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History of City College of San Francisco

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

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

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

Because of rapid growth, the College subsequently formed two separate divisions: one for credit courses located on the Balboa Park (Ocean) Campus; and one for noncredit courses offered throughout the City, under the umbrella of the San Francisco Community College District. This growth was also accompanied by additional building. Conlan Hall was completed in 1968, the Arts Extension in 1972, and Batmale Hall and the Downtown Campus in 1978.
The two divisions were merged in 1990, and a single City College of San Francisco was created. The College has grown over the last two decades and now offers both credit and noncredit courses at nine campuses and nearly 200 neighborhood sites. The nine campuses are Castro, Chinatown/North Beach, Civic Center, Downtown, Evans, John Adams, Mission, Ocean, and Southeast. The College now employs almost 800 full-time and slightly more than 1,000 part-time faculty. Ninety-five percent of faculty and administrators hold master’s degrees and approximately 200 hold doctorates. They teach approximately 91,000 credit and noncredit students annually.

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

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

Administrative & Governance Updates

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

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

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

Internal Audit Committee

Effective August 2009, the Chancellor convened the Chancellor’s Standing Internal Audit Committee, which is a non-Shared Governance workgroup, to address various audit findings, as well as other significant management issues that are brought to the Internal Auditor. This committee is comprised of the Chancellor, Acting General Counsel, and the District Internal Auditor. Each week, the Committee requests various administrators or members of the management team to appear before the Committee to provide solutions to issues raised, and report on their progress with audit issues. This workgroup also addresses complaints that are filed with the District Internal Auditor.

CCSF Foundation

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

Facilities & Infrastructure Upgrades

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

Bridge to Success

In a groundbreaking partnership, the City and County of San Francisco, City College of San Francisco, and the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) received a $3 million grant in Fall 2010 from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to be distributed over the next three years to double the number of students who receive a post-secondary degree. The year prior, the San Francisco Post-Secondary Success Partnership (CCSF, SFUSD, and the City and County of San Francisco) received a $250,000 planning grant to bring together mayors and other municipal leaders, K-12 superintendents, and community colleges to devise new ways of helping more students successfully complete an education beyond high school. The Bridge to Success program will enable the College to strengthen partnerships and collaborate closely with SFUSD to double the number of students who are completing their post-secondary degrees.

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

Student Equity Initiatives

In May 2010, in response to a series of Equity Hearings organized by members of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor’s Office organized a special task force to strategically work on the planning and assessment of the College’s intervention efforts to address the student achievement gap, and to assist in the implementation of those plans with the various College divisions and departments. The taskforce includes representatives of all College constituencies (faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators), as well as key leaders of Shared Governance committees. Initiatives in the following areas are underway: English course sequencing; mathematics course sequencing; financial aid; student placement testing; student registration; student employment; international students; and AB540 students.

Counseling

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

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

**Veterans Resource Center**

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

I. San Francisco Population¹

City College of San Francisco is located in the City and County of San Francisco, the fourth largest city in California with a current population of more than 800,000. The California Department of Finance projects the population will increase two percent by 2016. San Francisco is a diverse city with large Asian and Latino/a populations. It also has a graying population. By 2016, the percent of the population over 50 is projected to have increased by 11 percent. However, the youngest age group (under 16) is also projected to increase by nine percent. It is the middle age ranges from 16 through 49 that are projected to show a decrease. The predictions regarding school age populations reflect these age trends. While the K-8 population is projected to increase by 14 percent, the high school population is projected to decrease by four percent, and high school graduates are projected to decrease by 18 percent. Legal immigration decreased in the 1990's and is now flat to declining.

CCSF plays an important role in facilitating economic mobility. Nearly eight percent of San Francisco residents take classes at CCSF each year. A poll of likely San Francisco voters conducted in June 2011 by Tulchin Research revealed that a majority (55 percent) had either attended CCSF in the past or were currently attending CCSF. Of likely voters with an opinion, 87 percent thought favorably of CCSF.

In 2010-2011, approximately 47 percent of credit students enrolled in Career and Technical Education (CTE) Certificate or Degree programs to upgrade their skills or prepare to enter the workforce. In the past three years, the number of CCSF students that received Board of Governor (BOG) Fee Waivers increased by eleven percent. In 2010/2011, 42 percent of CTE students received BOG Fee Waivers.

The most recent census data (Graph 2.2 and Table 2.2) indicate that approximately 14 percent of the population of the City and County of San Francisco earns an annual income of less than $25,000. This despite the fact that per capita income in San Francisco is 60 percent higher than the rest of California and even more when compared to the U.S as a whole. This is in part due to the educational level of the majority of its residents. In 2007, nearly half of residents over 25 held a bachelor's degree or higher.²

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

² CCSF Environmental Scan, (http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/ExternalEnvironmentalScan2010.pdf)
Graph 1.1
San Francisco Population Actual and Projected 2001 to 2016

Table 1.1
San Francisco Population Actual and Projected 2001 to 2016

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

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

Table 1.2
San Francisco Ethnicity/Race Actual and Projected 2001 to 2016

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

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

Note: This table does not include the 'Other' category; thus the categories presented here do not add up to the totals in Table 1.1. Percents are calculated based on the totals in Table 1.1.
### Table 1.2a

#### Census 2010 Race and Ethnicity in San Francisco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>805,235</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>390,387</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Alone</td>
<td>267,915</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race Alone</td>
<td>53,021</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American Alone</td>
<td>48,870</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>37,659</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native Alone</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>805,235</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>337,451</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Alone, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>265,700</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino of Any Race</td>
<td>121,774</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American Alone, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>46,781</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>26,079</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race Alone, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census Summary File 1, Table PCT12 by Race/Ethnicity, California and Counties
Graph 1.3
Age Actual and Projected in San Francisco 2001 to 2016

Table 1.3
Age Actual and Projected in San Francisco 2001 to 2016

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total K-8</td>
<td>41,075</td>
<td>38,551</td>
<td>36,791</td>
<td>38,247</td>
<td>41,654</td>
<td>43,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 9-12</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>20,163</td>
<td>20,553</td>
<td>17,422</td>
<td>15,859</td>
<td>16,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduates</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>3,791</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>2,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CA Department of Finance
(http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/projections/k-12/view.php)
Graph 1.5

Legal Immigration into San Francisco 1999 to 2009

Table 1.5

Legal Immigration into San Francisco 1999 to 2009

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

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

Graph 2.1
Per Capita Income 1999 to 2009

Table 2.1
Per Capita Income 1999 to 2009

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

Source: US Bureau of Economic Analysis
(http://www.bea.gov/regional/reis/drill.cfm)
Graph 2.2

Income Distribution in San Francisco 2005-2009 Average

Table 2.2

Income Distribution in San Francisco 2005 - 2009 Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005-09 Estimate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Families</td>
<td>142,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median family income *</td>
<td>$ 86,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean family income *</td>
<td>$ 122,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2009 Inflation Adjusted Dollars

Source: US Census  
(http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Products/Profiles/Chg/2003/ACS/Tabular/001/A4000US0033.htm)
III. Profile of City College Students and Employees

City College of San Francisco has historically served as many as 107,000 students, but served more than 91,700 students in 2010-11. Recent cuts in state funding have limited the number of students served. Due to the recession that began in 2008, the college has been forced to cut the general operating budget by $20 million. Academic year 2010-11 was particularly affected. Summer 2010 was cut over 90 percent. Fall 2010 sections were reduced six percent. The result can be seen in Table 3.2. Academic year headcount for 2010-11 fell over 10,000. In credit, the decline in headcount enrollment was seen mostly in Asian and White populations whereas African-American and Hispanic/Latino populations increased. In noncredit, the population decline in enrollment was more uniform across all ethnic/racial groups. Declines were also uniform in credit and noncredit by age and gender (Tables 3.5 and 3.6).

Nonetheless, in 2010-11, students enrolled in more credit units (Table 5.4) and this led to nearly equal figures for Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES) for 2010-11 when compared to the prior year 2009-10 (Table 3.3). Career and Technical Education (CTE) FTES has been particularly strong. CTE FTES has continued to increase both in number (Table 3.3a) and as a proportion of Credit FTES (Table 3.3b). It seems safe to assume that this is a reflection of the changing economic landscape.

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

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

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

City College employed 2,703 administrators, faculty, and classified staff in Fall 2010—down from 2,890 in Fall 2004. This 6.5 percent decline mirrors a seven percent decline in student headcount from 98,513 to 91,704. During this same time, however, full-time faculty increased by 9.5 percent (Table 3.14) and full-time classified staff increased by two percent (Table 3.15). As a result, overall employee FTE remained stable during this time.
Table 3.1  
**Participation Rate 2000-01 to 2008-09**

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

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning  
Note: The participation rate is the percent of the population of San Francisco that is enrolled at CCSF in any given year.

Table 3.2  
**Annual Student Headcount 2000-01 to 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit + Noncredit *</td>
<td>93,850</td>
<td>100,699</td>
<td>90,125</td>
<td>89,348</td>
<td>95,457</td>
<td>84,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,717</td>
<td>54,025</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>49,627</td>
<td>51,701</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>44,414</td>
<td>38,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Programs</td>
<td>6,771</td>
<td>6,313</td>
<td>8,388</td>
<td>7,625</td>
<td>7,344</td>
<td>7,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT/Garment 2000</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College for Teens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>5,217</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>4,716</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>2,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Ed &amp; Title IV-E</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>3,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Internat'l Students</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Headcount</td>
<td>100,621</td>
<td>107,012</td>
<td>98,513</td>
<td>96,973</td>
<td>102,801</td>
<td>91,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unduplicated, i.e. students enrolled in both Credit and Noncredit are counted only once.

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Graph 3.2
Credit and Noncredit Student Headcount 2000-01 to 2010-11

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Graph 3.3

FTES 2005-06 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Noncredit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>24,541</td>
<td>12,176</td>
<td>36,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>24,615</td>
<td>11,744</td>
<td>36,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>26,102</td>
<td>11,826</td>
<td>37,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>27,490</td>
<td>12,218</td>
<td>39,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>27,194</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>38,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>28,459</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>38,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Note: The data source is identical to that used for 320 Report apportionment calculations, with the following clarifications:
1) These FTES totals include non-resident FTES, as well as resident FTES.
2) FTES for the prior summer is included for each academic year. For example, 2010-11 data consists of Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011. This differs from the methodology used for apportionment which adjusts summer each year based upon the conditions for that particular year.
3) Data above do not include FTES from State Flex (Day) Factor.
Graph 3.3a

Career Technical Education (CTE) and Total Credit FTES 2000-01 to 2010-11

Table 3.3a

Career Technical Education (CTE) and Total Credit FTES 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit CTE</td>
<td>8,745</td>
<td>9,027</td>
<td>9,046</td>
<td>10,121</td>
<td>11,525</td>
<td>11,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credit</td>
<td>22,118</td>
<td>24,795</td>
<td>26,649</td>
<td>29,086</td>
<td>31,175</td>
<td>27,711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: Data Mart FTES methodology differs from that used for the 320 Report apportionment calculations which underlie Table 3.3. See Data Mart link for more details.
Table 3.3b  
**Career Technical Education (CTE) Credit Student Headcount 2000-01 to 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit CTE</td>
<td>19,804</td>
<td>21,540</td>
<td>19,975</td>
<td>19,673</td>
<td>22,768</td>
<td>22,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Credit Students</td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE as Percent of Credit</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning

Table 3.3c  
**Number and Percent of Career Technical Education (CTE) Students in Credit Who Received a Board of Governors Fee Waiver (BOGW) 2000-01 to 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTE Students in Credit</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Receiving Waiver</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Receiving Waiver</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td>6,119</td>
<td>6,255</td>
<td>7,090</td>
<td>9,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Table 3.4
Credit and Noncredit Headcount by Ethnicity 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4,087</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>4,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13,783</td>
<td>15,768</td>
<td>13,030</td>
<td>11,119</td>
<td>14,628</td>
<td>12,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>3,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>7,058</td>
<td>7,649</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>7,286</td>
<td>8,494</td>
<td>9,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Non Latino</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SouthEast Asian</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>3,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>14,683</td>
<td>15,926</td>
<td>13,543</td>
<td>13,549</td>
<td>14,808</td>
<td>13,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Total</td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>1,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17,960</td>
<td>18,903</td>
<td>17,291</td>
<td>16,756</td>
<td>15,639</td>
<td>14,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>13,184</td>
<td>14,062</td>
<td>11,576</td>
<td>11,038</td>
<td>11,557</td>
<td>9,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Non Latino</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SouthEast Asian</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>8,198</td>
<td>6,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>7,475</td>
<td>6,625</td>
<td>5,515</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>4,644</td>
<td>3,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Total</td>
<td>49,827</td>
<td>51,701</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>44,441</td>
<td>38,249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
### Graph 3.5
Credit and Noncredit Student Headcount by Gender 2000-01 to 2010-11

