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 is 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.

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.

All California community colleges are subject to the System’s mission as described in California Education Code §66010.4(a), which mandates that the California community colleges serve all state residents who have graduated high school or who are at least 18 and capable of profiting from the instruction offered. CCSF has, in addition, two local purpose statements, a Vision Statement and a Mission Statement:

[Remove the following if it is in the front matter]

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
- Promotion of economic development and job growth
- Lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment

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.

The Mission Statement’s seven components describe in broad terms the sorts of programs we offer: transfer, degrees, certificates, workplace skills, civic engagement/citizenship, GED/adult ed, and lifelong learning. 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 we feel each Mission component is equally important, we often minimize the appearance of a prioritized order by presenting the components in two columns. Our Vision Statement is a narrative that describes the students we hope to serve and how their education will help improve themselves and their communities. It describes also the environment we wish to foster at the College itself. 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). (I A 1)
I.A.1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

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. Ours is a large urban district serving over 100,000 students each year in both credit and noncredit modes at many neighborhood campuses (“centers” per Ed Code) and at hundreds of sites. Our “average” students are in their mid-30s and we serve slightly more women than men. Many of our students are immigrants or children thereof and so the plurality of our course sections is ESL and citizenship. An entire department, Transitional Studies, eases many precollegiate students’ way into the collegiate credit curriculum. 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). Each year, over 1,000 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. Indeed, the College offers over 100 certificate curricula, both in credit and noncredit modes. The English and mathematics departments have significantly increased the number of their pre-transfer sections to accommodate better our ever-growing body of students requiring developmental education. (I A 2)

Student demographics and student needs vary among the neighborhoods. The neighborhood campuses and sites usually focus on specific components of the mission. For example, the Downtown Campus focuses on noncredit business, the Evans Campus on career and technical education, John Adams on allied health, Fort Mason on art, and Castro on foreign languages. The Ocean Avenue Campus, the largest, has the full spectrum of CCSF offerings. Lifelong learners benefit from our 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 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.

The District’s services are organized so as to be responsive to our students’ diverse needs. We offer high school outreach, matriculation, financial aid services, an EOPS department, and a DSPS department, as almost all California community colleges do. We offer also four specialized counseling departments (for new, continuing, transferring, and international students) and four retention centers: the African American Scholastic center, the Latino Services Network, the Asian and Pacific American Student Success center, and, new since the last accreditation cycle, the Tulay Center for Filipino-American Student Success. Students wishing to demonstrate academic distinction may enroll in our Honors Program. Furthermore, we have an entire department, Learning Assistance, to help students achieve college success skills. Their offerings include the Writing Success Project, designed specifically to promote our students’ composition skills. (I A 18)

Many specific student populations have access to these resources, which assess themselves in multiple ways that depend on where they are housed and how they are funded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Resource Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>veterans</td>
<td>Veterans Ed. Transition Serv. Ctr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Our 21st-century students expect copious online programs and services. Prospective students can learn about the College before setting foot on campus through the Outreach and Recruitment Office’s Facebook page. They can then use our free “CCSF Guest” WiFi at about 50 hot-spots, apply for admission online (with CCC Apply), register or waitlist themselves online, and monitor their educational progress in their student accounts. Incoming credit students receive CCSF email accounts courtesy of Google. Our online course offerings have more than doubled from 83 sections in 2005 to 170 sections in 2011 in the last six years, giving our students access to distance learning and scheduling flexibility. Indeed, two rooms in the Multi-Use Building are designated for distance-learning (details still being planned as of this writing). See also II.A.1.b and II.A.2.d for further exposition on CCSF programs and resources designed to meet our 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. [Ref 2, 8, 9, 17]

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

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. All three Shared Governance councils reviewed the draft statements several times before the Policy committee’s action. This review is part of the College’s regular evaluation and planning cycle, roughly every 6 years.

We publish the Mission and Vision Statements in various places. They occur in the front matter of each year’s catalog (e.g., in the 2010—2011 Catalog it is on p. iii) and usually between pages 2-5 in each semester’s class schedule (e.g., in the 2010 Fall schedule the Mission Statement is on p. 2). Typically, we mail schedules to nearly all San Francisco households, thus communicating the District’s mission to our primary service area. Various forms of the Mission Statement (sometimes abbreviated) appear in other places, e.g., on a placard above the trustees’ meeting table at 33 Gough Street and in the front of the Student Handbook and Planners given to the new students at orientation. They appear on the College website in at least two places: directly from the College home page under the “About City College” tab and under “College Mission” on the Board’s webpage. (IA 2, 3, 10)
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.

CCSF has a 6-year evaluation and strategic planning cycle, driven by the 6-year accreditation cycle. Our evaluation and planning cycle is steered by the Shared Governance council now known as the College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC). In advance of each Strategic Planning process, the CPBC calls for the various Shared Governance and other District groups (e.g., collective bargaining agents) to review the Mission and Vision Statements and propose appropriate modifications. In the most recent review, the entire College community, including students, were invited in November of 2008 to fill out a two-part survey addressing both the Mission and Vision, intended to determine appropriate focus and language for each component. There were 792 responses. This input resulted in significant modifications to the Vision in particular, as well as some modifications to the Mission. These modifications were proposed by the Research and Planning Office 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. For further on the evaluation and planning cycle, see below and the Standard I.B. and IV responses. (I A 10–13)

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

An abbreviated overview of the CCSF planning process is in order here. Every six years (roughly), the College reviews the Mission and Vision 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, numerous 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 our 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. (Hereafter, “Mission” refers to both the Mission and Vision.)

Meanwhile, each College unit prepares a program review (annually from 2009–2011, biennial thereafter) which reports on the extent to which it has achieved its goals from the previous year and outlines its future goals. Units are asked to associate these goals explicitly with specific references to plans. The College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC), a Shared Governance council, and the Research and Planning Office use the elements of the Strategic Plan and the results of the program reviews 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 CPBC and the Research and Planning Office 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.

Thus is seen the central role of the mission in 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 2003–2008 Strategic Plan (pp. 7 and A-12), the draft Strategic Plan (various places), the 2010–2011 Institutional Annual Plan (p. 2), the 2009–2011 Technology Plan (various places), 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 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16)

**Evaluation**

1. CCSF has a well-developed Vision Statement in addition to its Mission Statement. Together, these form a robust articulation of the College’s education philosophy. Our Vision Statement informs the seven components of our Mission Statement and nearly all decisions can be traced to at least one and often more than one of those components.

2. To fulfill our mission, CCSF offers a tremendous variety of programs and services nonpareil, all developed to meet our students’ needs and promote their future success.

**Planning Agendas**

1. Although our mission includes civic engagement and lifelong learning, Federal law prohibits us from offering financial aid support to students seeking those goals. Furthermore, there are indications in Sacramento that within a few years our major source of funding may cease to cover courses in those areas.
   - CCSF will need to seek other sources for providing financial aid to students seeking civic engagement and lifelong learning.

2. The College’s noncredit certificate programs are well-known in the San Francisco area and attract many students. The other noncredit certificate curricula (e.g., culinary arts) are less well-known.
   - If resources permit, the College can promote more heavily its noncredit certificate programs.

**References**

1. CCSF Vision and Mission Statements
2. CCSF Catalogs
3. CCSF Class Schedules
5. Strategic Plan 2011-2016
6. Annual Plans
7. Program Review templates
8. College Performance Indicators
9. End-of-Year Assessments
10. Board of Trustees minutes
11. Academic Senate Executive Council minutes
12. College Advisory Council minutes
13. College Planning and Budgeting Council minutes
14. Program Review Committee minutes
15. Shared Governance Agreement
17. Faculty Handbook
Standard I.B: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness.
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.

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

Nearly all collegial dialogue at CCSF takes place in over 40 Shared Governance committees. They operate under an extensive Board policy, BP 2.07, often called the Shared Governance Agreement. This Agreement creates an extremely robust participatory governance structure headed by three councils. The committees reporting to the Academic Senate Executive Council are the ones most attentive to our students’ learning needs. The committees reporting to the College Advisory Council and the College Planning and Budgeting Council are concerned more with institutional processes. There are occasional but inevitable overlaps among the Councils’ concerns and thus many issues will come to two or to all three of them. Each Shared Governance body has a purpose statement that defines its responsibilities for developing policies and initiatives. Indeed, all committees are charged somehow 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: the administrators, the classified staff, the faculty, and the students. Each constituency has an appointing agent that tries to ensure broad, democratic representation. A casual glance at the CCSF Shared Governance brochure will reveal the breadth of issues addressed by the system: all academic and professional matters, sustainability, public relations, and many, many more. The District maintains a Shared Governance Office with an attendant Coordinator charged with facilitating communications to ensure that the committee system operates smoothly. It is within this System that most College-wide dialog takes place. In the Spring 2011 Employee Survey, the average response to a question about satisfaction with College-wide dialog about data and research on student learning was 2.68 on a scale from 1 to 4 (N = 415).

CCSF has also a strong, productive history of “ad hoc” work-groups that focus more intensely on specific issues. A particularly salient example is the Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee, the body charged with producing the drafts of this very document but which then is approved for publication by the Shared Governance Council and the Board. Also, the Chancellor convened his Student Equity Task Force so that the District and the Board could examine 8 areas (including English and math sequences, placement testing, financial aid, student employment) in which we
might better serve all our students. Proposals from the Equity Task Force are supposed to go to various committees, thus 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 are the Strategic Planning Team, the Basic Skills Ad Hoc Task Force, and the “Cost Savings” group.

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 (the English Department calls some of these “retreats”). 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 here, at the departmental level, that collegial dialog most strongly shapes our students’ learning. The outcomes of that dialog include certain math and English offerings in compressed timeframes and the inclusion of major learning outcomes in all course outlines. (I.B.11–16)

**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.**

CCSF has a 6-year cycle for strategic planning and a 1-year cycle for annual planning. Each Strategic Plan lists a wide variety of long-term goals. The current Strategic Plan has six major Strategic Priorities ranging from academic excellence to inclusiveness to facilities planning. Within each Priority are 10–15 Objectives which CCSF intends to employ in order to make substantial and measurable progress over the next six years.

The development of each Strategic Plan includes contributions from various constituencies and stakeholders. For example, the District held “listening sessions” in December 2009 and February 2010 to help inform the current Strategic Plan. Representatives from business, industry, organized labor, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco City and County Departments, San Francisco Unified School District, local universities, and community members provided input on the role the College plays in the community. Over 35 community representatives participated in these sessions.

Each year, the College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) consults the Strategic Plan, the most recent Program Review recommendations, the most recent End-of-Year Assessment, the Chancellor’s Objectives. and the current year’s Annual Plan to select specific goals for next year’s Annual Plan. The selection process varies but the CPBC’s very broad membership ensures input from all College constituencies. The Annual Plan goals are often separated into “operational” and “developmental” subsets and then prioritized within each subset. The many unit plans and Program Review reports inform the prioritization.

The Board of Trustees approved the 2009-2010 Annual Plan during its meeting August 2009. 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 units, departments, schools and administrative operations. At the end of each fiscal year, the College Planning and Budget Council holds a year-end assessment noting specific progress made in each area. For example, the End-of-Year Assessment for 2008-2009 was finalized in December 2009 and served as the baseline to measure progress in 2009-2010.

The Strategic Planning Team and the College Planning and Budgeting Council both strive to communicate the goals thus developed to the College community—indeed, we urge the entirety of the community to contribute toward the goals’ development—and to solicit as much participation as possible in achieving them. The Strategic Planning Team members bring drafts of the plan to dozens of committee meetings to explain the Plan and ask for feedback. Unit managers (administrators, classified supervisors, 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 CPBC 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.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.

For many years, the College addressed progress on the Strategic and Annual Plan goals in the End-of-Year Assessments (EYAs). These have recently been replaced by more concise performance indicator reports. The outcomes of these assessments then inform the decisions for the next year’s planning cycle. Also informing our decisions is the Decision Support System (DSS), a data-mining tool accessed from the Research and Planning webpage. 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 Research and Planning 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.

For example, in the 2007–2008 EYA, the first Operational Objective is “O1.1. Provide educational programs and services at each of CCSF’s campuses.” We assessed progress on this objective with such DSS data as “Headcount enrollment increased in 2007-08: 51,027 credit students, up 7% from 2006-07. 45,162 noncredit students, up 2% 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 2008–2009 Annual Plan in the hopes of continuing progress. (I B 4–9)

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.

The CCSF evaluation and planning process is exceptionally broad-based; our 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
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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.

Perhaps the most significant change in planning since our last accreditation cycle is the newly redesigned program review process. At the time of our last accreditation visit, program review was not explicitly part of the annual planning system. Each District unit (office, department, program—any entity with a budget) 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 feedback than was requested. The program review templates were open-ended and invited lengthy, diffuse responses.

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.

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 Research Office now hosts a series of meetings where District unit representatives can come together to discuss their data and responses. Various deans and department chairs are also hosting similar sessions.

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. Now, almost all units are submitting their program reviews. The Program Review Committee intends in 2011–2012 to assess the District’s satisfaction with the new process.

The Program Review Committee and its various workgroups collect the aforementioned reports. The Committee then makes recommendations to the College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) 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. As of this writing, the CPBC received the most recent Program Review recommendations on 2011 May 3. Still, the current process is still very new and so the CPBC is still considering how best to receive and judge the Committee’s recommendations.(I B 4–9)

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

The CCSF Research and Planning Office (RPO) collects large amounts of documented assessment results. Through our 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 RPO 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. At one time, these broad surveys occurred annually, but the RPO determined that conducting these surveys less frequently (every four years) would yield more visible changes and cause less survey fatigue.

Targeted surveys focus on a variety of topics, for example, the College’s Mission and Vision statements (in preparation for the renewal of our strategic plan), book loan strategies, counseling services, and alumni needs and interests. Traditionally, the RPO 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 Survey Monkey™. Examples of units that develop and conduct surveys for program improvement include Library and Learning Resources, the English Department, the Engineering Department, the Learning Assistance Center, Counseling, and the Veterans Center.

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.

General data on student demographics, student success, and course demand is available through an online Decision Support System (DSS). The Research and Planning Office developed the DSS in 2001. 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 present. While the system certainly has its 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 CCSF’s Banner system, which houses all student enrollment information, financial aid information, and budgeting information.

The RPO then 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, formerly, the End of Year Assessment. Reports such as these are available on the Research and Planning website. The High School Report is the most widely disseminated; at one time, representatives from the Research Office met individually with selected local high schools to discuss the findings. Today, we mail out paper copies and email electronic copies of the report to all high schools and San Francisco Unified School District’s administration. There is significant, regular demand for the report from local schools and Unified. Program reviews that utilize a variety of data sets (revenues, expenditures,
student success) for each unit are now also developed annually/biennially and made public through the CCSF website.

We also develop and disseminate regular (but not annual) reports such as environmental scans and special topic reports such as the Equity Report issued in 2010, the results of which all available online.

In addition to making written reports available through the website, we also circulate reports internally via email to the relevant stakeholders and College-wide when appropriate. The College responds also to state and federal reporting requirements on such programs as EOPS, DSPS, CalWORKs, and Puente.

Although CCSF does not have in place a formal process to assess the effectiveness of our communications about institutional quality to the public, Board meetings can serve as a venue in which the public has the opportunity to comment on the quality of our communications about data. However, we continually assess internally and informally the effectiveness of our communications. The program review process serves as an example of how we do this. We have engaged internal stakeholders in an ongoing dialog regarding the quality of data provided, the meaning of these data, and the relevance of these data. For example, after the initial pilot of the new program review format, the research office issued a survey that led to changes in the format and content of program review. (I B 7–9, 14)

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.

At the end of each evaluation cycle, the Program Review Committee, the College Planning and Budgeting Council, and the Board continue to 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 how we developed the improved Program Review process, to be firmly integrated into the evaluation and planning cycle. It is also the way the College decided to replace the End-of-Year Assessments with a more easily read document on College performance. (I B 13)

One formal mechanism by which CCSF assesses the effectiveness of our collegial dialog (through which much planning and resource allocation takes place) 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 2007, a small work group of veteran 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 12–16)

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.
The most important means by which CCSF reviews its effectiveness to improve instruction and services is its program review cycle, 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 7)

Evaluation

1. Collegial dialog takes place primarily 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.

2. Our collegial dialog has brought about much progress in the development of course-level SLOs (required in the new course outline review cycle) and institutional-level SLOs, namely, the SLOs for our G.E. areas.

3. The new program review process allows College units the opportunity to communicate the results of their own assessments.

4. The End-of-Year Assessments and its successor performance indicator reports show that, on the whole, the District makes satisfactory progress each year on achieving that year’s goals.

5. The CCSF Research and Planning Office has been magnificently successful in publishing College reports online, especially considering reductions in its office staffing. The Office will continue to make online availability of reports a priority.

Planning Agendas

1. Although our program review process has been re-designed 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. Indeed, more generally, CCSF does not produce evidence of its assessments of its evaluation mechanisms.
   • The College Planning and Budgeting Council should begin requiring from the Program Review Committee regular reports that include the effects of resource allocation.

2. The most recent Shared Governance reviews have not been comprehensive in nature. It is time for a District-wide, highly coordinated review complete with listening sessions at the campuses.
   • 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.

3. CCSF uses student demand as an informal means of assessing the effectiveness of our communicating institutional quality to the public. Developing a formal process for doing so would require substantially enhancing the staffing in the Research and Planning Office.

4. Although students participate in the planning and evaluation cycle through their representatives on Shared Governance committees, there are no students on the Strategic Planning Team. This is primarily because of the onerous time commitment which 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.

5. The End-of-Year Assessments and their successor reports have not recently been presented to the Board.

• The Board (or one of its committees) will receive presentations on the College performance indicators at the end of each academic year.
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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.

DESCRIPTION

The college’s Mission and Vision statements provide overall guidance that informs decision-making about the programs offered by the college. This Vision and Mission statement frames the program review process and is 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 non-credit instructional and vocational programs are developed and reviewed by departmental/program faculty, (in some cases with the input from local/regional Industry Advisory Committees and/or state/national professional associations and national vocational/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

- transfer to baccalaureate institutions
- achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Sciences
- acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace
- citizenship preparation and acquisition of English as a second language so that all can engage in the civic and social fabric of the community
- completion of requirements for the Adult High School Diploma and GED
- promotion of economic development and job growth and
• promotion of lifelong learning 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 interest in their students and shifts within the discipline. Further, 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 this program review cycle is a review of courses and programs including a report on their 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 falls 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 our Associate Degree in 2007-08.

