development and improvement of distance-learning courses or support services for students and instructors involved in them. The Distance Learning Advisory Committee reviews applications to develop online courses and telecourses. These two committees meet monthly and provide feedback about whether technology is effectively distributed and used within the distance-learning program [III C-16, III C-18].

In 2009, when the College decided to switch to a new learning management system for distance education classes because the WebCT-Blackboard system was not delivering the quality of service that faculty and students required, a lengthy College wide discussion and review of new learning management tools took place in multiple committees and groups over several months. Following the review, the College chose Moodle as its new learning-management system. While WebCT-Blackboard had been hosted locally, the institution decided to host Moodle and all of the College’s online classes through a private web-hosting and support company. This decision was made to ensure that the workload of the ETD didn’t increase. The move also decreased the cost per student while improving reliability and scalability of our programs. When faculty and students were disappointed with the reliability of the first hosting vendor, the decision was made to move to another company [III C-19].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.
The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of the programs and services at the College. Rapidly evolving technological innovations have a significant impact on how CCSF delivers services to students and the educational community. CCSF has responded to the changing lifestyles and demands by implementing more efficient ways to provide information and services to students and faculty. This effort has also created more sustainable practices that reduce waste.

At CCSF, technology infrastructure is reviewed periodically to determine the level of usability, and systems are replaced as they become out of date or fail, resources permitting.

**Planning Agenda**

1. Implement a system to estimate the useful life of equipment so that the College can be proactive instead of reactive concerning replacement of key operational systems.

**III.C.2. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Since 1997 CCSF has integrated technology planning into institutional planning through its Technology Plan, which develops from a shared governance process and includes input from relevant committees and the Board of Trustees. The CCSF Vision, Mission, and Strategic Plan drive the Technology Plan’s conceptual framework and implementation [III C-1, III C-2, III C-3, III C-4]. The 2009-11 Technology Plan is evidence based and addresses the technology needs as articulated by administrators, faculty, staff, and students. These constituents provide input by means of the Shared Governance process (e.g. Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable), departmental committees (e.g. the Library Technology Committee), from requests and problems logged by Service Desk staff and other technology staff, and from comments and suggestions provided in surveys and coming from employees and students who use technology for a variety of purposes.

Technical Services continually assesses its work regarding customer service and service support. Inputs from District committees such as the ITPC, TLTR, and Technology Advisory Groups, as well as inputs from Associated Students, Academic Senate, Department Chairpersons Council, and the Classified Senate all contribute to efforts to improve service and service support. Additionally, the newly established work order system used by the Technology Service Desk provides insight into maintenance issues, mean-time-to-repair (MTTR), and serviceability of equipment. These insights help to improve customer service and support as well as indicate the direction classroom and infrastructure technology will go. Further, a continuous process of evaluating project outcomes and technology advancements all provide important feedback for technology decision making.
The allocation of funds for technology projects follows the Strategic Plan, the Technology Plan, and the Annual Plan and is approved by the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC), as discussed in sections III.C.1 and III.C.1.a of this report.

The Annual Plan is based primarily upon the College’s Strategic Plan. The Annual Plan serves as an operational version of the College’s plans for a one-year period; it consists of a set of institutional objectives that are to be achieved by the College through the efforts of the College’s departments, schools, and administrative operations. Clear objectives are provided each year to encourage each department to align its plans with overall College plans and the implementation of technology initiatives [III C-5].

With respect to evaluation, departments and student service divisions undertake a Program Review process, where they examine and report on their specific needs and goals, reflecting on the success at meeting previous objectives. ITS also submits an annual self assessment, documenting progress in accomplishing objectives [III C-20]. The College’s PBC, through its Program Review Committee, reviews all these unit plans so that requests for funds are viewed from an institutional perspective [III C-13].

Resources for academic support are allocated through the instructional departments and their respective school deans. In the annual Program Review process, departments analyze their program budgets, student learning outcomes, and department needs and describe future plans for extending or upgrading technology. This process also includes the College’s PBC. Fewer resources have been available due to budget cuts, and technology resources for individual departments have suffered for this reason [III C-12, III C-13].

The Technology Plan is a living document that is subject to continuous review in order to adapt to technological changes and shifts in College resources and priorities. The plan provides detailed information for each unit, including Information Technology Services (ITS), Educational Technology Department (ETD), Broadcast Media Services (BMS), Educational Access Television (EATV), Student Development, and Library and Learning Resources (LLR).

The process of creating the 2009-11 Technology Plan was an inclusive one: A workgroup was formed of faculty, staff, and administrators representing ITS, ETD, the Technology Learning Center (TLC), the Office of Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI), the Office of Student Development, LLR, the Office of Planning/Institutional Advancement, the Office of Academic Affairs, the Information Technology Policy Committee (ITPC), and the College Advisory Council (CAC) [III C-1].

Using the Technology Plan as a roadmap, the District selects projects that provide students and the College with the maximum benefits in the most cost-effective manner. The key goals outlined in the current plan strive to “promote institutional effectiveness, efficiencies, and learning, to provide guidelines and standards for technology-enhanced curriculum, and to bridge the digital divide, empowering students for mastery of information competency and attainment of their educational goals” [III C-1]. In implementing the Technology Plan,
guidelines set forth in the CCSF Sustainability Plan were also followed. With respect to energy conservation and recycling, the College is currently implementing sustainability measures to recycle and reduce energy consumption and other waste [III C-21].

The College also relies on its shared governance process to review and provide input into technology decisions. Throughout the year, there are meetings of the ITPC, which is the Shared Governance committee that provides policy recommendations to the CAC concerning technology. The Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable (TLTR) reviews the technology needs of learning and teaching. These Shared Governance groups review and provide feedback to draft plans, review and recommend policies for the use of technology, and evaluate progress and results [III C-15, III C-16, III C-22].

In the selection of software, CCSF has established selection criteria to ensure maximum benefit. Institutional applications are chosen with an eye towards scalability, security, reliability, data integrity, ease of use, and robustness. They should also encourage innovation. Instructional applications are chosen with criteria about access, ease of use, suitability for course management, ability to address the needs, learning styles and learning outcomes of CCSF students, and faculty and staff training needs. In all College technology purchases, sustainability, including total cost of ownership, is an important factor.

Recent California state budget cuts have compelled the College to evaluate the staffing levels for its technology functions to establish better user support and more efficient use of IT personnel. Starting in the 2009-10 school year, the College began a review of its staffing levels and utilization in the Information Technology Services area. At that time, Information Technology (IT) and Information Services (IS) personnel were distributed throughout the institution in many departments and offices in a highly decentralized manner. During the course of review, the College determined that it could increase efficiency and productivity by consolidating its technology workforce. Starting in the 2010-11 academic year, all classified employees with civil service classifications in the IT and IS categories were reassigned to the ITS department. Moreover, the position of Chief Technology Officer was established and the person hired began work in Summer 2010.

Findings from employee and student surveys are useful evidence that technology programs and services are effective. In the 2011 Employee Survey Report, respondents gave all areas of the Technology Learning Center slightly more than a “Good” rating, with the Service Desk earning a 3.16 on a 4-point scale with 3 defined as “Good” (N = 462), the Training Programs 3.12 (N = 361), and the Distance Learning and Support 3.10 (N = 220). Other technology areas generally received scores greater than 3, including the Education Technology Department (3.16, N = 171), Instructional Computer Lab Support (3.04, N = 234), Library and Learning Resources (3.34, N = 281), and Broadcast Media Services (3.21, N = 198). The Information Technology Services area did not score quite as high, with Banner Support scoring 2.79 (N = 433) and Computer and Network Support scoring 2.97 (N = 528) [III C-7].

The 2010 Student Survey Report indicated a fairly positive response to questions about technology, with 81 percent (N = 2,196) of the students rating the computer labs good or
better (37 percent, rating them excellent and 44 percent good). Other ratings include: more than 77 percent of the students rated the online class schedule good or excellent ($N = 2,068$); more than 80 percent of the students rated the online registration and add/drop system good or excellent ($N = 2,783$); and nearly 75 percent of the students rated the website good or excellent ($N = 2,518$) [III C-6].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The College has an effective integrated technology planning process that takes input from multiple areas of the institution. The Strategic, Technology, and Annual plans, as well as the Vision and Mission of CCSF, emphasize that technological support should meet the needs of teaching, learning, College wide communications, research, and operations systems. The Shared Governance committees provide ongoing input into the fast-changing technology landscape at CCSF. The past five years have seen implementation of projects that have provided students, faculty, and staff with many benefits in the most cost-effective manner.

Procedures and workflow in ITS are under a recurring and continual evaluation process for greater efficiency and improvement. The primary challenge facing the Technology Division today is how to reduce the total cost of ownership of desktop systems while providing the required computer resources to allow faculty, staff, administrators, and students to perform their work in a cost-effective manner. The technology department is investigating alternative technologies such as thin-client and zero-client computing to provide continued improvement of desktop services. Key to this is the identification and designation of funding sources specifically allocated for the purposes of establishing a District wide refresh program.

After a period of evaluating staffing levels for technology functions at the College, all classified employees with civil service classifications in the IT and IS categories were reassigned to the ITS department starting in the 2010-11 academic year. The position of Chief Technology Officer was established and the person hired began work in Summer 2010. This reorganization of personnel strives to increase efficiency and productivity by consolidating the technology workforce.

**Planning Agenda**

1. Evaluate the true cost of ownership in all technology acquisitions.
2. Develop an evaluation plan for gathering feedback and other data to assess the benefits of the technology workforce reorganization to technology users and to learning and teaching across the District.
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Standard III.D: Resources:
Financial Resources:

Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources’ planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.D.1. The institution relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning.

III.D.1.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

Descriptive Summary

The College’s unrestricted general fund has an annual operating budget of slightly less than $200 million for fiscal year 2010-11 [III D-1]. Lack of adequate state support during recent years has led to annual budgets that do not provide adequate resources to meet the needs of the College’s current enrollment. This situation is even more challenging due to the inadequate level of financial support the state provides for noncredit education [III D-2, III D-3]. To make informed and intelligent decisions related to the distribution of relatively scarce resources, the College has implemented a comprehensive budget planning system that integrates financial planning with institutional planning [III D-4]. There is a strong connection between the priorities contained in the 2011 Strategic Plan (which reflects the College’s Vision and Mission statements) and the Annual Plan that the College's Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC) recommends to the Board of Trustees each year (see I.A.3 for further explanation) [III D-5, III D-6]. The Annual Plan serves as an operational version of the College’s plans for a one-year period. The Annual Plan consists of a set of institutional objectives that are to be achieved by the College through the efforts of the College’s organizational units—departments, schools, and administrative operations [III D-6]. The College’s PBC continues to work to make the integration between the Annual Plan and the Annual Budget more transparent. All significant expenditures for each major cost center are tied to one of the College’s planning objectives during the development of the annual budget [III D-5, III D-7].

In addition, all College cost centers now participate in the Program Review process. Unit managers use the Program Review process to identify specific resource needs in both personnel and non-personnel areas [III D-8]. The results of the Program Review process are analyzed by the Program Review Committee and presented to the College’s PBC for possible funding. While limited resources have not allowed for budget enhancements during recent fiscal years, it is anticipated that this process will allow all cost centers to compete on an equitable basis for future resources, and help to ensure that resources are spent in ways that support planning objectives. Moreover, it is expected that the next iteration of the Program
Review template is likely to prompt more explicit references to collaborations, efficiencies, and reductions [III D-9].

The new Program Review System, as well as the budget crisis, has increased the focus on data. Previously it was acceptable to have roughly equivalent data. Now data are subject to detailed inspection, which has highlighted alignment concerns. For example, Program Review data is not always well aligned with analogous data from other offices due to differences in definitions or run dates. The primary reason for this is that different reports for different government agencies and grants are generated to comply with different data definitions and different purposes. The Chancellor has recommended that the institutional researchers work more closely with all relevant offices to ensure data alignment and clear data definitions. Similarly, the Office of Research and Planning coordinates an effort initiated by the Chancellor in August 2010, now chaired by the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, whereby all data managers collectively review the MIS data submissions for accuracy. This ensures more serious review and greater inter-office understanding of the data.

The College’s finance team presents all budget related information it delivers to the College’s PBC at open public meetings chaired by the Chancellor [III D-7]. Any request to the College’s PBC for funding must make its way through either Program Review or another shared governance process such as the Faculty Position Allocation Committee, and must demonstrate a direct connection to one or more of the College’s plans. This system ensures that all of the institution’s major constituency groups have a say in how available resources are used to achieve the goals and objectives in the College’s Strategic Plan. The role of the College’s PBC has gained a great deal of acceptance across the College as a key part of a fair and open process for creating the annual budget, and for ensuring that longer-term efforts that require additional funding are phased into the budget over a series of years. During difficult years the College’s PBC has focused its attention on ideas to reduce spending that do not undermine the strategic directions of the College. Most recently the College’s PBC has played a critical role in maintaining unity across all College constituencies during a highly challenging period of time by allowing ideas for savings to be evaluated in a setting that facilitates consensus building [III D-7].

The College’s PBC's recommendations, reflecting a connection between planning and budget, are communicated to the Board of Trustees for both the tentative and final recommended budgets [III D-1, III D-7]. The Board’s Planning and Budgeting Committee now plays a very active role in the development of the annual budget and conducts multiple public hearings on revenue assumptions and spending decisions in the recommended budget prior to the full Board’s consideration of the budget. This is true for both the preliminary and final budgets [III D-10]. The budget resolutions the Board of Trustees voted on for fiscal year 2011-12 contained specific changes initiated by the Trustees during the Board’s Planning and Budgeting Committee hearings. This system has enabled the College to continue to make steady progress in its efforts to address the needs of its students. At different times, decisions related to the number of classes offered, the protection of student services budgets against state funding cuts, and the allocation of resources for basic skills education have all been accomplished using this approach [III D-11].

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets this standard.

The College has implemented a comprehensive budget planning system that integrates financial planning with institutional planning. There is a strong connection between the priorities contained in the 2011-16 Strategic Plan and the Annual Plan that the College's Planning and Budgeting Council recommends to the Board of Trustees each year. The institution clearly defines, widely distributes, and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budgeting on an annual basis. Financial information is provided throughout the institution, both on paper and electronically, to a variety of groups in a timely manner [III D-12]. The institution is committed to a budget planning process that relies on realistic assessments of available resources and strategic efforts for attracting additional resources. The College has been successful in its efforts to generate financial support from both grant agencies and private donors [III D-13]. When state revenues slumped, the institution managed its reserve funds in an intelligent manner to meet the goal of protecting direct spending for students.

**Planning Agenda**

None

**III.D.1.b. Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.**

The College’s annual budget development process begins in January with an assessment of the expected resources for the budget year based on the Governor’s proposed budget for the upcoming fiscal year [III D-7]. This assessment is a collaborative effort by the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for Student Development, the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, the Vice Chancellor for Campuses, the Vice Chancellor for Policy and Research, and the Chief Financial Officer. Information is gathered from a variety of sources including the State Chancellor’s Office, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Government Relations, and, for local revenues, the City Controller’s Office. This information is then incorporated into an overall resource projection and presented to the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College's PBC) as a parameter for the tentative budget for the new fiscal year [III D-7].

During times characterized by stable or growing funding, the annual set of budget instructions issued by the Chief Financial Officer to cost center managers specifies that cost center budgets seeking additional funds must submit their requests to the appropriate Vice Chancellor for review and approval [III D-14]. After the Vice Chancellor concurs that the cost centers’ budgets are a realistic plan for continuing ongoing operations, the budgets are forwarded to the members of the College’s PBC. The documents the College’s PBC members review, which include the College’s Technology Plan, Education Master Plan, and Strategic Plan, directly connect budget requests with specific strategic goals and objectives [III D-7]. The College’s PBC then ensures that available resources are framed around the College’s efforts to support student-learning outcomes and the overall needs of the local community. As a further check on this process, the Chief Financial Officer runs multiple iterations of the operating budget using Banner to certify that the College’s budget will be
balanced [III D-15]. The development of the fiscal year 2011-12 budget is being based on the expectation of a severe reduction in state apportionment funding as shown in the California Community College League’s allocation model [III D-2].

The dramatic national economic downturn that began in late 2008 has had a major impact on the College. Severe reductions in state revenue have in turn led to reduced funding. As a result the College was forced to implement multiple strategic spending reductions including: no across-the-board wage increases for employees since July 2007, a freeze on all step increases during fiscal year 2009-10, wage reductions for administrators during 2009-10 expanding to almost all College employees during fiscal year 2010-11, reducing spending for supplies, maintenance, and equipment, reducing the number of classes offered during Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, and elimination of nearly all 2010 summer classes [III D-16, III D-7, III D-10, III D-17]. All reductions in spending caused by declining revenue were discussed in multiple venues such as collective bargaining sessions, College Council, the Department Chairpersons Council, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council, and Board of Trustees public meetings. The collaborative decisions that allowed these actions to be implemented were absolutely critical for the College to navigate fiscal years 2009-10 and 2010-11. Reductions in spending were constructed in a manner that allowed the College to maintain its core educational offerings and protect essential student services. Following strategic reductions in the number of classes offered during fiscal year 2009-10, the College substantially rebuilt the number of class sections it offered during fiscal year 2010-11 to ensure that sufficient enrollment was generated to earn all of the base funding the College was entitled to as well as some growth funds [III D-3].