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

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

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Graph 3.6a
Credit Student Headcount by Age Group 2000-01 to 2010-11

Graph 3.6b
Noncredit Student Headcount by Age Group 2000-01 to 2010-11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>5,607</td>
<td>6,403</td>
<td>5,012</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>5,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>11,797</td>
<td>12,531</td>
<td>12,274</td>
<td>12,768</td>
<td>14,832</td>
<td>14,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>8,455</td>
<td>9,818</td>
<td>8,942</td>
<td>8,996</td>
<td>10,286</td>
<td>9,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>6,294</td>
<td>7,302</td>
<td>6,129</td>
<td>5,742</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>5,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>4,499</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>4,284</td>
<td>4,197</td>
<td>4,447</td>
<td>3,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>5,938</td>
<td>6,413</td>
<td>5,714</td>
<td>5,306</td>
<td>5,928</td>
<td>5,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 Plus</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>4,923</td>
<td>4,814</td>
<td>5,196</td>
<td>5,831</td>
<td>5,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>5,539</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,716</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>3,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>5,078</td>
<td>5,399</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>4,317</td>
<td>3,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>4,588</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>3,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td>5,171</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>4,055</td>
<td>4,128</td>
<td>3,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>8,270</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>7,782</td>
<td>7,289</td>
<td>7,344</td>
<td>6,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 Plus</td>
<td>14,567</td>
<td>15,108</td>
<td>14,740</td>
<td>14,905</td>
<td>15,591</td>
<td>14,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3,377</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>2,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,827</td>
<td>51,701</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>44,441</td>
<td>38,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Graph 3.7
Percent of Students Enrolled in Credit Who Have Taken Noncredit, and Students Enrolled in Noncredit Who Have Taken Credit 2000-01 to 2010-11

Table 3.7
Percent of Students Enrolled in Credit Who Have Taken Noncredit, and Students Enrolled in Noncredit Who Have Taken Credit 2000-01 to 2010-11

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

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Table 3.8
Residency of Credit Students 2000-01 to 2010-11

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

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning

Table 3.9
Board of Governors Fee Waiver (BOGW) for Credit Students 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received Fee Waiver</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>9,064</td>
<td>13,019</td>
<td>13,487</td>
<td>15,289</td>
<td>19,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Receive Waiver</td>
<td>39,549</td>
<td>43,434</td>
<td>34,211</td>
<td>34,224</td>
<td>38,770</td>
<td>29,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Credit Students</td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Graph 3.10

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

Table 3.10

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

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

Source: California Community Colleges Data Mart
(https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/sfawards.cfm)
Graph 3.11a

Student Receiving Matriculation Services in Credit 2000-01 to 2010-11

Graph 3.11b

Student Receiving Matriculation Services in Noncredit 2000-01 to 2010-11
### Table 3.11

**Student Receiving Matriculation Services in Credit and Noncredit 2000-01 to 2010-11**

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

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Graph 3.12
Placed or Attained Level of All Students in Credit 2000-01 to 2010-11

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Precollegiate</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Precollegiate</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (No Placement or Attained Level)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Credit Students</td>
<td>47,235</td>
<td>52,498</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,711</td>
<td>54,059</td>
<td>48,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate English</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Precollegiate English</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Precollegiate English</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested in English</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,033</td>
<td>10,108</td>
<td>10,140</td>
<td>9,973</td>
<td>11,543</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Precollegiate ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Precollegiate ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested in ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,798</td>
<td>5,836</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>3,849</td>
<td>3,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
### Table 3.14

**Administrators, Faculty, and Classified Staff for Fall Terms 1998 to 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response / Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full-Time Faculty</strong></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response / Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td>716</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Part-Time Faculty</strong></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response / Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>All Classified Staff</strong></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response / Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td>884</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15
Full- and Part-Time Classified Staff for Fall Terms 1998 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Classified Staff</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response / Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response / Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Classified Staff</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response / Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Human Resources. (For Tables 3.14 and 3.15)
IV. Student Opinion of CCSF

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

Graph 4.1
How successful have you been so far achieving at CCSF what you wanted to do at CCSF?

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Note: Results are based on 3,071 credit respondents in 2004 and 4,376 in 2010.
Graph 4.2

Would you recommend CCSF to a friend?

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Note: Results based on 3,034 credit respondents in 2004 and 4,292 in 2010.

Note for Table 4.3 (next page): Respondent groups vary by question. Overall, there were 3,095 credit respondents in 2004, and 4,493 respondents in 2010.
Table 4.3
Ratings from Credit Student Opinion Survey 2010 Compared to 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of instruction</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>New Student Counseling</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of courses</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Continuing Student Counseling</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of courses</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Transfer Counseling / Transfer Center</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of class scheduling</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Career Development &amp; Placement Center</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(times available)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of classes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Childcare Center</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSF application process</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Food Services / Cafeteria</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement testing</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Job placement assistance</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Course Time Schedule</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-13.4</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Longitudinal Student Achievement Data

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

Course success at CCSF has been stable to increasing slightly, whether that be overall, or in transfer or credit basic skills courses. In comparison to statewide averages, CCSF has had somewhat higher course success (Tables 5.1 to 5.3). Table 5.3b shows course success in Credit Career Technical Education courses. Difference by ethnic group is shown in Tables 5.1b and 5.3a.

The number of units taken per year by students has been increasing. From 2008-09 to 2010-11, the average number of units taken has increased by one unit (Table 5.4). That's a nine percent increase. In comparison to 2000-01, the increase has been over 20 percent. The increase has been at all ability levels. Persistence to the following year has also increased slightly, but that increase has tended to be in the collegiate population (Table 5.5).

There is no clear overall trend line for number of associate degrees and certificates awarded (Table 5.6) and number of transfers to CSU and UC (Table 5.7). Some years show an increase; others show a decrease. Graduation and transfer numbers are, of course, related to enrollment, course success, units per term and year, and persistence to following terms and years. In addition, transfer numbers can also be related to the availability of spots at the CSU and UC systems and cost of attendance there. The fall off in transfers in 2009-10 was due to the CSU system not accepting mid-year transfers. They made up for that in Fall 2010 and consequently the number of CSU transfers increased from 648 in 2009-10 to 1,349 in 2010-11.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community Colleges Data Mart (http://www.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/Divisions/TechResearchInfo/MIS/DataMartandReports/tabid/282/Default.aspx)

Note: Success is defined as courses grades of A, B, C, CR and P divided by grades of A, B, C, D, F, W, I*, NP, P, CR, NC and DR.

Table 5.1b
Success in All Credit Courses by Ethnicity 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non White</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouthEast Asian</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Research and Planning.

Note: The averages for all students differ slightly from averages in Tables 5.1a due to different sources. Passing is defined as grades of A, B, C, CR, P divided by all other grades except RD and blank grades.
Table 5.2
Success in Transfer Courses 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community Colleges Data Mart

Note: Success is defined as courses grades of A, B, C, CR and P divided by grades of A, B, C, D, F, W, I*, NP, P, CR, NC and DR.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community Colleges Data Mart

Note: Basic Skills courses are defined by the State of California to receive special funding. To be a basic skills course in credit, the course must be non-degree applicable and in certain subject matter areas including English, ESL, mathematics, and DSPS.
Table 5.3a
Enrollments and Success in Credit Basic Skills Courses by Ethnicity
2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>3,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non White</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouthEast Asian</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>1,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollments</td>
<td>10,026</td>
<td>11,107</td>
<td>11,489</td>
<td>11,188</td>
<td>12,444</td>
<td>11,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non White</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouthEast Asian</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No Response</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Success Rate</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Research and Planning

Note: Averages for all students differ from Table 5.3 due to different sources and definitions. Basic Skills courses in table 5.3a are restricted to ESL, English, and mathematics, specifically the lowest three levels in ESL, the lowest four levels in English, and Arithmetic and Elementary Algebra taught in mathematics.
### Table 5.3b
**Success in Credit Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses 2000-01 to 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Research and Planning
Note: Statewide averages are not available for comparison.

### Table 5.4
**Average Units Taken Per Student 2000-01 to 2010-11**

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

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Pre-Collegiate</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Pre-Collegiate</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Level</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2009-10 is included because persistence data is not yet available for 2010-11.
Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Table 5.6
Degrees and Certificates Earned 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: The increase in degrees and certificates in 2010-11 is in part due to a new method of reporting awards to the state Chancellor's Office that includes awards earned in prior years but granted in the current year.

Table 5.7
Transfers to CSU and UC from CCSF 2000-01 to 2010-11

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

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

Note: The decline in 2009-10 and increase in 2010-11 to CSU transfers is due to the CSU system not accepting spring transfers, but adding them to the following fall. See Table 1, "CCSF Student Transfer Data" in Section II.A.1 for information on transfers to private and out of state institutions.
Table 5.8
Performance of CCSF Students in Their First Year of Transfer to the CSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF to CSU</td>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Admission GPA</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Admission GPA</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All CCC to CSU</td>
<td>Post-Admission GPA</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2009-10 is included because GPA data is not yet available for 2010-11.

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

Table 5.9
Average Semesters to Degree or Certificate 2000-01 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semesters to Award</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average to Degree</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Semesters to Certificate</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Research and Planning
Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review and Planning

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Programs or services showing significant challenges with either operations or productivity levels will be identified and recommended for a special comprehensive program review. To date, no such units have been identified, as College constituent groups have agreed that the Program Review process would not be punitive. However, the longitudinal data is reviewed and programs are offered the option of peer guidance to help them develop improvement plans. Additionally, the PRC is researching criteria currently used by Bay Area community colleges for terminating programs. It will select criteria appropriate for the College and recommend how to incorporate them into the biennial Program Review process.

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

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

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

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

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

During the past three years, City College of San Francisco has been implementing an integrated planning process that includes the Strategic Plan, Program Review and the Annual Plan. Concurrently, the College dedicated focused attention and resources to the development and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course, program, degree, and College level.

A SLO workgroup was convened in Spring 2008 to address topics of importance to advancing the SLO assessment process. This included identifying the preferred model for the College, and the creation of professional development workshops to guide discussion of general education SLOs. The Workgroup consists of nine members; three each from the Department Chairpersons Council, the Academic Senate, and administration. The group meets once a month during the fall and spring semesters.

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

All department chairs were provided the SLO assessment templates for review and discussion with their faculty during Spring 2009 Flex Day. In this pilot year, every one of the 61 departments was asked to complete a minimum of one template for a course or program. During the pilot period, the SLO assessment templates were reviewed by the Workgroup and revised accordingly. Since then, departments have added courses and/or programs into their SLO assessment process, which is completely integrated into the Program Review System, and which in turn is completely integrated into the annual planning and budgeting system.

The SLO Workgroup continued to meet during Fall 2009 to address implementation of the SLO process. The philosophy generated has been labeled “centralized coordination and decentralized implementation.” Three of the Workgroup members participated in Commission training and the DCC sponsored five Spring 2010 Flex workshops related to the SLO process. Additional workshops have been scheduled since then as part of Flex activities.

In Spring 2010, the Program Review Committee 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 stated how they would close the assessment loop by revising instruction or other aspects of the curriculum.
In order to better guide and support the SLO process, the College has asked units to identify a six-year plan for revising course and program curriculum outlines and a plan to develop, assess, and utilize SLOs in all of their courses and/or programs by 2014-15. This expectation has been incorporated into the Curriculum Guide as well as the Program Review process. Preliminary review of plans indicates that the majority of courses and programs will complete one cycle of their assessment process by 2013.

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

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

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

In the last two years, the SLO assessment process has continued to be strengthened at CCSF. The SLO Workgroup has established an SLO website to offer guidance and instruction to faculty. Assessment has become a major component of FLEX day workshops, where departments share their most successful assessment methodologies with their peers. These workshops have involved hundreds of faculty and inspired meaningful dialog about how to use SLOs at an institution of this size. Many departments’ use of SLOs is truly exemplary and these workshops have allowed other departments to review successful techniques.

