Standard 2.A.2.a
Section: 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.

Team Members
Paul Johnson

Steps for Analyzing Evidence

Step 1: Review the specific standard section to be analyzed.
Step 2: Read and review the suggested questions identified from the Self-Study Guide about the evidence needed to make a strong case.
Step 3: Carefully review the evidence several times before drawing conclusions or making judgments.
Step 4: Draft a brief one or two paragraph description of what the College is doing to address the standard and its related questions focusing on the facts.
Step 5: Provide a rating of how well the College is addressing the specific standard (see below for scoring rubric). Draft a one or two paragraph explanation for this rating based upon your assessment of the College’s activities in relation to the standard. Pay particular attention to the quality of our involvement and interventions since the last WASC self-study report.
Step 6: Conclude with comments and suggestions relative to the College’s response to the standard.

Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>College has worked on this issue/area and considerable improvement is noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>College has taken some actions to address the issue/area and some improvement is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>College has not adequately addressed the issue/area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 1: Review the Specific Standard Section
Standard 2.A.2.a: The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

Step 2: Read and Review Self-Study Questions

Suggested questions from the Self-Study Guide to help you think about how best to address the standard:

- 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 the right 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?

Step 3: Review the Evidence

- Curriculum Committee Chair, John Odell, past chair Mike Kelly
- Curriculum Committee Membership (www.ccsf.edu/cc)
- Curriculum Committee Handbook (www.ccsf.edu/cc)
- Evaluation of courses/programs: Curriculum Committee Chair, DACUM Office, Design Collaborative (Architecture, Photo, Graphic Communications, Art)
- Improvements to courses and programs (refer to above)

Step 4: Briefly describe how CCSF is addressing this standard

The college identifies areas of need with regard to courses and programs in several ways. The Office of Research, Planning and Grants collects data which gives the college a profile of how incoming students do on placement tests. (The High School Report VI, September 2004; other resources listed at http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/reports_success.htm) In addition, it collects data on other student characteristics and data on economic and population trends in the Bay Area. (College Environmental Scan – 1999; other resources listed at http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/trends_resources.htm) Community needs are brought to the attention of the college through listening sessions that are incorporated into the Strategic Plan. (Strategic Plan, 2003-2008, pp. A3-A13) All vocational programs and most campuses as well as some departments such as Journalism, Disabled Students Programs and Services and Distance Learning have advisory boards which give feedback on needs in specific areas. The Chancellor participates on the executive committee of the local Workforce Investment Board which identifies workforce needs. The Program Review process also contributes to identifying needs in all departments. Photography used SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, opportunities and Threats) analysis to help identify needs.
Once needs are identified, it is the departments at the college that develop the courses and programs. The process is faculty-driven in that a particular faculty member or members with the consensus of the department works on developing the course outline and its accompanying student learning outcomes. The Curriculum Handbook is very comprehensive and gives a detailed description of the process. (Curriculum Handbook Revision 3.22 Spring 2003, especially pp. 11-13) Staff Development activities occur on a regular basis which train the faculty in the curriculum development process. (Course Outline Preparation, Fall Flex 2004, p. 19; What Works: What 25 Years of Research Says About Teaching and Preparing Basic Skills Students, Spring Flex 2004, p. 15; Course Outline Preparation, Spring Flex 2004, p. 16; Course Outline Preparation, Fall Flex 2003, p. 18; Student Learning Outcomes and Basic Skills, Fall Flex 2003, p. 20; Student Learning Outcomes and Information Competency, Fall Flex 2003, p. 20; Student Learning Outcomes and Occupational/Technical Programs; Fall Flex 2003, p. 20; Curriculum Workshop – Submitting Proposals; Spring Flex 2003, p. 15; Using the DACUM Process to Design an Ideal Curriculum, Spring Flex 2003, p. 18; Program Design for Grant Funded Initiative, Fall Flex 2002, p. 37) While the college has been incorporating learning objectives in courses for years, it has been and continues to be actively engaged in the process of training faculty in the development and evaluation of the broader student learning outcomes. The Curriculum Committee is currently working on revising its forms to incorporate student learning outcomes. Several departments have already developed departmental learning outcomes which will be published in the 2005-2006 City College of San Francisco Catalog. The California Resource Center (CRC), SCANS (Secretary of Labor's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills) Curriculum Project, and Technical Review by the Curriculum Committee are other college resources available to faculty in the curriculum development process. (Course Outline Technical Review, 11/5/2004) Faculty in the process of designing curriculum can also consult with college staff including the Articulation Officer, the Honors Program Coordinator, the Dean of Curriculum the Assessment and Prerequisites Coordinator, and the Catalog Editor for special help. (City College of San Francisco Curriculum Committee Resources, 10/15/2004) Faculty consults with colleagues at universities through groups such as IMPAC (Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum) to help determine course content. The college has supported the development of online courses through the granting of release time and the provision of expertise in online development to faculty. The Office of Technology Mediated Instruction also works with faculty to incorporate instructional technology into the on-campus curriculum. (Technology Learning Center Summary of Activities, Projects and Support Services July 2000- February 2004) Use of these resources and review by the Curriculum Committee help to insure that learning outcomes are identified.

Once a regular credit or noncredit courses has been developed and signed by the department chair and dean, it goes through approval by the Curriculum Committee (a shared governance committee made up of students, classified, faculty, and administrators), the Board of Trustees and then the California State Chancellor’s Office before being offered. It is the department that administers and delivers the courses and programs by assigning the funding and scheduling the offerings. This presents a dilemma in that the department usually must drop something in order to fund new courses.

Courses and programs can be reviewed as often as faculty and departments wish. Review often occurs when a department wants to work out better articulation among its courses or when it seeks to better insure that students meet learning outcomes for a particular course. Generally reviews occur prior to each accreditation period. Departmental offerings, currency and appropriateness may also be evaluated during Program Review and so Program Review may trigger a review of particular courses. However, course review is not on a set cycle as is Program Review.
When courses and programs have been reviewed as part of Program Review, significant improvements in curriculum can be cited. Among the departments showing recent significant improvement as a result of reviewing courses during Program Review are ESL, Latin American and Latino/a Studies, Photography, Film and Transitional Studies (*Synopsis of Interview with Bob Gabriner on 10/4/2004 by Paul Johnson*).

**Step 5: Provide rating of how well College meets the standard. Provide written explanation of why you gave that rating.**

My rating (see p. 1) is: Satisfactory

The reason I gave this rating is: While the curriculum development and approval process is superior, there is no cycle of systematic review of courses. In addition, there is not a way for departments to fund new classes without dropping current classes or sections of current classes.

**Step 6: Comments and suggestions relative to the College’s response to the standard**

It would probably be useful to establish a cycle of course review tied to program review (before or after) so that all courses are subject to regular review. In addition, the college should look at some kind of mechanism for funding new classes that does not necessarily require the dropping of a current class or section of a current class.