Many of our programs require approval by the State Chancellor's Office. The application process for State Chancellor's Office approval addresses five main areas:

• Appropriateness to Mission
• Need
• Curriculum Standards
• Adequate Resources
• 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. Job placement information from the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act Core Indicator report shows a placement match rate 87.3% for CCSF career technical students. Student transfer to baccalaureate institutions in recent years is summarized below:

### Table 1 CCSF Student Transfer Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To CSU</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To UC</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1416</strong></td>
<td><strong>1404</strong></td>
<td><strong>927</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To CA Private Colleges</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Not avail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Out-of-State Private Colleges</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Not avail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1863</strong></td>
<td><strong>1813</strong></td>
<td><strong>927</strong></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 City College and for community colleges statewide.

### EVALUATION

### PLANNING AGENDA

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.

### DESCRIPTION

City College of San Francisco conducts research to inform our practices leading to student success. Research in its broadest sense come from information gleaned from program reviews, assessment of success in meeting prior strategic plan objectives, and input from the college community. More direct student learning needs assessment is based on the City College of San Francisco’s Internal
and External scans which include data on student demographics, student performance indicators, and community and labor market information, among other things.

**Introduce results from Internal/External Scans**

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, staff can assess a wide range of factors, which informs 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, followed by its distribution 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. 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 at 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 have led to joint efforts with the local community and industry advisory committees, to create courses meeting demands for educated workers in biotechnology, green economy, and health and safety. Advisory meetings and DACUM (Developing A Curriculum) research groups are also held to investigate how our curriculum reflects the industry employment needs.

CCSF has also systematically incorporated a series of annual performance indicators tied to its strategic plan. At its disposal are internal sources of data to assess the varied educational needs of its students. Every other year, the college issues report briefs, which provide further analysis on topics of interest. These include movement of noncredit students to credit, basic skills and transfer rates. 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. Noncredit courses in English as a Second Language, adult basic education, and skills in business and the trades provide tuition-free, open-entry options for students seeking flexibility.

As part of the matriculation process for credit and noncredit courses, students take placement tests in English or ESL and math. Through orientations, students are informed that counselors use the results to guide their educational planning. The combination of placement tests results, placement test waivers and the matriculation exemption processes are used by counselors to insure that students are prepared for enrollment into their chosen courses. Students are encouraged to meet regularly with a counselor to review their progress towards graduation, certificate, transfer, and other educational goals.

**Mention retention programs and other Programs that serve diverse student needs?**
The data for student outcomes regarding success rates, persistence and retention rates are available through the program review process and vary by program. In an effort to rectify the inequity of outcomes, the college began to analyze more deeply the trends among its students. 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. 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 will be able to complete the English sequence in three rather than six semesters.

(Need to include information about how majority of departments are using research to determine if students are achieving stated learning outcomes.) SLO Survey & Program Review data

EVALUATION

Underlying CCSF’s broad base efforts to improve student learning are data findings that inform policy and practices on student equity and narrowing the achievement gap. Departments armed with the 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 ensure their success. Underway are ongoing efforts to integrate student learning outcomes at the program and course level. These continue to be assessed at the department level.

PLANNING AGENDA

The College will move toward providing certificate and degree 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.

SLO survey info

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.

DESCRIPTION

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 organizations in the City of San Francisco.
The college maintains campuses throughout the City of San Francisco and also offers courses at numerous off-site locations 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 serve. 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. The

**Distance Learning:** Distance learning courses are offered in all six schools within the college as well as within Library and Learning Resources. In the fall 2010 semester, CCSF supported 5,551 students in both online classes and telecourses. A student can complete 100% of the requirements for an AA/AS degree by taking distance learning courses. Students can complete approximately 95% of the courses required to transfer to the CSU through distance learning.

Faculty members at CCSF develop online courses following various steps compliant with the Educational Technology Office, the Campus-wide Curriculum Committee and other shared governance committees.

The Office of Technology Mediated Instruction, housed within the Educational Technology Department, 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 as well as Federal ADA regulations. The Ed Tech Department provides on-going 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. Faculty teaching credit courses are required to complete seven hours of training by the Educational Technology Department. CCSF supported almost 100 tech-enhanced course sections in fall 2009 semester; this number increased by approximately 90% with 192 course sections being tech-enhanced in the fall 2010 semester.  

**Study Abroad:** Since 1985, CCSF has been a leader in Study Abroad education. Thousands of City College 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 earn 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 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 moving towards offering more options 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. Students receive cohort instruction, tutoring, content-focused student mentoring, designated counselors and linked class scheduling.

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 that lead to employment and courses that lead to transfer. CCSF has over 30 K-12 partnership programs, many of which offer 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. Another example is the School to Career High School Teachers Pathway program which is offered in partnership with San Francisco Unified School District.

The College uses a variety of methods to assess the effectiveness of its programs. Student surveys are conducted by the Office of Technology Mediated Instruction and they provide valuable information for assessing student satisfaction with these courses. Student focus groups are also conducted and have provided more in-depth feedback.

Add student survey results from TMI.

Obtain completion rates of dual enrollment and online classes and compare to statewide averages, and/or general population from Research Office.

Student feedback is also solicited through the faculty evaluation and tenure review process conducted by the Office of Faculty Evaluation, Tenure Review and Curriculum. The college has also conducted student equity hearings at various campuses as a means to solicit student feedback and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs and services.

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 offering 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.

EVALUATION
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**

**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.**

**DESCRIPTION**

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 in the Major Learning Outcomes section and strategies in the Content and Instructional Methodology sections.

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.

The SLO workgroup consists of three representatives from each of the Department Chair Council, the Academic Senate and administration, for a total membership of nine. The group was convened in Spring 2008 to begin to address topics of importance to advancing the SLO assessment process. This included discussion on the preferred model for the College, the development of professional development workshops for preliminary discussion of general education SLOs. The group meets once a month during the fall and spring semesters.

Faculty involved in any of 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 teaching faculty, often in consultation with their department chairs, and exhibit the entire range of assessment modalities.

The most effective method for verifying SLOs at the college level is the annual Program Review, a vehicle for department chairs and faculty to evaluate their programs, assessment tools and outcomes. All departments are required to review and update course outlines to include measurable SLOs. Through the program review process, departments assess their progress from year to year.
and share one example that reflects their department 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 use assessment results to revise 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. The 2011 survey results indicate that ___ percent of courses and ___ percent of programs had identified SLOs with ___% of the courses and ___% of the program completing the assessment process. (results due May 16)

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 dialogue about how to use SLOs at an institution of this size. Many departments’ use of SLOs is truly exemplary and these workshops allowed other departments to review successful techniques. There were presentations from such diverse departments as Earth Sciences, Learning Assistance, Business and Radiation Technology. The 2010 Program Review gave the college community an opportunity to review other stellar examples from Art, Mathematics, English, Architecture and Health Education.

For the past year CCSF has been addressing the achievement gaps and its 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 campus community. Students offered testimony of their experiences and the discussions that ensued involved everyone from administrators and faculty to trustees and elected student officials. The results were an often an array of institutional modifications with the oft-stated intention of reassessing those changes after a pilot semester or year.

**Include examples of assessment methods and results, e.g., real examples of assessment activities that have influenced SLOs or other aspects of teaching/learning. From Program Review data?**

**EVALUATION**

Though there has been some debate, CCSF has been adopting SLOs and the assessment agenda at an ever increasing pace. Note: After getting results of survey, indicate what work remains to be done on SLOs, along with plan/timeline

**PLANNING AGENDA**
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.

DESCRIPTION

The college offers courses in developmental, pre-collegiate, collegiate, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training, programs for international student, or contract education programs. These 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 an annual program review system that applies to all instructional departments as well as programs including continuing and contract education, study abroad, and our programs for international students. Units complete a document that gives 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 courses and programs meet the standards of Title 5 for credit and noncredit courses and programs. When courses are brought to the Curriculum Committee, an element of the Course Outlines of Record that is reviewed is the number and type of hours (lecture, lab, conference) and the instructional methodology. 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.

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

The evaluation of courses and programs is largely completed at the departmental level. Individual departments have used the evaluation of courses and programs that they have done in their program review to improve those programs. A timely example is the recent curriculum work that the English and Math departments have done to address their achievement gaps. The 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.

EVALUATION

PLANNING AGENDA

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.

DESCRIPTION

The role of the faculty is paramount in the review and improvement of the quality of our courses and programs. Faculty are involved at every level of the assessment process from development of learning outcomes to their applications and evaluation. Detailed guidelines in the Curriculum Committee Handbook relevant to the development process include recommendations for mapping courses and program outcomes. 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 Work Group 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 improvement.

The concept of a course and/or program starts with faculty in their respective departments and is based on labor market information, student demand, transfer trends, advisory committee recommendations, and/or other factors. They develop the course often in consultation with colleagues and always with their 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.

Each department is 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.

The Curriculum Committee conducts a rigorous peer-review process of every course and program proposed. 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. A component of the evaluation of an individual faculty member is whether the courses they are teaching 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 is subject to an annual program review where all offerings can be evaluated and goals for improvement discussed. In 2008-2009 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 faculties 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 new courses, revisions to course outlines as well as the deletion of outdated outlines.

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 Chairs Council, provides staff development opportunities and coaching. Included in the PRC’s 2009-2010 overview of the annual Program Review was the comment that, “each department needs to establish and maintain an on-going cycle of planning, assessment, review and revision of curriculum.”

EVALUATION

PLANNING AGENDA

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.

DESCRIPTION

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. These outcomes were the result of mapping against our institutional criteria and Title 5 requirements for general education, but they have yet to be assessed. 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.
All career-technical 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 required among 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. 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. 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 NATEF certification.

For years, CCSF CTE departments have struggled to interpret Perkins core indicator reports and use this data for meaningful program improvement. 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 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”. Through this initiative Institutional Research 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 tools—including student surveys, student and faculty focus groups and student data analysis—to assess student outcomes. This model can 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 organizational improvement. For example, the research results indicated that better course alignment was needed and as well as 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.

A number of departments 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.

**EVALUATION**

The College has established general education SLOs but has yet to assess them.
PLANNING AGENDA

The College will identify the method for assessing GE SLOs 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.

DESCRIPTION

The College ensures appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, and time to completion of programs at various levels. The College Curriculum Committee’s formal review process (as detailed in Standard II.A.2.a) ensures at the institutional level that all instructional programs meet the standard of high-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. Individual departments are expected to continually assess the overall quality of instruction of their programs. The Office of Matriculation works closely with department faculty to ensure that all course prerequisites and co-requisites are in compliance with applicable Title 5 requirements. These pre- and co-requisites are then reviewed and are approved by the Curriculum Committee.

The institution continues to use data generated by the Office of Research, Planning, and Grants 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. 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 web site, and the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. Figures available on these sites show us that students who transfer from City College 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. 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, Planning, and Grants 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.

<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>

Include data on time to completion-Research Office.
Because academic rigor, time to completion, and other concerns addressed by this standard are important to the college and access to student services and retention programs are so tightly linked to student success, the offerings of the college’s Student Support Service units have been a frequent topic of discussion at meetings of the Department Chairs Council (DCC), the Academic Senate Executive Council, the City College Board of Trustees, the College Curriculum Committee, and most departments’ curriculum committees.

A number of services are designed to help students do 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, available to students in many departments. Examples include collaborative courses formed by CTE and ESL (Bridge to Biotech, ESL for Health Professionals, ESL for Child Development); Metropolitan Health Academy (MHA); Math, Science and Engineering 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.

Many departments have created new majors to provide a breadth of program offerings for students. For example, in Foreign Languages, new majors have been created in Chinese, French, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish. Additional majors include Dance, Health Studies, Women’s Studies, Latin American and Latino/a Studies, and English. Science faculty have designed new majors in Biology, Biotechnology, Computer Networking Information Technology, Environmental Studies and Science, Geology, Geography, Oceanography, and Paleontology. A major in Liberal Studies with four areas of emphasis served to replace the non Title 5 compliant General Studies major. In light of Senate Bill 1440, the College has also created associate degrees for transfer in Psychology, Speech Communications and Physics. Through the major and degree development process, the departments have had to evaluate the course content, rigor, breadth and depth in relation to transfer institution standards as well as industry expectations.

The drive to increase the quality of instruction by shaping course offerings and sequencing to satisfy measurable Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) has been the center of dialog in all departments within the College since the last accreditation visit in 2006. Each department is in the process of devising, refining, establishing, enacting, and measuring SLOs as per the CCSF Student Learning Outcomes philosophy. SLO development is highly individualized to meet each department’s goals and the needs of its faculty and students.

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 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.

English faculty have created two new intensive courses, English 95 and English 96/1A, 6-unit courses whose purpose is to 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.

Mathematics is offering 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 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.

**Add data from faculty evaluation student survey to assess quality of instruction.**

**Basic skills students and their progression to transfer.**

**EVALUATION**

Meets the standard.

All departments focus quite heavily on high-quality instruction, breadth, depth, and rigor. Time to completion, sequencing, and synthesis of learning are more complex, difficult concerns, but are being addressed at varying degrees by different departments. Progress varies among departments; not all have addressed problems with sequencing or time to completion at an equivalent level, for example. However, departments in which these concerns were most pressing—those with long sequences like Math, ESL, and English—considerable changes have been made.

**PLANNING AGENDA**

The college and its administration will continue to work to ensure that all departments address sequencing or time to completion issues, as appropriate.

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

**DESCRIPTION**

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.

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).
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 Math, Earth Sciences, ESL and Languages 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.

Flex Day sessions always include activities referring to diversity topics thus improving faculty skills in certain areas (e.g., the following topic which 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 by meeting each semester to discuss teaching strategies and the diversity of the student body. During the semester, faculty also meet to talk 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, 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, the Multicultural Infusion Project helps selected instructors modify their teaching methods to increase their focus on multicultural perspectives.

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 Filipino American Student Success Program (Tulay) and the Latino Services Network (LSN). Most of them 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 that provide 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 Math, Engineering, Science, Achievement Program (MESA) (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. 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. The LAC also provides Introduction to Tutoring classes.

Other designated departmental learning centers include the Math Lab, English Cyberia Labs, ESL CLAD, Biology Resource Center, Graphic Communication 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. 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.

**EVALUATION**

The college always strives to improve its outreach to a diverse population and its students’ learning styles (e.g. the recent creation of the Veteran Educational Transition Services which offers counselors and psychologists as well as a welcoming study area). Also, CCSF has been trying to monitor its students’ success with more efficiency (in 2010, the Academic Senate convened a workgroup to address the needs of the Student Preparation and Success Committee). While CCSF has a multitude of services and programs available for students, a lack of funding prevents faculty from participating in more conferences and workshops, thus limiting their opportunities to advance their teaching methods and share ideas with other instructors.

Although many departments recognize the value of identifying and using teaching methodologies that address multiple learning styles, there has been little work at the institutional level to show that leaning styles have been assessed and that teaching methods are indeed meeting the learning styles of its students.

**PLANNING AGENDA**

Although many departments recognize the value of identifying and using teaching methodologies that address multiple learning styles, there has been little work at the institutional level to show that leaning styles have been assessed and that teaching methods are indeed meeting the learning styles of its students.

**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.**

**DESCRIPTION**
In the previous accreditation self study 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.” In response to this recommendation, the College inaugurated a new program review process in 2008/2009. 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 units completed program reviews using a revised program review template developed by the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the Office of Research and Planning. 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 the 120 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 a written and verbal report to the full PRC. The PRC prepares a final report summarizing the review process and presents it to the College Planning and Budgeting Committee. All reports are posted on the Office of Research website for collegewide review.

The PRC is the heart of the College’s program review system, and in effect, the first filter for reviewing all annual planning objectives and budget requests. The new program review plan detailed that the PRC would:

- Review all annual program review reports and make recommendations directly to the Planning and Budgeting Council (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.

The pilot process was evaluated in spring 2009 and fall 2009. Results from this evaluation were used to reshape the second round of the program review process which was completed in 2009/10. This round also focused on providing more detailed data on program expenditures to strengthen connections to budgetary planning. The third round in 2010/11 focused on the inclusion of revenue data. While this data was not available for this round, there is ongoing work by the Business Office to collect it for the next round of program review.

The information contained in the program reviews, which now included student achievement data and student learning outcomes, was combined with comments from School Deans, program review subcommittee comments and discussions with department chairs into individual School Master Education Plans. These will, in turn, be incorporated into the overall College Annual Plan and future planning documents.

The program review process has engendered increased activities 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 Planning and Budgeting Council.

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.

**EVALUATION**

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 dependant on guidance from department chairs, college deans and the Program Review Committee.

**PLANNING AGENDA**

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.

The Strategic Plan is the College’s longest-range plan. It is supported by the College Education Master Plan, Technology Plan and Institutional Advancement Plan. 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 monitoring of results. The Strategic Plan is the foundation on which the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) reviews cost and makes recommendations to the Chancellor. It should be noted that the PBC represents all major constituencies at the college: faculty, administration, staff, and students.

The Annual Plan reflects annual institutional objectives. 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 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 PBC who 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 Budget 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 for the full board.

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” (College Performance Indicators Report, 2006-2007, September 2008 - http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/ccpi2008.pdf) is distributed to and discussed with faculty, staff, and administrators. 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 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 CPBC, links to all program review documentation is provided to the college community at large. Departments also share SLO assessment results at departmental and interdepartmental meetings, on their websites, and at Flex workshops.

Another process used to evaluate instructional programs is the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA) of 2006 (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) For many years the institution has used a formal and systematic method for the allocation of Perkins funds. The Office of Career and Technical Education administers this evaluation process that begins with an annual election of an allocation group. To access Perkins funds, a CTE department must submit a proposal. A Perkins Development Team must be established within the department and receive training from the Perkins Coordinator regarding the effective development of proposals that fulfill departmental needs and the criteria established under Federal legislation. These proposals must demonstrate how departmental needs were evaluated (e.g., use of focus groups, advisory committee recommendations, or institutional data) and how the department will meet the eight permissible uses of funds as authorized by Perkins. Proposals also must 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,

Metro Academy (Health/Child Development)

Bridge to Biotech

Radiology

EVALUATION

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 Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) 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
The CPBC 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.

DESCRIPTION

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:

Broadcasting 119, 120
Chemistry 101A, 101B
Fire Science 111
English 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 96/1A
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 administrations 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. The reading and grammar questions have been locally validated for both predictive validity and correlations with 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.

English 95 and 96/1A make use of common examinations, as have English 93 and 96 until recently. English 90 and 91 does not make use of common examinations, but does require a common portfolio for promotion into subsequent courses. These portfolios, based on essays, annotated readings, and a cover letter, make use of 1 essay and 1 reading common to all sections. The English
faculty uses 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.

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 under way 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 conducts 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 faculty diversity to attenuate these problems. They indicated 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 math, English, ESL, and chemistry, in order to increase likelihood of success.

All City College placement testing in these subjects has been validated by the Matriculation Office and the Office of Research, Planning and Grants for predictive validity, reliability, and bias as stipulated by Title 5 placement assessment standards. Furthermore, the tests have been continually reviewed and refined to ensure that they maintain content and cut-score validity, and to monitor 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.

