MEMORANDUM

Date: February 28, 2011
To: All Employees
From: Vice Chancellor Alice Murillo, Co-chair, Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee
       Academic Senate President Karen Saginor, Co-chair, Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee

Subject: First Draft Accreditation Self Study Report

A first draft of the Accreditation Self Study Report is now available on the web for review by all members of the College Community. You will find links to the Report in both Word and pdf format at http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/study.html. We would like to encourage you to discuss relevant sections within your department and through shared governance structures. You can send your suggestions and comments to Steering committee co-chairs: Karen Saginor (ksaginor@ccsf.edu) and Alice Murillo (amurillo@ccsf.edu) or directly to the co-chairs for the standard as shown in the footer to each page.

The Self-Study Report is a key document that will be carefully examined and evaluated by the WASC Evaluation Team who will start their work with us in Fall, 2011 and visit us in March, 2012. After their visit, the WASC Evaluation Team will make recommendations regarding our reaffirmation of accreditation. The Self-Study Report is our vehicle for providing honest and constructive self-assessments of our success in meeting all the required standards.

Well over a hundred members of the College Community have contributed their work to help produce this initial draft. Correction, completion, and updating are needed in many areas. We will continue to work on it, and we especially welcome your input. Most helpful to us are suggestions that provide us with specific language to use or specific facts or examples to refer to. Planned for the Self-Study Report, but not yet included in this initial draft, are introductory materials, summaries, full references to resources, and supplemental information. Your feedback from this draft will inform a second draft to be sun-shined later in the semester. Schedules and timelines for the full Accreditation Self Study process are provided on the website.

The **deadline** for submitting feedback for this draft is **March 24th, just before Spring break.**
Standard I. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness.

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


Mission:

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

Questions:

• What does the institution’s mission statement say about its educational purposes? Are these purposes appropriate to an institution of higher learning?

• Who are the college’s intended students? How does the institution determine its intended population? Is the identified population a reasonable match for the institution’s location, resources, and role in higher education?

• What processes does the institution use to foster college-wide commitment to student learning? Does the mission statement express this commitment?

CCSF has two purpose statements, a Mission Statement and a Vision Statement. Our Mission Statement has seven components in a thoughtfully-formatted bulleted list. It describes the sorts of programs we offer, e.g., degrees, certificates, transfer, workplace skills, civic engagement, citizenship, GED/adult ed., and lifelong learning. Because we feel each component is equally important, we often minimize the appearance of a prioritized order by presenting the bullet items in two columns. Our Vision Statement is a narrative that describes the students we hope to serve and how their education will help improve themselves and their communities. The elements of the Vision Statement (e.g., the benefits of an informed electorate) inform the components of the Mission Statement (e.g., citizenship). [Ref 1]

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

Questions:

• Have discussions been held among key constituents regarding the relevance of the mission statement to student learning?

Co-chairs for Standard I: Frederick Teti, and Kristin Charles
Co-chairs for Standard I: Frederick Teti, and Kristin Charles

- What statements about student learning are included in the mission statement? How do these statements make explicit the purposes of the institution?
- How does the institution know that it is addressing the needs of its student population?
- What assessments of institutional effectiveness are undertaken?

CCSF goes to great lengths to align our offerings with our purposes, character, and student needs. The College’s purposes as defined in the Mission Statement are common among the California community colleges. Ours is a large urban district serving over 100,000 students each year in both credit and noncredit modes at a dozen fairly autonomous neighborhood campuses (“centers” per Ed Code) and at hundreds of sites. Our “average” students are in their mid-30s and we serve slightly more women than men. Many of them are immigrants or children thereof and so the plurality of our curriculum is ESL and citizenship. We have an entire department, called Transitional Studies, to ease noncredit students’ way into the collegiate credit curriculum. Our nearly 15,000 transfer-seeking students take courses that articulate with not only the California State University and the University of California but also other destination institutions across the country (e.g., the Historically Black Colleges and Universities). Each year over 1000 degree-seeking students choose from among nearly 60 AA and AS options and thousands more choose from among our Career-Tech Ed certificates. The English and mathematics departments have significantly increased the number of their pre-transfer sections to accommodate better our ever-growing body of students requiring developmental education.

Their demographics and needs vary among the neighborhoods and the neighborhood campuses focus on the specific components of the mission. Thus the Downtown Campus focuses on noncredit business, the Evans Campus on Career-Tech Ed, John Adams on Allied Health, Fort Mason on Art, and Castro on foreign languages. The Ocean Avenue Campus, the largest, has the full spectrum of CCSF offerings. Lifelong learners benefit from our Continuing Education and Older Adult offerings. Students with interests in biotechnology can enter our Bridge to Biotech programs at the Mission and Southeast Campuses and in collegiate BioTech courses at Mission and the Ocean Avenue Campuses.

The District’s services are organized so as to be responsive to our students’ diverse needs. Certainly we offer high-school outreach, matriculation, and financial aid services (as almost all colleges do) but we offer also four specialized counseling departments (for new, continuing, transferring, and international students) and four retention centers: the African-American Scholastic center, the Latino Services Network, the Asian- and Pacific-American Student Success center, and---new since the last accreditation cycle---the Tulay Center for Filipino-American Student Success. Furthermore, we have an entire department, Learning Assistance, to help students achieve college success skills. Of course, we have dedicated departments for EOPS and DSPS students. Students wishing to demonstrate academic distinction may enroll in our Honors program.

Many specific student populations have access to these resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Resource Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>veterans</td>
<td>Veterans R. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female students</td>
<td>Women’s R. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students managing families</td>
<td>Dr. Betty Shabazz Family R. C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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San Francisco is known as one of the most “wired” cities in the world; thus, our 21st-century students expect copious online programs and services. They can learn about the College before setting foot on campus through the Outreach and Recruitment Office’s Facebook page. Then, they have the option of seamlessly using our free “CCSF Guest” WiFi at about 50 hot-spots, apply for admission online (with CCC Apply), register or waitlist themselves online, and monitor their educational progress in their student accounts. All incoming credit students now receive CCSF email accounts courtesy of Google. Our online course offerings have more than doubled from 83 classes in 2005 to 170 sections in 2011 in the last six years, allowing our students distance learning and scheduling flexibility. Indeed, two rooms in the Multi-Use Building are designated for distance-learning (details still being planned as of this writing). [Ref 2, 8, 9, 17]

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

Questions:
- When was the current mission statement approved by the board?

The Board approved the most recent version of the CCSF Mission and Vision statements on 2010 April 29 (resolution P4, amending Board Policy 1200), as recommended by the Board’s Policy Implementation Committee on 2010 March 3. All three Shared Governance councils reviewed the draft statements several times before the Policy committee’s action. This review is part of the College’s regular ~6-year evaluation and planning cycle.

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

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

- How effective is the institution’s process for periodic review of the mission statement? Does the process allow for incorporating the interests of the institutions’ stakeholders?

- How does the institution know that the way the mission statement is developed, approved and communicated to all stakeholders is effective? What circumstances prompt changes to the statement?

CCSF has developed a ~6-year evaluation and planning cycle (driven, naturally, by the 6-year accreditation cycle). Our evaluation and planning cycle is usually steered by the Shared Governance council now known as the College Planning and Budgeting Council. About two years in advance of each Strategic Planning process, the College Planning and Budgeting Council will call for the various Shared Governance and other District groups (e.g., collective bargaining agents) to review the Mission and Vision Statements and propose appropriate modifications. In the most recent review, the entire College community, including students, were invited to fill out surveys, one for each Statement, intended to determine appropriate focus and language for each component. This report expands further on the evaluation and planning cycle below and in the Standard I.B. and IV responses. [Ref 10–13]

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

Questions:

- How effectively does the mission statement prompt planning and decision making? To what extent is the mission statement central to the choices the college makes?

An abbreviated overview of the CCSF planning process is in order here. Every six years (roughly), the College reviews the Mission and Vision Statements as noted above. These statements then drive the development of a Strategic Plan, a large-scale process involving a team of coordinators, listening sessions, countless presentations, drafting and re-drafting, and the occasionally-successful search for consensus. The Strategic Plan, once complete, articulates objectives that focus on the Mission Statement’s components.

Meanwhile, each College unit prepares an program review (annually from 2009–2011, biennial thereafter) to report on its status, its efforts on achieving previous year’s goals, and its future goals. The College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC), a Shared Governance council, and the Research and Planning Office use the elements of the Strategic Plan and the results of the program reviews to prepare the Institutional Annual Plan. Each semester (ideally), the CPBC and the Research and Planning Office evaluate the District’s progress on the current annual plan; they publish the outcomes of this evaluation in an End-of-Year Assessment.

Since the last accreditation cycle, CCSF has refined its program review process. Part of that refinement was to require units completing program reviews to link their activities and plans to elements of the various planning documents listed above. The CPBC uses those linkages to choose the priorities for the next year’s Annual Plan.

Here, now, is the central role of the mission in this process: All of the most important CCSF plans and various other structural documents that are part of the cycle described above cite the Mission
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Statement. For example, there are citations in the 2003–2008 Strategic Plan (pp. 7 and A-12), the draft Strategic Plan (various places), the 2010–2011 Institutional Annual Plan (p. 2), the 2009–2011 Technology Plan (various places), the Education Master Plan, the Faculty Handbook (p. 5), the 2010 Shared Governance Handbook (p. 36, where committees are urged to read the Mission Statement each year), and the School Plans. In effect, whenever a program review item cites a link to an element of any of these plans, that link can be traced to some component of the Mission Statement. [Ref 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16]

Standard I.B: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness.
Improving Institutional Effectiveness:

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

See the responses to Standard I.A.4 and Standard IV for summaries of the CCSF evaluation and planning cycle.]

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

Questions:

- How has the college structured its dialogue? How well does the college embrace and understand the purpose of the dialogue?
- When, how, and about what subjects has the college engaged in dialogue? What impact has the dialogue had on student learning?
- Does the dialogue lead to a collective understanding of the meaning of data and research used in evaluation of student learning?

Nearly all collegial dialogue at CCSF takes place in our more-than-40 Shared Governance committees. They operate under an extensive Board policy called the Shared Governance Agreement. This Agreement creates an extremely robust participatory governance structure headed by three councils. The committees reporting to the Academic Senate Executive Council are the ones most attentive to our students’ learning needs. The committees reporting to the College Advisory Council and the College Planning and Budgeting Council are concerned more with institutional processes. Needless to say there are often overlaps among the Council’s concerns and thus many issues will come to two or all three of them. Each Shared Governance body has a purpose statement that defines its responsibilities for developing policies and initiatives. Indeed, all committees are Co-chairs for Standard I: Frederick Teti, and Kristin Charles
charged somehow with the search for best practices and the assessment of the District’s effectiveness. Nearly all Shared Governance bodies are quadripartite, i.e., they have representatives from all four campus constituencies: the administrators, the classified staff, the faculty, and the students. Each constituency has an appointing agent that tries to ensure broad, democratic representation. A casual glance at the CCSF Shared Governance brochure will reveal the breadth of the system: all academic and professional matters, sustainability, public relations, and many, many more. The District maintains a Shared Governance Office with an attendant Coordinator charged with facilitating communications to ensure that the committee structure operates smoothly.

CCSF has also a strong, productive history of “ad hoc” work-groups that focus more intensely on specific issues. For example, the Basic Skills Steering Committee came into existence in response to the statewide basic skills initiative. Proposals from the Basic Skills Steering Committee go to the Academic Senate via the Basic Skills Subcommittee. Also, the Chancellor convened his Student Equity Task Force so that the District could examine five areas (English, math, placement testing, financial aid, student employment) in which we might better serve all our students. Proposals from the Equity Task Force are supposed to go to various committees (not all of them did, alas), thus, ideally, tying the ad hoc bodies to the existing Shared Governance structure. Other examples range from the Strategic Planning Team to the Cost Savings group.

In addition to these District-wide bodies, there are countless committees within each department; curriculum, scholarship, equity, and learning outcome assessment are just some of the many issues that are discussed at the departmental level as well as at the institutional level. It is here, at the departmental level, that collegial dialogue most strongly shapes our students’ learning. Examples include certain math and English offerings in compressed timeframes and the inclusion of major learning outcomes in all course outlines. Ref [11–16]

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

Questions:

- What criteria does the college use to determine its priorities (set goals)?
- Is there broad-based understanding of the goals and the processes to implement them? Is there institutional commitment to achieve identified goals?
- How well does the college implement its goals?
- Are goals articulated so that the institution can later determine the degree to which they have been met?
- To what extent does the college achieve its goals?

CCSF has a ~6-year cycle for strategic planning and a ~1-year cycle for annual planning. Each Strategic Plan lists a wide variety of long-term goals. Each year, the College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) consults the Strategic Plan, the most recent Program Review
recommendations, and the previous year’s Annual Plan to select specific goals for that year’s Annual Plan. The selection process varies but the CPBC very broad membership ensures input from all College constituencies. These goals are often separated into “operational” and “developmental” and then prioritized within each subset. The many unit plans and Program Review reports inform the prioritization. The Research and Planning Office drafts an implementation schedule (a “gantt” chart) for each Annual Plan. The End-of-Year Assessments show that, on the whole, the District makes satisfactory progress each year on achieving that year’s goals.

The Strategic Planning Team and the College Planning and Budgeting Council both strive to communicate the goals thus developed to the College community—indeed, we urge the entirety of the community to contribute toward the goals’ development—and to solicit as much participation as possible in achieving them. The Strategic Planning Team bring drafts of the plan to dozens of committee meetings to explain the Plan and ask for feedback. Unit managers (administrators and department chairs) also share the drafts with their units (staff and faculty) so that input from all College employees may inform the Plan’s development. The CPBC conducts listening sessions to inform its decisions. Initiatives are directed to appropriate Shared Governance bodies for deliberation and possible action.

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

Questions:

- To what extent does the institution understand and embrace the notion of ongoing planning?
- Does the college have a planning process in place? Is it cyclical, i.e., does it incorporate systematic evaluation of programs and services, improvement planning, implementation, and re-evaluation? How does college budgeting of resources follow planning? How is planning integrated?
- To what extent are institutional data available and used for planning? Are data analyzed and interpreted for easy understanding by the college community?

We address progress on the Strategic and Annual Plan goals in the End-of-Year Assessments (EYA). The outcomes of these assessments then inform the decisions for the next year’s planning cycle. Also informing our decisions is the aptly-named Decision Support System (DSS), a data-mining tool accessed from the Research and Planning webpage. The DSS provides a broad range of data, including demand for courses, student demographics, productivity, persistence, and success, that can be dis-aggregated chronologically, by department, or by campus. Also available at the Research and Planning webpage are the results of student and employee surveys; these are a valuable source of qualitative information about the District’s performance. Furthermore, the Institutional Researcher is available to department chairs who request special data and analysis needs.

For example, in the 2007–2008 EYA, the first Operational Objective is “O1.1. Provide educational programs and services at each of CCSF’s campuses.” We assessed progress on this objective with such DSS data as “Headcount enrollment increased in 2007-08: 51,027 credit students, up 7% from Co-chairs for Standard I: Frederick Teti, and Kristin Charles
2006-07. 45,162 noncredit students, up 2% from 2006-07. 99,495 total unduplicated headcount includes other programs in addition to credit and noncredit.” The next year, Operational Objective 1.1 was retained in the 2008–2009 Annual Plan in the hopes of continuing progress. (As it happened, credit service increased while noncredit decreased.) [Ref 4–9]

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

Questions:

- What mechanisms exist for participation in college planning?
- How is broad involvement guaranteed?
- To what extent does the college allocate resources to fulfill its plans?
- When resources to fulfill plans are not available, does the college identify and follow strategies to increase its capacity, i.e., seek alternate means for securing resources?
- What changes have occurred as a result of implemented plans?

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

Perhaps the most significant change in planning since our last accreditation cycle is the newly-redesigned program review process. At the time of our last accreditation visit, program review was not explicitly part of the annual planning system. Each District unit (office, department, program…any entity with a budget) conducted a program review on a three-, four-, or six-year cycle. This occurred in a staggered manner; roughly 15 units were undergoing program review at the same time. Units tended to see program review as their one opportunity to assert their needs and generally provided more than was requested. The program review templates were open-ended and invited lengthy, diffuse responses.

To address this situation, the Shared Governance system overhauled the program review process, including the templates. Today, program review is driven by specific questions that keep the District units focused on their plans for the coming year. Each unit participates in program review annually (or biennially) at the same time. The current format is much more quantitative in nature, and College units receive the data needed to assess progress on their goals: revenue, expenditures, more detailed student demographics, and more detailed student success indicators. The new templates include a focus on assessment and improvement, not just allocation requests. The completed templates are publicly available online.

Now, because all units are participating in program review concurrently, more opportunities for discussing and comparing responses take place within and across departments. In prior years,
program review was a more isolated process in which costs centers (and often only the managers of those cost centers) would review data and respond to prompts without interacting with others. The Research Office now hosts a series of meetings where cost center representatives can come together to discuss their data and responses. Various deans and department chairs are also hosting similar sessions.

As a result of changes to program review, a significantly greater number of departments are in compliance. In the past, it was typical for only two-thirds of the College units scheduled to submit program reviews actually did so. Now, the Research Office confirms that 120 of 123 units (~98%) have been submitting their program reviews.

The Shared Governance Program Review Committee (and its various subcommittees) collect the units’ reports. Ideally, that Committee then makes recommendations to the College Planning and Budgeting Council for resource allocation based on the strength of the units’ defense of their needs and goals. For example, the English Department’s record of unmet student demand resulted in the approval of extra expansion positions in 2011. Still, the current process is still very new and so the CPBC is still considering how best to receive and judge the Committee’s prodigious output of recommendations. [Ref 4–9]

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

Questions:

- What assessment data does the college collect?
- By what means does the college make public its data and analyses internally and externally?
- How does the college assess whether it is effectively communicating information about institutional quality to the public?

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

Broad, college-wide surveys include a student opinion survey, an employee satisfaction survey, and a technology use survey directed toward faculty and staff. At one time, these broad surveys occurred annually, but the RPO determined that conducting these surveys less frequently (every four years) would yield more visible changes and cause less “survey fatigue”.

Targeted surveys focus on a variety of topics, for example, the College’s mission and vision statements (in preparation for the renewal of our strategic plan), book loan strategies, counseling services, and alumni needs and interests. Traditionally, the RPO has helped design and administer these surveys by request, but individual units are increasingly handling survey activities on their own to gather more thorough information about student learning outcomes. This is made possible through the availability of online tools such as Survey Monkey™. Examples of units that have begun developing and conducting their own surveys for program improvement include Library...
Services, the English Department, the Engineering Department, the Learning Assistance Center, Counseling, and the Veterans Center.

The College also gathers qualitative data from the public through strategic planning listening sessions and industry advisory boards. The strategic planning listening sessions include panels comprising individuals from local industry, government, or the community who present their perspectives on the College’s areas of strength and need for improvement.

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

The RPO then communicates quality assurance matters by analyzing and issuing written reports on the data we collect. Annual reports include the High School Report (which documents first-time student placement within the College), College Performance Indicators, and End of Year Assessment. All reports are available on CCSF’s Research Office website. The High School Report is the most widely disseminated; at one time, representatives from the Research Office met individually with selected local high schools to discuss the findings. Today, we mail out paper copies and email electronic copies of the report to all high schools and San Francisco Unified School District’s administration. At this point in time, significant demand for the report has been generated both among local schools and within SFUSD, and we receive regular requests for the report. Program reviews that utilize a variety of data sets (revenues, expenditures, student success) for each unit are now also developed annually/biennially and made public through the CCSF website.

We also develop and disseminate regular (but not annual) reports such as environmental scans and special topic reports such as the Equity Report issued in 2010. As with all other reports, reports such as these are available online.

In addition to making all written reports available through the website, we also circulate reports internally via email to the relevant stakeholders—and college-wide when appropriate.

Although we do not actively or formally assess the effectiveness of our communications about institutional quality to the public, Board meetings serve as a venue in which the public has the opportunity to comment on the quality of our communications about data. Internally, however, we continually assess the effectiveness of our communications. The program review process serves as an example of how we do this; we have engaged internal stakeholders in an ongoing dialog regarding the quality of data provided, the meaning of these data, and the relevance of these data. After the initial pilot of the new program review format, the Research Office issued a survey that led to changes in the format and content of program review. [Ref 7–9, 14]
I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Questions:

• What processes does the institution use to assess the effectiveness of its cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation implementation, and re-evaluation?

• How effective is the college planning process for fostering improvement?

CCSF does not have a formal mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of its evaluation and planning cycle and, hence, no instrument for assessing that mechanism. Nonetheless, in each evaluation cycle the College Planning and Budgeting Council considers the merits of the current process and proposes modifications for improvement. Indeed, this unscheduled, organic consideration is how we developed the improved Program Review process, to be firmly integrated into the evaluation and planning cycle. [Ref 13]

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

Questions:

• What mechanisms does the institution use to gather evidence about the effectiveness of programs and services?

• How effectively do evaluation processes and results contribute to improvement in programs and services?

The most important means by which CCSF reviews its effectiveness to improve instruction and services is its program review cycle, described earlier in this Standard and elsewhere in this report.

The formal mechanism by which CCSF assesses the effectiveness of our collegial dialog is the biennial Shared Governance review, required by the Shared Governance Agreement, item IV.J. The Agreement does not specify the nature of this review so it has taken many forms. For example, in 2006-2007, a small work group of veteran committee members met with the Shared Governance Coordinator to produce a list of guidelines intended to help improve the effectiveness of the committee chairs. This list, approved by the College Advisory Council, is now included as an addendum to the annually-published Shared Governance Handbook. [Ref 12, 16]

Strengths

1. CCSF has a well-developed Vision Statement in addition to its Mission Statement. Together, these form a robust articulation of the College’s education philosophy. Our Vision Statement informs the seven components of our Mission Statement and nearly all decisions can be traced to at least one and often more then one of those components. To fulfill our mission we offer a range of programs and services nonpareil, all of which are designed to serve our exceptionally diverse student body.
2. Collegial dialog takes place primarily within an expansive participatory governance structure, described in the District’s Shared Governance Agreement and coordinated by a dedicated classified staff member. Administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students all play appropriate roles within that structure.

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

Areas for Improvement

4. Although our program review process has been re-designed and better integrated into the evaluation and planning cycle, it is difficult to produce evidence that it is having a salutary effect on resource allocation. Indeed, more generally, CCSF does not produce evidence of its assessments of its evaluation mechanisms.

5. The most recent Shared Governance reviews have been piecemeal in nature. It is time for a District-wide, highly coordinated review complete with listening sessions at the campuses.

6. The College is only just beginning to examine the development of program-level SLOs in the non-CTE disciplines. These efforts should expand.

References
1. CCSF Vision and Mission Statements
2. CCSF Catalogs
3. CCSF Class Schedules
5. Strategic Plan (in progress)
6. Annual Plans
7. Program Review templates
8. College Performance Indicators
9. End-of-Year Assessments
10. Board of Trustees minutes
11. Academic Senate Executive Council minutes
12. College Advisory Council minutes
13. College Planning and Budgeting Council minutes
14. Program Review Committee minutes
15. Shared Governance Agreement
17. Faculty Handbook
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services.

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

Standard II.A: Student Learning Programs and Services.

Instructional Programs

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

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

Questions:

• How does the institution ensure that all institutional offerings fit the stated mission of the institution?

• How does the institution ensure that its programs and services are high quality and appropriate to an institution of higher education?

• How does the institution choose the fields of study in which it offers programs?

• What are the student achievement outcomes of the institution’s programs; i.e., to what extent do students progress through and complete degrees and certificates, gain employment, or transfer to four-year institutions? By what means are programs assessed for currency, teaching and learning strategies, and student learning outcomes?

• How does the institution ensure that its programs and curricula are current?

The college’s Mission and Vision statement provides overall guidance that informs decision-making about the programs offered by the college. This Vision and Mission statement frames the program review process and is reflected in the college’s Strategic Plan, which in turn is one of the bases of the college’s Educational Master Plan.

The creation, revision, and deletion of academic programs falls largely under the purview of the College’s Curriculum Committee, a quadripartite shared governance organization of faculty, administrators, students, and classified staff that reports to the Academic Senate. Departments wishing to create, modify, or delete academic programs must, as a first step, get Curriculum Co-chairs for Standard II: Ophelia Clark, Alice Murillo, and Deana Abma
Committee approval. Using the standards provided by Title 5, the Curriculum Committee approval process ensures that programs are appropriate to the mission of the institution and to higher education. Once Curriculum Committee approval is attained, the Board of Trustees provides the final district approval of programs and courses.

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

- Appropriateness to Mission
- Need
- Curriculum Standards
- Adequate Resources
- Compliance

The other organization that is involved in the approval of programs is the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. This committee consists of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and several administrators. The Bipartite Committee’s purview is the various requirements of the Associate Degree. Much of the Bipartite Committee’s work is in approving courses for inclusion in the various General Education areas, although the Bipartite Committee has also approved larger changes, including the major structural changes to our Associate Degree in 2007-08.

The college’s collection of academic departments has been relatively stable since our last accreditation visit. The only changes we have had to our academic departments have been in administrative reorganization, and not in expanding or contracting entire curricular areas.

In this context, the college takes a decentralized approach to choosing the fields of study in which it offers programs. Departments review their course and program offerings annually, and make programmatic changes to reflect shifts in interest in their students and shifts within the discipline. Further, programs that are career-technical in nature hold annual industry advisory meetings to get feedback about their curriculum. These departments make regular adjustments to course and program offerings to retain currency with the labor market.

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

In 2009-10, the college awarded 1145 Associate Degrees, 1144 credit certificates, and 52 noncredit certificates. Transfer rates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To CSU</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To UC</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted that 2009-10 was an unusual year for transfer. Because of budget concerns, most CSU campuses did not accept spring semester transfer applicants, which resulted in a significant reduction in transfer numbers for City College and for community colleges statewide.

Again, we have taken a decentralized approach to the assessment of learning outcomes. Departments have been given the autonomy of determining how to assess the learning outcomes of their courses and programs in a way that makes sense for their disciplines. In our annual Program Review process, departments report on the progress that they are making in the assessment of learning outcomes.

For the past few years, all departments are engaged in an annual program review cycle. A key element of this program review cycle is a review of courses and programs. Each department has been tasked with developing a six-year timeline in which they will review every one of their courses and programs for currency.

**Evaluation—IIA.1**

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

**Questions:**

- What research is conducted to inform what student learning needs are? What means does the institution use to assess students’ educational preparedness?
- How is this information incorporated into program planning?
- What kind of research is being conducted to determine if students are achieving stated learning outcomes?

City College of San Francisco conducts research to inform our practices leading to student success. Research in its broadest sense come from information gleaned from program reviews, assessment of success in meeting prior strategic plan objectives, and input from the college community. More direct student learning needs assessment is based on the City College of San Francisco’s Internal and External scans. The data is reviewed with Academic Deans and the College Council, followed by its distribution to departments for their use in Program Review.
More in depth analysis of needs are also conducted through student focus groups, surveys, and feedback from students and staff. Program reviews also address developmental needs for more or less course offerings. Through CCSF’s Decision Support System, staff can assess a wide range of factors, which informs the planning process, including the demand for enrollment into courses, enrollment productivity, student characteristics and student success.

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

Over the last several years, ongoing research of educational needs by departmental faculty have led to joint efforts with the local community and industry advisory committees, to create courses meeting demands for educated workers in biotechnology, green economy, and health and safety. Advisory meetings and DACUM (Developing A Curriculum) research groups are also held to investigate how our curriculum reflects the industry employment needs.

As part of the matriculation process, students are informed about the required placement tests in English or ESL and math. Course descriptions in the catalog and schedule of classes also identify the prerequisite levels and courses. Through orientations, students are informed that counselors use the results to guide their educational planning with students. The combination of placement tests results, placement test waivers and the matriculation exemption processes are used by counselors to insure that students are prepared for enrollment into their chosen courses.

Students are encouraged to meet with a counselor to review their progress towards graduation, certificate and transfer goals. For students seeking open entry, foundation courses in English as a Second Language, adult basic education and trade skills in business and the trades, CCSF offers tuition free non credit courses. According to data from the February 2010 Internal Scan, twenty percent of credit students originated from non credit and approximately thirty percent of credit students have enrolled in a non credit class.

CCSF has also systematically incorporated a series of annual performance indicators tied to its strategic plan. At its disposal are internal sources of data to assess the varied educational needs of its students. Every other year, the college issues report briefs, which provide further analysis on topics of interest. These include movement of non credit students to credit, basic skills and transfer rates.

In an effort to rectify the inequity of outcomes, the college began to issue deeper analysis of trends among its students. In 2009, the Board of Trustees directed the college to prepare an educational equity report, detailing the outcomes for specific groups, so as to eliminate disparities. As a result, the math and English departments have initiated pilot projects that shorten the length of course sequence completion by scheduling short term classes and/or by consolidating sequential courses. Students beginning in the first level of basic skills English will be able to complete the English sequence in three rather than six semesters.
In Fall 2010, the college community reviewed the latest CCSF Strategic Plan for adoption in Spring 2011. Relevant annual plan objectives to this standard are outlined in the Institutional Annual Plan 2010-2011.

The data for student outcomes regarding success rates, persistence and retention rates are available and it varies by program. Under the Office of Career Technical Education, eight departments have been funded through Perkins to collect and analyze data, which will then drive activities to promote student success. Departmental representatives will be presenting their findings during 2010-2011, over a series of professional development activities.

Evaluation—IIA.1.a

Satisfactory – Underlying CCSF’s broad base efforts to improve student learning are data findings which inform policy and practices on student equity and narrowing the achievement gap. Departments armed with the evidence on differential impact have restructured their services.

For example, the Office of Financial Aid has reorganized their unit into three dedicated units with separate offices to better serve CCSF students more effectively. Both the English and Math departments are looking into course consolidations to enhance the likelihood of student success.

However, the college would like to be more proactive in providing data to ensure student success, such as providing a degree audit to all students systematically, rather than on an individual basis. Needs Improvement: Systematic assessment of student learning needs to be conducted to determine if students are achieving stated learning outcomes. Underway are ongoing efforts to integrate student learning outcomes at the program and course level. These also need to be assessed.

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

Questions:

- How does the institution determine that delivery of instruction fits the objectives and content of its courses?
- How are delivery methods evaluated for their effectiveness in meeting student needs?
- What dialogue is taking place about delivery systems and modes of instruction?
- How effectively are delivery systems and modes of instruction facilitating student learning?

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

The college maintains campuses throughout the City of San Francisco and also offers courses at numerous off-site locations making CCSF easily accessible to students with diverse needs and goals. In addition to various modes of instruction, CCSF offers a variety of time scheduling options including short-term classes, weekend classes, classes that meet one, two, three, or five
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times a week and flexible early morning and evening classes. The college continues to adapt its delivery modes to best meet the changing needs of the various communities we serve.

**Distance Learning**

Distance learning courses are offered in all six schools within the college as well as within the Library and Learning Resources. In the fall 2010 semester, CCSF supported over 7,000 students in both online and tech-enhanced classes. Courses are offered either exclusively online or with required meetings. A student can complete approximately 85% of the requirements for an AA/AS degree by taking online courses or telecourses. Students can complete approximately 95% of the courses required to transfer to the CSU through distance learning.

Faculty members at CCSF develop courses and programs in various phases. The Technology Mediated Instruction Office works with department chairs and faculty members to identify courses appropriate for online delivery. Faculty members with department chair and school dean approval are selected to develop online courses through an open application process with preliminary selection determined by the shared governance Distance Learning Advisory Committee. Courses are selected based upon the initial conclusion that the online mode of delivery would be an effective means to deliver the course content and objectives. After the course is selected, the department submits an online course proposal to the Curriculum Committee for approval. The Curriculum Committee requires an online addendum that addresses factors such as suitability of the course for online instruction, faculty contact hours, and distance evaluation integrity. The Office of Technology Mediated Instruction, the Distance Learning Advisory Committee and the Curriculum Committee have worked together to develop a rigorous approval process of online courses.

After a course is chosen to be delivered online, the Office of Technology Mediated Instruction works closely with the faculty member to migrate the course from traditional lecture mode to online delivery. Faculty enroll in a semester long course offered by the college to learn online pedagogical principles and how to use technological tools necessary to navigate effectively within the learning management system. The course is evaluated at various phases of development to ensure that the delivery is meeting the objectives and content of the course outline. The Alternative Media Specialist reviews the course at various stages to ensure accessibility. Once the course meets approval at all of the various levels, it is scheduled for online delivery. The course is followed closely by the Office of Technology Mediated Instruction. The Office of Technology Mediated Instruction offers topic workshops to support faculty in understanding technology of the course management system and guiding faculty in ways they can improve the deliverability of online classes and thus increase student success and decreasing attrition.

Telecourses are offered as part of the distance learning offerings. Content is regularly evaluated for timeliness and appropriateness to the CCSF student. Beginning in Fall 2010, students now have an option to stream telecourse content. Content is still broadcasted via EATV. Telecourses are offered in five of the six schools within Academic Affairs.

Faculty members are given an option to enhance the delivery of their face-to-face courses by delivering the objectives and content of the course using CCSF’s learning management system. Faculty teaching credit courses are required to complete nine hours of training by TMI in order to technology-enhance their classes. The training focuses on understanding the pedagogical implications of delivering the content online as well as learning the skills necessary to work within the LMS as a face-to-face instructor. CCSF supported 141 tech-enhanced course sections in the
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spring 2010 semester; an increase of about 30% from the fall 2009 semester. The college is supporting 192 tech-enhanced course sections in the fall 2010 semester.

Students enrolled in distance learning courses are regularly given entry and exit surveys measuring the effectiveness. In particular, students in Telecourses are provided with entry and exit surveys. The Office of Instruction works with TMI to provide students with online questionnaires to evaluate faculty teaching online courses. TMI regularly monitor enrollment in online courses paying specific attention to attrition and success rates.

Distance Learning courses are discussed within several Shared Governance Committees; the Distance Learning Advisory Committee, the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable, the College Curriculum Committee as well as Academic Policies and College Planning and Budget Committee. The Insight Instructor News Course also provides several discussion topics where faculty discusses pedagogical and technological issues related to online instruction. The forum discussions are archived. Also, all faculty are able to enroll in the Online Teaching and Learning Course as a refresher and the Insight FAQ provides the faculty with a system that is searchable by topic.

Along with distance learning, CCSF offers a variety of other modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of students. Examples include the following:

**Study Abroad**

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

**Internships and Work Experience Courses**

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

**Short-Term Classes**

These are designed to help students progress toward their educational goals more quickly. Short-term courses use an accelerated format to allow students to focus upon a particular class or set of classes more intensively and over a shorter period of time than usual.

**Cohort Pathways**

These are designed to allow students to progress through a certificate program as a single group. Examples of cohort programs include the Metro Child Development, Youth Worker, and San Francisco Green Training Cohorts. Students receive cohort instruction, tutoring, content-focused student mentoring, designated counselors and flexible class scheduling.
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Dual Enrollment Programs

These are designed to provide students with learning opportunities that better prepare them for successful completion of CCSF certificate and degree programs that lead to employment. The high school dual enrollment program offers numerous courses to San Francisco Unified high school students in career and technical oriented fields of study. The School to Career High School Teachers Pathway program is offered in partnership with San Francisco Unified School District.

CCSF has developed an instructional delivery system that provides easy accessibility to students. Departments use various methods to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in meeting student needs. Student surveys conducted by the Office of Technology Mediated Instruction are valuable in assessing student satisfaction with these courses. Student focus groups provide more in-depth feedback from students. For example, the Business Department recently conducted student focus groups in Introduction to Business Courses to help develop strategies to increase retention and success in the General Business Program.

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

Evaluation—IIA.1.b.

Our rating is Superior.

CCSF employs a variety of instructional modes and delivery systems and continues to create new modes of instruction in order to address the needs of our students. Since its last accreditation the college has significantly grown its online program and continues to provide innovative approaches to increasing accessibility to the college for its diverse students.

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

While the college should be commended on successfully reaching out to adult students through its noncredit programs by offering courses at numerous campus sites and community centers throughout the City of San Francisco, the college is encouraged to explore expanding modes of instruction for its noncredit programs to include online offerings and other forms of distance learning. However, under the current budget crisis we do not have funds to expand our online offerings. We do compensate instructors for developing online courses, but we do not have the funds to offer compensation at this time.

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

- What student learning outcomes has the institution identified for its courses, its programs, its certificates, its degrees?

- How and by whom are student learning outcomes and strategies for attaining them created? How and by whom are student learning outcomes and program outcomes assessed? How are the results used for improvement?

- Are student learning outcomes verifiably at the collegiate level? What assessments are in place for measuring these outcomes? How effectively are the assessments working?

- What dialogue has occurred about using assessment results to guide improvements to courses, programs, etc.? What improvements have resulted?

The development of curricula is a faculty initiated and controlled process, which includes the development of new courses, majors, programs, certificates, degrees and the revision of existing ones. This can be an individual or collective activity. Course-level learning outcomes and strategies for attaining them are stated in the course outline; outcomes in the Major Learning Outcomes section and strategies in the Content and Instructional Methodology sections. Accredited programs in the Career and Technical Education area are mandated to hold industry advisory meetings. Programs that receive Perkins funding are also required to hold meetings with their advisory group to assure that curriculum reflects current industry needs.

Course outlines are written by faculty and in some cases reviewed by a department-specific curriculum group. Further review occurs by the respective department chairs and school deans prior to submission to the Curriculum Committee (CC). Majors, programs, certificates, and degrees also have learning outcomes identified on their respective documentation that is submitted to the CC.

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

In order to coordinate assessment activities, Program Review 2010 asked each department to state their assessment and course outline revision timetable through 2016 as well as provide two example of on-going SLO assessment; one at the course level and the other for a program. The departments were also asked to state how they would complete the SLO process by utilizing assessment results to revise instruction or other aspects of the curriculum.

The most effective method for verifying SLOs at the college level is the annual Program Review, a vehicle for department chairs and faculty to evaluate their programs, assessment tools and outcomes. Departments have been asked to assess their progress from year to year and share one example that reflects their department dialog and action on SLOs. Also, departments are asked to identify the percent of courses with SLOs and complete assessment for purposes of the
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Accreditation Annual Report. (This process is under development in consultation with the SLO Workgroup; a complete description of the actual activities and summaries will be posted at the end of the spring 2011 term).

In the last two years assessment has become pervasive at CCSF. The SLO Workgroup has established an SLO website to offer guidance and instruction to faculty. Assessment has become a major component of faculty development days (FLEX days). At FLEX workshops departments share their most successful assessment methodologies with their peers. These workshops have involved hundreds of faculty and inspired meaningful dialogue about how to use SLOs at an institution of this size. Many departments’ use of SLOs is truly exemplary and these workshops allowed other departments to review successful techniques. There were presentations from such diverse departments as Earth Sciences, Learning Assistance, Business and Radiation Technology. The 2010 Program Review gave the college community an opportunity to review other stellar examples from Art, Mathematics, English, Architecture and Community Health.

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

Evaluation—IIA.1.c.

Though there has been some resistance, CCSF has been adopting SLOs and the assessment agenda at an ever-increasing pace and is rapidly moving toward a superior rating.

IIA.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.

Questions:

- By what criteria and processes does the institution decide to offer developmental, pre-collegiate, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training, international student, or contract education programs?

- Which of these (or other) categories of courses and programs does the institution offer?

- By what means does the institution ensure that all of its instructional courses and programs are of high quality? Are they all of high quality?
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- What is the process for establishing and evaluating each type of course and program? How does the college determine the appropriate credit type, delivery mode, and location of its courses and programs?

- Is the quality of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution ensured? Does the institution use evaluation of courses and programs effectively for improvement?

The college offers courses in developmental, pre-collegiate, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training, international student, or contract education programs. For example:

- Developmental: Noncredit ESL and Transitional Studies
- Pre-collegiate: Basic skills courses in English, Math, and ESL
- Short-term training in numerous career-technical fields

The college ensures that its courses and programs are of high quality through an annual program review system that applies to all instructional departments as well as programs including continuing and contract education, study abroad, and our programs for international students. Units complete a document that gives opportunity for reflection and planning. Immediate supervisors as well as subcommittees of the Program Review Committee review the program review documents.

An important element of the review of individual courses is the faculty peer evaluation process. A component of the evaluation of an individual faculty member is whether the courses they are teaching are being taught in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline and department. This mechanism allows departments to ensure that departmental and discipline expectations for courses are common across the department and discipline. Since the faculty evaluation process is based on peer review, the process allows faculty within a discipline to have an ongoing dialog about the expectations of their courses.

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

The Curriculum Committee ensures that courses and programs meet the standards of Title 5 for credit and noncredit courses and programs. When courses are brought to the Curriculum Committee, an element of the Course Outlines of Record that is reviewed is the number and type of hours (lecture, lab, conference) and the instructional methodology. In addition, courses that are to be taught via distance education require separate review and approval by the Curriculum Committee, which considers factors such as course suitability for distance education, student-instructor contact, and distance evaluation integrity.

The location of our courses and programs has been fairly stable since our last accreditation visit; however, the institution has been making a concerted effort to expand the general education course options available at campuses other than Ocean. For example, the remodeling of the Mission Campus included the creation of laboratory space to support science lab classes, and general education courses in Biological Sciences, Chemistry, and Physics are now offered. In addition, this
lab space has allowed the Mission Campus to become a center of some of our Biotechnology programs. Similar plans are in place for the construction of the new Chinatown campus. Expanding the campuses other than Ocean to become more full-service campuses has been the product of the college’s Vision and Mission Statement and the college’s Strategic Plan.