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

Since CCSF is a very large institution, gathering detailed and reliable information about the extent of existing SLO implementation in all of its courses and programs continues to represent a significant step forward. There is much more information and evidence than before. Nonetheless, documentation is an ongoing challenge, and ways to continue to expand SLO reporting processes within existing resources have been discussed. Some departments have chosen to share their SLO activities through video clips available on their website.
A Library SLO Task Force was convened in Fall 2009 to address development of SLOs for Library and Learning Resources (LLR) services and programs. The outcome of their work is six SLOs that reflect all LLR service and resource units. The SLOs have been shared with all staff and discussed at library faculty meetings and the Dean’s Library Advisory Committee meeting. The six program SLOs will be available from the Library’s homepage and will link assessment findings with plans for improvement. This information is now available internally to LLR staff through the Library wiki. Workshop and information competency SLOs are included in the Library website.

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

CCSF’s Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, a joint committee of the Academic Senate and the Administration, formed a workgroup to identify learning outcomes for each of its eight General Education areas. These outcomes were presented to and approved by the Bipartite Committee in late February 2009 for publication in the 2009-10 College Catalog. One of the challenges the College has in establishing the SLO process for General Education coursework is the scope of work involved, as there are more than six hundred courses spread across the eight General Education areas.

Student Development departments continue to make substantial progress in the area of SLOs. In the summer of 2008 the departments began a series of workshops to better prepare the units in the development and assessment of SLOs. This process has grown from one or two student development units with SLO pilot projects to each of the 10 major units, and many of their sub-units, working on clearly identified SLOs.

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

Student Development departments have continued to include active SLO projects in their unit objectives and priorities. Updates and progress on SLOs are reported annually through the Program Review process. Data collection and analysis is becoming more sophisticated as units progress in their projects. Cycles of continuous improvement are being integrated across additional departments. Reports containing data, analysis and recommendations for programmatic change in several departments are available to other units and serve as models of effective practice in the continuous improvement cycle.
For the past year CCSF has been addressing achievement gaps and their relationship to student equity. This process has been carried out in the best spirit of continuous quality improvement. Reports of current practices throughout the institution, from English and mathematics course sequencing to financial aid, student employment, registration, student employment, counseling, international student programs, and placement testing were evaluated by the College community. Students offered testimony about their experiences and the discussions that ensued involved everyone from administrators, classified staff and faculty to trustees and elected student officials. The level of awareness of the SLOs model has increased significantly at the leadership level through these various discussions. The results were institution wide, including an array of institutional modifications.

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

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

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

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

City College of San Francisco is a unique institution with one large campus, the Ocean Campus, eight smaller campuses, and many additional sites. Three of these additional sites are discussed below. The smaller campuses originated as noncredit centers, but they have evolved to offer vocational training courses, specialized certificates, credit courses for general education and transfer, and associate degrees. CCSF departments may offer credit and/or noncredit courses in as many campuses as appropriate, and their faculty may be assigned to classes at any of the locations. All faculty, regardless of work location, belong to the same Academic Senate, have the opportunity to participate on the same Shared Governance committees, follow the same curriculum, and get evaluated under the same rigorous process. All programs at all locations undergo the Program Review process with their home department to assess program effectiveness in meeting student and programmatic needs.

City College of San Francisco offers courses at all campuses and numerous other locations throughout the City of San Francisco, making CCSF easily accessible to students with diverse needs and goals. A concerted effort has been made 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/North Beach Campus. Likewise, there has been a concerted effort to enhance student support services at all campuses other than Ocean, in response to student demand. Expanding the campuses other than Ocean to become more full-service campuses is the product of the College’s Vision and Mission statements and the College’s Strategic Plan.

Castro Campus

The Castro Campus, housed at Everett Middle School, provides facilities for evening classes Monday through Thursday in the Castro District of San Francisco. The Campus originated as an educational center for San Francisco’s lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Studies (LGBT) curriculum. Outreach to those communities continues to be an essential part of the Campus’ mission. The department chairs and the campus dean strive to provide courses that respond to the demographic characteristics of the communities near the Campus as well as the characteristics of the students who come to the Campus from other parts of San Francisco. The Campus was established by faculty and staff who wanted to create a learning environment that respects, celebrates, and profits from diversity; their vision continues to guide and inspire the Castro Campus.
Programs and Services
The Castro Campus provides access to courses and programs that fulfill general education, associate degree, transfer, and Award of Achievement requirements. This includes extensive foreign language instruction to prepare students to function in diverse local and global communities.

Fifteen departments offered 83 classes at the Castro Campus during Fall, 2010. Over 60 percent of these classes (53) were Foreign Language classes in Chinese, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. The English Department offered seven classes. Other departments offering LGBT-interest classes included Art, LGBT Studies, Music, Theatre Arts, and Women’s Studies.

The services provided to students have been reduced due to budget restrictions. Though advising and online registration are available on-site, counseling services are no longer available. Students requiring counseling can make evening appointments at the Ocean Campus, which is about four miles south. A complete bookstore is available to students at the site during the first two weeks of classes. The Campus has no library or learning laboratories. Students are informed of the availability of these services and facilities at other CCSF campuses.

Chinatown/North Beach Campus
The Chinatown/North Beach Campus provides facilities for credit, noncredit, and not-for-credit instruction to meet the needs of neighborhood citizens, including the academically bound, vocationally inclined, and senior student.

Program and Services
The Campus provides classes in the northeast quadrant of San Francisco at various locations in the Chinatown, Marina, and North Beach neighborhoods. It schedules classes in ESL, ESL citizenship, vocational ESL, foreign language, business (credit and noncredit), continuing education, child development, health science, real estate, home health aide training, housekeeping training, health care technology, sign language, college orientation, and small business administration.

The Campus has a wide range of student services including bilingual/bicultural support services, academic, career and technical, individual, and financial aid counseling, referral services, admission and registration services, tutoring, limited bookstore and DSPS services, ESL assessment and placement, education and career workshops, noncredit to credit transfer services, and an Associated Students Council.

Civic Center Campus and Fort Mason Site
The Civic Center Campus provides facilities for credit and noncredit instruction. The Campus supports students with access to the language and culture of the United States, enables students to acquire the necessary language skills to survive and thrive in society, and
prepares students for enrollment in career and technical training and undergraduate degree programs.

Programs and Services

The Civic Center Campus provides facilities for classes in the northeast quadrant of San Francisco and at various locations in the Civic Center, Fort Mason, outer Sunset, and inner Richmond neighborhoods. It schedules classes in noncredit instruction in ESL, vocational ESL (VESL), VESL Immersion Program, business office support skills, computer applications, and credit instruction in art and child development.

Classes scheduled at the Fort Mason Art Center site include beginning, intermediate and advanced level studio art classes in credit, Continuing Education art classes, and noncredit art instruction in the Older Adults program.

Student services include admissions and registration services, testing and assessment, counseling and orientation, financial aid, Steps to Credit workshops, a bookstore, and an Associated Students Council and clubs.

Downtown Campus

The Downtown Campus provides facilities for credit and noncredit instruction in the heart of downtown San Francisco near the city conference center. Because of its proximity to the business community and to main public transportation lines, the Campus is dedicated to meeting the educational needs of a diverse group of students from all parts of the Bay Area.

Program and Services

The Downtown Campus schedules credit courses in art, business, culinary arts and hospitality services, economics, English, ESL, fashion, foreign languages, history, interdisciplinary studies, philosophy, and sociology. Noncredit courses are scheduled in baking and pastry, business, ESL including citizenship and vocational ESL, fashion, food technology and dining services, green and sustainable small business, international business, and courses designed for older adults. Not-for-credit/specialized classes are also available through contract education.

Comprehensive student services include admissions and registration, career and general counseling, tutoring, financial aid, DSPS, testing and assessment, tutoring, student photo ID, a full service library, and a bookstore. The Associated Students Council at this Campus plays a prominent role in working with faculty and administration to provide support and services to students. It also provides a forum for exchange and dialog between students and the administration.

The Educated Palate, a dining room operated by the Culinary Arts faculty and students, is open to the public for lunch Monday through Friday and for dinner on Thursday.
Evans Campus

The original goal of the Evans Campus was to consolidate City College of San Francisco’s Skilled Trades and Automotive Programs at one site. The Campus has established as its mission the continuous improvement of workforce education and seeks to achieve this mission through a commitment to improve existing training programs, to develop new programs and community partnerships, and to provide the flexible delivery of these programs.

Program and Services

The Evans Campus provides facilities for classes in the southeast quadrant of San Francisco. It schedules credit courses in automotive and motorcycle technology, construction, welding, and fashion. Noncredit courses are available in automotive, business, construction, custodial training, and fashion. The City Build Academy, a partnership with the City of San Francisco and the local unions, provides workforce training and job placement services to San Francisco residents interested in pursuing a career in the construction industry.

The Campus also houses statewide initiatives supporting workforce development. These include the Office of Workforce and Economic Development, the Design Studio, the Advanced Transportation Technology Office, the Geographic Information Systems Education Center, and the California Resource Center for Occupational Program Design and Evaluation.

Student services available at the Campus include admissions and registration, financial aid counseling, general counseling, and an Associated Students Council.

John Adams Campus

The John Adams Campus provides facilities for credit and noncredit programs and classes enabling students to acquire the necessary competencies to attain entry level career and technical positions, update workplace skills, enter CCSF credit classes, obtain basic education skills, complete high school equivalency, acquire English language skills (for non-English speaking students), and/or gain employment in the workforce.

Program and Services

The John Adams Campus schedules classes in the northwest quadrant of San Francisco and at various locations throughout San Francisco. Classes offered include business, child development, consumer education, ESL and vocational ESL, health care technology, a GED and adult High School Diploma Program, consumer education, vocational nursing, fashion, library information skills, and courses designed for older adults.

Health related programs dominate the offerings at the John Adams Campus. The Health Care Technology Department alone offers 15 areas of concentration that lead to a certificate and/or an associate degree. Credit courses that are prerequisites for many health care programs, such as English and anatomy, are also available.
Student services available at the Campus include admission and registration, career development, counseling, child care, DSPS, financial aid, GED and assessment testing, a library, a bookstore, and an Associated Students Council.

**Mission Campus**

The Mission Campus provides facilities for credit and noncredit courses and endeavors to assist students in developing the necessary skills and education to allow them to actively engage in the civic and social functions of their communities. The courses and programs help students prepare for transfer to a four-year institution to complete their baccalaureate degree.

The Mission Campus also endeavors to serve a large immigrant population by offering courses and programs that promote full participation of students. The Campus offers the opportunity for acquisition of career and technical certificates and career skills for success in the workplace, as well as citizenship preparation courses, ESL courses, and a GED and adult High School Diploma Program.

**Program and Services**

The Mission Campus schedules classes in the centrally located Mission District, and at various community locations in the neighborhood. The Mission Campus now offers a comprehensive general education curriculum that meets requirements for the associate degree and for transfer. The Campus also offers courses in business, biotechnology, child development, journalism, administration of justice, graphics/multimedia, digital printing, and transitional studies, which are necessary for the completion of certificate programs and associate degrees. Courses designed for older adults are also available at the Campus as well as at a variety of locations throughout the community.

Student services available at the Mission Campus include admissions and registration, a bookstore with limited hours, career counseling, child care, counseling, DSPS, financial aid, testing, tutoring, a library, and an Associated Students Council. Also available is Single Stop, a center that offers comprehensive screening and application assistance to connect students to critical benefits, such as health insurance, food assistance (through Electronic Benefit Transfer cards), PG&E discounts, and low-cost auto insurance.

**Southeast Campus**

The Southeast Campus is an outgrowth of the San Francisco Community College District’s former Skills Center, which primarily offered career and technical education training. It is housed in the Southeast Facility, which is owned by the City and County of San Francisco. According to the city legislation establishing the building, the Southeast Facility is by law supposed to house an educational program, a child care program, a community meeting room, and a program for senior citizens. City College of San Francisco is the anchor tenant in the facility, leasing approximately 85 percent of the building.
Program and Services

The Southeast Campus serves the southeast sector communities of Bayview Hunter's Point, Potrero Hill, and Visitacion Valley. The present academic programs balance college preparation classes, certificate career and technical education programs, and university transfer courses. College level courses include mathematics, English, Spanish, history, biology/biotechnology, child development, administration of justice, fire science, health technology, African American studies, psychology, physics, physical education, hotel front office operations, and certified nursing assistance.