**EVALUATION**

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.

**PLANNING AGENDA**

None

Abma, Clark, Murillo
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.

City College follows Title 5 standards for awarding credit for student work. 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 their 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. [ref 2]

EVALUATION

Meets the standard and 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.

DESCRIPTION

The College offers ______ majors, ______ awards of achievement, ______ credit certificates of accomplishment, ______ credit certificates of achievement, ______ noncredit CDCP (Career development college preparation) certificates, and ________ noncredit certificates. In 2009-10, the college awarded 1145 Associate Degrees, 1144 credit certificates, and 52 noncredit certificates. In response to State Bill 1440 the College developed and approved 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. As more statewide Transfer Model Curricula are approved, the College will be reviewing them and developing more degrees. 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 requirements are based on faculty established program major learning outcomes.

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 for Community Colleges. 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 our 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 dialogue 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. Departments have also been asked to assess their progress in using SLOs to enhance student learning via the program review process.

EVALUATION

The College partially meets the standard.

The college curriculum includes about 3000 courses and [___] programs. While a concerted effort has been made to identify SLOs for all courses and programs, it has been limited due to the sheer volume of work associated with this task. Through a process of dialogue throughout the college, we have set our focus 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. We need to further our work to continue to identify and assess SLOs for all programs.

PLANNING AGENDA

The College will assess its general education SLOs, identify SLOs for certificates and programs that do not have any, and complete a corresponding assessment. We 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.

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.

DESCRIPTION

The College Catalog is the primary venue for communicating the general education (GE) goals, rationale, and philosophy to all stakeholders. The GE requirements section of the catalog begins with a summary of the goals of the requirement areas, and a more detailed discussion of each requirement precedes the list of courses that satisfy each requirement. 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 (see recent change to the title of Area H, as an example).

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. The latter areas further affirm CCSF’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 GE requirements undergoes a rigorous review, comparing its course outline to the requirements for inclusion in the area that is proposed, to ensure that the learning outcomes for each course within the area mirror the mission of the GE Program as a whole. The review begins with the college’s Curriculum Committee, which assesses each submission in accordance with the Standards and Criteria as outlined in Title 5 and our Curriculum Committee Handbook. This review includes a careful examination of the course’s major learning outcomes (the language the Curriculum Committee has adopted instead of “student learning outcome”) to ensure that they are appropriate, measurable, and reflected in the course content.

From there, proposals to place a course in a GE requirement area use forms that list the criteria for inclusion into each area. Successful proposals detail how the course meets those criteria, with specific reference to sections of the course outline. 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 GE 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, of the administrators on the committee. The process to add a new course to the GE requirements is a thoughtful, rigorous one that has resulted in a wide range of choices for students that ensure them a diverse, enriching education.

GE courses are required in eight different areas that together represent the philosophy of City College and the liberal arts tradition: “All students granted an Associate degree should be required to study a variety of general breadth courses in addition to those courses which are required by a student’s major” (CCSF Catalog, 2010-2011, 44). It should be noted that the new transfer degrees
developed in response to SB 1440, by law, are based on the transfer general education patterns of CSU and UC.

The Catalog can be purchased at the campus bookstore in hard copy or CD format. It is also available on the college website in a user-friendly HTML format. In addition, students may examine copies at the library, at the counselors’ offices, in student support service locations, and at department offices. All faculty, administrators, and classified staff have access to hard copy and/or online versions of the catalog.

The College’s general education philosophy is further reflected in its vision and mission statements which iterate CCSF’s commitment to foster an inclusive environment in which graduates are prepared not only for employment and/or college transfer but also to contribute to the community at large in substantial ways. City College students that complete the GE requirements have successfully met the student learning outcomes defined in the GE Program. Numerous departments participate in formal and informal inquiries to track the success of our students as they go on to pursue degrees at four-year institutions, find work, and contribute to our community.

EVALUATION

The College meets the standard.

The GE 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 GE area very seriously. City College continues to meet and exceed the standard in this area.

PLANNING AGENDA

None.

IIA.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.

DESCRIPTION

Title 5 Section 55063 establishes minimum requirements of the Associate Degree, including General Education requirements. These regulations institute general education requirements in several areas, which have become the basis for most of our general education requirements, which are:

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

Possibly move above to II.A.3?

The Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, a joint committee of the faculty and administrators, reviews and approves all proposals for the inclusion of courses into the various General Education areas. The committee meets twice a year (in October and February).

Provide more information on how students demonstrate achievement of comprehensive SLOs in general education. Also mention how information comp is included in Areas A and B.

Mention program mlos? E.g., earth sciences

EVALUATION

PLANNING AGENDA

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.

DESCRIPTION

A Student Learning Outcomes Task Force, with representation from the Academic Senate, Department Chairperson Council, and Administration, has created an overarching guiding document, entitled Primary Aim of Student Learning Outcome Assessment, to guide the formation of student learning outcomes at the College. Prior to the formation of the SLO Task Force, the Academic Senate’s Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements delineated General Education Student Learning Outcomes specified for areas A - H, thereby forming the framework for the development of individual courses. Given the size and diversity of courses, CCSF has embarked on a grassroots development of its student learning outcomes. SLOs vary per course and are written into the course outlines.

Refocus section to include evidence of how students have gained general education skills.
EVALUATION

The College partially fulfills the standard.

While CCSF has begun the writing of measurable SLOs, it still lacks a tool to measure student achievement of these outcomes. A final grade measures performance in a course, but does not reflect how students will apply the skills covered in the course in subsequent education or employment related to the course. For noncredit students, CCSF is able to track by student ID whether these students go on to take credit classes.

CCSF has begun the writing of measurable SLOs. CCSF needs to develop a tool to measure student achievement of outcomes in connection with their success in subsequent education and employment related to the coursework undertaken at CCSF.

PLANNING AGENDA

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.

DESCRIPTION

“Citizenship” within the college is fostered through the Office of Outreach and Recruitment’s Ambassadors’ program. A cadre of current students help 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 partners with CCSF student development services to facilitate students’ matriculation and engagement with the college and wider community.

Under Student Activities, students may get more involved on campus through either the student clubs or student government. Student government is composed of a student body president and fifteen students elected to the student senate. Members of student government are required to enroll in Student Leadership 12. Other options for student engagement include seventy nine student clubs on campus. Each club sends a representative to form the membership for the Interclub Council.

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

In addition, there are approximately fifteen 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: WOM 25, English 93, English 96, Biology 26, LALS 15, Sociology 1, Sociology
2, Sociology 30, LBCS 93D, CNIT 197, Fashion 45A and Music. In Fall 2010, credit courses that offered Project SHINE as a service learning option included: ASAM 20, 30, and 35; IDST 50; Spanish 3A; ESL 79, 150, 160; POLS 1, 2, and 3; LALS 10, HLTH 10; and English 93.

Faculty 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 learn pedagogy and content. Annual meetings enable participants to reflect on ways in which the institution can better serve students 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 an awareness of a historical movement, which addressed relevant social and political issues. The mural, staffed with trained student docents, is accessible to the public and incorporated by student ambassadors in their campus tours presentations. Faculty in many departments (ESL, 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.

Incorporate evidence that addresses how SLOs are developed in courses to address ethics and effective citizenship. Need more curriculum based examples. Area H cultural diversity requirement, Area F requirement? Mention voter registration drive?

EVALUATION

Satisfactory. While existing programs provide excellent vehicles for students to engage in activities and practices to grow as ethical human beings and effective citizens, there is a dearth of resources given the institutions’ size and diversity of students. Both manpower and fiscal resources constrain the ability of the college to get more students engaged with each other as well as with the local communities.

PLANNING AGENDA

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

DESCRIPTION

CCSF offers associates 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. 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 our 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).

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.

DESCRIPTION

City College of San Francisco offers 25 general areas of career and technical study, which includes
178 credit and non-credit 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
Ed 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. (Title 3, Sections 78015-78016)

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 the data. 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 (88%), Diagnostic Medical Imaging (100%), Licensed Vocational Nursing (94%),
Registered Nursing (89%), Cardiovascular Tech/Echocardiography (100%), Emergency Medical
Technician (81%), Pharmacy Technician (100%), Health Information Technology (92%), Medical
Assisting (100%), Paramedic (100%), and Phlebotomy (92%).

Other college-wide efforts promote the goal of meeting employment standards. Occupational
programs are required to meet with Industry Advisory Boards, although some are more active than
Advisory boards provide feedback that assist departments in leading the curricular changes to maintain programs current. Recent examples: Business Advisory Board provided input into Green and Sustainable Business program development and the use of social media in business; 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; Trauma Prevention and Recovery Advisory Board reviewed student learning outcomes and provided input for certificate modifications; 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. (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 curricula updates and increased standards. Child Development faculty are members of a total of 15 local advisory and policy boards in San Francisco.

The California Resource Center for Occupational Program Design and Evaluation is a branch of CCSF. The function is to provide service to business, education and industry by conducting DACUM (Developing a Curriculum) job analyses. With the services offered by trained faculty a department can 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 Calif. State 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%. This reflects an increase of almost 9% 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. (Calif. State Chancellor’s Office Core Indicator Report, February 2011)

Career Connection is a grant-funded project that serves as an online job placement tool free to all CCSF students and alumni. An employer follow-up survey tracking system was implemented. This year, the college has started a working group to assess our current mechanism for job placement college-wide. The group is reviewing other tools that are available. By the end of 2011, the college plans to have a robust online tool for facilitating and tracking student internships and employment.
EVALUATION --IIA.5

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 highly skilled graduates the local economy demands.

Program success is also exemplified through the national and statewide recognition. In Fall 2010, the Diagnostic Medical Imaging program received the Minnies’ Award as one of the top two institutions for learning diagnostic radiology, second only to John Hopkins University Medical Center. 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.

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. More advanced technological resources are now available that didn’t exist previously, making this a more feasible option.

PLANNING AGENDA

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.

DESCRIPTION

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. Courses and programs are reviewed by Department Chairs, the Curriculum Committee and Dean of Instruction. Instructional Departments complete program review on an annual basis. All courses are updated and reviewed...
within a six-year cycle. Program Learning Outcomes 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. In the 2010-11 Credit Student Opinion Survey, 93% of students responded favorably when asked if they had received a syllabus that specified what they would learn in the class. Additionally, all faculty are subject to evaluation every three years, which would include reviewing course syllabi and their relation the official course outline of record.

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.

All credit instructors are mandated in the Faculty Handbook to provide students with course syllabi. 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

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 2010-11 college catalog (pg. 392) includes a clear policy of how coursework transferred in from other institutions is evaluated. 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. 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 City College 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, and Information. 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. Updates are presented through meeting presentations, workshops and emails.

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 and Transfer Model Curriculum efforts.

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.

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 and 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.

EVALUATION

The college meets the 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.

**DESCRIPTION**

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. Guidance for program revision is covered in the Curriculum Committee Handbook: 4.3 Revising a Major. 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. Interviews with department heads, school Deans, and program chairs have revealed the following: in general, departments assess the needs for its programs according to internal and external criteria and revise accordingly.

There is no college-wide policy for departments to follow in evaluating its individual programs for termination or modification. Students are informed and supported by faculty, department heads, and counselors/advisors when programs are modified or terminated. *CCSF Catalog 2010 p.44* 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 in effect at the onset of their 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.

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.

**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.

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.

DESCRIPTION

City College 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.

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 through the year, based on Curriculum Committee actions. In addition to publishing the catalog on College’s website, the Office of Instruction gives paper copies to counselors and some key offices. Students may also purchase a paper copy of the catalog at the Campus bookstore.

When the Office of Instruction receives notification of approval of new certificate or degree programs after the catalog has been published, they include this information in an online catalog addendum. 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 campus bookstore and on all neighborhood 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 Public Information and the Chancellor.

The Public Information Office (PIO) oversees the accuracy of all publications by individual departments, campuses and sites and responds to all press inquiries and requests of public records. PIO publishes the weekly in-house newspaper City Currents, which features faculty accomplishments, Board news, individual students’ achievements and current events at the college.

In order to save on printing costs, PIO 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. PIO 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, PIO communicates City 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 publications (Southwest Spirit, the in-flight magazine of Southwest Air).

The Faculty Handbook informs City College 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 Colleges 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 process. 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.

The College’s website provides information on the college’s mission, instructional programs, support programs and administration. In 2007, after a public bidding process, City College 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 web pages.

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 Office of Research, Planning and Grants webpage 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: [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/ProgramReview.htm).

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: [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports.htm](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports.htm).

**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 problems with its website mentioned in its 2006 WASC review, and continues to work on the currency and accessibility of information.

**PLANNING AGENDA**

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.**

**DESCRIPTION**

There is print and online access to the SFCCD Policy Manual that includes Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Freedom.” 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.”

The “Student Rights and Responsibilities” section of the CCSF College Catalog (“College Rules and Regulations”) contains Board-approved policy on student academic honesty. This document is available on line and in hard copy at the college bookstore. The policy is also in the Student Handbook, distributed at the start of each semester.

**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. Our website has been expanded so all materials are readily available online.

PLANNING AGENDA

None.

IIA.7.a. Faculty distinguishes between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

DESCRIPTION

Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Freedom”, clearly defines academic freedom with its rights and responsibilities. It demonstrates institutional commitment to free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

The college communicates its expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views through many references in Article 8 of the faculty 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.”

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, and ESL 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.

EVALUATION

The College meets this standard.

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

DESCRIPTION

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.” 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. 377) under College Rules and Regulations in the CCSF Catalog 2010-2011 as well as the “Types of Discipline” to be administered. 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.

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. 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. 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 (http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/assess08.pdf) confirmed the need to address responsible use of information and to support curricular opportunities to learn about plagiarism. 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. The workshop content and activities 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 statement which is 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.

**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 hardcopy and online (through the cc.sf.edu website). The student handbook is published in hardcopy (a small, spiral bound booklet) and available to students at the various CCSF campuses through student services/counseling offices and other locations.

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**

The College needs to insure 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 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.
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.

DESCRIPTION
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 2006, CCSF was recognized nationally for its efforts to recruit diverse students when it received the MetLife Community College Excellence Award for reaching out to first generation, immigrant, low-income, and working adults. 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.

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, 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 available services 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 Scholarship, CalWORKs, and Single Stop USA), Matriculation Office, Veteran’s Transitional
Services Center, 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’s Transitional 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’s Transitional Services Center.

Eighty percent (80%) of the Student Support Service units and departments have engaged in Student Learning Outcome development and assessments. 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 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, Planning, and Grants 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.

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. 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 in conjunction with the Budget Office, Office of Instruction, and Human Resources and populated in the annual review form. The annual report 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. (Reference: Focused Midterm Progress Report, March 15, 2009)

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.
The draft Strategic Plan was made available online on November 2010, and has been refined to reflect the extensive input collected and sent to the Team.

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. 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. 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.” 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.

In 2010-11, CCSF conducted an opinion survey asking credit students to rate their experience with various student support services at the colleges. Typically, over 70% 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.

**Table 3: Sampling Comparison of Surveys from 2010-2011 and 2004-2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010 – 2011 Ratings</th>
<th>2004 - 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Labs</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</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>

**EVALUATION**

Overall, the College uses information from the Office of Research, Planning, and Grants 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**

N/A

**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.**
DESCRIPTION
The Student Support Service Units is a leader in the Institution’s Student Learning Outcomes efforts to assess the quality of student learning and uses these results to provide continuing quality improvement. In addition to the individual student learning outcome 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 outcome projects. Additionally, despite the fact that funding for professional development diminished greatly due to budget restrictions over the last few years, numerous opportunities exist throughout the year for faculty and staff to participate in professional development activities. Continuous 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 all support a culture of continuous evaluation that ensures the support and improvement of student learning.

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, program review, and feedback from the Basic Skills Initiative recommendations, and the student equity hearings:

- Veterans Transitional 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.
- In response to student feedback and need, the testing policy was revised to allow students to retest more frequently.
- The 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 were offered to incoming students as part of a summer initiative to increase student access and close the achievement gap for under-served 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 Evan campuses.

**EVALUATION**
Student Support Service units have actively gathered data to analyze and improve the quality of their programs and services for students.

**PLANNING AGENDA**
Work with remaining the 20% of the student support service units who have yet to develop 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.

**DESCRIPTION**
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. Students may obtain hard copies of the Catalog at the College’s Bookstore, 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 work group. Catalog information is reviewed for accuracy and relevancy annually. Sections of the Catalog are sent to stakeholders for review and update. 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 (2010-2011 Catalog, 14-20), graduation (44-49), and transfer (52-59) are easily accessible. Degrees and certificate programs are listed alphabetically by department/discipline in the Programs and Courses section of the Catalog (62-367). 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. College Rules and Regulations address academic regulation, including Academic Honesty (Catalog, 377; Grievances and Complaint Procedures (378-380), and Sexual Harassment (371). The Admission to the College section addresses the fee refund policy and procedures (17-18). Acceptance of Transfer Credits (392) 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. 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 printed schedules are available at the campuses. Additionally, hard copies are freely available throughout all campus locations.

EVALUATION
Both the Catalog and Time Schedule are precise, accurate and contain essential information. In the 2010-11 credit student opinion survey, close to 80% of students rated the online Catalog and Time Schedule as either “good” or “excellent.”

PLANNING AGENDA

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.

DESCRIPTION
The institution assesses student learning support needs by inference from College research on student enrollment, performance, persistence, and achievement. This research is presented in the College’s Environmental Scan, Performance Indicator report, and various other research reports and briefs. 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. 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 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 annual program reviews for each department and unit. The 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 last 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 5-6 years. They are also asked to indicate what environmental factors informed their projections. The information the department gives Student Development will be used for the Strategic Planning process.
Student learning outcome 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, which increased student utilization of the strategies after they completed the study skills course.

EVALUATION

PLANNING AGENDA

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.

DESCRIPTION
City College 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 City College 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 their 2004-2006 surveys. The 2005-2006 Noncredit Student Survey asked students to indicate their experience in noncredit overall and at the particular campus they attend. The survey also asked students to rate various noncredit services and instruction(e). A similar survey was conducted with Credit Students in 2004-2005 and 3,095 credit students gave their opinions about their relationship to the college, barriers to success and satisfaction with services (d). In spring 2011 a new student satisfaction survey was conducted; those results are currently being analyzed.

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 CCSF Research unit produced a document titled Community College Student Report, which outlines the survey findings. Included in their report (p. 6) is a chart that displays the average (mean) importance students ascribe to various services, as well as their satisfaction with those services (e).

The CCSF College Performance Indicators Report (CPI) is a key tool that the College uses to evaluate how it is doing on its eight strategic priorities. These briefs allow faculty, classified
staff, and administrators to learn about College performance by means of short, periodic reports. The fifth strategic priority is to increase the quality and accessibility of student development services to positively impact student outcomes related to student learning, retention, course completion, graduation and job placement. Relevant research was conducted for the purposes of this report and CCSF is currently working on the items brought to light as a result of the information that was gathered (f).