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

**Evaluation—IIA.2**

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

**Questions:**

- What established policies and institutional processes guide the development and evaluation of courses and programs? What is the role of faculty?
- Do these procedures lead to assessment of quality and improvement? Who is responsible for identifying appropriate student learning outcomes?
- Are student learning outcomes established for each course and program? How is this “fit” evaluated?
- What processes exist to approve and administer courses and programs? Are the processes effective?
- How are courses and programs evaluated? How often? What are the results of the evaluations?
- What improvements to courses and programs have occurred as a result of evaluation? How does the institution assure that it relies on faculty discipline expertise for establishing the quality of its courses and programs?

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) has developed a rigorous method of identifying, approving, and evaluating learning outcomes for courses and programs. Review of course and program learning outcomes has become an ongoing part of the Curriculum Committee approval process. Also, thanks to the efforts of the SLO Work Group and faculty departmental leadership, there is
now a wide and shared understanding of how the assessment of SLOs provides a framework for course and program improvement.

The role of the faculty is paramount in the review and improvement of the quality of our courses and programs. The faculty is involved at every level of the assessment process from development of learning outcomes to their applications and evaluation. There is a very detailed set of protocols in the Curriculum Committee Handbook, relevant to every stage of the development process, and a refined set of protocols for evaluation in the program review process.

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

Each department is responsible for creating, reviewing and assessing course and program outcomes within its offerings. Delivery and assessment is the responsibility of classroom faculty who are supervised by their department chair. The Curriculum Committee conducts a rigorous peer-review process of every course and program proposed. The committee consists of 18 faculty, 6 administrators, 1 classified staff and 2 students. After a course and/or program has CC approval it is referred to the Board of Trustees for their approval and in certain cases (non-credit courses, programs exceeding 17 units, etc.) the State Chancellor’s Office as well.

At CCSF the faculty peer evaluation includes an appraisal of the quality, academic rigor and appropriateness of that professor’s instruction. Additionally, each department is subject to an annual program review where all offerings can be evaluated and goals for improvement discussed.

In 2008-2009 CCSF piloted a revised program review process where the means of assessment, measurement criteria, analysis and plans for improvement of one course and one program. After the first year the template was modified and this procedure is now integral to the program review process with departments expected to discuss the assessment process in depth. The decentralized nature of implementation of the SLO process at CCSF ensures that discipline-specific faculties are responsible for the quality of their courses and programs.

There are two functioning bodies coordinating these activities, the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the SLO Workgroup. The PRC reviews unit progress in course and program assessment. The SLO Workgroup, along with the Department Chairs Council, provides staff development opportunities and coaching. Included in the PRC’s 2009-2010 overview of the annual Program Review was the comment that, “each department needs to establish and maintain an on-going cycle of planning, assessment, review and revision of curriculum.”

**Evaluation—IIA.2.a.**

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

- How are competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes determined? What is the role of faculty? What is the role of advisory committees?

- How has the institution structured the relationship between student learning outcomes, competency levels for degrees, certificates, programs, and courses?

- Do students have a clear path to achieving the student learning outcomes required of a course, program degree, certificate? How well does the institution achieve and evaluate the effectiveness of learning at each level?

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

General education student learning outcomes have been identified by the Bipartite Committee, which includes faculty and administrators. These outcomes were the result of mapping against our institutional criteria and Title 5 requirements for general education, but they have yet to be assessed.

Departments are undertaking a continuous review of program learning outcomes. They are introduced at the Curriculum Committee and revised within the department through unit dialog. (Add additional information regarding percentage of departments with PLOs after the data is collected for the Accreditation Annual Report.)

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

For example, the Diagnostic Medical Imaging Program uses an advisory committee to measure success in areas such as on-the-job competency and the professionalism of its graduates. [Ref.] Moreover, some vocational programs have undergone the DACUM (Developing A Curriculum) process in order to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes in their curriculum. Another example is Automotive Technology, which worked with industry advisors to develop course and program learning outcomes that are in line with national standards. As a result this program recently received NATEF certification.

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

CCSF’s Office of CTE launched a new initiative to support faculty that had an interest in collecting and analyzing data to make changes in course and program delivery called the “CTE Student Success Initiative”. Through this initiative Institutional Research staff and CTE administrators worked together with the Architecture and Childhood Development departments to gather evidence...
and develop action plans based on data. During the process, CCSF developed and is currently implementing a set of tools—including student surveys, student and faculty focus groups and student data analysis—to assess student outcomes. This model can be replicated across occupational disciplines to evaluate program success, strategize changes and help direct dialog with industry partners. This approach helps programs both meet outcome mandates for Perkins as well as address institutional goals focused on continuous organizational improvement.

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

Evaluation—IIB.2.b.

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

Questions:

- How does the institution demonstrate the quality of its instruction? What evidence exists that all programs are characterized by the variables cited in this standard?
- What institutional dialogue has occurred to enhance understanding and agreement about the quality and level of its programs?
- What criteria does the college use in deciding on the breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning breadth of each program it offers?
- What role do faculty play in these decisions? How does the college use these qualities (breadth, depth, etc.) to determine that a program is collegiate or pre-collegiate level?

A number of college-wide, program-level, and departmental initiatives have evolved to supplement traditional formal mechanisms that ensure compliance with Title 5 regulations regarding the appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing and time to completion for all programs.

The College Curriculum Committee’s formal review process ensures at the institutional level that all instructional programs meet the aforementioned requirements. The Office of Matriculation also ensures that all course prerequisites and co-requisites are reviewed and approved in compliance with applicable Title 5 requirements. The Program Review process makes yearly checks of departmental progress [Source: CCSF Program Review 2010]. Individual departments are expected to assess their compliance with Title 5 regulations.

The institution continues to use data generated by the Office of Research, Planning, and Grants to determine the efficacy of instructional programs. For example, a yearly cycle of research tracks the performance of all students who enter CCSF from the San Francisco Unified School District. The institution also tracks transfer, job placement, student enrollment, and persistence and success rates by consulting with UC and CSU campuses and using information from sources like UC Statfinder, the CSU Academic Performance web site, and the California Community College Chancellor’s
Office. Figures available on these sites show us that students who transfer from City College graduate from UC and CSU campuses at rates as high as or higher than students from other public and private high schools and colleges around the state. The Office of Career Tech-Ed (CTE) receives data from the State Chancellor’s Office about student employment, and a number of CTE departments track job placement data of their graduates.

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

Departments that specialize in core courses with longer sequences, like Mathematics, ESL, and English, are demonstrating their commitment to student success and high-quality instruction by formally integrating access to student service programs into their course sequences.

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

[Source: CCSF Course Catalog 2010; Learning Resources and Student Services; Chancellor’s Progress Report on Student Equity and the Achievement Gap, 2010]; also, see the List of Sources at the end of this document.

Many departments have created new majors to increase the breadth of offerings for students; in Foreign Languages, new majors have been created in Chinese, French, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish. An English Major has been created in the Department of English. Earth Sciences faculty have designed new courses in Geology, Geography, and Oceanography, and Paleontology. All new courses are listed in the College Curriculum Committee minutes, but others include Automotive Mechanics, Finance, Latin American and Latino/a Studies, Marketing, Radiation Therapy Technology, and Women’s Studies.

[Sources: Flex Day Meeting Agenda, Foreign Languages Department (August 13, 2010); CCSF Catalog: English Major; Earth Sciences Program Review 2010; “Catalog Policy and Other Updates”: Counselor Seminar, March 9, 2010]. Also see the List of Sources at the end of this document.

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

[Source: Academic Senate Plenary Session Minutes, January 9, 2009].

Sequencing has been addressed by enlisting the help of students, faculty, counselors, the Board of Trustees, and the college administration. Departments with longer sequences and required transferable courses, like Mathematics and English, have addressed concerns about sequencing by increasing the number of ways students can progress to graduation or university transfer.

English faculty have created two new intensive courses, English 95 and English 961A, 6-unit courses whose purpose is to provide an alternative pathway through the English course sequence. Five sections of the former and ten of the latter will be offered starting in Spring 2011.

Mathematics is offering four sets of intensive short-term sections of Math 840 and Math 860 in Spring 2011 so that a qualified student could take both 840 and 860 in the same semester. In ESL, in the credit integrated skills sequence, reading and vocabulary are integrated with grammar and writing skills in ESL 110-170; the noncredit division offers pathways to vocational programs and to credit ESL courses.

[Sources: Executive Summary for English Department Proposal to Address Student Equity, Fall 2010-Fall 2011; “We Can Do Better: A Comprehensive Proposal from the Department of English; Update on Mathematics Department Student Equity Action Plan].

Evaluation—IIA.2.c.

Satisfactory. Although City College of San Francisco has made superior progress in some areas related to this standard and the progress of some departments within the college can be rated as “superior,” overall, the “satisfactory” rating is based on a number of factors.

First, the level of improvement has been uneven when one considers the wide range of concerns that this standard addresses. For instance, most departments focus quite heavily on high-quality instruction, breadth, depth, and rigor. But time to completion, sequencing, and synthesis of learning are more complex, difficult concerns and are being addressed more slowly.

Second, improvement varies among departments; not all have addressed problems with sequencing or time to completion at an equivalent level, for example. The college and its administration will continue to work to ensure that all departments address these two issues in particular, though it must be said that the departments in which these concerns were most pressing—those with long sequences like Math, ESL, and English—considerable changes have been made.

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

Questions:

- What assessment of student learning styles has the college performed?
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• How does the institution demonstrate that it is meeting the needs and learning styles of its students? What do faculty and staff know about learning needs and pedagogical approaches?

• Do courses include multiple ways of assessing student learning? How does the college determine what delivery modes are appropriate for its students?

• What teaching methodologies are commonly used? How are methodologies selected? Have faculty discussed the relationship between teaching methodologies and student performance? What efforts has the college made to match methodologies with particular needs of students with learning styles?

• Has the college investigated the effectiveness of its delivery modes? How effective are delivery modes and instructional methodologies that the college uses in producing learning?

Description—IIA.2.d. (Compare with Standard I.A.1 -- at some point)

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

CCSF provides an exceptionally wide range of programs and services addressing students’ diversity as well as their needs and learning styles. Students have access to several groups of counselors who are available on a daily basis (New Student Counseling, Continuing Student Counseling, and International Student Counseling, etc.).

Students can also turn to various networks for resources and guidance. To quote just a few: the Asian Pacific American Student Success Center (APASS), the African-American Scholastic Program (AASP), the Filipino American Student Success Program (Tulay) and the Latino Services Network (LSN). Most of them offer a variety of classes (some pertaining to learning strategies), group sessions, peer-support study groups, mentoring, computer stations and further counseling. Students with special needs can turn to The Disabled Students Programs and Services that provide similar help in addition to equipment (hearing aids, note takers, scooters, etc.).

Some projects also target specific populations: Veterans’ Success Center, Second Chance (which supports formally incarcerated students), Guardian Scholars (which assists foster and emancipated youth), Project SHINE (which benefits immigrant and refugee students), PUENTE (which helps prepare educationally disadvantaged students for college), and Math, Engineering, Science, Achievement Program (MESA) (which assists educationally disadvantaged students pursuing a math based career).

CCSF also has a large Learning Assistance Center that serves an average of 8,000 students for a total of 120,000 hours per semester. The LAC offers a multitude of labs and resource centers. Examples include: the Tutorial Center, the Writing Lab, the Biology Resource Center, and the Transitional Studies Department Adult Learning and Tutorial Center. Tutors are taught how to determine a student’s learning style whereas the students, on their SLO surveys, get to rate their tutor’s ability to recognize and respond to their learning styles. The LAC also provides Introduction to Tutoring classes.
Flex Day sessions always include some activities referring to diversity topics thus improving faculty skills in certain areas (e.g., the following topic which was discussed in 2010: Does a Learning Problem Always Mean a Learning Disability). These sessions also allow the instructors to meet and discuss student learning challenges. In the Foreign Language Department, faculty devotes part of its Flex Day by meeting each semester to discuss teaching strategies and the diversity of the student body. During the semester, instructors also meet to talk and reflect on their teaching methods and textbooks (whether informally or during Curriculum Committee meetings).

Faculty also addresses the diverse needs of the students in light of the recent “Student Equity Hearing” which have spotlighted the concerns of various groups such as students with basic skills requirements, international students, students with limited English proficiency. In addition, instructors participate in professional developmental conferences and workshops offered on or off campus (i.e. California Community College Foreign Language Council meeting). Also, the Multicultural Infusion Project helps instructors modify their teaching methods to increase their focus on multicultural perspectives.

Course outlines include references to the methodologies employed. Methodologies take multiple forms: lectures, case studies, individual research, group discussion, group projects, research papers and independent studies. Instructors are encouraged to incorporate multiple methodologies in all of their courses. When interviewed, instructors (in Math, Earth Sciences, ESL and Languages) all agreed that they make sure to vary their approaches during their class (using the board or visual aids to appeal to visual learners or hands-on activities for kinesthetic learners for instance).

Instructors use standardized tests that can be modified accordingly but also include portfolio, performances, research-based projects, essays, etc.

CCSF offers online classes. The number of students enrolled in online classes doubled between 2005 and 2008 while the number of sections increased by 80%. Online classes give students greater flexibility in terms of scheduling and choice of classes.

The effectiveness of delivery modes is defined by the success of the students. While instructors can follow the growth of their own students through continuous assessments, it is presently difficult to evaluate how well these students are doing once they move on to other institutions (other than through anecdotal evidence).

Evaluation—IIA.2.d.

Satisfactory: The college always thrives to improve its outreach to a diverse population and its students’ learning styles (e.g. the recent creation of the Veterans’ Success Center which offers counselors and psychologists as well as a welcoming study area). Also, CCSF has been trying to monitor their students’ success with more efficiency (in 2010, the Academic Senate convened a workgroup to address the needs for a Student Preparation and Success Committee). While CCSF has a multitude of services and programs available for students, a lack of funding prevents faculty to participate in more conferences and workshops, thus limiting their ability to self-evaluate their teaching methods and share ideas with other instructors.
IIA.2.e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an ongoing systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

Questions:

- How does the college evaluate the effectiveness of its courses and programs?

- Do criteria used in program review include relevancy, appropriateness, achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, planning for the future? Is this process consistently followed for all college programs, regardless of the type of program (collegiate, developmental, etc.)?

- What types of data are available for program evaluation? Does the evaluation include a curricular review? Does the evaluation include a comprehensive review of the role of the program in the overall college curriculum?

- How is the relevancy of a program determined? Have student learning outcomes for the program been identified? How well are student achieving these outcomes?

- How are results of program evaluation used in institutional planning? What changes/improvements in programs have occurred as a result of the consideration of program evaluations?

Prior to the 2006 WASC accreditation report on City College of San Francisco, program reviews were completed on six year cycles. Moreover, in the statement prepared, by the College, in response to Standard II.A.2.e. for the accreditation committee (page 119 CCSF 2006 Accreditation Report) it was written, “While Program Review provides a clear and comprehensive framework to evaluate the overall effectiveness of an instructional program it does not include a comprehensive curriculum review process. In fact, curriculum review is not a required element of Program Review.

It was noted by the College, “At this time, assessment of student learning outcomes within the Program Review process” was based on “completion rates for all instructional programs, the number of students that transition from basic skills to degree applicable coursework, rates of transfer to four year institutions, the number of associate degrees, awards of achievement, and certificates granted, the number of students acquiring external licensure, and the number of students who complete internships.”

Finally, in the 2000 Accreditation Self Study Report, the visiting team stated, “given the importance of the program review system in assessing institutional effectiveness and that the findings of program reviews are an important consideration in the budget allocation process, the team recommends the College ensure the institutionalization of their program review process by requiring that all units complete their program reviews in a timely and thorough fashion.”

Following the completion of the 2006 Institutional Self Study Report and pursuant to the WASC Accreditation teams recommendations with specific reference to: Recommendation 2, Planning and Assessment, and Recommendation 3, Student Learning Outcomes, College leadership began the concentrated and systematic process to completely revamp and revitalize the CCSF program review process.
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The Focused Midterm Progress report (3-25-09) stated that the second stage of the College annual planning and budgeting process relied on the proposed new annual program review system which was designed to be inclusive for all units in the College and completely integrated into the annual planning and budgeting cycle. In 2008/09 the College inaugurated a voluntary pilot program review process. A total of 105 units completed program reviews using a revised program review template developed by the Program Review Committee and the Office of Research and Planning. Each College unit received an electronic template that included five years of data on enrollment, personnel budgetary responsibilities, student and/or employee satisfaction and a productivity measure depending upon whether it was an instructional student service or administrative unit. The template also included text boxes designed to elicit information on:

- Reflections on data trends
- Summarize progress on prior planning objectives
- Identify major planning objectives for next fiscal year
- Discuss the status of learning assessment for courses and programs
- Describe resources needed to meet planning objectives

During the pilot period all program review templates were reviewed by the appropriate senior administrators and then forwarded to the Program Review Committee for discussion and action.

The Program Review Committee (PRC) consists of the College’s three Vice Chancellors, four faculty, two classified staff and two student representatives. The PRC is the heart of the College’s program review system, and in effect, the first filter for reviewing all annual planning objectives, and budget requests. The new pilot program review plan detailed that the PRC would:

- Review all annual program review reports and make recommendations directly to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) for budget modifications.
- Review program review reports for alignment of cost center unit planning objectives with College planning objectives.
- Review the status of student learning outcomes.
- Be responsible for the periodic evaluation of the College program review system and submit a final report with recommendations for improvements to the Chancellor.
- Review special program review reports and evaluations where the Chancellor requests a special review.

In the 2008/09 pilot a template was provided for the purpose of documenting Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Required information included means of assessment, measurement criteria, analysis, and plans for improvement. The goal was to begin the systematic and explicit integration of including SLOs into the annual program review. The program review template now asks units to identify a six year plan for revising course curriculum and programs.

During the spring 2009 semester the evaluation of the pilot process began and continued through the fall 2009. In addition another round of program review was completed for 2009/10. Based on information contained in the program reviews and student learning outcomes generated, Deans’ comments, program subcommittee comments and discussions with department chairs individual School Master Education Plans will be written which in turn will be incorporated into the overall...
College Annual Plan and future planning documents. The new program review document is now a living document which has the potential to continually evolve and over a period of years map a unit and the SLOs associated with course curriculum and learning programs. It should be noted the College is engaged in another round of College wide 2010/11 program reviews.

Evaluation—IIA.2.e.

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

The department chairs understand that program reviews can and will effect the direction of their department, so they document carefully, demonstrate need, demonstrate curriculum relevancy and systematically update and revise courses as appropriate, demonstrate efficacy of courses and programs through the use of well designed SLO’s.

IIA.2.f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

Questions:

- To what extent does the institution understand and embrace the notion of ongoing planning?
- Does the college have a planning process in place? Is it cyclical, i.e., does it incorporate systematic evaluation of programs and services, improvement planning, implementation, and re-evaluation? How does college budgeting of resources follow planning?
- To what extent are institutional data available and used for planning? Are data analyzed and interpreted for easy understanding by the college community?

In 2004, the college adopted ongoing planning as an essential component of its review process. The overall process consists of five major components: 1) Strategic Planning; 2) Annual Planning; 3) Cost Center Planning; 4) Budget Planning, and 5) Assessment.

The Strategic Plan is the College’s longest-range plan. It is supported by the College Education Master Plan, Technology Plan and Institutional Advancement Plan. These plans are developed in a collaborative manner through the College’s Shared Governance System. The College’s mission, goals, and objectives stated in the Strategic Plan are the basis for continuous planning, thereby facilitating consistency and continuity in educational and fiscal planning. This process also allows for the monitoring and review of program implementation and monitoring of results. The Strategic Plan is the foundation on which the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) reviews cost and makes recommendations to the Chancellor. It should be noted that the PBC represents all major constituencies at the college: faculty, administration, staff, and students.
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The Annual Plan reflects annual institutional objectives. Institutional objectives are developed based on the Strategic Plan Implementation Schedule and reflect institutional priorities. Again, the Annual Plan reflects the collective thinking from the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and the PBC. The Annual Plan represents core educational and administrative activities, which focus on the improvement and expansion of the programmatic direction at the college.

Departments, schools, programs, and administrative offices are classified as cost centers for the purpose of aligning programmatic and budget planning. The cost center objectives are then aligned to institutional objectives through the completion of a Cost Plan and Budget Form. This Cost Center Planning process ensures the linkage between individual objectives generated by the cost centers and the annual institutional objectives. The cost center budgets are then reviewed by the PBC who recommends budget allocation to the Chancellor. The Board of Trustees then reviews and adopts budget.

The assessment process takes place semiannually in January and June. The purpose of the assessment is to address the progress of cost center and institutional objectives. Further, this process enables college constituencies to identify needs and areas of improvement.

To monitor its strategic objectives, CCSF produces an annual report on its progress and achievements. This report called “The College Performance Indicators Report” (College Performance Indicators Report, 2006-2007, September 2008 - http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/ccpi2008.pdf) is distributed to and discussed with faculty, staff, and administrators. This report is included as part of the College’s Annual Progress Report to the people of San Francisco. It is available on the College website. This data serves as the basis of educational planning since it evaluates student outcomes in the areas of retention, persistence, and graduation rates. Further, the findings of this report become the basis for the development of goals as articulated in the Strategic and Annual Plans for the college.

The institution engages in planning at all levels through its Shared Governance structure. This is evidenced by overarching planning documents, which include the Strategic Plan, the Management Plan and the Educational Master Plan. Planning also occurs on an annual basis and includes the Annual Plan and the Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment Reports. The College Performance Indicators Report is an annual publication and serves to provide a set of performance indicators aligned with the eight priorities of the Strategic Plan. This report is published and made available to the residents of San Francisco.

The systematic review of instructional programs primarily occurs through the Program Review process and is supplemented by the College Curriculum Committee. Program Review is designed to provide faculty the opportunity to engage in a self study that encompasses several aspects of their program including a review of student learning outcomes and program improvement.

Another process used to evaluate instructional programs is the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA) of 2006 (Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=109_cong_bills&docid=f:s250enr.txt.pdf) For many years the institution has used a formal and systematic method for the allocation of Perkins funds. The Office of Career and Technical Education administers this evaluation process that begins with an annual election of an allocation committee. To access Perkins funds, a CTE department must submit a proposal. A Perkins Development Team must be established within the department and receive training from the
Perkins Coordinator regarding the effective development of proposals that fulfill departmental needs and the criteria established under Federal legislation. These proposals must demonstrate how departmental needs were evaluated (e.g., use of focus groups, advisory committee recommendations, or institutional data) and how the department will meet the eight permissible uses of funds as authorized by Perkins. Proposals also must demonstrate the use of Core Performance Indicators data in the proposal planning process and in the assessment of performance outcomes.

There are also faculty-initiated efforts to evaluate instructional programs. For example, beginning four years ago, several departments and one program (i.e., Architecture, Art, Graphic Communications, Photography, and Multimedia Studies) began a collaborative effort to develop courses that could be taught in any of the participating departments. After review of the course offerings for each department, a common instructional need was discovered that was not adequately addressed by any of the departments involved. As a result of these initial discussions, the Design Collaborative was established. Those courses developed by the Design Collaborative have now been offered for two years and have been evaluated by participating faculty with regard to the learning outcomes and student competency.

**Evaluation—IIA.2.f.**

Based on assessment of the process, CCSF would qualify for a superior rating in relation to the process it has undergone. The College is committed to ongoing planning. As evidenced, the College utilizes a cyclical approach to review process, monitor progress, and align funding resources. Institutional data are available to the college community on the website and efforts are continuously made to summarize and synthesize information in a readily understood format. For example, the Chancellor has instituted a series of ongoing presentations made by various departments to address the achievement gap. The Board of Trustees has also conducted hearings for the same purpose. It should be noted that the College has been severely impacted by the reduction in state funding. Nonetheless, CCSF continues to show constant progress and growth in measuring achievement through systematic, cyclical, and data driven methods.

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

- How does the institution ensure the use of non-biased valid measures of student learning?

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

- Broadcasting 119, 120
- Chemistry 101, 101A, 101B
- Fire Science 111
- English 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 961A
- English as a Second Language 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, 160, 170; Noncredit Levels 2, 4, 6
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Spanish 1, 1A and French 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 2B

Departments making use of cross-section assessments were asked how the validity of these measures had been established, and how cultural and linguistic biases were avoided in the creation and administrations of the tests.

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

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

In credit English as a Second Language courses, students take common final examinations at each level assessing reading, grammar, and writing. The reading and grammar questions have been locally validated for both predictive validity and correlations with subsequent success in general courses. The writing components, graded holistically, are grounded by the use of rubrics and anchor papers. All questions are panel-written by diverse faculty to avoid cultural and linguistic biases, and revised during a final editing process.

English 95 and 96/1A make use of common examinations, as have English 93 and 96 until recently. English 90 and 91 does not make use of common examinations, but does require a common portfolio for promotion into subsequent courses. These portfolios, based on essays, annotated readings, and a cover letter, make use of 1 essay and 1 reading common to all sections. The English faculty uses a common rubric for grading, and grade portfolios as a group, using two raters to minimize differences between instructors, and a third reader in the event of discrepancies.

In French and Spanish courses, instructors make use of a common bank of test sections to minimize differences in assessment between instructors, and work is currently underway in Foreign Languages courses to incorporate common elements into final examinations. Other departments that do not currently use common assessments are also in the process of implementing them. Broadcast Electronic Media Arts is implementing a common examination into Broadcasting 119.

Chemistry 101 and 101A use common, team-written sections for the midterm examination, and all students in these courses take the same final. Chemistry 101B sections share common portions of both midterm and final examinations. These common materials have been developed by faculty consensus over time, and faculty conducts regular revision, taking into account how different student populations are performing, and looking for common mistakes indicating flawed or biased items.

Many departments responding indicated some reliance upon nationally-vetted textbook question banks written by experts in the respective fields, or norming to criteria of professional organizations, as ways to help minimize bias in tests. There is, however, recognition that these materials, though they minimize differences between college instructors, have inherent biases. Departments therefore take full advantage of CCSF’s faculty diversity to attenuate these problems.
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They indicated that, when an exam item is deemed to demonstrate bias, it is removed from examinations through faculty consensus.

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

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

**Evaluation—IIA.2.g.**

The College’s performance on this standard is satisfactory at present. The academic domains that move large numbers of the College’s students through well-defined sequences are making use of common examinations, in some cases validated scientifically. Many more departments and academic units are moving toward common examinations as a way to help gauge attainment of student learning outcomes, so this process is likely to continue in a positive direction.

**IIA.2.h.** The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

**Questions:**

- Are student learning outcomes the basis for credit awarded for courses? Are credits awarded consistent with accepted norms in higher education?

Title 5 Section 55002.5 establishes the standards for awarding credit for student work. Our Course Outlines of Record follow these standards [ref 1]. The ratio of hours of student work to units is verified by the Curriculum Committee during their review. The Curriculum Committee also reviews the Course Outlines of Record to ensure that the content of the course supports the learning outcomes of the course, and that the content justifies the units awarded. [ref 2]

**Evaluation—IIA.2.h.**

**IIA.2.i.** The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.
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Questions:

- By what means does the institution ensure that achievement of stated programmatic learning outcomes are the basis for awarding degrees and certificates?
- What institutional dialogue has occurred about the learning expected of students in order for them to earn a degree or certificate?
- How has the college identified student learning outcomes for its degrees and certificates?

The College Catalog contains detailed descriptions for all degree and certificate programs. The college awards degrees and certificates based upon completion of coursework from a program’s required core and selective units. These requirements are based on faculty established major learning outcomes and student learning objectives which are part of the Course Outline of Record.

Grades and successful completion of courses are based on student demonstration of proficiency of the stated major learning outcomes and learning objectives. All course outlines include multiple measures of assessment to ensure that students have indeed achieved the learning objectives. Theses formats include essays, quizzes, exams, presentations, oral reports, demonstrations and performances. Some programs in the arts and in career and technical education areas require the completion of capstone courses, portfolios, internships or clinicals.

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

The college is currently formalizing and aligning the development of SLOs for all programs through the Curriculum Committee. Currently, the career technical education departments are implementing program SLOs. The college Bipartite Committee, comprised of administrators and members of the Senate Executive Committee recently approved general education SLOs. These SLOs will form the basis for our transfer curriculum and non CTE associate degree programs.

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

Evaluation—IIA.2.i.

The college curriculum includes about 3000 courses. While a concerted effort has been made to identify SLOs for all courses and programs, the sheer volume of work associated with this task has encouraged us to pursue a broader view. Through a process of dialogue throughout the college, we have set our focus on general education and major SLOs to address student capacity to pursue...
continued higher education; basic skills curriculum to ensure student progress from noncredit to credit and basic skills to college level in areas of math, English and English as a Second Language; and CTE SLOs to ensure students’ competency to enter the workforce as identified by the field experts.

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

Questions:

• What evidence is found in the catalogue of a faculty-developed rationale for general education that serves as the basis for inclusion of courses in general education?

• How are student learning outcomes used to analyze courses for inclusion as general education?

• How is the rationale for general education communicated to all stakeholders?

• How is the general education philosophy reflected in the degree requirements?

The College Catalog is the primary venue for communicating the general education (GE) goals, rationale, and philosophy to all stakeholders. The GE requirements section of the catalog begins with a summary of the goals of the requirement areas, and a more detailed discussion of each requirement precedes the list of courses that satisfy each requirement. These requirements and their descriptions are revised periodically and as needed in a process that usually begins with faculty and is always approved by the Academic Senate Executive Council before final review by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, which includes both faculty and administrators (see recent change to the title of Area H, as an example).

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

From there, proposals to place a course in a GE requirement area use forms that list the criteria for inclusion into each area. Successful proposals detail how the course meets those criteria, with specific reference to sections of the course outline. Faculty on the Academic Senate Executive Council (a 29-member body, elected by the entire faculty) examine each proposal closely, looking for evidence in both the major learning outcomes and the course content that the course meets the criteria. To receive final approval for inclusion in a GE area, a course must be unanimously approved by all 34 members of the Bipartite Committee or by at least a two-thirds majority of the
faculty and, separately, of the administrators on the committee. The process to add a new course to the GE requirements is a thoughtful, rigorous one that has resulted in a wide range of choices for students that ensure them a diverse, enriching education.

GE courses are required in eight different areas that together represent the philosophy of City College and the liberal arts tradition: “All students granted an Associate degree should be required to study a variety of general breadth courses in addition to those courses which are required by a student’s major” (CCSF Catalog, 2010-2011, 44).

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

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

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

Evaluation—IIA.3

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

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

Questions:

- How are the basic content and methodology of traditional areas of knowledge in general education determined?
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- What process is used to ensure that general education courses include this content and methodology?
- Do general education courses demonstrate student achievement of comprehensive student learning outcomes?
- Do student learning outcomes for general education courses require students to understand the basic content and methodology in the major areas of knowledge? Is there a consistent process for assuring that the content and methodology are included in course outlines?
- How well are students able to apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors?

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

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

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

Evaluation—IIA.3.a.

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

Questions:

- What criteria have been developed to determine if general education students have attained these goals?
- What criteria does the college use to assure that the required skill level meets collegiate standards? Is there a consistent process for assuring that expected skill levels are included in
course outlines? What measures of student skill are employed? Is the college satisfied that these measures are effective?

- How well are students achieving these outcomes? How well are students able to apply these skills to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors?

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

CCSF continues to expand and publish course and program SLOs. By the end of the spring 11 term ___ percent of courses and ___ percent of programs had identified SLOs with ___% of the courses and ___ % of the program completing the assessment process. Each department is now required to review and update course outlines to include measurable SLOs.

**Evaluation—IIA.3.b.**

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

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

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

**Questions:**

- How are student learning outcomes developed to address concerns about ethics and effective citizenship? How is it determined where to include student learning leading to development of these qualities?

“Citizenship” within the college is fostered through the Office of Outreach and Recruitment’s Ambassadors’ program. A cadre of current students help to orient incoming freshman to the
campus and college culture. During the year, the Ambassadors visit high schools and community based agencies to recruit prospective students.

The Associated Students partners with CCSF student development services to facilitate students’ matriculation and engagement with the college and wider community.

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

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

In addition, there are approximately fifteen projects designed for students to provide service both to communities outside of the college and within the college, enabling students to develop leadership skills. Many of the projects are not tied to a specific course, but are associated with the following departments: LGBT, Health, Child Development, Astronomy and Student Health Services. Courses which have sections linked to the projects include: WOM 25, English 93, English 96, Biology 26, LALS 15, Sociology 1, Sociology 2, Sociology 30, LBCS 93D, CNIT 197, Fashion 45A and Music. In Fall 2010, credit courses that offered Project SHINE as a service learning option included: ASAM 20, 30, and 35; IDST 50; Spanish 3A; ESL 79, 150, 160; POLS 1, 2, and 3; LALS 10, HLTH 10; and English 93.

Faculty at CCSF have access to the Multicultural Infusion Project, which supports faculty in transforming curriculum to infuse multicultural content and practice. Monthly meetings are held to learn pedagogy and content. Annual meetings enable participants to reflect on ways in which the institution can better serve students underrepresented students.

The college is privileged to be the steward of Mexican muralist Diego Rivera’s work depicting Pan American unity. It exemplifies the use of art to create an awareness of a historical movement, which addressed relevant social and political issues. The mural is accessible to the public and incorporated by student ambassadors in their campus tours presentations. Under Latin American & Latino Studies 14 (LALS 14), students participate in on going research about the Diego Rivera mural and contribute their work to the library archives.

Evaluation—IIB.3.c.

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

Co-chairs for Standard II: Ophelia Clark, Alice Murillo, and Deana Abma
IIA.4 All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

Questions:

- Do degree programs include at least one area of focused study or interdisciplinary core?

The Associate in Science and Associate in Arts degrees are awarded by CCSF based on the satisfaction of several different requirements, as noted in the Associate Degree Graduation Requirements section of the catalog. Among the listed requirements is the Major requirement. Students can satisfy this requirement in one of several ways:

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

Program advisors within CCSF’s various departments help students who desire to plan special programs of study for their degree.

Evaluation—IIA.4

Rating: Superior. CCSF continues to make it a priority that the education offered in its degree programs is not only consistently broad and current, but also comprehensive and elective- reflecting the interests of the student earning the degree. Evidence for this can be found in the Programs and Courses guides from past years. These documents reinforce that CCSF’s priorities as an institution are to provide broad perspective as well as specialization within all of its degree programs.

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

Questions:

- What evidence exists that students who complete vocational and occupational degrees and certificates meet employment competencies? Are prepared for licensure? Are prepared for certification by external agencies?
- How does the college acquire reliable information about its students’ ability to meet these requirements?

City College of San Francisco offers 25 general areas of career and technical study, which includes 178 credit and non-credit certificates, degrees or Awards of Achievement. Of these programs, at least 28 prepare students for passing external licensing or certifying exams. Any new certificate (or
18 units or higher) or degree program must complete a rigorous review process established by the Ed Code. The process involves obtaining Labor Market Research, input from Advisory Boards, and approval from the College Curriculum Committee, as well as the endorsement of the Bay Area Community College Occupational Planning Committee. These activities, along with the program review conducted by each career and technical education program, contribute to the standards demanded by employers and external licensing agencies. (Title 3, Sections 78015-78016)

The College currently does not track graduates who pass external licensure or certification exams. However, the Office of Institutional Advancement, Research, Planning and Grants collects data for licensure pass rates for individual CCSF departments. The Office must rely upon licensing agencies for the data and in some instances is experiencing difficulty retrieving the data. A software program that will help students find employment and then track students success is currently under evaluation. (College Performance Indicators Report, 2006-07, p.32)

Each career and technical program that prepares students for external licensure or certification must adhere to program standards as required by the applicable licensing agency. Individual departments handle data collection of external licensing data differently. While many do not collect data, several programs assure that students meet employment standards by receiving external agency approval or accreditation. (refer to evidence at end of section).

Other college-wide efforts promote the goal of meeting employment standards. Occupational programs are required to meet with Industry Advisory Boards, although some are more active than others. Members include industry professionals who communicate to faculty information about skill sets needed to be successful in the industry at hand.

Recent Advisory Board activities include: Business Advisory Board met in October 2010 and provided input into Green and Sustainable Business program development and the use of social media in business; Real Estate Advisory Board met in October 2010 for curriculum development input for Real Estate Marketing and Commercial Real Estate courses, and updates on local commercial leasing and mortgage lending changes; Trauma Prevention and Recovery Advisory Board met in March and November 2010 and reviewed student learning outcomes and provided input for certificate modifications; Drug and Alcohol Studies Board met in October 2010 and provided input on the collaboration between the Drug and Alcohol Studies program and the new CCSF Community Mental Health Certificate program and the development of an internship preparation workshop. (Calif. Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sect. 55601; Calif. Gov. Code, Sect. 15370.24)

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

The California Resource Center for Occupational Program Design and Evaluation is a branch of CCSF. The function is to provide service to business, education and industry by conducting
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DACUM (Developing a Curriculum) job analyses. With the services offered by trained faculty a department can create or update an ideal education or training program for specific industry needs. Several career and technical programs have completed DACUMs, most recently Fashion and Design and Hybrid Technology in Automotive Technology.

Currently, there is no college-wide mechanism for measuring student job placement. However, the Calif. State Chancellor’s Office furnishes annual reports that reflect Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA) Core Indicator data uploaded from the College to the State MIS. Core Indicator #4 measures placement by the number of student completers included in the California Employment Development Department Unemployment Insurance wage database. The most recent data available, 2007-08, reports the college aggregate match rate of 84.6%. This reflects an increase of almost 6% from the last report. This data, however, is not entirely conclusive in that it does not demonstrate how well CCSF graduates meet employment standards, nor does it measure the number of graduates who become successfully self-employed or move out of state for employment. (Calif. State Chancellor’s Office Core Indicator Report, February 2010)

There is new data from the CCCCO that is being validated and will need to be added to this section before the summer final edit of this accreditation report.

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

Evaluation --IIA.5

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

Overall, CCSF earns a “Satisfactory” score in developing processes to acquire information about students’ ability to meet employer standards and pass external exams. Since the previous Self-Study report was completed the college has been looking at this area more carefully. As a result, a working group has been developed which is taking serious steps to adopt a comprehensive job development and placement tracking tool. More advanced technological resources are now available that didn’t exist previously. By next year, the college will have implemented a technologically sophisticated, online system that is in use by other colleges.

IIA.6 The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution’s officially approved course outline.
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Questions:

- How does the institution assure that information about its programs is clear and accurate? Are degrees and certificates clearly described? Are student learning outcomes included in descriptions of courses and programs?

- How does the institution verify that students receive a course syllabus that includes student learning outcomes?

- How does the college verify that individual sections of courses adhere to the course objectives/learning outcomes?

The catalog is available in print and online. Courses and programs are reviewed for catalog inclusion by department chairs at least once a year, and are further reviewed by the Dean of Instruction before inclusion in the catalog.

New courses and programs are developed according to standards outlined in the Curriculum Committee Handbook, which includes student learning outcomes. Courses and programs are reviewed by Department Chairs, the Curriculum Committee and Dean of Instruction. Instructional Departments complete program review on an annual basis. All courses are updated and reviewed within a six-year cycle. Program Learning Outcomes are increasingly being developed and added to the catalog and program brochures.

As stated in the CCSF Faculty Handbook, all instructors are mandated to distribute thorough syllabi, which include course expectations and student learning outcomes (insert student survey results re: receipt of syllabus in classes). All faculty are subject to tenure review, or peer review every three years, which would include reviewing course syllabi and their distribution to students.

Evaluation --IIA.6

Satisfactory. CCSF is undergoing a systematic effort to ensure that all new courses and programs meet the requirements for clarity and stated learning outcomes. Instructors, Department Chairs, School Deans and the Dean of Instruction all review courses and/or program descriptions for clarity and stated outcomes and objectives. Course /program descriptions are based on the rubric as stated in the Curriculum Committee Handbook.

All instructors are mandated in the Faculty Handbook to provide students with course descriptions. The college verifies that individual courses adhere to the course objectives/learning outcomes through peer/tenure review of faculty and thorough departmental review of courses and program requirements.

The college needs to review the many existing courses and programs that have not been updated to reflect student learning outcomes.

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

Questions:

- What policies does the institution have to address transfer of coursework in and out of the institution and how are they communicated to students? Are these policies regularly reviewed?

- How does the institution develop, implement, and evaluate articulation agreements?

The college catalog (pg. 392) includes a clear policy of how coursework transferred in from other institutions is evaluated. Students may use coursework completed at other institutions to fulfill program, general education, and/or elective unit requirements for the Associate Degree or certificate programs at City College of San Francisco. Specifically, students may use lower and/or upper division transfer coursework to fulfill any or all of the following:

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

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

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

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

Transfer of coursework from City College to other institutions is spelled out in the thousands of detailed articulation agreements the college has with University of California, California State University, California Independent Colleges and Universities, and Out-of-State Public and Private Colleges, and Information. These agreements are continually expanded and updated as curriculum information and student needs and interests change. Articulation information is available in the print and online catalog, general education worksheets for students, time schedule transfer information pages, statewide ASSIST website, college articulation website, and student alphabetical transcripts generated from the Banner database. Updates are presented through meeting presentations, workshops and emails.