The Unit Coordinator Program is unique to the site. Adult basic education, GED preparation, business, fashion sewing, older adult classes, and ESL are the primary noncredit programs serving the educational needs of the local community.

Student support services available include admissions and registration, counseling, testing, financial aid, a library, and an Associated Students Council. Other tenants in the Facility include Human Services Agency (HSA), Hunter’s Point Family (HPF), and Renaissance Parents of Success, some of which may provide services to our students.

Gough Street Site

The mission of the Adult Learning and Tutorial Center (ALTC), a part of the noncredit Transitional Studies Department, is to provide an environment where adults who are learning basic skills can thrive and build strong academic and vocational foundations. Group and individualized classes with tutor support are offered in beginning literacy, math, and writing as well as in preparation for the GED exams.

Program and Services

The ALTC is an open entry program offering clusters of morning, afternoon, and evening classes to meet adults’ scheduling needs. The intake/orientation process includes preliminary assessment of reading levels and administration of official GED practice tests as appropriate. More in depth diagnostic tests are offered by a faculty reading specialist. A disabilities counselor assists with adaptations and GED accommodations.

The Gough Street site’s central location near Market Street transportation lines gives easy access to students throughout San Francisco and the Bay Area and especially serves the surrounding neighborhoods of the Tenderloin, South of Market, and Mission (English speaking residents). Student outreach is to the numerous social service and community agencies in the area and in the larger city.

While the majority of students have English as their first language, English speaking adults from many countries also study at the ALTC. Volunteer tutors come from Project Read, the Volunteer Center, San Francisco State University, Project 20, Pretrial Diversion, City College of San Francisco credit classes, and from among the ALTC’s alumni and retirees. The Center has a student mentor through the Office of Mentoring and Service Learning, student workers, an active Associated Students Council, a computer lab, an annual book of student writings, and an annual GED graduation/all-level student awards ceremony.
Airport Site

The Airport instructional site is located at the San Francisco International Airport. The site provides facilities for courses for the Aircraft Maintenance Technology Department and the Fire Science Program in the Administration of Justice and Fire Science Department. These facilities are compliant with Federal Aviation Administration Regulation 147, which prescribes the requirements for an Aviation Maintenance Technician School.

Program and Services

Successful completion of the degree or certificate curricula in the Aircraft Maintenance Technology Program can lead to employment in areas such as aircraft powerplant maintenance, airframe maintenance, avionics maintenance, manufacturer’s technical representative, maintenance personnel for public transit, and composite fabrication technician.

The Fire Science Program training provides certificates for three groups of students: those seeking employment as members of city and county fire departments and other governmental agencies that involve fire prevention, fire investigation, fire suppression, and fire protection engineering; those employed in the fire service who want further technical training to prepare for promotion; and those who are seeking private employment as safety instructors in industry, insurance adjusters, fire protection technicians, fire equipment salespersons, and fire-equipment installers. The Firefighter One Academy, the main focus of the Fire Science Technology Program at the Airport Site, is a semester-long program that, if satisfactorily completed, provides students with a California State Fire Marshal Office of State Fire Training Firefighter One Certification. This allows students to be able to test with fire departments for entry-level firefighter positions.

Student services available at the Airport site include limited general counseling and a library of aviation technical manuals.

Summary

The College campuses strive to respond to community educational, cultural, and civic needs through their curricular offerings. Table 1 summarizes the number of certificates and degrees having more than 50 percent of the unit requirements offered at a campus outside the main campus, and the campus(es) where they are offered. These certificates and degrees represent 11 departments from across the College: Administration of Justice and Fire Science; Automotive/Motorcycle, Construction, and Building Maintenance; Business; Child Development and Family Studies; Culinary Arts and Hospitality Studies; English as a Second Language; Graphic Communications; Health Care Technology; Journalism; Licensed Vocational Nursing; and Transitional Studies.
### Table 1: Number of Certificate and Degree Programs
(At least 50% offered at a Campus outside the Main Campus)

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

A total of 60 credit and 46 noncredit certificates, and 9 associate degree programs have more than 50 percent of their unit requirements offered at one or more of the campuses outside the main campus. Of these, 10 of the credit and 31 of the noncredit certificates, plus one of the associate degrees have attained this status since 2006. This expansion is in response to student and community demand and to the availability of expanded and remodeled facilities. This is also a reflection of the availability and scheduling flexibility of faculty.

Since the last accreditation report, student support services have increased at campuses outside the main campus. While the College recognized a need to offer services at different locations, the expansion of services was limited by a lack of space. Now that facilities have been remodeled and new ones built, a greater array of services can be offered. The College determined which services were to be offered and at which locations based on feedback from student equity hearings, listening sessions, and basic skills meetings. Table 2 outlines the services offered at the various campuses.

### Table 2: Services Offered at Campuses outside the Main Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Services offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castro</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown/ North Beach</td>
<td>Counseling, DSPS, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing, Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>Counseling, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Career Services, Counseling, DSPS, 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, DSPS, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Career Services, Counseling, DSPS, Financial Aid, Registration, Single Stop, Testing, Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Counseling, Financial Aid, Registration, Testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Reasonable accommodations and counseling for qualified disabled students are made available at all campuses and sites when needed.*
Additionally, students at the campuses have an opportunity to engage in student leadership, with seven campuses and the 31 Gough Street site having active Associated Students Councils. Those campuses are: Chinatown/North Beach, Civic Center, Downtown, Evans, John Adams, Mission, and Southeast.

The College works to maintain quality instruction and services at all its campuses. It has conducted student equity forums at various campuses as a means to solicit student feedback and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs and services.

**Distance Learning**

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

A student can complete 100 percent of the requirements for an AA/AS degree (but not necessarily all their prerequisites) by taking distance learning courses. Students can complete approximately 90 percent of the courses required to transfer to California State University or the University of California through distance learning. City College of San Francisco now enables students to earn 12 degrees, 25 certificates, and the general education program with more than 50% of credits being earned via distance education. ACCJC approved the College’s Substantive Change in 2008.

The Curriculum Committee conducts a rigorous peer-review process of every course and program proposed. Faculty members develop online courses following various steps compliant with the standards set by the Curriculum Committee and the Distance Learning Advisory Committee. 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 Office of Technology Mediated Instruction, housed within the Educational Technology Department (ETD), works closely with faculty in the migration process of a traditional lecture mode course to online delivery. Faculty participate in extensive training and the newly developed online course is evaluated at various phases of development to ensure that the delivery is meeting the objectives and content of the state-approved course outline, the College’s standards for distance education, and federal ADA regulations. The ETD provides ongoing support to distance learning faculty via online modules, face-to-face workshops, and one-to-one meetings.
Faculty members teaching credit courses are given an option to enhance the delivery of their face-to-face courses by delivering the objectives and content of the course using CCSF’s learning management system. These faculty are required to complete seven hours of training by the ETD. Additionally, the ETD offers special topic workshops to support faculty in understanding the technology behind the management system and guides faculty in ways they can improve the deliverability of online classes, thus increasing student success and decreasing attrition. CCSF supported almost 100 tech-enhanced course sections in Fall 2009; this number increased to over 350 tech-enhanced face-to-face sections by the end of 2010-11.

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

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

Online courses attract many students to City College and have won eleven statewide and two national awards for quality of course design. 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 Internet Protocol 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.

Broadcast Media Services (BMS) will be ready to accommodate televised interactive instruction from room MUB 388 by Summer 2012. The new teleclass production room will be ready for faculty training and practice in Spring 2012. The control room is working, the cameras are installed, the interactive projector is installed, and work continues as BMS technical staff time allows.

The College continues to anticipate the needs of its rapidly growing distance education program. Through the integrated Program Review process, the ETD will continually assess its distance education program to ensure continuous quality improvement and that student needs are being met.
External Audit and Use of Federal Grant Monies

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instructional Programs

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

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

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

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

The faculty peer and student evaluation process includes an appraisal of the quality, academic rigor, and appropriateness of that professor’s instruction. A component of the evaluation of an individual faculty member is whether the courses are being taught in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline and department. This mechanism allows departments to ensure that departmental and discipline expectations for courses are common across the department and discipline. Since the faculty evaluation process is based on peer review, the process allows faculty within a discipline to have an ongoing dialog about the expectations of their courses and student learning.
City College of San Francisco conducts research to inform its practices leading to student success. Research in its broadest sense utilizes data from program reviews, assessment of success in meeting prior strategic plan objectives, and input from the College community. Information is also obtained through listening sessions, planning retreats, student equity forums, and individual feedback. The data for student outcomes regarding success rates, persistence and retention rates are available through the Program Review process.

In the last two years, the SLO assessment process has been strengthened at CCSF. The SLO Workgroup has established an SLO website to offer guidance and instruction to faculty. Assessment has become a major component of faculty development days (FLEX days). At FLEX workshops departments share their most successful assessment methodologies with their peers. These workshops have involved many faculty and inspired meaningful dialog about how to use SLOs at an institution of our size. General education student learning outcomes have been identified by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. These outcomes were based on institutional criteria and Title 5 requirements for general education.

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

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

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

Student Support Services

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

Student Support Services is a critical aspect of the College. Consistent with its mission, the College offers programs and services that meet the needs of its diverse students and enhance student access, retention, and success. These programs and services include: New Student Counseling; Continuing Student Counseling; International Student Counseling; Transfer Counseling; Career Development Counseling; Extended Opportunity Programs and Services; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Counseling; and Multicultural Retention Services (African American Scholastic Programs, Latino Services Network, TULAY: Filipino American Success Program, and the Asian Pacific American Student Success Program).

Additional student support services include the Admissions and Records Office, Financial Aid Office (including Scholarship, CalWORKs, and Single Stop USA), Matriculation Office, Veterans Educational Transition Services, Outreach and Recruitment, Homeless At-Risk Transitional Students Program, Student Health Services, the Learning Assistance Center, Disabled Students Programs and Services and the Office of Student Affairs, which includes the Student Advocacy Rights and Responsibilities unit and the Student Activities unit. More than 60 student clubs help students expand their cultural perspectives. Students are further supported through information provided in the Catalog, Class Schedule, Student Handbook, and on the College website.

Overall, CCSF works to ensure quality in all its services, programs, and units. Shared Governance committees, such as Student Preparation Success Committee, make critical recommendations for program improvements. Student Services units have made considerable progress in the area of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs): 100 percent of the units have developed SLOs and 80 percent have assessed them. Program Review, a comprehensive review by departments of all courses and programs, has resulted in better promotion of student access, progress, learning, and teaching excellence.
Abstract: Standard II.C

Library and Learning Support Services

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

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

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

Resources: Human Resources

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

The College publishes the annual Employee and Hiring Data Report and uses this information to assess how effective recruiting and hiring practices are related to increasing the diversity of its staff.

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

The College has integrated human resource planning with institutional planning from the Strategic Plan to the Annual Plans and the Program Review process. The number of full-time faculty has consistently exceeded state requirements for many years. The College has strategically used attrition with respect to its administrators and classified staff to generate the budget savings necessitated by reductions in state funding. The College is effectively using the planning and budgeting process to ensure that core staffing needs are addressed in most cases.

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

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

Resources: Physical Resources

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

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

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

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

Since the last Self Study, the College has significantly improved communications related to facilities across departments and offices. The Facilities Review Committee makes recommendations on both long-range and short-range facilities plans for all College campuses based upon the College’s priorities. The Committee meets on a regular basis to solicit ideas from faculty, staff, administrators, and students for major and minor facilities projects and equipment upgrades. In addition, each major facility has a Building Users Group (BUG) that develops needs proposals for departments and building users. Before any facility has major changes implemented, the BUG group is often consulted. This process has promoted more meaningful interactions between the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Facilities and Planning to assure the quality of programs and services as well as the health and safety of students.
In support of institutional goals and cost effectiveness of physical facilities, the College has also dedicated considerable energy to improving its operation of physical resources by approving the Sustainability Plan, which the Board of Trustees adopted in December 2009. Whereas the past efforts of the College to provide for the total cost of ownership have been limited, more recently the College established a user’s group for design review and total cost of ownership in the planning for its next project, the new Performing Arts Complex.
Abstract: Standard III.C

Resources: Technology Resources

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

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

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

Many units have also developed efficient online systems and enhancements to assist faculty and students with teaching and learning activities, improving communications, student access, information gathering and delivery, and other operational systems. Information Technology Services staff are responsible for the infrastructure and equipment for 78 computer labs housing around 2,000 computers available for student use. There are also about 3,000 computers in use by faculty and classified staff.