In January 2009 online services were evaluated throughout the district. The resulting January 2009 Brief 7CPI report focused on Technology. 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%. 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% 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% of the time. (Ref. January 2009-Brief 7: Technology). 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 approximately 85% of the requirements for an AA/AS degree through online classes or telecourses. Students can complete approximately 95% of the courses required to transfer to the CSU or fulfill the IGETC pattern by taking online classes or telecourses. Online courses attract many students to City College and have won eleven statewide and two national awards for quality of course design. 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.

Table 4: Services Offered by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Services offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castro</td>
<td>Counseling, Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown/North Beach</td>
<td>Counseling, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing, Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>Registration, Counseling</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, Tutoring, Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Counseling, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION

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

• Continue to evaluate campus needs and provide for them when appropriate.

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.

DESCRIPTION

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 evident 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 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 of 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 on Shared Governance Committees whereby students sit on key 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 whereby students voiced 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, 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 and in learning communities for students with basic skills needs.

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 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 benefitting from the College’s effort to provide an environment conducive to learning. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been successfully implemented across the entire Student Support Service units and progress has been made toward development of SLO’s in the Academic Affairs Division. Additionally, annually each department submits a Program Review indicating their specific areas of success and growth related to progress made towards meeting departmental measurable objectives, another indicator that the college is focused on meeting students’ academic and support needs.

**EVALUATION**

By engaging its community in dialog in several forums—basic skills, listening sessions, and student equity hearings—the College is showing a concerted effort to improve in the stated areas.

**PLANNING AGENDA**

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.

**DESCRIPTION**

CCSF counseling departments have been intensively exploring their impact on student learning since 2002 when the first student learning outcome 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 work groups 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 work groups will be critical to the implementation of new student learning outcome 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.

EVALUATION

PLANNING AGENDA

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

DESCRIPTION
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.

The College 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 Student Support Center promotes college-wide activities highlighting Latin cultures. Examples include the cultures of Central and South America, the Caribbean, and many other countries are highlighted through food, music and dance. Celebrations of specific holidays such as Cinco de
Mayo and Dia de los Muertos and others enrich the diverse community of San Francisco and CCSF incorporates these aspects into the curriculum at every opportunity.

The African American Studies Program sponsors special events during Black History Month to acknowledge and celebrate the achievements of African Americans and individuals of African descent.

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. The program will include activities designed to recognize and support the cultures of Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander students.

Disabled Student Program and Services (DSPS) has a high tech center and learning strategies lab to address learning styles needed for 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 infuse multicultural content and perspectives into the curriculum, but also on helping us to expand our 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. 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 its activities. One such example is the Joint Special Populations Advisory Committee (JSPAC), a committee comprised of K-12, adult education, and community colleges, as well as business, industry, and the trades. They are committed to enhancing the career and technical education field as well as encourage girls and women to explore and enter into training programs and careers that are non-traditional by gender as well as high-wage and high-demand.

In addition to the aforementioned programs, the College works to ensure that all its new students are engaged in exploring and understanding diversity by including diversity as a topic of
discussion in the Student Success Seminar (Counseling 20). Students learn about each others’ cultures through a variety of class assignments.

EVALUATION

PLANNING AGENDA

- 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.

DESCRIPTION

The College began using the California Community College statewide web-based admissions application (CCCApply) for the Spring 2009 semester. The Admissions and Records (A&R) student learning outcome (SLO) focused on improving students’ technological skills in locating the application through navigating the CCCApply system and successfully completing the admission application process. 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 is also implemented. The Noncredit admission application is multi-lingual in English, Spanish, and Chinese on both paper and web-based.

As mandated by the California Community Colleges, assessment instruments used for placement assessment must be 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.

Part of the assessment validation process examines and evaluates bias. During the research process, cultural and linguistic bias is 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 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, trustees) has participated in a series of college-wide equity hearings. In this venue, participants had an opportunity 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.
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. (See Table 2)

Table 5: Placement Testing Retests
Spring 2011 Testing Cycle (October 2010 – January 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th>Arithmetic</th>
<th>Elementary Algebra</th>
<th>College-level Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Tests</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Retests</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Retests</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Retests resulting</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in a higher placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, assessment instruments received approval in six-year cycles. However, recent legislative changes in categorical program mandates now include categorical flexibility until 2013 and allow for the suspension of further validation. CCSF placement tests remain on the Approved Assessment Instruments List as approved by the CCCCO.

EVALUATION

PLANNING AGENDA

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.

DESCRIPTION
The college annually and periodically publishes in the college catalog, college schedule of classes, and on the college website the policy about how student records are kept.

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 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. As a result, A&R began storing student records electronically in response to this potentially damaging information, 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 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 dealing with records requests. Moreover, a privacy statement is included in the College catalog. Consultation with legal counsel is commonplace.

Other departments such as DSP&S, 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.

EVALUATION
When the College discovered a breach of security, it notified the public immediately and provided the necessary steps that should be taken to protect the public’s privacy.

PLANNING AGENDA
A plan is being developed to keep and better secure student records through the use of document imaging.

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.

DESCRIPTION
The college provides for systematic review of its student support services through an annual 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 the annual program review process all departments including Student Support Service units and programs undertake a comprehensive review and issues 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 services units such as the Office of Outreach and Recruitment, the Disabled Student Program and Services, the various counseling departments and the various retention programs.

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 2009-2010 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 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 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.

EVALUATION

PLANNING AGENDA

- Create a feedback system whereby comments can be made about needs and questions can be asked.
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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 in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.

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

II.C.1.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.

DESCRIPTION

Library and learning support services (LLSS) are a vital component of the “teaching and learning community” described in the college’s mission. LLSS directly contribute to instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic and cultural activities through the collections, services, courses and facilities they provide. LLSS include: Library & 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 from the Ocean Campus.

Library & 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 to develop a new library and learning resource center for the 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 (AV) and Alice Statler Library, which serves primarily the Culinary Arts & 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, by phone, via e-mail and by instant messaging
- Print collections of books, periodicals and audio-visual resources serving specific courses (over 800 via 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 at the Rosenberg, Mission, and John Adams campus libraries
- Audio, visual and computer software learning materials 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 aide 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 liaisons reach out to subject area faculty. These efforts have improved service to the Castro campus via close communication forged by the Mission librarian with Castro campus faculty and staff and to DSPS students via Audiovisual Unit collaboration with DSPS to caption or replace non-captioned videos. In the Fall 2010 library survey of faculty, 81% of the 175 respondents were satisfied with their communication with subject liaisons (II.C-3).
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 and community organizations. To enhance the curriculum, each program and exhibition has identified student learning outcomes and emphasizes the scope, breadth and depth of related library resources.

The Language Center supports the curriculum of the Foreign Language Department with a Language Lab at the Ocean Campus and a Language Lab/Media Center at the Mission campus, each equipped with audio and video workstations and, at the Ocean campus, a classroom with 34 workstations. Language Center materials and online language-learning and culture resources are selected, reviewed and assessed by foreign language faculty and made available in the open lab, via the Electronic Classroom and online. Textbook audio is digitized to allow word and phrase isolation and speed adjustment, especially important to beginning learners, enhancing student engagement and thereby student success and retention. 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-4).

The Media Center provides audio, visual, and multimedia materials and equipment for academic and vocational programs on 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-5). The Media Center also houses a lab with 50 computers.

Learning Assistance Department (LAD)
The Learning Assistance Department 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 Learning Assistance Center serving 1,200 students per semester and 2,800 hours per semester
• Mobile LAC serving 15 incarcerated youth per semester

LAD faculty stay current with professional literature and practices in the field of student success through conferences, workshops, staff meetings and reflective dialogues on student needs. College success faculty teach using student-centered, outcomes-based strategies and measure student learning outcomes with practical examinations, portfolio development, and pre and post testing. LAD 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 7% more than average students over the period 1998-2010 (II.C-6).

The Learning Assistance Department collaborates with many departments and programs to provide comprehensive learning support services across the district. Collaborative efforts include, but are not limited to: English, Math and Biology departments; EOPS; Basic Skills Ad Hoc Committee; and many student retention programs (II.C-7). 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.

The Learning Assistance Center 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 into the Learning Assistance Center increased considerably in the last six years, from 92,488 hours during Spring 06, to 132,038 hours Spring 2010 (II.C-8).

Broadcast Media Services and Audiovisual Unit
Broadcast Media Services (BMS) and the Audiovisual (AV) Unit 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. The Audiovisual unit 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, 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 web pages; 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-9). 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 offer a variety of equipment needs to support student learning. Broadcast Media Services and the Audiovisual unit on Ocean campus meet the projection, video and broadcasting needs of the faculty. Campus libraries provide equipment checkout for classroom instruction.

**EVALUATION**

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% in the last three years, while supporting more locations (e.g. the new Mission campus library, which was subsequently featured in a *Guardsman* article (10 Sept. 2008), for the lack of available books). 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-10).
In response to a declining budget, library faculty have undertaken several measures to continue
to ensure a current, quality collection. Measures include developing an e-book collection,
implementing a project to increase the number of instructional faculty who place textbooks on
reserve and, most significant, the 2007 initiation of participation in the San Francisco Public
Library’s (SFPL) Community Redistribution Program to obtain current, quality withdrawn
materials at no charge and selected by CCSF subject librarians. Since inception, this program has
added over 6,319 titles to the collection with an estimated cost savings of $151,855.85 (II.C-11).
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 much LLR can depend on the continued high quality of materials
available from SFPL, since many of the withdrawals have resulted from SFPL branch
renovations.

The inclusion of increasingly expensive periodical and research database subscriptions in the
library materials budget diminishes the budget even further. Since the loss of
Telecommunication and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) funds, the ability to provide
databases has been uncertain each year. In the 2009/10 academic year, over concern for the
ability to retain databases, subject librarians chose to withhold portions of their print materials
allocations for application toward database costs. Database research is an essential method of
academic research. A stable funding source is essential and becomes an even more pressing issue
as the college implements Strategic Priority #7 to offer more distance learning opportunities.

The Library assesses the effectiveness of its library 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-12). The 2011 student survey revealed that
71% of students (N=2,075) have two or more courses requiring use of library collections and
equipment (II.C-13). 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-14). Furthermore,
student perception of the importance of library services and resources, whether on-site or online,
academic success in college is very high; of the 2,021 respondents, 87% marked either very
important (66.7%) or important (19.8%) (II.C-15).

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 computers for student use. Comments in the Fall 2010 Faculty Survey expressed the need for updated equipment at the Downtown campus and from the Audiovisual unit in general (II.C-16). In the Spring 2011 student survey, numerous comments expressed dissatisfaction with the number of computers available and many students find the computers old and slow (II.C-17).

While the budget has adversely affected the library in countless ways, some progress has been made in spite of budget cuts. Enough staff computers were upgraded to enable implementing three years of new releases of the integrated library system. In Fall 2010 supplies were ordered and replenished for the first time in two years.

LLSS faculty and staff continue to find creative ways to address student learning needs despite the budget crisis. However, without increased allocations, the collections run the risk losing currency and failing to meet student learning needs, and access to vital article databases may be eliminated from our online collections.

**PLANNING AGENDA**

1. Institute the library peer group comparison process recommended by the Association of College and Research Libraries to discover how CCSF Library & Learning Resources compares to libraries serving community colleges with similar enrollment, in terms of collection size, budget, equipment, staffing, etc.
2. Secure separate general fund budget for online database subscriptions in absence of TTIP funding.
3. Continue to collect and prepare materials and equipment for the new Chinatown 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.**

**DESCRIPTION**

City College of San Francisco is committed to providing students with opportunities to develop information competency skills which support lifelong learning. Both the LLR mission statement and program-level student learning outcomes state this goal and support teaching and learning of these critical skills as stated in the general education goals of the college. Information competency instruction is in alignment with the Association of College and Research Libraries Information Literacy/Competency Standards for Higher Education (II.C-18). Librarians and department instructors share responsibility for providing opportunities for students to learn and practice information competency (IC) skills.
Each library location has a librarian at the reference desk during all open hours. Electronic reference services are available via eRef and Instant Messaging during most open hours, except Saturday. At all library locations and online, librarians engage in instructional-based reference work. Librarians use active learning techniques, which engage students in the search rather than simply providing students with an answer.

The Library’s instructional services/information competency plan consists of three components: drop-in and online basic information competency workshops, course-related workshops, and the one-credit, online LIS 10 course. Since Fall 2006 all students completing a degree and/or who plan to transfer are required to satisfy the information competency 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-19). Students accomplish this requirement by successfully completing English 1A, of which the course outline requires a minimum of five hours of library/information competency skills workshops and assignments, such as evaluating source reliability; creating an annotated bibliography, and completing essay/research paper assignments. A Walking Tour and Workshop G 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, have clarified the core information competencies and designed a series of seven workshops to 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, all students are encouraged to take the workshops to improve their research skills. From 2007/8 to 2008/9, 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 non-credit course outline (LIS 1000), effective Spring 2011 (II.C-20).

In addition to the series workshops, librarians collaborate with department faculty to teach these competencies through course-related and -integrated instruction sessions as well as orientations at all 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. Information competency instruction is also offered via the one-credit, transfer-level online LIS 10 course, reaching approximately 160 students each year.
Since 2008, library faculty conducted two pilot programs to extend library services and resources to more online students. As a result, all online courses now include links to library resources; increasing numbers of online faculty are including the online 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% of online courses within the next two years, supports Strategic Priority #7 (II.C-21).

**EVALUATION**

The assessment cycle outlined in the LLR program review has been successful in developing, implementing, assessing and revising the Instructional Service Plan of Library & Learning Resources.

Opportunities to teach information competency continue to increase in both individual reference sessions and classroom settings. The increase in teaching 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 workshops G and P. 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 increase: 2009/10 data records 298 workshops and orientations reaching 6,677 students in more than 25 academic and vocational programs (II.C-22).

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 during the 2008/09 academic year indicated the need for more practical examples and engaging learning activities. Training sessions were offered to librarians, focusing on the new workshop content and teaching techniques to involve students in their 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-23). Also as a result, the library created Workshop P “Citing Sources to Responsibly Use Information,” which is now offered in the classroom and online.

Library liaison faculty for Culinary Arts & 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-24). 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.

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-25). 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-26).

**PLANNING AGENDA**
- Continue implementation of the LLR Instructional Services Plan as scheduled.
- Develop online Workshop G and explore ways to require this workshop for all new students and to recommend it for all new faculty and staff.

**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.**

**DESCRIPTION**
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, from 7:45am to 7:45pm Monday through Thursday, 7:45am to 2:45pm Friday, and 10am to 1:45pm on Saturday, a decrease of just over 24% from 77.5 hours in 1999/00. With few exceptions, hours at campus libraries have remained stable since 2007, the Mission library with 43, John Adams with 42, Southeast and Downtown with 36, and Statler library open 30 hours per week. Mission Campus library hours have decreased from a high of 61.5 hours for Fall 2007 to Fall 2008 (II.C-27).
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, 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 8:45pm (II.C-28). Faculty write-in comments in the Fall 2010 library survey included requests for more hours of access to Audiovisual equipment, that district faculty have input into the question of whether to reduce library hours, and, more directly, for “Longer open hours.” Responses also included the need for increased evening and weekend hours to serve evening classes and working students (II.C-29). In the Spring 2011 student survey, 75% of 2,013 respondents indicated either 1) the library opens too late; 2) closed to early; or 3) needs additional hours on Saturday (II.C-30). This input came after library hours had been increased one hour in the evening for Spring 2011, and library faculty and staff voted to volunteer time to open the library at 7:45am on weekdays to provide access before 8am 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 collection 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 7% in the last five years (II.C-31). Collaboration is ongoing between 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 campus-wide surveys year after year; furthermore, 92% of 2,877 student respondents found librarians to be supportive in the Fall 2010 CCSF student survey (II.C-32).

**Electronic Access**

The library website provides 24/7 access to the library's online catalog and electronic collections, including article databases and electronic books as well as research, writing and subject guides, tutorials, and more. Five of the seven library workshops are now 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 for 2005/06 (II.C-33). Electronic course reserves were piloted over 2009/10, with full implementation during Spring 2011.

As part of the CCSF website redesign, over three years a library committee planned the library website’s overhaul. A Fall 2008 student website evaluation guided the site’s restructure. The new structure comprises four primary areas, represented on the homepage, with a search box to immediately search the library catalog, another student request (II.C-34). As a cost-effective
solution to providing dynamic subject guides, a template using RSS feeds and Delicious tags makes subject guides migrated into the new content management system updatable on the fly, whereas the older system was labor intensive, often falling to the Distance Learning and Electronic Services Librarian for updating when time allowed.

The Library homepage received 1,687,544 hits during 2009/10. Since the new website debuted in January 2010 through June 2010, website hits increased almost 70% from the year before (621,637 in 2009 as compared to 1,056,457 in 2010) (II.C-35). ERef use has remained limited, but Instant Message reference, now available on most Library web pages, rapidly increased after the redesign (II.C-36).

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-37). In addition, the Technical Services unit has added 21 new location codes; added local subject headings to increase access to foreign films, ESL materials, and basic skills materials; conducted multiple authority record cleanup projects; and corrected tens of thousands of errors in bibliographic records. The READ collection, a centralized and easy to locate collection for English language learners and basic skills students was made possible by these efforts. Bibliographic records were also created for print periodicals to improve access.

**Equitable Access**

The library continues to work with faculty and students of online courses and those at campuses without libraries. LLR provides five of its seven workshops online, with plans to develop a sixth online version. The intercampus delivery service continues twice a week between campus libraries, and requests from the Rosenberg library alone numbered 2,486 (II.C-38). The service has not received 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-39). 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 as one of its top 10 priorities a new campus with a library and learning assistance center in the Bayview/Hunter’s Point neighborhood (II.C-40).

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.

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. The embedded librarian service, providing direct support in online courses, as well as grants utilizing Rosenberg funds awarded to four online faculty, are two examples of LLSS dedication to increasing access.

To increase access to course materials, a Library Course Reserves (LCR) project was piloted in Fall 2010. Librarians and circulation staff recorded unfilled requests for reserve materials. Of 140 instructors contacted in the first semester, 20% submitted materials. Library faculty voted to formalize this project as an ongoing library practice.

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

**Media Center**
With the exception of Spring 2011, Media Center hours parallel those of Rosenberg Library. 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 not takes student requests for AV materials to use in the Media Center.

Other CCSF locations have alternate access to media materials and equipment. The 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.