The college has also participated in statewide efforts to streamline articulation through common course numbering and model curricula programs. Currently, it is engaged in the statewide Course Identification Numbering System and Transfer Model Curriculum efforts.

Co-chairs for Standard II: Ophelia Clark, Alice Murillo, and Deana Abma
The College supports an Office of Articulation with a full-time articulation officer and a half-time clerical assistant. The Office is responsible for the development and maintenance of articulation agreements and the dissemination of all information related to articulation.

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

**Evaluation –IIA.6.a.**

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

A longer term project would be to develop a database of courses from other colleges and universities that have been approved for equivalency with CCSF courses. This database would need to be updated regularly and should be available online.

**IIA.6.b. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.**

**Questions:**

- What policy does the institution have to address elimination of or major changes in programs?
- Are students advised on how to complete educational requirements when programs are eliminated or modified?

According to California Education Code Section 70902/Title 5, CCR, Sections 55230 et seq. and 53203, ultimate approval for program revision (major changes) rests with the Chancellor of the College. Guidance for program revision is covered in the Curriculum Committee Handbook: 4.3 Revising a Major. Revisions themselves originate and develop at the Departmental level with final forms being submitted to the Curriculum Committee for further processing and approval.

For non-Academic programs, California Education Code, Section 78016 provides for the review of and termination of vocational programs that do not meet established criteria, and Board Policy 6.14 establishes that the institution will terminate vocational programs in accordance with applicable law. Interviews with department heads, school Deans, and program chairs have revealed the following: in general, departments assess the needs for its programs according to internal and external criteria and revises accordingly.
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There is no college-wide policy for departments to follow in evaluating its individual programs for termination or modification. Students are informed and supported by faculty, department heads, and counselors/advisors when programs are modified or terminated. CCSF Catalog 2010 p.44 explains protection against changes in programs (catalog rights). The stated policy basically ensures that if programs are changed during the time a student has been continuously enrolled, the student has a right to follow the program as originally stated in the catalog in effect at the onset of their study. If a course is no longer offered, the department makes accommodations for that student by accepting a replacement course, waiving a course requirement, etc.

In practice, when a program is deemed terminable, the usual procedure (phasing out) is to allow current students to finish out the program while no new students are taken in. All efforts are made to ensure students achieve their educational goals. When revisions are finalized, the College’s counseling department is notified and the appropriate campus counselors are informed and advised on how to help affected students realize their educational goals.

**Evaluation --IIA.6.b.**

Superior. Program eliminations and modifications are successfully handled at the departmental level with appropriate approvals received higher up. Special care is taken to ensure students’ progression toward their educational goals. There were no involvements or interventions found since the last WASC self-study report. Although there is no system-wide policy set that establishes a step-by-step procedure to follow regarding program modification and elimination other than the Curriculum Committee’s Handbook, each department has successfully handled needed program adjustments to ensure its viability and supported affected students to ensure their educational success.

IIA.6.c. The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.

**Questions:**

- What policy does the institution have to address elimination of or major changes in programs?
- Are students advised on how to complete educational requirements when programs are eliminated or modified?

City College represents itself to students, personnel and the public through a range of publications and statements. The College Catalog contains descriptions of all courses, information about programs of study, and statements of the College’s regulations, rules and policies. The Catalog is produced, updated, reviewed for accuracy, and reprinted annually under the supervision of the Office of Instruction, and is available in both print and electronic forms. Updates to program and course information are done based on Curriculum Committee actions – any new courses, modifications to courses, or course deletions are done through the Curriculum Committee.
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Other sections of the catalog (e.g., Library and Learning Resources, Academic Policies) are reviewed by the owners of that section. The Office of Instruction asks for such updates each year in the late fall/early spring, and incorporates all reported changes into the next printed version of the catalog.

The Office of Instruction also maintains two versions of the catalog on the College’s website: the first is a PDF version that matches that year's printed catalog exactly, and has all sections of the catalog; the second contains just course and program information, and is updated continuously through the year, based on Curriculum Committee actions. In addition to publishing the catalog on College’s website, the office of instruction gives paper copies to counselors and some key offices. Students may also purchase a paper copy of the catalog at the Campus bookstore.

When the office of instruction receives notification of approval of new certificate or degree programs after the catalog has been published, they include this information in an online catalog addendum. Such programs are typically listed as "pending state approval" in the printed version of the catalog, and the addendum gives details of these programs once approval has been gained.

The college’s class schedule is printed thrice-yearly and mailed to all San Francisco Residents and public libraries, and is available through the campus bookstore and on all neighborhood campuses. This schedule provides detailed information about each semester’s course offerings, campus maps and information about programs and services the college offers. With each publication, the schedule is reviewed for accuracy, currency and completeness by the Office of Public Information and the Chancellor.

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

In order to save on printing costs, PIO recently shifted from a print to an electronic format for City Currents, which is now posted weekly on the college’s website and distributed electronically to all personnel via the college’s email system. PIO also serves as a point of entry for all outside inquiries about the College’s policies and procedures, referring requests for public records to the College’s Legal Counsel, and directing all press inquiries to the appropriate vice-chancellor, dean or department chair.

Finally, PIO communicates City College’s mission and programs to the community via outreach such as advertisements in all San Francisco neighborhood and ethnic newspapers, and at least one national publications (Southwest Spirit, the in-flight magazine of Southwest Air). Most recently, the Outreach Office started a City College Facebook page offering information about upcoming scholarship applications, registration deadlines, job opportunities, and campus events, as well as links to in-house videos about the college counseling programs, student achievements, and international student assistance programs. The Facebook page has 5,337 registered “fans.”

PIO also produces a bi-annual “Flex Day” Booklet for faculty attending the college’s professional development day, which takes place each semester before the first day of instruction. This booklet contains an official statement by the college’s Chancellor, addressed to the faculty and personnel. The statement is written and reviewed by the Chancellor himself.
The college’s website provides information on the college’s mission, instructional programs, support programs and administration. In 2007, after a public bidding process, City College contracted with Earthbound Media Group to redesign its website. By 2009, Earthbound had completed the overhaul, creating a unifying visual motif, organizing information for easier access, dramatically improving its search engine capabilities, and bringing the site into compliance with ADA standards.

Nevertheless, the organizational structure of the website could adhere to a more logical taxonomy. For example, the homepage features a link entitled “About City College,” which in turn refers users to links to “Mission,” “Administration,” “The Board of Trustees,” and “The Diego Rivera Mural Project.” While the first three categories represent parallel categories, the fourth, while intriguing, seems taxonomically dissonant. In general, the website could better reflect the college’s organizational structure.

For example, the category “Administration” includes the links “Office of the Chancellor,” “Governmental Relations,” “Legal Affairs,” “Institutional Advancement,” and “City College Foundation,” but none of these links direct users to the office of instruction, buildings and grounds, facilities and planning, campus police, etc.

In order to begin instituting such changes, the College might consider assigning the oversight of its website to a content manager to review and update information on the site and a webmaster to detect and correct technical problems, such as broken hyperlinks.

The Faculty Handbook informs City College professional staff of the principal rules, regulations, practices and procedures that are essential to their role in the operation of the District. It is produced by the Human Resources Department, is distributed to all faculty members and is available on the College’s website.

**Evaluation --IIA.6.c.**

Satisfactory. CCSF reviews and updates its published materials thoroughly and regularly, and communicates its mission, policies and procedures in a clear, consistent manner to students, personnel and the public. The college has taken steps to address problems with its website mentioned in its 2006 WASC review, and continues to work on the currency and accessibility of information. CCSF should continue making its website more easily navigable and keeping its content up-to-date.

In order to begin instituting such changes, the College might consider assigning the oversight of its website to a content manager to review and update information on the site and a webmaster to detect and correct technical problems, such as broken hyperlinks.

In addition to the above improving its website, the college might also better inform the public about City College student achievement. While some individual student achievements are featured in City Currents and on the college’s Facebook page, the College might consider publishing more comprehensive data on such registers of student achievement as transfer rates, degree/certificate completion and job placement.
IIA.7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or world views. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

Questions:

- Do board-approved policies on academic freedom exist and are they made public? Do board-approved policies on student academic honesty exist and are they made public?

There is print and online access to the SFCCD Policy Manual that includes Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Freedom.” This policy clearly defines academic freedom with its rights and responsibilities. In addition, the policy also contains guidelines for textbook, library selections and public forums. The Faculty Handbook of February 2010 references the AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement 10/22/09-6/30/12) that includes Article 8, “Academic Freedom, Duties, and Responsibilities,” and Article 30, “Intellectual Property.”

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

Evaluation --IIA.7

Superior. The college has always been committed to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and has in place policies that support these commitments. The policy on student academic policy is readily available to students and staff. Our website has been expanded so all materials are readily available online.

The academic integrity of the teaching-learning process has needed defense over the past year because of lack of funding and difficulties with educating our Board on their role in curriculum. Thus far, the college has managed to control costs without compromising academic freedom. Per Board directive we have adopted some courses without sufficient study of their potential impact on students.

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

Questions:

- What policies demonstrate institutional commitment to free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge?

- How does the college communicate its expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline?
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• In what discussions have faculty engaged to deepen understanding of this expectation? How successfully does the faculty make this distinction in the classroom? What mechanisms does the college have for determining how effectively it is meeting this expectation?

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

The college communicates its expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views through many references in Article 8 of the faculty AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement. For example, section C.4 states, “Faculty cannot, however, expect academic freedom to be unlimited, for the right to exercise any liberty implies a duty to use it responsibly. Academic freedom does not give faculty freedom to engage in indoctrination. Nor can faculty invoke the principle of academic freedom to justify non-professional conduct.”

POSSIBLE SENATE VALUE STATEMENT.

Evaluation --IIA.7.a.

IIA.7.b The institution establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and consequences for dishonesty.

Questions:

• What mechanism does the institution have for informing students and faculty about, and enforcing, its policies on academic honesty?

Academic or intellectual dishonesty is outlined in Rules of Student Conduct (P. 377) under College Rules and Regulations in the CCSF Catalog 2010-2011 as well as the “Types of Discipline” to be administered. Also, academic or intellectual dishonesty, such as cheating or plagiarism is the first item discussed in the section on Grounds for Disciplinary Action under the heading, Student Conduct (P.58) in the CCSF Student Handbook.

The types of disciplinary action are also clearly identified in the handbook. Furthermore, some departments such as the English and ESL Departments have specific policy documents addressing plagiarism. These documents are given to students during the first week of class and are available at the departmental offices throughout the year. The Chair of the Behavioral Sciences Department also plans to draw up a policy document on plagiarism for students.

The College has been very thorough in establishing and publishing clear expectations regarding student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty. The CCSF Catalog clearly states the disciplinary sanctions for academic or intellectual dishonesty and the process. Moreover, the Catalog clearly specifies that students have a right to due process and it is the responsibility of the Office of Student Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities to assure the implementation of this due process.
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The Library & Learning Resources Spring 2008 Assessment of Research Skills Workshop (http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/assess08.pdf) confirmed the need to address citation format in all of the library skills workshops and also prompted the LLR Information Competency & Curriculum (IC&C) committee to develop a separate workshop to teach citation format and how to avoid plagiarism.

During Fall 2008, the IC&C committee began development of a new library skills workshop to more specifically address two IC learning outcomes which state: 1) “Students prepare in-text citations and citations for the “Works Cited” list/bibliography using an appropriate style manual such as MLA or APA;” and 2) “Students demonstrate understanding of CCSF computer-use policies and legal-ethical practices regarding access and use of the Internet, plagiarism and copyright.” Prior to the development of Workshop P, Workshop D; LIS 10; LIBR 51; citations format handouts; web tutorials; writing lab; and reference librarians were the main L&LSS learning opportunities which addressed these two information competency learning outcomes. Workshop P has been well received by all instructors who are aware of it, many of whom require students to complete it as part of their course.

In its Mission and Vision statement which is posted at every campus, on various publications and on the CCSF website, the College emphasizes that “In our community, respect and trust are common virtues…”. At an institutional level, these high ideals set a standard of conduct that fosters academic honesty.

Evaluation --IIA.7(b)

Superior. The College makes its policies on academic honesty readily available to both students and faculty through the CCSF Catalog and the CCSF Student Handbook and Planner. The catalog is available both in printed hardcopy and online (through the ccsf.edu website). The student handbook is published in hardcopy (a small, spiral bound booklet) and available to students at the various CCSF campuses through student services/counseling offices and other locations.

In addition, the fact that various departments have also developed specific policy documents further serves to inform both students and faculty that policies on academic honesty do exist and that there are formal procedures and a process in place when breaches occur.

As stated in the SFCCD Policy Manual, “the College requires certain standards of conduct of all its students. The College shall adopt rules and regulations governing student behavior along with appropriate penalties for student misconduct consistent with applicable law.” With reference to academic honesty, it has adopted and published policies to address this issue, so that faculty, students and the public are kept informed.

The College has made a conscious effort to make all public documents available on its website. With the CCSF Catalog readily accessible online, students and faculty can directly access the College’s policies on academic honesty, the consequences of academic dishonesty and the disciplinary sanctions to be imposed for such misconduct.

However, the College needs to insure that printed matter such as the CCSF Student Handbook and Planner is readily available at all campus locations and that there are enough copies printed for the
student population. This would further insure students’ awareness of college’s code of conduct; in particular, those pertaining to academic honesty as covered in this standard.

It may be in the interests of more individual departments to consider creating specific policy documents on plagiarism/academic honesty to be passed out with class syllabi and to be available at departmental offices.

IIA.7.c. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.

Questions:

• How are requirements of conformity to codes of conduct communicated?

• If a college seeks to instill specific beliefs or world views, what policies does it have in place to detail these goals? How are the policies communicated to appropriate constituencies?

Not Applicable.

IIA.8 Institutions offering curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals operate in conformity with standards and applicable Commission policies.

Questions:

• How well do curricula offered in foreign locations to non-U.S. students conform to the specifications of Commission policy Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals.

Not Applicable.

Standard II.B: Student Learning Programs and Services.
Student Support Services

II.B. The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.

Questions:
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• How does the institution determine that admitted students are able to benefit from its programs? How is this information applied to admissions policies and procedures?
• What college-wide discussions have occurred about how student access, progress, learning, and success are consistently supported?

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) serves one of the largest student populations in the nation and is committed to providing services that are accessible, inclusive and sensitive to the needs of its diverse student body. CCSF assures equitable access by providing appropriate student support services at its campus locations and some of the other instructional sites throughout San Francisco. In 2006, CCSF was recognized nationally for its efforts to recruit diverse students when it received the MetLife Community College Excellence Award for reaching out to first generation, immigrant, low-income, and working adults. In April 2007, The New York Times featured CCSF as one of 11 models of success in the country with respect to its instructional and student support practices. Moreover, in June 2008, CCSF was highlighted in The Chronicle of Higher Education as an outstanding example of a thriving community college—the only community college in the nation to be so recognized. Ref: (Management and Budget Plan 2009 - 2010 Office of Research and Planning November 2009).

To enhance student success, the college provides an array of academic and student development services that support students' intellectual, cultural, and civic achievements. Student Services begins with the Office of Outreach and Recruitment as high-quality comprehensive college readiness services are provided to prospective students, high school and middle school students, K-12 faculty, staff, administrators from both public and private sectors, and community-based organizations. The Office of Outreach and Recruitment provides early-outreach services to ensure prospective students are knowledgeable and prepared for the college experience at CCSF. A focus of the Office is to strengthen partnerships with K-12 schools, community-based organizations and government agencies in order to ensure students are adequately informed of the comprehensive support services offered by the campus community.

Student Support Services is a critical aspect of the College and makes available services to all its students. Part of the governance system is the Student Success Preparation Committee, which helps make critical decisions in this area. Included in the range of programs and services to enhance student access, retention, and success are the following: New Student Counseling; Continuing Student Counseling; International Student Counseling; Transfer Counseling; Career Development Counseling; Extended Opportunity Programs and Services; Gay, Lesbian, Bi-Sexual and Transgender Counseling; and Multicultural Retention Services (African American Scholastic Programs, Latino Services Network, TULAY (Filipino-American Student Success Program) and the Asian Pacific American Student Success Program. Additional student support services include the Admissions and Records Office, Financial Aid Office (including Scholarship, CalWORKs and Single Stop USA), Matriculation Office, Veteran’s Education Benefits Program, Outreach and Recruitment, Student Activities Office, Homeless At-Risk Transitional Students Program, Student Health Services, the Learning Assistance Center and the Disabled Students Programs and Services Department.

Grants augment these services by offering specialized programs such as Gateway to College, Guardian Scholars, Foster Youth Initiative and the Bridge 2 Success Collaborative Partnership Program with SF Unified School District and the SF Mayor’s Office. In Fall 2010, the new Veteran’s Assistance Center opened. The Center was a collaborative effort by CCSF and key labor
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unions to respond to the unique needs of Veterans on campus. Over 400 veterans will be provided academic counseling and certification services providing them assistance to access their federal financial benefits. In addition, VA psychologists and personnel from community agencies focused on serving veterans regularly hold office hours in the CCSF Veteran’s Assistance Center. (Ref. Guardsman 12/17/2009)

Eighty percent (80%) of the Student Development units and departments have engaged in Student Learning Outcome projects. Several departments completed evaluation cycles and implemented programs of continuous quality improvement as a result of the project outcomes. For example, high school students now get priority registration. All departments are committed to teaching students how to navigate a complex system such as ours. For example, the system now accommodates different language skills. Additionally, classes taught by the Student Development Division assist students in learning about important services and methods to support them in achieving their educational and lifetime goals. Ref: (Report Briefs 2008-09).

The Office of Research, Planning, and Grants conducts ongoing college-wide inquiries regarding student access, progress, learning, and success. For example, the Overview of 2007 CCSSE Results for CCSF provides a snapshot of what credit students and faculty had to say about student engagement at CCSF. The overview includes information about the survey, respondent’s academic experience, student learning, support services, barriers to persistence, and more. Additional inquiries surveyed the effectiveness of Division programs and services in relation to the institutional mission and the quality of support provided to enhance student access, progress, learning, and success.

Our Program Review System has as its goal the promotion of student access, progress, learning and teaching excellence. This is accomplished by conducting comprehensive reviews by departments of all courses and programs and by reviewing and updating, where appropriate, learning assessments plans and student development programs. Program reviews are conducted annually for all units in all divisions of the College. Program reviews utilize five-year data trends in the areas of enrollments, personnel, annual expenditures, productivity and student/employee satisfaction, as applicable. All data are gathered by the Office of Research in conjunction with the Budget Office, Office of Instruction, and Human Resources and populated in the annual review form. The annual report form provides reflections on data trends, summarizes progress on prior year planning objectives and identifies major planning objectives for the next fiscal year to describe resources needed to meet planning objectives. (Reference: Focused Midterm Progress Report, March 15, 2009)

Also, college-wide discussions hosted by the Strategic Planning Team in Spring and Fall 2010 were conducted through a series of interactive listening sessions to get feedback about CCSF programs and services, and discuss a new draft of the Strategic Priorities and Major Objectives. The draft Strategic Plan was made available online on November 2010, and is being refined to reflect the extensive input collected and sent to the Team.

Additionally, the CCSF College Performance Indicators Report (CPI) is a key tool the College uses to evaluate how it is doing on the eight strategic priorities of its Strategic Plan. The CPI is organized according to strategic priorities. From September 2008 to January 2009, seven research briefs evaluated: Basic Skills, Academic Programs, Education for the Workforce, Outreach and Recruitment, Student Development, Fiscal Resources, and Technology. For example, the fifth strategic priority of the CCSF Strategic Plan relates to student development. This priority
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increases “the quality and accessibility of student development services to positively impact student outcomes related to student learning, retention, course completion, graduation and job placement.” One area in the research brief examined student development in terms of student satisfaction. The questions were asked at CCSF in Spring 2007 through the national Community College Survey of Student Development. “Computer lab” had the highest reported frequency of use, the highest level of satisfaction reported, and was viewed as among the most important (2.67 on a scale of 1-3). Academic Advising/Planning, Transfer Credit assistance, Financial Aid advising, and Career Counseling were also scored as among the most important services, but the satisfaction rating for those services was closer to “somewhat” (2.0), ranging from 1.98-2.09. Peer Tutoring and Skills Labs (writing, math, etc.) had been reportedly used by more respondents and had relatively higher satisfaction ratings, yet were rated slightly lower in importance than services mentioned above. Ref. (http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports_briefs.htm)

Overall, the College uses information from the Office of Research, Planning, and Grants and college wide discussions to insure that student programs and support services remain effective and are in line with annual planning and our institutional mission.

II.B.1 The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.

Questions:

- By what means does the institution assure the quality of its student support services? How does the institution demonstrate that these services support student learning?

The Student Development Division is a leader in the Institution’s Student Learning Outcomes efforts to assess the quality of student learning and uses these results to provide continuing quality improvement. In addition to the individual student learning outcome projects conducted within each unit, the Office of Research and Planning distributes both credit and noncredit student surveys and employee satisfaction surveys, which provide valuable information in a variety of critical areas that departments use in program review and in the implementation of new student learning outcome projects. Additionally, despite the fact that funding for professional development diminished greatly due to budget restrictions over the last few years, numerous opportunities exist throughout the year for faculty and staff to participate in professional development activities. Continuous evaluation of data gathered through the Sars Grid electronic appointment system; local surveys distributed to employees and students seeking assessment of specific support services; student equity hearings focusing on counseling and other support services; pilot programs initiated to experiment with new deliveries of services to students; and special faculty committees that focus on analysis of data, surveys and new services all support a culture of continuous evaluation that ensures the support and improvement of student learning.

A yearly program review cycle allows each student support unit the opportunity to reflect on the year’s accomplishments and challenges. The following are some of the 2009/2010 accomplishments/changes made as a result of student learning outcomes, program review, and feedback from the student equity hearings:

Questions:
• Veterans Resources Center. The new center is a place where veterans returning to school can study and obtain services, including mental health counseling.

• LERN 1000: This course improved the method used to train tutors making them more effective in their interactions with those tutored.

• The Transfer Center tripled the number of transfer admissions guarantees between CCSF and the UC system.

• In response to student feedback and need, the testing policy was revised to allow students to retest more frequently.

• The Student Development Division developed and implemented a comprehensive space proposal resulting in the creation of a new student service hub and centralization of critical services for students.

• New registration priorities for San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) graduates have increased enrollment and retention of graduating high school seniors.

• New enhanced orientations were offered to incoming students as part of a summer initiative to increase student access and close the achievement gap for under-served communities.

• The Financial Aid Office is implementing a document imaging system that will allow students to submit documents online and create a paperless student file system for its 30,000 students. Financial Aid employees will be able to access students’ files at any of our educational centers.

• Financial Aid is beginning to decentralize by establishing full service offices at Mission and Evan campuses.

Student support service units will continue to gather data to analyze and improve the quality of their programs and services for students.

II.B.2.a-d: The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: (a) general information, (b) requirements, (c) major policies affecting students, and (d) locations and/or publications where other policies may be found.

Questions:

The College produces an annual, academic-year catalog inclusive of all general information required of students, including relevant policies, rules and regulations, credit and noncredit programs, student services, names of faculty and administrators. The Catalog is clear, concise, user-friendly, well-organized, and is available in hard copy and online at www.ccsf.edu. Catalog information, updated by department personnel, is maintained and reviewed for currency and accuracy by the Office of Instruction, assisted by the Communication Committee, a component of the Shared Governance structure. Over the past few years, more and more (Do we know the percentage?) students have begun using CCSF’s online catalog, which was one of the College’s goals. One benefit of this usage is the convenience it offers students to manage their accounts such as registration, adds, and drops. At the same time, double-entry errors are minimized. Departments can update information anytime since all course programs have been saved to the online version.
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Whenever information is added, Banner will automatically update the Course Program and Degree PDF file.

The requirements for admission and enrollment fees (2010-2011 Catalog, 14-20), graduation (44-49), and transfer (52-59) are easily accessible. Degrees, Awards of Certificates, and certificate programs are listed alphabetically in the Programs and Courses section of the Catalog (62-367). Students are informed of additional financial obligations or optional fees at the time of registration, at program orientation, on the website, or on the first day of class by the instructor.

Major policies affecting students can be found in several sections of the Catalog. College Rules and Regulations address academic regulation, including Academic Honesty (Catalog, 377; Grievances and Complaint Procedures (378-380), and Sexual Harassment (371). The Admission to the College section addresses the fee refund policy and procedures (17-18). Acceptance of Transfer Credits (392) was recently updated to reflect statewide changes to the interpretation of Title 5, particularly in relation to acceptance of upper division credit. The Equal Opportunity Statement (XIV-XV) is written in English and five other languages commonly used by our students.

A complete set of contact numbers for campuses and sites and all contact numbers and locations for academic and student service departments can be obtained through a central college telephone exchange and online at www.ccsf.edu. Information, including campus directories and maps, is posted throughout campus sites, a host of employees readily provide information, and the college website is easily accessed on campus and beyond. Our free CCSF Student Planner provides easy reference to important information about CCSF policies, procedures, and practices, highlighting important dates throughout the academic year. Departmental and/or divisional workshops, along with informational outreach events, are regularly conducted for the CCSF student community.

Finally, each campus has a central office where students and the general public can obtain information about the college’s policies provided directly by College personnel and/or published materials. Moreover, coordinators for individual programs produce flyers for distribution and display on bulletin boards, in kiosks, at public libraries, in classrooms and the Student Union, as well as other strategic locations. Key locations where policy publications beyond the Catalog are easily accessible include the Financial Aid office, Counseling departments, the offices of admissions, Outreach and Recruitment, and research, Planning, and Grants. Several departments conduct program specific orientations and information sessions to ensure that students are informed of policies and procedures, as well as services related specifically to their departments. The Schedule of Classes, which is published every semester including summer session, also provides information about policies and procedures. Additionally, many departments have specific information pertaining to their policies on the CCSF website. Thus, within the CCSF community, students can access policy information that supplements the College Catalog from various locations and publications.

II.B.3. The institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.

Questions:

- By what means does the institution determine the support needs of its students? How well does it address these needs?
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The institution uses several methods to address student needs. For example, City College conducts an annual Environmental Scan that yields extensive information that informs the College about the student population it serves. The 2010 scan revealed that nearly three quarters of new students taking the English placement test placed into basic skills English. One third of new students tested into basic math. As a result, the math and English offerings have been increased, more math tutoring has been provided.

A number of retention programs at City College support students’ learning needs. Students are informed of these programs beginning with the College Catalog and the Student Handbook. Information about two of the programs is also available online; other programs are developing web sites. As a result of student equity hearings about the achievement gap, support of these programs has become even more paramount. Some of the support already offered includes counselors assigned to work directly in the classroom with the instructor for some of the English classes for students in these programs and creation of Math Bridge.

Another way that CCSF determines the support needs of its students is through annual program reviews for each department and unit. The department reports on approximately ten areas ranging from comparing the population the program serves to the general CCSF population to measuring how the department met last year’s goals. One particular benefit of the reviews is the feedback system it provides in such a large institution. All departments are asked to review various institutional planning documents such as the Educational Master Plan, the 2009 Environmental Scan, the Annual Plan, etc. and to consider information from Advisory Boards, field activities, and other appropriate sources in order to project where they would like to be in 5-6 years. They are also asked to indicate what environmental factors informed their projections. The information the department gives Student Development will be used for the Strategic Planning process.

Student learning outcome projects across Divisions continually identify student needs and evaluate new data sets as information is collected from students and participants. Some departments conduct individual surveys in order to determine more effective directions for their teaching or services. For example, based on survey results, the Learning Assistance Center (LAC) altered the way in which they presented learning strategies to their students, which increased student utilization of the strategies after they completed the study skills course.

II.B.3.a. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.

Questions:

- What evidence is provided that the institution assesses student needs for services regardless of location and provides for them?

- How are on-line services and services at off-site locations evaluated? How well are services meeting the needs of students?

City College has been committed to expanding, improving and promoting greater access to services for its students, regardless of the service location and delivery method. The assessment of student needs and how the current level of services is meeting the needs is evident when reviewing multiple data available on the City College website.
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Some of the information pertinent to the assessment process was gathered by the Office of Research and Planning when it polled Student Satisfaction in their 2004-2006 surveys. The 2005-2006 Noncredit Student Survey asked students to indicate their experience in noncredit overall and at the particular campus they attend. The survey also asked students to rate various noncredit services and instruction(c). A similar survey was conducted with Credit Students in 2004-2005 and 3,095 credit students gave their opinions about their relationship to the college, barriers to success and satisfaction with services (d). In spring 2011 a new student satisfaction survey was conducted; those results are currently being analyzed.

Another form of needs assessment is the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). The survey results help institutions assess quality in community college education, focus on good educational practice, and identify areas in which they can improve programs and services for students. In 2007, CCSF was able to collect 1,179 usable student CCSSE survey responses from both day and evening students from all campuses. (Most of the students polled were credit students.) The CCSF Research unit produced a document titled Community College Student Report, which outlines the survey findings. Included in their report (p. 6) is a chart that displays the average (mean) importance students ascribe to various services, as well as their satisfaction with those services (e).

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

In January 2009 online services were evaluated throughout the district. The resulting January 2009 Brief 7CPI report focused on Technology. The report noted that in the last seven years from Fall 2000 to Fall 2007, the number of online sections offered at CCSF rose from 9 to 137, a dramatic, fifteen-fold increase of 1422%. The average enrollment per online section stayed in the range of 28-33 for the entire period. Over the same period, total enrollment in online sections increased from 248 to 4,053, a 1534% increase. Student Satisfaction with Online Learning Courses was positive. In Fall 2005, Spring 2006, and Fall 2007 students were asked in a survey: “Would you recommend this (online) course to someone else?” Respondents answered “yes” over 77% of the time. (Ref. January 2009-Brief 7: Technology). One of the results of the increased demand for online courses is the creation of the Education Technology Department, thereby giving a stronger voice to this area.

In 2009-10, online instruction and hybrid courses were increased. In the spring 2010 semester almost 6,000 students were enrolled in online education (in over 150 sections spread over 115 different courses.) Additionally, TMI (Technology Mediated Instruction) supported 141 tech-enhanced course sections in the spring 2010 semester. Currently, a student can complete approximately 85% of the requirements for an AA/AS degree through online classes or telecourses. Students can complete approximately 95% of the courses required to transfer to the CSU or fulfill the IGETC pattern by taking online classes or telecourses. Online courses attract many students to City College and have won eleven statewide and two national awards for quality of course design. Additionally, Insight (Moodle) was adopted as the College’s new open source learning management system.
system and every online course now uses it. The use of interactive television (IPTV) to deliver educational programming to students at various campuses has been explored, with concerns arising relating to feasibility, costs, and the size of a potential IPTV audience. Every campus has at least some video infrastructure in place. (Ref. http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/SP5Acc.pdf )

II.B.3.b. The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

Questions:

• What is the institution doing to provide a learning environment that promotes these personal attributes? What dialogue has the institution engaged in concerning what constitutes a good learning environment?

• What programs or services has the institution determined contribute to this environment? What areas have been identified for improvement? How does the college evaluate its efforts in this area? How are the results of the evaluations used to improve the environment?

Several initiatives at the College create an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. First, there are several programs that provide learning environments that promote these attributes. The office of Mentoring and Service Learning provides support for academic and vocational peer-mentor programs and service learning projects. The Student Ambassador Program utilizes current students as the avenue for connecting with prospective students in helping them realize that they are college material and their life dreams can be fulfilled through a community college pathway. Student Ambassadors do this by conducting outreach at middle and high schools and community based organizations throughout the year, serving over 10,000 prospective students annually. The Puente Program also encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students as evident by the program’s mission to increase the number of students transferring to four-year institutions and returning to the community as mentors and leaders to future generations. Additionally, the College supports a college voter registration drive effort lead by an instructor in the social science area and augmented by the Office of Governmental Affairs. Furthermore, the retention programs all foster a culturally sensitive environment that promotes students’ intellectual and personal development and students’ personal and civic responsibility. Moreover, the Student Activities office facilitates empowerment, leadership, and advocacy by strengthening student participation in the life, governance, and success of the College. The Student Activities office provides resources, support and training to eight Associated Student Councils and more than 60 clubs, student organizations, and centers. Associated Students are actively involved in the annual March on Sacramento, a political event where students help lead demonstrations at the state capitol to voice their opinion of issues such as the budget crisis. Also, events organized by Concert/Lecture series and music and theatrical performances inform students of civic responsibility and diversity. Public works of art, library exhibits, and campus walking tours add to the activities.
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Secondly, the college offers a wide range of opportunities for students to develop their personal and civic responsibility through participation on Shared Governance Committees whereby students sit on key committees including Academic Policies, Basic Skills, Communications, Concert/Lecture Series, Diversity, K-12 Partnerships, Planning and Budgeting, Student Prep/Success, and more. Recently, students have actively participated in the Student Equity Hearings whereby students voiced their opinions in a series of public forums in several areas including financial aid, student services, counseling, registration priority, English and Math Department sequencing, etc. Students were afforded the opportunity to express their support in each of these areas and/or express suggested areas of improvement directly to our Board of Trustees.

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

II.B.3.c. The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

Questions:

- Does the institution develop, implement, and evaluate counseling and/or academic advising?
- Does the evaluation of counseling and/or academic advising include how it enhances student development and success?
- Are those responsible for counseling/advising trained?

CCSF counseling departments have been intensively exploring their impact on student learning since 2002 when the first student learning outcome initiatives were defined by several departments. CCSF counselors engage in a multitude of activities that promote professional development. Currently, a continuous cycle of analysis leads to regular evaluation and improvement in the delivery of counseling services. A regular program review process also offers a forum for departmental self-reflection. Beginning in 2010 counselors from various counseling areas joined together to form two work groups to evaluate the counseling response to the achievement gap and to create an annual evaluation cycle using employee and student questionnaires on a wide variety of issues impacting the organization and delivery of student services. Recommendations from these two work groups will be critical to the implementation of new student learning outcome projects among the different counseling units.

Each semester counselors are required to attend a Flex Day counseling meeting where topics such as curriculum changes, graduation requirement updates, and new/revised policy initiatives are covered. In addition, counselors are offered an array of professional development seminars during the semester including an “All Counselors” meeting (in which attendance is strongly recommended by all department chairs.) Topics such as catalog rights, graduation, degree changes, and new Co-chairs for Standard II: Ophelia Clark, Alice Murillo, and Deana Abma
programs are covered. The Dean’s Professional Development Seminar Series is held two to four times a semester and is available to all counseling faculty. Individual departments also hold separate trainings for their faculty and staff focusing on issues unique to each department or in areas directly affecting students accessing their services. Outside conference attendance is encouraged, although participation has diminished over the past several years as a result of the State budget crisis. The Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) offers a small number of faculty stipends each semester to engage in specialized projects and then share the results in a professional development activity. MIP sponsored guest speakers and seminars are also offered to all faculty, administrators, and staff.

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

Questions:

• What does the institution do to promote student understanding and appreciation of diversity? What measures does the institution use to determine the effectiveness of services?

The College demonstrates its commitment to diversity in the broadest sense through programs and services designed to promote and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.

II.B.3.e. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

Questions:

• What processes are used to evaluate the effectiveness of practices and tools of admissions? What evaluations of placement processes are used to ensure their consistency and effectiveness? How are cultural and linguistic bias in the instruments and processes minimized?

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

As mandated by the California Community Colleges, assessment instruments used for placement assessment must be evaluated and approved by the State Chancellor’s Office prior to their use. CCSF currently administers to its students locally-written placement tests in English and ESL as well as College Board published assessment instruments in mathematics. The requisite validation studies were submitted in compliance with CCCCO requirements, which have resulted in full approval for our placement tests.
Part of the assessment validation process examines and evaluates bias. During the research process, cultural and linguistic bias is assessed by faculty and staff who represent various cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Their role is to identify and remove test items that may negatively impact various populations from understanding and performing well on the assessment instrument and that would present hardships for students from diverse backgrounds.

More recently, the college community (students, faculty/staff, administration, trustees) has participated in a series of college-wide equity hearings. In this venue, participants had an opportunity to offer comments related to their experiences with the placement assessment process. Resulting from these conversations, an evaluation of the Placement Testing Re-Take Policy was reviewed and revised, ultimately lessening the wait period between subsequent tests. The revision allows students who are poor test takers and students who need a refresher to retake the test, possibly allowing them to complete their sequence in less time.

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

II.B.3.f. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

Questions:

- What institutional policies govern the maintenance of student records? Are records secured? Does the institution have a policy for release of student records?

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

Historically, the Office of Admissions and Records stored student records as hard copies in boxes in various storage areas throughout the campus. Maintaining such records required an extraordinary amount of physical space and required the attention of multiple individuals responsible for the collection, storage and security of documents. Additional staff was required to search and retrieve the records. In addition, these records were susceptible to damage and loss from mishandling, misplacement and environmental conditions.

In 2007, A&R began storing student records electronically in response to the need for better student service and to support a move toward an increasing online system. Student records are scanned in PDF format and scanned records incorporated into the existing Student Record System (Banner). Although scanning of existing paper records is ongoing, a considerable number of records still must be converted. It is estimated about one-third of the existing records have been converted electronically. Scanning priority is given to the most recent records, working backwards over time. All scanned records are stored digitally and indefinitely in our secured computer network system and can be transferred easily from one platform to another. Other departments such as DSP&S, Student Health, and Financial Aid are also undergoing record conversion. Since the implementation
of the scanning system in A&R, work efficiency and turnaround has improved dramatically now that many records can be located effortlessly on the student database system.

The security of student records in A&R and other departments at the college is paramount. A&R has a redundant backup system of all its records in the event one system should fail. The College follows the guidelines mandated by FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) when it comes to the release of student information and records. All necessary training is given and precaution is taken when dealing with records requests. Consultation with legal counsel is commonplace.

II.B.4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as a basis for improvement.

**Questions:**

- How does the institution provide for systematic and regular review of its student support services? How are the results used?
- Does the evaluation assess how student support services contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes? How are evaluation results used to improve services?

The college provides for systematic review of its student support services through an annual program review process and through solicitation of input derived from the strategic planning process, as well as the input from various student equity and basic skills evaluations, hearings and committee reports. Evaluation of student support services' student learning outcomes provides another important avenue of review. Such input is analyzed and discussed within the various student support services administrative units and incorporated into each unit’s goals and future plans.

Under the annual program review process each department including student services departments and programs undertakes a comprehensive review and issues a report. The Strategic Plan, statistics on student demographics, student success, student satisfaction and numbers of students served, progress on previous objectives, input from advisory boards, and Student Learning Outcomes are reviewed. Faculty and staff are actively involved in the review process and bring in information from various shared governance committees on which they serve. All this information is used to assess progress and develop new objectives and a report is issued. The reports are used as strong evidence in making funding decisions.

Additionally, the college has undertaken a comprehensive review of student equity in terms of achievement gaps and access. A Student Equity Plan was issued on February 28, 2005, which included an analysis of gaps in student equity as well as goals and objectives for student services units such as the Office of Outreach and Recruitment, the Disabled Students Programs and Services, the various counseling departments and the various retention programs. A number of public listening sessions have subsequently been held in recent years and the college has 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 priority registration, financial aid, matriculation testing, counseling services and student employment.
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Updates and progress on student learning outcomes are now reported annually through the Program Review process. Data collection and analysis is becoming more sophisticated as units progress in their projects. Cycles of continuous improvement are being instituted across departments. Recent examples include curriculum changes in LERN 1000 (the tutor training course) and the implementation during the summer of enhanced orientations for new students. Additionally, several projects are underway pairing counseling and instructional faculty in the classroom—taking advantage of the proven best practice of integrating the academic with student support services. A recent change in registration priority affecting graduating seniors from San Francisco Unified has resulted in increased student retention and success (progression, units taken and GPA). These are only a few examples of the innovations and positive impact on student learning resulting from the implementation and analysis of student learning outcomes across the Student Development Division over the past decade.

**Strengths and Areas for Improvement**

1. The College continues to strive for excellence in improving services, service delivery, and accessibility. It goes to great efforts to support students’ learning needs. The retention programs and programs within programs such as those supported by EOP&S serve specific populations (Second Chance for the formerly incarcerated and Guardian Scholars for foster youth.)

2. Eighty percent (80%) of the units in Student Support Services have ongoing student learning outcome projects at different stages of the assessment and response cycle. Some of these projects involve collaboration with instructional departments. Discussions have also included cross training employees in an effort to improve the overall customer service. Further, the College has recently elevated its efforts to listen to students’ concerns by implementing a series of televised listening sessions and equity hearings in an effort to close the achievement gap. As a result, the Board of Trustees, Administrators, faculty, and staff have made significant changes to improve services and programs to better meet students’ needs.

3. The College keeps its catalog updated to reflect course and program information changes. Efforts to improve and increase usage of an online registration system have lessened the need for a print catalog. However, students can purchase them from the Bookstore. PDF files of the paper catalog are available online to departments, which make it easy to update new editions.

4. The security of student records in A & R is paramount. In 2007 A & R begin to store records electronically in response to a need to better serve students.

**Standard II.C: Student Learning Programs and Services.**

**Library and Learning Support Services**

Library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the institution’s instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and Co-chairs for Standard II: Ophelia Clark, Alice Murillo, and Deana Abma
wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.