The College’s Board Designated Reserve was $6.65 million at the end of 2008-09. During fiscal year 2009-10, the College received authority from the Board of Trustees to use $2 million from the reserve to partially backfill the severe state cuts of 2009-10 [III D-18]. The College’s objective was to try to avoid spending the $2 million and this objective was successfully achieved. While it was even more challenging to replicate this during fiscal year 2010-11, the same authority was granted and the same objective was met [III D-11]. On a continuing basis the College’s total fund balance, which includes other items such as departmental accounts and a prepaid lease, has been substantially greater than the 5 percent guideline recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office [III D-19]. The College’s careful approach to budgeting is reflected in the College’s bond ratings for the Spring 2010 sale of $46 million in General Obligation Bonds. Both Moody’s (Aa3) and Standard & Poor’s (AA) rated the College as favorably as the City and County of San Francisco for that sale [III D-12]. In April 2011, Fitch Ratings provided a similar rating for existing bonds [III D-9, III D-20].

During the current recession, requests for additional funds have not been solicited by the College’s PBC. However, the Program Review Committee has continued to inform the College’s PBC about the specific items that are most needed by departments. The College’s senior managers, including the Chancellor, have presented to the College’s PBC detailed plans to reduce overall spending. The College’s PBC has reviewed these savings strategies to ensure that they do not counteract the College’s strategic, developmental, and operational plans [III D-7]. The College’s PBC does not play a role in savings that have been generated through the collective bargaining process. Senior management is responsible for ensuring
that these particular savings ideas do not counteract the College’s adopted plans. When this process is completed, both the proposed tentative budget and the proposed annual plan are submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval. During fiscal year 2011-12 the tentative budget included linkages to the draft strategic plan as the annual plan was not available in June. The final budget for 2011-12 contained linkages to the annual plan for that year [III D-1].

The College has begun raising outside funding to support achievement of the goals and objectives established in its strategic, developmental, and operational goals and objectives. During 2010-11 the College included as part of its operating revenue $1.75 million in funds to be raised from private sources. The College succeeded in raising a total of more than $2 million during 2010-11, all of which either directly or indirectly supported College operations [III D-13]. The College’s Advancement Plan maps out a strategy for helping to provide funding for those items that go beyond basic operations [III D-10]. For example, priority areas for increased funding in the Advancement Plan include basic skills education, workforce training, access to student services, and improved technology for classrooms [III D-21]. In addition, the College’s Office of Grants and Resource Development, as well as its Workforce Development Office, have been highly successful in attracting new sources of funding through the competitive grants process. The College currently receives more than $10 million per year in grants. Examples of this include $2 million from the National Science Foundation for various Biotechnology training programs (including Bio-Link, the National Advanced Technological Education Center for Biotechnology Education), and grants totaling $434,000 from the Haas Foundation for professional development and training in the College’s Child Development Program [III D-22].

Furthermore, the College continues to successfully forge new partnerships with groups such as the Mayor’s Office, the San Francisco Unified School District, and San Francisco State University. These partnerships have increased the College’s ability to leverage resources in the grants arena. An example of this is the 2010 Gates Foundation funding the College received for the purpose of increasing the number of at-risk high school students who obtain a college degree [III D-23].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The planning processes employed by the College realistically assess financial resources availability and expenditure requirements, using funding priorities directly connected to students learning and key student services. Accurate and timely information about available funds is widely communicated. The College’s senior managers, including the Chancellor, have presented to the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council detailed plans to reduce overall spending. The College’s PBC has reviewed these savings strategies to ensure that they do not undermine the College’s strategic, developmental, and operational plans. [III D-7] Additional savings have been generated through the collective bargaining process, which is not part of the shared governance system. [III D-24] Senior management is responsible for ensuring that these negotiated savings ideas do not conflict with the College’s adopted plans.

Planning Agenda
III.D.1.c. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

Descriptive Summary

One of the six strategic priorities contained in the College’s 2011 Strategic Plan is focused on “Resources and Staffing." A major objective under this priority is to “identify dependable funding streams for operational priorities and innovation while ensuring educational excellence and effective and efficient use of College resources.” This explicit objective in the longer-term Strategic Plan informs the annual planning process [III D-5]. The College’s annual fiscal planning process is the Annual Plan, which includes operational and developmental objectives that are tied to the Strategic Plan. During years characterized by stable or growing funding, these objectives are used by each major cost center and its respective departments to develop annual budget requests for submittal to the appropriate Vice Chancellor for approval [III D-14, III D-6].

Long-range financial liabilities and obligations that the College plans for include employee fringe benefits, property and liability insurance, workers compensation, and retiree health benefits. The cost of providing fringe benefits to the College’s workforce continues to increase substantially on a yearly basis, particularly for health insurance premiums and pension fund contributions [III D-1]. To ensure that these costs do not erode long-term fiscal stability, the options available are to seek additional revenue from local voters, modify the circumstances under which employees are eligible for benefits, or modify the sources of payment for these benefits. Any changes related to eligibility or the sources of payment are issues that must be bargained through formal negotiations. The College has already begun negotiating with its labor unions regarding these issues and expects to reach agreement on these issues during 2011 [III D-25]. It should also be noted that the Board of Trustees may place a ballot measure for a parcel tax before San Francisco voters in either November 2011 or November 2012. Such a measure may help the College in its effort to fund its long-term liabilities for post retirement healthcare and for classified pensions [III D-26].

The College covers its property and liability insurance needs through its membership in the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), a joint powers authority. The College is responsible for the first $50,000 in costs for each liability claim and the first $25,000 for each property claim. SWACC covers the costs above those limits. SWACC in turn is a member of a larger joint powers authority, the Schools Association for Excess Risk (SAFER). SWACC also sells a portion of its risk to reinsurance firms. Through a combination of SWACC, SAFER membership, and reinsurance the College has coverage for claims up to $25 million for liability and $250 million for property damage [III D-27, III D-28].

The College is self-insured for workers compensation for the first $500,000 of any claim, and has excess workers compensation insurance coverage with a private insurer for claims greater than $500,000. This coverage has a limit of $50 million per claim [III D-29]. The College’s self-funded portion of the program generates annual expenditures ranging between $900,000
and $1.2 million [III D-1]. This cost has grown slowly over the years and has not generated substantial budgetary pressure. Periodic reviews of the cost-effectiveness of switching to a fully insured program have consistently shown that such a change would be more expensive than the College’s current structure. During 2010-11 the College strategically increased the amount it budgets for workers compensation expenses to fund the long-term liability for these costs [III D-30].

The College pays for the cost of retiree health benefits on a “pay as you go” basis, with estimated total expenditures of approximately $7.1 million in fiscal year 2011-12. The cost of this benefit is increasing by about $700,000 per year [III D-31]. A combination of factors has led to this increase in costs, including general increases in health care premiums, changes in life expectancy, and an initiative passed by San Francisco voters that improved retiree health benefits. The Government Accounting Standards Board requires an actuarial study of the unfunded liability in this area. The College has completed this study and has also complied with requirements related to its disclosure. [Ref X] The need for a long-term financial strategy to match this long-term liability is being addressed through labor negotiations. An agreement on a solution is expected during 2011 [III D-32].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability in making short-range financial plans. The College's Planning and Budgeting Council will be reviewing proposals for ongoing savings during the Spring 2011 semester in anticipation of the need to reduce spending during the 2011-12 fiscal year. The institution expects to reach agreement with the labor unions that represent the College’s workforce on measures to address the cost of retiree health benefits by the end of 2011. This item may also be affected by a local ballot measure during November 2011.

Planning Agenda

None

III.D.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget.

Descriptive Summary

The College follows its previously described planning and budget processes. These processes are documented in an annual planning and budget guide that is distributed to all cost center managers. This guide for budget submittals contains instructions that are discussed and reviewed on an annual basis by the College’s PBC. The Chief Financial Officer incorporates feedback from both the College's PBC as well as individual cost center managers to modify and improve the annual guide [III D-14]. A final budget guide for fiscal year 2010-11 was not produced due to the sudden departure of a key staff member; however, remaining staff generated all budget tables needed for adoption. A budget guide for 2011-12 was produced and made available to the public on the College’s website. The College followed the
previously described process for developing the annual budget for fiscal year 2011-12 [III D-1].

The College’s annual audit reports, quarterly financial reports, and annual budget are all posted on the College’s website [III D-12]. In addition, the financial information, including the annual budget, is widely distributed via the College’s PBC and public meetings of the Board of Trustees [III D-1]. Each year, both the College’s PBC and the Board of Trustees’ Planning and Budget Committee conduct public hearings prior to the adoption of the budget. During recent years the Board of Trustees has played a larger role in the development of the annual budget. During 2011, the Board’s Planning and Budgeting Committee conducted a series of public hearings that reviewed both the College’s revenue assumptions and spending plans for the upcoming year [III D-10]. The College’s Budget and Accounting Office provides financial reports on a monthly basis to the Board of Trustees, the public, and the representatives of the College’s constituency groups [III D-33].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College publishes and makes available to all cost center managers its guidelines and processes for budget development and financial planning and follows these guidelines and processes. The annual budget guide is made available to the public on the College's website, as are other budget documents such as preliminary and final budgets.

Planning Agenda

None

III.D.2. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.

III.D.2.a. Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

Descriptive Summary

The College employs a variety of control mechanisms to ensure responsible use of financial resources. These include the use of detailed matrixes for designating signature authority for contract execution and invoice payments [III D-34], as well as separation of duties for all key components of the College’s business operations. Financial transactions are subject to review by both external auditors and the College’s internal auditor. Finally, the College makes extensive use of the control features that are a part of the Banner general ledger system that is used for processing all business transactions [III D-12, III D-32].
The annual budget, the annual audit report, and all quarterly financial reports are available on
the College’s website. The annual budget document reflects the cost of carrying out the
District’s annual operating objectives in support of student learning programs and services.
The final budget incorporates the availability of state and local funding, and includes a
summary of the activities the budget will support. This typically includes information related
to the hiring of new and replacement full-time faculty, improvements in salary schedules, net
increases for additional salary step movement, the cost of fringe benefits, and all budget
requests approved for funding through the College’s PBC [III D-1].

During recent years, reductions in state funding have forced the College to focus on ways to
reduce spending as a final budget is developed. The same open collaborative approach, led
by the College’s senior managers and the College’s PBC, has been used to plan for
reductions, as it was previously used to plan for increases. This approach has enabled the
College to focus on the needs of its students in the face of shrinking resources. At different
times, decisions related to the number of classes offered, backfilling student services budgets
in the face of state funding cuts, and improving basic skills education have all been made
using this approach [III D-7].

The annual 311 Report required by the state documents the College’s compliance with the
“fifty percent rule” related to spending for instruction. Historically the College has compared
favorably with other districts on this measure [III D-19]. For fiscal year 2009-10, the last
year for which comparative data are available, the ratio of the College’s “percent of
instructor’s salaries to current expense of education ratio” was 52.07 percent, which
exceeded the statewide average of 51.75 percent [III D-19]. In addition the College’s level of
compliance with its full-time faculty obligation, known as the “seventy-five percent rule”
compares quite favorably with other districts. [Ref. 17] In fact for Fall 2009, the last
semester for which comparative data are available, the College exceeded its full-time faculty
obligation by 127 FTE, the largest margin in the state [III D-35]. These two items are
evidence of the high priority the College places on supporting student learning. Furthermore,
during the recent multi-year period of state fiscal distress, numerous concessions related to
compensation have been agreed to by all College employees in an effort to save jobs and
protect direct spending for student needs. This unprecedented level of cooperation has been
critical to safeguarding student access to educational opportunities.

The District received an unqualified audit opinion for fiscal years 2007, 2008, and 2009 in its
Annual Financial and Single Audit report. This means that the independent auditor
determined that the College’s financial statements were a fair presentation of the College’s
financial position at the end of each of those fiscal years [III D-32]. The independent auditor
presents all audit findings directly to the Board of Trustees or the Board’s Audit Committee
in open public session [III D-36]. In addition, the College hired a full-time Internal Auditor
during 2008, who also presents findings directly to the Board of Trustees or its Audit
Committee [III D-37]. The District’s Business Office responds to all audit recommendations
in as timely a manner as feasible. Those recommendations that can be effectively
implemented within the next audit cycle are identified and changes are implemented.
Typically, audit findings are brought to the College’s attention in December; therefore some
recommendations require a longer time horizon for completion than the next audit year. The
District is currently working on implementing changes needed as identified in the fiscal year
2009-10 audit report. [Ref. 11] While the audit report was unqualified, it included three material weaknesses. Two of these weaknesses involve long-term liabilities for workers compensation and retiree health benefits. See III.D.1.c for more information on the retiree benefits issue. As previously noted, the workers compensation issue was addressed in the 2011-12 budget. The third material weakness was related to the need to revise the 2009-10 311 report. The Board of Trustees Audit Committee monitors the administration’s progress in addressing audit findings on a regular basis including the material weaknesses [III D-32].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

Financial integrity is ensured by control mechanisms, independent external and internal review, transparency of processes, and timely dissemination of information. Financial documents, including the budget and the independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. The College focuses spending on student learning as evidenced by its history of high numbers related to the “fifty percent law” and the “seventy-five percent rule.” While resources for the support of student-learning programs and services are not adequate, the institution has made informed and intelligent decisions in a Shared Governance setting related to the distribution of these relatively scarce resources.

**Planning Agenda**

None

**III.D.2.b. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The institution distributes financial information in a timely manner in several forms to a variety of groups. The College’s annual budget is widely distributed via the College’s PBC, the College’s website, and public meetings of the Board of Trustees [III D-1, III D-12]. Each year the College’s PBC conducts an open hearing on the proposed annual budget, which includes presentations from the Vice Chancellors and some of the College’s cost center managers. In addition, the Board of Trustees conducts at least one public hearing on the proposed budget prior to adoption. The College’s finance team provides monthly financial reports to the Board of Trustees at public meetings, and during the academic year the finance team provides financial reports to the College’s PBC (which includes representatives from all four College constituencies) on a biweekly basis. All key financial documents are posted to the College’s website. The College’s annual audit report for 2009-10 was completed in a timely manner, with wide distribution. Furthermore, the independent auditor presents all audit findings directly to the Board of Trustees in an open advertised public session [III D-7, III D-12, III D-33].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.
Information about the budget, fiscal conditions, financial planning and audit results is provided in a timely fashion and throughout the College. The information provided is sufficient in content and timing to support institutional and financial planning and management.

Planning Agenda

None

III.D.2.c. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

Descriptive Summary

The most severe economic downturn since the Great Depression and the slow recovery that has ensued have created significant financial challenges for the College. This situation was even more challenging for the College due to the historically inadequate level of financial support the state provides for noncredit education [III D-3]. In addition to budget shortfalls, the extreme tardiness with which state budgets have been adopted has resulted in serious cash strains for the College. As of June 30, 2011, the College’s Board Designated Reserve totaled $6.65 million, the largest it had ever been [III D-1]. As noted in the response to III.D.1.c, during fiscal year 2009-10 and 2010-11, the College received authority from the Board of Trustees to use $2 million from the reserve to partially backfill the severe state cuts of 2009-10. The College’s objective was to try to avoid spending the $2 million and this objective was successfully achieved during both of these fiscal years. A similar goal may be set for 2011-12 depending on the size of the state cut in apportionment funding for that year [III D-1].

The College’s objective is and has been to maintain a five percent available unrestricted general fund balance as recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office. During fiscal year 2010-11 the unrestricted general fund balance exceeded the recommended five percent level. This is partly attributable to the remaining value on a long-term prepaid lease [III D-1].

The chart below shows the actual fund balance as a percentage of relevant expenditures for each of the past five fiscal years [III D-19, III D-32]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Ending Unrestricted General Fund Balance*</th>
<th>% of Unrestricted General Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$21.2 million</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$20.3 million</td>
<td>10.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$23.1 million</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 est.</td>
<td>$20.9 million</td>
<td>10.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes long-term prepaid ground lease for the site of the new Mission Campus valued at $10.42 million as of June 30, 2010.
As previously cited, the College’s careful approach to budgeting is reflected in the College’s bond ratings for the Spring 2010 sale of $46 million in General Obligation Bonds. Both Moody’s (Aa3) and Standard & Poor’s (AA) rated the College as favorably as the City and County of San Francisco for that sale. In April 2011, Fitch Ratings provided a similar “AA” rating with a stable outlook for existing bonds [III D-20].