**Audiovisual Unit and Broadcast Media Services**
Broadcast Media Services and Audiovisual have coordinated to provide clear information in a one-stop shared media services web page, in the faculty handbook, as well as at various other locations, each department’s hours, services, equipment, deliveries and process for making service requests. (II.C-41).
The Audiovisual unit at the Ocean campus, open Monday through Thursday 7:30am to 6:45pm and Friday 7:30am to 2:45pm, provides equipment maintenance and delivery district-wide, as well as three multimedia rooms in the LLRC, equipped for DVD, videocassette, film, 35mm slide and computer projection, including Internet access. Broadcast Media Services at the Ocean Campus, open Monday through Thursday 8:00am-10pm and Friday 8am-5pm, provides district-wide video production and distribution services and Ocean Campus classroom video playback equipment delivery services.

The Mission, Downtown and John Adams libraries handle AV equipment requests at the campus. 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, onsite 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. A second new campus, Chinatown/North Beach, will include a small Learning Assistance Center in the library as well. The Learning Assistance Center extends its location by collaborating with other departments and programs such as academic department labs, 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-42).

EVALUATION
CCSF provides satisfactory access to library and learning support services. While the District has made significant strides in increasing access, regardless of ability or location, 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 included dedicated staffing and expansion of the intercampus delivery service to CCSF sites without libraries (II.C-43). The delivery service is essential to maximize access with declining materials budgets and demand demonstrated in the Spring 2011 student survey, which showed that over 27% of 1983 respondents had requested delivery of books from other CCSF campuses (II.C-44). Expansion of the service has been discussed amongst campus deans, but cannot take place without resources for an additional driver. The service will have to expand to include the Chinatown Campus library when that campus opens.

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 ITS department, and the hiring of a CTO, may create the opportunity as District computer equipment is brought under the auspices of ITS.

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-45).

**PLANNING AGENDA**
1. Prepare for opening of the Chinatown/North Beach Library and Learning Assistance centers.
2. Advocate 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.**

**DESCRIPTION**
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 monitor the three floors of Rosenberg Library for security purposes, as well as the rear entrance to Rosenberg LLRC and adjacent parking lot. Campus police respond quickly when called for emergency situations or disturbances.
All LLSS locations rely upon District maintenance and janitorial services. The Buildings & 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, upgraded and additional security cameras, and possible other improvements to the facility, but these projects are still in the proposal phase (II.C-46). 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 multipurpose 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 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 minimal downtime. In addition, the lab staff keeps an up-to-date inventory, including verified and documented software licenses. All this is accomplished by a classified staff that has been reduced 50% 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.

**EVALUATION**
CCSF 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.

DESCRIPTION
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 loan 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 online databases are recorded, and the number of database searches has more than doubled in the last five years (II.C-47). Student surveys assess user satisfaction with the computers and photocopy machines and the purchase of PC Cop, the computer access management system currently used in 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-48).

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-49), and satisfaction has been high (II.C-50).
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**

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, and 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 lead 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-51). The workshops had student learning outcomes and assessment strategies several years before the College required all courses and programs to have SLOs.

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 wiki page 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 which identifies assessment performed, with recommendations and results (II.C-52).

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-53). Other recent examples of assessment follow-through include: the library website redesign; the electronic reserves pilot project; and the ongoing library advocacy for increased 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 the periodical databases 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-54). Of the 1,983 student respondents, 40% rated library programs “Important” or “Very important” in the 2011 LLR Student Survey (II.C-55).

Additionally, the Language Center identified student learning outcomes in Spring 2010 (II.C-56). Assessment includes surveys emailed directly to a representative sampling of Foreign Language Department classes at the end of each semester. Access to the survey is also available online via the Language Center homepage and in print at the center itself. Of preliminary responses received in Spring and Fall 2010 ($N = 80$), more than 85% of respondents felt the Language Center helped them to do better in their foreign language courses. More than 80% indicated that the Language Center helped them to identify the language-learning resources that are most effective for them personally. More than 55% felt their computer skills increased by using the Language Center. Seventy percent indicated their study habits and focus improved. More than 65% felt they developed a better understanding of other cultures and people by using the Language Center (II.C-57).

**Learning Assistance Department**

The Learning Assistance Department 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 believe 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 requires changes. The assessment has led to a number of changes in the course curriculum to improve student learning (II.C-58).

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 completed LERN 50 with an A, B, or C grade (Fall 2006), enrolled in a subsequent term, and had an e-mail in Banner. The survey was also administered spring semesters 2008-10 (II.C-59). 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 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; 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-60).

**BMS, 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, student ratings for computer labs were 44% good and 37% excellent ($N = 4,493$) and students rated their ability to use software applications (e.g. word processing) to be successful in their courses: 47% excellent and 41% good (II.C-61). Informally, the Technology Division 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.

**EVALUATION**
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 which assist in the planning processes. Annual program review reports provide an overall assessment and an effective means for planning and requests for institutional support. Both the LAD and the LLR use multi-method approaches to assessment and are consistent in meeting student learning needs. Aside from user satisfaction questions, computer labs throughout the district are not fully assessed. Usage statistics are needed to fully understand how the labs are used and whether they meet the needs of students.

**PLANNING AGENDA**

1. Formalize a process to assess computer labs across the district.
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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 assu res 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.

City College of San Francisco has a clear hiring policy and process that meets the requirements of Title 5 regulations 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 web sites, and on the CCSF web site.

City College of San Francisco 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/Department Chair, Associate Director of Affirmative Action, Academic Senate, and appropriate Dean/Vice Chancellor/ 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 degree(s) 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. 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 part of the interview process.

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, and educational achievement, sexual orientation, or disability.

In accordance with faculty hiring procedures, the background of 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, 2)

These processes yield faculty and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The College employs approximately 760 full-time and 1,090 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, almost 20 percent of the College’s administrators retired. CCSF hired interim administrators to fill the positions while the process to hire more than 10 permanent administrators continues through the 2010-2011 academic year. (III A 4)
Pursuant to 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 exempt from the Civil Service process by the San Francisco Charter. All non-exempt District classified positions have been reviewed and classified by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (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 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)

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.

The purpose of evaluation for all segments is to identify strengths and special qualities of the evaluatee, and to define areas where it is determined that 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. They are weighed seriously, and may serve as a revealing indicator of potential areas of concern.

The “job performance” component of an evaluation consists of an in-depth evaluation of course content, subject knowledge and classroom presentation for classroom faculty. 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 resource.

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 falling into the “Unsatisfactory” category. The process also includes a provision that addresses the matter through an Improvement Plan. More specific evaluation components 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)

Department Chairs are evaluated in regard to the performance of their supervisory duties and responsibilities in accord with Article 8 – Evaluation of the 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 the term of office, except for the third or last year of their term as department chair. The department chairperson and the administrator to whom he/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 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, the Human Resources Department has put the evaluations online. One of the staff from the Human Resources Department 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. A dedicated HR staff member monitors the process. In addition, permanent and non-permanent classified employees will be evaluated going forward. Prior to Fall 2010, only permanent classified employees were 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 was 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. All administrators evaluated during this cycle received ratings of satisfactory and above, and as a result thereof, received three-year appointments effective July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2007.

In 2009, to further improve and provide executive-level oversight of the administrator evaluation process, the supervision of these evaluations was moved from the Human Resources Department to the Office of the Chancellor. The current evaluation process requires that administrators set a minimum of five performance objectives early in the evaluation process in addition to their day-to-day activities that are in line with the Chancellor’s objectives and the College’s Annual Plan. These objectives are reviewed and approved by the Chancellor’s Office. The current process also identifies measurable outcomes for evaluation of the objectives and an increase of the weight of the supervisor’s review, which is now 25 percent of the overall evaluation. (III A 10)

For information on how the College evaluates the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, please see Standard IV.

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.

All faculty who teach courses are evaluated regularly in accordance with Article 9 of the District/AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement. 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 their syllabus, teaching materials, methodology and grade books, relevant findings are incorporated into the evaluation. Several components that measure the effectiveness in producing student-learning outcomes are rated and discussed by the evaluation team, including the following areas of instructional interest:

- The course content is up to date and appropriate.
- The course content is taught in an approach that is acceptable to the discipline/department.
- The materials used are pertinent to the course outline.
- The class is taught at an appropriate level.
• The pacing of the class is appropriate to the level and the material presented.

CCSF course outlines describe 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. Much dialogue 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 work site 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?

The student evaluations are considered an important piece of evidence of faculty success during the evaluation process. (III A 7)

III.A.1.d. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel.

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 The Faculty Handbook, pp. 16-24. (III A 11) Additionally, Article 8 of the AFT/SFCCD CBA speaks to Academic Freedom, Duties, and Responsibilities. Article 8.D. specifically addresses faculty-student relationships. The Classified Handbook, pp. 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 Local 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 12)
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.

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 14)

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/.

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.

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 restrictions on hiring in the classified unit.

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 continued to result in the continued delivery of efficient and effective programs and services. This is a direct reflection of the quality of faculty and administration employed by the College. Additionally, the College, with respect to the “seventy-five percent rule,” has always exceeded state requirements since 2005. (III A 15)

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, yet one of the smallest per employee within the California Community College system. Approximately 43 administrators are responsible for overseeing the more than 2700 employees (active adjunct faculty fluctuate from one semester to the next) and more than 110,000 students served throughout the College’s campuses. (III A 16)

Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. Departments and programs write an annual Program Review report, which is used as the basis for developing specific plans prepared by administrators and other supervisory personnel. (III A 17) The College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC)
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.

Once the allocation of resources is identified, administrators, supervisory personnel, department heads, and other staff responsible for hiring work with the Human Resources Department to fill their staffing needs as indicated in the respective hiring documents. (III A 1) As an example, the Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) plays the key role in setting the priorities for the hiring of new 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 18) The Committee utilizes the Decision Support System (DSS) data to assess faculty position requests. The DSS consists of four database modules: (1) student demands for courses and sections; (2) enrollment productivity; (3) student headcount and characteristics; and (4) student success. FPAC prioritizes the requests using the DSS as indicators of supply and demand for a particular course/subject and presents the list to the College Planning and Budgeting Council, which determines the total number of full-time positions to be filled College-wide. The CPBC recommendations are subject to the Chancellor’s approval.

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 of the Academic Senate 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.

With a slow state recovery and impending budget restrictions, the District has continued to impose 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), comprised of 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 are rare.

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 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 and are identified on a job seniority basis. In addition to the City’s process, the District also facilitates a process for receiving new employees that join the District. 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.

III.A.3. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

III.A.3.a. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

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 Section 87359 and Title 5 Section 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 through 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, 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 are distributed to all employees pertaining to unlawful discrimination. Employee handbooks contain as an appendix the San Francisco Community College District Policy and Procedures for Handling Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination under Title 5 Sections 59300 et. seq. (III A 11,12,19,20,21)
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 on the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 12 – Upgrading provisions. (III.A 21) The process has been improved to include samples and forms on paper screening criteria, interview questions, and teaching demonstrations. Our procedures call for an Affirmative Action 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 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 web site.

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.

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 District/AFT 2121 Contract during regular business hours. Classified employees may also view their personnel file upon written notice in accordance with the District/SEIU 1021 Contract. Additionally, an employee may authorize/designate a Union representative or a representative other than the Union to review their file upon written authorization as described by both the AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021 Contracts. (III.A 20,21)

In accordance with the District/SEIU 1021 Contract, the District/AFT 2121 Contract 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, 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 the 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. (III.A 20,21)

Employees are able to access and update some of their personal information, such as 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 Banner information system. Each user has a unique Oracle logon and password. Within Banner, each user is given permissions only to view or update areas appropriate for their job duties. Moreover, only select staff members in the administrative area of the College are granted access to the College’s Banner information system.

**III.A.4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.**

**III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.**

CCSF demonstrates through both high-level policy and daily practice that the appropriate understanding of 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 22)

In the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan, Objective Four is dedicated to Diversity and Inclusiveness. The goal of this objective is to “Promote diversity and inclusiveness at all levels of the College.” Many goals are outlined to advance this objective, 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 to providing better support for and expand 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 23)

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 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, Planning and Grants, to produce an annual report regarding educational equity, which would discuss the College’s progress toward equity for all students. (III A 24)

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. (III A 25)
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 strategically work 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 the full Board and Board committees since in 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 26)

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 27)

Additionally, strides have also been made by the student retention and success programs and centers throughout the College, including 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, Puente, Math Bridge, Bridge to Biotech and MESA/STEM. These programs reach out to the students who are at the highest risk of not succeeding and provide them with supplementary instruction and counseling. In this way, the District is looking to continue to improve the delivery of services and to better accommodate more students.

The College also has an active College Diversity Committee. The College Diversity Committee is a Shared Governance committee that meets regularly to ensure that diversity remains at the top of the College’s agenda for discussion. This committee has been very effective in implementing and changing practices to increase knowledge and understanding of diversity. (III A 28)

Programs for faculty that promote the understanding of equity and diversity issues include 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 infuse multicultural content and perspectives into the curriculum, but also on helping them 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 Colloquia, Departmental Chairperson Council-sponsored Student Learning Outcomes Workshops, ESL Colloquia and FLEX.

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 are a very effective forum to invite outstanding speakers and lecturers on campus to address current institutional needs, such as diversity training. The institution is also committed to providing all personnel the opportunity to stay abreast of technology trends by regularly offering courses through workshops given by the Technology Learning Center (TLC). (III A 30)

The College determines the kind of support its personnel need through various forums, such as College Council, the Joint Labor Management Council, the College Diversity Committee, the Human Resources Committee, employee unions, and various Shared Governance advisory committees, as well as through the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and the Administrators’ Association. The management team of the institution, under the leadership of the Chancellor, is very involved and sensitive to the needs of personnel. As such, the institution administers a periodic Employee Satisfaction Survey through the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, which serves as a tool to identify the kind of support personnel needs.

Union and Senate representatives, in consultation with the Chancellor and management, are instrumental in ensuring that programs and services are designed to provide for the range of personnel needs. In addition, the institution networks with other community colleges to stay abreast and on the competitive edge of retention. The institution has been very cooperative in accommodating classified personnel who have not historically been afforded the level of services desired as identified per the Joint Labor Management Council.

The Student Equity Hearings also helped drive a conversation specifically about the diverse needs of CCSF students, programs and faculty. 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.

The Program Review process is also a tool that helps the institution focus on the needs of departments and programs. In the yearly plan, reports from departments and programs discuss progress relative to the major objectives identified in previous year’s program review. (III A 17)

The Strategic Planning process has also focused the institution on updating priorities and objectives based upon input from more than 20 college groups and committees and many individuals. In the discussions, this Strategic Planning team has helped identify how to support faculty and staff in the teaching and learning of best practices and develop professional learning programs that promote and share strategies and knowledge (e.g., basic skills, retention programs, early intervention, tech-enhanced courses) of how to support CCSF’s diverse group of students and employees. (III A 23)

Although the understanding of and concern for diversity at City College of San Francisco has been at the forefront of instructional and student services for many years, recent discussions at the state and federal levels about the challenges of student completion has helped drive deliberations about tenable solutions.
III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

In compliance with Title 5 and at the request of the Board of Trustees, the Human Resources Department of the institution 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 College fosters an appreciation for diversity. In recent years, the recruitment efforts of the College have been focused and funded through the Human Resources Department. The Human Resources Department, in conjunction with College constituents, has made a concerted effort through its hiring procedures to maintain the highest levels 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 show 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 2009)</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty (Fall 2009)</th>
<th>Full-Time Classified Staff (Fall 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>53 percent</td>
<td>60 percent</td>
<td>55 percent</td>
<td>58 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>47 percent</td>
<td>40 percent</td>
<td>45 percent</td>
<td>42 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16 percent</td>
<td>8 percent</td>
<td>7 percent</td>
<td>11 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>19 percent</td>
<td>17 percent</td>
<td>18 percent</td>
<td>37 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>37 percent</td>
<td>54 percent</td>
<td>57 percent</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
<td>12 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>21 percent</td>
<td>11 percent</td>
<td>8 percent</td>
<td>15 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>7 percent</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
<td>6 percent</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>7 percent</td>
<td>9 percent</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
<td>2 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>2 percent</td>
<td>6 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number:</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty and staff are also diverse with respect to their age. (III A 4)
In an attempt to foster diversity within the faculty ranks, the institution has implemented a “Grow Your Own Program” where current students have an opportunity of mentorship with selected interns in areas where historical underrepresentation has persisted. (see also III.A.4.a). The recruitment of classified employees for the San Francisco Community College District is governed by the District’s Collective Bargaining Agreement (BCA) with SEIU Local 1021 and the City and County of San Francisco Civil Service System also known as the “merit system.”

In February 2008, the Human Resources Department implemented an automated applicant hiring and tracking system with the goal of streamlining the hiring processes and saving hiring manager and supervisor’s time by permitting them to create and submit job announcement requests online for review and approval using an electronic workflow.

This system allows hiring managers and supervisor to work directly with HR staff to track job announcements as they move through the approval process. Moreover, the system provides applicants with automated notification both online and via email regarding their application status. From February 2008 through December 6, 2010, the Human Resources Department has posted 184 job postings and had 7500 applicants apply to a job posting or announcement. It has saved approximately 112,500 sheets of paper and other funds from mailings, postings and duplicating. (III A 31)

In September 2010, the institution also streamlined the student-hiring process to increase the visibility of on-campus positions and decrease the amount of time it takes to employ a student. Although this process is in the early stages, it has successfully accomplished its goals thus far.

To ensure 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. (III A 31)

III.A.4.c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.

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 via the employee...
handbooks. As required by law, sexual harassment training for employees serving in management and supervisory ranks has been ongoing since 2005.

The District has identified the 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, section 59328, and for coordinating any investigation. (III A 32)

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 web site.

As stated in III.A.4.a, the FLEX events have served as a forum for presenting informational workshops and trainings about the institution’s policies concerning personnel.

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.

As discussed throughout this report, the institution provides all personnel with opportunities for continued professional development. 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.

Professional development requirements for faculty are outlined in the Faculty Handbook on page 16, on the Office’s website, and in the FLEX Day programs. The FLEX Day programs are consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

The Office of Professional Development plans annual FLEX activity programs for faculty and staff. 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.

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.

After this change was made, it became clear that only one FLEX Day per semester creates scheduling difficulties for several reasons. First, Department and Representative meetings are held in the morning and workshops can only be scheduled after 1 pm. Second, many departments
hold meetings all-day long. Finally, faculty are no longer required by the Human Resources Department to submit proof of attendance.

These changes 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. For this reason, to provide more opportunities for professional development, the institution should focus on improving FLEX Day policies. Negotiations are underway to restore one of the programmed FLEX days to the Fall Semester.