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

II.C.1.a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

Questions:

- What information about student learning needs is provided by other instructional faculty and staff to inform selection of library resources?
- How does the institution assess the effectiveness of its own library collection in terms of quantity, quality, depth and variety?
- What is the quality determined as necessary by the institution?
- How does the institution know it has sufficient depth and variety of materials to meet the learning needs of its students?
- What information does the library use to determine whether it is enhancing student achievement of identified learning outcomes?

DESCRIPTION

Library and learning support services (LLSS) are a vital component of the “teaching and learning community” described in the college’s mission. LLSS directly contribute to instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic and cultural activities through the collections, services, courses and facilities they provide. LLSS include: Library & Learning Resources (LLR), Learning Assistance Department (LAD), Broadcast Media Services (BMS), and student computer labs. Services, resources and facilities directly supporting student learning include: 1) courses, workshops and learning support services provided by the LLR and the LAD; 2) library exhibitions and programs; 3) facilities and services provided by the Language and Media Center; and 4) delivery and broadcasting of videos and teaching support services provided by Broadcast Media Services and the Audiovisual Unit from the Ocean Campus.

Library & Learning Resources (LLR)

LLR consists of one Library comprising nine units at six locations: Ocean Campus, Downtown Campus, John Adams Campus, Mission Campus, Southeast Campus and the Gough Street facility. Planning is underway to develop a new library and learning resource collection for the Chinatown
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Since the Rosenberg Library and Learning Resource Center opened in November 1995, LLR has grown to receive over a million visits each year, providing interactive language labs; special equipment for disabled users and ADA-compliant computer workstations at all library locations; fax and color printing services; teleconferencing facilities; heavily used print, audiovisual and online collections; and computing and media resources. Library instructional services reach students each year through reference services, online and in-person workshops and a one-credit course. The Library Programs Committee collaborates with departments and campuses, as well as student organizations, to create events that reflect and enrich the creative, intellectual and cultural diversity of the City College community. More than 15,000 students and college community members view exhibitions in the libraries during any academic year.

LLR’s presence on the Ocean Campus is the largest, with five units: Rosenberg Library, Media Center, Language Center, Audiovisual Unit and Alice Statler Library, which serves primarily the Culinary Arts & Hospitality Studies Department. Collections and services specific to the Rosenberg Library are the Diego Rivera Collection and the CCSF Archive (II.C.1.a. - 1).

Programs, resources and services directly serving students at all the campus libraries* include:

- Library research and information competency workshops that teach specific skills for finding appropriate information and critically evaluating it for assignments and independent learning
- Reference/research and information assistance to individuals in person, by phone, via e-mail and by instant messaging
- Print collections of books, periodicals and audio-visual resources serving specific courses (over 800 via Course Reserves) and the entire curriculum in general
- Online books and periodicals; online materials are available 24/7 via the Internet
- Copying, printing, scanning and faxing services
- Access to computers and a wide variety of software applications
- A quiet study environment, with group study rooms at the Rosenberg, Mission, and John Adams campus libraries
- Audio, visual and computer software learning materials for across-the-curriculum support and independent learning, particularly for foreign language courses in the Language Center locations at the Ocean and Mission campuses
- ESL and basic skills course-related learning materials, many of which support specific courses

*The Distance Learning librarian provides many instructional support services to faculty and students at campuses without their own libraries.
Guided by the collection development policy and input from faculty, subject librarians manage the collections of library resources according to course outlines and student learning outcomes (II.C.1.a. - 2). The new position of Outreach Librarian helps coordinate subject liaison activities throughout the district. Subject librarians use professional selection tools to select books, periodicals, subscription databases, audiovisual materials, eBooks and websites. Collaborative dialogue with faculty plays a significant role in ensuring collections meet the teaching and learning needs of the CCSF community. Examples of such dialogue include: 1) the new Mission Campus librarian developing a close relationship with the Castro campus faculty, soliciting Castro staff and faculty input into equipment and materials purchases for the Mission Library; and 2) the Audiovisual Unit working closely with DSPS to caption existing videos and purchase closed-captioned video and DVD replacements for non-captioned videos. In the Fall 2010 library survey of faculty, 81% of the respondents were satisfied with the communication with their librarian subject liaisons (II.C.1.a. - 3).

**Library Exhibitions and Programs** create learning experiences for all styles of learning. Visual, auditory and interactive programs, rich visual displays, exhibits, and films engage students in curricular and co-curricular subjects. Events and exhibitions are always planned and co-sponsored with academic departments and programs to directly connect to the curriculum and general education goals such as increasing and understanding of diversity, as well as to emphasize library resources and related materials.

**The Language Center** supports the curriculum of the Foreign Language Department. The facility on Ocean campus serves the largest number of students with 120 audio and video workstations and a classroom with 34 workstations. The new Mission campus has a combined Language Lab/Media Center serving students and faculty. Language Center materials and online language-learning and culture resources are selected, reviewed and assessed by foreign language faculty. These materials are available in the open lab, via the Electronic Classroom and online. Textbook audio is digitized to allow word and phrase isolation and speed adjustment, especially important to beginning learners, enhancing student engagement and thereby student success and retention. Use of the online Language Lab continues to increase. In 2005/06, the total number of Language Center website views was 104K, by 2008/09, the number reached 550K (II.C.1.a. – 4).

**The Media Center** provides audio, visual, and multimedia materials and equipment for academic and vocational programs on Ocean campus. The Media Center librarian depends on faculty to assist with collection development. With a collection of over 6,000 audio cassettes, 1,700 videocassettes and 175 CDs, the Media Center receives a high rating from faculty for providing material supporting the curriculum, and supplementing coursework and programs (II.C.1.a. - 5). The Media Center also provides a computer lab with 50 computers, currently being used by the English department.

**Learning Assistance Department (LAD)** faculty and staff assist students in achieving their academic, vocational and personal goals through the following learning support offerings:

- College Success courses, LERN 50 and 51, serving 520 students per semester
- Successful Online Learning course, LERN 55, serving 110 students per semester
- Study Strategies workshops serving 85 students per semester
- Study Strategies for Standardized Exams, LERN 53A, B, C and D, serving 90 students per semester
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Supplemental Instruction groups serving 120 students per semester

Learning Assistance Center (LAC) tutoring and computer lab, 100 peer tutors in 34 subjects and 15 computer lab assistants together serving 9500 students per semester and 125,000 hours per semester

Mission Campus Learning Assistance Center serving 1200 students per semester and 2800 hours per semester

Mobile LAC serving 15 incarcerated youth per semester.

LAD faculty stay current with professional literature and practices in the field of student success through conferences, workshops, staff meetings and reflective dialogues on student needs. College success faculty teach using student-centered, outcomes-based strategies. They use a variety of classroom assessment techniques to adequately measure student learning outcomes, such as practical examinations, portfolio development, and pre and post testing. LAD recognizes the importance of variety and means of delivery to address various learning styles and provide more equitable access for all students. Following an extensive research process, LAD implemented a new Successful Online Learning course and a new Supplemental Instruction small group program. LERN 50 College Success course students persisted to the next term at a rate on average of 7% more than average students over the period 1998-2010 (II.C.1.a. - 6).

The Learning Assistance Department collaborates with many departments and programs to provide comprehensive learning support services across the district. Collaborative efforts include, but are not limited to, the following entities: English, Math and Biology departments; EOPS; Basic Skills Ad Hoc Committee; and many student retention programs (II.C.1.a. - 7). Additionally, the Transitional Studies Department offers professional and peer tutoring for students taking noncredit courses in literacy, reading, math and GED preparation at four campuses: John Adams, Mission, Southeast and the Adult Learning and Tutorial Center (ALTC) at Gough Street. The ALTC has 20 volunteer tutors from community organizations such as Project Read and San Francisco State University who provide one-to-one tutoring to noncredit literacy and GED preparation students. John Adams offers 150 hours of professional tutoring per semester, Mission offers 60 hours, and the ALTC offers 50 hours.

Learning Assistance Center on Ocean campus offers a large open-access computer lab that provides 83 student workstations, 3 scanners and a printer for student access 53 hours per week. The LAC Computer Lab is set up with Internet access and more than 50 software programs supporting CCSF academic courses. Between 400 and 600 students visit LAC Computer Lab every day for a total of approximately 50,000 hours per semester. Student hours logged into the Learning Assistance Center increased considerably in the last six years, from 173,000 hours per semester in 05/06, to 250,000 hours per semester in 09/10 (II.C.1.a. – 8). Other open access computer labs are available throughout the district and through various retention program locations such as the African American Scholastic Program, Latino Services Network, Asian Pacific American Success Program, Writing Success Project and the counseling departments.

**Broadcast Media Services and Audiovisual Unit**

Broadcast Media Services (BMS) and the Audiovisual (AV) Unit support student learning needs indirectly by providing instructional audio and video production services, video distribution and equipment delivery services to faculty for classroom instructional use on the Ocean campus.
Computer/Multi-Purpose Labs

There are 95 computer labs with approximately 2050 computers at nine campus locations across the district (II.C.1.a. - 9). Labs fall under two categories: 1) open access and; 2) departmental multi-purpose labs, which are used by faculty as classrooms as well as providing open lab hours to students. Maintenance of computer hardware and software is the responsibility of Information Technology Services (ITS), which operates the Help Desk. The Help Desk works closely with instructional faculty to ensure that all course-related software is loaded, managed and updated in support of student learning. ITS specifies equipment and installs and maintains all computers, printers and other peripherals in the labs and manages them through a series of servers across the district. Lab technicians provide direct support to faculty and students.

All library and learning support service locations offer a variety of equipment needs to support student learning. BMS and the Audiovisual unit on Ocean campus meet the video and broadcasting needs of faculty. Campus libraries provide equipment, such as DVD players, LCD projectors, tape recorders and televisions to faculty to assist classroom instruction. Library and learning support service units do not have separate equipment budgets. Equipment needs are documented and proposed upgrades and replacements are presented to department chairs and administrators.

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

1. The continued decline in the library’s materials budget since 2006 has directly affected the quantity, variety and currency of library collections. The total expenditures for print materials decreased 48% in the last three years, while being distributed across a great number of locations. Since 2005/06, during this time period, the Mission campus library opened and LLR began to acquire materials for the Chinatown/North Beach library, which is...
scheduled to open in 2012. The increasing cost of all materials further jeopardizes the
effectiveness of our library collections in supporting the curriculum and student success.
This risk is especially significant to subject areas where currency of materials is essential,
notably for programs accredited by outside agencies, such as many of the vocational
programs (II.C.1.a. - 10).

In response to a declining budget, library faculty have undertaken several measures to
continue to ensure access to a variety of current, quality materials. Two such measures
include developing an eBook collection and implementing a project involving instructional
faculty placing more textbooks on reserve (II.C.1.a. - 11). The third and most significant
measure was initiated in 2007, when the library entered into an agreement with San
Francisco Public Library (SFPL) to obtain current, quality withdrawn materials selected by
CCSF subject librarians, through the SFPL Community Redistribution Program, at no
charge (II.C.1.a. - 12). Since inception, this program has added over 6319 titles to the
collection with an estimated cost savings of $151,855.85 (II.C.1.a. - 13). The majority of the
items is copyrighted within the last three years and includes materials in languages other
than English, as well as general and subject specific encyclopedia sets. It is uncertain
however, how much LLR will be able to depend on the continued high quality of materials
available from SFPL, since much of the withdrawals have been the result of one-time
funding for SFPL branch renovations.

Further compounding the problem of the declining materials budget is the continued
inclusion of periodical and research database subscriptions in the library materials budget.
Database costs continue to rise, and since the loss of Telecommunication and Technology
Infrastructure Program (TTIP) funds, the college’s ability to continue providing databases is
uncertain each year. In the 2009/10 academic year, out of concern for the ability to retain the
databases, subject librarians chose to withhold portions of their print materials allocations to
be applied toward the expense of the databases. Database research is a primary method of
finding quality academic material. A stable funding source is essential and becomes an even
more pressing issue as the college moves toward offering more and more distance learning
opportunities.

The Library assesses the effectiveness of its library collections in a variety of ways: with
comparative data about the quantity, variety and currency of the collections in relation to the
curricula; survey data from students and faculty; and collection analysis reports prepared for
in-house assessment and professional association accreditation studies. In 2010, department
and program faculty on average rated the library's online and on-site services and resources
3.6 out of 5 for meeting students’ learning needs (II.C.1.a. - 14). The 2011 student surveys
revealed that ___% of students have more than 2 courses that require use of library
collections and equipment (Student survey 2011, Q7). For each of the following LLR
program student learning outcomes, over ___% of student respondents found as a result of
using library collections, services and facilities, they are better able to 1) acquire, evaluate
and use information; 2) understand and appreciate diverse peoples and 3) effectively use
computers and information technology (II.C.1.a. - 15). Also, over ___% find the use of the
library and its resources and services very important to their academic success (II.C.1.a. -
16).
2. LLSS equipment needs are assessed and planned for in the CCSF Technology Plan. LLSS faculty work with ITS to anticipate future upgrades and enhancements in technological equipment. Individual departments like BMS, LLR and LAD prioritize yearly equipment needs through the program review process. Recent acquisitions include DVD and video players for the Media Center and laptops and LCD projectors for the Audio Visual Department. John Adams campus library computers are out of date and unable to process a number of media operations. Comments in the Fall 2010 Faculty Survey expressed the need for updates equipment at the Downtown campus and from the Audiovisual unit in general (II.C.1.a. - 17). Many write-in comments in the 2011 student survey reveal that students find INSERT DATA (II.C.1.a. - 18).

3. While the budget has adversely affected the library in countless ways, some progress has been made in spite of budget cuts. Enough staff computers have been upgraded to implement the last three years of new releases of the integrated library system software. In Fall of 2010 supplies were ordered and replenished for the first time in two years. LLSS faculty and staff continue to find creative ways to address a student learning needs despite the budget crisis. However, without increases the current budget, the currency of the collections runs the risk of failing to meet student learning needs and access to vital research and periodical databases may have to be eliminated from our online collections.

II.C.1.b. The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.

Questions:

- What are the information competencies that the institution purports to teach all students? What is the evidence that the institution acts purposefully to teach these competencies?
- How does the institution assess the competencies in information retrieval/use that it teaches students? How does the institution evaluate its teaching effectiveness and set goals for improvement?

DESCRIPTION

City College of San Francisco is committed to providing students with opportunities to develop information competency skills which supports life long learning. Both the LLR mission statement and program-level student learning outcomes state this goal and support teaching and learning of these critical skills as stated in the general education goals of the college. Information competency instruction is in alignment with the Association of College and Research Libraries Information Literacy/Competency Standards for Higher Education (II.C.1.b. - 1). Librarians and instructors share responsibility for providing opportunities for students to learn and practice information competency (IC) skills (II.C.1.b. - 2).

Each library location has a librarian at the reference desk during all open hours. Electronic reference services are available via eRef, the library email reference service, and Instant Messaging during most open hours, except Saturday. At all library locations and online, librarians engage in instructional-based reference work. Librarians use active learning techniques, which engage students in the search rather than simply providing students with an answer. Librarians teach students to narrow research topics; develop search strategies; use search tools more effectively;
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evaluate information using a set criterion; and cite information correctly. A Walking Tour and Workshop G address the needs of new and Basic Skills students by providing orientation to the library collections, facilities and services.

The Library’s instructional services/information competency plan consists of three components: drop-in and online basic information competency workshops, course-related workshops, and the one-credit, online LIS 10 course. Since Fall 2006 all students completing a degree and/or who plan to transfer are required to satisfy the information competency requirement by successfully completing the Area B Written Composition requirement, which states: “The College intends to graduate students who have developed English language and information competency skills so that they can communicate clearly, both orally and in writing; can evaluate what they hear and read; and can acquire, interpret and use information appropriately.” (II.C.1.b. - 3). Students accomplish this requirement by successfully completing English 1A, of which the course outline requires a minimum of five hours of library/information competency skills workshops and assignments, such as evaluating source reliability; creating an annotated bibliography, and completing essay/research paper assignments.

The Library’s Curriculum Development/Information Competency (CD/IC) Committee, working with faculty, student and librarian input, have defined more clearly the information competencies and have designed a series of seven workshops, all but one are available online, to teach these skills. During the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 academic years, all of the course outlines, including SLOs, for the workshops were revised and submitted for College Curriculum Committee approval. At the request of the College Curriculum Committee, the workshop SLOs and content have been merged into a revised non-credit course outline (LIS 1000), effective Spring 2011. The most recent learning outcomes for each workshop are posted on the LLR website. Faculty in both academic and vocational disciplines require students to complete library skills workshops. In addition, all students are encouraged take library skills workshops to improve their research skills.

In addition to the series workshops, library faculty are committed to teaching these competencies by collaborating with department faculty to offer course-related and course-integrated instruction and orientation sessions at all campus libraries. Several programs are noteworthy for the large number of IC instruction session incorporated into the curriculum: Health Education, ESL, Learning Assistance courses and English. Another means of information competency instruction is the one-credit, transfer-level online LIS 10 course, which reaches approximately 160 students each year. Over the past three years, the library faculty conducted two pilot programs to reach more online students with library services and resources. As a result of the pilots, all online courses now include links to library resources; six online course faculty revised their online courses to include the online IC workshops and/or use the online library resources; and several online courses include an “embedded librarian.” An “embedded librarian” is the department subject librarian being an active participant in an online or tech-enhanced course, assisting students with narrowing topics, research strategy and citation, as well as assisting the instructor in developing assignments that promote information competency. The “embedded librarian” project will be expanded with the goal of reaching more than 50% of the online courses within the next two years (II.C.1.b. - 4).

**STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

1. Opportunities to teach information competency skills continue to increase in both one-on-one reference situations and in classroom settings. The use of the reference desks has
increased partly due to a huge increase in correcting assignments generated by students taking library workshops (both in person and online). The number of students completing research and information competency skills workshops has increased significantly because of a continued increase in students completing workshops online, as well as the addition of an online version of workshop P. Also contributing to the increase is the change in the ENGL 1A course outline, which occurred in the 09/10 year and requires students to complete 5 hours of library workshops. The number of course-related instruction sessions supporting specific courses and assignments continues to increase: 2009/10 data records 298 workshops and orientations, reaching 6,677 students in more than 25 academic and vocational programs (II.C.1.b. - 5). The number of in-class workshops offered is slightly less than the previous year due to the cancellation of the summer 2009 session and the reduction of IC in-class workshops offered in Spring 2010.

Assessment of the competencies is on-going and accomplished by a multi-methods approach. As part of a continuous feedback loop, the drop-in and online basic IC workshop outlines and instructional materials are revised based on student feedback from surveys typically administered every two years. Survey results during the 2008/09 academic year indicated the need for more practical examples and engaging learning activities. Training sessions were offered to librarians, focusing on the new workshop content and teaching techniques to involve students in their learning.

The LIS 10 course was substantially revised with refined SLOs based on several years’ of results from student performance on pre- and post-assessments of learning, as well as student performance on course tests and graded assignments. During the 2010/11 academic year, the course’s final project was revised with more precise SLOs and a grading rubric.

Other assessments include a Spring 2008 analysis of three sections’ worth of ENG 1A student surveys about their research process and an analysis using a rubric of their research papers’ in-text and “Works Cited” citations (II.C.1.b. - 6). As a result of this assessment a recommendation was made to the English Department’s curriculum committee to revise the ENG 1A course outline to specify the completion of five IC workshops with a minimum of five hours, thus increasing student preparation and experience using online research tools.

Another outcome was the development of a new workshop, Workshop P “Citing Sources to Responsibly Use Information,” which is now offered in the classroom and online.

Three library faculty working with their academic/vocational program colleagues have designed and administered a variety of assessments since 2006: Culinary Arts & Hospitality Studies (CAHS), Health Education, and Sociology. As a result of these surveys and pre- and post-test assessments, research-based assignments and workshop presentations covering IC skills have been revised. One example of the revisions is Sociology 1, where three sections of students completed a pre- and post-assessment during the Spring 2010 semester. The results were shared with the course instructor and the two librarians who taught the workshops, prompting a focused dialogue with the course instructor and a complete revision of the workshop outline. Additionally, the librarian working closely with the CAHS faculty identified the need for CAHS students to complete IC workshops on database searching and citing sources earlier in their education at CCSF. Many CAHS students wait until their third or fourth semester to complete the General Education English requirement and as a result do not have formal instruction on citing sources and searching online databases effectively. In the 2011 revision of the introductory CAHS 100 course outline, two IC workshops are required.
Working in conjunction with the LLR’s Program Review Assessment Plan, the Library’s CD/IC Committee planned three assessments for the newest workshop, P “Citing Sources to Responsibly Use Information”, to determine student satisfaction and performance -- student surveys, workshop assignments and a pre- and post-test. Two other workshops (C and D) are being evaluated during fall 2010 for student satisfaction with workshop content and clarity and usefulness of the workshop assignment.

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

II.C.1.c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.

Questions:

- What are the hours of operation of the library?
- What is the availability of electronic access to library materials?
- Are all campus locations/all types of students/all college instructional programs equally supported by library services and accessibility?

DESCRIPTION

CCSF provides adequate access to library and learning support services in a number of modes to support student learning on campus and at satellite locations and for day, evening and weekend courses, as well as for distance education and online learning.

Library Hours

As of Spring 2011, the Rosenberg Library on the Ocean campus is open 58.75 hours per week, from 7:45 a.m. to 7:45 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 7:45 a.m. to 2:45 p.m. Friday, and 10 a.m. to 1:45 p.m. on Saturday, a decrease of just over 24% from 77.5 hours in 1999/00. With few exceptions, hours at campus libraries have remained stable since 2007, the Mission library with 43, John Adams with 42, Southeast and Downtown with 36, and Statler library open 30 hours per week. Mission Campus library hours have decreased from a high of 61.5 hours Fall 2007 to Fall 2008 (II.C.1.c-1).

Decreased hours have been an issue for students and faculty. In February 2010, a grassroots group calling itself the General Assembly of CCSF staged an event in which approximately 80 students, faculty and staff peacefully occupied Rosenberg Library to keep it open for the evening to its previous closing time of 8:45 pm, as a way to increase awareness of how budget cuts have affected students (II.C.1.c-2: the Guardsman, theguardsman.com/students-occupy-library-to-protest-cuts). Faculty write-in comments in the Fall 2010 library survey included requests for more hours of access to Audiovisual equipment, that district faculty have input into the question of whether to reduce hours, and, more directly, for “Longer open hours”. Without the prompt of a specific question in the survey, several faculty also declared the need for increased hours in the evenings and on weekends to accommodate evening classes and working students (II.C.1.c-3: Faculty Survey,
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Fall 2010). Write-in comments from the Spring 2011 student survey indicate

Reference and circulation services facilitate access to library collections. Reference and circulation services are available at each library location during all open hours. In spite of the reduction in hours, use of services and collection has increased. The number of reference questions has risen from 48,741 in the 2005/06 academic year to 93,487 in 2009/10 (II.C.1.c-5). The circulation staff is in charge of circulating materials, managing the reserve books and overseeing group study rooms. The number of circulated items, both reserve and non-reserve has increased over 7% in the last five years (II.C.1.c-6). Collaborations between DSPS and the Library, Language Center, Media Center, and LAC/D to better serve disabled student are ongoing. A superior level of service may be one of the reasons the library and other learning support services such as the Language Lab and the learning Assistance Center are among the highest rated services year after year in campus-wide surveys (II.C.1.c-7: Waiting for College Survey).

Recommendations from the 2006 self-study included expanding library hours to Sundays (II.C.1.c-8). As of Spring 2011, only the Rosenberg library is open on the weekends, for 3.75 hours on Saturdays (II.C.1.c-9).

**Electronic Access**

Via the library website, there is 24/7 access to the library's online catalog and electronic collections, including article databases and electronic books as well as research, writing and subject guides, tutorials, and more. Electronic materials are accessible from off-campus with a valid CCSF ID card barcode, obtainable from the Registration office and from distance learning instructors. During 2009/10 alone, there were 4,703,399 article database searches, as compared to 297,122 for 2005/06 (II.C.1.c-10).

Since the last Self Study, new LLR services have increased online access to resources and instructional services. Five of the seven library workshops are now available to be taken and graded online. Remote access to article databases and electronic books has been improved for end-users with the implementation of EZProxy, which enables users to log in with their CCSF ID barcode only once per session to access any online library resources. Electronic course reserves were piloted over 2009/10, and after revision and modification based on pilot findings and in response to pending federal litigation against an educational institution for its electronic course reserves practice, the service is cleared for full implementation in Spring 2011 (II.C.1.c-11).

As part of the CCSF website redesign, a library committee is in the process of implementing a major redesign of the library website, which was planned over three years. Input from a student survey conducted in Fall 2008 indicated that while students felt the library website was useful, many found it cluttered and hard to navigate: “It's a little disorganized, takes some time to find the link that I need” and “[V]ery cluttered and busy. [C]annot find anything quickly!” (II.C.1.c-12). In response, the site was restructured into four primary areas, represented on the homepage, with a search box to immediately search the library catalog, another student request. The four areas are Finding Information, Research Help, Library Services, and About the Library. As a cost-effective solution to providing dynamic subject guides, a template using RSS feeds and Delicious tags make
subject guides migrated into the new content management system updatable on the fly, whereas the older system was labor intensive, often falling to the Distance Librarian for updating when time allowed (II.C.1.c-13).

The Library homepage received 1,687,544 hits during 2009/10. Since the new website went online in January 2010 until the end of June 2010, website hits increased almost 70% over the same period in 2008/09 (621,637 in 2009 as compared to 1,056,457 in 2010). ERef use has remained limited, but Instant Message reference, since being made accessible from most Library web pages with the redesign, increased approximately 350% in 2009/10 (II.C.1.c-14).

Bibliographic access has also been improved in several ways since the last self-study. The library implemented an upgrade of its online catalog over the 2010/11 winter break; incorporating feedback from the library’s 2008 library website survey of faculty and students and input from reference librarians’ experience serving students at the reference desk. In addition, the Technical Services department has added 21 new location codes, added local subject headings to increase access to foreign films, ESL materials, and basic skills materials; conducted multiple authority record cleanup projects; and corrected tens of thousands of errors in bibliographic records. The READ collection, a centralized and easy to locate collection for English language learners and basic skills students was made possible by these efforts. Bibliographic records were also created for remaining print periodical subscriptions to help improve access.

**Equitable Access**

The library continues to work with faculty and students of online courses and those at campuses without libraries. LLR provides five of its seven workshops online, with plans to develop a sixth online version. The intercampus delivery service continues twice a week between campus libraries, and requests from the Rosenberg library alone numbered 2,486 (II.C.1.c-15). The service has not received anticipated staff allocation to make the service more frequent and reliable, or to expand it to district sites without libraries.

The Fall 2007 grand opening of the Mission campus library increased access to physical collections and to the Language, Learning Assistance and Media Centers to students enrolled in courses at the Mission campus as well as at the Castro campus, through the outreach efforts of the Mission campus librarian (II.C.1.c-16). An additional library location is now under construction at the Chinatown/North Beach campus, tentatively expected to open Fall 2012 (II.C.1.c-17).

Librarians also provide services to CCSF sites without libraries, including workshops at the Castro, Civic Center (formerly Alemany) and Chinatown/North Beach campuses (II.C.1.c-18). Reference services are also available by telephone during all library hours, by instant message during most hours of operation, and by email reference. The library website provides access to a number of research aids, such as online library skills workshops and citation guides. Subject librarians and the Distance Learning librarian help online faculty develop assignments that use library resources. The Distance Learning librarian provides dedicated service to distance learning faculty and students, including grading of online library skills workshops. Campus librarians serve as liaisons to the faculty and courses offered at their campus and nearby satellite locations. In Fall 2009, library faculty and staff assisted faculty at the Civic Center campus in setting up a reading room there for ESL students. In Fall 2010, two librarians piloted an embedded librarian service, providing support “embedded” in online courses through the District's online learning system, Insight. Using
Rosenberg Grant funds, LLR offered four grants to online faculty to encourage the integration of library resources into their classes.

Several other measures have been undertaken by library and learning support services to increase access to materials and services. To increase access to course materials, a Library Course Reserves (LCR) project was piloted in Fall 2010. Librarians at the reference desk and circulation staff recorded requests for textbooks not available on reserve. Of 140 instructors contacted, twenty percent responded by providing materials to the library. Library faculty voted to formalize this project as an ongoing library practice. The project has carried on into Spring 2011.

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

**Media Center**

The Media Center at the Ocean Campus provides access to multimedia materials that supplement course work throughout the curriculum at City College. All registered students, faculty and staff may use the facilities. Faculty may check out materials for one week at a time. Ten percent of the media carrels are wheelchair accessible and a special reader that slows down books on tape is available. Departments that consistently utilize the Media Center’s services include Music, ESL, English, Health Education, Physical Education and telecourses. With the exception of Spring 2011, Media Center hours parallel those of Rosenberg Library (Funding for Spring 2011 did not allow for the Media Center hours to increase along with library hours.). To increase student access to materials held in the AV unit, the Media Center has begun allowing students to request material from AV for viewing in the Media Center. The John Adams and Southeast campus libraries have video and audio equipment stations for student use, while the Downtown and Mission campus libraries have dedicated multimedia labs. In Fall 2010, the ESL lab moved out of the Media Center and was replaced by the library word processing lab formerly in room 521, making available an additional 50 computer stations to students. The space is in use by the English department for the Spring 2011 semester.

**Audiovisual Unit and Broadcast Media Services**

Audiovisual and Broadcast Media Services provide media services, equipment and deliveries for Ocean Campus classrooms. Broadcast Media Services and Audiovisual have coordinated to provide clear information in their respective websites, in the faculty handbook, and at various other locations to inform faculty about available classroom services, hours of operation, and where and how to request services (II.C.1.c-19).

The Audiovisual unit at the Ocean campus, open Monday through Thursday 7:30am to 6:45pm and Friday 7:30am-2:45pm, provides equipment maintenance and delivery district-wide, as well as three multimedia rooms in the LLRC equipped for DVD, videocassette, film, 35mm slide and computer projection, including Internet access.

The Mission, Downtown and John Adams campus libraries handle audiovisual equipment request for the campus. AV requests at the Southeast campus are directed to the campus audiovisual room. Audiovisual equipment and materials for campuses without libraries or designated audiovisual resources are provided through the AV department in Rosenberg LLR, by arrangement with the instructor or department.
Language Center

The Language Center on the Ocean Campus provides access to all students enrolled in foreign language courses at CCSF during library hours, with additional labs at the Downtown and Mission campuses, all of which have stations for disabled users. The Language Center in Rosenberg LLRC has faculty monitors and student workers to provide assistance, and offers general orientations to classes in the Language Center or in the classroom at any campus, both days and evenings. There are also student workshops offered on the use of various textbooks and ancillary materials to increase their use. The Online Language Lab provides remote access to textbook audio and video materials and supplemental resources 24/7. Instructors can reserve the Electronic Classroom (R205E), equipped with 32 student computers, an instructor computer, DVD/video/laser disc player and presentation stand, during Language Center hours. The Language Center also increases access to collections and services by providing space and equipment for instructors to create ancillary materials and allow students to submit oral assignments electronically (II.C.1.c-20).

Learning Assistance Department

The Learning Assistance Center extends its location by collaborating with other departments and programs such as academic department labs, retention programs and EOPS. Online courses and the Learning Assistance Department website, newly updated, provide alternative means of delivery for students to utilize services if location or time is a barrier to physical access. The Learning Assistance Center is open 53 hours per week, including evening and Saturday hours (II.C.1.c-21).

The addition of the Mission Campus included an LAC operating within the library. A second new campus, Chinatown, will include a small Learning Assistance Center in the library as well. In addition, each of the campuses will have new computer labs where students will be able to do homework and other assignments.

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

1. CCSF provides satisfactory access to library and learning support services. While the College has made significant strides in making services more accessible to students under worsening economic constraints regardless of ability or location, some areas of improvement identified in the previous Self-Study have remained stagnant or declined. The last Self Study indicated a need to reinstate Sunday hours; instead, hours have further decreased, leaving an entire segment of students – those in evening classes or weekend classes that span the 3.75 hours on Saturday – without physical access to materials.

Faculty and student input through surveys and action indicate library hours must be increased to satisfactorily support student learning. Recommendations made in the 2006 Self Study included dedicated staffing and expansion of the intercampus delivery service to CCSF sites without libraries (II.C.1.c-22). _AWAITING SURVEY_ of respondents to the Spring 2011 student survey marked “not satisfied” with the delivery of books from another CCSF campus (II.C.1.c-23). Expansion of the service has been discussed amongst campus deans, but cannot take place without resources for an additional driver. The service will have to expand to include the Chinatown Campus library when that campus opens.

An inventory and tracking system for instructional equipment throughout the district was recommended in the last Self-Study, but it has not been created. The recent reorganization of the IT department, and the hiring of a CTO, may create the opportunity as District computer equipment is brought under the auspices of IT.
The greatest strides have been made in the areas of online access to services, especially in recent years with the expanded online workshop offerings, redesigned library website and included innovations and the electronic course reserves and embedded librarian pilots. Use of online resources and services continues to increase, and survey feedback indicates a high level of satisfaction with online services and resources.

II.C.1.d. The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services.

DESCRIPTION

CCSF provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services. Each library location employs a 3M security system to secure library materials within the facility, and a Sonitrol alarm for the location. Video cameras monitor the three floors of Rosenberg Library for security purposes, as well as the rear entrance to Rosenberg LLRC and adjacent parking lot. Campus police respond quickly when called for emergency situations or disturbances. In 2010 LLR worked with campus police to reduce incidents in the library with increased patrols and measures such as staff trainings and sting operations.

The library and all learning support service locations rely upon District maintenance and janitorial services. The Building & Grounds department makes general repairs to the buildings. Some equipment, the elevators and copy machines have service agreements with the District to provide equipment repair and troubleshooting. Rosenberg Library has heavily stained carpet, with multiple patches and worn areas, as well as many threadbare chairs. Rosenberg grant money has been earmarked for replacement chairs and possible other improvements to the facility, but these projects are still in the proposal phase (II.C.1.d. - 1).

The library adequately maintains the materials within the library collections. Librarians are responsible for subject areas within the collection; duties include weeding, updating and filling gaps in the collection to ensure quality (II.C.1.d. - 2). A major weeding project was undertaken in Spring and Summer 2010.

BMS staff members constantly monitor the department for suspicious activity. All Broadcast Electronic Media Arts students are required to sign an Open Lab Use Agreement which addresses equipment and facility security issues. All the equipment has locks and bolts secure equipment to carts and furniture. The Broadcast Electronic Media Arts facilities at Ocean and Mission Campuses have additional and separate Sonitrol Systems.

Library Automation Services (LAS) is responsible for the integrated library system, including maintenance and upgrades. Information Technology Services (ITS) provide an excellent level of maintenance and security for library equipment and computer systems throughout the district. In 2009, ITS was restructured and members of LAS were reassigned to ITS. In 2010/11, ITS began ordering, configuring, installing, securing, upgrading, troubleshooting, maintaining and replacing all Library, Language Center and LAC student and staff hardware and software in multiple City College of San Francisco locations. The project is still underway and so the effects of this change have yet to be determined.

ITS supports some department and program multipurpose labs and all of the campus computer labs. Several tools are used to maintain the proper function of the lab: 1) Imaging / ghosting; 2) freezing
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computers or locking user profiles; and 3) utilizing limited user profiles. Various combinations of these methods are used depending on the needs of the lab. ITS staff is able to maintain high availability of computers in the labs. Because funding for equipment replacement is often difficult to secure, there is a need to establish standard replacement cycles for computers. All units commented on the need for a general fund media services equipment budget.

**Strengths and Areas for Improvement**

1. CCSF effectively maintains and secures its library and other learning support services, although there are areas where improvement is possible. Strengths include the collaborative relationship with campus police in support of a safe and secure learning environment and the responsiveness of LAS and ITS in keeping student computers operational and available. However, equipment (especially computer equipment) and furnishings should have planned replacement schedules.

II.C.1.e. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.

**Questions:**

- What contracts, if any, exist for the provision of library and learning support services?
- What processes does the institution have for evaluating and ensuring the quality of those contracted services?
- How does the institution gather information to assess whether the services are being used?

**DESCRIPTION**

None of the library and learning support services are formally contracted out to external entities, but formalized agreements with outside organizations do exist. The Library, as a participant in OCLC, in addition to cataloging agreements, maintains an agreement through its Interlibrary Loan Policy (ILL) to borrow and loan materials. An agreement also exists with Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (III) for the provision of services and maintenance of the integrated online catalog. Standard licensing agreements are in place with software vendors and online databases such as EBSCOHost, NetLibrary and Gale. Pinnacle is contracted with the District to service and maintain copiers and printers.

Services provided by III, EbscoHost, Gale and Pinnacle are all integral to library use. Usage statistics for searches in both the library catalog and online databases are recorded, and the number of database searches has more than doubled in the last five years (II.C.1.e. -1). Student surveys assess user satisfaction with the computers and photocopy machines (II.C.1.e. - 2) and the purchase of PC Cop, the computer access management system used in the library, was a direct response to survey results that showed students were dissatisfied with their ability to find an open computer in the library (II.C.1.e. - 3).
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Each year before renewing databases, the acquisitions librarian reviews licensing agreements with database vendors and reports back to the library faculty committee and library administration. Librarians attend database vendor product demonstrations and obtain input from their assigned departments before voting on the various packages. In 2007, before the library offered EBSCOHost databases, the library conducted a thorough comparison of both EBSCOHost and Gale databases. In addition to reviewing full-text titles, librarians assessed student preference and usability of both database vendors. The library held four sessions in which students conducted the same searches in both databases and evaluated the user interface. Use of EBSCOHost quickly increased after the licensing agreement was initiated, from 562,039 searches in 2007/08 to 1,680,650 in 2009/10 (II.C.1.e. - 4), and satisfaction has been high (II.C.1.e. - 5).

Library administration consults with the LLR Automation department and ITS regarding purchases of new equipment. The vendor from which CCSF purchases computer hardware offers a 5 year warranty on each system; hardware maintenance and repair is not a major concern because of these warranties.

**Strengths and Areas for Improvement**

1. There are no formal or contractual agreements with outside vendors to directly provide library or learning support services. However, for the agreements which do exist with library and learning support service units, there are adequate evaluation and oversight mechanisms.

II.C.2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

**Questions:**

- What methods does the institution use to evaluate its library and other learning support services?
- Does the evaluation assess use, access, and relationship of the services to intended student learning?
- Does the evaluation include input by faculty, staff and students?

**DESCRIPTION**

Library and learning support service (LLSS) program review processes are evaluated to ensure sufficiency in meeting student learning needs. Library & Learning Resources (LLR) and Learning Assistance Department (LAD) assessment cycles ensure that workshop and course student learning outcomes meet student learning needs. A variety of measures are used to evaluate SLOs, services, facilities and resources. Types of assessment include but are not limited to: statistical data analysis; student and faculty surveys; focus groups; program reviews; and informal anecdotal feedback from the college community. Assessment of LLR instructional services includes statistical data, faculty and student evaluation of workshops and pre and post testing within specific programs. College-wide faculty and student surveys also assess overall satisfaction with the library, learning assistance centers, media and language center, audiovisual and broadcast media services and computer labs.
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In addition to surveying students and faculty, each library and learning support service generates usage statistics. When compiled into data surveys, trends emerge that assist in the library planning process. Annual program review reports provide an overall assessment of accomplishments and identify problems and needs. Findings and recommendations are included in budget requests, program reviews and other planning documents.

**Library & Learning Resources**

Library & Learning Resources plays two important roles relating to student learning as an instructional unit with credit and non-credit courses that directly support student learning outcomes and as an academic support area. In its capacity as an academic support area, it provides: 1) online and print collections of information resources that directly support the curriculum and independent learning; 2) services to help students access and use these resources; 3) and facilities and an environment that provide computers and other equipment, and individual and group study space to complete coursework and foster learning and academic success.

LLR has carried out a variety of data collection and assessment activities to monitor the quality of its services and resources for purposes of improvement, and to prepare reports for state, national and regional professional and accreditation associations. The Library Instructional Services program, with the assistance of the advisory Information Competency (IC) & Curriculum Development Committee, has taken the lead over the past eight years in assessing the research skills workshops, since the Library’s role in teaching information competency/research skills directly supports the College’s general education learning goals and many of the academic programs’ student learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes and assessment strategies were developed for these research skills workshops several years before the College required all courses and programs to have SLOs.

In response to changes in College program review requirements and regional accreditation standards, LLR completed the following initiatives within the past five years:

- Created a Statistics Task Force which has centralized and streamlined data collection for information resources, services and facilities usage;
- Significantly revised research skills workshop SLOs, based on assessment findings, to foster student engagement and active learning;
- Established an LLR Assessment Committee which has developed the LLR program SLOs and the student survey for use every three to five years and which works with other LLR Committees to draft the Assessment Plan and timeline of assessment activities (II.O.C.2. -1).

The LLR employs a departmental committee structure that enables librarians and classified staff members to come together to review policies and goals and make improvements. Examples of library committees include: Assessment; Curriculum Development and Information Competency; Communication and Outreach; Technology; Web; and Library Advisory. Committees work to improve services, plan new services, offer more resources and enhance access. Often, issues that arise from student surveys or faculty consultation are brought to the appropriate committee for further analysis. Recent committee work that has furthered the goals of the library include: 1) the Web Committee redesign and migration of the library web site; 2) the Communication and Outreach Committee’s development of the LLR Communication Plan; and 3) the Assessment Committee’s development of LLR Program-Level Student Learning Outcome. All committee work
that impacts the library as a whole is presented to the Faculty and Supervisors’ Council for support and then recommendations are made to Library Advisory.

