review and to clarify the fundraising line item in the budget (Draft CPBC Minutes of February 28, 2012).

As a result of unclear leadership roles and governance processes made worse by declining revenues, the full implementation of what could be an effective planning process has been thwarted. Components of the process have been delayed. For example, the recent annual plans were completed part of the way into the fall semester of the plan year, which has impacted program review reports. The 2011-12 Annual Budget final recommendations were approved on September 22, 2011, nearly four months into the fiscal year. The development of measures of institutional effectiveness has been delayed, and communication about planning efforts is sometimes ineffective (I.B.6, III.D.1.a-c, IV.A.2.a).

The problems noted above have inhibited the ability of the college to work collaboratively toward the achievement of college goals, assure the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource process, and assess the effectiveness of its evaluation mechanisms. It also affects the ability of the planning process to allocate necessary resources and improve institutional effectiveness. The barriers to effective planning need to be removed to connect the new planning processes fully with resource allocation, including both awarding new resources and implementing resource reductions (I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7).

City College of San Francisco demonstrates limited accomplishment, both in measuring student learning and evaluating and in fully implementing an assessment and planning process. The core of its planning system is the program review process, which includes the analysis of data provided by the CCSF Research and Planning Office, information on progress of prior-year planning objectives and major planning objectives for the next fiscal year, discussion of the status of learning assessment for courses and programs, and description of resources needed to meet planning objectives. Student learning outcomes are in place for courses and programs. However, the implementation of SLO assessment, and the use of that assessment information to make changes, varies across the college. Some departments have exemplary processes in place, while others do not. Some program review reports address SLO assessment in depth; others treat the subject only in a cursory fashion or have incomplete information (I.B.1).

The college identifies strategic priorities and major goals in each year’s Annual Plan. Many, but not all, of these goals are associated with objectives that are stated in measurable terms. This allows the college to assess progress toward achieving its stated goals and make data-informed decisions as part of an ongoing integrated planning cycle. The new planning system, if fully implemented, could be very effective. However, the links from the work of the Program Review Committee (PRC) and CPBC to specific resource allocations, both awarding resources and planning for specific resource reductions, need to be strengthened. Funding reductions, difficulties in financial planning, and ongoing financial constraints have negatively impacted effective use of an integrated planning system (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.7).