Other areas available for faculty professional development activities include the Basic Skills Faculty Colloquia, Department Chair Counsel-sponsored Student Learning Outcomes Workshops, Multicultural Infusion Project and individual department workshops. When State funding improves, CCSF should increase support for professional development activities concerning student success and completion. Identifying and securing sources of income, such as the Basic Skills Initiative and Bridge to Success funding, will assist City College in achieving these goals without taxing our already stretched budget. (III A 33,34)

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 is probably due to the lack of funding for any type of travel or conference now that the 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. (IIIA 35)

The Technology Learning Center (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 36)

An additional professional development option offered through contractual agreement with the AFT 2121 include sabbatical leave awards (AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 17.N), which allow 4 percent of the faculty to be on sabbatical during an academic year. The Sabbatical Committee makes decisions about those who are awarded sabbaticals. (III A 37)

In the Fall 1999 semester, AFT 2121 and the District agreed to grant salary column movement to non-Ph.D. faculty. To date, the parties have continued to implement phases of this salary column movement. 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 38)
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 who have not previously been awarded a sabbatical will be favored, granted the seniority rules are applied. Administrators may also be granted a short-term paid leave for professional development and unpaid leaves. Due to the reduction in the number of administrators, no administrator has received a sabbatical in recent years. (III A 39)

In cooperation with the leadership of the classified employees (SEIU 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, in its purpose to be supportive of the classified staff, 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 members: (1) enrollment fee waiver program; (2) Book Loan Program; and (3) the SEIU 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/SFCCD CBA. (III A 40)

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.

The FLEX Workshop Evaluation form is distributed to participants during FLEX Day seminars. While attendance at FLEX is mandatory, faculty may select which of various events to 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 and varied offering of workshops. Therefore, the annual staff development evaluation and the FLEX workshop evaluations serve as the sole source for assessing attendees’ satisfaction and for determining future event planning. (III A 30)

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.

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 dialogues.

In the first example, the 2011-2016 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 23)

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 41)

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 Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC). 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 2) The Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) review all requests for new or replacement faculty positions and makes recommendations to the College Planning and Budgeting Council. For Classified positions, decisions are made by the Vacancy Review Group (VRG) composed of administrators and SEIU 2121 officers and not referred to CBPC 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 17,18)

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 Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) or the Vacancy Review Group (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.

**Evaluation:**

3. City College of San Francisco employs faculty and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The College is also committed to having a diverse faculty and staff reflective of the communities the College serves. The Human Resources Department should continue to focus on strategies for increasing diversity in the applicant pool and in hiring.

4. The institution understands both through high-level policy and daily practice that the appropriate understanding of equity and diversity are key to the success of the institution. Although the understanding of and concern for diversity at CCSF has been at the forefront of instructional and student services for many years, recent discussions at the state and federal levels about the challenges of student completion have helped drive
deliberations about additional solutions to meet our local challenges. 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 we are already engaged.

5. Prior to 2003, the fall semester FLEX event was held over three days, and the spring semester events were two days. 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. To provide more effective activities, the institution should focus on improving FLEX Day policies so that more employees can participate.

6. Although CCSF currently offers a number of professional development activities, the institution should increase support for them, especially those concerning student success and completion. Identifying and securing sources of income, such as the Basic Skills Initiative and Communities Learning in Partnership (CLIP) funding, will assist City College in achieving student success goals without taxing the already stretched budget.

7. 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 had recommended to develop a code of ethics for all employees. This is still pending, and completion of this process should be a priority during 2011-2012.

8. Given that student achievement gaps exist nationally, statewide and locally, CCSF expects to continue to find new ways to address the issue while maintaining the successful methods in which we are already engaged. With the rich diversity among CCSF’s population, the community understands that we have a responsibility to promote issues of equity.

9. 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 Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC), the Vacancy Review Group (VRG) (for classified staff) does not send their recommendations to CPBC for review and final decision-making. Moreover, the VRG operates outside of the Shared Governance structures. 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. This process should change 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 CPBC before a final decision is made on position allocations.

10. Faculty hiring processes have proceeded without Equal Employment Opportunity monitors because of the shortage of trained monitors and funds to pay them. The College should recruit and provide training for more monitors and identify funding for them.
Planning Agenda: None.
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Standard III.B: Resources:

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.

City College of San Francisco provides safe and sufficient physical resources at 9 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 is currently under construction and will be on a site that the District owns. Chinatown/North Beach, Southeast, Fort Mason and Castro/Valencia are all leased. Since the last accreditation, facility improvement work that assures the integrity and quality of our 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 resource for improving its physical resources was $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 2,3,4)

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. While a variety of factors helped drive this need for a systematic analysis and planning approach, the City and County of San Francisco also requires a Facilities Master Plan every 10 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)

To date, several large facility projects have been successfully completed in support of student learning programs, including a permanent 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. Future projects the College intends to construct are 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.

**Inventory and Assessment of Buildings**

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 a comprehensive report on the physical state of all existing facilities (the 3D/I 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 3DI’s report assigns an “FCI” for each facility. The “FCI” is the ratio of the repair cost to the replacement value of the facility. An assessment of 10 percent or greater is considered poor and a score of 5 percent or lower is considered good. It is recommended that facilities with an FCI rating of 60–70 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. Four buildings that exceeded an FCI rating over 60 percent are slated for replacement.

The 2010 3DI Report showed many of the District’s older facilities are in poor condition. The report stated the overall Facilities Condition Index, or “FCI” was 37.4 percent. Given that of the 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 Accreditation Report.

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, and the Creative Arts, Arts Extension, and Visual Arts buildings, which were constructed between 1960–1972. Now any of the remaining original building system components are at least 40 years old, and in need of repair or replacement.

The 3DI report would suggest 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 10 percent for District-owned facilities.

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 2008–2009 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 have to be supplemented 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.

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.

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, security, and creating a healthful learning and working environment. Projects completed to date as well as projects not yet started, such as the Performing Arts Center, are being 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 the College’s campuses to support academic programs. During 2008-2010, more than $18 million has been expended on improving 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.

Finally, work is undertaken on an ongoing basis to maintain the quality, safety, and function of the buildings. These efforts are conducted both by the College’s own 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, 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.

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.

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 being 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. As all College programs and departments continue to participate in this 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 1,6,7,8,9)

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. The Parking and Transportation Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, meets to advise on parking and traffic and other forms of transportation relevant to the College District. The Health and Safety Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, recommends policies pertaining to the safety of students and college employees. (III B 10)

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 11)

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 user’s group for design review and total cost of ownership in the planning for its next project, the new Performing Arts Education Center. (III B 12)

Facilities Linked to Sustainability

Since 2009, the College has dedicated considerable energy to improving its operation of physical resources by developing Part 1 of a Sustainability Plan that the Board of Trustees adopted during
2010. 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 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 13)

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.

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 10-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, 3DI District Facility Condition Assessment Report, which was discussed earlier in this report, provides a periodic inventory and assessment of the physical condition of all buildings. (III B 1,5,10)

The College also has an extensive strategic planning process for the building 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 for capital project funding in priority order. 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 14)

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; 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.
The Works of Arts Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, works to obtain, maintain and enhance the many works of art associated with the College. Since the last Accreditation report, 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, and other murals, lithographs and some dinosaur skeletons. Restorations of mosaics, murals, sculptures and busts have been completed. Other projects to bring more art to our campuses are also in progress. (III B 15)

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 16) The planning process begins with the Strategic Plan, which is supplemented by the Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and the 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.

Since the last self-study, the College has significantly improved communications related to facilities across institutional 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 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 with about the change. This has promoted more meaningful interactions between the Offices 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.

III. Evaluation:

11. The College has effectively integrated physical resources into the District’s institutional planning system and developed a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan. With an influx of resources from the 1997, 2001 and 2005 bond measures and related state dollars leveraged as a result, 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.

12. 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. Since the last accreditation review, significant improvements have been made in the organizational structure that supports facilities planning, construction, and maintenance. 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 that need to be completed before new ones are attempted, such as the Environmental Horticulture/Floristry Center and the Broadcasting and Visual Arts buildings.
Planning Agenda: None
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Standard III.C: Resources:

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.

Identifying, Prioritizing and Supporting Technology Needs at CCSF

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) provides technology resources 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.

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, Strategic Plan, and Annual Plan drive the Technology Plan’s conceptual framework and implementation. (III C 1,2,3,4)

The 2009-2011 Technology Plan is evidence-based and addresses the technology needs of the College as articulated by faculty, staff and students. It 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 division, 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). In the plan, deadlines are articulated and resource and personnel needs are described.

Using the Technology Plan as a roadmap, the institution 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)

The specific goals in the Annual Plan, which describes strategies to focus on each year in response to the current needs of the institution, derive from these two long-term plans. This plan is also the institution’s measure of how effective the college is in meeting its goals over time. With respect to evaluation, departments and student service divisions undertake a yearly 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. The College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) reviews all these unit plans so that requests for funds are viewed from an institutional perspective. (III C 5,6,7)

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 Information Technology Policy Committee (ITPC), which is the Shared Governance committee that provides policy recommendations to the College Advisory Council (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 8,9)

This subsection highlights some of the ways in which recent technology resources have been deployed under the guidance of these plans. It also looks at areas that need improvement.

**Information Technology Services Personnel Developments**

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 Information Technology (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 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 moved to the ITS department. Employees were moved to the ITS Office from a number of academic departments, the library and campus offices. (III C 10)

In 2010, the College established the position of Chief Technology Officer (CTO). Following a nationwide search a new CTO was hired in the summer of 2010. As the most senior technology administrator of the College, the CTO has been charged with providing visionary and operational leadership for strategic planning, implementation and improvement of instructional and administrative technologies and related support services that are closely aligned with the vision, mission and priorities of CCSF. (III C 11)

He has also been charged with developing and implementing the reorganization of the technology staff. The reorganization is intended to improve productivity, reduce costs, and provide better service to the College’s academic departments and offices while reducing the number of technology employees overall. While the College does not plan to layoff technology employees, it hopes to reduce staffing levels over time through attrition as employees leave. Since this process is in its early stages, the discussion about IT staffing system and the user involvement processes should be reviewed. Feedback from both ITS employees and their customers should be gathered to investigate how the new model has helped drive organizational effectiveness.

**Keeping Pace with Changes in Technology**

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. At CCSF, we have responded to the changing lifestyles and demands by implementing more efficient ways to provide information and services to students and faculty. This effort also helps create more sustainable practices that reduce waste. All divisions are looking at ways to decrease old processes that involve excess paper.

The following is a list of the most important technology-driven developments since our last self-study (III C 12):

- In 2009, launched a redesigned web site with a more user-friendly interface and information architecture. The launch of the site included:
  - Google search, a more refined search engine
  - Enhanced Online Catalogue
  - CCSF Email account for students
  - A robust easily updated back-end web technology
- Students have the option to receive communications via a text message.
- Google applications
- 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 was published.
- Admissions and Records implemented CCC Apply, the online application to the California Community Colleges.
- Online credit and non-credit application workstations are available at all principal campuses.
- Admissions and Records formalized electronic transcript data exchange agreements with local universities.
- Student Health Services implemented Medicat, an electronic healthcare information system.
- Photo identification cards, including a unique, scanable barcode number, are now available for all credit and non-credit students and employees.
- Direct deposit of financial aid is the disbursement method utilized by 70 percent of students.
- Counselors utilize Academic and Progress Review to monitor student progress.
- Matriculation uses computerized enforcement of prerequisites to facilitate the registration process.
- Outreach and Recruitment uses social media, such as Facebook, to communicate with students. Other departments and divisions are also using social media to network with students and alumni.
- The Scheduling Office, in conjunction with ITS, has greatly enhanced the online version of the class schedule.
- Computerized testing centers expanded to the Downtown and Mission campuses.
• An Ocean Campus training lab was developed to address the growing need for professional development in the student services division.

• 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.

• Fifty-one WIFI access points are available at the main and satellite campuses.

• A Content Management System (CMS) was chosen for the new web site that allows CCSF content developers to work from any computer with Internet access.

• Several online and database systems have been developed 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.

• The College operates two educational access television channels for the City and County of San Francisco, providing educational programming and courses for college credit 24/7. The EATV has upgraded its equipment to automate the workflow.

• Broadcast Media Services (BMS) provides instructional video production, editing, and duplication services for the College district. In addition, BMS schedules and delivers classroom video support equipment to classrooms and meeting rooms on Ocean Campus.

• EATV, Broadcast Media Services and ITS have collaborated to implement live-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.

• Two distance-learning rooms with a control room are designated in the MUB. Faculty and staff will meet to plan deployment of these rooms in Spring 2011. ** UPDATE IN FINAL DRAFT

Evaluation:

13. While many divisions have developed efficient online systems to assist faculty and students with processes and information gathering and delivery, many systems are still paper-based, time-consuming and wasteful. In addition, much of the work that has been done to simplify operations has been in response to understaffing – with fewer people available to work, it’s necessary to create ways to automate the work.

Technology Infrastructure and Support:

Developments in IT infrastructure and support are as follows (III C 12):

• Implementation of a SAN solution to provide more reliable data-storage environment and an enterprise-wide data backup solution to assist in data recovery.

• Fifty classrooms have had multimedia equipment installed. The highest concentration being at the Mission campus and the Multiuse Building (MUB).

• With the exception of the Chinatown campus, all sites have been connected to the fiber ring. Once the new Chinatown campus is completed, it will also be connected to the network.
- Upgrade to Banner 8 was completed in 2010. This will assure that all regular updates to Banner will continue.

- The technology division established a documentation advisory workgroup to collect and standardize all IT documentation.

- A self-service ticketing system was implemented in Spring 2011, which allows end users to monitor the progress of their service request. This system will also benefit the organization by allowing better dispatching, utilization and evaluation of staff resources in the technology area.

- With no additional staff, the hours of the Help Desk operation have been expanded to include coverage during lunchtime.

**Evaluation:**

14. Concern continues about insufficient electrical power in the data and computer center in Batmale Hall, which hampers the College’s use of technology. However, a resolution was approved in the October 2010 Board of Trustees meeting authorizing an engineering study to determine the exact needs and scope of the project. This will activate the project that will lead to an upgrade of the power in 2011. (III C 13)

15. Wireless connectivity is not reliably available in many facility areas where it is needed.

**Status of Educational Technology and Distance-Learning Programs:** (UPDATE DATA WHEN AVAILABLE FROM CYNTIA DEWAR)

The following are the key highlights of this area of CCSF (III C 14):

- The College has expanded its online course offerings from 65 credit courses in 2005 to 126 credit courses and 168 sections in spring 2011.

- The Educational Technology Department (ETD) supported 141 tech-enhanced course sections in the Spring 2010 semester; an increase of about 30 percent from the Fall 2009 semester.

- In certain departments, a student can complete approximately 85 percent of the requirements for an AA or AS degree by taking online classes or telecourses.

- Students can complete approximately 95 percent of the courses required to transfer to the CSU or fulfill the IGETC pattern by taking online classes or a telecourses.

- Distance-learning courses are offered in 27 academic departments, all six schools within Academic Affairs and within the Library and Learning Resources.

- 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.
• In spring 2010, ETD trained credit and non-credit faculty at the Evans Campus on how to tech-enhance their courses. This is the first such training at another campus and the first to include non-credit faculty.

• CCSF’s Educational Technology Department has 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.

Evaluation:

16. The training budget for the Educational Technology Department for faculty to develop online courses has been significantly cut. It will not be able to expand the number of online classes without a budget to train new instructors. In addition, the lab spaces that they use to train instructors and for faculty to use for on-campus meetings were reassigned. They currently don’t have use of facilities for these activities. Finally, continued IT support for the online-education program is needed for its continued success and expansion.

More details about the education technology and distance-learning programs can be found in section III.C.1.b.

III.C.1.b. The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.

Assessing Need for Technology Training

The Technology Learning Center (TLC) organizes the Educational Technology Professional Development Training Program. The TLC provides training for faculty and staff on a variety of educational and operational software through on-going workshops and FLEX activities. Training is delivered in a variety of modes to meet the needs of CCSF faculty and staff. From hands-on workshops, to online training, to sessions created specifically for departments’ needs, the TLC is providing tools that educators in the 21st Century need to be effective teachers.

When new software or application-specific tools are implemented at CCSF, trainings are offered to both faculty and staff. For example, when CCSF implemented new web-site technology, the TLC worked to develop Content Management System training for the new program and assisted ITS with training, outreach and documentation. This training has been offered to staff and faculty since May 2009. The TLC, in conjunction with ITS trainers, is also developing and delivering training on CCSFmail and Google applications for employees. In order to gauge the success of these activities, evaluation forms are provided to all participants of all trainings. (III C 15)

The TLC works with faculty and ITS 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 Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable (TLTR), a Shared Governance Committee 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.

Additional Technology Assistance for Personnel
Faculty and staff also receive technical assistance from the Help 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. Help Desk Support staff are available via phone and email. Faculty and staff can also either drop-in at the Help Desk Office for more complex technical support. Support staff also provides outreach to individual faculty and staff in their offices. Due to the increasing use of technology by faculty and staff, the Help Desk is faced with an escalating demand to deliver IT resources and support to users across all of the campuses. (III C 12)

The Technology-Mediated Instruction Office provides extensive 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 their 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 tech-enhance a face-to-face course. (III C 14)

In fall 2010, when TMI began providing faculty and students with more advanced-level topic-specific workshops focused on Insight, the following three projects were implemented:

- The front-page of Insight was re-designed 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.

Technology Training for Students

Outside of classroom activities, students use technology in a number of ways at CCSF, including the use of the WIFI network, Web4 registration and student account information, Insight, CCSF student mail, Financial Aid software, and Google applications. The Student Services Division trains students in using a variety of these applications. The Library and Learning Resources also offers students training in individual workshops via face-to-face classes, online workshops and an online credit class.

The most effective way to train students to meet their specific needs is for departments to integrate technical training into specific curriculum after the department determines what technology is required to meet student learning outcomes. Instructional departments teach students how to use relevant software for the class and also provide computer labs with student and faculty tutors when necessary.

The students also receive guidance and training from the Career Development Counseling Department (CDPC) counselors, who use Eureka software and other career-assessment software. In addition, Academic Computing Resource Center, the DSPS High-Tech Centers, and the Retention Program computer labs for students enrolled in specific courses also provide assistance. TMI, in partnership with the Learning Assistance Department, created a one-unit credit class, Successful
Online Learning, in order to train students on how to effectively navigate a distance-education course.

III.C.1.c. **The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.**

Management, Maintenance and Operation of Technological Infrastructure

The 2009-2011 Technology Plan details goals for institutional needs at CCSF. Subsequent CCSF Annual Plans review progress and determine priorities in all areas of the College. Academic departments also write an annual Program Review report, which describes their budgets and technical needs. The College Budget and Planning Council reviews all of these plans. Through these plans, 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 Section III.C.1 and III.C.2. (III C 1,5)

In crafting the most recent technology plan, the College considered that technology decisions tend to be high-stakes decisions involving large amounts of resources with 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 is being financed by bond proceeds from the 2001 and 2005 CCSF bond initiatives. 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 the passage difficult.