The LLR Assessment Committee developed the most recent student survey. LLR conducts a student survey every three years to solicit information on how well it provides services and resources to support student learning. The most recent survey was distributed Spring 2011 online and in paper format at all library locations. Specific questions target the LLR’s new program-level student learning outcomes (II.C.2. -2). **INSERT SURVEY FINDINGS**

A LLR faculty survey was conducted in Fall 2010 to assess: 1) the librarian subject liaison communication practices; 2) faculty use of library services and collections; 3) faculty perceptions the library’s ability to meet student learning needs; and 4) which new library services the faculty is most interested. When rating the library’s on-site and online resources and services meeting student learning needs, 82% of the faculty respondents provided an average to above average rating (II.C.2. -3). Faculty also identified a need for electronic reserves and embedding librarians into online courses. Both new services will increase access and address student learning needs. As a result, a LLR task force has been working with CCSF counsel to draft a policy on copyrighted e-reserves and the Distance Education Librarian is working with the Chair of the Technology Mediated Instruction department to map out a strategy for embedding librarians into more online courses.

Informal faculty assessment of library and learning support services is constant. The dialogue between library subject liaisons and instructors helps to shape library services and collections and to focus on specific student learning and curricular needs. For example, each year when the library is assessing the periodical databases and print periodical subscriptions, librarians solicit feedback from faculty on which periodicals are essential to their discipline and support curricular needs. Library exhibitions receive continual anecdotal feedback from faculty and students. The chair of one department commented: Rosenberg Library exhibitions “are vital, expansive, intimate. They give our campus the feel of an intellectual community, in the positive, rich sense of the phrase” (II.C.2. -4).

In Spring 2010, the Language Center identified student learning outcomes (II.C.2. -5). The Language Center uses surveys to assess faculty and students. A link to the assessment survey is emailed directly to a representative sampling of Foreign Language Department classes at the end of each semester. In addition, a prominent link to each semester’s survey is located on the Language Center home page. Students can also submit a printed copy of the survey in the survey/suggestion box located on the check-in counter. Additionally, every semester the Language Center conducts a user feedback survey to ensure that its services are meeting students’ needs. In the most recent survey more than 85 percent of respondents felt the Language Center helped them to do better in their foreign language courses. More than 80 percent indicated that the Language Center helped them to identify the language-learning resources that are most effective for them personally. More than 50 percent felt their computer skills increased by using the Language Center. Sixty-five percent indicated their study habits and focus improved. More than 55 percent felt they developed a better understanding of other cultures and people by using the Language Center (II.C.2. -6).

In addition to surveying students and faculty, each library and learning support service generates usage statistics. When compiled into data surveys, trends emerge that assist in the planning processes. Annual program review reports provide an overall assessment of accomplishments and identify problems and needs. Findings and recommendations are included in budget requests, program reviews and other planning documents.
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Learning Assistance Department

The Learning Assistance Center developed SLO’s specific to their tutor training course in Fall 2007. First, the faculty developed outcomes, activities, tutor reflections and faculty assessments. Then during Fall 2008, they addressed the problem of evaluating the faculty assessments. LAD also developed two complimentary online surveys to assess the student learning outcomes in the tutor training course. The intention was to understand 1) how the SLO’s covered in the tutor training course were used in tutoring by tutors who completed the tutor training course; and 2) if students who are tutored by those tutors believe they are recipients of the same outcomes. The two surveys have been used for six semesters and the LACD has learned which tutoring strategies are most used, least used, most valued, and requires changes. Indeed, the assessment has pointed the way to a number of changes in the course curriculum (II.C.2 -7).

During Fall 2006, College Success faculty engaged in an extensive dialogue to develop SLO’s and teaching “Best Practices” for the course. As a result, the LERN 50 course was redesigned with SLO’s in mind and an SLO rubric was developed. This activity included redefining SLOs, content, and assessment activities for the course. During Spring 07, a College Success Survey was developed and administered to students who completed LERN 50 with an A, B, or C grade (Fall 2006), enrolled in a subsequent term, and had an e-mail in Banner. The survey was also administered Spring 08, 09 and 10 (II.C.2 -8). The purpose of the survey was to assess the students’ application of SLOs in current classes. The survey also assessed the overall usefulness of SLOs for the course. The data from this survey has been used to redesign the SLOs for LERN 50. LAD faculty are beginning to understand which SLOs for LERN 50 are being applied to other courses and which SLOs students apply more/less frequently. This data has assisted the faculty in the development of course curriculum for College Success and its faculty.

The Learning Assistance Department, during Fall 10, reformatted all its assessment surveys following the purchase of a Survey Monkey license. They now have the following SLO assessment surveys: 1) LAC Tutor Survey: Assesses tutors’ ability to use tutoring techniques taught in the course; 2) LAC Student Survey: Assesses (a) students’ review of tutors’ abilities, and (b) students’ own learning while tutoring; 3) LAC College Success Survey: Assesses students’ use of college success skills one semester after completing their college success course; 4) LAC Computer Lab Survey: Assesses (a) students’ review of computer lab and its staff, and (3) students’ own learning while using the LAC computers (II.C.2 – 9).

BMS, Audiovisual Unit and Computer Labs

Assessment of media and audiovisual services for faculty is conducted through employee surveys administered college-wide or through LLR surveys. In the 2010 LLR faculty survey, INSERT DATA (II.C.2.-10). Formal assessment of the multi-use computer labs throughout the district is infrequent. Periodically, the college conducts a technology-focused college-wide survey to determine the overall satisfaction of instructional technology services to the college community. In a college-wide student survey administered in fall 2010, students rated their satisfaction with computer labs on campus INSERT DATA and students rated their ability to use software applications (e.g. Word-processing) to be successful in their courses: INSERT DATA (II.C.2 -11). Informally, the Technology Divisions lab managers work closely with the departmental liaisons to address concerns relating to each lab’s day to day and long term operation. However, at present, no formal process exists to evaluate the computer services supporting student learning outside of user satisfaction questions.
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Strengths and Areas for Improvement

1. Library and Learning Support Service departments and units evaluate the services, resources and facilities in a variety of ways that results in improvements in meeting student learning needs. The yearly program review process is effective in keeping departments on track in terms of assessment, planning for improvements and requesting institutional support. Both the LAD and the LLR use multi-method approaches to assessment and are consistent in meeting student learning needs. Aside from user satisfaction questions, computer labs throughout the district are not fully assessed. Usage statistics are needed to fully understand how the labs are used and whether they meet the needs of students.
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Standard III: Resources:

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

Standard III.A: Resources:

Human Resources:

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

Questions:

- What methods does the institution use to assure that qualifications for each position are closely matched to specific programmatic needs? What analyses and discussions have led the institution to agree on those needs?
- Are the institution’s personnel sufficiently qualified to guarantee the integrity of programs and services?

III.A.1.a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for the selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Questions:

- How does the institution decide on hiring criteria?
- How are faculty involved in the selection of new faculty?
• How does the college decide an applicant is well-qualified?
• How does the college know that the faculty selected have knowledge of their subject matter?
• By what methods does the college define and evaluate “effective teaching” in its hiring processes? How is that effectiveness judged?
• How does the college define and judge scholarship in a candidate, and by what means does it judge a candidate’s potential to contribute to a college mission?
• How are jobs advertised?
• By what means does the institution verify the qualifications of applicants and newly hired personnel?
• How does the college check the equivalency of degrees from non-U.S. institutions?
• What evidence is there that hiring processes yield highly qualified employees?
• What safeguards are in place to assure that hiring procedures are constantly applied?

City College of San Francisco has a clear hiring policy and process that assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training and experience to provide and support these programs and services. The Human Resources Department oversees the hiring processes for all District personnel, ensuring that the established hiring procedures are equitably and fairly administered. To ensure a large number of applicants, job announcements are advertised in the Chronicle of Higher Education, at job fairs, on employment web sites, and on the CCSF web site.

City College of San Francisco has established and published inclusive procedures for administrative, faculty, and classified employee hiring. For each category of employee, hiring criteria, including job announcements, paper screening criteria, and interview questions, are established by the hiring departments, reviewed by key personnel, and approved by the Human Resources Department and Affirmative Action Office to ensure that results yield effective hiring of knowledgeable personnel. Job announcements list the required employment qualifications, the state-mandated minimum qualifications, and the desirable qualifications established by the hiring search committee.

The Search Committee/Department Chair, Associate Director of Affirmative Action, Academic Senate, and appropriate Dean/Vice Chancellor/Chancellor review Job announcement drafts. The Human Resources Academic Hiring Unit is responsible for ensuring that applicants meet the state-mandated minimum qualifications, including verification of degree(s) from accredited institutions, and relevant work experience. Procedures are in place for determining equivalency through the Academic Senate Equivalency Committee and for evaluating foreign degrees where applicable. Prospective candidates for faculty positions are required to provide evidence of effective teaching and show their potential for contributing to the institution’s mission by providing such evidence in their application materials, including letters of interest and the diversity statement, and during the interview and teaching demonstration. The hiring process is rigorous, and nearly all departments require a teaching demonstration and a portfolio of work as apart of the interview process.
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The institution serves a great diversity of students in a wide variety of programs, including credit, noncredit, contract education and continuing education. This variety requires that greater emphasis be placed on understanding current issues pertaining to equity and diversity when hiring. For this reason, CCSF provides guidelines to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse backgrounds related to their ethnicity, culture, socioeconomic status, and educational achievement, sexual orientation, or disability.

In accordance with faculty hiring procedures, the background of committee members should reflect the diversity, range of interests, philosophies, and programs in the department. The composition of each hiring committee is consistent with federal and state guidelines on race and sex. The Human Resources Academic Hiring Unit, along with the Affirmative Action Office, works to ensure that search committee members are oriented on the hiring procedures, employment regulations, and on the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 12 – Upgrading provisions.

These processes yield faculty and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The College employs approximately 790 full-time and 1,090 part-time faculty. Ninety-five percent of faculty and administrators hold master’s degrees and approximately 250 hold doctorates. They bring to the students extensive backgrounds gained through years of study, research, and extensive experience in business, industry, education, the arts, and government service. Many are prominent in a variety of communities. Others are officers and policy makers in professional organizations. Some are authors of nationally and internationally published texts in their fields, and a large number have done pioneer work in developing special courses and curricula.

In 2010, almost 20 percent of the college’s administrators retired. CCSF hired interim administrators to fill the positions while the process to hire more than 10 permanent administrators continues through the 2010-2011 academic year.

Pursuant to Education Code 88137, the City and County of San Francisco’s merit system, overseen by the Civil Service Commission, governs the District’s employment of classified employees. All permanent and provisional positions, with the exception of positions exempted from the merit system process, have been classified by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR) according to their duties and responsibilities. Exempt employees serve at the pleasure of the appointing officer and are exempt from the Civil Service process by the San Francisco Charter. All non-exempt District classified positions have been reviewed and classified by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR) according to their duties and responsibilities. If a classified position is new or an additional position is to be added to a College department, a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) or Express Classification form (EXP) must be completed. The JAQ or EXP serves as the survey instrument designed to elicit complete and thorough information for a specific position, such as major functions, essential duties and responsibilities.

In September 2008, the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District adopted Resolution No. 080926-S4 requiring SFCCD to consider certain job applicant finalists who have been convicted of a felony involving controlled substances. Under this resolution, finalists who submit evidence of at least five years of rehabilitation would be referred to a Committee on Rehabilitation. The Committee would then review the rehabilitation evidence and make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding whether or not the finalist is sufficiently rehabilitated. A Committee on Rehabilitation has been formed composed of faculty and...
administrators. Employee handbooks, employment applications and employment websites have also been updated to reflect this new policy.

III.A.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Questions:

- How does the college decide on appropriate institutional responsibilities for personnel participation? How is participation judged?
- What process is in place to assure that evaluations lead to improvement of job performance?
- What is the connection between personnel evaluations and institutional effectiveness and improvement?
- Do evaluation criteria measure the effectiveness of personnel in performing their duties?

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 collective bargaining agreement. District policies and procedures outline criteria for evaluating staff and administrators.

The purpose of evaluation for all segments is to identify strengths and special qualities of the evaluatee, and to define areas where it is determined that improvement is needed. At all levels, a criterion that effectively measures and evaluates an employee’s work performance is incorporated. The evaluation process includes performance indicators that are linked to institutional effectiveness and improvement. At all levels, where employees receive a less than satisfactory rating, a remediation process is implemented.

The Faculty Evaluation process is administered by the Office of the Dean of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation, and Tenure Review in accordance with AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 9. In general, classroom faculty are evaluated every three years on: (1) professional qualities, including keeping current in their discipline; (2) performance—classroom instruction; and (3) classroom presentation, including demonstrating sensitivity to the learning difficulties of students. Student evaluations, taken via an in-class survey, are a crucial component of every classroom instructor’s evaluation. They are weighed seriously, and may serve as a revealing indicator of potential areas of concern.

The “job performance” component of an evaluation consists of an in-depth evaluation of course content, subject knowledge and classroom presentation for classroom faculty. For librarians, job performance is evaluated in areas such as promoting student access to and use of the library, providing students with materials that are appropriate to their needs, and striving to maintain an environment conducive to study, research, reading and learning. Counselors’ job performance is evaluated according to how they: help students define problems, support students in seeking
solutions to problems and provide opportunities for students to express concerns. Resource instructors’ job performance is evaluated on how effectively they develop instructional resource.

To further improve the evaluation process and provide feedback for improvement to faculty members, an additional category was added to the ratings component of the evaluation. The category of “Satisfactory but needs improvement” addresses issues prior to a faculty falling into the “Unsatisfactory” category. The process also includes a provision that addresses the matter through an Improvement Plan. More specific evaluation components are outlined in the Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review document available from the Office of the Dean of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation, and Tenure Review.

Department Chairs are evaluated in regard to the performance of their supervisory duties and responsibilities in accord with Article 8 – Evaluation of the DCC/SFCCD CBA. This article specifies that each department chairperson should be evaluated by the academic and classified members of the department during February or March of each year of the term of office, except for the third or last year of their term as department chair. The department chairperson and the administrator to whom he/she reports examine and discuss the feedback submitted by faculty and staff in the Faculty and Classified Staff Review Form for Department Chairperson. The administrator then summarizes the review results, which are placed in the evaluatee’s personnel file. (REF)

The Classified employee evaluation currently follows the Performance Appraisal System of the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR). [Ref. 6] The purposes of the performance plan and appraisal are to: (1) evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the employee’s work; (2) communicate these to the employee; and (3) set goals for performance, improvement, and career development. New permanent classified staff are evaluated after three months and on the anniversary date of employment. The current appraisal/evaluation process does not provide for a specific rating on dedication to professional growth as made evident by an employee’s participation in District-wide committees, organizations, and projects (for example, Classified Senate or Accreditation workgroups).

During the previous Accreditation Self-Study, the Human Resources Department reviewed and developed its own classified evaluation process for all classified employees. This new structure has served as a means of dialog between supervisor and evaluatee, and as a way to create progressive work plans. To further improve the ease and timeliness of evaluations for classified staff, the Human Resources Department has put the evaluations online. Staff from the Human Resources Department send an email notice about the need for an evaluation, and then a reminder to the employee’s department head prior to the due date. The Department also sends a reminder after the due date if necessary. A dedicated HR staff member monitors the process. In addition, permanent and non-permanent classified employees will be evaluated going forward. Prior to Fall 2010, only permanent classified employees were evaluated.

Administrators are evaluated on their performance relating to program planning, problem solving, professional relationships, job knowledge and application, human resources skills, communication skills, organizational leadership skills, personal leadership skills and teamwork. A new Administrative Evaluation and Contract Renewal Procedures was implemented during the fiscal year 2003-04. The Administrative Evaluation process was revamped to ensure a more direct relationship between the evaluatee and his or her direct supervisor. All administrators evaluated
during this cycle received ratings of satisfactory and above, and as a result thereof, received three-year appointments effective July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2007.

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

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

III.A.1.c. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student-learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. The evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student-learning outcomes does include effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

Questions:

• What are the roles of teachers, tutors, and others in producing student learning outcomes?

• What deep thinking have faculty, as individuals and collectively, engaged in about how well students are learning in their courses and programs? What measures have they, again as individuals and collectively, created or selected to measure that learning?

• What discussions have faculty had about how to improve learning? What plans have been made?

• What changes have faculty made in teaching methodologies to improve learning?

• What changes in course content or sequencing have resulted from analyses of how well students are mastering course content?

• What methods has the institution developed to evaluate effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes? Are these methods yielding meaningful and useful results?

• How does the institution use analysis of the results of assessment to improve student learning outcomes?

• How has staff development supported faculty performance in satisfactory development and assessment of student learning outcomes?

All faculty who teach courses are evaluated regularly in accordance with Article 9 of the District/AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement. During the evaluation of classroom faculty, evaluators review course materials to make sure that faculty are following the course outlines. The dialog that ensues between the evaluation committee and the evaluatee includes a review of their
syllabus, teaching materials, methodology and grade books, relevant findings are incorporated into the evaluation. Several components that measure the effectiveness in producing student-learning outcomes are rated and discussed by the evaluation team, including the following areas of instructional interest:

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

CCSF course outlines describe student-learning outcomes in relation to course content, teaching methodology and student evaluation criteria. As a result, the estimation of these during a faculty evaluation demonstrates a link to the significant role faculty play in the integration of student-learning outcomes into their curriculum and teaching practices. Much dialogue about student learning outcomes and teaching methodology begins at the departmental level, coordinated by the chairs. Faculty involved in course outline development engage in a technical review process, whose primary goal is to ensure that the learning outcomes, course content, instructional methodology and student evaluation criteria reinforce and support one another. All proposed course outlines are subsequently subject to the review and approval of the Curriculum Committee with these measures in mind.

The evaluation process also includes a student evaluation component for all classroom instructors, and, if applicable, for non-classroom faculty as well. Classroom and/or formal work site visitations and observations are also conducted. Students are asked to evaluate instructors with a series of questions, including:

- Are the methods of testing (examinations, papers, etc.) a valid evaluation of the knowledge and or skills you have gained from this course?
- Are assignments relevant and helpful in understanding the subject area?

The student evaluations are considered an important piece of evidence of faculty success during the evaluation process.

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

- How does the institution foster ethical behavior in its employees?
- Does the institution have a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel?

While City College of San Francisco does not have one single institutional code of professional ethics for administrators, faculty and staff, expectations for ethical behavior by employees of the District are covered in various District policies, employee handbooks, and collective bargaining agreements.

District Policies concerning instructors’ responsibilities in classrooms and laboratories are published in the The Faculty Handbook, pp. 16-24. [Ref. 9] Additionally, Article 8 of the AFT/SFCCD CBA speaks to Academic Freedom, Duties, and Responsibilities. [Ref. 10] Article 8.D. specifically addresses faculty-student relationships. The Classified Handbook, pp. 16-17,
outlines the requirements of classified employees at the time of hire, such as fingerprinting, misrepresentation or falsification of information, the arrest and conviction policy, and security clearance. [Ref. 11] District Policy 4.09 – Use of Slurs is included in the handbook on p. 12 and as Appendix B. [Ref. 12] All new employees are provided with a handbook at the time of their new-hire processing. The handbooks are updated regularly and are distributed via an interoffice mailing to all employees, as well as made available on the Human Resources website.

Other relevant policies and articles that define professional ethics expectations at CCSF include:

SEIU Local 1021/SFCCD CBA Article 9 – Discipline covers the discipline process for represented SEIU classified employees. Article 9.C. – Causes for Discipline outlines circumstances under which unit members may be disciplined for cause. [Ref. 8]

The Board of Trustees adopted the Workplace Violence Policy on June 10, 2004. A Workplace Violence Policy and Procedure Brochure for distribution to all employees was developed and reviewed through the Shared Governance procedure during the Fall 2005 semester. The policy is included in the latest versions of the faculty and classified employee handbooks.

The Affirmative Action Office disseminates information to all employees pertaining to the District’s Sexual Harassment and Unlawful Discrimination policies and procedures for filing complaints. Additional information is available on their website.

On July 29, 2010, the Board of Trustees passed Board Policy 3052 – Conflict of Interest. This policy stated that no trustee, officer, or employee of the District shall make, or in any way attempt to use his or her official position to influence a District decision in which he or she has an economic interest. (REF XX)

The Board of Trustees has also been working on drafts of Board Policy 3050 -- Institutional Code of Ethics, an amendment to the SFCCD Policy Manual. This policy is expected to be adopted during spring 2011.

CCSF promotes a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration and improved levels of communication, and policies and procedures are in place that ensure healthy working conditions and foster an environment of respect and trust. However, during the last accreditation cycle, the self-study had recommended that the College develop a code of ethics for all employees. This is still pending, and completion of this process should be a priority during the next review cycle.

District policies and procedures may be found in the College Catalog, as well as the College’s website at http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/.

III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.

Questions:

- By what means does the institution determine appropriate staffing levels for each program and service?
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• How does the institution decide on the organization of administrative and support staffing?

• How effectively does the number and organization of the institution’s personnel work to support its programs and services? How does the institution evaluate this effectiveness?

In normal budget years, the District has been able to maintain a sufficient number of qualified employees to maintain the integrity of its services and programs. In recent years, the College has suffered from the effects of budget reductions resulting from a major economic downturn, which required the College to implement strategic spending reductions throughout the institution, including a severe restrictions on hiring in the classified unit.

Despite difficult setbacks, the reduction in spending has focused on ensuring the continuance of core educational programs and student services. Increased efforts by faculty and staff have continued to result in the continued delivery of efficient and effective programs and services. This is a direct reflection of the quality of faculty and administration employed by the College.

Additionally, the College, with respect to the “seventy-five percent law,” has always exceeded state requirements since 2005. [Ref. 14]

As noted in III.A.1., the faculty and administrators of City College of San Francisco are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence (please refer to III.A.1. for more details about the types of degrees held by faculty and administrators and their breadth of experience). The Chancellor’s administrative structure is highly efficient, yet one of the smallest per employee within the California community college system. Approximately 43 administrators are responsible for overseeing the more than 2700 employees (active adjunct faculty fluctuate from one semester to the next) and more than 110,000 students served throughout the College’s campuses.

Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. Departments and programs write an annual Program Review report, which is used as the basis for developing specific plans prepared by administrators and other supervisory personnel. [Ref. 43] The College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) reviews the Program Review reports and respective budget requests. As a component of planning, administrators and supervisory personnel are required to indicate resources needed for completion of their objectives, including staffing. Positions allocation for all employees is a Shared Governance process aligned with College goals, strategic priorities, and financial resources.

Once the allocation of resources is identified, administrators, supervisory personnel, department heads, and other staff responsible for hiring work with the Human Resources Department to fill their staffing needs as indicated in the respective hiring documents. [Refs. 1, 2, 3] As an example, the Faculty Positions Allocation Committee (FPAC) plays the key role in setting the priorities for the hiring of new faculty. FPAC is a Shared Governance committee composed of three administrators and three faculty. Departments submit their FPAC requests (FPAC request form) as per the criteria and procedures established by the Committee. [Ref. 16] The Committee utilizes the Decision Support System (DSS) data to assess faculty position requests. The DSS consists of four database modules: (1) student demands for courses and sections; (2) enrollment productivity; (3) student headcount and characteristics; and (4) student success. FPAC prioritizes the requests using the DSS as indicators of supply and demand for a particular course/subject and presents the list to the College Planning and Budgeting Council, which determines the total number of full-time
positions to be filled College-wide. The CPBC recommendations are subject to the Chancellor’s approval.

The Chancellor has primary responsibility for the allocation of the Administrative structure. If it is determined that an administrative position is needed to ensure the effective operation of College services, top administration consults with the Academic Senate. If the position is new, the Human Resources Department will be called in to conduct a job analysis survey, determining in consultation with the Chancellor and the appropriate Vice Chancellor the accurate job duties and responsibilities, as well as the respective salary and benefits. After the availability of funds is determined, a request accompanied by a justification and a job description is sent to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate for review. The Executive Council of the Academic Senate is empowered to make its own recommendations on the request and job description. If the Senate and Administration cannot agree on the job description, the final determination falls to the Chancellor. Recommendations for amendments to the hiring procedures are made by the Chancellor in consultation with the Academic Senate and taken before the Board of Trustees for review and adoption.

With a slow state recovery and impending budget restrictions, the District has continued to impose severe restrictions on hiring in the classified unit and generally does not fill replacement positions of those who retire or leave for other reasons. The Vacancy Review Committee (VRC), comprised of administrators, classified staff, and SEIU representatives, became effective October 2004. Since then, the VRC has been assigned the duty of discussing requests for new and replacement classified positions. VRC approval of requests for new positions are rare.

In November 2009, approximately 34 classified staff laid off by other San Francisco Civil Service agencies “bumped” the College’s existing classified staff. This is this highest number of classified staff to get bumped out of their positions at one time in the past 20 years. This wide-scale bumping created anxiety and inefficiencies for those getting bumped and their supervisors. It also generated an atmosphere of uncertainty within the community, which is not conducive to running high-functioning teams within departments and programs that rely on classified staff.

The classified bumping process is governed by the City and County of San Francisco rules, not by the District’s collective bargaining agreement. Classified bumping and displacement are facilitated by the City’s Department of Human Resources and are identified on a job seniority basis. In addition to the City’s process, the District also facilitates a process for receiving new employees that join the District. While there is little that anyone at CCSF can do to control the bumping process, it has been a struggle, nonetheless, to manage during the ongoing economic crisis in San Francisco and California.

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

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

Questions:
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- What processes does the institution use to develop and publicize its personnel policies?
- How does the institution ensure that it administers its personnel policies and procedures consistently and equitably? Do these policies and processes result in fair treatment of personnel?
- The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

Personnel policies are governed by District policy and procedures, the California Education Code and Title 5, union contracts, and state, federal, and local labor laws. [Ref. 17] For example, Education Code Section 87359 and Title 5 Section 53430 regulations specify minimum qualifications for faculty and administrative hiring. The employment of classified employees is governed by the City and County of San Francisco’s Civil Service Commission.

Personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered, and reviewed regularly through the Shared Governance process and, if appropriate, by the unions. Employee needs and concerns are voiced and addressed via the Joint Labor Management Council, the Diversity Committee, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the Academic Senate, and through the unions. AFT 2121 has a Grievance Committee that meets on a regular basis with the head of Employee Relations to work out any perceived problems between the District and faculty. Additionally, the Human Resources Committee meets every other week to address pertinent personnel issues, employee concerns, new and updated employment laws, and personnel policies. The Human Resources Committee is composed of the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, Legal Counsel, the Employee Relations Officer, the Director and Associate Director of Human Resources, the Affirmative Action Officer, and the Human Resources Supervisors. Recommendations for adoption of new and/or amended personnel policies are taken before the Board of Trustees. All policy manual amendments and additions go through two readings before the Board of Trustees prior to adoption.

The Human Resources Department communicates updates and new personnel policies, procedures, and/or laws by disseminating the information to employees through institutional mailings and making the information available via the Department’s website. Moreover, employment policies and procedures are stated in the Policy Manual (P.M.3.02), the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA, the SEIU 1021/SFCCD CBA, and in the Faculty and Classified Handbooks, as well as posted on job announcements and on the Department website. [Ref. 29] The institution establishes and adheres to written policies that ensure informational brochures are distributed to all employees pertaining to unlawful discrimination. Employee handbooks contain as an appendix the San Francisco Community College District Policy and Procedures for Handling Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination under Title 5 Sections 59300 et. seq.

It is the responsibility of the Human Resources Department and the Affirmative Action Office to orient faculty and administrative hiring committees on the hiring procedures, employment regulations, and on the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 12 – Upgrading provisions. [Ref. 25] The process has been improved to include samples and forms on paper screening criteria, interview questions, and teaching demonstrations. An Affirmative Action monitor attends every hiring search committee meeting during the interviewing process to ensure compliance with all state and federal labor rules, regulations, and laws. The Human Resources Department and the Office of Instruction
hold new employee orientations once yearly to educate all incoming employees on the District’s policies and to inform employees about their responsibilities. The Employee Relations Officer is responsible for ensuring that College constituents are educated on new contract language.

The Human Resources Department is responsible for developing and distributing employee handbooks that inform employees of the principal rules, regulations, practices, and procedures essential to their role in the District. The handbooks are updated every two years. Current handbooks for Classified, Faculty and Administrators can be found on the Human Resources web site.

III.A.3.b. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

Questions:

• What are the institution’s provisions for keeping personnel records secure and confidential?

• How does the institution provide employees access to their records?

The institution makes provisions for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Classified and academic files are kept in secure and locked areas in the Human Resources Department. Personnel records are confidential and may only be viewed by authorized personnel. [Ref. 19] Academic employees may view their personnel file by appointment with authorized Human Resources personnel as described in the provisions of the District/AFT 2121 Contract during regular business hours. Classified employees may also view their personnel file upon written notice in accordance with the District/SEIU 1021 Contract. Additionally, an employee may authorize/designate a Union representative or a representative other than the Union to review their file upon written authorization as described by both the AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021 Contracts.

In accordance with the District/SEIU 1021 Contract, the District/AFT 2121 Contract and District policy, there must be only one official District personnel file for each academic and classified employee. [Ref. 18] Each personnel file consists of District employment records, educational advancement, and other work experience that relates to employee service. The following items are considered part of a classified and academic personnel file but are maintained separately: time rolls, attendance records, payroll records, work orders, TB records, history cards, salary cards, credential records, schedule files, and assignment files. The District may add similar categories of routine personnel recordkeeping as long as both the AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021 Unions are notified respectively as described in the contracts. Medical records and investigative reports are not filed in an employee’s personnel file.

Additionally, the ITS Department takes great measures within its technical infrastructure to secure employment records in the Banner information system. Each user has a unique Oracle logon and password. Within Banner, each user is given permissions only to view or update areas appropriate for their job duties. Moreover, only select staff members in the administrative area of the College are granted access to the College’s Banner information system.

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

Questions:
• In what ways does the institution foster an appreciation for diversity?

• How effective are the institution’s policies and practices in promoting understanding of equity and diversity issues? How does the institution know these policies and practices are effective?

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

Questions:

• How does the institution determine what kinds of support its personnel need?

• How does the institution design programs and services that provide for the range of diverse personnel at the institution?

• What programs and services does the institution have to support its personnel? How effective are these programs?

CCSF demonstrates through both high-level policy and daily practice that the appropriate understanding of equity and diversity are key to the success of the institution. The Vision Statement summarizes CCSF’s perspective on diversity as: “In our community, respect and trust are common virtues, and all people are enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding. We will maintain a supportive, positive, and productive working environment for our diverse faculty and staff, as well as a responsive environment in which student needs are met in a friendly, timely, and caring manner.” (REF)

In the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan, Objective Four is dedicated to Diversity and Inclusiveness. The goal of this objective is to “Promote diversity and inclusiveness at all levels of the College.” Many goals are outlined to advance this objective, from the broader goal of fostering a supportive, positive and productive environment for our diverse employees and students to specific implementation strategies, such as providing more access to educational technology to providing better support for and expand the success of underrepresented students in meeting transfer goals and improving the registration process to enable students to better access all pre-collegiate courses in a manner that promotes persistence. (REF)

Other groundwork for promoting equity and supporting diversity is reflected in an April 2009 CCSF Board of Trustees “Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution,” which acknowledged that CCSF is committed to ensuring equal opportunity treatment for all students. This resolution, crafted by the Board and college community, originated with students’ concerns about the number of students, especially students of color, who don’t make it through the basic skills sequences into transfer-level courses and beyond to graduate and transfer. It called for the Chancellor, in collaboration with the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, to produce an annual report regarding educational equity, which would discuss the college’s progress toward equity for all students. (REF)

In October 2009, the Chancellor published the “Preliminary Report on the Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution.” (REF) As the report was reviewed through the Shared Governance process, it helped drive discussions in all constituencies of the College about what can be done by our faculty, classified staff, and administration, to better serve our diverse student body.
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CCSF has been sponsoring Student Equity Hearings, which began in early 2010 and are continuing through 2011. These have brought the community of faculty, students and administrators together to discuss salient issues and solutions concerning equity, diversity and student success.

Although the Chancellor initially planned on providing a revised Equity Resolution for the Board’s consideration in April 2010, he decided instead to create a special task force to strategically work on the planning and assessment of CCSF intervention efforts, and to assist in the implementation of those plans with the various College divisions and departments. This task force has been providing regular reports to the full Board and Board committees since in June 2010. CCSF is also planning a review and update to the College’s State Equity Plan, which was last submitted in March 2005.

The “Grow Your Own Program” was designed to encourage and help prepare City College of San Francisco graduates to return as teaching, counseling or library faculty at CCSF after they have completed their upper division and graduate education. The students participate in a special support program, receive scholarships to pursue advanced degrees, and serve as teaching interns at the College. This initiative is crucial toward the goal of increasing the extent to which faculty are representative of our student populations.

Additionally, strides have also been made by the student retention and success programs and centers throughout the College, including the African American Scholastic Programs, the Disabled Students Programs and Services, the Extended Opportunity Programs, the Latino Services Network, the Writing Success Project, the Asian Pacific Islander Student Success program, TULAY, Puente, Math Bridge, Bridge to Biotech and MESA/STEM. These programs reach out to the students who are at the highest risk of not succeeding and provide them with supplementary instruction and counseling. In this way, the District is looking to continue to improve the delivery of services and to better accommodate more students.

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

Programs for faculty that promote the understanding of equity and diversity issues include the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP), a professional development program that provides faculty with the incentives, time and resources to revamp their curricula and teaching methods to increase their focus on multicultural issues. The project focuses on helping faculty not only infuse multicultural content and perspectives into the curriculum, but also on helping them to expand teaching strategies to meet the needs of a diverse student population. MIP supports the expansion of strategies that seek to meet the needs of CCSF’s diverse student population and increase equity throughout the College. MIP has been developing a group of “resource faculty” who can serve faculty at-large who are interested in increasing multicultural awareness through theory and practice. MIP also provides professional development activities throughout the year and a Summer Institute to help address current issues in teaching and learning.

Other Faculty professional development activities include the Basic Skills Faculty Colloquia, Departmental Chairperson Council-sponsored Student Learning Outcomes Workshops, ESL Colloquia and FLEX.
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FLEX Day continues to be an integral part of the institution’s support of faculty. While funding for staff development programs has been discontinued on a state level, the institution, in consultation with the Human Resources Department, continues to fund this effort. Classified FLEX Day was established in 2001-02 for all classified employees to ensure that the more specific needs of support staff, which may be significantly different from academic staff, are addressed (see also III.A.5.a). The programs are a very effective forum to invite outstanding speakers and lecturers on campus to address current institutional needs, such as diversity training. The institution is also committed to providing all personnel the opportunity to stay abreast of technology trends by regularly offering courses through workshops given by the Technology Learning Center (TLC). (ref. 44)

The College determines the kind of support its personnel need through various forums, such as College Council, the Joint Labor Management Council, the Diversity Committee, the Human Resources Committee, employee unions, and various Shared Governance advisory committees, as well as through the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and the Administrators’ Association. The management team of the institution, under the leadership of the Chancellor, is very involved and sensitive to the needs of personnel. As such, the institution administers a periodic Employee Satisfaction Survey through the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, which serves as a tool to identify the kind of support personnel needs. [Ref. 22]

NOTE: Need to add results of employee survey when we get them.

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

The Student Equity Hearings also helped drive a robust conversation specifically about the diverse needs of CCSF students, programs and faculty. In these hearings, the CCSF community identified programmatic changes that would benefit students and faculty. For example: increase math sections to relieve faculty teaching in crowded math classes and identify professional development needs, such as mandatory two-day retreats for English Department faculty to focus on pedagogy, student learning, assessment, and learning outcomes.

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

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

Although the understanding of and concern for diversity at City College of San Francisco has been at the forefront of instructional and student services for many years, recent discussions at the state and federal levels about the challenges of student completion has helped drive deliberations about
tenable solutions. Given that student achievement gaps exist nationally, statewide and locally, CCSF expects to continue to find new ways to address the issue while maintaining the successful methods in which we are already engaged. With the rich diversity among CCSF’s population, the community understands that we have a responsibility to promote issues of equity.

III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

Questions:

- What is the institution’s record on employment equity and diversity?
- How does the institution track and analyze its employment equity record? How does it use this information?

At the request of the Board of Trustees, the Human Resources Department of the institution prepares an annual Employee and Hiring Data Report (see also III.A.2.). [Ref. 13] This document provides an extensive summary of the institution’s hiring record and is used as a reference and educational tool for the institution’s hiring needs and goals. The historical data in these reports show that the institution is committed to hiring people with varied backgrounds and experiences. This is reflected across the District, and, as a result, the College’s diversity statistics remain at or near the 40 percent level.

The College fosters an appreciation for diversity. In recent years, the recruitment efforts of the College have been focused and funded through the Human Resources Department. The Human Resources Department, in conjunction with College constituents, has made a concerted effort through its hiring procedures to maintain the highest levels of commitment to academic excellence as well as to diversity and equity. The Human Resources Department actively recruits underrepresented populations and participates in the California Community College Affirmative Action Job Fairs.

The Human Resources Employee and Hiring Data Report Fall 2010-Spring 2011 show the demographic make up of administrators, faculty and classified staff as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators (Fall 2010)</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty (Fall 2009)</th>
<th>Full-Time Part-Time Faculty (Fall 2009)</th>
<th>Classified Staff (Fall 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>53 percent</td>
<td>60 percent</td>
<td>55 percent</td>
<td>58 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>47 percent</td>
<td>40 percent</td>
<td>45 percent</td>
<td>42 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16 percent</td>
<td>8 percent</td>
<td>7 percent</td>
<td>11 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>19 percent</td>
<td>17 percent</td>
<td>18 percent</td>
<td>37 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>37 percent</td>
<td>54 percent</td>
<td>57 percent</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
<td>12 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>21 percent</td>
<td>11 percent</td>
<td>8 percent</td>
<td>15 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Other/Unknown</th>
<th>Gay/Lesbian</th>
<th>Veteran</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
<td>7 percent</td>
<td>7 percent</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
<td>2 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
<td>9 percent</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
<td>6 percent</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
<td>7 percent</td>
<td>6 percent</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number:</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty and staff are also diverse with respect to their age. [Ref. 13]

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

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

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

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

To ensure inclusive, expedient and successful recruitment processes, the District utilizes when applicable broad recruitment strategies including advertising with local advertising agencies and using electronic media, such as Monster.com and Craigslist.org as well as advertising in HigherEdJobs.com and Insidehighered.com.

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

- What policies and procedures about the treatment of personnel does the institution have in place?
- How does the institution ensure that its personnel and students are treated fairly?

CCSF maintains integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students by adhering to a number of regulatory policies and laws, including union contracts, the State Education
Code and Title 5, the City and County of San Francisco's Civil Service Charter, District personnel policies and practices, and federal, state, and local labor laws.

The institution has also established procedures and guidelines to enable it to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds, sexual orientation, or disability. In addition, the institution has an Equal Opportunity Statement that addresses CCSF’s policy on equal employment and educational opportunities. The compliance officer for this policy is the District Affirmative Action Officer. The Affirmative Action Officer is also responsible for disseminating informational brochures to all students and employees regarding District policies and procedures pertaining to Sexual Harassment and Unlawful Discrimination. This information may also be found in the Affirmative Action website and via the employee handbooks. As required by law, sexual harassment training for employees serving in management and supervisory ranks has been ongoing since 2005. [Ref]

The District has identified the Associate Dean of the Office of Affirmative Action to the State Chancellor’s Office and to the public as the single District officer responsible for receiving all unlawful discrimination complaints filed pursuant to Title 5, section 59328, and for coordinating any investigation. [Ref. 34]

The Office of the Dean of Student Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities is responsible for student conduct and complaints. College Rules and Regulations pertaining to conduct are also contained in the College Catalog, in the Faculty Handbook and on the CCSF website.

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

**III.A.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.**

**III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.**

As discussed throughout this report, the institution provides all personnel with opportunities for continued professional development. Faculty, classified staff, and administrators are provided varied opportunities for professional development through FLEX Day activities and workshops, conferences and conventions (funding permitting), sabbatical leave awards, and individual professional development.

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

The Office of Professional Development plans annual FLEX activity programs for faculty and staff. With the discontinuation of state funding, AB1725 travel funds were eliminated and the quality of FLEX Day events was directly affected because funding is not currently available for guest keynote speakers, diversity workshop presenters and agencies. However, through the efforts of the
Chancellor, the Office of Professional Development, and the Staff Development Committee, the College has continued to offer a limited program.

Prior to 2003, the fall semester FLEX event was held over three days, and the spring semester events were two days. This allowed for a varied and quality offering of workshops. Negotiations reduced the programmed FLEX days down to one each semester. The other four days are given as independent FLEX days for the faculty to attend conferences or pursue individual developmental activities.

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

These changes directly affected the FLEX events by reducing attendance, causing difficulties in contracting and soliciting presenters and limiting the number of quality workshops that could be offered. For this reason, to provide more opportunities for professional development, the institution should focus on improving FLEX Day policies. Negotiations are underway to restore one of the programmed FLEX days to the Fall Semester.