The College’s primary source of funding is apportionment, which is comprised of three major sources: state general fund monies, property tax payments, and student fees. Because property tax payments comprise about one-third of the College’s unrestricted revenue but are received in two semiannual payments, annual planning for cash needs has been quite important for several years. The primary method the College uses to deal with cash needs is its participation in the annual Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) pool sponsored by the California Community College League. The College typically borrows between $20 and $30 million in the TRANS pool to deal with cash needs during the upcoming fiscal year. Due to mounting deferrals in cash payments by the state, this amount will increase substantially in 2011-12 [III D-38].

Additionally, the College has had ongoing access to short-term borrowing for cash via the City and County of San Francisco Treasury. This emergency procedure is convenient and helpful but it does come at a price equal to the rate the City and County Treasury is earning on deposits at the time. [III D-39] Recent passage of Proposition 25 which lowered the required vote for passage of a state budget from two-thirds to a majority plus one may result in state budgets being approved sooner, thereby reducing some of the College’s need to borrow short-term cash.

As noted in the response to III.D.1.c, the College covers its property and liability insurance needs through its membership in the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), a joint powers authority. The College is responsible for the first $50,000 in costs for each liability claim and the first $25,000 for each property claim. SWACC covers the costs above those self-covered limits [III D-27].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. The institution has made concerted efforts to meet the State Chancellor’s guidelines for a five percent fund balance even during under-funded years. The cash flow needs of the District have been supported through the issuance of TRANS and short term borrowing from the County Treasury. Risk management needs are handled through SWACC.

Planning Agenda

None

III.D.2.d. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual
relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

Descriptive Summary

The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration (VCFA) is responsible for financial oversight for all monies held by the College, including its auxiliary bookstore [III D-37]. The Office of Grants and Resource Development in the Division of Policy and Research provides overall management of grant funded activities. To accomplish effective oversight of finances, including grants, the College’s Chief Financial Officer, the Controller, and their staff support the VCFA. The College uses SCT Banner integrated management information system to track and process all financial transactions, including financial aid and grants. All financial transactions are subject to formal approval queues. The College’s accounting staff employs several different approval queues to ensure that financial transactions are legitimate and within budget [III D-32]. All of the College’s revenues are invested by the San Francisco County Treasurer. An oversight committee, whose members include the College’s Chancellor and various City and County officials, meets on a regular basis to monitor these investments [III D-40].

After the retirement of the Chief Administrative Services Officer, responsibility for overseeing the College’s entry into contractual relationships for a wide variety of services and for clinical placements of students in health-related fields has been shifted to the administrator serving as Acting General Counsel. The institution emphasizes extensive front-end efforts to ensure that contract language is in the best interest of the institution, and goes beyond statutory requirements for competitive processes for contractual services [III D-41]. In addition, the Board of Trustees has enacted many new policies designed to strengthen controls on finances and contracts and to prevent the misuse of any College funds [III D-42].

After the retirement of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning and Construction, the College entered into a contract with Swinerton Inc for direct project management of the College’s capital construction program [III D-43]. The manager of the College’s Facilities Planning and Construction Office, who reports directly to the VCFA, oversees the Swinerton contract. Both of these individuals have access to attorneys with construction law expertise as needed [III D-44].

The College’s bookstore is an auxiliary organization run by a full-time on-site manager who reports directly to the College’s Chief Financial Officer who has primary responsibility for overseeing its operations [III D-37]. The Foundation of City College of San Francisco is an independent nonprofit organization, whose financial activities are overseen by a Board of Directors, which includes the College’s Chancellor [III D-45].

The District received an unqualified audit opinion for fiscal years 2007, 2008, and 2009 in its Annual Financial and Single Audit report. While the most recent report, issued for fiscal year 2010, did identify three material weaknesses, the report was unqualified and the College is taking steps to address these weaknesses. The material weaknesses were not related to effective oversight of the College’s finances. Two of these weaknesses involve long-term liabilities for workers compensation and retiree health benefits. The third was related to the need to revise the 2009-10 311 report. These items are detailed in III.D-2.a. The District’s Internal Auditor tracks progress towards resolution for all annual audit findings, and the
Chief Financial Officer and his staff work directly with the independent auditors to resolve all findings [III D-32].

The annual audit report for the College includes an audit of the auxiliary bookstore. The City College of San Francisco Foundation has become more independent of the College as a result of a new master agreement signed in 2010. A separate audit report is issued for the CCSF Foundation by a firm hired directly by the Foundation’s Board of Directors. There have been no significant audit findings for the auxiliary bookstore. The Foundation’s Board of Directors reviews the independent audit of the Foundation and forwards a copy of all audits to the Board of Trustees for review [III D-46].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The College practices effective oversight of finances and maintains procedures, including SCT Banner integrated management information system to track and process all financial transactions. Its most recent audit report, issued for fiscal year 2010, was unqualified. While the audit did identify three material weaknesses, the College is taking actions to address these weaknesses. The institution monitors finances not only for the College itself but also for the auxiliary bookstore and separate foundation as well. The institution makes extensive efforts to connect spending with planning, and has consistently done so with the highest level of integrity. Financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution. The institution emphasizes extensive front-end efforts to ensure that contract language is in the best interest of the institution, and goes beyond statutory requirements for competitive processes.

**Planning Agenda**

None

**III.D.2.e. All financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The College uses its financial resources, including all financial resources from auxiliary activities, fundraising efforts, and grants with integrity and in a manner consistent with the missions and goals of the institution. Oversight processes are in place and independent audits are conducted to ensure this integrity.

The Office of Grants and Resource Development administers the grants application process. The Interim Vice Chancellor for Policy and Research works closely during post-award grant administration with the Chief Financial Officer on both the development of contracts as well as accounting issues related to grant-funded expenditures.
The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, with the assistance of the Acting General Counsel and the accounting department, ensures that grant-related financial reporting and contract terms are in full compliance with all terms required by the granting agency. All financial transactions for grant-funded activities are processed through the College’s SCT Banner management information system, and are subject to annual audits by awarding agencies [III D-47]. In addition, all grant-funded contracts are publicly noticed on the monthly agendas of the Board of Trustees [III D-33].

The Foundation of the City College of San Francisco, which operates under a Master Agreement with the College, has a separate Board of Directors and maintains a separate general ledger system. Policy is implemented through the Executive Director of the Foundation. During 2010, the Foundation assumed responsibility for its own accounting functions [III D-45]. The Foundation has been successful in its fundraising efforts the past few years, primarily in generating support for student scholarships for basic skills programs. Under the Master Agreement, funds raised by the Foundation must be spent in a manner that benefits the College. All funds raised by the Foundation have been spent in a manner that is consistent with the College’s mission and goals, as evidenced by annual audit reports and their bylaws [III D-46].

The annual audit report for the College includes an audit of the auxiliary bookstore. A separate audit report is issued for the College’s Foundation [Ref. 19]. There have been no significant audit findings for either of these two entities [III D-32, III D-46].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College practices effective oversight of finances and maintains procedures, including SCT Banner integrated management information system to track and process all financial transactions. The institution monitors finances not only for the College itself but also for the auxiliary bookstore as well. Financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. There have been no significant audit findings for the auxiliary bookstore. The Foundation’s Board of Directors reviews the independent audit of the Foundation and forwards a copy to the Board of Trustees.

Planning Agenda

None

III.D.2.f: Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

The College enters into a wide variety of contractual agreements including but not limited to the following:
Personal services contracts under $2,000, referred to as limited services contracts, which are reported to the Board of Trustees as “Information Only;”

Professional services contracts for more than $10,000, which require higher levels of insurance, complete descriptions of deliverables and timetables, and Board of Trustees approval before being awarded;

- Grant and sub-recipient contractual agreements;
- Informal construction contracts under $15,000, which go to the Board of Trustees for approval;
- Formal construction contracts greater than $15,000 which are subject to public bid requirements and must be approved by the Board of Trustees before being awarded;
- Construction-related professional services, such as architecture and engineering, awarded through a fair and competitive process and approved by the Board of Trustees before being awarded;
- Rental agreements for classroom space which are approved by the Board of Trustees;
- Vendor agreements that produce revenue for the College and the Associated Students and are subject to approval by the Board of Trustees;
- Master Agreement with the Foundation;
- Master Agreement with the Bookstore Auxiliary approved by the Board of Trustees; and
- Clinical Agreements for placement of students in clinical settings [III D-33].

The integrity of District contracts is maintained by adherence to regulatory codes including the Public Contract Code, the Education Code, the Business and Professions Code, the Labor Code, and the Government Code as they relate to specific types of contracts. The College’s Acting General Counsel reviews all contracts prior to signing and implementation [III D-41]. The College for convenience or cause may terminate contracts. It should be noted that College policy adopted in 2003 requires any services contract in excess of $50,000 to be awarded only after a competitive process has been conducted. This amount moves in accord with Public Contracts Code Section 20651 and is currently $78,900. This policy acknowledges that factors other than price, such as particular research skills, may be included as selection criteria [III D-48].

An independent performance audit of the District’s bond funded capital projects program conducted during 2008 documented several problems related to construction contracts. More specifically the audit report noted that many contract modifications were enacted without receiving prior approval from the Board of Trustees. A subsequent audit confirmed that this problem as well as all other findings from the 2008 audit report have been addressed [III D-32].

During the 2009 and 2010 calendar years the Board of Trustees adopted many new policies and policy changes related to contracts to correct previous deficiencies. These policies created requirements for greater oversight and standardization of the contracting process. They also established personal liability for employees as a penalty to ensure that contracts are not implemented without the prior approval of the Trustees [III D-42]. In addition, the
administration has worked cooperatively with the Board to develop a process in which all construction-related contracts are reviewed by the Board's Facilities, Infrastructure and Technology Committee prior to consideration by the full Board of Trustees [III D-49].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Contractual agreements with external entities are in accordance with the College's mission and goals and are governed by institutional policies to ensure maintenance of institutional integrity. Weaknesses identified by the 2008 audit report have been addressed and the Board of Trustees has adopted several new policies and policy modifications to correct previous deficiencies.

Planning Agenda

None

III.D.2.g. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems.

Descriptive Summary

The College uses both the annual external audit report as well as feedback from key user functional groups to assess the effectiveness of its financial management systems. While service to internal and external customers is a priority, so are safeguards against fraud and abuse. Internal requirements for processing transactions are streamlined whenever such changes do not reduce important checks and balances. The Business Office is continually seeking new ways to use technology to improve business processes. Examples of such changes in recent years include processing student hires and applicant tracking [III D-50].

The College’s management team treats seriously all external audit findings. The District’s Business Office responds to all audit recommendations in as timely a manner as feasible. Audit findings are addressed in both a short- and long-term manner, depending on the nature of the appropriate remedy. Recommendations that can be effectively implemented within the next audit cycle are identified and changes are implemented. Typically audit findings are brought to the College’s attention in December; therefore, some recommendations require a longer time horizon for completion than the next audit year. The College’s Internal Auditor tracks all audit findings and the Board of Trustees Audit Committee reviews progress [III D-51].

On the macro level, the relative scarcity of resources requires the College to continually examine how well it is planning for both current and future needs. While the preliminary annual budget is adopted in June and the final budget is adopted in September (or in October when the State Chancellor’s Office extends the deadline), both the College's Planning and Budgeting Council and the Board of Trustees are updated regularly by the College’s finance team regarding how well the annual financial plan is or is not tracking. Expenditures are now tracked every pay period via an ongoing forecast model. When revenue information changes during the course of a fiscal year adjustments are made to budgets and spending. During the
past few years, such adjustments to spending have been necessary for both personnel and non-personnel items as mid-year changes in state funding are unfortunately now common [III D-15, III D-33].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The College regularly evaluates its financial management processes by means of the review of external audit reports and from ongoing feedback coming from the College's management team. Moreover expenditures are tracked every pay period via an ongoing forecast model.

Planning Agenda

None

III.D.3. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

The College assesses the use of its financial resources on an annual basis. The methods employed include an annual assessment for all divisions, Program Review analyses for all departments, as well as an annual publication of the College’s Core Performance Indicators Report. The results of these processes are shared with the College’s PBC and the Board of Trustees, and some are posted on the College’s website [III D-12].

The College anticipates modifying the Program Review process to augment the way efficiencies are addressed. During the first three years of the annual Program Review process, the Program Review Committee and College’s PBC members identified many possibilities for sharing resources between discrete units. Some of these possibilities were mentioned explicitly by the units, but more were noted by those reading across Program Review reports from various areas of the College. This resulted in the decision to make explicit within the Program Review template and overall process the goal of promoting and leveraging shared resources in order to create greater efficiencies. The synergy created by an “all units” Program Review cycle, where all units undergo Program Review simultaneously, further allows these types of discussions and resource planning to occur [III D-9].

Self Evaluation

The College frequently and systematically assesses the effectiveness of its use of financial resources.

Planning Agenda

None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III D-2</td>
<td>California Community College League Budget Charts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccleague.net/district-budget-impact/">http://www.ccleague.net/district-budget-impact/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-7</td>
<td>College PBC minutes (multiple mtgs)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/pbc.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/pbc.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-8</td>
<td>List of Departments Completing Program Reviews</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-9</td>
<td>Program Review Committee Minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/prog.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/prog.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-10</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Planning &amp; Budget Committee Agendas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_committee_agendas0.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_committee_agendas0.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-11</td>
<td>2011-12 Board Trustees Annual Budget Resolutions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-13</td>
<td>List of Donors Fiscal Year 2011-12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-14</td>
<td>Budget Instructions for Cost Center Managers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-15</td>
<td>Expenditure Forecast Model</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-17</td>
<td>Various Shared Governance Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-18</td>
<td>2009-10 Annual Budget Resolution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-19</td>
<td>Fiscal Year 2010-11 Annual 311 Report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-20</td>
<td>Letters from Bond Rating Agencies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-21</td>
<td>College Advancement Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-23</td>
<td>Award Letter from Gates Foundation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-27</td>
<td>Annual SWACC Coverage Summary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.swacc.org/sps/index.jsp?site=swacc&amp;menu=member%20resources_administration_program%20structure&amp;nocache=">http://www.swacc.org/sps/index.jsp?site=swacc&amp;menu=member%20resources_administration_program%20structure&amp;nocache=</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-28</td>
<td>Annual SAFER Coverage Summary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.swacc.org/sps/index.jsp?site=swacc&amp;menu=member%20resources_administration_program%20structure&amp;nocache=">http://www.swacc.org/sps/index.jsp?site=swacc&amp;menu=member%20resources_administration_program%20structure&amp;nocache=</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-29</td>
<td>Excess Workers Compensation Insurance Coverage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-30</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Resolution re:Workers Comp Funding Rate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-33</td>
<td>Monthly Finance Reports to the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_meetings_1.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_meetings_1.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-34</td>
<td>Contract Approval Signature Matrix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-35</td>
<td>Full Time Faculty Obligation Report and Statewide</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-36</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Audit Committee Agenda</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_committee_agendas0.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_committee_agendas0.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-37</td>
<td>Organization Chart Internal Audits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Office_of_the_Internal_Auditor/">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Office_of_the_Internal_Auditor/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-39</td>
<td>Letter from City/County Controller</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-41</td>
<td>General Counsel Review Sheet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-42</td>
<td>District Policy Manual Sections 1 and 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/pm7.shtml">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/pm7.shtml</a> <a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/pm1.shtml">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/pm1.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D-43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard IV. Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

IV.A. The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

Descriptive Summary

The CCSF Vision and Mission statements, approved in 2010, state that:

In our community, respect and trust are common virtues, and all people are enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding. We will maintain a supportive, positive, and productive working environment for our diverse faculty and staff, as well as a responsive environment in which student needs are met in a friendly, timely, and caring manner [IV A-1].

During the early 1990s, in response to Assembly Bill (AB) 1725 the College established the Shared Governance System. The Shared Governance Policy was approved by the Board of Trustees in accordance with Title V, Section 53200 in 1993 and updated in 1998. Hundreds of members of the College community work collaboratively each year within the CCSF Shared Governance System. (See section A.2.A for an expanded description) [IV A-2, A-3].

In 1994, the Chancellor and the Academic Senate, with the approval of the College Advisory Council (CAC), created the Office of Shared Governance and the position of the District Shared Governance Coordinator, the first one in the state of California.

Since the establishment of the CCSF Shared Governance System, the College actively engages in a participatory process in all matters that have policy and/or significant institution wide implications. For example, the College is engaged in several institution wide
discussions on such issues and ideas as the District Sunshine Policy [IV A-4], student equity and the achievement gap [IV A-5, IV A-6], faculty diversity issues [IV A-7], the state budget and its implications on budget and planning [IV A-8, IV A-9], content filtering on the Internet [IV A-10, IV A-11], proposing designated smoking areas on campus [IV A-12], student learning outcomes [IV A-13], and Program Review [IV A-14, IV A-15]. Classified staff, students, faculty, and administrators are invited to attend discussion and/or committee review sessions to share information, make comments and provide feedback. Invitations to participate are distributed via District wide communication in a variety of forms: emails from both the Chancellor’s and Academic Senate President’s offices, Office of Shared Governance, SEIU 1021 and the President of the Associated Students, announcements in City Currents, flyers, and announcements at various group meetings such as the Department Chairpersons Council, Administrators’ meetings, Department meetings and Associated Students’ meetings. Any District policy recommendation needs to be discussed and approved through the CCSF Shared Governance system before it can be presented to the full Board of Trustees as a resolution [IV A-2].