In addition, the institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel. Faculty and staff training and technical assistance needs are provided by several units: the Technology Learning Center (TLC) the Technology Mediated Instruction Office (TMI), and individually by the Service Desk and online documentation and tutorials. Library faculty also train students in online research/information competency skills as well as provide individual training to faculty and students about using online resources and technology applications. Staff in many departments of the Student Services Division also provide group and individual training for students, such as in Career Development and the Learning Assistance Center.
The institution systematically and effectively plans for the technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs. Planning for ongoing maintenance, upgrades and replacements is also systematic. Acquisition of needed technology resources is heavily dependent on funding and although grant and bond funding may be a good source for starting new projects, funding for ongoing operational support and maintenance requires a continuous source that grant and bond funding do not supply.

After an evaluation period of the staffing levels for the technology functions at the College, all classified employees with civil service classifications in the IT and IS categories began to be reassigned to the ITS Department starting in the 2010-11 academic year. The position of Chief Technology Officer was established and the person hired began work in Summer 2010. This reorganization of personnel strives to increase efficiency and productivity by consolidating the technology workforce.
Abstract: Standard III.D

Resources: Financial Resources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Board and Administrative Organization

The College's Board of Trustees 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 Board devotes considerable attention and discussion to reviewing and amending the College Mission and Vision statements, Strategic and Annual Plans, Program Review, Education Master Plan, and other institutional planning documents which address program quality and student learning outcomes as well as services provided to ensure student success. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and the fiduciary responsibility for the District. The Board reviews, evaluates, and periodically commissions studies, reports, and other documents related to the quality of student learning programs and services and how District resources are allocated to support learning programs.

The Board receives information and updates regarding the accreditation process, status, and documentation. The Board reviewed previous WASC Accreditation Reports and Mid-Term Reports and has been informed of and involved in the current accreditation self study.

The Board has enacted many new policies designed to strengthen controls on finances and contracts. Since the last accreditation visit, the Board has also examined its existing practice and policies and has revised policies to specify that the Board’s responsibilities include selecting, hiring, and evaluating the Chancellor. The Board's code of ethics includes a clear definition of how the Board will deal with behavior that violates its code and the Board has adopted a policy on Conflict of Interest. Furthermore, the Board is committed to conducting a self evaluation on an annual basis.

The Board hires a Chief Executive Officer with the title of Chancellor and delegates to him/her the day-to-day operations of the District as well as the drafting of the multi-year College plans. The Chancellor also recommends all personnel for employment for Board approval; provides leadership for academic excellence; administers the instruction, student services, and business affairs of the District; reviews board policies and recommends changes; establishes and maintains working relationships with other government agencies; promotes a positive District image in the community; serves as the Board’s designated representative with respect to all employer-employee matters; annually evaluates administrative employees; and manages and controls District property.

The Chancellor’s Objectives, developed annually with the Board, further delineate the annual goals for the Chancellor and encompass his relationship with the Board; planning, resources and staffing, technology, information and communication, campus facilities, and communication with various communities.
With the Chancellor’s leadership, the College is in the process of finalizing the 2011-16 Strategic Plan as well as updating the Education Master Plan, both of which provide a more coherent and transparent planning framework guided by the Board-approved Mission and Vision statements.

During the past few years, the administrative structure of the College has been heavily impacted by the fiscal crisis beginning in FY 2007-08 and the large number of administrators who retired in FY 2009-10. Working very closely with the Human Resources Department, the Chancellor realigned the administration to create a more efficient and effective administrative structure.

The Chancellor interacts with the various constituencies; classified staff, faculty, students, administrators, Board members, community and government agencies, and citizens. He relies on administrative chains to ensure that all annual operational and developmental objectives are met.

The Chancellor is responsible for recommending appointments, assigning functions, delegating responsibilities to administrators, and approving various College plans and initiatives.

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 and most temporary part-time employees. The Chancellor oversees a comprehensive and integrated budgeting, planning, and assessment system. He meets regularly with the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council to review, evaluate, and develop recommendations related to budget and planning.

The Chancellor works with the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration and the Chief Financial Officer to review all major budget accounts at the District level, including categorical programs, on a regular basis. Revenue estimates are also reviewed on a continuing basis and adjusted if data support such a change. Any such changes are brought to the immediate attention of the Board of Trustees at their regularly scheduled meetings.
Organization for the Self Study and Acknowledgements

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

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

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

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

**January to March, 2011.** The Steering Committee read the standard drafts, reviewed the text together, and made suggestions to the co-chairs for the standards. The improved, “raw” drafts were posted on the Web. The Steering Committee reviewed and approved a survey instrument that was sent to employees to provide information for the report.

**March to May, 2011.** College constituent groups and individuals were invited to review and comment on the “raw” draft of the Self-Study report. The co-chairs for the standards wrote preliminary second drafts based on feedback from constituents and on their own further research. The Steering Committee reviewed the preliminary second drafts. Second drafts were posted online as they were finished. A workgroup was created (“Webcred”) which functioned independently from the Steering Committee to review CCSF webpages and make improvements. Over the next six months, it provided advice and support to offices and departments and implemented redesigns of numerous webpages.
May to August, 2011. The second drafts of the responses to the standards were turned into final drafts by small teams of faculty and administrators who revised the text, identified and supplied missing or inconsistent information, and provided specific evidential references for the standards. The introduction was written and the front matter was compiled. A former administrator was brought in to serve as Accreditation Liaison Officer and editor-in-chief. With an editing team, he provided final revisions, stylistic rewrite, and copy-editing to the Self-Study report.

September to October, 2011. The semifinal draft of the Self-Study report was posted online and distributed in paper copy to representatives of constituent groups and the Board of Trustees for discussion and approval. Feedback was solicited and revisions made to the report. Layout work commenced.

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

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

Academic Senate President
Accreditation Liaison Officer
AFT 2121 President
Articulation Officer
Associated Students Presidents
Board of Trustees President
Chancellor
Classified Senate President
Department Chairpersons Council President
Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
SEIU 1021 President
Shared Governance Coordinator
Student Trustee
Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration
Vice Chancellor of Research and Policy
Vice Chancellor of Student Development

The Steering Committee included additional faculty, administrators, students, and classified staff.
Composition of the Standards Work Groups

The co-chairs for the standards were selected to include faculty, administrators, and classified staff. For some of the standards, the co-chairs were assisted in the initial collection of materials and texts by coordinators for the letter sections, e.g. II B, IV A. The volunteers for the initial phase included trustees, faculty, administrators, students, and classified staff.

Templates used by the volunteers in September-November, 2010

Each template showed a small section of the text of a standard along with the questions from the *Guide to Evaluating Institutions*. Steps for researching and analyzing the evidence were provided, along with a scoring rubric, and a sample completed template.
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INTRODUCTION
Eligibility Requirements

Authority

City College of San Francisco is a public two-year community college operating under the authority of the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District.

City College of San Francisco is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community & Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. This organization is recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education [E-1, p. ii].

The College also offers programs accredited by the American Culinary Federation Accrediting Commission, the California Board of Registered Nursing, the Commission on Accreditation of the American Dental Association, the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Programs, the Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management, the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation, and the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology [E-1, p. 2].

Mission

The Board of Trustees publicly affirms the College’s educational Mission Statement, and reviews and updates it regularly [E-2, E-3]. The Mission Statement appears in the CCSF Strategic Plan and is published in the official College Catalog. It is also published on the College website.

Governing Board

The seven-member board of trustees of the San Francisco Community College District is an independent policymaking board, which ensures that the District’s educational mission is being implemented. The Board also ensures the quality, integrity, and financial stability of City College of San Francisco. Members are elected for four-year terms, and these terms are staggered. Current Board members have no financial interest (employment, family, or personal) in the College or the District [E-4, E-5, E-6].

Chief Executive Officer

City College of San Francisco has a chief executive officer who is appointed by the Board of Trustees and whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who possesses the authority to administer board policies [E-7, E-8].
Administrative Capacity
City College of San Francisco has sufficient administrative staff to support the services necessary to carry out the institution’s mission and purpose (see the Organizational Chart immediately preceding these Eligibility Requirements). Their preparation and experience are scrutinized through an open and competitive employment process [E-1 Faculty & Administrators, p. 422-446].

Operational Status
City College of San Francisco is operational, with students actively pursuing programs in noncredit, credit, and not-for-credit programs [E-9] (see Introduction, City and College Data, Table 3.2. Annual Enrollment 2001-11 and Table 5.6 Degrees and Certificates Earned 2000-01 to 2010-11).

Degrees
Seventy-five percent of all programs and educational offerings lead to associate degrees or certificates of achievement, or prepare students for transfer to a four-year university or college [E-1 Associate Degree Graduation Requirements p. 46-53, Programs & Courses p. 67-388].

Educational Programs
The College Catalog contains a comprehensive statement of educational purpose and objectives for each of the academic programs offered. Degree programs are in line with the College’s mission, are based on recognized fields of study, are of sufficient content and length, are conducted at appropriate levels of quality and rigor, and culminate in identified student outcomes [E-1 Programs & Courses p. 67-388, E-10].

Academic Credit
The College awards credit in accordance with Title 5 Section 55002.5 and 34 CFR 600.2, where one credit hour requires a minimum of 48 hours of lecture, study, or laboratory work. Courses may only be adopted upon approval of the Board of Trustees, which acts on the recommendation of the College Curriculum Committee [E-11]. The Curriculum Committee uses these standards in its review of the relationship of contact hours and units in proposed Course Outlines of Record [E-12, Chapter 3]. The credit associated with each course offered by the College is clearly indicated in the College Catalog.

Student Learning Achievement
The College Catalog contains a comprehensive statement of educational purpose and objectives for each of the academic programs offered [E-1 Programs & Courses p. 67-388]. Additionally, the College is fully engaged in the assessment of course- and program-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to improve student achievement and learning [E-13]. Every course outline currently includes learning outcomes that are achieved and assessed by a
variety of methods. Coordinated by department faculty and administrators, every course, regardless of its location or delivery system, must follow the course outline [E-14].

**General Education**

All degree programs require a minimum of 18 to 24 units of general education to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry [E-1, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements p. 48-53]. Mathematics and writing requirements are also stipulated in the above requirements. The College Curriculum Committee scrutinizes the institution’s courses for rigor and quality and the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements reviews the institution’s general education pattern for breadth and depth and decides which courses are included in the general education areas (cf. II.A.1) [E-1, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements p. 44-53, E-12 Chapter 7 p. 97-99]

**Academic Freedom**

The College’s employees and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of work or major study as ensured by Board Policy 6.06 on academic freedom [E-15].

**Faculty**

The College employs almost 800 full-time and slightly more than 1,000 part-time faculty, all of whom are qualified under state-mandated minimum qualifications to conduct the institution’s programs [E-1, Faculty & Administrators p. 421-456]. Faculty duties and responsibilities are clearly outlined in the SFCCD /AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Faculty Handbook [E-16, E-17].

**Student Services**

Student services are comprehensive and accessible to all students. The array of services is provided based on the College’s mission and on the assessment of student needs [E-1, Learning Resources & Student Services p. 33-45, E-13 see Student Services units’ program reviews, E-18].

**Admissions**

City College of San Francisco maintains an “open door” admissions policy [E-1 Admission to the College p. 14]. This policy is consistent with the College Mission Statement, the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, and the statewide mission for California Community Colleges [E-19, E-20].

**Information and Learning Resources**

The College houses a variety of media collections and is staffed to assist students in their use. Internet access and online computer search capabilities are available without charge to students in the library, in computer labs, and in open media centers. The College is committed to enhancing its learning resources, regardless of location or delivery method [E-21].
Financial Resources
The College maintains and documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability [E-22, E-23, E-24].

