Improving Institutional Effectiveness

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

Descriptive Summary

Collegial dialog takes place at all levels of the College community in an effort to advance institutional effectiveness. Through department level and District wide committees, employees and students exchange ideas that foster a positive learning environment and allocate necessary resources that effectively support student success. The CCSF Board of Trustees also have developed a vehicle for dialog on improving learning and the institution’s processes. In 2010, the Board formed its own Institutional Effectiveness Committee; agendas have included a broad range of issues, including hiring diversity, the creation of a Master Plan for Community Satellite Campuses, strategic planning and college performance indicators, and the Chancellor’s objectives in relation to institutional effectiveness.

Nearly all collegial dialog at CCSF takes place in more than 40 Shared Governance committees that operate under an extensive Board policy called the Shared Governance Agreement, dating back to 1993 [I B-1]. This Agreement creates an extremely robust participatory governance structure headed by three councils. The committees reporting to the Academic Senate Executive Council most closely address students’ learning needs. The committees reporting to the College Advisory Council and the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council primarily concern institutional processes. When the councils’ scopes overlap, issues go before all appropriate groups. Each Shared Governance body has a purpose statement that defines its responsibilities for recommending policies and developing initiatives. Committees are charged 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: administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students). Each constituency has an appointing agent that tries to ensure broad, democratic representation. The CCSF Shared Governance Handbook reveals the breadth of the system. It provides: background and historical information on the entire Shared Governance System; detailed information on each of the three governance systems, including committee charges and membership; directories of committee chairs and appointing bodies; guidelines for chairs; and formalized customary practices of the committees.[I B-2]. The District maintains a Shared Governance Office with a coordinator charged with facilitating communications to ensure that the committee structure operates smoothly [I B-3]. In the Spring 2011 Employee Survey, the average response to a question about satisfaction with College dialog about data and research on student learning was 2.68 on a scale from 1 to 4 (N = 415), with 3 indicating Good and 2 Below Average [I B-4 p. 4].

CCSF has a strong, productive history of ad hoc workgroups that focus more intensely on specific issues. A particularly salient example is the Student Learning Outcomes Workgroup comprising representatives from the Academic Senate, Department Chairpersons Council, and Administration. The Student Learning Outcomes Workgroup discusses implementation of the Student Learning Outcomes process at the College and has been very productive in
implementing SLOs at the College since the last Self Study [I B-5]. One hundred percent of
courses have defined SLOs; 75 percent of courses have ongoing assessment of learning
outcomes; 85 percent of departments have defined program level learning outcomes; 100
percent of student and learning support services have identified SLOs and 82 percent of those
activities are assessed [I B-6]. As a result of this effort, student learning outcomes are an
integral part of the College dialog at all levels of the institution.

Another example is the Accreditation Self Study Steering Committee, which leads the entire
College in the self-study process, by recruiting participation at all levels, organizing and
guiding the effort and producing and reviewing the document. Once reviewed by the College,
the document is then approved for publication by the Shared Governance councils and the
Board of Trustees [I B-7].

In addition, the Chancellor convened a Student Equity Task Force so that the District and the
Board could examine eight areas (including English and mathematics sequences, placement
testing, financial aid, and student employment) in which the College might better serve all
students. Proposals from the Student Equity Task Force will go to various committees, tying
the ad hoc bodies to the existing Shared Governance structure. The Student Learning
Outcomes Workgroup meets regularly and has made recommendations to the Vice Chancellor
of Academic Affairs, the Program Review Committee, and the Curriculum Committee. Other
examples of ad hoc workgroups are the Strategic Planning Team, the Basic Skills Ad Hoc Task
Force, and the Cost Savings Group.

In addition to these District wide bodies, there are many committees, groups, and teams within
each department. Each department holds official department meetings on Flex Days and, in
many cases, throughout the semester. Career and Technical Education departments have
industry advisory groups to ensure that course content matches industry needs and
expectations. Curriculum, scholarship, equity, and learning outcomes assessment are just some
of the many issues that are discussed at the departmental level as well as at the institutional
level. It is at the departmental level that collegial dialog most strongly shapes students’
learning. The outcomes of that dialog have included certain mathematics and English offerings
in compressed timeframes and the inclusion of major learning outcomes in all course outlines.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

Collegial dialog takes place 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.

**Planning Agenda**

None.
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.

Descriptive Summary

CCSF has a six-year cycle for strategic planning and a one-year cycle for annual planning. Each Strategic Plan lists a wide variety of long-term goals. The 2011-16 Strategic Plan has six major Strategic Priorities ranging from academic excellence to inclusiveness to facilities planning. Within each Priority are 10 to 16 objectives that CCSF intends to make substantial and measurable progress toward over the next six years [I B-8].

The Strategic Planning Team and the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC) both strive to communicate the goals to the College community and to solicit as much participation as possible in achieving them [I B-9]. The Strategic Planning Team members bring drafts of the plan to 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 College’s PBC conducts listening sessions to inform its decisions. Initiatives are directed to appropriate Shared Governance bodies for deliberation and possible action. For further exposition of the CCSF evaluation and planning cycle, see II.A.2.f and III.D.1.a.