Another example where the College community is encouraged to participate and provide comments and feedback to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation on programs, policies, and improvements that have significant institution wide implications is with the development of the various College plans: the Annual Plan, Education Master Plan, Strategic Plan, Student Equity and Achievement Reports, Sustainability Plan, and the Technology Plan [IV A-16, IV A-17, IV A-18, IV A-19, IV A-20, IV A-21, IV A-22, IV A-23].

In addition to formal participative processes, CCSF leaders also encourage classified staff, faculty, administrators, and students to take initiative in creating improvements through less formal channels. A recent example was the CCSF Cost Savings Idea Contest of 2010 that solicited ideas for saving money for the District and awarded donated prizes to six students, two classified staff members and two faculty members for the ten best ideas [IV A-24].

Other examples of individuals taking the initiative to drive change at the College are the recently formed WebCred Workgroup established by the College’s Communications Committee, which is directing and implementing improvements to the usability of the College website and the library’s electronic suggestion box, which helps drive improvements at the library [IV A-25 p. 5, A-26, A-27].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Since the establishment of the CCSF Shared Governance system, the College has actively engaged in a participatory process in all matters that have policy and/or significant institution wide implications. Institutional leaders encourage classified staff, faculty, administrators and students to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved.

Planning Agenda
None

IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

Descriptive Summary

The Office of Shared Governance produces and regularly updates the Shared Governance Handbook, based on the Shared Governance Agreement (Board Policy 2.07) that details specifically how each constituent group can participate in the decision-making processes of the College [IV A-2, IV A-28]. Shared Governance committees have membership positions for the four constituencies—administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students—as appropriate to their purpose. Each committee has a parent “Council” that is empowered to bring recommendations to the Chancellor [IV A-28, A-29]. The Office of Shared Governance maintains a calendar on the Web of the meetings of the three Councils and some of the Committees [IV A-30]. The Office of Shared Governance also posts agendas, minutes, and other documentation on pages linked to an online index of Shared Governance groups [IV A-31]. The District Sunshine Policy requires audio recordings of the three Councils. These are also posted online [IV A-32, IV A-33, IV A-34, IV A-35].

In addition, the Board of Trustees has its own Board Committee structure where board policies are developed and discussed. Audio recordings are made of these meetings and are available on request in accordance with the District Sunshine Policy. In the current year (2011), there are seven Board Committees: Audit; Chancellor/Board Relations; Facilities, Infrastructure, and Technology; Institutional Effectiveness; Planning and Budgeting; Policy Implementation; and Special Joint Committee with the San Francisco Unified School District Board of Education. Each Committee reviews any policy recommendation or changes before they are introduced to the full Board as a policy resolution [IV A-36].

All policy resolutions are debated at open-session meetings of the full Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees holds at least two meetings for each policy, which are open to input from all constituencies—students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators—as well as members of the public.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

- The depth and specificity of the Shared Governance section in the Policy Manual (section 2.07) is considerable. It is one of the most developed areas of College policy.

- The Shared Governance Calendar, located on the CCSF Home Page and maintained by the Shared Governance Coordinator, provides accessible information and has helped to bring the College community together to work within the framework of Shared Governance [IV A-30].
• It has been difficult to capture accurate, up-to-date information on all Shared Governance meetings in the Shared Governance Calendar due to the lack of information provided by the Shared Governance committee chairs. It has also proved difficult to maintain a central repository (electronic or otherwise) of agendas, minutes, and other records of the activities of Shared Governance committees, because there are inconsistencies in both the production and posting of minutes for some shared governance committees. Recommendations to improve the Calendar and the Shared Governance website are being reviewed.

• Although the District’s Sunshine Policy requires audio recording of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate, College Advisory Council and Planning and Budgeting Council meetings, the CAC as well as the PBC have missing audio recording of meetings when the Shared Governance Coordinator was out sick.

Planning Agenda

None

IV.A.2.a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

Descriptive Summary

More than 400 members of the College constituent groups participate in the work of over 43 committees and subcommittees in the CCSF Shared Governance System. The College recognizes these four constituency groups throughout Shared Governance: the Academic Senate, representing faculty; the Administrator’s Association, representing administrators, SEIU 1021, representing classified staff, and the Associated Students, representing students.

The CCSF Shared Governance organization consists of three systems, each with a set of permanent councils and committees. Members of the College community—students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators—are represented in this system. The Councils may establish task forces and ad hoc committees and the committees may establish working groups and subcommittees, as appropriate. The Shared Governance Agreement and its appendices specify the number of representatives each constituent group may elect or appoint to the Councils [IV A-29].

Appointments to the committees, subcommittees, ad hoc committees, and task forces are the responsibility of each constituent group. In the case of the administrators, the Administrators Association calls for volunteers and then submits those names to the Chancellor, who finalizes the appointments in consultation with the Vice Chancellors, as appropriate. For Classified employees, SEIU 1021 makes the appointments as specified in Board Policy 2.07.
For faculty members, the Academic Senate's Committee on Committees customarily reviews requests from faculty members and makes recommendations to the Executive Council, which makes appointments. The student appointments are made by the Associated Students [IV A-28 p. 33].

Students participate in decision making through the Associated Students (AS). All students who attend CCSF are members of the Associated Students. The mission statement of the Associated Students of the Ocean Campus states:

The Associated Students at Ocean Campus, represented by an elected council of 16 students, serves the CCSF student body by voicing student concerns and organizing and funding programs. The Associated Students also advocates for the student body on issues of campus safety, cultural diversity, social and political awareness, improving access to higher education and building a sexual-harassment-free campus [IV A-37].

In addition, there is an Associated Student Council at the Civic Center, Downtown, Evans, John Adams, Mission, and Southeast campuses as well as at the Adult Learning and Tutorial Center located at 31 Gough Street. The presidents of each of these Councils are represented on the Executive Council of the Associated Students. The current Student Trustee is working with the Associated Students to increase the number of student representatives from campuses other than Ocean who serve on Shared Governance committees.

Student representatives participate in task forces, and other College wide groups that are outside the Shared Governance System, such as the Textbook Affordability Task Force and the Accreditation Steering Committee. The Associated Students Presidents communicate regularly with the Chancellor and organize opportunities for student leaders to interact with the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, administrators, and other campus leaders. Brown bag lunches with the Chancellor and other administrators are scheduled several times each year. Trustees have worked with students to create public forums for broad issues affecting students, such as achievement gaps. Associated Students allocate funding from student activities fees to sponsor programs and support resources that help build student leadership. Associated Students encourages students to organize to work on a wide range of issues, such as creating a farmer’s market on campus and organizing statewide actions against cuts to funding for California Community Colleges [IV A-37 bis].

**The College Shared Governance System has three parts:**

1. **The Collegial Governance System** is the system through which the College consults collegially with the Academic Senate and its representatives on matters related to academic and professional matters. There are a range of academic and professional matters for which the California Education Code requires governing boards to rely primarily on recommendations from the Academic Senate or to reach mutual agreement with the Academic Senate [IV A-38, IV A-39, IV A-40, IV A-41, IV A-42, IV A-43, IV A-44]. California Title 5 Regulations, Section 53200, provides definitions of the academic and professional matters that are included and directs that “the district governing board shall develop policies on academic and professional matters through either or both of the
following: 1) Rely primarily upon the advice and judgement of the Academic Senate, OR 2) The governing board, or its designees, and the Academic Senate shall reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of the governing board effectuating such recommendations” [IV A-45]. It is CCSF Board policy that, for the ten Title 5 academic and professional areas, the Board will rely primarily upon the recommendations of the Academic Senate [IV A-2 p.2]. The Board has mutual agreements with the Academic Senate for policies that cover procedures for administrator hiring and retreat rights and faculty hiring. The mutual agreement policy on faculty hiring also established the members, authority, and responsibilities of the Faculty Positions Allocation Committee (FPAC) [IV A-46, IV A-47, IV A-48, IV A-48 p.2].

All faculty are members of the Academic Senate and may engage directly in decision making through plenary and special meetings of the Academic Senate, participation in meetings of the Academic Senate Executive Council, through membership in committees and subcommittees that report to the Academic Senate, and other venues [IV A-49, IV A-50]. The Executive Council of 29 members elected from the Senate at large meets about twice a month during the fall and spring to consider and discuss issues of significance in academic and professional matters [IV A-49]. There are four standing committees in this system: Academic Policies, Curriculum, Student Preparation and Success, and Staff Development. Representation on these committees includes administrators, faculty, classified staff, and students. These committees provide information, give reports, and make recommendations to the Executive Council on all academic and professional matters [IV A-50, IV A-28]. Policy recommendations from the Executive Council are forwarded to the Chancellor (or to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs if designated) for review before being sent to the Board of Trustees. Recommendations may also be sent directly to the Board [IV A-2 pp. 6-9].

At an Academic Senate special meeting in March 2010, the Chancellor, the Ocean Campus Associated Student President, the Classified Senate President, and three faculty members presented introductory remarks at the beginning of the meeting. As the business of the meeting was about to begin, the Student Trustee also requested to speak and had to wait until much later in the meeting. To ensure adequate time for input from all constituencies for future meetings, the Academic Senate instituted a practice of “Public Comment” near the beginning of every meeting, starting in Fall 2010. The Academic Senate also opened to the public its Committee on Committees meetings, to ensure compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act [IV A-51, IV A-52, IV A-53].

2. The College Advisory System is the system in which the College obtains advisory recommendations in key operational areas from four committees: Information and Public Records, College Diversity, Communication, and Information Technology Policy. These committees report directly to the College Advisory Council (CAC) which is composed of leadership from all the major College organizations—students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators. The Chancellor chairs the CAC. The CAC discusses ideas and policies that have District wide significance, coordinates policy development and makes recommendations in areas not under the leadership of the Academic Senate. The CAC also provides a forum for dialogs between the various constituencies at the highest level as well as
with the Board of Trustees via the Chancellor. Also the CAC has the responsibility to regularly evaluate the Shared Governance System [IV A-28, IV A-34].

The membership of the College Advisory Council consists of thirteen leaders, both appointed and elected. The appointed leaders who sit on the CAC are three Vice Chancellors designated by the Chancellor, the District and the student Shared Governance Coordinators and the Chancellor, who also serves as the chair of the CAC. Currently, the elected institutional leaders are the presidents of the Academic Senate, Faculty Union (AFT 2121), and Department Chairpersons Council (DCC), the Presidents of the Classified Union (SEIU 1021) and Classified Senate, as well as the Student Trustee and the President of the Associated Students, Ocean Campus. The College Advisory Council meets monthly during the course of the spring and fall semesters [IV A-28, IV A-34].

3. The Planning and Budgeting System is an integrated system of College wide planning and budgeting for the College. The standing Council in this system is the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC). The twenty voting members of this Council include representatives from each of the College constituencies—students, faculty, administrators, and classified staff [IV A-28, IV A-35].

The Chancellor chairs the College’s PBC. The College’s PBC oversees the development of the College Strategic Plans, the Annual Plans, End-of-Year Assessments, and the annual College budgets [IV A-19, IV A-16, IV A-54, IV A-55]. During recent tight financial years, the College’s PBC has increased the number of its meetings and held some meetings as open hearings to provide a conduit for information and collective thinking about the College budget [IV A-16, IV A-56 p.1]. The major standing committees of the College’s PBC include Program Review and Facilities Review (FRC) [IV A-28 pp. 21-26]. Through the Program Review Committee, the College’s PBC governs the Program Review process, providing direction to departments and receiving reports and recommendations [IV A-57, IV A-58, IV A-59]. Facilities Review forwards recommendations to the College’s PBC regarding the use of College facilities, plans for future facilities, parking and transportation issues (from its Parking and Transportation Subcommittee, sustainability issues (from its Sustainability Subcommittee), and other facility related issues [IV A-60, IV A-61]. The Faculty Position Allocation Committee reviews and forwards recommendations about full-time faculty positions, which the College’s PBC reviews for funding and approves or disapproves [IV A-62, IV A-63]. Recommendations from the College’s PBC are advisory through the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees.

Implementation of the Shared Governance System has seen changes over time. The documents attesting to the nature of the Shared Governance System, such as the Shared Governance Handbook and related literature, are numerous. The Shared Governance Handbook provides an organizational chart outlining where the committees fit within the system. The Handbook details the charge of each committee as well as the numerical membership of each constituent group, including a directory with committee name, the chair’s name, and contact information. California’s laws and administrative regulations provide that students, classified staff, and administrators play an advisory role to the Chancellor. The faculty role is more specific. In accordance with Title 5, section 53200, “the
governing board or its designees will consult collegially with the academic senate when adopting policies and procedures on academic and professional matters.” The CCSF Shared Governance System is compliant with this Title 5 regulation [IV A-28, IV A-45].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

- The CCSF faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators continue to collaborate effectively through the 43 Shared Governance councils, committees, and subcommittees to discuss issues, resolve problems, and recommend policies for adoption by the Board of Trustees. The Shared Governance system and the subsequent support for the process and practices from the District, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution.

- The District plans to continue its ongoing efforts to better incorporate the Associated Student councils from the campuses into the College wide decision-making process.

- To ensure adequate time for input from all constituencies, the Academic Senate will continue its practice of including a “Public Comment” opportunity near the beginning of every meeting. It will also continue to hold Committee on Committee meetings in public, to ensure compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act.

Planning Agenda

None

IV.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

As described above in IV.A.2.a, CCSF has clearly defined policies and practices that follow Title 5 and give authority to the appropriate Shared Governance constituency. The most significant documents that describe the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters are the Curriculum Handbook and Board Policy 2.07[IV A-64, IV A-2 p.2]. Under Board Policy 2.07, the College relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in all ten Title 5 academic and professional matters.

The Board of Trustees, and its official representative, the Chancellor, shall rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in the following areas as defined by Title 5, Section 53200:
1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies
4. Educational program development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
9. Processes for program review
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon [IV A-2, p. 2]

For policy changes affecting academic matters, discussion takes place mainly in the Academic Policies Committee, an Academic Senate standing committee in Shared Governance. During the last academic year (2010-11), the Academic Policies Committee considered the following issues for possible recommendation to the Academic Senate [IV A-65, IV A-66, IV A-67, IV A-68, IV A-69, IV A-70]:

- Credit by Exam policy changes: The changes mostly involved residency, required enrollment, fees, and the maximum credits-by-exam allowed with certain limitations.
- Registration priority for students entering CCSF from SF high schools: The District began piloting registration priority for fully matriculated students incoming from San Francisco high schools.
- Registration priority for Guardian Scholars: The District began granting Guardian Scholars (foster youth) the same registration priority as athletes.
- Transfer degrees: The College has begun creating majors suitable for associate degrees compliant with SB 1440.
- Removal-of-Incomplete Policy: All students now have a uniform one-semester grace period in which to remove an Incomplete.
- Grades affecting Financial Aid Eligibility: The Grading Policies Subcommittee is discussing the advisability of adopting usage of the “FW” grade.
- Retroactive Degrees and Certificates: Committee members have been working with department chairs to draft a policy for conferring retroactive degrees and certificates.

To encourage discussion and further participation in the decision-making process, on February 9, 2011 the Executive Council of Academic Senate voted to implement an Electronic Faculty Forum (EFF) to provide faculty the opportunity to engage in District wide conversations on academic and District wide matters. EFF provides faculty with a means to post diverse questions, concerns, and ideas as well as invite dialog and build consensus among faculty. EFF was launched at the end of February and has hosted discussions about campus safety, grading policy, a perceived backlash against colleges across the country, and SDI insurance for part-time faculty [IV A-71].

The Executive Council chose for its format the current email discussion list for its simplicity, inclusiveness, and easy access. All faculty members have been included from the first
discussion; however, faculty also have the option to choose to “opt out” or unsubscribe from EFF. This electronic communicative tool provides a flexible alternative for faculty to participate in the discussion of academic issues affecting the College. Faculty feedback and response to EFF has been positive; in particular faculty have expressed an appreciation for the opportunity to participate in College-wide dialog [IV A-72].

The Executive Council of the Academic Senate meets about twice a month during the academic year. Using Robert’s Rules of Order for parliamentary procedure, it deliberates and makes recommendations to the administration and to the Board of Trustees on academic and professional matters, including academic policies and the language for recording such policies in the College Catalog, if applicable [IV A-50].