Financial Accountability
Annual financial audits are conducted by externally contracted certified public accountants. The Board of Trustees Audit Committee and the Board as a whole review these and capital improvement audit reports several times throughout the year. The financial audit and management responses to any exceptions are reviewed and discussed in public sessions [E-23, E-25, E-26, E-27 see Reports].

Institutional Planning & Evaluation
The College has continued to foster a culture of evidence that serves as the foundation for the critical and continuous cycle of assessing and improving College programs, services and policies. Institutional planning and program evaluation is systematic for all departments and divisions of the College, including instruction, student services, and administrative services. The focus in all three areas is to enhance student learning and success [E-28, E-29, E-30, E-31].

Public Information
City College of San Francisco publishes in its Catalog and Schedule, and posts on its website, precise and up-to-date information on the following [E-1, E-9]:

- General Information: including educational mission; course, program, and degree offerings; academic calendar and program length; academic freedom statement; available student financial aid; available learning resources; names and degrees of administrators and faculty; and names of Board of Trustees members; contact information for all employees is included in a web directory
- Requirements: including admissions, student fees and other financial obligations; and degree, certificate, graduation, and transfer requirements
- Major policies affecting students

Relations with the Accrediting Commission
The College and the Board of Trustees hereby affirm by signatures of the official representatives above, that City College of San Francisco has consistently adhered to the eligibility requirements, standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community & Junior Colleges. The College describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the commission to carry out accrediting responsibilities. All disclosures by the College are complete, accurate, and honest [E-1 Overview of the College p. 2, E-32].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-5</td>
<td>Policy Manual 1.7 Powers and Duties of the Board</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/pml07.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/pml07.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-6</td>
<td>Policy Manual Board Policy 3052 Conflict of Interest</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/bp3052.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/bp3052.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7</td>
<td>Fact Sheet: Chancellor Dr. Don Q. Griffin</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/content/dam/ccsf/documents/OFFICEOFCHANCELLOR/PDFS/ccsf-chancellor-factsheet-0909.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/content/dam/ccsf/documents/OFFICEOFCHANCELLOR/PDFS/ccsf-chancellor-factsheet-0909.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-8</td>
<td>Employment Agreement San Francisco Community College District and Dr. Donald Q. Griffin</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Plan">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Plan</a> ning/WASC/ChancellorEmployAgree.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-9</td>
<td>Class Schedule</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Schedule/">http://www.ccsf.edu/Schedule/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-10</td>
<td>List of Fall 2011 Online Course Offerings</td>
<td><a href="http://insight.ccsf.edu/course/category.php?id=105">http://insight.ccsf.edu/course/category.php?id=105</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-11</td>
<td>Policy Manual 6.3 Course Development</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm603.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm603.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-15</td>
<td>Policy Manual 6.6 Academic Freedom</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm606.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm606.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-19</td>
<td>Application for Admission, Credit Division</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/admissions/forms/credit-app.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/admissions/forms/credit-app.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-20</td>
<td>Application for Admission, Noncredit</td>
<td><a href="https://www.ccsf.edu/Forms/cgi-bin/applicationNC-English.cgi">https://www.ccsf.edu/Forms/cgi-bin/applicationNC-English.cgi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-21</td>
<td>Library &amp; Learning Resources Profile of Holdings and Electronic Resources</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/LLRCollectionSnapshot1107.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/LLRCollectionSnapshot1107.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-22</td>
<td>Annual Budget 2010-11</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/budget/FY1011_Preliminary_June_2010_V6.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/budget/FY1011_Preliminary_June_2010_V6.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-24</td>
<td>City College Foundation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.foundationccsf.org/">http://www.foundationccsf.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-25</td>
<td>Policy Manual 1.17: Audit Committee Guiding Principles</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/pm1_17.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/1/pm1_17.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-26</td>
<td>Policy Manual 8.3: Auditing</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/8/pm8_03.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/8/pm8_03.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-27</td>
<td>CCSF Budget Website (Audit reports are available in the section labeled Reports)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/employee-services/district-business-office/budget.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/employee-services/district-business-office/budget.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-32</td>
<td>Policy Manual 6.1 Instruction - General</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_01.doc">http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/6/pm6_01.doc</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to CCSF Major Findings
(2006 Action Plans)

Response to CCSF Action Plan #1

1. Develop an institutional plan through Shared Governance processes to further address the discussion, development, implementation, and assessment of student learning outcomes. (T.2, S.II.A)

   a. Support and train instructional and student development faculty and staff on development and assessment of learning outcomes at the course and program levels, including training of some faculty to act as resources to others, expanding participation and promoting time for dialog. (S.II.A, T.2, T.3, T.5)

   b. Develop human and financial resources to provide programs and services, expertise, and technology support necessary to implement student learning outcomes. (T.2)

   c. Bring students into the student learning outcomes discussions. (S.II.A)

   d. Explore the possible implications such an institutional plan could have for changes in institutional processes such as curriculum development and review, faculty and administrative evaluations, and institutional planning. (T.2, S.II.A)

Please see “Response to WASC Recommendation #3 on Student Learning Outcomes.”

Response to CCSF Action Plan #2

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

In response to recommendations formalized in the CCSF Student Equity Plan, the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) was developed in 2003. This is a faculty led, year long staff development program with the goal of introducing culturally relevant teaching and learning strategies into the classroom and counseling practices. Each year faculty are selected to participate in a series of workshops and seminars, including a poster session that disseminates those strategies. To date, 165 faculty have participated in the MIP program. The success of this project has translated into its inclusion as a priority in our Basic Skills Initiative Plan along
with associated funding. The MIP program work is ongoing and is included in the current Fiscal Year 2011-12 budget.

The College has a graduation requirement in Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Studies. Since 2006, 12 new courses have been approved by the Bipartite Committee and included on the list of courses meeting this requirement. The creation of these courses, across nine academic departments, reflects broad institutional commitment to the integration of diverse perspectives into the curriculum. Currently within our curriculum, 117 courses meet the Ethnic Studies requirement, 30 courses satisfy the Women’s Studies option, and 32 courses meet the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies option.

The Business Department Paralegal/Legal Studies Program is participating in the Destination Law School Program sponsored by the San Francisco Bar Association and the Diversity Internship Program of the Association of Legal Administrators in San Francisco to promote diversity in the legal profession.

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

The Metro Academies, initiated in Fall 2008, are learning communities that prepare students to transfer to California State University campuses for further study in health, early childhood education, or other human services. As students proceed through the Metro sequence, they experience course work that is reinforced from one class to another, and faculty that work closely with each other to share both knowledge of the students and effective pedagogy. Students demonstrate their mastery of competencies and knowledge by creating an electronic portfolio that meets explicit proficiency requirements.

Faculty in Health and Child Development and Family Studies (CDEV) learn in professional development seminars together with faculty from other departments (like English) how to integrate writing across the curriculum and how to include health and CDEV content in English courses. Students learn by working with real issues. Metro faculty work together in an interdisciplinary learning community. The linked courses share common learning objectives and integrated assignments. Plans are underway to secure funding to expand the model to a science discipline.

Elementary Algebra, Math 840, with a Women’s Study Focus is another interdisciplinary studies class that integrates into the standard Elementary Algebra curriculum discussions of gender bias and its intersection with culture, class, race, age, and disability. The course was developed to meet the challenges women continue to experience in mathematics classrooms. Issues of math anxiety, learning styles, and learning differences are addressed through the completion of a math study skills workbook. Students complete a mathematics autobiography which challenges them to examine stereotypes and to explore the origins of their personal attitudes towards mathematics. In addition, students discover the accomplishments of female mathematicians through a short research paper.
The Youth Worker Certificate was developed in partnership with several CCSF departments, including Health Education, Child Development and Family Studies, Administration of Justice, Women’s Studies, Learning Assistance, Interdisciplinary Studies, and local employers. There are two Youth Worker Certificates at City College of San Francisco: 1) Youth Worker: Organizing, Advocacy, Counseling and Education; and 2) Youth Worker: Child Development. The Organizing, Advocacy, Counseling and Education Certificate is based in the Health Education Department and designed to prepare individuals for positions working with youth ages 13–21 with community health and social service agencies and programs. Youth Workers provide health education, client-centered counseling, and case management services, and conduct community organizing and advocacy in a wide variety of employment settings. As part of their education, students complete an internship with a local youth serving agency. The second certificate, based in the Child Development and Family Studies Department, focuses on preparing individuals to work in after-school and recreation settings with youth of all ages and also focuses on administration for those already working in the field seeking career advancement. Both certificates require student to take 1 unit (1-2 classes) of the Diversity and Social Justice courses in the Interdisciplinary Studies Department.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #3

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

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

The Student Development Division offers a robust internal professional development program for counseling faculty. Individual counseling departments include a professional development topic as part of their regular monthly department meeting. In 2007, the Dean of Counseling created a professional development seminar series offered to all counseling units across departments and divisions. Three to five topical seminars are offered each semester. In Spring 2011, an additional professional development track for counselors was added through the Bridge to Success (Gates) grant. Each semester, a series of three to four seminars are offered conjointly to CCSF counseling faculty and counselors from the SF Unified School District.
Response to CCSF Action Plan #4

Expand innovative methods of delivery of instruction and student services to meet the multiple needs of students. (S.II.B) a. Improve the dissemination of information on instructional pedagogies and evaluation techniques related to students’ diverse learning styles. (S.II.A) b. Expand the use of technologies for the delivery of student services. (S.II.B)

The supplemental instruction (SI) model is a new format introduced last year by the Learning Assistance Center. This model is funded jointly by College and grant funds. Group tutoring, linked to a specific course section, is led by a former student who was successful with that course and instructor. Specialized training is offered to the SI leader, who also is responsible for meeting with the content instructor for direction and exchange on student learning. In Fall 2008 14 SI groups served approximately 136 students in the disciplines of chemistry and psychology. In Spring 2011, only four SI groups served approximately 50 students in chemistry. In Fall 2011, there are four groups serving approximately 50 students. This reduction is the result of the loss of grant funds; the College is currently seeking a new source of funding for SI groups.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The implementation of a new photo ID card for all CCSF credit students began in Fall 2008. Shortly thereafter, the service was made available to noncredit students. During the original phases, the service was available only at the Ocean Campus. Students, attending other campuses needed to come to the main campus to get their student photo ID cards. Subsequently, through a planned rollout, this service was established at all CCSF campuses with the Civic Center Campus being the latest, in 2011. This service will also be available at the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus, opening in 2012.

The Admissions & Records Office implemented an online transcript ordering process in March 2011. This process has helped alleviate a majority of the ordering “log jam” and sped up the processing. It is available through Web4, the College’s self-service online system for students and employees to access information from its enterprise database. The Web4 system also processes payments, which has reduced the number of incoming orders and payments through the mail.

Web registration began ten years ago at CCSF. Since then, the College has integrated online class schedules, grade reports, free unofficial transcripts, official transcript ordering, parking permit purchases, and soon, student self-service verification for all credit students. The Admissions & Records Office is currently collaborating with several departments to develop and implement an online noncredit Web registration and attendance system. There is a team currently in place to create a pilot for Web registration for the Spring 2012 semester. An attendance system has been created and it is in the final phase of testing.

Student Services has increased communication with students through different technological formats. Text message updates are sent to students and email communication has replaced paper mailings. Several CCSF Facebook pages are available to students including the main page maintained by the Office of Outreach and Recruitment which regularly posts informational videos, updates student-related information, and employs student ambassadors to answer student questions posted on the Facebook Wall.
Response to CCSF Action Plan #5

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

The College has not been able to respond fully to this recommendation due to reduced state funding. However, Library and Learning Resources staff have found creative ways to build core collections at the Mission and Chinatown/North Beach campuses. “Core collections” focus primarily on meeting the anticipated needs of students and faculty during a campus’s first year of operation, and will form the basis of more complete and comprehensive collections that the library staff will develop over time. Currently $30,000 has been allocated for the initial purchase of library books and materials for Chinatown/North Beach; this initial allocation will need to be supplemented. Additional materials are being culled and selected from the San Francisco Public Library’s Community Redistribution Program. Such no-cost materials played a key role in building the Mission core collection and are currently being used to build the Chinatown/North Beach core collection.

As with all campus library collections, the Dean of Library & Learning Resources allocates the yearly materials budget based on the prior year’s allotment. Standard library review and in print sources, circulation data, course information, and departmental faculty are consulted before the materials budget is spent to assure quality standards and effectiveness in supporting course offerings.