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

The Technology Learning Center (TLC), an office within the Education Technology Office (ETO), provides technology-training programs to faculty and staff through regularly scheduled and FLEX workshops. Training is delivered in a variety of modes that meet employee needs. The TLC offers workshops, online training and tutorials and sessions created specifically for a department’s needs. Additionally, the TLC website contains information on accessing CCSF networks, email, and web accounts, and information on current projects and educational technology resources.

An additional professional development option offered through contractual agreement with the AFT 2121 include sabbatical leave awards (AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 17.N), which allow 4 percent of the faculty to be on sabbatical during an academic year. [Ref. 30] The Sabbatical Committee makes decisions about those who are awarded sabbaticals.

In the Fall 1999 semester, AFT 2121 and the District agreed to grant salary column movement to non-Ph.D. faculty. To date, the parties have continued to implement phases of this salary column movement. Faculty wishing to take college courses to accumulate units for salary column movement may: (1) take undergraduate courses, requiring prior approval from their respective School Dean and Vice Chancellor; (2) take graduate courses; or (3) develop a long-term professional development plan (AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 20, Attachment 3 Professional Development Plan). [Ref. 31] The Human Resources Department administers the evaluation of faculty coursework.
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Administrative sabbatical awards are granted at the Chancellor’s discretion. In accord with the Sabbatical Leave for Administrators, up to two sabbatical leaves may be granted per academic year and the award may be for one semester, one year, or a split (two non-consecutive semesters). Approval is based on seniority, benefit to the institution, and benefit to the individual, and consideration is given to the timing of the leave and its consistency with institutional priorities. Administrators who have not previously been awarded a sabbatical will be favored, granted the seniority rules are applied. Administrators may also be granted a short-term paid leave for professional development and unpaid leaves. [Ref. 40] Due to the reduction in the number of administrators, no administrator has received a sabbatical since NEED DATE HERE.

In cooperation with the leadership of the classified employees (SEIU and the Classified Senate), the Office of Professional Development and the Chancellor’s Office sponsor a classified employee FLEX Day once a year, as noted in III.A.4.a. The District provides release time for training and/or presenting during FLEX days. The Classified Senate, in its purpose to be supportive of the classified staff, established the Joan McClain (founding member of the Classified Senate) scholarship to aid classified employees pursuing academic goals.

The following educational opportunities are also available to classified SEIU members: (1) enrollment fee waiver program; (2) Book Loan Programs; and (3) the SEIU Enrollment Fee Reimbursement Grant and (4) the Lifelong Learning Accounts (Lila). Specific information about each of the aforementioned programs is available in the Classified Handbook and in Article 13 – Staff Development of the SEIU/SFCCD CBA. [Refs. 32, 33]

III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Questions:

- What professional development programs does the institution support?
- How does the institution identify teaching and learning needs of its faculty and other personnel?
- What processes ensure that professional development opportunities address those needs?
- How does the college ensure meaningful evaluation of professional development activities?
- What impact do professional development activities have on the improvement of teaching and learning? How does the institution evaluate that improvement?

The FLEX Workshop Evaluation form is distributed to participants during FLEX Day seminars. While attendance at FLEX is mandatory, faculty may select which of various events to attend and participate in. Due to elimination of state funding, the event is limited to one-day per semester, some of which is devoted to departmental meetings. The reduced schedule makes it difficult to schedule a wide-range and varied offering of workshops. Therefore, the annual staff development evaluation and the FLEX workshop evaluations serve as the sole source for assessing attendees’ satisfaction and for determining future event planning. [Ref. 21]
III.A.6. Human resources planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Questions:

- By what process does the institution assess the use of its human resources?
- How does the institution ensure that human resource decisions emanate from institutional needs and plans for improvement? Specifically, what evidence is there that the institution bases its human resource decisions on the results of evaluation of program and service needs?
- How does the institution determine that human resource needs in program and service areas are met effectively?

City College of San Francisco includes human resources planning in institutional planning. Results from recent long-term assessment and planning activities demonstrate how human resources planning has been included in these institutional dialogues.

In the first example, the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan’s Objective Six describes goals of Human Resources and Staffing. The overall objective is to: “Support workforce practices that are economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable for the College and its employees.” The ten goals in this section help define priorities during the next cycle, which include such objectives as expanding the recruitment and hiring of a diverse faculty, staff, and administration and ensuring that professional development opportunities are available to all CCSF employees. [REF]

Another example can be found in the 2010-11 Annual Plan, where Section 8.1 outlines the need to “Improve efforts to recruit and hire a diverse faculty and staff, and continue to evaluate processes to ensure that the College workforce reflects the diverse communities the College serves all as permitted by applicable law.”

In addition to the long-term plans, the yearly Program Review process integrates human resources needs into long-term planning. As discussed earlier (Section III.2.), Program Review reports and respective budget requests are reviewed by the College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC). As a component of planning, departments, administrators and supervisory personnel are required to indicate resources needed for completion of their objectives. Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. The relationship between the planning and budgeting process and position allocations is integral to decision-making about new and replacement positions. The Faculty Positions Allocation Committee (FPAC) and Vacancy Review Committee (VRC) (for classified staff) review all requests for new or replacement personnel. In the end, position allocation for all employees is a Shared Governance process aligned with College goals, strategic priorities, and financial resources. [Ref. 1,2,315]

Reduced state funding has forced the District to be cautious about hiring new faculty and classified staff. However, departments and programs are still requesting staff through either the Faculty Positions Allocation Committee (FPAC) or the Vacancy Review Committee (VRC). The requests from the FPAC are considered and then passed along to the CPBC.
In Spring 2011, a plan to temporarily upgrade part-time, temporary faculty to full-time status was negotiated in order to fill emergency vacancies and most effectively use the expertise of our current, experienced part-time, temporary faculty, allowing them to opportunities to more fully develop their professional skills.

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

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

2. The institution understands both through high-level policy and daily practice that the appropriate understanding of equity and diversity are key to the success of the institution. Although the understanding of and concern for diversity at CCSF has been at the forefront of instructional and student services for many years, recent discussions at the state and federal levels about the challenges of student completion have helped drive deliberations about additional solutions to meet our local challenges. Given that student achievement gaps exist nationally, statewide and locally, CCSF should continue to find new ways to address the issue while maintaining the successful methods in which we are already engaged.

3. Prior to 2003, the Fall semester FLEX event was held over three days, and the spring semester events were two days. Negotiations reduced the FLEX days down to one each semester. After this change was made, it became clear that only one FLEX Day creates scheduling conflicts that directly affect the FLEX events by reducing attendance, causing difficulties in contracting and soliciting presenters and limiting the number of quality workshops that can be offered. To provide more effective activities, the institution should focus on improving FLEX Day policies so that more employees can participate.

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

5. CCSF promotes a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration and improved levels of communication, and policies and procedures are in place that ensure healthy working conditions and foster an environment of respect and trust. However, during the last accreditation cycle, the self-study had recommended to develop a code of ethics for all employees. This is still pending, and completion of this process should be a priority during 2011-2012.

6. The relationship between position allocations and the planning and budgeting process is integral to decision-making about new and replacement positions. While the Faculty Positions Allocation Committee (FPAC) forwards their recommendations to the College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC), the Vacancy Review Committee (VRC) (for classified staff) does not send their recommendations to CPBC for review and final decision-making. This process should change so that both reviewing and recommending committees are required to sent their respective budget requests to the CPBC before a final decision is made on position allocations.
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Standard III.B: Resources:

Physical Resources:

Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

Questions:

- Against what criteria and by what processes does the institution evaluate the safety of its facilities?
- Upon what data has the institution determined the sufficiency of its classrooms, lecture halls, laboratories, and other facilities? What mechanisms does the college employ to evaluate how effectively facilities meet the needs of programs and services?
- How well does the institution meet its facilities needs? Does the institution use the same criteria and processes for determining safety and sufficiency of facilities at off-campus sites? To what extent are off-campus sites safe and sufficient?
- How does the college use the results of facilities evaluations to improve them? Does the college employ similar processes to assure the safety and sufficiency of its equipment?
How does the institution support the equipment needs of the distance delivery modes it offers? Are institutional needs for equipment met?

III.B.1.a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

Questions:

- How does the institution consider the needs of programs and services when planning its buildings?
- What processes ensure that program and service needs determine equipment replacement and maintenance?
- How does the institution evaluate effectiveness of facilities and equipment in meeting the needs of programs and services?
- How effectively does the institution use its physical resources?

City College of San Francisco provides safe and sufficient physical resources at 9 owned and more than 100 rented sites throughout the City and County of San Francisco. The District owns the facilities on the Ocean Avenue, John Adams, Downtown, Civic Center and Evans campuses and the District Offices at Gough Street. The Airport Campus building is owned by the District, but is on leased land. The Mission Campus is on a site owned by the San Francisco Unified School District via a 75-year-ground lease with an option for a 24-year extension beyond that time period. The Chinatown/North Beach campus is currently under construction and will be on a site that the District owns. Chinatown/North Beach, Southeast, Fort Mason and Castro/Valencia are all leased. Since the last accreditation, facility improvement work that assures the integrity and quality of our programs and services has been undertaken at every site owned by the District.

A successful bond initiative earned the approval of more than sixty percent of San Francisco voters in 2005, providing $246 million for facilities over the next several years. Prior to the 2005 bond initiative, the District’s only significant resource for improving its physical resources was $50 million from a local bond passed in 1997 and $195 from a local bond passed in 2001. The District leveraged the $491 million obtained from these three local bonds to apply for and receive $185 million in State matching funds, bringing total resources from these sources to $696 million. The District is also seeking to raise private funding to support the construction of new facilities and renovation of others. [Refs. and for 2005 bond and bond expenditure reports and local grants]

A Facilities Master Plan has guided the institution in the planning, building, maintenance, and upgrading and replacing of its physical resources since 2004, when it was adopted by the Board of Trustees. While a variety of factors helped drive this need for a systematic analysis and planning approach, the City and County of San Francisco also requires a Facilities Master Plan every 10 years. The CCSF Master Plan, developed with the assistance of a facilities planning firm experienced in college master-plan development, provides a comprehensive strategy for the development of grounds and facilities to meet the College’s needs for enrollment growth, access and traffic concerns, and improving aging facilities, through the year 2015. The plan evaluated existing campus conditions relative to institutional needs, and recommended ways to organize and phase short- to long-term campus development to meet those needs. This Master Plan focused on
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the Ocean Avenue Campus, and also discussed planned changes at all CCSF sites and projects. The Plan has guided decision-making regarding the location and timing of facilities and supporting infrastructure. It also includes guidelines for site, building, and landscape design that provides a tool for steering and evaluating the preparation of facility proposals. The combination of local support for the 1997, 2001 and 2005 initiatives along with state funding enabled the College to make significant progress in the implementation of this Master Plan.

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

Construction began on the permanent Chinatown/North Beach Campus during 2010 and will be completed during spring 2012. Future projects the College intends to construct are a new Performing Arts Center (PAC). The College has secured its share of funds for this project from a local bond measure, and the state recently committed to funding the project in the 2011-12 California State Budget.

While bond funding and additional state dollars leveraged as a result of the local bond made it easier for the College to address the problems associated with many of the aging facilities, additional resources are needed to cover the costs of upgrades and repairs that have not yet occurred. At this time, the District plans to leverage additional state support through a future local bond. A date for a future local bond measure has not been determined but is expected within the next few years.

**Inventory and Assessment of Buildings**

In cooperation with the State Chancellor’s Office, the College undertook a major effort to inventory and assess the condition of all of its buildings during fiscal year 2003 and then again in 2010. The result is a comprehensive report on the physical state of all existing facilities (the 3DI District Facility Condition Assessment Report). This report is the basis from which the College submits applications to the state for funding maintenance and renovation projects. The College has begun to undertake maintenance and renovation projects cited in the report. [Ref]

The data in 3DI’s report assigns an “FCI” for each facility. The “FCI” is the ratio of the repair cost to the replacement value of the facility. An assessment of 10 percent or greater is considered poor and a score of 5 percent or lower is considered good. It is recommended that facilities with an FCI rating of 60 – 70 be replaced instead of repaired. As a result of these findings, the District set a higher priority on plans for renovating and replacing facilities with the worst conditions. Four of buildings that exceeded an FCI rating of 60–70 percent, are slated for replacement.

The 2010 3DI Report showed many of the District’s older facilities are in poor condition. The report stated the overall Facilities Condition Index, or “FCI” was 37.4 percent. Given that of the 20 of the 32 buildings assessed were constructed prior to 1975, and in need of repairs, a somewhat low rating is to be expected. Some older facilities, such as the John Adams Campus main building, have been renovated since the last Accreditation Report.
While the 2005 bond provided some of the needed funds for modernization projects, another local bond issue will be needed to complete this effort. This is certainly the case for the Science Building which has an FCI of 74 percent, and where more than $50 million is required for renovation work to replace elevator, mechanical, and electrical systems, and interior finishes and furnishings that have exceeded their useful service life, and are failing. Similarly, additional funds of at least $40.5 million will be needed to modernize the Horticulture, and the Creative Arts, Arts Extension, and Visual Arts buildings, which were constructed between 1960–1972. Now any of the remaining original building system components are at least 40 years old, and in need of repair or replacement.

The 3DI report would suggest that in a ten-year period from 2010 through 2020, the District could expend more than $180 million to maintain or replace existing facilities to provide the a reasonable FCI rating of 10–15 percent for District-owned facilities.

It can be concluded that renovation of the District’s older buildings, such as Science Hall and Civic Center Campus, would be significant expenditures. These buildings have not had any extensive renovation or refurbishing similar in scope to the 2008–2009 John Adams Campus modernization. Any necessary replacement of the original building systems in these aged buildings would be a costly capital improvement, and any limited state funding may also have to be supplemented by other funding sources. Because of limited funds, it may worthwhile to evaluate which ones of the aged facilities should be selected for modernization, and which may be taken off-line after all the construction of the 2005 Bond funded new facilities has been completed.

III.B.1.b. The institution assures that the physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

Questions:

- How does the institution assure access to its facilities?
- How does the institution ensure that it maintains sufficient control over off-site facilities to ensure their quality?

The dramatic efforts the College has made to improve physical resources demonstrates its commitment to providing a state-of-the-art environment for student learning programs and services, in addition to improving access, safety, security, and creating a healthful learning and working environment. Projects completed to date as well as projects not yet started, such as the Performing Arts Center, are being developed to support and advance student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.

In addition to constructing new facilities, major renovation and maintenance projects are undertaken every year on the College’s campuses to support academic programs. During 2008-2010, more than $18 million has been expended on improving access for students with mobility disabilities. In addition to the ADA work, other renovation projects have included the creation of dedicated spaces for the Asian Pacific American Student Success (APASS), Math Engineering Science Achievement (MESA) and TULAY Filipino American programs as well as a Veterans Educational Transition Services (VETS) center.
Finally, work is undertaken on an ongoing basis to maintain the quality, safety, and function of the buildings. These efforts are conducted both by the College’s own employees in the Department of Buildings and Grounds as well as on a work order basis with the City’s Department of Public Works.

The Facilities Construction and Planning Office is responsible for directing and coordinating all projects concerning physical resources; this includes planning new facilities as well as undertaking major maintenance and renovation projects each year. This office closely coordinates efforts with the College’s Buildings and Grounds Department, which is responsible for maintaining facilities and undertaking minor repair projects. The Buildings and Grounds Department includes Custodial Services, responsible for keeping the facilities clean. These functions are all a part of the organization overseen by the College’s Vice-Chancellor for Finance and Administration. Security is provided by the Campus Police Department, which reports directly to the Chancellor's office.

**III.B.2. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.**

**Questions:**

- By what process does the institution assess the use of its facilities? How often does the evaluation occur?

- How does the college use the results of the evaluation to improve facilities or equipment?

**III.B.2.a. Long-range capital plans support institutional goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.**

**Questions:**

- What process does the institution follow to make capital plans? How are long-range capital projects linked to institutional planning?

- What elements comprise the definition of “total cost of ownership” the institution uses when making decisions about facilities and equipment?

- How do planning processes ensure that capital projects support college goals? How effectively is long-range capital planning helping the college to achieve improvement goals?

The College’s major facilities planning documents are linked with the Facilities Master Plan, the Annual Plan and the Strategic Plan. In addition, on an annual basis all departments and major cost centers state their facilities needs and goals in their Program Review reports. For long-range facilities planning, the College is linking the Program Review process, which gathers feedback directly from the programs and departments, more closely with the Facilities Master Plan. Departments are being asked to develop clear statements about the need for and the impact of new facilities, major renovations and new equipment on their departments and programs. As all College programs and departments continue to participate in this annual Program Review process, the planning and assessment “feedback loop” will be more streamlined, which will ensure evaluation of the facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account in how the College supports academic programs and student support services. [Refs.]
The Facilities Review Committee (FRC) makes recommendations on both long-range and short-range facilities plans for all College campuses based upon the College’s priorities. The Committee meets on a regular basis to solicit ideas from faculty, staff, administrators and students for major and minor facilities projects and equipment upgrades. The Parking and Transportation Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, meets to advise on parking and traffic and other forms of transportation relevant to the College District. The Health and Safety Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, recommends policies pertaining to the safety of students and college employees. (Refs)

The College actively seeks input from the general public on major facilities projects. The College specifically sought public input and support for the District Facilities Master Plan by conducting multiple public hearings as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and by offering multiple community-outreach meetings that were not required by CEQA. The College works with many neighborhood groups and city agencies to integrate its facilities plans with the City’s General Plan and neighborhood planning goals. [Refs.]

In the past, the College’s efforts to provide for the total cost of ownership, a concept that seeks to measure not just the cost of planning and construction but also the cost of operating a facility over its expected lifetime, have been limited. More recently, the College established a user’s group for design review and total cost of ownership in the planning for its next project, the new Performing Arts Education Center. [Refs.]

Facilities Linked to Sustainability

Since 2009, the College has dedicated considerable energy to improving its operation of physical resources by developing Part 1 of a Sustainability Plan that the Board of Trustees adopted during 2010. The College has become more proactive with respect to environmental issues surrounding new construction while trying to drive long-term energy-cost savings. In all of its current projects, the College has directed its architectural teams to incorporate conservation of resources in their final designs to the extent that construction budgets allow. Sustainable design, planning, architecture, indoor/outdoor environment, and Leadership in Energy and Building Design (LEED) Green Building standards are addressed in the 2004 Facilities Master Plan approved by the Board. The Multi-Use Building completed in July 2010 is expected to receive a LEED Gold rating. The Chinatown/North Beach Campus when completed in 2012 is expected to receive a LEED Gold rating as well. [Refs.]

III.B.2.b. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

- How does the institution ensure that facilities decisions emanate from institutional needs and plans for improvement?

- What evidence is there that the institution bases its physical resource decisions on the results of evaluation of program and service needs? How does the institution prioritize needs when making decisions about equipment purchases?

- How does the institution determine that physical resource needs in program and service areas are met effectively? How effectively are those needs met?
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The College has integrated facilities planning into its institutional planning process while systematically assessing the effective use of physical resources and using those results as a basis for improvement. Fostering a strategic approach to addressing the physical resource needs of its students, faculty, and staff, this process makes effective use of the College’s Shared Governance System, including the planning and budgeting process, to evaluate and, when possible, to dedicate resources to these needs.

The College’s Shared Governance Facilities Review Committee actively participated in the development of the Facilities Master Plan. Adopted in 2004, this 10-year plan for building, replacing, and renovating College facilities was developed with the assistance of a facilities planning firm experienced in college master plan development. The District has other assessment mechanisms for evaluating the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services. For example, 3DI District Facility Condition Assessment Report, which was discussed earlier in this report, provides a periodic inventory and assessment of the physical condition of all buildings. [Ref.]

The College also has an extensive strategic planning process for the building of new facilities and the upgrading and maintenance of existing facilities. Each year the Shared Governance Facilities Review Committee recommends to the Board of Trustees projects to be submitted to the California State Chancellor’s Office for capital project funding in priority order. This list, commonly known as the Five-Year Construction Plan, is submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval early in the spring of each year. Upon approval by the Board of Trustees, the plan is then submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office. [Ref.]

Physical resource planning is also fully integrated into the College’s yearly institutional planning process. Shared Governance committees meet at regular intervals throughout the semester to discuss and evaluate facilities needs. The committees involved in this discussion include: the Facilities Review Committee; the Sustainability Subcommittee; the Campus Projects Subcommittee; the Parking and Traffic Subcommittee; the Works of Art Subcommittee; and the Health and Safety Subcommittee. There are also regular reviews, such as the bi-annual insurance safety inspection report and special reports, such as the annual space inventory and facilities condition reports, that assess the use of College facilities. As discussed earlier in this report, the annual Program Review reports from departments and major cost centers also describe their facilities needs and goals. [Ref.]

The Works of Arts Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, works to obtain, maintain and enhance the many works of art associated with the College. [Need to get updated information here about the Works of Art committee. [Ref. 7]

Integrated planning is also accomplished through the planning, budgeting and assessment system that is led by the shared governance College Planning and Budget Council. The planning process begins with the Strategic Plan, which is supplemented by the Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and the Sustainability Plan. From the Strategic Plan, other more detailed plans are developed such as the Annual Plan, Annual Budget and Assessment Reports. This system-wide evaluation, planning and implementation process fully integrates physical resources as a component. This process assures that physical resources are designed and used to meet the College’s educational mission. [Refs.]

Since the last self-study, the College has significantly improved communications related to facilities across institutional departments and offices. The Facilities Review Committee and its Campus

Co-chairs for Standard III: Beth Cataldo and Peter Goldstein
Projects subcommittee review all plans and proposals for both renovations and new construction. In addition, each major facility has a BUG (Building Users Group) that develops needs proposals for departments and building users. Before any facility has major changes implemented, the BUG group must be consulted with about the change. This has promoted more meaningful interactions between the Offices of Academic Affairs and the Office of Facilities and Planning to assure the quality of programs and services as well as the health and safety of students. [Ref.]

III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. The College has effectively integrated physical resources into the District’s institutional planning system and developed a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan. With an influx of resources from the 1997, 2001 and 2005 bond measures and related state dollars leveraged as a result, the District has developed major new facilities and improved existing facilities that promote student learning and achievement. There has been significant participation in the facilities-planning processes through regular Shared Governance activities as well as “user groups” for design and remodeling of specific facilities. The College has successfully secured state funding for one additional project and another bond initiative is planned to secure funding to meet the objectives of the Facilities Master Plan.

2. The physical resources at all locations where the College offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluations as the basis for improvement. Since the last accreditation review, significant improvements have been made in the organizational structure that supports facilities planning, construction, and maintenance. Additional funding will be needed to upgrade some of the District’s older buildings, such as Science Hall and the Civic Center Campus, or these facilities will continue to deteriorate. In addition, projects that have been put on hold from previous bond issues that need to be completed before new ones are attempted, such as the Environmental Horticulture/Floristry Center and the Broadcasting and Visual Arts Centers.
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Standard III.C: Resources:
Technology Resources:

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.C.1. The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.

Questions:

• How does the institution make sure that its various types of technology needs are identified?

• If the college is not supported by technology, how did the college make that decision?

• How does the institution evaluate the effectiveness of its technology in meeting its range of needs? How effectively are those needs met?

III.C.1.a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.

Questions:

• How does the institution make decisions about technology services, facilities, hardware, and software?

• How well does technology accommodate the college’s curricular commitments for distance learning programs and courses? Whether technology is provided directly by the institution or through contractual arrangements, are there provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security?

Identifying, Prioritizing and Supporting Technology Needs at CCSF

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) provides technology resources and support in order to improve the effectiveness of the institution and meet the needs of the learning and teaching
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community. Technology is crucial to the support of CCSF’s Mission and Vision, and discussions and decisions concerning technology are made through multiple shared-governance and institutional-planning processes.

Since 1997, CCSF has integrated technology planning into institutional planning through its Technology Plan, which develops from a shared-governance process and includes input from relevant committees and the Board of Trustees. The CCSF Vision and Mission and Strategic and Annual plans drive the Technology Plan’s conceptual framework and implementation.

The 2009-2011 Technology Plan is evidence-based and addresses the technology needs of the College as articulated by faculty, staff and students. It is a living document that is subject to continuous review in order to adapt to technological changes and shifts in College resources and priorities.

The plan provides detailed information for each division, including Information Technology Services (ITS), Educational Technology Department (ETD), Broadcast Media Services (BMS), Educational Access Television (EATV), Student Development and the Library and Learning Resources (LLR). In the plan, deadlines are articulated and resource and personnel needs are described.

Using the Technology Plan as a roadmap, the institution selects projects that provide students and the college with the maximum benefits in the most cost-effective manner. The key goals outlined in the current plan strive to “promote institutional effectiveness, efficiencies, and learning, to provide guidelines and standards for technology-enhanced curriculum, and to bridge the digital divide, empowering students for mastery of information competency and attainment of their educational goals.”

The specific goals in the Annual Plan, which describes strategies to focus on each year in response to the current needs of the institution, derive from these two long-term plans. This plan is also the institution’s measure of how effective the college is in meeting its goals over time. With respect to evaluation, departments and student service divisions undertake a yearly Program Review process, where they examine and report on their specific needs and goals, reflecting on the success at meeting previous objectives. ITS also submits an annual self-assessment, documenting progress in accomplishing objectives. The College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) reviews all these unit plans so that requests for funds are viewed from an institutional perspective.

The College also relies on its shared governance process to review and provide input into technology decisions. Throughout the year, there are meetings of the Information Technology Policy Committee (ITPC), which is the overall Shared Governance committee providing policy direction for technology and the Teaching and Learning Technology Roundtable (TLTR), which looks at the technology needs of learning and teaching. These shared-governance groups review and provide feedback to draft plans, review and recommend policies for the use of technology and evaluate progress and results.

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

**Information Technology Services Personnel Developments**
Recent California State budget cuts have compelled the college to evaluate the staffing levels for its technology functions to establish better user support and more efficient use of Information Technology (IT) personnel. Starting in the 2009-10 school year, the college began a review of its staffing levels and utilization in the Information Technology Services area. At that time, Information Technology and Information Services (IS) personnel were distributed throughout the institution in many departments and offices in a highly decentralized manner.

During the course of review, the college determined that it could increase efficiency and productivity by consolidating its technology workforce. Starting in the 2010-11 academic year, all classified employees with civil service classifications in the IT and IS categories were moved to the ITS department. Employees were moved to the ITS Office from a number of academic departments, the library and campus offices.

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

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

**Keeping Pace with Changes in Technology**

Rapidly evolving technological innovations have a significant impact on how CCSF delivers services to students and the educational community. While many organizations move to deliver more and more information on the Web and other devices rather than in print, CCSF has also enhanced the way it delivers information. The mobility of content, accessible via ever-smaller and more powerful mobile devices, is also a trend that drives technology priorities. At CCSF, we have responded to the changing lifestyles and demands by implementing more efficient ways to provide information and services to students and faculty. This effort also helps create more sustainable practices that reduce waste. All divisions are looking at ways to decrease old processes that involve excess paper.

The following is a list of the most important technology-driven developments since our last self-study:

- In 2009, launched a redesigned web site with a more user-friendly interface and information architecture. The launch of the site included:
  - Google search, a more refined search engine
  - Enhanced Online Catalogue
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- Google applications
- CCSF Email account for students
- A robust easily updated back-end web technology

- Students have the option to receive communications via hand-held devices through e-mail or text messages.
- An online Access Guide with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mobility information about renovation and construction updates, accessible paths, disabled-only parking, ramps, elevators and other disability-related features was published.
- Admissions and Records implemented CCC Apply, the online application to the California Community Colleges.
- Online credit and non-credit application workstations are available at all principal campuses.
- Admissions and Records formalized electronic transcript data exchange agreements with local universities.
- Student Health Services implemented Medicat, an electronic healthcare information system.
- Photo identification cards are now available for all credit and non-credit students and employees.
- Direct deposit of financial aid is the disbursement method utilized by 70 percent of students.
- Counselors utilize Academic and Progress Review to monitor student progress.
- Matriculation uses computerized enforcement of prerequisites to facilitate the registration process.
- Outreach and Recruitment uses social media, such as Facebook, to communicate with students. Other departments and divisions are also using social media to network with students and alumni.
- The Scheduling Office, in conjunction with ITS, has greatly enhanced the online version of the class schedule.
- Computerized testing centers expanded to the Downtown and Mission campuses.
- An Ocean Campus training lab was developed to address the growing need for professional development.
- The Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) computer labs on the Ocean and John Adams campuses were updated and remodeled to allow for better wheelchair access.
- Fifty-one WIFI access points are available at the main and satellite campuses.
- A Content Management System (CMS) was chosen for the new web site that allows CCSF content developers to work from any computer with Internet access.
- Several online and database systems have been developed in the Office of Instruction to streamline faculty evaluations, tenure review, Program Review, Curriculum Committee agendas and minutes, non-class-related room reservations, and sabbatical leaves.
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The college operates two educational access television channels for the City and County of San Francisco, providing educational programming and courses for college credit 24/7. The EATV has upgraded its equipment to automate the workflow.

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

EATV, Broadcast Media Services and ITS are collaborating to implement live captioned webcasts of Board of Trustee meetings, which will be archived and indexed for easy public access. The system’s potential for distance learning is being explored.

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

Areas for improvement:

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

Technology Infrastructure and Support:

Developments in IT infrastructure and support are as follows:

- Implementation of a SAN solution to provide more reliable data-storage environment and an enterprise-wide data backup solution to assist in data recovery.
- Fifty classrooms have had multimedia equipment installed. The highest concentration being at the Mission campus and the Multiuse Building (MUB).
- With the exception of the Chinatown campus, all sites have been connected to the fiber ring. Once the new Chinatown campus is completed, it will also be connected to the network.
- Upgrade to Banner 8 was completed in 2010. This will assure that all regular updates to Banner will continue.
- The technology division established a documentation advisory workgroup to collect and standardize all IT documentation.
- A self-service ticketing system was implemented in Spring 2011, which allows end users to monitor the progress of their service request. This system will also benefit the organization by allowing better dispatching, utilization and evaluation of staff resources in the technology area.
- The hours of the Help Desk operation have been expanded to include coverage during lunchtime. Additional staff has been assigned to the Help Desk during peak hours.

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

Status of Educational Technology and Distant-Learning Programs:

The following are the key highlights of this area of CCSF:

- The College has expanded its online course offerings from 65 credit courses in 2005 to 126 credit courses and 168 sections in spring 2011.
- The Technology-Mediated Instruction Office (TMI) supported 141 tech-enhanced course sections in the Spring 2010 semester; an increase of about 30 percent from the Fall 2009 semester.
- In certain departments, a student can complete approximately 85 percent of the requirements for an AA or AS degree by taking online classes or telecourses.
- Students can complete approximately 95 percent of the courses required to transfer to the CSU or fulfill the IGETC pattern by taking online classes or a telecourses.
- Distance-learning courses are offered in 27 academic departments, all six schools within Academic Affairs and within the Library and Learning Resources.
- Nine percent of students taking an academic class at CCSF have taken a distance-learning course.
- As of Fall 2010, CCSF converted all online academic courses from the learning management system WebCT to Insight (Moodle). When the College contracted with a vendor to host the learning management system, provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy and security were all negotiated within the contract between the vendor and CCSF.
- In spring 2010, TMI trained credit and non-credit faculty at the Evans Campus on how to tech-enhance their courses. This is the first such training at another campus and the first to include non-credit faculty.
- CCSF’s Education Technology Department has partnered with EduStream to offer faculty access to a centralized library of on-demand videos that can be streamed for a face-to-face class, referenced in a tech-enhanced course or required as part of an online class.

Areas for Improvement:

1. The training budget for the Technology-Mediated Instruction Office for faculty to develop online courses has been significantly cut. It will not be able to expand the number of online classes without a budget to train new instructors. In addition, the lab spaces that they use to train instructors and for faculty to use for on-campus meetings were reassigned. They currently don’t have use of facilities for these activities. Finally, continued IT support for the online-education program is needed for its continued success and expansion.
More details about the education technology and distant-learning programs can be found in section III.C.1.b.

[Note: Need to add information from surveys and student focus group.]

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

Questions:

- How does the institution assess the need for information technology training for students and personnel?
- What technology training does the institution provide to students and personnel? How does the institution ensure that the training and technical support it provides for faculty and staff are appropriate and effective? How effective is the training provided?

Assessing Need for Technology Training

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

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

The TLC works with faculty and ITS to decide on the most appropriate training to conduct each semester given the budget allowance. Discussions and suggestions concerning the needs for educational technology and training also emerge from Teaching and Learning Technology Roundtable (TLTR), a Shared Governance Committee whose purpose is to recommend policies for the use of technology for instructional support and student services. Training in all these areas has decreased with the recent and ongoing budget cutbacks.

Additional Technology Assistance for Personnel

Faculty and staff also receive technical assistance from the Help Desk in the following areas: desktop (hardware and software), printer and equipment support, phone support, and support for College-wide applications such as Banner, Groupwise and Web4. Help Desk Support staff are available via phone and email. Faculty and staff can also either drop-in at the Help Desk Office for more complex technical support. Support staff also provides outreach to individual faculty and staff.
in their offices. Due to the increasing use of technology by faculty and staff, the Help Desk is faced with an escalating demand to deliver IT resources and support to users across all of the campuses.

The Technology-Mediated Instruction Office provides extensive training for faculty converting a class from a face-to-face mode to online delivery. With budget cuts in fall 2009, TMI sustained a 50-percent cut to their training budget resulting in funding 24 units of online credit-course development per academic year. In spring 2010, TMI began providing training for faculty wanting to use Insight, the College’s learning management system, to tech-enhance a face-to-face course.

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

- The front-page of Insight was re-designed in order to provide more focused training to students and faculty.
- An online searchable knowledge base was activated for faculty and students to continue training on Insight using a self-paced format.
- TMI began working directly with departments to provide tech-enhanced trainings to meet more specific student needs. For example, TMI provides support for the English Department, which has a new accelerated pathway for students and is planning to use a tech-enhanced model to build the English 96/1A coursework.

**Technology Training for Students**

The most effective way to train students to meet their specific needs is for departments to provide training after they determine what technology is required to meet student learning outcomes. Instructional departments across all areas of the college teach students relevant software and also provide computer labs with student and faculty tutors.

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

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

[Note: Need to add information from surveys and student focus group.]

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

- How has the institution provided for the management, maintenance, and operation of its technological infrastructure and equipment?
- Does the college provide appropriate system reliability and emergency backup?

Management, Maintenance and Operation of Technological Infrastructure

The 2009-2011 Technology Plan details goals for institutional needs at CCSF. Subsequent CCSF Annual Plans review progress and determine priorities in all areas of the college. Academic departments also write an annual Program Review report, which describes their budgets and technical needs. The College Budget and Planning Council reviews all of these plans. Through these plans, the College decides in a centralized manner how to upgrade and replace technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs. The institutional planning process is also discussed in more detail in Section III.C.1 and III.C.2.

In crafting the most recent technology plan, the college considered that technology decisions tend to be high-stakes decisions involving large amounts of resources with consequences lasting many years. Cost and performance were main considerations. Dealing with challenging State cutbacks, the College planned to be efficient and effective in its use of resources, setting priorities despite severely constrained departmental budgets. Fortunately, effective implementation of technology may also provide demonstrable cost efficiencies throughout the college. In addition, grant funding or bond funding may be successfully pursued for many projects. A great deal of the current technology implementation at the College is being financed by bond proceeds from the 2001 and 2005 CCSF bond initiatives. Although the possibility of a Phase 3 bond has been discussed, the Board of Trustees has not voted to pursue such a bond, and the economic climate may make the passage difficult.

Although grant and bond funding may be a good source for starting new projects, funding for ongoing operational support and maintenance requires a continuous source that grant and bond funding do not supply. Funding for ongoing operational support needs to be identified for existing as well as new technology projects.

With regard to maintaining equipment, support agreements for CCSF hardware and software have a standard four-hour response time. For less critical applications, the service-level agreement is next business day. The ITS department oversees the contractual agreements with outside vendors.

The Help Desk has been the primary avenue to report technology problems. In order to streamline the IT support process at CCSF, a new ticketing system was implemented in Spring 2011 that tracks IT issues and evaluates response time and service.

System Reliability and Backup

Technical support staff makes recommendations to management about the type and frequency of preventative maintenance. An estimate of the remaining useful life of equipment is made throughout the year in order to help plan for replacements of servers.
System reliability has been achieved through a combination of proactive preventive maintenance, replacement of aging infrastructure, and software upgrades. Currently only a limited number of systems have an emergency backup; however, a project has recently been started that will provide emergency backup of mission-critical systems through the use of virtualization technologies.

Even though a limited amount of hardware has backups, it should be noted that all critical data, such as email, website content and Banner information, is routinely backed up and stored at an off-site data-storage facility. A plan for full redundancy of all mission-critical systems should be in place by the end of 2011.

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

Questions:

- How does the institution make decisions about use and distribution of its technology resources?
- What provisions has the institution made to assure a robust and secure technical infrastructure, providing maximum reliability for students and faculty?
- What policies or procedures does the institution have in place to keep the infrastructure reasonably up-to-date?
- Does the institution give sufficient consideration to equipment selected for distance programs? How effectively is technology distributed and used?

Decision-making About Use and Distribution of Technology Resources

The institutional processes that determine the use and distribution of technology resources at CCSF are also discussed in sections III.C.1 and III.C.2. The allocation of funds for technology projects follow the Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, Annual Plan and Program Review reports and are approved by the College Planning and Budgeting Council. Capital equipment requests are made as part of the annual budgeting process.

In addition to these processes, several Shared Governance committees are responsible for setting policy and driving details of the discussion about utilization of technology resources. The Information Technology Policy Committee (ITPC) sets policy regarding technology usage. The Technology Learning and Teaching Roundtable (TLTR) provides a monthly forum for faculty to discuss their technology needs and the Communications Committee manages policies concerning web-site design and content.

A Robust and Secure Infrastructure

The College provides for a robust and secure technical infrastructure via a firewall, the physical separation of the network infrastructure into an administrative side and an instructional side, account passwords, use of switch ports, use of standardized anti-virus and anti-spam software, and secure logon and passwords into the enterprise information system. In addition, all enterprise servers are backed up on a regular basis. Enterprise level software is kept up-to-date to ensure vendor support.
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The College keeps its infrastructure up-to-date by establishing standards for its cabling infrastructure to be applied to all new construction, by purchasing technology products early in the product life cycle, assuring that equipment will have a maximum lifespan of use before becoming obsolete, and by making cost-effective design decisions. Infrastructure is periodically reviewed in order to determine its level of usability and an estimate is made on its remaining useful life. Equipment is replaced as it becomes out of date or fails.

Although these operational reviews are ongoing, CCSF relies on manufacturer’s maintenance and service advice codes to extend equipment’s serviceable life. A priority during this next technology review cycle is to put a plan in place so that the IT department can be pro-active instead of reactive concerning replacement of key operational systems.

Technology Support and Distance-Learning Programs

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

Two other shared governance committees also provide input to the ETD to further strengthen distance-learning programs and courses. As discussed earlier, the Teaching and Learning Technology Roundtable is a Shared Governance Committee whose purpose is to recommend policies for the use of technology in instructional support and student services. During their monthly meetings, much of the discussion concerns development and improvement of distant-learning courses or the supports that are offered to the students and instructors involved in them. The Distance Learning Advisory Committee reviews applications to develop online courses. These two committees meet monthly and provide feedback about whether technology is effectively distributed and used within the distance-learning program.

In 2009, when the college decided to switch to a new learning-management system for distance education classes because the WebCT-Blackboard system was not delivering quality of services that faculty and students required, a lengthy college-wide discussion and review of new learning-management tools took place in multiple committees and groups over several months. Following the review, the College chose Moodle as its new learning-management system. While WebCT-Blackboard had been hosted locally, the institution decided to host Moodle and all of the college’s online classes through a private web-hosting and support company. This decision was made to assure that the workload of the Technology-Mediated Instruction department didn’t increase. The move also decreased the cost per student while improving reliability and scalability of our programs. When faculty and students were disappointed with the reliability of our first hosting vendor, we moved quickly to another company.

III.C.2. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.
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Questions:

- How does the institution ensure that facilities decisions emanate from institutional needs and plans for improvement?
- What evidence is there that the institution bases its technology decisions on the results of evaluation of program and service needs?
- How does the institution determine that technology needs in program and service areas are met effectively?
- How does the institution prioritize needs when making decisions about technology purchases? How effectively are those needs met?

Technology and Institutional Planning

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

In fall of 2008, as a part of a shared governance review, faculty, classified staff, students and administrators provided feedback about the document. All areas of the college provided input to this plan before presenting it to the Board of Trustees for approval in 2009.

This process is a common one used for other decisions about the use and distribution of significant technology projects. The Information Technology Policy Committee sets policies regarding technology usage. The allocation of funds for technology projects follows the Strategic Plan, the Technology Plan, and the Annual Plan and is approved by the College Planning and Budgeting Council, as discussed in sections III.C.1 and III.C.1.a of this report.

The Annual Plan is based primarily upon the College’s Strategic Plan. The Annual Plan serves as an operational version of the College’s plans for a one-year period; it consists of a set of institutional objectives that are to be achieved by the College through the efforts of the College’s departments, schools and administrative operations. Clear objectives are provided each year to encourage each department to align its plans with overall College plans and the implementation of technology initiatives.