Recent policy matters deliberated upon by the Academic Senate include [IV A-73, IV A-74, IV A-75, IV A-76, IV A-77, IV A-78, IV A-78b(s):

- Upper Division Transfer Units
- Breadth Requirements
- Satisfactory Progress (SP) Grade for Noncredit Courses
- Credit Matriculation Plan
- Incomplete Removal Policy
- Pilot Program for Concurrently Enrolled High School Students
- Waiting lists for fully enrolled class sections
- Content Filtering on the CCSF Computer Network

In addition, the Executive Council of the Academic Senate makes recommendations regarding new administrative positions and the position announcements for filling vacant administrative positions [IV A-79, IV A-80, IV A-78]. It also reviews and/or recommends changes to the Program Review process, the College Mission and Vision statements, and other long-term, College-wide plans, such as the Strategic Plan, Education Master Plan, Student Equity Plan, Sustainability Plan, and Technology Plan [IV A-81, IV A-82, IV A-83, IV A-84, IV A-85, IV A-86, IV A-87].

The Executive Council also makes recommendations regarding policies under consideration by the Board of Trustees [IV A-88, IV A-89]. In Spring 2010, the Academic Senate Executive Council endorsed, with some suggestions for change, a draft Board of Trustees document: “Recommendations on the Achievement Gap and Equity” [IV A-90, IV A-91]. Members of the Academic Senate (which includes all faculty) exercised the right to call a special meeting of the Academic Senate by a petition signed by 200 members [IV A-92, IV A-93]. At the special meeting, a resolution was approved that recommended extensive changes to the draft Board of Trustees document to redirect its concerns through appropriate shared governance bodies and administrative channels [IV A-93, IV A-94]. The draft Board of Trustees document was not considered by the full Board.

The Curriculum Committee is a quadripartite Shared Governance Committee of eighteen faculty, six administrators, two students, and one classified member. The Committee is the reviewing and approving body for curricula for the College as a whole. The Committee is
responsible for studying curricular proposals (courses and programs) and recommending action on them to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. It meets approximately every two weeks during the spring and fall semesters [IV A-95].

The role of the Curriculum Committee is to review and determine the merit and expression of curriculum proposals. Proposals brought to the Curriculum Committee are the product of a department, not of an individual faculty member. The department that prepares a proposal is solely and entirely responsible for the content of a proposal. During its review, the Curriculum Committee may cite the content of a proposal for review or explanation, but it relies on the expertise of discipline faculty. The focus of the Committee is the academic merit of each proposal and its contributions to the overall educational goals of the College. Inclusion of Student Learning Outcomes is among the requirements for every new and revised course outline [IV A-64 pp.9-10].

The Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements is composed of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and Academic Administrators. It meets once each semester and makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees on associate degree policies and on the addition of specific courses into area graduation requirements [IV A-96, IV A-97].

As an implementation aid, CCSF Board resolutions now feature a "Shared Governance Review" box to indicate the proximate source of policy recommendations meritng such review. The list of committees in the Review box must end with one of the three Councils or with the College Curriculum Committee (which makes Board recommendations without explicit Academic Senate approval). Other bodies (committees, subcommittees, bargaining agents, or task forces) do not satisfy a requirement for Shared Governance review.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

- CCSF has clearly defined policies and practices that follow Title 5 and give authority to the appropriate Shared Governance constituency. Specifically, the College relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in all ten Title 5 academic and professional matters. It also looks to the Curriculum Committee, Department Chairs, and the Academic Administrators for recommendations concerning student learning programs and services.

- There are occasional inconsistencies in the Shared Governance Review box on Board resolutions. For example, there have been some Board resolutions which were reviewed by various groups within the College, but not by one of the three Councils or the Curriculum Committee [IV A-94, IV A-99]. Conversely, it is rare, but it has happened that a proposed Board resolution that affects educational programs is agendized without prior Shared Governance review. An example is the pair of related resolutions 090924-S8 and 091119-S1. These were proposals to give San Francisco residents certain admission priority to the Licensed Vocational Nursing program. The first resolution was reviewed by the Academic Senate but there was no notation to
that effect on the Board agenda. The second was not reviewed by the Academic Senate [IV A-100, IV A-101, IV A-102]. The College Advisory Council is considering revising the Shared Governance Review box.

Planning Agenda

None

IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

Descriptive Summary

CCSF’s written policies on governance procedures specify appropriate roles for all staff and students. As noted above, these written policies also specify the academic roles of faculty in areas of student educational programs and services planning. An ongoing challenge has been finding strategies to encourage full engagement by students in Shared Governance. In addition, the current budget cuts, attrition within the ranks of employees, and increased workloads have also made it difficult for classified staff and faculty to participate fully in committee work.

The Board Policy Manual (Revised September 29, 1998) gives the College constituent groups—students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators—the right and responsibility to serve on committees and to address all facets of the College’s Mission. The appendix of the BP section 2.07 defines the standing committees of the Shared Governance System, including the number of representatives of each constituency and their terms. It provides for continuing evaluation by those constituent groups, which is to be summarized by the Chancellor and passed through to the Board of Trustees [IV A-2, pp. 10-16].

An example of collegial collaboration involves the current relationship with the bargaining units. The growing financial crises facing the College created the opportunity for cooperation with the College unions in their negotiations to avoid layoffs and minimize cutbacks in student services and class offerings. This was a critical factor allowing the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council to make decisions that would save the College millions of dollars during one of the worst funding downturns in the College history [IV A-103].

Another example is the Strategic Planning process. Members of all constituency groups were invited to attend Community Listening Sessions. Constituency groups were represented during two day-long planning sessions held in Spring 2010. In addition, drafts of the 2011-16 Strategic Plan were circulated throughout the District Shared Governance System, allowing for further employee and student input. Based on this input the Strategic Planning team revised the current Strategic Plan (2011-16), which they brought to numerous committee meetings to seek final feedback prior to approval [IV A-19 pp.3-5].
Reports from constituent groups are listed on every agenda for regular meetings of the Board of Trustees [IV A-104]. Every month, the Presidents or other representatives of the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and Associated Students have the opportunity to update the Trustees directly on Shared Governance activities, bring forward ideas for public notice, or express concerns about the welfare of the College. As part of their reports, the presidents often yield time for public remarks from other College leaders, such as the President of AFT 2121. Before June 2010, the only Associated Student President invited to speak regularly was the President of Associated Students at Ocean Avenue Campus. On the suggestion of the Student Trustee, this practice was extended to the leadership of Associated Students at every campus.

College wide discussion and communication is facilitated in committees and subcommittees throughout the Shared Governance System. While there is an ongoing collegial discussion among the constituencies, continued improvement and expansion of existing communication is always a goal.

In 1994, the College created an Office of Shared Governance. In 2004, the Shared Governance Evaluation recommended that the Office of Shared Governance be placed in a location close to the office of the Academic Senate and that the District Shared Governance Coordinator report directly to the Chancellor, both of which were accomplished by 2007 [IV A-105].

CCSF is a large institution and it is a constant challenge to ensure effective communication. The College consistently reviews and examines ways in which it can better reach out to its constituent groups to engage participation and active dialog to facilitate discussion of ideas and to inform the College community.

While the Shared Governance System is an intricate process by which the College attempts to engage College community participation in the College wide discussion, formal and informal surveys indicate that many faculty and students do not know about, understand, or participate in Shared Governance. In an effort to provide more outreach, the College Shared Governance Coordinator provides information and trainings about the Shared Governance System during new employee orientations, Board of Trustees orientations, Academic Senate Executive Council retreats, Flex Day workshops, Associated Students meetings, and meetings of the Associated Students Executive Council. Information is regularly updated on the Shared Governance website and in City Currents, the CCSF internal weekly newsletter [IV A-106, IV A-107].

Both the Shared Governance Handbook and the website, which include information regarding the roles of constituent groups and each Committee’s mission statements, are updated annually. The Shared Governance Coordinator also posts on the Office of Shared Governance website information received from constituent groups and committee chairs regarding committee membership updates, meeting schedules, meeting agendas and approved meeting minutes [IV A-28, IV A-107].

Communication and distribution of information has evolved over time to keep up with changing technology, increased outreach, and improved timeliness. As new technologies
emerge and new policies are implemented, the Shared Governance Coordinator endeavors to keep all the information up to date. The two latest developments are the use of streaming media for the Board of Trustees meeting and the change in the District Sunshine Policy to increase transparency in the institution. The District Sunshine Policy calls for audio recordings of all meetings of the College Advisory Council, the Planning and Budgeting Council, and the Executive Council of the Academic Senate [IV A-32, Article II.A.4.b, pp.2-3 and Article II.B.8.b, p.12].

Current issues, such as the speed of processing for hiring student workers and financial aid applications, have definitely been much improved through District wide discussions. Other ideas are still being discussed and implemented, such as the pilot math and English compressed course sequences. The College needs to assess the outcomes of these pilots before reaching consensus on how to further proceed.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The CCSF faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators continue to collaborate effectively through the 43 Shared Governance councils, committees and subcommittees to discuss issues, resolve problems, and recommend policies for adoption by the Board of Trustees. The Shared Governance system and the subsequent support for the process and practices from the District, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution.

**Planning Agenda**

None

**IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study, and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.**

**Descriptive Summary**

CCSF has responded expeditiously and honestly to the Accrediting Commission’s recommendations and any citations of difficulties, and agrees to continue to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, guidelines, and requirements.

For example, during the last accreditation visit, the visiting team suggested increasing outreach and education on the Shared Governance System to the various stakeholders. As a result, the District Shared Governance Coordinator now regularly provides orientations to
new employees, to the Executive Committee of the Associated Students, the Executive Council of the Classified Senate, and other groups as needed [IV A-106, IV A-108].

The College’s relationship with the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) primarily involves the Financial Aid Office and the Office of Workforce and Economic Development. The CCSF Financial Aid Office regularly participates in staff development training activities with the training specialist for Region IX and also attends other USDE training events. The Program Participation Agreement with USDE, which is similar to an accreditation approval, has been approved through June 30, 2015 [IV A-109].

The Division of Policy and Research regularly reviews USDE publications regarding current and future policies and legislation, particularly as it relates to the Carl Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006. Administrators, faculty, and staff actively participate with local, regional, state, and national Workforce and Economic Development Councils, Consortia, and Associations, including the Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC), the California Community College Association of Occupational Education (CCCAOE), and the National Council for Workforce Education (NCWE). Faculty and administrators regularly attend and present at national and state conferences. Currently, the Chancellor serves on the San Francisco Workforce Investment Board (WISF) and the Interim Vice Chancellor of Policy and Research serves on the WISF Youth Council and as President of NCWE (2010-11), a council of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). Information is communicated to CCSF’s Career and Technical Education Department chairs, faculty, Career and Technical Education (CTE) Subcommittee, Academic Policies Committee, and the Executive Council of the CCSF Academic Senate. Input from CCSF is provided via surveys generated from both the State Chancellor’s Office and the U.S. Department of Education on Career and Technical Education Act Reauthorization and reporting requirements. Various departments within CCSF have also applied for and received grants from the USDE [IV A-110].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

CCSF exercises the highest level of integrity in its communication and in its relationship with WASC and the ACCJC. Honest communication with external agencies continues to be a goal of the College. For example, there is open and well-established communication between the USDE and the CCSF Financial Aid Office and the CCSF Office of Workforce and Economic Development.

**Planning Agenda**

None

**IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and**
effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

The Shared Governance Agreement specifies that each constituency should evaluate the Shared Governance System every two years. The last substantive evaluation and revision of the Shared Governance System was in 2007, with the involvement of the leadership of all four constituent groups. The Committee on Information and Public Records reviewed the results of the Shared Governance survey, and reported to the College Advisory Council [IV A-111]. To improve guidance for chairs and members of Shared Governance groups, “Additional Formalized Customary Practices of Shared Governance Committees” was added to the Handbook [IV A-112, IV A-28 pp. 39-40]. An extensive evaluation of the Shared Governance System did not take place in 2009 because throughout 2008-09 the Committee on Information and Public Records was dedicated to developing the District Sunshine Policy which was recommended by the College Advisory Council in May, 2009 and adopted by the Board of Trustees in September, 2009 [IV A-112bis, IV A-112tres, IV A-32].

A survey of employees conducted in Fall 2010 asked several questions about Shared Governance. The respondents reported levels of satisfaction with the three Shared Governance Councils ranging from 2.86 (for “Academic Senate recommendations to the Board of Trustees regarding academic and professional matters”) to 2.46 (for “PBC as a channel for employee and student ideas regarding institutional decision-making”) where 3 represented ‘Good’ and 2 represented ‘Below Average.’ Of the respondents to that survey, 72 percent spent one hour or more per week on Shared Governance activities. Those engaged in Shared Governance activities included 83 percent of administrators, 77 percent of faculty, and 55 percent of classified staff. The diminished participation among classified staff reflects attrition and consequent increased workloads due to the College’s greatly reduced budget [IV A-113, IV A-114].

Since the last accreditation visit, our Board has begun conducting an annual self evaluation that is informed in part by surveying all College constituencies. The results of that evaluation are publicly available on the Web as an attachment to the Board meeting at which the results are presented [IV A-115, IV A-116, IV A-117]. The Board also evaluates the Chancellor each spring; this evaluation is informed in part by employee surveys. Specifically, the trustees and the employees express how well they feel the Chancellor is achieving the Board-identified objectives. College constituents are encouraged to engage in these evaluations [IV A-118].

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

- The College conducts an annual evaluation of the Chancellor.
- The Board of Trustees conducts a self evaluation and the results are presented at a public meeting.
• A review and evaluation of the Shared Governance structure is supposed to take place every two years. The last evaluation occurred in 2007. Beginning in 2011-12, the Office of Shared Governance will conduct a Program Review.

Planning Agenda

Acting upon a recommendation of the Committee on Information and Public Records, the Office of Shared Governance will conduct a survey of College employees and students in Fall 2011 and biennially thereafter to evaluate the CCSF Shared Governance System by using the District’s new license of the online survey tool Survey Monkey™.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV A-2</td>
<td>SFCCCD Policy Manual: CCSF Shared Governance System Board Policy Number 2.07</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/2/pm2_07.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/2/pm2_07.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-3</td>
<td>Title V, Section 53200</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/shared_governance/title5.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/shared_governance/title5.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-6</td>
<td>Student Equity Hearings [audio/video tapes]</td>
<td>Not online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-7</td>
<td>Documents related to Faculty Hiring, Equal Employment Opportunity, and related issues</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/EEO-HiringResources.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/EEO-HiringResources.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-9</td>
<td>Documents related to State and CCSF Budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/BudgetResources.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/BudgetResources.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-12</td>
<td>Associated Student</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/Student_Activ">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/Student_Activ</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV A-24</td>
<td>CCSF Cost Savings Idea Contest of 2010 evidence</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/SavingsContest/index.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/SavingsContest/index.htm</a> Is this the evidence we want to use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-26</td>
<td>Letter to the college community from Chancellor Griffin,</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/News/WebCredRequestCover.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/News/WebCredRequestCover.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-29</td>
<td>Shared Governance Agreement</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/shared_governance/bd_resolution.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/shared_governance/bd_resolution.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-31</td>
<td>CCSF Shared</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/council.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/council.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-32</td>
<td>Governance Committees and Subcommittees Index</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/pmSunshine.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/pmSunshine.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-34</td>
<td>College Advisory Council</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/cac.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/cac.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-35</td>
<td>Planning and Budgeting Council</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/pbc.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/pbc.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-37bis</td>
<td>Email from Elizabeth Weinberg, Past President of Associated Students of Ocean Campus.</td>
<td>NOT online. KS has electronic document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-38</td>
<td>California Education Code Sec 70902 (b) (7)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=70001-71000&amp;file=70900-70902">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=70001-71000&amp;file=70900-70902</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-39</td>
<td>California Education Code Sec 87359 (b)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87355-87359.5">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87355-87359.5</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-40</td>
<td>California Education Code Sec 87360 (b)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87360">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87360</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-41</td>
<td>California Education Code Sec 87458 (a)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87400-87488">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87400-87488</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-42</td>
<td>California Education Code Sec 87610.1 (a)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87600-87612">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87600-87612</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-43</td>
<td>California Education Code Sec 87663 (f)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87660-87683">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87660-87683</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-44</td>
<td>California Education Code Sec 87743.2</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87743-87746">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87743-87746</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-47</td>
<td>Right to Faculty Status for Administrators</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Committees/3-AdministrativeRetreat.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Committees/3-AdministrativeRetreat.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-48</td>
<td>Faculty Hiring Procedures</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/faculty_hiring.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/faculty_hiring.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-51</td>
<td>Audio recording of Academic Senate Special meeting, March 23, 2010</td>
<td>CD ROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-52</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council Minutes, Sept. 22, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-79</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council minutes Mar. 17, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-80</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council minutes, Oct. 20, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMin20101020-R.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMin20101020-R.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-81</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council minutes, Sept. 22, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMin20100922R.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMin20100922R.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-83</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council minutes, Mar. 9, 2011</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_S11/AsMin20110309.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_S11/AsMin20110309.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-84</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council minutes Nov. 11, 2009</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/listofmeetings_f09/Asminutes20091111.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/listofmeetings_f09/Asminutes20091111.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-85</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council minutes Sept. 8, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMin20100908.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMin20100908.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-88</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council minutes Apr. 7, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_S10/AsMin20100407.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_S10/AsMin20100407.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-89</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council minutes, Oct. 6, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMin20101006.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMin20101006.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-90</td>
<td>Board of Trustees draft resolution: Recommendations on the Achievement Gap and Equity</td>
<td><a href="http://math.ccsf.edu/pdf/CCSF_Board_Draft_Resolution_Feb_2010.pdf">http://math.ccsf.edu/pdf/CCSF_Board_Draft_Resolution_Feb_2010.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-91</td>
<td>Academic Senate Executive Council minutes, Mar. 13, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_S10/AsMin20100317.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_S10/AsMin20100317.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-92</td>
<td>Academic Senate Special Meeting minutes, March 23, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_S10/AsMin20100323_Special_Meeting.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_S10/AsMin20100323_Special_Meeting.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-94</td>
<td>Resolution Responding to “Recommendations on the Achievement Gap and Equity Draft</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/College_Council/PDFs/ApprovedReso.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/College_Council/PDFs/ApprovedReso.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-95</td>
<td>Board Resolution co-sponsored by Trustees Jackson, Marks, and Ngo Approved at Academic Senate Special Meeting 3/23/10</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Curriculum_Committee/home_page">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Curriculum_Committee/home_page</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-96</td>
<td>Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements minutes, Nov. 3, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMinBip20101103.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeetings_F10/AsMinBip20101103.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-94</td>
<td>Example of Board Resolution with wrong body</td>
<td>KS will supply later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-99</td>
<td>Example of Board Resolution with wrong body</td>
<td>KS will supply later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-100</td>
<td>SFCSD 090924-S8; Resolution to Create Community Access and Opportunity in City College’s Nursing Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/090924/S8.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/090924/S8.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-102</td>
<td>SFCSD 091119-S1; Resolution to Create Community Access and Opportunity in City College’s Vocational Nursing Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/091119/S1.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/091119/S1.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-103</td>
<td>Evidence for the relationship with the bargaining units and negotiations</td>
<td>Documentary evidence probably not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-104</td>
<td>SFCSD Board of Trustees Agenda, June 24, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/BOT/june_resolution.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/BOT/june_resolution.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-105</td>
<td>Interview with Attila Gabor, Shared Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-106</td>
<td>Employee Orientation Agenda, August, 2011</td>
<td>Not online, ks has in electronic form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-108</td>
<td>Associated Student Council Ocean Campus minutes Sept. 15, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/Student_Activities/minutes/ASCMinutes091510.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/Student_Activities/minutes/ASCMinutes091510.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-109</td>
<td>Evidence that the Financial Aid Office participates in staff development training exercises</td>
<td>Evidence not yet identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-110</td>
<td>Evidence about our participation in NCWE, BACCC, CCCAOE</td>
<td>Evidence not yet identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-112tres</td>
<td>SFCCD 090924-P1; Notice of Intention to Amend the SFCCD Policy Manual by Adding Section 2.08 – Public Access Sunshine Policy for the San Francisco Community College District</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/090924/P1.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/090924/P1.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-114</td>
<td>Q5_Time Spent on Shared Governance Activities Based on Responses to 2011 Employee Survey 5/16/11</td>
<td>Not online. KS has electronic copy of this question broken out by constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A-118</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Self</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, Faculty and Classified Instrument for Chancellor’s Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