Additionally, in Fall 2011, a Library Peer Group Comparison is being conducted to determine how the College’s Library compares to other California community colleges with similar enrollment numbers in terms of collection size, budget, equipment, and staffing. The survey will close in November 2011 at which time the data will be analyzed. These data will help show whether the College’s funding levels are adequate in serving a District of this size.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #6

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

Please see “Response to WASC Recommendations in Standard II A Findings and Evidence—BMS and AV.”

Response to CCSF Action Plan #7

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

a. Expand the number of College venues throughout the District to conduct dialogs on planning objectives, budget allocations, and assessment reports using current and additional College information and data. (S.1, S.II, T.3)

b. Ensure that the College’s Program Review System is integrated into the College’s Budget, Planning, and Evaluation System. (S.I, T.5)
c. Establish a schedule for the review of all major College business processes to identify improvement objectives that will be integrated into the College Planning and Budgeting System. (S.III.D)

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

Response to CCSF Action Plan #8

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

The College inaugurated a new Program Review process in 2008-09 that includes all units in the College. The Program Review template now used for the process asks units to identify a six-year plan for revising course curriculum and programs.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #9

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

The Program Review Committee is researching criteria currently used by Bay Area community colleges for terminating programs. A subcommittee of the PRC, which will include additional College wide representatives, will review the criteria and recommend to the full committee those to be considered through institutional processes. It will also recommend how to incorporate the criteria into the Program Review process as part of the scheduled Program Review evaluation.

Response to CCSF Action Plan #10

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

CCSF has an ongoing policy of involving all constituents of the College (classified staff, faculty, administrators, and students) to the greatest extent possible in Shared Governance activities. The Office of Shared Governance publishes the Annual Report, Handbook, committee reports and minutes, maintains a Shared Governance website, and has an experienced Shared Governance Coordinator (who is a classified staff member) who also provides online audio recordings for the College Advisory Council and the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council.

There is a concerted effort to review committee memberships for as balanced a representation as possible. One of the major Shared Governance pipelines, the College Advisory Council, chaired by the Chancellor, has four members from each of the constituent groups; classified staff, faculty, administrators, and students.
The CCSF Academic Senate continues its efforts to promote faculty participation in the Shared Governance System. The Senate tries to ensure that search committees list Shared Governance participation among the examples of duties in faculty position announcements. The Senate notifies the faculty of committee vacancies through the District newsletter *City Currents*, in weekly emails, and by posting up-to-date information on the Academic Senate webpage. Academic Senate officers and the members of Shared Governance committees and subcommittees frequently recruit individual faculty members to broaden committee representation. Starting in September, 2010, the Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees, the body that nominates faculty to Shared Governance committees, began holding its meetings in public sessions in order to promote openness and understanding of the process and to ensure Brown Act compliance. At last count in early Fall 2011, there were 248 faculty members serving on 50 Shared Governance bodies.

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

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

The Classified Employees are appointed by the Service Employees International Union, Local 1021. The vacancies are advertised in the District newsletter, *City Currents*.

Data provided by the Office of Shared Governance reflect the following percentage of positions filled on Shared Governance committees by constituent groups; administrators 99 percent, classified 82 percent, faculty 89 percent, and students 68 percent. This reflects a 1 percent increase for the administrator participation and a 9 percent increase for the faculty participation, while the student participation remained the same as at the time of the midterm report. However, the classified employees’ participation reflects a decline of 12 percent.

An evaluation of the Shared Governance System is conducted every two years. However the last comprehensive evaluation was conducted in Fall, 2007, as explained in Standard IV.A.5. A full evaluation is planned for Fall, 2011.

**Response to CCSF Action Plan #11**

*Continue to improve College communication and publicity efforts.*

1. Improve the College’s website for clarity, currency, content, and functionality of design. *(S.II.A, S.II.B, T.6)*
2. Expand EAtv/Channel 27 programming and improve access. *(S.II.A, S.II.B, T.6)*
3. Improve marketing and information about the campuses. *(S.II.A, S.II.B, T.6)*
4. Improve dissemination of College policies, especially those on academic freedom and student honesty. *(S.II.A)*
The College website has been redesigned, re-organized, and upgraded to a Content Management System. The design and organization were established after extensive professionally conducted focus groups consisting of students, community members, classified staff, administrators, and faculty. Because budget limitations prevented hiring a Content Manager, the College’s Communication Committee formed a workgroup (WEBCREDS) with faculty, staff, and students. Volunteers review content for clarity, accuracy, and navigation. Volunteers assist departments and programs with website improvements. The Communications Committee monitors the site, reviews proposals for locating webpages in the College site, and presents recommendations to the College Advisory Council.

Educational Access Television (EATV) Ch 27 and 75 both operate 24 hrs a day, seven days a week. EATV began distributing programs on ATT-U-verse in September 2011. Programming has been expanded and production facilities have been upgraded at Ocean Campus and added at Mission Campus. Operations and production are fully integrated with the Broadcast Electronic Media Arts career and technical education programs. EATV capital improvement funds are being used to install a live interactive teleclass production room in collaboration with the Educational Technology Department. Faculty training will occur during Spring 2012 and the room will be available for live interactive CCSF instruction on EATV Ch 27 by Summer 2012.

EATV Ch 27 and 75 airs telecourses coordinated with the Educational Technology Department, has produced and webcast a California Community College Board of Governor’s meeting in collaboration with 3C Media in Palomar, has broadcast the 2011 San Francisco Mayoral Candidate’s Debate live from the Diego Rivera Theater, and webcasts and cablecasts captioned monthly San Francisco Community College Board of Trustees meetings.

Please see also “Response to WASC Recommendation in Standard II.A Conclusions—Academic Freedom Statement.”

**Response to CCSF Action Plan #12**

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

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

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

In 2007 the Library and Learning Resources (LLR) Department created the Communication and Outreach Committee whose charge is to promote and market LLR services and resources to the College community and San Francisco residents. They accomplish this by participating
in the College Career Fair every semester and by publishing articles in the student newspaper, *The Guardsman*, the College's *City Currents*, and different department publications. Librarian liaisons also meet with their assigned subject departments to promote instructional workshops, programs, and new materials and services being offered. Furthermore, the library has assigned a librarian to a newly created position to keep the communication and coordination of information among counseling, library/learning resources, and instructional programs available.

The Outreach and Community Librarian participated in Frisco Day (a day long outreach and recruitment event to matriculate San Francisco Unified School District high school students), along with other librarians to reach out to a citywide audience. All librarians do presentations and lectures at the invitation of department chairs and directors; some of the library presentations have been extended to faculty and counselors with a particular emphasis on content specific electronic resources and Read/Speak technology used for hearing impaired and ESL students.

The Outreach and Community Librarian teaches instructional and library presentations to keep the College community informed of new technologies, programs, strategies, services, and resources. Students at all campuses have access to all books, periodicals, journals and other library resources available at all College libraries. All campuses other than Castro are staffed by counselors who work to improve communication and coordination of information with the credit and noncredit instructional programs offered at the sites. The College continues to expand curricular offerings and services at all campuses as part of its effort to strengthen the opportunity of a comprehensive experience for students.

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

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

Also, in response to the self assessment conducted under the auspices of the statewide Basic Skills Initiative, the Academic Senate approved the newly created Basic Skills Ad Hoc Coordinating Committee. This committee’s charge will be to coordinate instruction and support services for students in basic skills courses.
Over the past several years the Office of the Dean of Counseling and Student Support, (within the Student Development Division) has implemented many initiatives and activities aimed at improving communication and coordination of information between counseling, library/learning resources, and instructional programs. Activities include:

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

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

**Response to CCSF Action Plan #13**

*Continue to refine the College hiring procedures.*

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

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

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

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

The partial travel reimbursement for interviews and the District’s commitment to partially reimbursing finalists with their incurred relocation expenses, continues to serve as an incentive to recruit candidates from outside of the Bay Area.

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

For the periods Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011, the Human Resources staff processed applications as demonstrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Applications Processed (Including Administrative &amp; Faculty)</th>
<th>Classified Applications Processed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>1370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to CCSF Action Plan #14

Expand College technology capacity.

a. Update the College technology plan. (S.III.C)
b. Expand training and expertise of technical support staff for the College’s technology infrastructure. (S.II.C, S.III.C)
c. Increase electrical capacity to support College technology needs. (S.III.C)
d. Establish standard replacement cycle for institutional computers and peripherals. (S.II.C)

Please see “Response to WASC Recommendation #7 on Technology Planning.”

Response to CCSF Action Plan #15

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

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

Response to CCSF Action Plan #16

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

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

Response to CCSF Action Plan #17

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

City College of San Francisco classifies, maintains, and categorizes the final disposition of all student records in strict accordance with Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 59020-59029) and the California Education Code (76210-76220). All records are scanned and stored in electronic format and, if applicable, hard copies are filed and placed in storage as prescribed by the State Chancellor’s Office. The policy of disposal of applicable records is set in accordance with Title 5 and the California Education Code, which includes submitting to the Board of Trustees, for approval, a list of records to be destroyed. In accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, the College provides notification to students about student rights in regard to their education records (http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/student-services/admissions-and-registration/admissions/FERPA.html).

The Board of Trustees has adopted policies on the ethical behavior of employees and the Board self evaluation. Board policy on the Filing of Statements of Economic Interest is in the process of being revised. More information on Board of Trustees policies is in Standard IV.B.
Response to CCSF Action Plan #18

Continue to improve the College facilities and College physical infrastructure.

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

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

Please see “Response to WASC Recommendation #5 on Physical Facilities Maintenance Planning.”
Responses to WASC Team Recommendations, 2006

MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2006 TEAM

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

Response to Recommendation #1 on Mission Statement

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

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

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

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

Final approval from CAC and the College’s PBC occurred in February 2010. The Board of Trustees approved the statements on April 29, 2010.
Response to WASC Recommendation #2 on Planning and Assessment

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

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

Modification of Annual Planning

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

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

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

**Development of a New Program Review System**

The second stage of the assessment, planning, and budgeting process relies upon the new Program Review System, which is inclusive for all units in the College. This new process was piloted in 2008-09. The pilot year was evaluated and several modifications were made for the 2009-10 cycle. Further improvements were made in 2010-11.

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

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

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

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

Reports are also reviewed by the immediate supervisor; for example, for instructional units, school deans read and comment on all departmental reports in their school. Reports for most administrative units are reviewed by the appropriate vice chancellor, unless there is an intermediate supervisor. This process serves as the first filter for reviewing unit-level planning objectives and budget requests.
Programs or services showing significant challenges with either operations or productivity levels will be identified and recommended for a special comprehensive program review. Special comprehensive program reviews can use the old standard CCSF Program Review framework (2006), an alternative method, or an external peer review process. To date, no such units have been identified as College constituent groups have agreed that the Program Review process would not be punitive. However, the PRC has identified and suggested areas where units might work more closely together. The next iteration of the Program Review template is likely to highlight the desire for increased collaboration and resource-sharing, an objective highlighted in the new Strategic Plan. Moreover, interest in more detailed data and increased focus on assessment is moving the College toward better tracking of budget allocations and related results.

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

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

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

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

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

Response to WASC Recommendation #3 on Student Learning Outcomes

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

Course and Program SLO Progress

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

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

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

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

All department chairs were provided the student learning outcomes assessment templates for review and discussion with their faculty during Spring 2009 Flex Day. In this pilot year, every one of the 62 departments was asked to complete a minimum of one template for a course or program. During the pilot period, 2008-09, the student learning outcomes assessment templates were reviewed by the Workgroup and revised accordingly. Since then, departments have had an opportunity to add courses and/or programs into their student learning outcomes assessment process, which is completely integrated into the Program Review System, which in turn is completely integrated into the annual planning and budgeting system.
Some of the SLO reports received were exemplary, showing a cycle of continuous improvement that was data driven and included the use of student learning outcomes data. The Program Review Committee reviewed the information submitted in the pilot year. While some reports were outstanding, others did not yield full information on the means of assessment, measurement criteria, or plans for improvement. Some departments did not find that the timeline gave them sufficient time to make plans for improvement. Also, there were different interpretations of the terminology used in the templates. The College now has a general sense of a baseline in terms of the departments which reported in the pilot year.