Technology resources for academic support are allocated through the instructional departments and their respective school deans. In the annual Program Review process, departments analyze their program budgets, student learning outcomes, department needs and describe future plans for extending or upgrading technology. This process also includes the College Planning and Budgeting Council.

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

In the selection of software, CCSF has established selection criteria to ensure maximum benefit. Institutional applications are chosen with an eye towards scalability, security, reliability, data integrity, ease of use, and robustness. They should also encourage innovation. Instructional applications are chosen with the criteria about access, ease of use, suitability for course management, the ability to address the needs, learning styles and learning outcomes of CCSF students, and the training needs of our faculty and staff. In all College technology purchases, sustainability, including but not limited to, total cost of ownership, is an important factor.

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

(Note: Need to add results from the technology, employee and student survey and focus groups.)

III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. The College has an integrated technology planning process that takes input from multiple areas of the institution. The Strategic, Technology and Annual plans as well as the Mission and Vision of CCSF emphasize that technological support should meet the needs of teaching, learning, College-wide communications, research and operations systems. The Shared Governance committees provide ongoing input into the fast-changing technology landscape at CCSF. The past five years have seen implementation of projects that have provided students and the college with the maximum benefits in the most cost-effective manner. A reorganization of the IT staff has helped provide better user support and more efficient use of personnel. However, processes in ITS are under a recurring and continual evaluation process for greater efficiency and improvement. Top priorities include: replacing the insufficient electrical power in the computer and data center in Batmale Hall. This hampers the College’s use of technology and upgrading the power must be operational by fall 2011. In addition, a plan for full redundancy of all mission-critical systems should be in place by the end of 2011. Finally, a system should be put in place to estimate the useful life of equipment so that the CCSF can be pro-active instead of reactive concerning replacement of key operational systems.

2. CCSF has 78 computer labs housing around 2,000 computers available for student use. There are also about 3,000 computers in use by faculty and classified staff. Due to the continual improvement of technology, the need to upgrade will be an ongoing issue. The challenge facing the technology division today is how to reduce the total cost of ownership of desktop systems while providing the required computer resources to allow faculty, staff, and students to perform their work in a cost-effective manner. The technology department is investigating alternative technologies such as thin-client and zero-client computing to provide continued improvement of desktop services. With this in mind, City College should develop a strategy for replacing aging components of the College’s technology systems and
evaluate the true cost of ownership in all technology acquisitions. Key to this is the identification and designation of funding sources specifically allocated for the purposes of establishing a District-wide refresh program.

3. Although CCSF provides training for employees, the budget constraints have made the Technology Learning Center cut back on much of the non-essential training. In order to better provide the necessary knowledge to improve teaching and learning at CCSF, a number of actions are recommended to increase professional development. First, the ETD office should identify and establish teams of trainers from different departments to help expand training in education technology and operational software across the college. In addition, it should increase the use of @ONE training through grants, or an incentive program for further professional development and drive collaboration to learn about state-of-the-art training tools with other community colleges and universities. It should also explore and establish best technology practices for non-credit classes, identify and use non-credit faculty to test and establish these best practices and develop department-specific trainings across the campuses.

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

5. Although the implementation of the new website design and back-end, student email and Google applications has upgraded and expanded the use of technology systems and improved levels of communication, organizational effectiveness and efficiency at CCSF, we can further improve on this work. CCSF should encourage and provide more support and training to departments to migrate content to the new website. CCSF should also continue to publicize and fully use the new student email system. In addition, to maximize the productivity of the college website, the vacant Website Content Manager position in the Marketing Office should be filled when funds become available.

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

Questions:

- What is the institution’s overall budget?
• Does it have sufficient revenues to support educational improvements?

• Does the resource allocation process provide a means for setting priorities for funding institutional improvements?

**III.D.1.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.**

**Questions:**

• Does the institution review its mission and goals as part of the annual fiscal planning process?

• Does the institution identify goals for achievement in any given budget cycle?

• Does the institution establish priorities among competing needs so that it can predict future funding? Do institutional plans exist, and are they linked clearly to financial plans, both short term and long range?

• Does the financial planning process rely primarily on institutional plans for content and timelines?

• Can the institution provide evidence that past fiscal expenditures have supported achievement of institutional plans?

• Does the board and other institutional leadership receive information about fiscal planning that demonstrates its links to institutional planning?

The College’s unrestricted general fund has an annual operating budget of slightly less than $200 million for fiscal year 2010-11 (Ref. 1). Lack of adequate state support during recent years has led to annual budgets that do not provide adequate resources to meet the needs of the College’s current enrollment. This situation is even more challenging due to the inadequate level of financial support the state provides for noncredit education (Ref. 2). To make informed and intelligent decisions related to the distribution of relatively scarce resources, the College has implemented a comprehensive budget planning system that integrates financial planning with institutional planning (Ref. 3). There is a strong connection between the priorities contained in the Strategic Plan 2010-2015 and the Annual Plan that the College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC), a Shared Governance committee, recommends to the Board of Trustees each year. During the development of the annual budget all significant expenditures for each major cost center are tied directly to one of the College’s planning objectives during the development of the annual budget. Specifically, the Annual Plan serves as an operational version of the College’s plans for a one-year period. The Annual Plan consists of a set of institutional objectives that are to be achieved by the College through the efforts of the College’s organizational units—departments, schools and administrative operations (Ref. 4). In addition, all college cost centers now participate in the annual Program Review process. Cost centers use the Program Review process to identify specific resource needs in both personnel and non-personnel areas.

The results of the Program Review process are analyzed by a shared governance committee and presented to the CPBC for possible funding. While limited resources have not allowed for budget enhancements during recent fiscal years, it is anticipated that this process will allow all cost centers...
to compete on an equal basis for future resources, and help to ensure that resources are spent in ways that support planning objectives.

The college’s finance team presents all budget related information it delivers to the CPBC at meetings that are open to the public. Any request to the CPBC for funding must make its way through either Program Review or another shared governance process such as the Faculty Position Allocation Committee, and must demonstrate a direct connection to the College’s Strategic Plan. This system ensures that all of the institution’s major constituency groups have a say in how available resources are used to achieve the goals and objectives in the College’s Strategic Plan. The role of the PBC has gained a great deal of acceptance across the College as a key part of a fair process for creating the annual budget, and for ensuring that longer-term efforts that require additional funding are phased into the budget over a series of years. During difficult years the CPBC has focused its attention on ideas to reduce spending that do not cause the college to stray from its strategic plan. Most recently the CPBC has played a critical role in maintaining unity across all college constituencies during a highly challenging period of time by allowing ideas for savings to be evaluated in a setting that facilitates consensus building.

The CPBC’s recommendations, reflecting a connection between planning and budget, are communicated to the Board of Trustees for both the tentative and final recommended budgets (Ref. 3). The Board’s Planning and Budget Committee conducts a public hearing on the recommended budget prior to the full Board’s consideration of the budget. This is true for both the tentative and final budgets. This system has enabled the College to continue to make steady progress in its efforts to address the needs of its students. At different times, decisions related to the number of classes offered, the protection of student services budgets against state funding cuts, and the allocation of resources for basic skills education have all been accomplished using this approach.

III.D.1.b. Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.

Questions:

- Do individuals involved in institutional planning receive accurate information about available funds, including the annual budget showing ongoing and anticipated fiscal commitments?

- Does the institution establish funding priorities in some fashion that helps the institution achieve its goals in reasonable fashion? Are items focused on student learning given appropriate priority? What other documents describing funding priorities are used by institutional planners?

The College’s annual budget development process begins in January with an assessment of the expected resources for the new fiscal year based on the Governor’s proposed budget for the upcoming fiscal year. This assessment is a collaborative effort by the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Student Development, the College’s Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, and the Chief Financial Officer. Information is gathered from a variety of sources including the State Chancellor’s Office, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Government Relations, the College’s representative in Sacramento, and, for local revenues, the City Controller’s Office. This information is then incorporated into an overall resource projection and presented to
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the College’s Planning and Budget Council (CPBC) as a parameter for the tentative budget for the new fiscal year (Ref. 6).

During times of stable funding, the annual set of budget instructions issued by the Chief Financial Officer to cost center managers specify that cost center budgets seeking additional funds must submit their requests to the appropriate Vice Chancellor for review and approval (Ref. 7). After the Vice Chancellor concurs that the cost centers' budgets are a realistic plan for continuing ongoing operations, the budgets are forwarded to the members of the CPBC. The documents CPBC members review directly connect budget requests with specific strategic goals and objectives. The CPBC then ensures that available resources are squarely framed around the College’s efforts to support student-learning outcomes and the overall needs of the local community. As a further check on this process, the Chief Financial Officer runs multiple iterations of the operating budget using Banner to certify that the College’s budget will be balanced.

During the current recession, requests for additional funds have not been solicited by the CPBC. Instead the college’s senior managers have presented to the CPBC detailed plans to reduce overall spending. The CPBC has reviewed these savings strategies to ensure that they do not counteract the college’s strategic, developmental, and operational plans. The CPBC does not play a role in savings that have been generated through the collective bargaining process. Senior management is responsible for ensuring that these particular savings ideas do not counteract the college’s adopted plans. When this process is completed, both the proposed tentative budget and the proposed annual plan are submitted to the Board of Trustees for its approval. (Ref. 8).

The College has enjoyed a successful track record in raising outside funding to support achievement of the goals and objectives established in its strategic, developmental, and operational plans. During 2010-11 the College included $1.75 million in funds to be raised privately as part of its operating revenue. The College’s Advancement Plan maps out a strategy for helping to provide funding for those items that go beyond basic operations (Ref. 9). For example, priority areas for increased funding in the Advancement Plan include basic skills education, workforce training, and access to student services, and improved technology for classrooms. In addition, the College’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants, as well as its Workforce Development Office, have been highly successful in attracting new sources of funding through the competitive grants process. The College currently receives more than $XXX million per year in grants. Examples of this include $XXX million from the National Science Foundation for various Biotechnology training programs (including Bio-Link, the National Advanced Technological Education Center for Biotechnology Education), and grants totaling $XXX from _______________the Koret Foundation for basic skills programs (Ref. 1). Furthermore, the College continues to successfully forge new partnerships with groups such as the Mayor’s Office, the San Francisco Unified School District, and San Francisco State University. These partnerships have increased the College’s ability to leverage resources in the grants arena. An example of this is the 2010 Gates Foundation funding the College received for the purpose of increasing the number of at-risk high school students who obtain a college degree.

III.D.1.c. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

Questions:
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• What evidence of long-term fiscal planning and priorities exits?

• Does the institution have plans for payments of long-term liabilities and obligations, including debt, health benefits, insurance costs, building maintenance costs, etc? Is this information used in short-term or annual budget and other fiscal planning?

The College’s 2011 Strategic Plan contains X strategic priorities, one of which is to “create dependable funding streams for operations and innovation while ensuring effective and efficient use of College resources”. This goal includes an objective that states “support workforce practices that are economically sustainable for the College and its employees”. The College’s annual fiscal planning process begins with the creation of an Annual Plan, which includes detailed operational and developmental objectives that are tied to the College’s long-range strategic plan. During normal years these objectives are used by each major cost center and its respective departments to develop annual budget requests for submittal to the appropriate Vice Chancellor for approval.

The dramatic national economic downturn that began in late 2008 has had a major impact on the College. Severe reductions in state revenue have in turn led to reduced funding for the College. As a result the College was forced to implement multiple strategic spending reductions including: no across-the-board wage increases for employees since July 2007; a freeze on all step increases during fiscal year 2009-10, wage reductions for administrators during 2009-10 expanding to almost all college employees during fiscal year 2010-11, reducing spending for supplies, maintenance, and equipment; reducing the number of classes offered during the fall of 2009 and the spring of 2010, and elimination of nearly all 2010 summer classes. (Ref. 1). All reductions in spending caused by declining revenue were discussed in multiple venues such as collective bargaining sessions, College Council, the Department Chairs Council, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the College Planning and Budget Council, and Board of Trustees public meetings. The collaborative decisions that allowed these actions to be implemented were absolutely critical for the College to navigate fiscal year’s 2009-10 and 2010-11. Reductions in spending were constructed in a manner that allowed the College to maintain its core educational offerings and protect essential student services. Following strategic reductions in the number of classes offered during fiscal year 2009-10, the College substantially rebuilt the number of class sections it offered during fiscal year 2010-11 to ensure that sufficient enrollment was generated to earn all of the base funding the College was entitled to as well as a modest amount of growth funds.

The College’s Board Designated Reserve was $6.65 million at the end of 2008-09. During fiscal year 2009-10, the College received authority from the Board of Trustees to use $2 million from the reserve to partially backfill the severe state cuts of 2009-10. The College’s objective was to try to avoid spending the $2 million and this objective was successfully achieved. While it will be far more challenging to replicate this during fiscal year 2010-11, the same authority has been granted and the same objective has been set. On a continuing bases the College’s total fund balance, which includes other items such as departmental accounts and a prepaid lease, has been substantially greater than the 5 percent guideline recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office. The College’s careful approach to budgeting is reflected in the College’s bond ratings for the spring 2010 sale of $46 million in General Obligation Bonds. Both Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s rated the College as favorably as the City and County of San Francisco for that sale. (Ref. 12).

The cost of providing fringe benefits to the College’s workforce continues to increase substantially on a yearly basis, particularly for health insurance premiums and pension fund contributions. To ensure that these costs do not erode long-term fiscal stability the options available are to seek
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additional revenue from local voters, modify the circumstances under which employees are eligible for benefits, or modify the sources of payment for these benefits. Any changes related to eligibility or the sources of payment are issues that must be bargained through formal negotiations. The College has already begun negotiating regarding these issues with its labor unions and expects to reach agreement on these issues during 2011.

The College covers its property and liability insurance needs through its membership in the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), a joint powers authority. The College retains the first $50,000 in costs for each liability claim and the first $25,000 for each property claim. SWACC covers the costs above those self-retained limits. SWACC in turn is a member of a larger joint powers authority, the Schools Association For Excess Risk (SAFER). SWACC also sells a portion of its risk to reinsurance firms. Through a combination of SWACC, SAFER membership and reinsurance the College has coverage for claims up to $25 million for liability and $250 million for property damage (Ref. 13).

The College is self-insured for workers compensation for the first $500,000 of any claim, and has excess workers compensation insurance coverage with a private insurer for claims greater than $500,000. This coverage has a limit of $50 million per claim. The college’s self-funded portion of the program generates annual expenditures ranging between $900,000 and $1.2 million. This cost has grown slowly over the years and has not generated substantial budgetary pressure. Periodic reviews of the cost-effectiveness of switching to a fully insured program have consistently shown that such a change would be more expensive than the college’s current structure.

The College pays for the cost of retiree health benefits on a “pay as you go” basis, with estimated total expenditures of approximately $6.3 million in fiscal year 2010-11. The cost of this benefit increases by about $700,000 per year. A combination of factors has led to this increase in costs, including general increases in health care premiums, changes in life expectancy, and an initiative passed by San Francisco voters that improved retiree health benefits. The Government Accounting Standards Board requires an actuarial study of the unfunded liability in this area. The College has completed this study and has also complied with requirements related to its disclosure. (Ref X) The need for a long-term financial strategy to match this long-term liability is being addressed through labor negotiations. An agreement on a solution is expected during 2011.

III.D.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget.

Questions:

- Where or how are the processes for financial planning and budget recorded and made known to college constituents?

The financial planning and budget process is documented in an annual planning and budget guide that is distributed to all cost center managers. This guide for budget submittals contains instructions that are discussed and reviewed on an annual basis by the College’s CPBC. The Chief Financial Officer incorporates feedback from both the CPBC as well as individual cost center managers to modify and improve the annual guide (Ref. 3).

The College’s annual audit reports, quarterly financial reports, and annual budget are all posted on the College’s website. (ADD REF) In addition, the financial information, including the annual
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budget, is widely distributed via the CPBC and public meetings of the Board of Trustees. Each year, both the CPBC and the Board of Trustees’ Planning and Budget Committee conduct at least one public hearing prior to the adoption of the budget. The College’s Budget and Accounting Office provides financial reports on a monthly basis to the Board of Trustees, the public, and the representatives of the College’s constituency groups (Ref. 15).

III.D.2. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.

III.D.2.a. Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

Questions:

- Are funds allocated, as shown in the budget, in a manner that will realistically achieve the institution’s stated goals for student learning?
- What do the audit statements say about financial management?
- Does the institution provide timely corrections to audit exceptions and management advice?

The College’s annual budget development process begins in January with an assessment of the expected resources for the new fiscal year based on the Governor’s proposed budget for the upcoming fiscal year. (Ref. 6).

The annual budget, the annual audit report, and all quarterly financial reports are available on the College’s website. (ADD REF) The Annual Budget document reflects the cost of carrying out the District’s annual operating objectives. The final budget incorporates the availability of state and local funding, and includes a summary of the activities the budget will support (Ref. 1). This typically includes information related to the hiring of new and replacement full-time faculty, improvements in salary schedules, net increases for additional salary step movement, the cost of fringe benefits, and all budget requests approved for funding through the CPBC.

During recent years, reductions in state funding have forced the College to focus on ways to reduce spending as a final budget is developed. The same open collaborative approach, led by the College’s senior managers and the CPBC, has been used to plan for reductions, as it was previously used to plan for increases. This approach has enabled the College to focus on the needs of its students in the face of stagnant or even shrinking resources. At different times, decisions related to the number of classes offered, backfilling student services budgets in the face of state funding cuts, and improving basic skills education have all been made using this approach.

The annual 311 Report required by the state documents the College’s compliance with the “fifty percent law” related to spending for instruction. Historically the College has compared favorably with other districts on this measure (Ref. 16). In addition the College’s level of compliance with the “seventy-five percent law” related to the number of full-time faculty compares quite favorably with other districts (Ref. 17). These two items are evidence of the high priority the College places on
supporting student learning. Furthermore, during the recent multi-year period of state fiscal distress, numerous concessions related to compensation have been agreed to by all College employees in an effort to save jobs and protect direct spending for student needs. This unprecedented level of cooperation has been critical to safeguarding students’ access to educational opportunities.

The independent auditor presents all audit findings directly to the Board of Trustees in open public session. In addition, the College hired a full-time Internal Auditor during 2008 who also presents findings directly to the Board of Trustees. The District’s Business Office responds to all audit recommendations in as timely a manner as feasible. Those recommendations that can be effectively implemented within the next audit cycle are identified and changes are implemented. Typically, audit findings are brought to the College’s attention in December; therefore some recommendations require a longer time horizon for completion than the next audit year. The District is currently working on implementing changes involving ________ and _______ as identified in the fiscal year 2009-10 audit report (Ref. 11). The Board of Trustees Audit Committee monitors the administration’s progress in addressing audit findings on a regular basis.

III.D.2.b. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.

Questions:
- What information about budget, about fiscal conditions, about financial planning and about audit results is provided through out the college? Is this information sufficient in content and timing to support institutional and financial planning and financial management?

The institution distributes financial information in a timely manner in several forms to a variety of groups. The College’s annual budget is widely distributed via the CPBC, the College’s website, and public meetings of the Board of Trustees. Each year the CPBC conducts an open hearing on the proposed annual budget, which includes presentations from the Vice Chancellors and some of the College’s cost center managers. In addition, the Board of Trustees conducts at least one public hearing on the proposed budget prior to adoption. The College’s finance team provides monthly financial reports to the Board of Trustees at public meetings, and during the academic year the finance team provides financial reports to the CPBC (which includes representatives from all four College constituencies) on a biweekly basis. All key financial documents are posted to the College’s web site. The College’s annual audit report for 2009-10 was completed in a timely manner, with wide distribution (Ref. 8). Furthermore, the independent auditor presents all audit findings directly to the Board of Trustees in an open advertised public session.

III.D.2.c. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

Questions:
- What is the ending balance of unrestricted funds for the institution’s immediate past three years. Is this amount sufficient to maintain a reserve needed for emergencies?
- Does the institution have any other access to cash should the need arise?
• How does the institution receive its revenues? Does this receipt pose cash flow difficulties for the college? If so, how does the college address cash flow difficulties? (e.g., COPS, loans)?

• Has the institution sufficient insurance to cover its needs? Is the institution self-funded in any insurance categories? If so, does it have sufficient reserves to handle financial emergencies?

The most severe economic downturn since the Great Depression has created significant financial challenges for the College. This situation was even more challenging for the College due to the historically inadequate level of financial support the state provides for noncredit education. In addition to budget shortfalls, the extreme tardiness with which state budgets have been adopted has resulted in serious cash strains for the College. As of June 30, 2010, the college’s Board Designated Reserve totaled $6.65 million, the largest it has ever been. As noted in the response to III.D.1.c, during fiscal year 2009-10, the College received authority from the Board of Trustees to use $2 million from the reserve to partially backfill the severe state cuts of 2009-10. The College’s objective was to try to avoid spending the $2 million and this objective was successfully achieved. While it will be far more challenging to replicate this during fiscal year 2010-11, the same objective has been set.

The College’s objective is and has been to maintain a 5 percent available unrestricted general fund balance as recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office. During fiscal year 2009-10 the unrestricted general fund balance exceeded the recommended 5 percent level. This is partly attributable to the remaining value on a long-term prepaid lease.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Ending Unrestricted General Fund Balance</th>
<th>% of Unrestr'd Gen'l Fund Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Because property tax payments comprise about one-third of the College’s unrestricted revenue but are received in two semiannual payments, annual planning for cash needs is quite important. The Co-chairs for Standard III: Beth Cataldo and Peter Goldstein
primary method the College uses to deal with cash needs is its participation in the annual Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) pool sponsored by the California Community College League. The College typically borrows between $15 and $20 million in the TRANs pool to deal with cash needs during the upcoming fiscal year (Ref. 18). Additionally, in an emergency, such as very late passage of the state budget, the College has access to short-term borrowing for cash via the City and County Treasury. This emergency procedure is convenient and helpful but it does come at a price equal to the rate the County Treasury is earning on deposits at the time. Recent passage of Proposition 25 which lowered the required vote for passage of a state budget from two-thirds to a majority plus one should result in state budgets being approved sooner, thereby reducing some of the College’s need to borrow short-term cash.

As noted in the response to III.D.1.c, the College covers its property and liability insurance needs through its membership in the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), a joint powers authority. The College retains the first $50,000 in costs for each liability claim and the first $25,000 for each property claim. SWACC covers the costs above those self-retained limits. SWACC in turn is a member of a larger joint powers authority, the Schools Association For Excess Risk (SAFER). SWACC also sells a portion of its risk to reinsurance firms. Through a combination of SWACC, SAFER membership, and reinsurance the College has coverage for claims up to $25 million for liability and $250 million for property damage (Ref. 13).

III.D.2.d: The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

Questions:

- What are the institution’s procedures for reviewing fiscal management? Are those regularly implemented?

- What evidence about fiscal management is provided by external audits and financial program reviews?

- Has the institution received any audit findings or negative reviews during the last six years?

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

With the retirement of the Chief Administrative Services Officer responsibility for overseeing the College’s entry into contractual relationships for a wide variety of services and for clinical placements of students in health-related fields has been shifted to the administrator serving as Acting General Counsel. After the retirement of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities, the
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College entered into a contract with Swinerton Inc for direct project management of the College’s capital program. The manager of the College’s Facilities Planning and Construction Office, who reports directly to the VCFA, oversees the Swinerton contract. Both of these individuals have access to attorneys with construction law expertise as needed.

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

The District received an unqualified audit opinion for fiscal years 2007, 2008, and 2009 in its Annual Financial and Single Audit report. While, the most recent report, issued for fiscal year 2010, did identify three material weaknesses, the report was unqualified and the College is taking steps to address these weaknesses. The District’s Internal Auditor tracks progress towards resolution for all annual audit findings, and the Chief Financial Officer and his staff work directly with the independent auditors to resolve all findings.

The annual audit report for the College includes an audit of the auxiliary bookstore. A separate audit report is issued for the College’s Foundation (Ref. 19. There have been no significant audit findings for either of these two entities since _____.(Ref. 11).

III.D.2.e: All financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

Questions:

• Are the institution’s special funds audited or reviewed by funding agencies regularly?

• Do the audits demonstrate the integrity of financial management practices?

The College uses its financial resources, including all financial resources from auxiliary activities, fundraising efforts and grants with integrity and in a manner consistent with the missions and goals of the institution.

The District’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants administer the grants application process. This Office is reporting on a temporary basis to the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, who, during post-award grant administration works closely with the Chief Financial Officer on both the development of contracts as well as accounting issues related to grant-funded expenditures.

The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, with the assistance of Acting General Counsel and the accounting department, ensures that grant-related financial reporting and contract terms are in full compliance with all terms required by the granting agency. All financial transactions for grant-funded activities are processed through the College’s Banner management information system, and are subject to annual audits by awarding agencies. In addition, all grant-funded contracts are publicly noticed on the monthly agendas of the Board of Trustees.
The Foundation of the City College of San Francisco, which operates under a master agreement with the College, has a separate Board of Directors and maintains a separate general ledger system. Policy is implemented through the Executive Director of the Foundation. During 2010, the Foundation assumed responsibility for its own accounting functions. The Foundation has been successful in its fundraising efforts the past few years, primarily in generating support for student scholarships for basic skills programs. Under the Master Agreement, funds raised by the Foundation must be spent in a manner that benefits the College. All funds raised by the Foundation have been spent in a manner that is consistent with the College’s mission and goals (Ref. 19 and Ref. 20).

III.D.2.f: Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.

Questions:

- What contractual agreements exist, and are they consistent with institutional mission and goals?
- Does the institution have appropriate control over these contracts? Can it change or terminate contracts that don’t meet its required standards of quality?

The College enters into a wide variety of contractual agreements including but not limited to the following:

- Personal services contracts under $X, referred to as limited services contracts which are reported to the Board of Trustees as “Information Only”;
- Professional services contracts for more than $10,000, which require higher levels of insurance, complete descriptions of deliverables/timelines, and Board of Trustees approval before being awarded;
- Grant and sub-recipient contractual agreements;
- Informal construction contracts under $15,000, which go to the Board of Trustees for approval;
- Formal construction contracts greater than $15,000 which are subject to public bid requirements and must be approved by the Board of Trustees before being awarded;
- Construction-related professional services, such as architecture and engineering, awarded through a fair and competitive process and approved by the Board of Trustees before being awarded;
- Rental agreements for classroom space which are approved by the Board of Trustees;
- Vendor agreements that produce revenue for the College and the Associated Students and are subject to approval by the Board of Trustees;
- Master Agreements with the Foundation and Bookstore Auxiliary approved by the Board of Trustees; and
- Clinical Agreements for placement of students in clinical settings. (See Ref. 22)
The integrity of District contracts is maintained by adherence to regulatory codes including the Public Contract Code, the Education Code, the Business and Professions Code, the Labor Code, and the Government Code as they relate to specific types of contracts. The College’s Acting General Counsel reviews all contracts prior to signing and implementation. The College for convenience or cause may terminate contracts. It should be noted that College policy requires any services contract in excess of $XX,000, an annually indexed amount tied to inflation, to be awarded only after a competitive process has been conducted. This policy acknowledges that factors other than price, such as particular research skills, may be included as selection criteria (Ref. 22).

During the 2009 and 2010 calendar years the Board of Trustees adopted several new policies related to contracts. These policies are intended to ensure that contracts are not implemented without the prior approval of the Trustees. In addition, the administration has worked cooperatively with the Board to develop a process in which all construction-related contracts are reviewed by the Board’s Facilities, Infrastructure and Technology Committee prior to consideration by the full Board of Trustees.

III.D.2.g. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems.

Questions:

• Does the institution have an annual external audit to provide feedback on its processes?

• Does the institution review the effectiveness of its past fiscal planning as part of planning for current and future fiscal needs?

The College uses both the annual external audit report as well as feedback from key user functional groups to assess the effectiveness of its financial management systems. While service to internal and external customers is a priority, so are safeguards against fraud and abuse. Internal requirements for processing transactions are streamlined whenever such changes do not reduce important checks and balances. The Business Office is continually seeking new ways to use technology to improve business processes. Examples of such changes in recent years include __________ and __________.

The College’s management team treats all external audit findings seriously. The District’s Business Office responds to all audit recommendations in as timely a manner as feasible. Audit findings are addressed in both a short- and long-term manner, depending on the nature of the appropriate remedy. Those recommendations that can be effectively implemented within the next audit cycle are identified and changes are implemented. Typically audit findings are brought to the College’s attention in December; therefore, some recommendations require a longer time horizon for completion than the next audit year. The College’s Internal Auditor tracks all audit findings and the Board of Trustees Audit Committee reviews progress.

On the macro level, the relative scarcity of resources requires the College to continually examine how well it is planning for both current and future needs. While the preliminary annual budget is adopted in June and the final budget is adopted in September (or in October when the State Chancellor’s Office extends the deadline), both the CPBC and the Board of Trustees are updated regularly by the College’s finance team regarding how well the annual financial plan is or is not tracking (Ref. 23). Expenditures are now tracked every pay period via an ongoing forecast model.
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When information regarding revenue changes during the course of a fiscal year necessitates, adjustments are made to budgets and spending. During the past few years, such adjustments to spending have been necessary for both personnel and non-personnel items as mid-year changes in state funding are unfortunately now common.

**III.D.3. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.**

**Questions:**

- What processes does the institution use to assess its use of financial resources?
- How does the institution ensure that it assesses its use of financial resources systematically and effectively?
- How does the institution use results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement?

[Answers to these questions repeat information already given]

**Strengths and Areas for Improvement**

1. The College has implemented a comprehensive budget planning system that integrates financial planning with institutional planning. There is a strong connection between the priorities contained in the Strategic Plan 2011-2016 and the Annual Plan that the College Planning and Budgeting Council recommends to the Board of Trustees each year. The institution clearly defines, widely distributes, and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budgeting on an annual basis. Financial information is provided throughout the institution, both on paper and electronically, to a variety of groups in a timely manner. The institution is committed to a budget planning process that relies on realistic assessments of available resources and strategic efforts for attracting additional resources. The College has been successful in its efforts to generate financial support from both grant agencies and private donors.

   The institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability in making short-range financial plans. When state revenues slumped, the institution managed its reserve funds in an intelligent manner to meet the goal of protecting direct spending for students. The College Planning and Budget Council will be reviewing proposals for ongoing savings during the Spring 2011 semester in anticipation of the need to reduce spending during the 2011-12 fiscal year. The institution expects to reach agreement with the labor unions that represent the College’s workforce on measures to address the cost of retiree health benefits by the end of 2011.

2. Financial documents, including the budget and the independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. The College focuses spending on student learning as evidenced by its history of high numbers related to the “fifty percent law” and the “seventy-five percent law.” While resources for the support of student-learning programs and services are not adequate, the institution has made informed and intelligent decisions in a Shared Governance setting related to the distribution of these relatively scarce resources.
3. The College has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. The institution has made concerted efforts to meet the State Chancellor’s guidelines for a 5 percent fund balance and acknowledges how difficult that is during under-funded years. The cash flow needs of the District have been supported through the issuance of TRANS and risk management needs are handled through SWACC.

4. The institution practices effective oversight of all of its finances. Its most recent audit report, issued for fiscal year 2010, was unqualified. While the audit did identify three material weaknesses the College is taking actions to address these weaknesses. The institution monitors finances not only for the College itself but also for the auxiliary bookstore and separate foundation as well. The institution makes extensive efforts to connect spending with planning, and has consistently done so with the highest level of integrity. Financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution. The institution emphasizes extensive front-end efforts to ensure that contract language is in the best interest of the institution, and goes beyond statutory requirements for competitive processes.

III.D. References (NOTE: references will be finalized and ordered after final edit of document)
Ref. 1 Annual Budget 2004-05 Final Recommendation 9/30/04
Ref. 2 Report of The Workgroup on Community College Finance 2004
Ref. 3 Unit Budget Plan/ Major Cost Center Plan
Ref. 4 Institutional Annual Plan 2004-05
Ref. 5 Strategic Plan 2003-2008
Ref. 6 Management Plan 2004-05
Ref. 7 Annual Budget Letter of Instructions
Ref. 8 Annual Board Resolution for Adopting the Final Budget
Ref. 9 Institutional Advancement Plan 2004
Ref. 10 Revised Calculation for 2003-04 Apportionment Exhibit E
Ref. 11 Annual Audit Reports
Ref. 12 Letters from Rating Agencies
Ref. 13 SWACC 2004-05 Property & Casualty Binder
Ref. 14 Extracts from Budget Documents
Ref. 15 Quarterly Financial Reports
Ref. 16 CCF – 311 Reports
Ref. 17 California Community Colleges FT Faculty Obligation Report Fall 2004
Ref. 18 Annual Resolution for Participation in Pooled TRANs
Ref. 19 Annual Audit Report for 2003-04 for the CCSF Foundation
Ref. 20 Bylaws of the CCSF Foundation
Ref. 21 Bylaws of the CCSF Bookstore
Ref. 22 Summary of College Policies Related to Contracts with Outside Entities
Ref. 23 Agenda for Regular Monthly Board of Trustees Meeting
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Standard IV. Leadership and Governance.

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

Standard IV.A: Leadership and Governance: Decision-Making Roles and Processes:

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

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

Questions:

- Are the institution’s goals and values clearly articulated and understood by all? Can college staff tell you what those goals and values are?
- Can staff describe their own roles in helping the institution achieve its goals?
- What information about institutional performance is circulating and available to staff and students?

The CCSF Vision and Mission statement, approved in 2010, states that:

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

While this section of the vision statement was recently reworded it continues to reflect the spirit of a long standing tradition at our college. During the early 90's, the college administration and representatives of the major college constituencies engaged in a series of discussions about participatory governance at CCSF, in response to Assembly Bill (AB) 1725. In September of 1993, the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District established the CCSF Shared Governance System, in accordance with Title V. Over the next two decades members of the college community has demonstrated their commitment to work collaboratively within the CCSF Shared Governance System. The level of trust and collaboration has grown each year as faculty, classified staff, students and administrators set together in over 43 Shared Governance committees.
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and subcommittees, to discuss issues, to resolve problems and to recommend policies for adoption by the Board of Trustees.

The College Advisory Council (CAC) consists of the institutional leadership, both appointed and elected. The appointed leaders who sit on the CAC are: the three senior vice chancellors, the district and the student Shared Governance Coordinators and the chancellor, who also serves as the chair of the CAC. The elected institutional leaders are; the co-chairs of the Administrators Association, the presidents of the Academic Senate, Faculty Union (AFT 2121), and Department Chair Council (DCC), the Presidents of the Classified Union (SEIU 1021) and Classified Senate, as well as the Student Trustee and the President of the Associated Students, Ocean Campus. The College Advisory Council meets monthly during the course of the spring and fall semesters. During these meetings the college leadership discusses ideas and policies that have district-wide significance. The CAC also provides a forum for dialogues, between the various constituencies at the highest level, as well as with the Board of Trustees via the chancellor.

Within a year of implementing Shared Governance System at CCSF, the leadership of the institution recognized the need to improve the way the district articulates the institution's goals and values to the members of our college. In 1994, the Chancellor and the College Advisory Council created the Office of Shared Governance, and the position of the District Shared Governance Coordinator, the first one in the state of California. The first project suggested and implemented by the coordinator with the approval of the CAC was the CCSF Master Calendar. It was published in the City Currents, the college’s internal weekly newsletter, and with the advancement of technology, posted on the Office of Shared Governance website. The concept was that in our multi-campus institution a Master Calendar, that included the meeting dates, times and location of all shared governance committees, would provide and easily accessible information to when and where to attend a meeting to provide input on any topic. This simple way of dissemination of information was an excellent first step to bring the college community together to work within the framework of Shared Governance. The transparency allowed for truly district wide ownership of our institutional goals and values.

The establishment of the shared governance system and the subsequent support for the process and practices from the district, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff and students work together for the good of the institution. College constituencies are familiar with and use the Shared Governance System to address the issues facing the College, bringing forth innovative solutions (e.g., a proposal for designated smoking areas) and filtering out ideas, such as the proposal for campus polices to carry guns on campus.

The Veterans Program is an example of how expediently the college can respond, using its Shared Governance processes to address urgent issues. The entire College pulled together to form a Veterans Program to help, encourage, and provide successful life options to our returning veterans.

During the implementation of the Student Success and Social Equity resolution many different approaches were taken by the various leaders of the institution, most significantly by the Board of Trustees. Members of the College’s constituencies through the well-defined Shared Governance System expressed their concerns. The Board remedied and rectified how they work with the College constituencies to ensure that the College would forward together in providing the best solutions to the students and communities the District serves.
Section: IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

The district has a Shared Governance handbook that details specifically how each constituent group can participate in the decision-making processes of the college. All Shared Governance committees except the Academic Senate Executive Council have membership positions for all four constituencies. All committees have a parent “Council” that is empowered to bring recommendations to the Chancellor.

All policy resolutions are debated at open-session Trustee meetings. The Board of Trustees holds two hearings for each policy. First reading is a draft and open to input from all constituencies. Second reading is not held until the policy is ready for passage, giving everyone adequate time to provide input and to develop consensus around the best and most appropriate policy. We are updating the entire policy manual. Thus, constituents participate in both the formal and informal processes.

IV.A.2.a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

Questions:

- What do institutional policies and procedures describe as the roles for each group in governance, including planning and budget development?

In September of 1993, the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District established the City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System, in accordance with Assembly Bill 1725 (AB 1725). The CCSF Shared Governance organization consists of three systems, each with a set of permanent committees. All members of the City College community – students, faculty, classified and administrators -- are represented in these committees. The committees may establish sub-committees and task forces, wherever needed and appropriate.

The College Shared Governance System has three parts:

1. The Collegial Governance system, in which the College relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate and its representatives. The membership of the Shared Governance committees and subcommittees in this area include all College constituent organizations but with at least a plurality of faculty sitting on each of the four major committees — Academic Policies, Curriculum, Student Preparation/Success, and Staff Development. Recommendations from the Collegial committees are forwarded to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, for review before being sent to, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees. Recommendations from the Executive Council of the Academic Senate are advisory to the Board of Trustees. However if the Board does not take the
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advice of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate the Board needs to give a written justification to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate.

2. **The College Advisory system**, in which the College obtains advisory recommendations in key operational areas from committees including Communication, Diversity, Information and Public Records and Information Technology Policy. The committees report directly to the College Advisory Council (CAC) and are composed of representatives from all the major College organizations—students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators as noted in details earlier. The CAC is chaired by the Chancellor. The CAC oversees the development of Board Policies, annual Shared Governance Report, annual Student Success and Social Equity Report, Technology Plan, Accreditation Report and Internet related reports. Recommendations from the CAC are advisory to the Board of Trustees.

3. **The Planning and Budgeting system** is an integrated system of college-wide planning and budgeting for the College. Included in this system is the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), composed of representatives from each of the College constituencies — students, faculty, administrators, and classified staff. The PBC is also chaired by the Chancellor. The PBC oversees the development of the College’s Strategic Plan (every five years), the Annual Plan (each year), the annual College budget, and the annual Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessments of the achievements of the Annual Plan. The PBC also oversees the annual College Performance Indicators Report. Additional committees reporting to the PBC include the Facilities Review Committee, Program Review Committee, Faculty Position Allocation Committee, and the Sustainability Committee. Recommendations from the PBC are advisory to the Board of Trustees.

Appointments to the committees, subcommittees and task forces are the responsibilities of each four constituent groups. For the administrators, the initial recommendation is made by Administrators Association to the Chancellor who finalizes the appointments. For classified employees, the SEIU 1021 makes the appointments. For faculty members, the Executive Council of the Academic Senate's Committee on Committees makes the initial recommendations and these are finalized by the Executive Council of the Academic Senate. The student appointments are made by the Associated Students. The 43 committees and subcommittees has over 400 members of the college constituent groups participates in the work of the CCSF Shared Governance System

IV.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

Questions:

- What documents describe the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters?

The institution has clearly defined policies and practices that follow Title 5 and give authority to the appropriate Shared Governance constituency. Specifically, it recognizes faculty primacy in all ten Title 5 academic and professional matters. Additionally, decisions about associate degree requirements rest with the Bipartite Committee on Graduation requirements, a body that comprises the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and administrators representing Student
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Development and Academic Affairs. The most significant main documents that describe the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters is the Curriculum Handbook and Ten-Plus-One based on California Education Code, Section 53200 and the Curriculum Handbook. Ten-Plus-One states that:

"Academic Senate means an organization whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters. Academic and Professional matters means the following policy development matters: 1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites. 2. Degree and certificate requirements. 3. Grading policies. 4. Educational program development. 5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success. 6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles. 7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process. 8. Policies for faculty professional development activities. 9. Processes for program review. 10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development. and 11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon."

IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

Questions:

- Do the written policies on governance procedures specify appropriate roles for all staff and students? Do these policies specify the academic roles of faculty in areas of student educational programs and services planning?
- Are staff and students well informed of their respective roles. Do staff participate as encouraged by these policies? Do the various groups work in collaborative effort on behalf of institutional improvements? Is the result of this effort actual institutional improvement?
- Is there effective communication at the college – clear, understood, widely available, current communication?
- Do staff at the college know essential information about institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve learning?