Section: IV.B.1. The Institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees has a policy manual that identifies Board roles. In 2008 the Policy Implementation Committee of the Board, with the assistance of outside legal counsel, began a process to review and update the policy manual. In the same year, partly because of budget constraints, and largely because of concerns raised in the Churchwell Report on the Special Investigation, the Board focused its attention on policies related to bidding, contracting, and construction in order to correct problems that had been identified by the Report. The Board had previously authorized a Performance Audit in 2007. Also in 2008 the Board established its Facilities, Infrastructure and Technology Committee, which immediately began close oversight, for the first time, of escalating construction costs and expenses. In addition, the Board passed a resolution requiring that every change order be approved by the Committee and forwarded to the Board. The process of Policy Manual review was resumed at the end of March 2010. Policies that the Board will enact, revise, or update by December 31, 2011 include: a statement that it is responsible for the selection, hiring, and evaluation of the Chancellor, clarification of the Conflict of Interest Policies, for trustees and clarification about Statements of Financial Interests, and a Code of Ethics for all employees.

The College Mission and Vision statement, Strategic and Annual Plans, Program Review, Educational Plan and other institutional planning documents address program quality and student learning outcomes as well as services provided to ensure student success as outlined in Standards 1 and 1A.

BP 1200 District Vision and Mission Statement addresses the College’s commitment to superior levels of educational participation and academic success among all students. The statement further addresses the College commitment to providing an affordable and unparalleled learning experience in a supportive and caring environment that leads students to successfully complete their goals. In addition, the College is committed to expanding out-of-classroom learning activities to provide a range of opportunities, including service learning, internships, tutoring, mentoring, and cultural and recreation activities throughout the district.

BP 1200 further states:
Our principal distinction will be high quality of instruction. The educational experience will feature successful learning in areas as varied as basic skills, academic skills, academic courses, advanced honors, career and technical courses, retooling of job skills, and preparation for transfer to other educational institutions. Learning opportunities will extend to a broad array of courses and programs to offer any student a pathway to educational and career success.

Since the last accreditation visit, the Board has examined its existing practice and revised PM 1.11 Chief Administrator: Selection, Authority and term of Office. This policy needs to state explicitly that the Board is responsible for selecting, hiring, and evaluating the Chancellor so that the policy describes long-standing Board and District practice.

Self Evaluation

The College will meet this standard by December 31, 2011.

Planning Agenda

Complete Board Policy updates by December 31, 2011, particularly in regard to its responsibility to select and evaluate the Chancellor.

Section: IV.B.1.a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

Descriptive Summary

As mandated by California Education code, the San Francisco Community College District is governed by a Board of Trustees, consisting of seven members elected by the voters of the City and County of San Francisco to represent the interest of the community at large. The Board has one student member elected by the Associated Students of City College of San Francisco to represent the interests of the student population of the college. The Student Trustee casts an advisory vote at open session Board meetings.

Board Policy Code of Ethics (PM 1.15) reads as follows:

1. Represent all segments of the community in advocating for their particular needs.
2. Function as a team seeking to stay well-informed and to act objectively.
3. Recognize that the Board of Trustees exercises power through the decisions it makes as a group. Individual Board members have no legal standing. Trustee powers cannot be utilized in any individual manner.

City College of San Francisco is a public institution; therefore, all governing board members are non-owners of the institution.
Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.

Section: IV.B.1.b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

Descriptive Summary

The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and the fiduciary responsibility for the district. The Board reviews, evaluates, and periodically commissions studies, reports, and other documents related to the quality of student learning programs/services and how District resources are allocated to support learning programs. The Board reviews programs and budgets at regular meetings and work sessions.

The College’s Strategic Plan, Annual Plan, Educational Plan and College catalog are all reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees.

In addition, the Board was successful in directing the focus of the Student Learning Outcomes effort to the issue of Student Equity. As a result of hearings that the Board required, the College has begun to develop a system of assessing and improving Student Learning Outcomes in regard to the differing results among different ethnic groups of students.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The Board and the Shared Governance process effectively insure that a holistic and public process is in place to produce Plans and reports that the Board deems necessary.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary
The governing board is independent and subject only to state and federal laws pertaining to post secondary education.

The Board is the ultimate authority for City College of San Francisco (as per California Education Code 70902, Title 5, as well as Board Policy Manual Section 1.09 and others) and is responsible to use that authority to create broad policies to insure the integrity of the institution in fulfilling its mission.

Some shared governance entities believe that all policies must be reviewed and agreed to by the Shared Governance system before the Board adopts them. Some trustees believe that Shared Governance entities are often hostile when the Board raises issues of public concern. These trustees are concerned that the Board’s attempts to accommodate shared governance review have resulted in unnecessary delays and a barrier to the Board’s fulfillment of its responsibility to adopt policies. They believe that the Board has the authority and responsibility to act even when Shared Governance review yields no results.

Examples of the Board’s exercise of authority in financial matters include the following resolutions:

110127-B2a  Clarification of accounting of Board of Trustees expenses through a Board budget

110127-S2  The appointment of Tracy Teale, CPA, to serve the Board’s Audit Committee as a CPA advisor and a financial expert

110526-S3 San Francisco Community College District adopts the written protocol to clearly delineate those employees who have authority to financially encumber or otherwise legally or financially obligate the District to third parties

100128-P4  Adding Board Policy BP 6347 – PROCEDURES AND POLICY MANUAL – FACILITIES OFFICE

In addition, for the 2011-12 draft budget, the Board wants detailed data and a plan that identifies clear criteria for making noninstructional faculty assignments prior to Board authorization of such assignments for Spring 2012. [Ref, Board Planning and Budgeting meeting, June 20, 2011 and June 23rd Draft Budget Part 4 Board of Trustees Modifications, Section 4. ]

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None
Section: IV.B.1.d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

Descriptive Summary
The Board of Trustees Policy Manual is available online. The Board Manual addresses the Board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures (see PM 1.01 – 1.16). [Ref. CCSF District Policy Manual] Dates of approval and the number of revisions indicate the frequency with which the Board revises its policies.

Self Evaluation
The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda
None

Section: IV.B.1.e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Descriptive Summary
The Board actions are consistent with the CCSF Board Policy Manual and bylaws. There is no evidence that Board actions are not final or that they are subject to the actions of any other entity. The Board addresses policy changes based upon shifts in federal, state, or local laws and regulations, or when a recommendation is presented through the College’s Shared Governance System.

The Board wants to explore ways that it and Shared Governance entities can understand each other better and work together more effectively and amicably.

In January 2009, the Board adopted BP 2745, which calls for the Board to assess its own performance as a Board in order to identify its strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning. The self-evaluation is intended to address effective Board operations and dynamics as well as the achievement of Board goals and the fulfillment of its responsibilities that support the District’s success. It cites the 2006 Self Study IV.b.1 e & g as the basis for its adoption. The Board is committed to conducting a self-evaluation on an annual basis each Spring semester.

However, the Self Evaluation conducted in 2010 is still incomplete, in that the Board Policy requires that the Evaluation results be discussed at a public meeting. Further, the policy states
that “The results of the process will be used to summarize accomplishments from the past year…”

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

The Board will complete its most recent Self Evaluation process, produce a summary of its accomplishments from the past year, and review its obligations for collegial consultation.

Section: IV.B.1.f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

Descriptive Summary

The Board does not have its own system for orientation and development; instead the Chancellor has taken on that role. Each Board member receives a personal orientation, involving the Chancellor, some leaders of college constituencies, and senior administrators. Topics such as the planning and budgeting system and all pertinent information are discussed and the Policy Manual and League’s New Trustees Orientation binder are distributed. In the 2006 Self Study, the College pledged that the Board would hold an annual retreat. The last retreat was held in Spring 2009, but no retreats were held in Spring 2010 or Spring 2011.

In addition, all new Trustees who have joined the Board in the last six years have attended orientations for trustees organized by the California Community College League held in Sacramento.

The Office of the Chancellor (CCSF) serves as an ongoing resource to all Board members. Board members are encouraged and provided with many different opportunities to attend both internal and external events, conferences, and other functions to improve and increase their understanding of policies affecting both the San Francisco Community College District and the state community college system.

The members of the Board of Trustees are elected by the voters of the San Francisco Community College district. The seven publicly elected Trustees serve four-year terms; the terms are staggered so that some board members face the electorate every two years. This ensures that the Board continues to be responsive to community concerns. Currently, five of the seven Trustees have served more than one four year term. The Student Trustee serves a one-year term. There are no term limits established for the Board of Trustees.
Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

1. Develop a system for Board development and new member orientation.

2. The Board is planning a retreat to occur by the end of October, 2011.

Section: IV.B.1.g. The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

Descriptive Summary

Resolution No. 090129-P21, dated January 29, 2009, clearly outlines the Board Self-Evaluation process at City College. The resolution stipulates that each Trustee have the opportunity to provide his/her opinion regarding the performance of the Board. District shared governance groups also offer input to the Board. These groups are the Academic Senate, Administrators' Association, AFT 2121, Associated Students, Classified Senate, Department Chairpersons Council, and SEIU 1021. Each group is asked to provide a single response based on its own determination of the best method for arriving at a single response. In order to maintain strict confidentiality, the Board President requested that the Office of Research and Planning collect and aggregate all responses. Responses are aggregated such that there is one “Trustees” response and one “College Groups” response.

The Board Self-Evaluation form is comprised of two parts: a quantitative section and a qualitative section. This approach is similar to approaches used by other California community colleges.

The quantitative portion includes an extensive series of items in the categories of Board Organization, Policy Role, Community Relations, Policy Direction, Board-Chancellor Relations, Standards for College Operations, Board Leadership, Advocating for the College, and Board Education. Respondents are asked to rate these items based upon a five-point scale.

The qualitative portion is drawn from several open-ended questions:

• What are the Board’s greatest strengths?
• What are the major accomplishments of the Board in the past year?
• What are areas in which the Board could improve?
• What are the one or two most important change(s) you think we need to make to improve our Board meetings and/or other functions?
• What issues do you feel the Board should make its priorities for the coming year?
According to BP 2745, the results from the Self-Evaluation form are provided as a basis for the Board to assess its own performance, and to identify its strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning.

The Board shall provide an opportunity for District shared governance entities to offer input to the Board regarding their assessment of the Board’s performance during the prior year in conjunction with the Board’s self-evaluation. The President of the Board, or his/her designee, shall distribute the Board Evaluation Form to each of the District’s shared governance organizations at the same time it is distributed to Board members. Each District shared governance organization that wishes to offer input into the Board’s self-evaluation process shall complete the Form sufficiently in advance of the Board’s preparation of its self-evaluation to allow the results to be compiled either into a master copy or a summary and to be provided to the Board. The compiled results shall be reviewed by the Board prior to its completion of its self-evaluation.

BP 2745 passed January 29, 2009 calls for an annual Board self evaluation to take place no later than April 1 of each year. To date, the Board has conducted two self evaluation studies, one in 2009 and the second in 2010, which was almost finalized in Spring 2011. The Board still needs to schedule a public discussion of the results and prepare a summary of areas for improvements as well as accomplishments.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

The Board of Trustees and College have done an excellent job in eliciting candid evaluation from constituent groups and from Board members. At its September, 2011 meeting, the Board plans to have a substantial public discussion of the findings and to produce a consensus list of Board accomplishments, which will be included in this Self Study. Scheduling of the self-evaluations has slipped. The first one was conducted in Spring, 2009, the second one was commenced in Fall, 2010, but not finalized until January, 2011. And finally, the Self Evaluation needs to include discussion of the Board’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in relation to Accreditation Standards.

Planning Agenda


Section: IV.B.1.h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

Descriptive Summary
The District Policy Manual contains a code of ethics (PM 1.15) as noted in the response to Standard IV.B.1.a. This code of ethics needs to be updated.

Because City College of San Francisco is a public institution, all of the governing board members are non-owners of the institution. However, voting members of the Board are required by California state law to make public their financial interests. To quote the District policy manual (PM 1.07B): “Designated employees shall file statements of financial interest with the Chancellor of the District, who shall serve as the filing officer for the District, and who shall retain the original of all statements filed in his or her office, unless otherwise directed by law or regulation to the contrary.” The San Francisco Ethics Commission is now the repository for each Board member to file a Statement of Economic Interest. Each year, the CCSF Chancellor’s Office sends each Trustee a memorandum and forms packet. The College never has physical custody of the completed Statements; they are filed directly with the San Francisco Ethics Commission by each Trustee. The Board Policy Manual needs to be updated to reflect these recent changes in law, particularly because Trustees are not employees.

Included in the SFCCD Policy Manual is a Code of Ethics and Responsibilities section (Number 1.15, p. 2) which states, “A violation of the Code of Ethics shall be subject to written censure charges by a Board member, a hearing held by the Board’s Personnel Committee and a resultant finding of recommendation to the full Board.” No such actions have had to be taken to date; therefore, no track record exists.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

Update Board policies on, Statements of Financial Interests and Code of Ethics.

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

Descriptive Summary

The Board receives information and updates regarding the accreditation process, status and documentation. The Board reviewed previous WASC Accreditation Reports and Mid-Term Reports. The Board of Trustees has been informed about, and involved in the current accreditation self-study process.

Individual Board Members have volunteered to serve as a resource to the various Standard Teams and have attended the CCSF Accreditation Steering Committee and Standard Team Meetings. The CCSF Board of Trustee President serves as ex officio to the Steering Committee.