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

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

Units were asked to identify a six-year plan for revising course and program curriculum outlines and a plan to develop, assess and utilize student learning outcomes in all of their courses and/or programs by 2014-15. This expectation has been incorporated into the Curriculum Guide as well as the Program Review process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**General Education SLO Progress**

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

There are more than six hundred courses spread across the eight General Education areas. The workgroup that is identifying the learning outcomes for each of the General Education areas is using the inclusion criteria as a starting point for these learning outcomes. The goal is to create a unified process that can be used to review courses for inclusion into a General Education area while simultaneously mapping the learning outcomes for that area to specific aspects of the course.

**Student Development/Student Services SLO Progress**

Student Development departments continue to make substantial progress in the area of SLOs. As previously reported, prior to the 2008 Summer Session, the Student Development Division had an SLO Workgroup that met regularly to discuss and brainstorm SLOs, initiated several SLO pilot studies, and began developing a timeline and mapping for SLOs within the Division. [Note: Student Development departments have more recently been divided into two Divisions.]

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

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

After these meetings were conducted, a grid with all Divisional SLO information was created and monthly SLO Workgroup meetings, with at least one representative attending from each unit, were initiated. At the Workgroup meetings, units shared SLOs, brainstormed goals, and began discussion of divisional SLOs. In addition to the Workgroup meetings, the Student Development SLO Coordinator met with individual units to keep everyone on task. SLO presentations were made available to departments within the major 10 units as needed. In December 2008, each department provided a Progress Report for their respective areas, outlining what SLOs they worked on in the fall semester, their progress, and their future plans for each SLO.
The result of the diligent work of the many units within the Student Development Division during this time was substantial. Over these seven months, the Division grew from one to two units with SLO pilot projects to each of the ten major units, and many of their sub-units, working on clearly identified SLOs. Although the units continued to move forward at different paces, and experienced different issues as they began collection, assessment, and analysis of data, the effort of the Division became unified in their collective approach and commitment to make significant impacts on student learning through the use of SLOs.

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

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

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

As referenced above, over the past two years (2009-11), Student Services has continued to include active SLO projects in their unit objectives and priorities. Updates and progress on SLOs are reported annually through the Program Review process. Data collection and analysis is becoming more sophisticated as units progress in their projects. Cycles of continuous improvement are being integrated across additional departments. Reports containing data, analysis, and recommendations for programmatic change in several departments are available to other units and serve as models of effective practice in the continuous improvement cycle.
Recent examples include curriculum changes in LERN 10 (the tutor training course) and LERN 50 (College Success). In Summer 2010 the College piloted enhanced orientations for new students. Results of this study informed changes to the content of the standard college orientations and led to the critical addition of financial aid workshops connected to the orientation sessions.

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

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

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

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

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

The leadership at the College has demonstrated a strong commitment to advancing the dialog on SLOs. The administration, the Department Chairpersons Council and the Academic Senate has each had a strong presence in guiding discussions, designing processes, and providing staff development opportunities to support this institutional priority.
Response to WASC Recommendation #4 on Financial Planning and Stability

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

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

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

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

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

**Match Ongoing Expenditures to Ongoing Revenue**

The ending balance in the College’s unrestricted general fund on June 30, 2011 was estimated at $3.1 million, an amount that was greater than the previous year. The fact that this was achieved without using any of the Board Designated Reserve supports the fact that the College had successfully matched ongoing spending with ongoing revenue during the fiscal year.

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

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

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

The College is once again making conservative revenue assumptions for fiscal year 2011-12 and has adopted a budget based on reductions in state funding that will take place if the statewide $4 billion revenue increase assumed in the state budget as enacted does not occur. With respect to expenditures, the strategies outlined above largely remain in place, and the College’s finance team carefully reviews spending by account on a frequent 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 attention of the Chancellor, and to the Board of Trustees at their regularly scheduled meetings.

**Maintain Minimum Prudent Reserve Level**

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

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

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

As reported in the Annual Financial Budget Reports (CCFS-311) the College’s percentages for this measure have consistently exceeded the recommended minimum amount, totaling more than 10 percent in fiscal years 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10. Based on current information, the College expects to exceed the 10 percent level once again at the end of fiscal year 2010-11. The College’s budget strategy for 2011-12 would achieve this goal once again.

An important component of a college’s fund balance is the Board Designated Reserve. On June 30, 2011, City College’s Board Designated Reserve remained at $6.65 million, the largest amount in the history of the College. In addition to the designated reserve, the fund balance included more than $3 million in the form of a closeout in the unrestricted general fund. These two components totaled more than $9.65 million or about 4.9 per cent of annual unrestricted general fund spending. The College’s independent external auditors have advised the College that an additional $1 million in restricted funds should be added to the $9.65 million figure which would create a revised total of $10.65 million or more than 5% of annual unrestricted general fund spending. This means that even under the narrowest measure of fiscal reserves, the College exceeded the five percent minimum amount recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office.

Reduce Percentage of Annual Budget Utilized for Salaries/Benefits

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

Retiree Health Benefits

An independent actuary has determined that as of October 2009 the College has an unfunded liability of approximately $158 million for the cost of retiree health benefits. This unfunded liability is now included in the College’s financial statements as documented by the annual independent audit report. The College did join the investment consortium sponsored by the Community College League for this issue but has not deposited any money into the fund. Recently San Francisco voters enacted a measure that modifies post retirement heath benefits for new hires, lengthening the number of years needed to qualify for the benefit and allowing the College to negotiate with its representative labor unions to charge new hires a percentage of their salary to prefund the future liability. The College cannot implement the charges to new employees without union approval. The College is making its first payment toward its Other
Post Employment Benefits obligation during 2011-12, as $500,000 was included as an specific allocation in the College’s final budget for the fiscal year. The College is currently negotiating issues concerning post retirement health benefits with the collective bargaining units and expects to reach an agreement to address this matter by the end of 2011.

Next Steps

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

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

Response to Recommendation #5 on Physical Facilities Maintenance Planning

The team recommends that the college include the future costs of operating and maintaining new and existing facilities in its planning models and allocate funds in a timely manner to ensure the effective operation of these facilities. (Standard II.B.2.a).

The College has opened five new facilities as a result of its bond program; Student Health Services, the Mission Campus, the Child Development Center, the Health and Wellness Center, and the Multi-Use Building. While these openings have increased operating costs, three of them, the Mission Campus, the Wellness Center, and the Multi-Use Building have also increased revenue by growing enrollment. While a true “total cost of ownership” methodology was not used during the initial planning stage for these facilities, the College was able to set aside adequate funding to operate each facility upon opening.

The College will occupy its Chinatown/North Beach Campus in April 2012. Classes will begin at the new facility during the Summer 2012 semester. This facility will require a significant amount of operating support. The cost of operating this facility will be significantly offset by the College’s ability to cease paying $613,000 per year in rent and utilities for the existing Chinatown/North Beach Campus currently leased from the SFUSD as well as other smaller sites near the new campus. To ensure a smooth transition, the College has already incorporated the net increased cost of opening the Chinatown/North Beach Campus into the three-year running model of the College’s operating budget.

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

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

Response to Recommendation #6 on Physical Facilities Contingency Planning

The team recommends that the college ensure the development of adequate contingency plans, 
which should be implemented in a timely manner in order to reduce potential exposure to 
losses. (Standard III.D.2.c).

Beginning with fiscal year 2007-08, and continuing through the present, the College has 
continued to make significant progress in its efforts to prepare for emergencies. More than one 
hundred employees are now trained in basic emergency preparedness. The College has also 
conducted three mock emergency drills and two evacuation drills at all campuses. In addition, 
more than 100 employees have also completed advanced emergency preparedness training 
sponsored by FEMA. The College is planning to continue to conduct an evacuation drill every 
academic year. Furthermore, the College has completed extensive physical improvements to 
meet the needs of the disabled community with respect to areas of rescue assistance and paths 
of travel. The College’s Chief of Public Safety and the Director of Student Health Services 
have led this effort and the College’s Shared Governance Health and Safety Committee 
monitors progress in this area on a regular basis.

Response to Recommendation #7 on Technology Planning

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

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

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

Response to Recommendation #8 on Board Self-Evaluation

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

The Board of Trustees at its November 20, 2008 meeting adopted a comprehensive policy on self evaluation. The Board President, with assistance from the Office of Research and Planning, developed a self-evaluation instrument to be completed by Board members as well as constituent groups. Constituent groups include the Academic Senate, Administrators Association, Associated Students, and Classified Senate, as well as local SEIU and AFT.

The self evaluation was first implemented in April and May 2009 covering the period July 1, 2008 through March 2009. The broadly encompassing instrument contained 52 statements to which respondents rated their level of agreement or disagreement. In addition, the instrument contained five open-ended questions. To facilitate comparisons, the same instrument was used both for Board members and for constituent groups. Results were presented and discussed at the May 2009 Board meeting, as well as the June 2009 Board Meeting.

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

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

For more information, please go to this link: http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2011/PDF_january_27_2011/Board%20_self_Evaluation_Docs_Jan_2011.pdf
Response to Recommendation in Standard II A Findings and Evidence--Broadcast Media Services (BMS) and Audiovisual (AV)  See p. 26 of 2006 Report

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

BMS and AV staff consistently and successfully collaborate on College wide projects, especially supporting classroom instruction. Presentations describing services and how to request them are made at “New Employee Orientations” at the beginning of each school year and during FLEX activities.

AV and BMS work together to provide equipment and staff support to the Ocean Campus. BMS assists with Mission Campus classroom equipment deliveries, provides District wide audio and video production services, and designs/installs video production systems. AV manages a video library with more than 3000 titles available for District wide use and provides equipment maintenance and repair for all campuses. BMS and AV collaborate to support special events District wide.

BMS and AV collaborated in the development of a Media Services website, which can be found in the Employee Services pull down menu located in the upper right hand corner of the College website. AV and BMS regularly update a joint handout that describes available media services and materials. The handout is disseminated to the broader community and is included in the new employee orientation packets.

AV and BMS are currently understaffed. As funding improves, staff resources will be increased along with additional and more robust District wide service.


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

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

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

On a practical note, the college still needs to address the issue of permanent maintenance of all student records.
City College of San Francisco classifies, maintains and categorizes the final disposition of all student records in strict accordance to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 59020-59029) and the California Education Code (76210-76220). All records are scanned and stored in electronic format and if applicable, hard copies are filed and placed in storage as prescribed by the State Chancellor’s Office. The policy of disposal of applicable records is set in accordance with Title 5 and the California Education Code.

Response to Recommendation in II C Conclusions--Age of Library Book Collection  See p. 32 of 2006 Report

There is great concern about the age of the overall collection, with many books that are outdated by two or more decades. This issue needs to be addressed within the overall campus planning and budgeting process.

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

Since 2009, the library budget has fluctuated between a low of $135,000 in 2009-10 to an even lower $108,414.95 in 2010-11. Additional funds will be needed in 2012 to cover the expenses associated with the anticipated opening of a new Chinatown/North Beach Library. These funds are used to purchase books, CD ROMs, microforms, periodicals, and videos. The College no longer receives funds from the Telecommunications and Technology Program.

The College is now faced with paying for the electronic materials from an insufficient budget. In 2006 there were not any electronic books (e-books) in the collection; today 17,466 e-books are available 24/7.

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

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

One of the efforts taken on by the library to compensate for dwindling funds is to join with the San Francisco Public Library Redistribution Program to obtain materials copyrighted within the last three years to increase the available current materials. This has been successful since the San Francisco Public Library has gone through major renovations but these renovation projects are coming to an end. The Collection Management Committee will work with the Dean of the LLR to investigate other ways to increase the current collection.

The team also encourages the college to incorporate examination of appropriate administrative staffing levels in its planning processes as it continues to expand programs and services.

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

The realignment included the creation of three new administrative positions: Chief Technology Officer, Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs, and Vice Chancellor of Campuses, Financial Aid, Admissions and Records and New Student Counseling. Reporting directly to the Chancellor are the following administrators: Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, Interim Vice Chancellor of Student Development, Interim Vice Chancellor of Policy and Research (formerly Institutional Advancement), Interim Vice Chancellor of Campuses, Financial Aid, Admissions and Records and New Student Counseling, Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs (proposed position currently vacant), Chief Information Technology Officer, and Chief of Police. As of Fall, 2010, 43 administrators were employed at the College.