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. Funding for ongoing operational support needs to be identified for existing as well as new technology projects.

The Help Desk has been the primary avenue to report technology problems. 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.

System Reliability and Backup

Technical support staff makes 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 replacements of servers. (III C 12)

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 backups, it should be noted that all critical data, such as email, web site content and Banner information, is routinely backed up and stored at an off-site data-storage facility. A plan for full redundancy of all mission-critical systems should be in place by the end of 2011. (III C 12)

III.C.1.d. The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.

Decision-making About Use and Distribution of Technology Resources

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 follow the Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, Annual Plan and Program Review reports and are received by the College Planning and Budgeting Council. Capital equipment requests are made as part of the annual budgeting process.

In addition to these processes, several Shared Governance committees are responsible for setting policy and driving details of the discussion about utilization of technology resources. The Information Technology Policy Committee (ITPC) sets 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 web-site design and content. The Distance Learning Advisory Committee (DLAC) oversees the policies concerning distance education at CCSF, including online and telecourses. (III C 16,17,18,19)

A Robust and Secure Infrastructure

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, assuring 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 pro-active instead of reactive concerning replacement of key operational systems. (III C 20)

Technology Support and Distance-Learning Programs
The 2011 Strategic Plan and 2009-2011 Technology Plan both outline the priorities for Distance Learning Programs. The Technology-Mediated Instruction Office, which is part of the Educational Technology Department and is within the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, continues to successfully support online courses, tech-enhanced classes and telecourses. The administrators, faculty and staff actively support the use of technology for teaching, learning, and student services. This office develops college-wide guidelines and standards regarding educational technology, overseeing and implementing the Education Technology Plan section of the Technology Plan. (III C 1,2,3)

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. During their monthly meetings, much of the discussion concerns development and improvement of distance-learning courses or the supports that are offered to the 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.

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 quality of services 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 assure 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 our first hosting vendor, we moved quickly to another company. (III C 21)

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.

Technology and Institutional Planning

The process of creating the 2009-2011 Technology Plan was an inclusive one: A work group was formed of faculty, staff and administrators representing Information Technology Services, the Educational Technology Department, the Technology Learning Center, the Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction, the Office of Student Development, Library and Learning Resources, the Office of Planning / Institutional Advancement, the Office of Academic Affairs, the Information Technology Policy Committee and the College Advisory Council. (III C 1)

In fall of 2008, as a part of a shared governance review, faculty, classified staff, students and administrators provided feedback about the document. All areas of the College provided input to this plan before presenting it to the Board of Trustees for approval in 2009.
This process is a common one used for other decisions about the use and distribution of significant technology projects. The Information Technology Policy Committee sets policies regarding technology usage. The allocation of funds for technology projects follows the Strategic Plan, the Technology Plan, and the Annual Plan and is approved by the College Planning and Budgeting Council, 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)

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, department needs and describe future plans for extending or upgrading technology. This process also includes the College Planning and Budgeting Council.

Fewer resources have been available due to budget cuts, and technology resources for individual departments have suffered for this reason. (III C 6)

While the basis of the long-term planning is the 2009-2011 Technology Plan, the goals of that plan depend on resources and feasibility, and the technologies, facilities, equipment, training and support that are available. Strategic, multi-year technology plans are challenging to develop, given how quickly technology changes and in an atmosphere of an ongoing Statewide budgetary crisis. As with all aspects of planning at CCSF, cost has become a very important factor in prioritizing technological developments. The current lack of adequate staffing and other resources can also undermine plans. For that reason, in the current economic culture, benefits of any initiative are communicated college wide.

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 the criteria about access, ease of use, suitability for course management, the ability to address the needs, learning styles and learning outcomes of CCSF students, and the training needs of our faculty and staff. In all College technology purchases, sustainability, including but not limited to, total cost of ownership, is an important factor.

In implementing the 2009-2011 Technology Plan, the guidelines set forth in the CCSF Sustainability Plan were also followed. With respect to energy conservation and recycling, the College is currently implementing the sustainability measures to recycle and reduce energy consumption and other waste. (III C 22)

In the 2011 Employee Survey, the employees gave all areas of the Technology Learning Center more than a “Good” rating, with the Help Desk earning a 3.16 (with 3 defined as “Good”), the Training Programs 3.12, and the Distance Learning and Support 3.10. Other technology areas generally came up with scores greater than 3, including the Education Technology Office (3.16), Instructional Computer Lab Support (3.04), Library and Learning Resources (3.34) and Broadcast Media Services (3.21). The Information Technology Services area did not score quite as high, with Banner Support scoring 2.79 and Computer and Network Support scoring 2.97. (III C 23)
The 2011 Student Survey indicated a fairly positive response to questions about technology, with students 96 percent of the students rating the Computer Labs fair or better (37 percent of those rating them excellent and 44 percent good). Other ratings include: more than seventy-seven percent of the students rated the online class catalogue and schedule good or excellent; more than 80 percent of the students rated the online registration and add/drop system good or excellent; nearly 75 percent of the students rated the web site good or excellent; and more than 88 percent of the students rated their ability to use software applications at to be successful in their coursework as either good or excellent. (III C 24)

III. Overall Evaluation

17. The College has an integrated technology planning process that takes input from multiple areas of the institution. The Strategic, Technology and Annual plans as well as the Mission and Vision 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 and the college with the maximum benefits in the most cost-effective manner. A reorganization of the IT staff has helped provide better user support and more efficient use of personnel. However, processes in ITS are under a recurring and continual evaluation process for greater efficiency and improvement. Top priorities include: replacing the insufficient electrical power in the computer and data center in Batmale Hall. This hampers the College’s use of technology and upgrading the power must be operational by fall 2011. In addition, a plan for full redundancy of all mission-critical systems should be in place by the end of 2011. Finally, a system should be put in place to estimate the useful life of equipment so that the CCSF can be pro-active instead of reactive concerning replacement of key operational systems.

18. CCSF has 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. Due to the continual improvement of technology, the need to upgrade will be an ongoing issue. The 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, 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. With this in mind, City College should develop a strategy for replacing aging components of the College’s technology systems and evaluate the true cost of ownership in all technology acquisitions. Key to this is the identification and designation of funding sources specifically allocated for the purposes of establishing a District-wide refresh program.

19. 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 non-credit classes, identify and use non-credit faculty to test and establish these best practices and develop department-specific trainings across the campuses as the budget allows.

20. The growth in online courses has been substantial in the past six years. In looking to more fully use the new learning-management system, CCSF will have to address budget issues that may inhibit more growth. Tech-enhanced classes save paper, increase time on task and feedback for individual students, and improve student-learning outcomes. To increase the number of tech-enhanced classes, the ETD office needs to provide more training to show faculty how to integrate online technology into their face-to-face courses. This is difficult given current budget constraints. In addition, the Educational Technology Department needs a lab dedicated to TLC and ETD for faculty to use when training on Insight. Currently trainers must share the lab with the open TLC lab. Finally, expansion of online programs cannot occur without adequate support from CCSF, including funding for equipment and maintenance of hardware and software. CCSF also needs to put in place a full-time faculty Instructional Designer to work with a team of other faculty to test and establish best practices for credit and non-credit online-course development.

21. Although the implementation of the new web site design and back-end, 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, we can further improve on this work. CCSF should encourage and provide more support and training to departments to migrate content to the new website. CCSF should also continue to publicize and fully use the new student email system. In addition, to maximize the productivity of the college website, the vacant Website Content Manager position in the Marketing Office should be filled when funds become available.

22. Overall, divisions have focused on promoting institutional effectiveness and efficiencies that drive student and faculty success. While divisions have expanded the use of digital technologies, many systems are still paper-based, time-consuming and costly. City College should continue to look at ways to expand technology to streamline processes, especially those that are paper-based, to cut waste and be more cost-effective. With this in mind, implementing a document-imaging system would be a clear goal for CCSF to achieve in the next period of technology expansion.

23. City College 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 have no access at all to online resources after 8:00 pm on weekdays or on Sundays during what are prime study hours for many students.

Planning Agenda: None
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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.

The College’s unrestricted general fund has an annual operating budget of slightly less than $200 million for fiscal year 2010-11 (Ref. 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 (Ref. 2). 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 (Ref. 3). There is a strong connection between the priorities contained in the Strategic Plan 2010-2015 (which reflects the College’s mission statement) and the Annual Plan that the College Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), a Shared Governance committee, recommends to the Board of Trustees each year (see I.A.3 for further explanation). All significant expenditures for each major cost center are tied directly to one of the College’s planning objectives during the development of the annual budget. Specifically, 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 (Ref. 4). 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.

The results of the Program Review process are analyzed by a shared governance committee and presented to the 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.

The college’s finance team presents all budget related information it delivers to the PBC at meetings the Chancellor chairs and are open to the public (Ref 5). Any request to the 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 the College’s Strategic Plan. 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 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 CPBC has focused its attention on ideas to reduce spending that do not oppose the strategic plan. Most recently the CPBC 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.

The CPBC’s recommendations, reflecting a connection between planning and budget, are communicated to the Board of Trustees for both the tentative and final recommended budgets (Ref. 6). The Board’s Planning and Budget 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 tentative and final budgets. 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.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. This assessment is a collaborative effort by the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Student Development, the College’s Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, Vice Chancellor for Campuses, Vice Chancellor for Planning 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, the College’s representative in Sacramento, 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 Budget Council (CPBC) as a parameter for the tentative budget for the new fiscal year (Ref. 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 specify that cost center budgets seeking additional funds must submit their requests to the appropriate Vice Chancellor for review and approval (Ref. 8). 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 CPBC. The documents CPBC 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. The CPBC 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. 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 California Community College League’s allocation model.

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 for the College. 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 the fall of 2009 and the spring of 2010, and elimination of nearly all 2010 summer classes. (Ref. 1). All reductions in spending caused by declining revenue were discussed in multiple venues such as collective bargaining sessions, College Council, the Department Chairs Council, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the College Planning and Budget 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 year’s 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.

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. The College’s objective was to try to avoid spending the $2 million and this objective was successfully achieved. While it will be far more challenging to replicate this during fiscal year 2010-11, the same authority has been granted and the same objective has been set. On a continuing bases 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. 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 and Standard & Poor’s rated the College as favorably as the City and County of San Francisco for that sale. (Ref. 12). In April 2011, Fitch Ratings provided a similar rating for existing bonds (Ref 9).

During the current recession, requests for additional funds have not been solicited by the CPBC. However, the Program Review Committee has continued to inform the CPBC about the specific items that are most needed by departments. The college’s senior managers, including the Chancellor have presented to the CPBC detailed plans to reduce overall spending. The CPBC has reviewed these savings strategies to ensure that they do not counteract the college’s strategic, developmental, and operational plans. The CPBC 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 its approval. (Ref. 9).

The College has begun raising outside funding to support achievement of the goals and objectives established in its strategic, developmental, and operational plans. 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’s Advancement Plan maps out a strategy for helping to provide funding for those items that go beyond basic operations (Ref. 10). For example, priority areas for increased funding in the Advancement Plan include basic skills education, workforce training, and access to student services, and improved technology for classrooms. In addition, the College’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants, 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 $XX million per year in grants. Examples of this include $XX 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 $XX from __________ the Koret Foundation for basic skills programs (Ref. 1). 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.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.

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”. The College’s annual fiscal planning process begins with the creation of an Annual Plan, which includes detailed operational and developmental objectives that are tied to the College’s long-range 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.

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. 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 regarding these issues with its labor unions and expects to reach agreement on these issues during 2011. It should also be noted that the Board of Trustees may place a ballot measure before San Francisco voters in November 2011, and while the details are not yet known, such a measure may help the College in its effort to fund its long term liabilities for post retirement healthcare and for classified pensions.

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
retains 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-retained 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 (Ref. 13).

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. The college’s self-funded portion of the program generates annual expenditures ranging between $900,000 and $1.2 million. 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.

The College pays for the cost of retiree health benefits on a “pay as you go” basis, with estimated total expenditures of approximately $6.3 million in fiscal year 2010-11. The cost of this benefit is increasing by about $700,000 per year. 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.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget.

The financial planning and budget process is 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 CPBC. The Chief Financial Officer incorporates feedback from both the CPBC as well as individual cost center managers to modify and improve the annual guide (Ref. 14). A final budget book for fiscal year 2010-11 was not produced due to the sudden departure of a key staff member, however all budget tables needed for adoption were generated. A budget book for 2011-12 was produced and made available to the public on the College’s web site (Must be Verified)

The College’s annual audit reports, quarterly financial reports, and annual budget are all posted on the College’s website. (ADD REF) In addition, the financial information, including the annual budget, is widely distributed via the CPBC and public meetings of the Board of Trustees. Each year, both the 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 Budget Committee conducted a series of public hearings that reviewed both the College’s revenue assumptions and spending plans for the upcoming year. 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 (Ref. 15).

**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.**

The annual budget, the annual audit report, and all quarterly financial reports are available on the College’s website. (ADD REF) The Annual Budget document reflects the cost of carrying out the District’s annual operating objectives. The final budget incorporates the availability of state and local funding, and includes a summary of the activities the budget will support (Ref. 15). 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 CPBC.

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 CPBC, 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.

The annual 311 Report required by the state documents the College’s compliance with the “fifty percent law” related to spending for instruction. Historically the College has compared favorably with other districts on this measure (Ref. 16). In addition the College’s level of compliance with the “seventy-five percent rule” related to the number of full-time faculty compares quite favorably with other districts (Ref. 17). 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 students’ 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. The independent auditor presents all audit findings directly to the Board of Trustees or the Board’s Audit Committee in open public session. 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. 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 the previous section for information on the retiree benefits issue. The workers compensation issue was addressed in the 2011-12 budget (Must be Verified). 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.2.b. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.

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 CPBC, the College’s website, and public meetings of the Board of Trustees. (Ref 15) Each year the CPBC 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 CPBC (which includes representatives from all four College constituencies) on a biweekly basis. All key financial documents are posted to the College’s website. (Ref 16) The College’s annual audit report for 2009-10 was completed in a timely manner, with wide distribution (Ref. 17). Furthermore, the independent auditor presents all audit findings directly to the Board of Trustees in an open advertised public session.

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.

The most severe economic downturn since the Great Depression has 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. 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, 2010, the college’s Board Designated Reserve totaled $6.65 million, the largest it has ever been. As noted in the response to III.D.1.c, 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. The College’s objective was to try to avoid spending the $2 million and this objective was successfully achieved. While it will be more challenging to replicate this during fiscal year 2010-11, the same objective has been set.
The College’s objective is and has been to maintain a 5 percent available unrestricted general fund balance as recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office. During fiscal year 2009-10 the unrestricted general fund balance exceeded the recommended 5 percent level. This is partly attributable to the remaining value on a long-term prepaid lease.

The chart below shows the actual fund balance as a percentage of relevant expenditures for each of the past five fiscal years (Ref. 16):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Ending Unrestricted General Fund Balance</th>
<th>% of Unrestr'd Gen'l Fund Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 est</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes long-term prepaid ground lease for the site of the new Mission Campus

The College’s careful approach to budgeting during 2008-09 was reflected in the College’s bond ratings for the spring 2010 sale of $46 million in General Obligation Bonds. Both Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s rated the College as favorably as the City and County of San Francisco for this sale (Ref. 12). This was also noted in the response to III.D.1.c. In April 2011, Fitch Ratings provided a similar rating for existing bonds (Ref 9)

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 is quite important. 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 $15 and $30 million in the TRANS pool to deal with cash needs during the upcoming fiscal year (Ref. 18). Due to mounting deferrals in cash payments by the state, this amount may increase substantially in 2011-12. Additionally, in an emergency, such as very late passage of the state budget, the College has access to short-term borrowing for cash via the City and County Treasury. This emergency procedure is convenient and helpful but it does come at a price equal to the rate the County Treasury is earning on deposits at the time. 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 retains 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-retained 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 (Ref. 13).

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.

The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration (VCFA) is responsible for financial oversight for all monies held by the College, including its auxiliary bookstore. The Office of Research, Planning, and Grants provides overall management of grant funded activities. To accomplish effective oversight of finances, including grants, the College’s Chief Finance Officer, the Controller, and their staff support the VCFA. The College uses SCT’s 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 employ several different approval queues to ensure that financial transactions are legitimate and within budget. All of the College’s revenues are invested by the San Francisco County Treasurer. An independent review committee oversees these investments.

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. After the retirement of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities, the College entered into a contract with Swinerton Inc for direct project management of the College’s capital program. 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.

The College’s bookstore is an auxiliary organization run by a full-time on-site manager who reports directly to the College’s Chief Finance Officer who has primary responsibility for overseeing its operations. The Foundation of City College of San Francisco is an independent non-profit organization, whose financial activities are overseen by a Board of Directors, which includes the College’s Chancellor. (Ref. 20 and Ref. 21).

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. 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 the previous section. 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.
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 since _____(Ref. 11).

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.

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.

The District’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants administer 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 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 Banner management information system, and are subject to annual audits by awarding agencies. In addition, all grant-funded contracts are publicly noticed on the monthly agendas of the Board of Trustees.

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. 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 (Ref. 19 and Ref. 20).

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 since _____(Ref. 11).

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.

The College enters into a wide variety of contractual agreements including but not limited to the following:
Personal services contracts under $X, 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/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. (See Ref. 22)

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. The College for convenience or cause may terminate contracts. It should be noted that College policy requires any services contract in excess of $XX,000, an annually indexed amount tied to inflation, to be awarded only after a competitive process has been conducted. This policy acknowledges that factors other than price, such as particular research skills, may be included as selection criteria (Ref. 22).

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. This problem as well as all other findings from the 2008 audit report has been addressed.

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. These policies also established personal liability for employees as a penalty to ensure that contracts are not implemented without the prior approval of the Trustees. 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.2.g. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems.

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.

The College’s management team treats all external audit findings seriously. 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. 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 College’s Internal Auditor tracks all audit findings and the Board of Trustees Audit Committee reviews progress.

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 CPBC 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 (Ref. 23). Expenditures are now tracked every pay period via an ongoing forecast model. When information regarding revenue changes during the course of a fiscal year necessitates, 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.3. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

The College assesses the use of its financial resources on an annual basis. The methods employed to conduct this assessment are varied. They include an annual assessment for all divisions; annual program review analyses for all departments, as well as an annual publication of the College’s core Performance indicators. The results of these processes are shared with the CPBC and the Board of Trustees, and some are posted on the College’s web site.

Need a paragraph from Pam Mery here

III: Strengths and Areas for Improvement
1. 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 Strategic Plan 2011-2016 and the Annual Plan that the College 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. 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.

The College considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability in making short-range financial plans. When state revenues slumped, the institution managed its reserve funds in an intelligent manner to meet the goal of protecting direct spending for students. The College Planning and Budget 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.