Self Evaluation
The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None

Section: IV.B.1.j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively. In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

Descriptive Summary

The Board hires a Chief Executive Officer with the title of Chancellor and delegates to him/her the day-to-day operation of the District and the drafting of the multi-year plans required for the future of the College. Documents attesting to the search, hiring, and retention of the Chancellor demonstrate that the Board takes the ability, authority, and autonomy of the Chancellor seriously. The Board also factors in viewpoints of the communities-at-large in the selection process.

The Board holds the Chancellor accountable by fully discussing a variety of issues. In regard to the 2011-12 budget, the Board Committee on Planning and Budget required and received numerous reports on the draft 2011-12 budget. The Board provided guidance to the Chancellor in the allocation of resources to activities at Grace child development program, at the Southeast campus, and at instructional sites throughout the city; in the allocation of funding for class sections; in the salary schedule for administrators; in the establishment of a fund for innovation; and in the adequate provision of funding for the Second Chance program. [References – Planning and budget meeting agendas and recordings for Grace, Southeast and campuses. For Salary schedule, Innovation and Second Chance, the June 23 Budget book, marks these areas as “Board Modifications.” The Board of Trustees]

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this Standard.
The College has established procedures for the hiring and evaluation of the Chancellor, but not a Board policy which explicitly states that the Board hires and evaluates the Chancellor. It is expected that this will be corrected by December 31, 2011.

**Planning Agenda**

Revise Policy Manual to clarify that the Board hires and evaluates the Chancellor.

**References:**

Transcripts/DVDs of Board meetings

Board Policy Manual

Monthly Chancellor’s Reports

Board minutes: [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/minutes.htm](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/minutes.htm)

Board transcripts: [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/transcripts.htm](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/transcripts.htm)


Audio tapes of Board Committee meetings

Student Equity Hearings (audio/video tapes)

Audit Report

**MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**TECHNOLOGY PLAN**

**ANNUAL PLAN**

**MID-YEAR ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**END-OF-YEAR ASSESSMENT REPORT**

- Board Policy Manual Section 1.09
- California Education Code 70902, Title 5

Board Policy manual

BP 2745 Board self evaluation

BP 2745
Board self-evaluation

Board agenda and minutes

Board Self-evaluation 2009, 2010

Board agenda/minutes June 2009

Board Self Evaluation

Board Policy Manual

CCSF Employment Agreement for the Chancellor

CCSF Annual Plan

Chancellor’s Monthly Reports

Chancellor’s Self Evaluation

Faculty’s Instrument for Chancellor’s Evaluation

**IV.B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Dr. Don Q. Griffin was appointed Chancellor of City College of San Francisco on December 18, 2008. He served as Interim Chancellor starting on March 1, 2008. Dr. Griffin has 41 years of service at CCSF both as an instructor and an administrator. Before becoming Interim Chancellor, Dr. Griffin served simultaneously as Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Vice Chancellor of Student Development, having been promoted from Dean of Instruction. Prior to becoming an administrator he was Chair of the Department of Behavioral Sciences where he taught from 1969 to 1996 [IV B-1].

The Chancellor’s Employment Agreement specifies the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Chancellor. In article 3A and 3B it specifically states that the Chancellor, as Chief Executive Officer, is responsible for executing policies and implementing identified goals through the day-to-day management of the District. In addition to the responsibilities conferred upon the Chancellor by the State of California, the Chancellor also recommends all personnel for employment for Board approval; provides leadership for academic excellence; administers the instruction, student services, and business affairs of the District; reviews board policies and recommends changes; establishes and maintains working relationships with other government agencies; promotes a positive District image in the community; serves as the Board’s designated representative with respect to all employer-employee matters; annually evaluates administrative employees; and manages and controls District property [IV B-2].
The Chancellor’s Objectives, developed annually with the Board, further delineate the annual goals for the Chancellor and encompass his relationship with the Board, planning, resources and staffing, technology, information and communication, campus facilities, and communication with various communities. The Chancellor’s Objectives also serve as a direct mechanism for the Board to provide ideas, suggestions and priorities for the College in any given year [IV B-3].

The Annual Plan consists of a set of institutional objectives that are to be achieved, or for which substantial progress is to be made, within the specified academic year through the efforts of the College departments, schools, and administrative operations. The Annual Plan is drafted based upon a series of inputs. It serves as an integration point for implementing the College longer-term plans. The Annual Plan also reflects imminent priorities derived from department- and unit-level program reviews which, since 2008-09, have been assembled with increased regularity by every unit within the College. Finally, the Annual Plan is refined through the Shared Governance and Board Approval processes [IV B-4].

The Committees of the Board include: Audit; Facilities, Infrastructure and Technology; Institutional Effectiveness; Planning and Budgeting; Policy Implementation; Joint Committee with SFUSD Board of Education; and Chancellor/Board Relations. All of the committees provide support to the College and directly to the Chancellor on various matters in implementing the College Annual Plan. Topics have ranged from Technology and Construction to Fundraising to Policies on Hiring. The Committee structure and support have been instrumental in moving the College forward [IV B-5].

With the Chancellor’s leadership, the College is in the process of finalizing the 2011-16 Strategic Plan as well as updating the Education Master Plan, both of which provide a more coherent and transparent planning framework guided by the Board-approved Mission and Vision statements.

The Chancellor provides leadership with internal constituent groups both outside and within the context of the Shared Governance process. He meets at least once per month with the Academic Senate, AFT 2121, SEIU 1021, the Labor Management Council, all Administrators and the Department Chairpersons Council. Further, he chairs the College Advisory Council, which oversees the Shared Governance process and has representation from all groups, including the Classified Senate. In addition, he chairs the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council, the Diversity Committee and the College Council. All of the aforementioned groups meet monthly. Meeting regularly with these groups has been constructive and allows issues to be addressed directly and in a timely manner [IV B-6].

The Chancellor works closely with administrators to provide hands-on oversight and evaluation through monthly meetings with all administrators, weekly meetings with the Vice Chancellors and Cabinet members and regular meetings with Shared Governance entities and other groups as described above [IV B-7].

The Chancellor reviews and evaluates the implementation of the College plans. He stresses a planning and evaluation process that promotes a coordination of effort which will lead to student success and increased rates of program and degree completion. This includes linking
the Strategic and Educational Plans to the Program Review and Planning and Budgeting processes.

The College has worked on integrating the process of institutional planning, budgeting, and assessment by combining various planning efforts and linking those to annual budgets. The College’s Planning and Budgeting Council plays a key leadership role in linking planning issues. For the past several years, the Council oversaw the development of a Management and Budget Plan containing a summary of the budget, the CCSF Annual Plan, and performance measures or outcome indicators to be evaluated at the end of the academic year. Similarly, the Annual Budget includes the Annual Plan. In order to eliminate redundancies and promote earlier and deeper integration between planning, budgeting, and assessment, the Management and Budget Plan is no longer being assembled (it was last assembled in 2009-10). Instead, the College is exploring ways to deepen the integration between the Annual Budget and the Annual Plan, and reflect this integration in the Annual Budget when it is published [IV B-8].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

- The Chancellor is a leader who has demonstrated the ability to work in a complex and demanding environment. He understands the current and future needs of the College and in response has directed the effort to implement a strategic set of Shared Governance initiatives to address these needs and challenges. In an atmosphere of dramatically reduced financial support for higher education and increasingly tough budget reductions, he has worked closely with various internal and external stakeholders to find and develop effective, yet reasonable solutions.

- The Chancellor has articulated the College strategy for dealing with the budget crisis of the past three years. An internal Fundraising Workgroup was established in May 2010 to develop alternate sources of funding to support the College. The “Save the Class” Campaign he launched raised over $395,000 between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011 to reinstate classes. CCSF’s Child Development, High School Diploma Programs and Gateway to College programs are now participating in an eScrip fundraising program [IV B-9].

- When the Chancellor began his tenure, he emphasized that the College was experiencing an unprecedented financial crisis that required the input and cooperation of every member of the CCSF community. The goal was to reduce costs without resorting to significant layoffs or the decimation of instruction and support services. For the past two years, the College has been successful in reducing costs, avoiding layoffs, and maintaining quality educational services. He continues to inform the College community of current and future budget challenges and encourages input from all groups.

**Planning Agenda**

None
IV.B.2.a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

Descriptive Summary

During the past few years, the administrative structure of City College has been heavily impacted by two factors, namely the fiscal crisis beginning in FY 2007-08 and the large number of administrators who retired in FY 2009-10. As of June 30, 2010, fourteen members of the administrative staff retired. The College administration was in a period of transition and only half of these positions were expected to be filled due to budgetary restraints. By Fall 2010, the administrative ranks fell from fifty-seven (57) to forty-three (43).

Working very closely with the Human Resources Department, the Chancellor re-aligned the administration to create a more efficient and effective administrative structure [IV B-10]. During 2010-11, although many administrative positions remained vacant, the duties continued to be performed by current deans taking on additional responsibilities. The Chancellor remained focused on implementing the College reorganization plans while making sure that succession planning was in place. This included the hiring for interim administrative positions, new administrator positions, transfer of positions, hiring of faculty, upgrading faculty positions and managing the expected negative effects of attrition across the institution, including classified staff.

The following administrators were transferred to backfill vacancies resulting from retirees and/or were asked to temporarily take on additional duties while continuing to perform their current positions: Dean of Faculty Support Services transferred to Dean John Adams Campus/School of Health & Physical Education; Dean of Southeast Campus transferred to Dean of Student Affairs; Dean of Matriculation transferred to Dean of Civic Center Campus.

The following were given additional responsibilities & duties: Interim Dean of Evans Campus temporarily assumed the responsibilities of the Dean of Southeast Campus; Dean of Financial Aid and EOPS temporarily assumed the responsibilities of the Dean of Mission Campus; Dean of Human Resources temporarily assumed the responsibilities of the Dean of Library and Learning Resources Center; ADA Compliance Director/Assistant Legal Counsel temporarily assumed the responsibilities of the Chief Legal Counsel.

Two new administrators joined the administrative ranks in July 2010, filling the Associate Dean Student Activities and the Chief Information Technology Officer positions.

In Fall 2010, the Chancellor began to chair monthly Administrators’ meetings to facilitate better communication among all administrators, many of whom were new to the ranks, to share ideas and learn from each other’s experiences. A newly revised Administrative Evaluation process includes administrative objectives with measurable outcomes. The new process has been revised so that 25 percent of the overall score would be based on the
supervisor’s comments. The Administrator’s Association offered Admin 101, workshops that focused on specific topics to help the learning curve of many new administrators [IV B-12].

The realignment also included the creation of three new administrative positions: Chief Information Technology Officer; Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs; and Vice Chancellor of Campuses, Financial Aid, Admissions and Records and New Student Counseling.

By July 1, 2011 the following positions were filled: Associate Dean, Contract Education/Continuing Education; Associate Dean, Registration and Records (Noncredit); Dean, Downtown Campus and School of Business; Dean, Faculty Support Services, Course/Room Scheduling; Dean, School of Behavioral and Social Sciences; Dean, School of Liberal Arts and Castro Campus; Dean, School of Science and Mathematics. Associate Vice Chancellor of Workforce and Economic Development was appointed Interim Vice Chancellor of Policy and Research. The Dean of Mission Campus/Financial Aid was appointed Interim Vice Chancellor of Campuses, Financial Aid, Admissions and Records and New Student Counseling.

As of July 1, 2011, reporting directly to the Chancellor are the following administrators: Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs; Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration; Interim Vice Chancellor of Student Development; Interim Vice Chancellor of Research and Policy (formerly Institutional Advancement); Interim Vice Chancellor of Campuses and Enrollment Services; Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs (Vacant); Chief Information Technology Officer; Chief of Police; Dean of Marketing and Public Information (Vacant); and Executive Assistant to the Chancellor.

The Chancellor delegates authority to these administrative chains to ensure that all annual operational and developmental objectives are achieved. This administrative coordination and leadership are managed through direct contact with the Vice Chancellors as well as regularly scheduled meetings with the Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet and monthly meetings with the entire administrative staff [IV B-13].

In addition, the Chancellor chairs the monthly College Council meeting comprised of all administrators, department chairs and the presidents of the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021. The Chancellor meets monthly with the College Advisory Council (CAC), a Shared Governance body comprising of the leadership of all the College Organizations: Academic Senate, Department Chairpersons Council, Classified Senate, SEIU 1021, AFT 2121, the Associated Students, the Administrator’s Association and the Vice Chancellors. The Chancellor also meets at least once a month with the leadership councils of each of these respective constituencies. In addition the Chancellor is in daily contact with his senior staff on all issues related to budget control and expenditures as well as key College projects authorized by the College Annual Plan [IV B-14].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.
In light of the current economic climate, the Chancellor realigned the administrative structure of the College to become more efficient and effective and significantly decreased the reliance on outside consultants. As a result, he has created an administrative structure that is more sustainable. At the end of Spring 2010, 14 administrators retired, creating many vacancies, particularly at the School and Campus Dean level. Recent interim and lateral administrative appointments created challenges for the College as these recent appointees gained experience in their positions. At the same time, this transition presented new opportunities for the College as a new generation of administrative leaders prepared to lead the College into the future.

Planning Agenda

None

IV.B.2.b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

- establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
- ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;
- ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and
- establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

Descriptive Summary

The Chancellor communicates the institutional values, goals and direction in multiple arenas. He addresses the entire College at the beginning of each semester and chairs key Shared Governance committees, such as College Council, the College Advisory Council, College’s Planning and Budgeting Council, The Diversity Committee, as well as monthly meetings with the Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet and major constituencies across the College. The Chancellor is accessible to all constituencies in the College, especially students [IV B-15].

The Chancellor interacts with the various constituencies, staff, faculty, students, board members, and community and government agencies and citizens. He works with these groups to understand their concerns and issues. The Chancellor relies on the administrative chains to ensure that all annual operational and developmental objectives are met. The College 2011-16 Strategic Plan has identified communication as a strategic priority throughout the College [IV B-16].

The Chancellor’s experience as Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Student Development gives him firsthand knowledge of academic, student development, and budgetary issues. He understands enrollment issues. Regular reviews of these issues are
discussed in Executive Cabinet, with the Board, and with other constituency groups. The Chancellor reviews data, issues, and proposed plans with the entire College community. The agendas at the monthly College Council meetings (including administrators, department chairs, and all constituency representatives), as well as the agendas at the Administrators meetings, have consistently included a review of enrollment data, as well as budget updates [IV B-17].

The Office of Research and Planning regularly provides data and statistics on enrollment in order to facilitate enrollment management and general planning. These data include figures for FTES (Full Time Equivalent Students) and unduplicated headcounts (counts of individual students and associated demographics), as well as registration attempts for classes in total and the percent of registration attempts that fail due to fully subscribed sections. Failed attempts highlight those classes where demand exceeds supply. At CCSF this includes the gateway programs of Mathematics and English and the nursing prerequisite classes of anatomy, physiology and microbiology. This data is provided directly to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellors. It has also been included in annual College Performance Indicators Report and is directly available to all College employees via the Decision Support System (DSS). Department Chairs and School Deans regularly use this information in their enrollment planning, including when they develop and schedule classes [IV B-18].

Over the past three years, the College has deepened and expanded the focus on enrollment management through the implementation of a newly reformed Program Review process. All College units, including campuses, instructional departments, student development and other units at the College, complete an annual program review based in part upon an analysis of longitudinal enrollment and student demographic data, including not only trends in student enrollment but also student success trends. Data is broken out by credit and noncredit areas. Training is available to deans and department chairs to support their understanding of and engagement with the data. Discussions throughout the Program Review process emphasize the importance of developing unit-level plans that account for and respond to data trends [IV B-19].

In addition to Program Review discussions, the College has recently engaged in a series of efforts to align enrollment reporting from various offices. In the past, different offices have reported figures that appear, at first glance, to be incongruent. For example, one office might report FTES for California residents only, while another might report FTES for all CCSF students. Insufficient labeling and inconsistent approaches to reporting has created confusion for many at the College. The new alignment and cooperation between offices has already fostered a deeper engagement and comfort level with the data, as the College community learns together to understand the nuances of the enrollment data. There have been multiple venues for this in addition to Program Review, including DCC meetings, College Council meetings and the College’s PBC [IV B-20].

During the Chancellor’s tenure, the institution’s Program Review process has been reorganized from a 5-year cycle to a biennial review process of more than 120 units and programs. Program Review was annual in 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11. During 2011-12, CCSF will be refining the templates and process. Then in 2012-13, all units will go through Program Review again. To maintain efficiencies and synergies, the units will not be split across years. Everyone will go through Program Review simultaneously every two years.
after 2012-13. Program Review includes the assessment of student progress, the assessment and implementation of Student Learning Outcomes, and requests for budgetary items (i.e. facilities, equipment and staffing).

Each department/unit is expected to describe its programs and services as well as identify and evaluate internal and external developments affecting program goals and objectives. In addition, each department/unit must submit a summary of progress since the last Program Review including areas for planned improvement. The Office of Research and Planning provides the data that help to support personnel expenditures and productivity for the prior year and to identify goals and objectives for the coming year [IV B-21].