CCSF’s written policies on governance procedures specify appropriate roles for all staff and students. As noted above, these written policies also specify the academic roles of faculty in areas of student educational programs and services planning.

The depth and specificity of the Shared Governance section in the Policy Manual (section 2.07) is considerable, and is one of the most developed areas of College policy. The Board Policy Manual (Revised September 29, 1998) gives the College’s constituent groups — students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators — the right and responsibility to serve on committees and to address all facets of the College’s mission. The appendix of the BP section 2.07 defines the standing committees of the Shared Governance System, including the number of representatives of each
constituency, their time to serve and provides for continuing evaluation by those constituent groups, which is to be summarized by the Chancellor and passed through to the Board of Trustees.

Implementation of the Shared Governance System has seen changes over time. The documents attesting to the nature of the Shared Governance System, such as the Shared Governance Handbook and related literature, are numerous and have been developed at considerable effort. The Shared Governance Handbook takes the process much further than the Policy Manual, providing an organizational chart of how the committees fit within the system. The Handbook defines the charter of each committee as well as the numerical membership of each constituent group, including a directory with committee name, the chair’s name, and contact information. California’s laws and administrative regulations provide that students, classified staff, and administrators play an advisory role to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. The faculty role is more specific. The provisions say that the College will “rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the faculty in academic and professional matters.” Title 5 regulations include 10 specific areas of academic and professional matters and a provision that other areas may be included if they are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the Academic Senate.

The CCSF Shared Governance System is organized in compliance with this Title 5 regulation.

There are many examples to attest to the level of trust and collaboration within the College’s shared governance system, especially since the past and current Chancellors. For example to lighten the growing financial crises the College is faces due to state cuts in the College’s budget, the College constituency groups within the Planning and Budgeting Council as well as the College Advisory Committee discussed and resolved to support the decisions of the College’s unions (AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021) to defer all contractual and step increases for all CCSF employees as well as adopt other financial measures such as hiring freeze for staff. This collective decision was a critical factor for the College to avoid layoffs and minimize cutbacks in student services and class offerings and saved the College millions of dollars during one of the worst downturns in funding the College's history. A second example of the commitment to collaboration and trust within the College is the 2010 agreement to support the use of short form for administrators’ evaluation by classified employees. At the same time there is still room for further improvements. For example, the new placement policy of the college was not taken to the matriculation committee of the college governance system, which would have been the proper shared governance venue; rather it was only reviewed by the administration.

College-wide discussion and communication is facilitated in committees and subcommittees throughout the Shared Governance System. While there is an ongoing collegial discussion amongst the constituencies’ further improvement and expansion already existing communication is always a goal. The Associated Student Council has an independent student council on each of the college's major campuses. There is an ongoing effort to better incorporate these AS councils from the satellite campuses.

In 1994, the college created an Office of Shared Governance, which is independent of all four constituent groups. In 2004, the College constituent groups recommended that the Office of Shared Governance be placed in an independent location close to the office of the Academic Senate. In addition it was recommended that the District Shared Governance Coordinator report directly to the Chancellor (Shared Gov Evaluation), which was accomplished by 2007.
The College’s Shared Governance Coordinator provides information and trainings about the Shared Governance System and updates information on its website and in *City Currents*, the CCSF internal weekly newsletter. Information is readily available regarding roles of constituent groups and committee mission statements on the College’s Shared Governance website and additional documents such as, the Shared Governance Handbook. The Shared Governance Coordinator posts on the Office of Shared Governance website information received from constituent groups and committee chairs regarding committee membership updates, meeting schedules, meeting agendas, and approved meeting minutes. The communication and distribution of information has evolved over time to keep up with the changing technology, increase outreach, improve timeliness, and expand coverage. As new technologies emerge and new policies are implemented the Shared Governance Coordinator works diligently to keep up with the changing demand. The two latest changes are, the use of Grenicus to use streaming media similar to the California State Assembly for the Board of Trustees meeting and the change in the District Sunshine Policy to increase transparency in the institution. The District Sunshine Policy calls for audio recording of all meetings of the College Advisory Council, the Planning and Budgeting Council, and the Executive Council of the Academic Senate.

CCSF embraces debate as an important way to educate constituencies on issues and voice different perspectives. Current issues such as the speed of processing student workers and financial aid have definitely been much improved because of the focused attention they have received. Other issues are still in process, such as the pilot math and English compressed course sequences. We will need to assess the outcomes of these pilots before reaching consensus on how best to proceed.

District employees have been made aware of essential information about institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve learning through multiple means.

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

IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study, and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

**Questions:**

- What does documentation of the institution’s past accreditation history show about integrity in its relationship with the Commission – has it responded expeditiously and honestly to recommendations, are there citations indicating difficulty, etc.?

- Are the institution’s communications of institutional qualities or effectiveness to the public accurate?

- What is the institution’s track record in its relationship with the U.S. Department of Education?

Co-chairs for Standard IV: Lisa Romano, Attila Gabor, and Phyllis McGuire
CCSF exercises the highest level of integrity communication and in its relationship with the Commission—it has responded expeditiously and honestly to recommendations and any citations of difficulties.

For example, during the last accreditation visit, the visiting team suggested to increase outreach and education on shared governance system to the various stakeholders. This recommendation was also addressed in the mid-term report and by the 2010 internal audit. The district shared governance coordinator regularly provides orientations to new employees, to the Executive Council of the Associated Students, the Executive Council of the Classified Senate and other groups as needed.

The College’s communications are handled by the Office of Public Information and Marketing. Checking on the accuracy of a given communication to the community, whether it be a brochure or a news release, continues to be a matter of honesty, integrity, and professionalism in the College’s relationships with external agencies.

The College’s relationship with the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) primarily involves the Financial Aid Office and the Office of Workforce and Economic Development. Since the last accreditation, the relationship between the USDE and the CCSF Financial Aid office has been excellent. The CCSF Financial Aid office continues with the established a staff development training program with the training specialist for Region IX and also participates in regular other USDE training opportunities. The Program Participation Agreement with USDE, which is similar to an accreditation approval, has been approved through June 30, 2015.

City College of San Francisco’s Office of Workforce, Economic Development and Grants relationship with the ESDE has been excellent as well. The Office regularly reviews USDE publications regarding current and future policies and legislation, particularly as it relates to the Carl Perkins CTE Act. Staff actively participates with local, regional, state and national Workforce and Economic Development Councils, Consortia and Associations, including the Bay Area Community College Consortia (BACCC), the California Community College Association of Occupational Education (CCCAOE) and the National Council for Workforce Education (NCWE). Faculty and administration regularly attend and present at national and state conferences. Currently, the Chancellor serves on the San Francisco Workforce Investment Board (WISF) and the Associate Vice Chancellor of Workforce, Economic Development and Grants serves on the WISF Youth Council and as President of NCWE (20010/2011), a council of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). Information is communicated to CCSF’s Career and Technical Education Department Chairs, faculty, Career and Technical Education (CTE) Subcommittee, Academic Policies Committee, and the Executive Council of the CCSF Academic Senate. Input from CCSF is provided via surveys generated from both the State Chancellor’s Office and the U.S. Department of Education on CTEA Reauthorization and reporting requirements. Various departments within CCSF have also applied for and received grants from the USDE.

IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Questions:
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• What process does the institution use to evaluate its governance and decision-making structures? Are the results communicated within the campus community?

• How does the institution use identified weaknesses to make needed improvements?

The Shared Governance Agreement specifies that each constituency should evaluate the Shared Governance System every two years. The last substantive evaluation and revision of the Shared Governance system was in 2007, with the involvement of the leadership all four constituent groups. During the initial phase of the writing of this accreditation report there will be a district wide survey sent out including questions regarding shared governance. The results of that survey will be reviewed by the Committee on Information and Public Records. Recommendations will be forwarded to the College Advisory Council. The results of that survey will be also included in the accreditation document. In addition, on the recommendation of the Committee on Information and Public Record the Office of Shared Governance will start an annual survey of the district employees and students to evaluate CCSF Shared Governance System by using the district newly purchased survey monkey.

Since the last accreditation visit, our Board has begun conducting an annual self-evaluation that is informed in part by surveying all College constituencies. The Board also evaluates the Chancellor each spring; this evaluation is informed in part by employee surveys. Specifically, the trustees and the employees express how well they feel the Chancellor is achieving the Board-identified objectives. If recommendations are made, they are then given to Shared Governance for follow-up.

References

• Strategic Plan Shared Governance and Community Review Process 8/9/10
• Student Equity and Achievement Gap 4/29/10
• Monthly Chancellors Report Board of Trustees: September 2010; March 2010
• Institutional Annual Plan 2010/11
• Annual Plan: Developmental Objectives 2010/11
• Accreditation Follow up Report for WASC March, 2010; Focused Midterm Progress Report 3/15/2009
• Annual Budget Report Recommendations for Board of Trustees: 2010/11; 2009/10; 2008/09
• Shared Governance Handbook 2006/7; 2007/8; 2008/9; 2009/10
• San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual
• CCSF Mission and Vision Statement
• Listening Sessions: December 9, 2009 and February 10, 2010
• CCSF Technology Plan 2009
• Executive Summary of Sustainability Plan December 2009
• Office of Research and Planning
Standard IV.B: Leadership and Governance.
Board and Administrative Organization.
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In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

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

**Questions:**

- Does the institution have a policy manual or other compilation of policy documents that show the board’s role in establishing said policy and reviewing it on a regular basis?
- What statements about quality of program, integrity of institutional actions and about effectiveness of student learning programs and services are to be found in the institution’s board-established policies, mission statements, vision or philosophy statement, planning documents or other statements of direction? (Standard 1 and 1A)
- What is the written policy describing selection of the chief administrator? Has the board followed it or another process?

City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees has a policy manual that identifies Board roles. In 2008, the Policy Implementation Committee of the Board with the assistance of an outside legal counsel began the process to review and update the policy manual. In 2009 due to budget restraints, the services of the outside legal counsel were terminated and the process delayed until the end of March 2010 at which point the Board of Trustees put forward its updated policies to be distributed through the Shared Governance system to elicit feedback in the development of policies, regulations, and recommendations from appropriate members of the college as stated in BP 2.07.

The College’s Vision and Mission statements, Strategic and Annual Plans, Program Review, Educational Plan and other institutional planning documents address program quality and student learning outcomes as well as services provided to ensure student success as outlined in Standards 1 and 1A.

BP 1.200, District Vision and Mission Statement, addresses the college’s commitment to superior levels of educational participation and academic success among all students. The statement further addresses the college’s commitment to providing an affordable and unparalleled learning experience in a supportive and caring environment that leads students to successfully complete their goals. In addition, the college is committed to expanding out-of-classroom learning activities to provide a range of opportunities, including service learning, internships, tutoring, mentoring, and cultural and recreational activities throughout the district.

BP 1.200 further states:

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

While the Board examined its existing practice and revised PM 1.11 Chief Administrator: Selection, Authority and Term of Office on October 31, 2008, it does not have a written policy regarding the process of selecting the Chief Administrator. The selection and hiring of the Chancellor is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees.

**IV.B.1.a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.**

**Questions:**

- Is the governing board appropriately representative of the public interest and lacking conflict of interest? Does the composition of the governing board reflect public interest in the institution?
- Are less than half of the board members owners of the institution? Are a majority of governing board members non-owners of the institution?

As mandated by California Education code, the San Francisco Community College District is governed by a Board of Trustees, consisting of seven members elected by the voters of the City and County of San Francisco to represent the interest of the community at large. The Board has one student member elected by the Associated Students of City College of San Francisco to represent the interests of the student population of the college. The Student Trustee casts an advisory vote at Board meetings.

In addition, Board Policy Code of Ethics (PM 1.15) provides the following guidelines regarding decision making and reflecting the public interest of institution:

1. Represent all segments of the community in advocating for their particular needs.
2. Function as a team seeking to stay well-informed and to act objectively.
3. Recognize that the Board of Trustees exercises power through the decisions it makes as a group. Individual Board members have no legal standing. Trustee powers cannot be utilized in any individual manner.

City College of San Francisco is a public institution, all governing board members are non-owners of the institution.

**IV.B.1.b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.**

**Questions**
• What policies, institutional goals or other formal statements exist that describe Board expectations for quality, integrity and improvement of student learning programs and services?

The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and the fiduciary responsibility for the district. The Board reviews, evaluates, and periodically commissions studies, reports, and other documents related to the quality of student learning programs/services and how District resources are allocated to support learning programs. The Board reviews programs and budgets at regular meetings and work sessions.

The College’s Strategic Plan, Institutional Annual Plan (Resolution 100624-S12), Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan (Resolution 090326-S1), and College catalog (Resolution 100325-S1) are all reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees.

IV.B.1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

Questions:

• Is the governing board independent – are its actions final, not subject to the actions of any other entity?

The governing board is independent and subject only to state and federal laws pertaining to post secondary education.

The Board is the ultimate authority for City College of San Francisco (as per California Education Code 70902, Title 5, as well as Board Policy Manual Section 1.09 and others) and is responsible to use that authority to create broad policies to insure the integrity of the institution in fulfilling its mission.

IV.B.1.d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

The Board of Trustees Policy Manual is available online. The Board Policy Manual addresses the Board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures (see PM 1.01 – 1.16). [Ref. CCSF District Policy Manual] Dates of approval and the number of revisions indicate that the Board has revised and adopted policy revisions on a regular basis.

IV.B.1.e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Questions:

• Do the records of board actions (minutes, resolutions) indicate that it acts consistent with its policies and bylaws?

• Does the board have a system for evaluating and revising its policies on a regular basis? Is this system implemented?
In most cases, Board actions are consistent with its policies and bylaws. BP 2220 states:

“IV. Committee Duties. Committees shall consider matters which have been referred to them by the President or Board or which a majority of the committee membership determines should be considered by the committee. In the latter case, where a committee recommends the conduct of a study, the Board shall be notified of the proposed study. The committee shall not proceed with the proposed study unless the study is authorized by the Board.

When a specific matter has been referred to a standing committee, the committee chair will schedule a committee meeting as soon as practicable so as to consider the matter and make timely recommendations to the full Board. A committee recommendation or a report on progress made towards a recommendation will be required by the second regular Board meeting following the referral or forty-five (45) days following the referral, whichever is later. Any matter previously referred to a committee may be placed on a regular Board agenda by the President with the concurrence of one additional Board member at any time in accordance with the timelines for preparing such agendas.

An adequate record of all committee meetings shall be maintained.”

In the recent past, Board of Trustees Committee meetings have frequently failed to achieve quorum. Although no resolutions or formal recommendations have been approved at such ad hoc meetings, discussions that took place without quorum have been a basis for proposals at Board meetings.

In addition, some actions have been taken without proper shared governance review. On several occasions the Board of Trustees have proposed resolutions affecting educational programs in the absence of shared governance review. Examples of these actions include: Resolution 070823-S1: Resolution Establishing Residential Preference in the Nursing Program’s Admissions Policy; Resolutions 090625-S10, 090924-S8 and 091119-S1; Resolution to Create Community Access and Opportunity in City College’s Vocational Nursing Program; and Resolution 090430-S7: Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution.

Furthermore, Board policies regarding its Committees’ functions are fact finding, deliberative and advisory. The Committees are expected to report to the Board, in the case of the above referenced resolutions, 090625-S10 was referred to the Community Relations Committee. The Committee was scheduled to meet on September 10, 2009; however, no record of this meeting has been located. This resolution was reintroduced in September 2009 (090924-S8) without Committee recommendation and failed. In November 2009 a similar resolution (091119-S1) was proposed and passed. None of these resolutions included the shared governance review check off statement.

In January 2009, the Board put into place a process for review of all policies guiding the College contained within the Board Policy Manual (BP 2745). According to this policy, the Board assesses its own performance as a Board in order to identify its strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning. The self-evaluation is intended to address effective Board operations and dynamics as well as the achievement of Board goals and the fulfillment of its responsibilities that support the District’s success. It cites the 2006 Self Study IV.b.1 e & g as the basis for its adoption. The Board is committed to conducting a self-evaluation on an annual basis each Spring semester.
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IV.B.1.f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

Questions:

- What is the board’s program for development and orientation?
- Does the board development program address the board’s need to learn about accreditation standards and expectations?
- Does the board have a formal, written method of providing for continuing membership and staggered terms of office?

The Board does not have its own system for orientation and development; instead the Chancellor has taken on that role. Each Board member receives a personal orientation, involving the Chancellor, some of leaders of the college constituencies, and senior administrators. Topics such as the planning and budgeting system and all pertinent information are discussed and the Policy Manual and League’s New Trustees Orientation binder is distributed. Although participatory governance is discussed, there is no formal training on the district’s shared governance system. The Board also holds an annual retreat. In addition, there is an orientation for Trustees held in Sacramento during the month of August. The Office of the Chancellor (CCSF) serves as an ongoing resource to all Board members.

Board members are encouraged and provided with many different opportunities to attend both internal and external events, conferences, and other functions to improve and increase their understanding of policies affecting both the San Francisco Community College District and the state community college system.

The members of the Board of Trustees are elected by the voters of the San Francisco Community College district. The seven publicly elected Trustees serve four-year terms; the terms are staggered so that some of board members must face the electorate every two years. This ensures that the Board continues to be responsive to community concerns. Currently, five of the seven Trustees have served more than one four year term. The Student Trustee serves a one-year term. There are no term limits established for the Board of Trustees.

IV.B.1.g. The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

Questions:

- What is the board self-evaluation process as defined in its policies? Does that process as described likely to be an effective review?
- Does the policy call for regular self-evaluation? Does the institution’s board regularly evaluate its own performance?
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) recommends that Boards adopt and implement a policy on self-evaluation. The recommendation states that the Board of Trustees should “establish a method of self-evaluation, determine the schedule for this process, and complete self-evaluations on a regular basis.”

Resolution No. 090129-P2, dated January 29, 2008, outlines the Board Self-Evaluation process at City College. The resolution stipulates that each Trustee have the opportunity to provide his/her opinion regarding the performance of the Board. District shared governance groups also offer input to the Board. These groups are the Academic Senate, Administrators' Association, AFT 2121, Associated Students, Classified Senate, Department Chair Council, and SEIU 1021. Each group is asked to provide a single response based on its own determination of the best method for arriving at a single response. In order to maintain strict confidentiality, the Board President requested that the Office of Research and Planning collect and aggregate all responses. Responses are aggregated such that there is one “Trustees” response and one “College Groups” response.

The Board Self-Evaluation form is comprised of two parts: a quantitative section and a qualitative section. This approach is similar to approaches used by other California community colleges.

The quantitative portion includes an extensive series of items in the categories of Board Organization, Policy Role, Community Relations, Policy Direction, Board-Chancellor Relations, Standards for College Operations, Board Leadership, Advocating for the College, and Board Education. Respondents are asked to rate these items based upon a five-point scale.

- The qualitative portion is drawn from several open-ended questions:
  - What are the Board’s greatest strengths?
  - What are the major accomplishments of the Board in the past year?
  - What are areas in which the Board could improve?
  - What are the one or two most important change(s) you think we need to make to improve our Board meetings and/or other functions?
  - What issues do you feel the Board should make its priorities for the coming year?

According to Resolution No. 090129-P2, the results from the Self-Evaluation form are provided as a basis for the Board to assess its own performance, and to identify its strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning.

The Board shall provide an opportunity for District shared governance entities to offer input to the Board regarding their assessment of the Board’s performance during the prior year in conjunction with the Board’s self-evaluation. The President of the Board, or his/her designee, shall distribute the Board Evaluation Form to each of the District’s shared governance organizations at the same time it is distributed to Board members. Each District shared governance organization that wishes to offer input into the Board’s self-evaluation process shall complete the Form sufficiently in advance of the Board’s preparation of its self-evaluation to allow the results to be compiled either into a master copy or a summary and to be provided to the Board. The compiled results shall be reviewed by the Board prior to its completion of its self-evaluation.
BP 2745 passed January 29, 2009 calls for an annual Board self evaluation to take place no later than April 1 of each year. To date, the Board has conducted 2 self evaluation studies, one in 2009 and the second in 2010 which will be finalized in Spring 2011.

IV.B.1.h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

Questions:

- What is the board’s stated process for dealing with board behavior that is unethical? Is there any track record of the board implementing this process? What was the result?

The Board adopted a District Policy Manual which contains a code of ethics (PM 1.15) as noted in the response to Standard IV.B.1.a.

Because City College of San Francisco is a public institution, all of the governing board members are non-owners of the institution. However, voting members of the Board are required by California state law to make public their financial interests. To quote the District policy manual (PM 1.07B): “Designated employees shall file statements of financial interest with the Chancellor of the District, who shall serve as the filing officer for the District, and who shall retain the original of all statements filed in his or her office, unless otherwise directed by law or regulation to the contrary.” However, this language pre-dates the creation of the San Francisco Ethics Commission which now is the repository for each Board member to file a Statement of Economic Interest. Each year, the CCSF Chancellor’s Office sends each Trustee a memorandum and forms packet. The College never has physical custody of the completed Statements; they are filed directly with the San Francisco Ethics Commission by each Trustee.

Included in the SFCCD Policy Manual is a Code of Ethics and Responsibilities section (Number 1.15, p. 2) which state, “A violation of the Code of Ethics shall be subject to written censure charges by a Board member, a hearing held by the Board’s Personnel Committee and a resultant finding of recommendation to the full Board.” No such actions have had to be taken to date therefore, no track record exists.

IV.B.1.i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

Questions:

- What kinds of training are provided to the board about the accreditation process, and Commission standards?

- How does the board participate appropriately in institutional self-study and planning efforts?

- How do board actions, including planning and resource allocation, indicate a commitment to improvements planned as part of institutional self-evaluation and accreditation processes?

- How do board actions reflect the commitment to supporting and improving student learning outcomes as reflected in the Accreditation Standards and expectations for institutional improvement?
• Is the board informed of institutional reports due to the Commission, and of Commission recommendations to the institution?

• Is the board knowledgeable about Accreditation Standards, including those that apply to the board?

• Does the board assess its own performance using Accreditation Standards?

The Board receives information and updates regarding the accreditation process, status and documentation. The Board reviewed previous WASC Accreditation Reports, Mid-Term Reports, etc. The Board of Trustees has been informed about, and involved in the current accreditation self-study process. All Board members have attended Orientation and Training for Accreditation in Sacramento. This training is provided by the California Community College League.

Individual Board Members have volunteered to serve as a resource to the various Standard Teams and have attended the CCSF Accreditation Steering Committee and Standard Team Meetings. The CCSF Board of Trustee President serves ex officio as a member of the Steering Committee.

Section: IV.B.1.j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively. In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

Questions:

• What is the established board process for conducting search and selection processes for the chief administrator? Are those processes written?

• Has the board used these processes in its most recent searches?

• How is the board delegation of administrative authority to the chief administrator defined? In policy documents? In a contract with the chief administrator?

• Is this delegation clear to all parties?

• How effective is the board in remaining focused at the policy level?

• What mechanisms does the board use in its evaluation of the chief administrator’s performance on implementation of board policies and achievement of institutional goals?

• How does the board set clear expectations for regular reports form the chief administrator on institutional performance?

• How does the board set expectations for sufficient information on institutional performance to insure that it can fulfill its responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity?
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The Board of Trustees is responsible for the recruitment and selection of the Chancellor. The Board of Trustees shall establish the qualifications for the position and the timeline for the search. The Board of Trustees, in its discretion, shall implement the appropriate recruitment method and may seek the services of an executive search firm in identifying and recruiting outstanding candidates for the position of Chancellor. The Human Resources Department assists and facilitates the process with the search firm.

In this hiring process, the Board of Trustees shall solicit input from representatives of the District's faculty, classified, administrative, and student constituencies.

As stated in BP 1.11 Chief Administrator: Authority, Selection, and Term of Office:

“The Board accepts and establishes the office of the Chancellor as that of Chief Executive Officer of the District, and delegates to this office all administrative authority within its power except that having to do with the Chancellor's own appointment or dismissal, or as otherwise especially provided in this manual.

The Chancellor shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees and serve for a term or terms not to exceed 4 (four) years at an annual salary to be fixed by the Board. The contract may be renewed at the discretion of the Board.”

The Personnel Committee of the Board is responsible for conducting the evaluation of the Chancellor. This process is based upon the annual goals and objectives that the Chancellor submits to the Board of Trustees.

Strengths and area for improvement:

1. The Board conducts an annual Self Evaluation. They also request evaluations from constituent groups throughout shared governance system.
2. The April 2010 Board Self Evaluation deadline was not met.
3. Currently, there are no established plans for acting on the findings of the April 2010 Board Self Evaluation (presented at the January 2011 Board meeting).
4. The college needs to address the areas of training in shared governance and accreditation for the Trustees.
5. The Board may want to revisit having a parliamentarian present to facilitate proper procedures and protocols during their meetings.

IV.B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

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

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

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

A key ingredient in the development of the College Strategic Plan has been the scrutiny and contributions from various constituencies and stakeholders. A series of Listening Sessions were held at the College in December 2009 and February 2010. Representatives from business, industry, organized labor, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco City and County Departments, San Francisco Unified School District, local universities and community members provided input on the role the College plays in the community. Over 35 community representatives participated in these sessions.

The Board of Trustees approved the 2009-2010 Annual Plan during its meeting August 2009. The Annual Plan serves as an operational version of the College’s plans for a one-year period; it consists of a set of institutional objectives that are to be achieved by the College through the efforts of the college units, departments, schools and administrative operations. At the end of each fiscal year, the College conducts an End-of-Year Assessment noting specific progress made in each area. The End-of-Year Assessment for 2008-2009 was finalized in December 2009 and will serve as the baseline to measure progress in 2009-2010.

The Chancellor works closely with administration to provide hands-on oversight and evaluation through weekly meetings with the Vice-Chancellors, bi-monthly meetings with administrators in the Student Development Division, Cabinet members, and regular meetings with shared governance and other groups.

The Chancellor reviews and evaluates the implementation of the college’s plans. He stresses a planning and evaluation process that promotes a coordination of effort that leads to student success and increased rates of program and degree completion. This includes linking the Strategic and Educational Plans to the Program Review and Planning and Budgeting processes.

The College worked on integrating the process of institutional planning and assessment by combining various planning efforts and linking those to annual budgets. The College’s Planning and Budgeting Council played a key leadership role in linking planning issues with the budget by its review and discussion of the College’s 2009-2010 Management and Budget Plan completed in November 2009. The Management and Budget Plan not only provides a composite document which contains both the summary Budget and the CCSF Annual Plan, but also includes the objectives of the divisions of the College – Academic Affairs, Student Development, Finance and Administration, and Institutional Advancement – as well as objectives of the Chancellor’s Office. The Plans include the primary performance measures or outcome indicators to be evaluated at the end of the academic year.
The document brings together in one place the financial resources that the College expects to have available, many of the programs, services, and initiatives to be provided with those resources, and the means for evaluating results. The Chancellor’s Budget Message gives a general outline of how well the budget is likely to address the current planning priorities of the college and what resource challenges might be anticipated.

As a result of this Management and Budget Plan, the Chancellor’s funding recommendations and decisions for the General Fund Expense Budget are the result of extensive collaboration at the department level, the divisional level, the shared-governance level, and the executive level. The goals of the strategic plan and the objectives of the Annual Institutional Plan are the driving influences in the inclusive budgetary decision-making process. This integrated approach to planning and budgeting ensures the College carries out its mission with great purpose, focus, and commitment to the community.

The Chancellor has clearly articulated the college’s strategy for dealing with the budget crisis of the past three years. In addition to the Management and Budget Plan, an internal Fundraising Workgroup was established in May 2010 to develop alternate sources of funding to support the college. The Save the Class Campaign he launched raised $320,000 between July 1, 2010 and February 2011 to reinstate classes. CCSF’s Child Development and High School Diploma Programs are now participating in an Escrip Program.

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

When the Chancellor began his tenure he emphasized that the College was experiencing an unprecedented financial crisis which required the input and cooperation of every member of the CCSF community. The goal was to reduce costs without resorting to significant layoffs or the decimation of instruction and support services. He continues to inform the college community of current and future budget challenges and encourages input from all groups.

### IV.B.2.a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

As of June 30, 2010, sixteen members of the administrative staff retired. The College’s administration is in a period of transition and only half of these positions are expected to be filled. A large number of the School and Campus Deans are recent appointments to their respective positions. While this transition period creates challenges for the College as new administrators gain experience in their positions, this transition also presents new opportunities for the College in that a new generation of administrative leaders is preparing to lead the college into the future.

The Chancellor recently re-aligned administration to create a more efficient and effective administrative structure. This re-alignment included the creation of a Chief Technology Officer and the creation of a Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs. The re-alignment has resulted in significant savings in administrative costs to the district. Reporting directly to the Chancellor are the Vice
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Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the Vice Chancellor of Student Development (Vacant), the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Research and Advancement (Vacant), the Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs (Vacant), and the Chief Technology Officer.

The Chancellor delegates authority to these administrative chains to ensure that all annual operational and developmental objectives are achieved. This administrative coordination and leadership are managed through direct contact with the Vice Chancellors as well as regularly scheduled meetings with the Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet and monthly meetings with the entire Administrative Staff.

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

In addition, the Chancellor chairs the monthly College Council meeting, which is comprised of all administrators, department chairs and the presidents of the academic senate, classified senate, AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021. The Chancellor meets monthly with the College Advisory Council (CAC), a Shared Governance body comprised of the leadership of all the College Organizations: Academic Senate, Department Chairperson Council, Classified Senate, SEIU 1021, AFT2121, the Associated Students, the Administrator’s Association, and the Vice Chancellors. The Chancellor also meets at least once a month with the leadership councils of each of these respective constituencies. In addition the Chancellor is in daily contact with his senior staff on all issues related to budget control and expenditures as well as key College projects authorized by the College’s annual plan.

IV.B.2.b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

- establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
- ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;
- ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; AND
- establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

Questions:

- What does the president do to communicate institutional values, goals and direction?
- How familiar is the president with data and analyses of institutional performance?
• How does the president communicate the importance of a culture of evidence and a focus on student learning?

• Where does the research office report in the institution – does it have easy access to the president’s office?

• What mechanisms has the president put in place to link institutional research, particularly research on student learning, institutional planning processes, resource allocation processes?

• How does the district chief executive officer follow the component parts of this standard in the role of providing effective district leadership?

The Chancellor communicates the institutional values, goals and direction in a multitude of arenas. He addresses the entire college every Flex Day and chairs key Shared Governance committees, such as College Council, the College Advisory Council, College Planning and Budget Council, The Diversity Committee, as well as monthly meetings with the Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet and major constituencies across the college. The Chancellor is accessible to all constituencies in the college, especially students.

The Chancellor interacts with the various constituencies, staff, faculty, students, board members and community and government agencies and citizens. The Chancellor relies on the administrative chains to ensure that all annual operational and developmental objectives are met. He effectively works with these groups and actively listens and works to understand their concerns and issues.

The college’s strategic plan has identified communication as a strategic priority throughout the college and the Chancellor believes that this is an area in which he needs to continue to improve.

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

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

The Chancellor’s experience as Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Student Development gives him firsthand knowledge of academic, student development and budgetary issues. He has a keen understanding of enrollment issues. Regular reviews of issues are discussed in Executive Cabinet, with the Board and other constituency groups. The Chancellor reviews data, issue and proposed plans with the entire college community. He clearly explains the complex issues and challenges facing the institution.

During the Chancellor’s tenure the institution’s of the Program Review Process has been reorganized from a 5 year cycle to a biannual review process of over 133 units and programs. Program Review includes the assessment of student progress, the assessment and implementation of Student Learning Outcomes, and requests for budgetary items.

The departments completing their units Program Review are expected to link their programs goals and objectives to the College’s Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan, Annual Plan, Sustainability Plan, Facility Master Plan, and Technology Plan. Program specific data provided by the Research
Office is included in these reviews. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) are now an integral part of the Program Review Progress in which units must identify and update their progress in implementing SLO’s at both course and program levels.

All Program Reviews are submitted to appropriate school deans or supervisors, as well as to the Program Review Committee (PRC). The PRC prepares reports and develops budget recommendations based upon these Program Reviews. The recommendations are forwarded to the College Planning and Budget Council (CPBC). The CPBC conducts budget hearings and develops budget recommendations which are forwarded to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for final action.

Currently, the Office of Institutional Advancement (Research, Planning and Grants) reports to the Vice Chancellor of Finance. The Program Review Process, Strategic Planning and institutional research activities are regularly reviewed with the Chancellor. The goal is to better link program effectiveness and budgetary priorities based on accurate data and reports.

Additionally, the ARRC (Accountability Reporting for the California Community College) Annual report is reviewed by the Chancellor with the Executive Cabinet. This data along with other reports and plans are also presented to the Board for review.

IV.B.2.c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

City College is governed by a Board of Trustees and the Office of the Chancellor with support from various Shared Governance Committees and other advisory groups. The Chancellor’s responsibility and administrative authority as the Chief Executive Officer for the College is delegated by the Board of Trustees in accordance with policies approved by the Board. The Chancellor is responsible for recommending appointments, assigning functions, approving various College plans and initiatives, and the delegation and responsibilities to various administrators within the administrative divisions of the College. (SFCC District Policy Manual # 1.11 & 2.01).

The Chancellor is a leader who has demonstrated the ability to work in a complex and demanding environment. He understands the current and future needs of the College and in response has directed the effort to implement a strategic set of Shared Governance initiatives to address these needs and challenges. His approach to problems and challenges facing the College has been thoughtful and measured. In an atmosphere of dramatically reduced financial support for higher education and increasingly tough budget reductions he has worked closely with various internal and external stakeholders to find and develop effective, yet reasonable solutions.

The Chancellor maintains frequent and effective lines of communication with students, faculty, classified staff, administrators, the Board and the community. He oversees and works collaboratively with the Shared Governance Process to develop solutions aimed at maintaining and improving the College’s core values and mission. For example, the Chancellor facilitated the creation of a special Student Equity and Achievement Gap task force. The goal was to encourage the College to evaluate the planning and assessment of current and past College practices in this area and to assist in the implementation of a renewed commitment to student equity and closing the achievement gap. The Chancellor communicated to the entire CCSF family, “As a college we are
committed to, and by implication recognize in our Vision Statement and Strategic Priorities the critical problem of Student Equity and the Achievement Gap.” (April 29, 2010)

The CCSF Annual Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System execution and implementation is a function of the Chancellor’s ability to lead and continually assess the College’s progress toward its goals and objectives as well as the Chancellor’s objectives which are developed in consultation with the Board of Trustees.

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

The Chancellor has effectively controlled the budget and expenditures of the college during one of the most uncertain financial periods in our history. The Chancellor oversees a comprehensive and integrated budgeting, planning, and assessment system, which are led by the College Planning and Budget Council (CPBC). The CPBC comprises representatives from students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators. The CPBC includes all the leaders of the college organizations. The College maintains an integrated system of planning development on an annual basis that is directly linked to budgeting and assessment. Each department conducts an annual program review that is directly linked to the budgeting process.

The Chancellor places the needs of students at the center of budget decisions. Through a policy of shared sacrifice on the part of administration, faculty, and classified staff, the Chancellor has effectively balanced the budget under most challenging circumstances. The Chancellor has reduced the administrative structure of CCSF and significantly reduced the number of college consultants resulting in significant savings in administrative costs. Plans have been developed to increase other sources of revenue in the areas of fundraising and grant development. While the Chancellor is to be commended for effectively controlling the budget and expenditures, the college is faced with serious budget challenges; (1) the state of California budget remains uncertain and the amount of funding apportioned to community colleges remains uncertain, (2) the cost of health care for both retired CCSF employees and current CCSF employees will continue to rise and place greater demands on the CCSF budget.

The District fully utilizes a three-year budget planning process. All budgets are prepared with his cycle foremost to provide a realistic context for budget planning. At all presentation, e.g. with Bargaining units, college constituents, and in Board presentations, the three-year budget planning process has brought into sharp relief the necessity of the College’s coming to grips with the short falls of the funding model used by the state for community college education.

Current economic conditions and state budget cuts have made it impossible for the College to continue spending at past levels. By working with the Board of Trustees, labor unions, and other shared governance groups, the College has maintained core academic offerings at all campus locations as resources have permitted, and has avoided the layoff of any full time employees. The three-year planning budget however indicates the next three years will present significant fiscal challenges.

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

The funding recommendations and decisions for the General Fund Expense Budget are the result of extensive collaboration at the department level, the divisional level, the shared-governance level, and the executive level. The goals of the strategic plan and the objectives of the Annual Institutional Plan are the driving influences in the inclusive budgetary decision-making process. This integrated approach to planning and budgeting ensures the college carries out its mission with great purpose, focus, and commitment to the community.

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

The Chancellor represents the College on several Boards, including the Workforce Investment Board, the Mayor’s Advisory Council and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. He meets regularly with local elected officials, business and labor leaders. He does an excellent job representing the interests of City College of San Francisco and is well respected in the community.

He has served on Congresswoman Jackie Speier’s Citizens Oversight Committee. He attends meetings in Sacramento with the State Chancellor and various California legislators, including Assembly Members Leno, Ma and Yee. As indicated in the Chancellor’s Monthly Report to the Board of Trustees, he also hosts meetings with foreign dignitaries, representatives from community and faith-based organizations, business and labor leaders.

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

Strengths and areas for improvement

6. The Chancellor informs the CCSF community concerning the problems and challenges the school must confront. He has been consistent in his focus and has designed and applied a clearly focused plan for leading the College in these difficult times. He understands the institution, its infrastructure, the students, and appreciates the people who work at the College.

7. The Chancellor has re-aligned the administrative structure of the College to become more efficient and effective. He has significantly decreased the reliance on outside consultants and has created and administrative structure that is more sustainable in light of decreased state funding to community colleges.

8. While the current budget crisis has been a strain on the college, the faculty, staff, and students continue to move forward in developing policies and procedures that support student success.

9. The Program Review process is more streamlined and manageable, yet there are still questions of how the budgetary requests of the departments are processed and allocated.

10. Progress has been made to better implement various plans, (e.g., Strategic Planning, Education Master Plan, etc.), but this work is in progress.
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11. The Chancellor is aware of his role, duty and functions in relation to the Board of Trustees, faculty, administrators, classified, students and the community. He works to bridge differences and seeks compromise to difficult problems. He has been transparent in dealing with all constituency groups and has demonstrated knowledge of and adherence to the statues, regulations, and policies of the Board of Trustees.

12. The Chancellor is to be commended for balancing the CCSF budget during one of the most challenging economic periods in the history of the nation, the state of California, and CCSF. The Chancellor and the leadership team of CCSF have been pro-active and to date have made budget cuts with the least impact on students and services.

13. The Chancellor’s office needs to provide prompt responses to (email) inquiries and requests.

14. Chancellor maintains frequent and effective lines of communication with students, faculty, classified, the Board and the community. He oversees and works collaboratively with the Board and Shared Governance groups to develop solutions aimed at maintaining and improving the Colleges core values and mission. He seeks to continuously improve these lines of communication.

References for Standard IV

- Vision and Mission Statements
- Board Policy Manual
- California Education Code 70902, Title 5
- Transcripts/DVDs of Board meetings
- Board agendas
- Board minutes: http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/minutes.htm
- Board transcripts: http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/transcripts.htm
- Audio tapes of Board Committee meetings
- Board Self-evaluation 2009, 2010
- Student Equity Hearings (audio/video tapes)
- Interview with Chancellor
- CCSF Employment Agreement for the Chancellor
- Chancellor’s Self Evaluation
- Faculty’s Instrument for Chancellor’s Evaluation
- Strategic Plan Shared Governance and Community Review Process 8/9/10
- Audit Report
- Management Plan
- Technology Plan
- Mid-Year Assessment Reports
- End of Year Assessment Reports
- CCSF Institutional Annual Plan
- Student Equity and Achievement Gap 4/29/10
- City Currents Fact Sheet September 2009; City Currents 3/10/2008; City Currents August, 2008
- Institutional Annual Plan 2010/11
- Annual Plan: Developmental Objectives 2010/11
- Chancellors Flex Day Address August 13, 2010
- Annual Budget Report Recommendations for Board of Trustees: 2010/11; 2009/10; 2008/09
- CCSF College Catalog
- Shared Governance Handbook 2006/7; 2007/8; 2008/9; 2009/10
- San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual
- CCSF Mission and Vision Statement
- CCSF Technology Plan 2009
- Executive Summary of Sustainability Plan December 2009
- Strategic Plan
- Listening Session Impressions, December 9, 2009 and February 10, 2010
- Program Review Process and Documents
- Monthly Chancellor’s Reports to the Board of Trustees
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- College Council Meetings 2009-2010, 2010-2011
- Deans Meetings 2009-2010, 2010-2011
- CCSF Organizational Chart
- Chancellor’s Self-Evaluation
- Chancellor’s Monthly Reports
- Chancellor’s Website
- Office of Shared Governance
- Shared Governance Committees Minutes
- District Shared Governance Organizational Chart
- Chancellor’s Biography
- Office of Shared Governance Website
- Office of Research, Planning, and Grants Website
- San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual
- 2009/10 Preface: Links from Planning and Budgeting
- CCSF Annual Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System
- Planning and Budget Documents
- Office of Shared Governance Annual Report 2006/7; 2007/8; 2008/9 2010/11
- College Planning Documents
- College Advisory Council
- College Planning and Budget Council
- Chancellor’s College-Wide emails
- Flex Day Addresses