2. 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 law.” 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.

3. 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 5 percent fund balance even during under-funded years.

The cash flow needs of the District have been supported through the issuance of TRANS and risk management needs are handled through SWACC.

4. The institution practices effective oversight of all of its finances. 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.
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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: Leadership and Governance.
Decision-Making Roles and Processes:

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

The CCSF Vision and Mission statement [Ref. 1], approved in 2010, states 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".

While this section of the vision statement was recently reworded it continues to reflect the spirit of a long standing tradition at our college. During the early 90's, in response to Assembly Bill (AB) 1725 the college administration and representatives of the major college constituencies engaged in a series of discussions about participatory governance at CCSF. In September of 1993, the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District established the CCSF Shared Governance System (Ref. 2), in accordance with Title V, Section 53200 (Ref. 3). Since then, hundreds of members of the College community have worked collaboratively each year within the CCSF Shared Governance System. (See section A.2.A for an expanded description)

Furthermore, 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 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 such as: the district sunshine policy, student equity and the achievement gap (Ref: 4), faculty diversity issues, the State budget and its implications on budget and planning, content filtering on the internet, proposing designated smoking areas on campus, and proposing campus policy carry guns on campus, etc. 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, announcements in City Currents, flyers, and announcements at various groups meetings such as the Department Chair’s Council, Administrator’s meetings, Department meetings, and Associated Students’ meeting, etc. Once the idea becomes a recommendation for policy change affecting the institution, it is sunshined through the CCSF shared governance system for further input and approval.

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 improvement that have significant institution-wide implications is with the development of the various college plans: the Annual Plan (Ref. 5), Education Master Plan (Ref. 6), Strategic Plan (Ref. 7 & 8), Student Equity and Achievement Plan (Ref. 9), Sustainability Plan (Ref. 10), and the Technology Plan (Ref. 11).

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 (2010–2011), the Academic Policies Committee considered the following issues for possible recommendation to the Academic Senate (Ref. 12):

- 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 SF high schools.
- Registration priority for Guardian Scholars: The District began granting Guardian Scholars (formerly incarcerated students) 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 effecting 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 confering retroactive degrees and certificates.

Section: 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.
The District has a Shared Governance handbook (Ref. 13), 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. All 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.

In addition the Board of Trustees has its own Board Committee structure where board policies are developed and discussed. Current year (2011) Board Committees are Audit, Chancellor/Board Relations, Facilities, Infrastructure, and Technology, Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Budget, Policy Implementation, and Special Joint Committee with Board of Education. Each Committee approves any policy recommendation or changes before they are introduced to the full Board as a policy resolution.

All policy resolutions are debated at open-session Trustee meetings. 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.

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.

The College recognizes these 4 constituency groups throughout shared governance: the Academic Senate, representing faculty; the Administrator’s Association, representing administrators, the Classified Senate, 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 City College community – students, faculty, classified 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. (Ref. 14) Shared Governance Agreement pp. 4, 16)

Appointments to the committees, subcommittees and task forces are the responsibilities of the four constituent groups. For 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, the SEIU 1021 makes the appointments. For faculty members, the Academic Senate's Committee on Committees customarily makes recommendations and these are finalized by the Executive Council of the Academic Senate. The student appointments are made by the Associated Students.
Students participate in decision-making through the Associated Students (A.S.). All students who attend CCSF are members of the Associated Students. The Associated Student mission 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.”

In addition, there is also an Associated Student Council on each of the college's major campuses.

More than 400 members of the college constituent groups participate in the work of the 43 committees and subcommittees in the CCSF Shared Governance System

**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 as outlined in Title 5, Section 53200. All faculty are members of the Academic Senate and may engage directly in decision-making through plenary meetings of the Academic Senate, participation in meetings of the Academic Senate Executive Council, through membership in Academic Senate committees and subcommittees, and other venues. The Executive Council meets about twice a month during the fall and spring to consider and discuss issues of significance in academic and professional matters. There 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. 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 depending on the subject matter. It is Board policy that, for the ten Title 5 academic and professional areas, the Board will rely primarily upon the recommendations of the Academic Senate. Administration also confers collegially with the Board via mutual agreement with the Academic Senate for matters covered in three additional policies that cover procedures for faculty hiring, administrator hiring, and evaluation and retreat rights.

2. **The College Advisory system** is the system in which the College obtains advisory recommendations in key operational areas from committees including College Diversity, Committee on Information and Public Records, Communication, and Information Technology Policy. The committees report directly to the College Advisory Council (CAC) and are composed of representatives from all the major College organizations—students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators as noted in details earlier. The CAC is chaired by the Chancellor. 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 dialogues, 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.
The College Advisory Council consists of the institutional leadership, both appointed and elected. The appointed leaders who sit on the CAC are; the three senior vice chancellors, 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 co-chairs of the Administrators Association, the presidents of the Academic Senate, Faculty Union (AFT 2121), and Department Chair 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.

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 Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC). The composition for this Council includes representatives from each of the College constituencies — students, faculty, administrators, and classified staff.

The PBC is chaired by the Chancellor. The PBC oversees the development of the College’s Strategic Plans (about every six years), the Annual Plans, End of Year Assessments (each year), and the annual College budgets. The PBC also reviews the annual College Performance Indicators Report. Additional committees reporting to the PBC include Facilities Review and Program Review. The decisions from the Faculty Position Allocation Committee are reviewed for funding. Recommendations from the 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, “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.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.

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. Additionally, decisions about associate degree requirements rest with the Bipartite Committee on Graduation requirements, a body that comprises the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and administrators representing Student Development and Academic Affairs.

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. Board Policy 2.07 states:

"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. and 11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon."

Board resolutions requiring review by Shared Governance bodies feature a box indicating which committee(s) and/or Council(s) have reviewed the resolution and on what dates.

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.

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. The current budget cuts, attrition within the ranks of employees and increased workloads have made it difficult for classified staff and faculty to fully participate in committee work.

The Board Policy Manual (Revised September 29, 1998) gives the College’s 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.

An example of collegial collaboration involves the current relationship with the bargaining units unions. The growing financial crises facing the College created the opportunity for cooperation with the College’s unions in their negotiations to avoid layoffs and minimize cutbacks in student services and class offerings. This was a critical factor allowing the Planning and Budgeting Council to make decisions that could save the College millions of dollars during one of the worst funding downturns in the College's history.

Another example is the Strategic Planning process. Members of all constituency groups were invited to attend Community Listening Sessions. In addition, drafts of all College Plans were...
circulated throughout the District Shared Governance System, allowing for employee and student input. Based on this input the strategic planning team wrote drafts of the current Strategic Plan (2011) which they brought to numerous committee meetings to seek further feedback.

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 College constituent groups recommended that the Office of Shared Governance be placed in a location close to the office of the Academic Senate. In addition it was recommended that the District Shared Governance Coordinator report directly to the Chancellor (Shared Gov Evaluation), which was accomplished by 2007.

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 constituency groups to engage participation and active dialogue to facilitate discussion of ideas and to inform the College community …… CCSF embraces debate as an important way to educate constituencies on issues and voice different perspectives.

While the shared governance system is an intricate process by which the college exercises to engage its community to participate in the college-wide discussion, formal and informal surveys indicate that many faculty and students are not familiar, know about, understand, or participate in shared governance. In an effort to provide more outreach, the College’s 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 and during flex day workshops. Information is regularly updated on the Shared Governance website and in City Currents, the CCSF internal weekly newsletter.

Both the Shared Governance Handbook and the website which includes 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. The communication and distribution of information has evolved over time to keep up with the changing technology, increased outreach, and improved timeliness. As new technologies emerge and new policies are implemented the Shared Governance Coordinator endeavors to keep up with the changing demand.

The two latest changes are the use of Granicus to use streaming media similar to the California State Assembly 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.

Current issues such as the speed of processing for hiring student workers and financial aid applications have definitely been much improved. Other issues are still in process, 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 best to proceed.

District employees have been made aware of essential information about institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve learning through multiple means. As part of the Strategic Planning process, employees are invited to attend Community Listening Sessions and presentations are made to all constituency groups. Drafts of all College Plans are circulated throughout the District Shared Governance System, allowing for employee and student input.

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.

CCSF has responded expeditiously and honestly to Commission recommendations and any citations of difficulties.

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.

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.

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 CTE Act. Office staff actively participate with local, regional, state and national Workforce and Economic Development Councils, Consortia and Associations, including the Bay Area Community College Consortia (BACCC), the California Community College Association of Occupational Education (CCCAOE) and the National Council for Workforce Education (NCWE). Faculty and administration 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 (2010/2011), 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 CTEA Reauthorization and reporting requirements. Various departments within CCSF have also applied for and received grants from the USDE.
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.

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 all four constituent groups. During the writing of this accreditation report there was a district wide survey sent out including questions regarding shared governance. The results of the shared governance survey were reviewed by the Committee on Information and Public Records and recommendations were forwarded to the College Advisory Council. The results of the survey on shared governance will be included in next year’s accreditation document.

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 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.

Evaluation

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, Economic Development.

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 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 Master Calendar, 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.

There are occasional inconsistencies in the Shared Governance Review box on Board resolutions. The list of committees in the box should always end with one of the three Councils, never with a committee or subcommittee, bargaining agent, or task force. In November, 2009, an academic policy that had received no shared governance review was considered and approved by...
the Board of Trustees: (090924-S8 and 091119-S1; Resolution to Create Community Access and Opportunity in City College’s Vocational Nursing Program).

Although the District’s sunshine policy requires audio recording of College Advisory Council and Planning and Budgeting Council meetings, this has not been done consistently.

At a Academic Senate Special meeting in March, 2010, the Student Trustee did not get an opportunity to speak. To ensure adequate time for input from all constituencies, 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 Committee meetings, to ensure compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act.

**Planning Agenda**

The current composition of the College Advisory Council (CAC) is not compliant with the District’s Shared Governance Agreement: There are 3 too many administrators and an extra student. Either the current membership should change or the District should amend the Agreement.

It has been difficult to capture accurate, up-to-date information on all Shared Governance meetings in the Master Calendar. 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, partially 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 should be reviewed and considered.

Program Review data is not always well-aligned with analogous data from Admissions and Records and the District Business Office. The Chancellor has recommended that the institutional researchers start using the same data provided by Admissions and Records and used by the Business Office.

The District should continue its ongoing effort to better incorporate the Associated Student councils from the campuses into the College-wide decision-making process.

Acting upon a recommendation of the Committee on Information and Public Records, the Office of Shared Governance will start an annual survey of the district employees and students to evaluate CCSF Shared Governance System by using the District new license of survey monkey.

Review and evaluation of the shared governance structure was to the place every two years. The last evaluation occurred in 2007. The college is not meeting this objective.
Standard IV.B: Leadership and Governance.
Board and Administrative Organization.:

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

IV.B.1. The Institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

This section is not yet ready for review.

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.

The Chancellor has served the college for 41 years starting as a Psychology Instructor and then Department Chair in the Behavioral Sciences Department, and progressing to Dean of Instruction, and Vice-Chancellor of both Academic Affairs and Student Development. He was appointed Interim Chancellor from March 2008 until December 18, 2008, when he was hired as Chancellor.

The Chancellor’s leadership and decision-making process is informed by a comprehensive and integrated set of planning documents which include: the Education Master Plan; a revamped Technology Plan; the Student Equity and Achievement Plan; the Sustainability Plan; and, a newly reformatted Strategic Plan. Each plan was established and continues to evolve in collaboration with all College constituencies.

The Chancellor emphasizes the significance of the newly adopted Vision and Mission Statements (April, 2010) and its links to the Strategic planning and budgeting processes. The importance of the College Strategic Plan was made implicit when the Chancellor directed that the newly adopted Program Review process should contextualize, as appropriate, the Strategic Plan along with the College Vision and Mission. The goal is for the Strategic Plan, College Mission/Vision and the various Program Review to serve as a comprehensive and integrated evidence-based anchor for writing and updating the Educational Master Plan and to guide the budget process.

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 and other groups.
The Chancellor reviews and evaluates the implementation of the college’s plans. He stresses a planning and evaluation process that promotes a coordination of effort that leads 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 and assessment by combining various planning efforts and linking those to annual budgets. The College’s Planning and Budgeting Council played a key leadership role in linking planning issues with the budget by its review and discussion of the College’s 2009-2010 Management and Budget Plan completed in November 2009. The Management and Budget Plan not only provides a composite document which contains both the summary Budget and the CCSF Annual Plan, but also includes the objectives of the divisions of the College – Academic Affairs, Student Development, Finance and Administration, and Institutional Advancement – as well as objectives of the Chancellor’s Office. The Plans include the primary performance measures or outcome indicators to be evaluated at the end of the academic year.

The Annual Plan brings together in one place the financial resources that the College expects to have available, many of the programs, services, and initiatives to be provided with those resources, and the means for evaluating results. The Chancellor’s Budget Message gives a general outline of how well the budget is likely to address the current planning priorities of the college and what resource challenges might be anticipated.

The Chancellor serves on the Board of the City College of San Francisco Foundation and he participates in all of their fundraising initiatives. In the Fall of 2010, the Foundation sponsored a City College of San Francisco fundraiser at a San Francisco Giants Baseball Game. The Annual Basic Skills Luncheon is sponsored by the CCSF Foundation Auxiliary and is held in the Fall. He regularly meets with major donors and philanthropic organizations.

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.

As of June 30, 2010, sixteen members of the administrative staff retired. The College’s administration is in a period of transition and only half of these positions are expected to be filled. The Chancellor recently re-aligned administration to create a more efficient and effective administrative structure. This re-alignment 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 Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the Interim Vice Chancellor of Student Development, the Interim Vice Chancellor of Policy and Research (formerly Institutional Research and Advancement), Interim Vice Chancellor of Campuses, Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, and New Student Counseling, the Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs (Vacant), and the Chief Technology Officer.

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.

A newly revised Administrative Evaluation process includes administrative objectives with measurable outcomes. The Chancellor reviews all final evaluations with the Vice Chancellors and forwards the evaluations to the Administrative Evaluation Oversight Committee. The members of the committee include the Presidents of the Academic and Classified Senate, Presidents of the DCC, AFT and SEIU, the Associated Student President, and the Co-Chairs of the Administrators’ Association. It is chaired by the Chancellor. After the committee review, the Chancellor presents the Board of Trustees with recommendations regarding appropriate Administrators’ contract extensions.

In addition, the Chancellor chairs the monthly College Council meeting. The College Council is 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 Chairperson Council, Classified Senate, SEIU 1021, AFT2121, 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’s annual plan.

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.

The Chancellor communicates the institutional values, goals and direction in multiple arenas. He addresses the entire college every Flex Day and chairs key Shared Governance committees, such as College Council, the College Advisory Council, College Planning and Budget 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.

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’s strategic plan has identified communication as a strategic priority throughout the college.

The Chancellor actively participated in the student equity hearings in Spring 2010 and Fall 2010. The Chancellor’s Progress Report – Student Equity and the Achievement Gap was completed on June 24, 2010. Various Taskforce Workgroups were established to focus on Math, English, Placement and Testing, Counseling, Financial Aid and Student Employment.

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 other constituency groups. The Chancellor reviews data, issues and proposed plans with the entire college community.

During the Chancellor’s tenure, the institution’s Program Review Process has been reorganized from a 5 year cycle to a biannual review process of more than 133 units and programs. 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, staffing, etc.)

Each department/unit is expected to describe their 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 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.

The departments/units completing their Program Review are expected to link programs goals and objectives with the following college plans: Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan, Annual Plan, 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 Planning and Budget Council (CPBC). The CPBC conducts budget hearings and develops budget recommendations which are forwarded to the Chancellor. The Chancellor prepares and submits a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

**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.**

City College 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).

The Chancellor maintains frequent 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’s 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’s progress toward its goals and objectives.

IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

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 Planning and Budget Council (CPBC) to review, evaluate and develop recommendations related to budget and planning. The CPBC comprises representatives from students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators.

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 supports such a change. Any such changes are brought to the immediate attention of the Board of Trustees at their regularly scheduled meetings.

The 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 goals 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.

IV.B.2.e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

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, 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 Assembly Members Leno, Ma and 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, business and labor leaders.

He meets and confers regularly with the Presidents of San Francisco State University, the University of San Francisco, the Universities of California, San Francisco and Los Angeles, and the Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District to discuss student completion and success issues.

Evaluation

As a result of the Management and Budget Plan, 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 goals 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 Chancellor has articulated the college’s strategy for dealing with the budget crisis of the past three years. In addition to the Management and Budget Plan, 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 $320,000 between July 1, 2010 and February 2011 to reinstate classes. CCSF’s Child Development, High School Diploma Programs and Gateway to College programs are now participating in an eScrip Program.

When the Chancellor began his tenure he emphasized that the College was experiencing an unprecedented financial crisis which 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. He continues to inform the college community of current and future budget challenges and encourages input from all groups.

Due to the current economic climate, the Chancellor re-aligned the administrative structure of the College to become more efficient and effective and significantly decreased the reliance on outside consultants and has created an administrative structure that is more sustainable. At the end of Spring 2010 over 15 administrator retired creating a void within the School and Campus Dean level. Recent interim and lateral administrative appointments are creating challenges for the College as these recent appointees gain experience in their positions. At the same time, this transition presents new opportunities for the College as a new generation of administrative leaders is preparing to lead the college into the future.

The Program Review Process, Strategic Planning and institutional research activities were regularly reviewed with the Chancellor. The goal is to better link program effectiveness and budgetary priorities based on accurate data and reports.

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 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, the students, and appreciates the people who work at the College. While the Chancellor continues to explain these complex issues and challenges facing the institution, regular and timely responses and communication are areas where improvement is needed.

Chancellor maintains frequent and effective lines of communication with students, faculty, classified, the Board and the community. He 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. He seeks to continuously improve these lines of communication. The Chancellor’s office needs to provide prompt responses to (email) inquiries and requests.

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 is to be commended for effectively 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.

Planning Agenda

The CEO should continue to provide the leadership and direction to bring the college to the point where the community understands the linkages between the major College Plans, Program Review and the Planning and Budget process.

The Program Review process should be continually evaluated and assessed to become more streamlined and manageable. In addition questions related to requests for new resources by departments/units need to be clarified.

While progress has been made to implement the various College plans (e.g., Strategic Planning, Education Master Plan, etc.), there is still more work to be done in this area.

The Chancellor is aware of his role, duty and functions in relation to the Board of Trustees, faculty, administrators, classified, students and the community. He continues to work to bridge differences and seeks compromise to difficult problems; however, improvement with communication and transparency in dealing with all constituency groups could improve relations between the various groups.
The Chancellor is to be commended for balancing the CCSF budget during one of the most challenging economic periods in the history of the nation, the state of California, and CCSF. The Chancellor and the leadership team of CCSF have been pro-active 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.
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