The departments/units completing their Program Review are expected to link programs goals and objectives with the following College plans and initiatives: Strategic Plan, Education Master Plan, Annual Plan, Student Equity Plans and initiatives, Sustainability Plan, Facility Master Plan and Technology Plan. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) are now an integral part of the Program Review process. Departments/units must identify and update their progress in implementing SLO’s at the course, program, and unit levels.

All Program Reviews are submitted to appropriate administrators or supervisors, as well as to the Program Review Committee (PRC). The PRC reviews and evaluates each program review and makes recommendations to the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC). The College’s PBC conducts budget hearings and develops budget recommendations that are forwarded to the Chancellor. The Chancellor prepares and submits a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees [IV B-22].

To make informed decisions related to the distribution of relatively scarce resources, the College has implemented a comprehensive budget planning system that integrates financial planning with institutional planning. There is a strong connection between the priorities contained in the 2011-16 Strategic Plan and the Annual Plan that the College’s PBC recommends to the Board of Trustees each year. By following these plans, priority is placed on the College efforts to support student learning in a financially sustainable manner. As the College bond program moves ahead, annual budgets are reviewed to ensure that resources are provided to open and operate new facilities.

The College annual budget development process begins in January with an assessment of the expected resources for the new fiscal year based on the Governor’s proposed budget for the upcoming fiscal year. This assessment is a collaborative effort by the Chancellor and the College senior managers. This information is then incorporated into an overall resource projection and presented to the College’s PBC as a parameter for the tentative budget for the new fiscal year. All College constituencies, including students, have an opportunity to discuss potential budget changes at the College’s PBC regular biweekly meetings. In addition, frequent budget updates are provided directly to the College labor unions and to the College Council. The Board of Trustees Planning and Budget Committee also conducts public hearings during which virtually every part of the budget is scrutinized [IV B-23].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.
The Chancellor’s funding recommendations and decisions for the General Fund Expense Budget are the result of collaboration at the department level, the divisional level, the shared-governance level, and the executive level. The priorities of the Strategic Plan and the objectives of the Annual Institutional Plan are the driving influences in the budgetary decision-making process. This integrated approach to planning and budgeting ensures the College carries out its mission and commitment to the community.

The Program Review process, strategic planning, and institutional research activities are regularly reviewed with the Chancellor. The goal is to better link program effectiveness and budgetary priorities based on accurate data and reports.

Assessment is embedded within each unit’s program review, which represents a significant step toward more regularly and transparently assessing programs. However, the approach to College wide assessment, which for that last decade or more has been accomplished primarily through the End-of-Year Assessment process, is being revisited. The process of integrating Program Review “results” with planning and budgeting is well underway; however, further refinements are needed to promote the degree of integration that is desired. In the upcoming academic year, Program Review will also be used more explicitly for personnel allocation that occurs via the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC), which reports to the PBC. In addition, the next iteration of the Program Review template is likely to prompt more explicit references to collaborations, efficiencies, and reductions.

The Program Review process is continually evaluated and assessed to become more streamlined and manageable.

The Chancellor provides the leadership and direction so that the College community understands the linkages between the major College plans, Program Review, and the Planning and Budgeting process.

The Chancellor informs the CCSF community concerning the problems and challenges the school must confront. He has been consistent in his focus and has designed and applied a clearly focused plan for leading the College in these difficult times. He understands the institution, its infrastructure, and the students, and appreciates the people who work at the College.

Planning Agenda

None

IV.B.2.c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco is governed by a Board of Trustees and the Office of the Chancellor with support from various Shared Governance Councils, Committees and other
advisory groups. The Chancellor’s responsibility and administrative authority as the Chief Executive Officer for the College is delegated by the Board of Trustees in accordance with policies approved by the Board. The Chancellor is responsible for recommending appointments, assigning functions, approving various College plans and initiatives, and the delegation to and responsibilities of various administrators within the administrative divisions of the College (SFCC District Policy Manual # 1.11 & 2.01) [IV B-24].

The Chancellor maintains lines of communication with students, faculty, classified staff, administrators, the Board, and the community. He works within the Shared Governance process to develop solutions aimed at maintaining and improving the College core values and mission.

The CCSF Annual Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation System execution and implementation allows the Chancellor to lead and continually assess the College progress toward its goals and objectives.

I’m not sure if we’ve answered the first part of the question: “The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies??—”

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

- The Chancellor oversees and works collaboratively with the Board and Shared Governance groups to develop solutions aimed at maintaining and improving the College’s core values and mission.

- The Chancellor is aware of his role, duty, and functions in relation to the Board of Trustees, faculty, administrators, classified, students, and the communities the institution serves. He continues to work to bridge differences and seeks compromise to difficult problems.

**Planning Agenda**

None

**IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The Chancellor has managed and monitored the budget and expenditures of the College during one of the most uncertain financial periods in our history. The Chancellor oversees a comprehensive and integrated budgeting, planning, and assessment system. He meets regularly with the College’s Planning and Budget Council (College’s PBC) to review, evaluate and develop recommendations related to budget and planning. The College’s PBC comprises representatives from students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators [IV B-25].
Current economic conditions and state budget cuts have made it impossible for the College to continue spending at past levels. By working with the Board of Trustees, labor unions, and other Shared Governance groups, the College has maintained core academic offerings at all campus locations as resources have permitted and has avoided the layoff of any full-time employees.

The Chancellor works with the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration and the Chief Financial Officer to review all major budget accounts at the District level, including categorical programs, on a regular basis. Revenue estimates are also reviewed on a continuing basis and adjusted if data support such a change. Any such changes are brought to the immediate attention of the Board of Trustees at their regularly scheduled meetings [IV B-26].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

- The Chancellor places the needs of students at the center of budget decisions. Through a policy of shared sacrifice on the part of administration, faculty, and classified staff, the Chancellor has effectively balanced the budget under most challenging circumstances. The Chancellor has reduced the administrative structure of CCSF and significantly reduced the number of College consultants resulting in significant savings in administrative costs. Plans have been developed to increase other sources of revenue in the areas of fundraising and grant development.

- While the Chancellor has been effective in controlling the budget and expenditures, the College is faced with serious budget challenges; (1) the State of California budget remains uncertain and the amount of funding apportioned to community colleges remains uncertain, (2) the cost of health care for both retired CCSF employees and current CCSF employees will continue to rise and place greater demands on the CCSF budget.

- The Chancellor and the leadership team of CCSF have been proactive and to date have made budget cuts with the least impact on students and services. This will continue to be one of the biggest challenges facing the Chancellor and the College.

Planning Agenda

None

IV.B.2.e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

Descriptive Summary

The Chancellor represents the College on several Boards, including the Workforce Investment Board, the Mayor’s Advisory Council and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. He meets regularly with local elected officials and business and labor leaders. He represents the interests of City College of San Francisco and is respected in the community.
He has served on Congresswoman Jackie Speier’s Citizens Oversight Committee. He attends meetings in Sacramento with the State Chancellor, other Community College CEOs and various California legislators, including the San Francisco Legislative Delegation, including Tom Ammiano, Mark Leno, Fiona Ma, and Leland Yee. As indicated in the Chancellor’s Monthly Report to the Board of Trustees, he also hosts meetings with foreign dignitaries, representatives from community and faith-based organizations, and business and labor leaders [IV B-27].

He meets and confers regularly with the Presidents of San Francisco State University, the University of San Francisco, the Universities of California, San Francisco, Berkeley and Los Angeles, and the Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District to discuss student completion and success issues [IV B-28].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The Chancellor meets, works and communicates well with CCSF constituents, including members of the communities that the College serves directly and others whom the College works with, such as businesses, local officials, and representatives of other colleges and universities.

**Planning Agenda**

None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard IV.B Evidence</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV B-1</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Biography</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need evidence here. (Gohar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-2</td>
<td>CCSF Employment Agreement for the Chancellor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need evidence here. (Gohar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-3</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Self Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need link or document (Gohar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-6</td>
<td>Monthly Chancellor’s Reports to the Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_meetings_1.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_meetings_1.html</a> (do we need more precise reports)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-8</td>
<td>Need evidence about Management and Budget plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-9</td>
<td>Need evidence about</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-X</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-10</td>
<td>Chancellor’s reorganization plan</td>
<td>Need evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-11</td>
<td>Evidence for data about administrators</td>
<td>Need evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-12</td>
<td>Evidence about Administrator 101 training</td>
<td>Need evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-15</td>
<td>Chancellors Flex Day Address August 13, 2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need evidence (is the the correct evidence to use here)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-18</td>
<td>Decision Support System</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://advancement.ccsf.edu/">http://advancement.ccsf.edu/</a> Is pointing them to this site enough or do we need more precise evidence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-20</td>
<td>Need evidence to support “align enrollment reporting” statement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need evidence here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-21</td>
<td>Program Review Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-22</td>
<td>Annual Budget Report Recommendations for Board of Trustees: 2010/11; 2009/10; 2008/09</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need online links to reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-23</td>
<td>Planning and Budgeting Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/pbc.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/pbc.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-24</td>
<td>SFCCD Policy Manual: # 1.11 &amp; 2.01</td>
<td>?</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/NEW.shtml">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/NEW.shtml</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B-26</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Monthly Reports to the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>?</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_meetings_1.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_meetings_1.html</a> Need more precise reports here or is this okay?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
Planning Agenda Major Findings

I.B.2. The Office of Research and Planning, in consultation with the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council, will design a new performance dashboard by the end of the 2011-12 school year that will provide a summary of the College’s progress in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed.

I.B.3. The next iteration of the Program Review template should prompt more explicit references to collaborations, efficiencies, and reductions.

I.B.5. The Board (or one of its committees) will receive presentations on the College Performance Indicators Report at the end of each academic year.

I.B.6. The Shared Governance Coordinator, in collaboration with the College Advisory Council and the Academic Senate Executive Council, will schedule a District wide review of the Shared Governance System, to include at least two listening sessions at non-Ocean campuses.

II.A.1.a. The College will move toward providing certificate and degree audit/evaluation capabilities to students so that they may monitor their progress towards program completion. It will also continue its assessment cycle to include all courses and programs.

II.A.1.b. Explore methods that are more systematic for evaluating effectiveness of all programs.

II.A.1.c. The College will move towards the proficiency level for SLO assessment of courses, certificates, programs and general education breadth requirements by Fall 2012.

II.A.2.b. The College will move towards the proficiency level for SLO assessment of courses, certificates and programs by Fall 2012. The College will identify the method for assessing GE SLOs in a cross disciplinary approach and complete such assessment.

II.A.2.d. Within existing budget constraints, expand existing options and devise additional ones for faculty to share effective practices that meet diverse student learning needs.

II.A.2.e. The College will continue to gather revenue data for inclusion in the program review process. The PRC will conduct a summative evaluation of the process which will include a review of timelines, frequency, content, and template format.

II.A.2.f. The College’s PBC will review alternative formats for the End-of-Year Assessment, such as scorecards, dashboards, or key performance indicator reports, which are used by other colleges.

II.A.2.i.
1. The College will assess its general education SLOs, identify SLOs for certificates and programs that do not have any, and complete a corresponding assessment. The College will ensure that all active courses are continually assessed. The College will create a plan to formalize this assessment cycle to ensure it is at the proficiency level by Fall 2012.
2. The College will continue working to update business practices to streamline the process of petitioning for certificates and degrees, and to encourage students to file for certificates for which they qualify. The College will continue to engage in discussions.
II.A.3.a. Despite the challenges faced, the College will pursue the assessment of learning outcomes across the disciplines represented in the College’s general education areas, to include the application of knowledge gained in the general education program to subsequent courses.

II.A.3.b. The College will pursue the assessment of learning outcomes across the disciplines and general education areas related to lifelong learning.

II.A.5. By the end of 2011, the College will implement the technologically sophisticated, comprehensive online job development and placement tracking system that is in use by other colleges.

II.A.6. Continue systematic effort to ensure all courses and programs meet the requirements for clarity and stated learning outcomes.

II.A.6.c. CCSF will continue making its website more easily navigable and keeping its content up to date.

II.A.7.b. The College will work to ensure that printed matter such as the CCSF Student Handbook and Planner is readily available online and at all campus locations and that there are enough copies printed for the student population. This would further insure students’ awareness of the College’s code of conduct; in particular, those pertaining to academic honesty as covered in this standard.

II.B.1. Work with the few remaining Student Support Service units that have yet to assess SLOs.

II.B.3.a. Continue to evaluate campus needs and provide for them when appropriate. Conduct the Noncredit Student Survey in 2012.

II.B.3.d. Continue to bring a diverse program of activities to the College community.

II.B.3.f. The College will continue to work to maintain and better secure student records. It will also continue the electronic conversion of student records to save space, provide a central location, allow easier retrieval of records, and prevent loss of records.

II.B.4. Create a feedback system whereby comments can be made about needs and questions can be asked.

II.C.1.a.
   1. Secure separate general fund budget for online database subscriptions in absence of TTIP funding.
   2. Continue to collect and prepare materials and equipment for the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus Library and Learning Resource Center scheduled to open in Fall 2012 (Education Master Plan).

II.C.1.c.
   1. Explore additional avenues to serve vocational and technical students and student populations not currently utilizing library resources.
   2. Develop plans for opening the Chinatown/North Beach Library and Learning Assistance Center and advocate for sufficient staffing and opening day collection funding.
   3. Conduct needs assessment and feasibility study for a library at the Evans Campus.
II.C.2. Formalize a process to assess computer labs across the District.

III.A.1.a. The College should recruit and provide training for more Equal Employment Opportunity monitors and identify funding for them.

III.A.1.c. Review the faculty and student evaluation forms to determine if more explicit language should be included about how the syllabus, course content, teaching methodology, instructional materials, and assessment activities contribute to student learning outcomes. If so, it will be necessary to negotiate changes in the forms.

III.A.1.d. Develop a code of professional ethics for all employees.

III.A.2. The College should discuss making the Vacancy Review Group for classified staff a part of the Shared Governance System, thereby making the process more transparent, involving faculty, and aligning it with the processes of the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council.

III.A.5.a. When State funding improves, CCSF should increase support for professional development activities concerning student success and completion.

III.A.5.b. Inventory the types of evaluation practices currently being used across all College professional development venues to determine how the findings are utilized and the potential need for coordination or revision. Use the results of this inventory to publicize and promote how training is benefiting student learning and faculty staff performance.

III.B.1.a.
1. Implement the recommendations of the 2010 District Facility Condition Assessment Report.
2. Plan for an upcoming local bond issue for upgrades and repairs and replacement or new facilities.

III.B.2.a. Focus efforts on determining total cost of ownership for all upcoming building projects.

III.B.2.b.
1. Review the need for a more formal evaluation process for systematically assessing the effective use of physical resources and using those results as a basis for improvement.
2. Complete the physical assessment of the Diego Rivera mural.

III.C.1.a.
1. Plan for the implementation of the results of the engineering study related to insufficient electrical power in the data and computer center in Batmale Hall.
2. Assess the causes related to unreliable wireless connectivity in affected facilities to determine if solutions are possible to implement.
3. Encourage migration of content to current website, increase training and support to departments and offices that have not yet migrated content from the former website.
4. When funding becomes available, fill the vacant website content manager position in the Office of Marketing and Public Information.

III.C.1.b.
1. Align budget priorities to support the training needs of instructors who want to learn to teach
online or use technology to enhance their teaching.
2. Restore the lab space formerly assigned to ETD so that adequate facilities are available for technology training to faculty and staff.

III.C.1.c.
1. Identify funding for ongoing operational support needs for existing as well as new technology projects.
2. Complete plan for full redundancy of back-up systems for all mission-critical systems.

III.C.1.d. Implement a system to estimate the useful life of equipment so that the College can be proactive instead of reactive concerning replacement of key operational systems.

III.C.2.
1. Evaluate the true cost of ownership in all technology acquisitions.
2. Develop an evaluation plan for gathering feedback and other data to assess the benefits of the technology workforce reorganization to technology users and to learning and teaching across the District.

IV.A.5. Acting upon a recommendation of the Committee on Information and Public Records, the Office of Shared Governance will conduct a survey of College employees and students in Fall 2011 and biennially thereafter to evaluate the CCSF Shared Governance System by using the District’s new license of the online survey tool Survey Monkey™.

IV.B.1. Complete Board Policy updates by December 31, 2011, particularly in regard to its responsibility to select and evaluate the Chancellor.

IV.B.1.e. The Board will complete its most recent Self Evaluation process, produce a summary of its accomplishments from the past year, and review its obligations for collegial consultation.

IV.B.1.f.
1. Develop a system for Board development and new member orientation.
2. The Board is planning a retreat to occur by the end of October, 2011.

IV.B.1.g. Complete the 2010 Self Evaluation. Revise the Evaluation questions for the 2012 and subsequent iterations.

IV.B.1.h. Update Board policies on Statements of Financial Interests and Code of Ethics.

IV.B.1.j. Revise Policy Manual to clarify that the Board hires and evaluates the Chancellor.