Each year, the College’s PBC selects specific goals for the following year’s Annual Plan. This is done through consulting the Strategic Plan, the most recent Program Review recommendations, the most recent College Performance Indicators Report, the Chancellor’s Objectives per his evaluation, and the current year’s Annual Plan. Other College plans such as the Education Master Plan, Technology Plan, and Sustainability Plan are also consulted. Up until 2009-10, the End-of-Year Assessment was also consulted. The College’s PBC ensures input from all College constituencies. Each annual objective has a performance measure that the College uses to determine success. The many unit plans and Program Review reports inform the prioritization of goals. Historically, the End-of-Year Assessments [I B-10] and College Performance Indicators Reports [I B-11] show that, on the whole, the District makes satisfactory progress each year on achieving that year’s goals [I B-12, I B-13, I B-14].

The College’s current annual planning process has been in place for more than a decade. The reports concerning assessment, including the End-of-Year Assessment (which measures the Annual Plan) and the College Performance Indicators Report (measuring the Strategic Plan), are being reviewed to determine how to make the documents more useful, particularly through more focused and relevant measures.
**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

CCSF has a six-year cycle for strategic planning and a one-year cycle for annual planning. Each year the College’s PBC consults the Strategic Plan, the current year’s Annual Plans, Program Review recommendations, and a variety of other College plans and progress reports to determine the next year’s objectives. Communication of these objectives and a call to participation go out to the College community.

The End-of-Year Assessment (EYA) reports have been in place for more than a decade. While the reports have provided a wealth of detail, each year the volume of information proves too difficult to absorb in the EYA format. Approximately 120 Program Review reports, which are posted online, currently provide the level of detail previously published in the EYA reports. As a result, no EYA Report was produced for 2009-10.

While the EYA reports have been replaced with yearly Program Review reports from individual departments and College units, the College still needs to provide yearly evidence of student achievement and institution and program performance. The Office of Research and Planning, in consultation with the College’s PBC, is developing a new template which will be refined through Shared Governance and Board review. This template will be similar to reports currently in use at many other community colleges throughout California and nationally. Called performance dashboards, institutional effectiveness reports, key performance indicators reports, or balanced scorecards, these reports are short (one to four pages) and provide a summary of the College’s progress. This summary view will be supplemented by the Program Review reports themselves, by an analysis of the Program Review reports as a whole, and by annual metrics pertinent to objectives for a given year.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

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.

**Descriptive Summary**

For many years, the College evaluated progress on the Strategic and Annual Plan objectives in the End-of-Year Assessments (EYAs) and College Performance Indicators reports, as discussed in Section I.B.2.
The Annual Plan, consisting of a set of institutional objectives for a specified academic year, is drafted based upon a series of inputs and serves as an integration point for implementing the College’s longer-term plans. In addition, the Chancellor’s Objectives, developed annually with the Board, directly inform the Annual Plan. The Annual Plan also reflects imminent priorities derived from department- and unit-level Program Review reports which, since 2008-09, have been assembled with increased regularity by every unit within the College. The Annual Plan is refined through the Shared Governance and Board approval.

The Program Review reports are the primary vehicle for linking planning and assessment to budgets. The current fiscal environment does not allow for new allocations, which would be directly linked to planning efforts. To date, planning efforts have not been used to delineate reductions. However, the Program Review reports do provide a body of information that can be used to examine the various units within the College and can inform budget-related activities. Moreover, Program Review is used to locate new opportunities for efficiencies and collaborations that advance a range of College objectives reflected in the various College plans.

The approach to College wide assessment, which for the last decade or more has been accomplished primarily through the End-of-Year Assessment report, is being revisited, as referenced in Section I.B.2 above.

The Decision Support System (DSS), a data-mining tool accessed from the Division of Research and Policy webpage, helps assess institutional performance. The DSS provides a broad range of data, including demand for courses, student demographics, productivity, persistence, and success that can be disaggregated chronologically by department or by campus. Also available at the webpage are the results of student and employee surveys; these are a valuable source of qualitative information about the District’s performance. Furthermore, the institutional researchers are available to department chairs who request special data and analysis needs.

As an example of the assistance provided by the DSS, in the 2007-08 EYA Report, the first Operational Objective is “O1.1. Provide educational programs and services at each of CCSF’s campuses.” The College assessed progress on this objective with such DSS data as “Headcount enrollment increased in 2007-08: 51,027 credit students, up seven percent from 2006-07. 45,162 noncredit students, up 2 percent from 2006-07. 99,495 total unduplicated headcount includes other programs in addition to credit and noncredit” [I B-15 p. 7]. The next year, Operational Objective 1.1 was retained in the 2008-09 Annual Plan in the hope of continuing progress [I B-16 p. 3].

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

Progress has been made. Assessment is embedded within each unit’s Program Review report. The PRC, in collaboration with the College’s PBC, is reviewing its process of connecting student, faculty, department, and infrastructure needs to student success. The PRC supports the College’s PBC in maintaining and ensuring the integration of planning and budgeting and will continually work to refine this integration process.
Planning Agenda

None.

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.

Descriptive Summary

The CCSF evaluation and planning process is exceptionally broad-based; the 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 other venues such as the Classified Senate and the Associated Students to give presentations, encourage discussions, and solicit feedback [I B-17, I B-18]. The Strategic Planning webpage includes a list of strategic planning sessions to which the entire College community was invited [I B-9].

Perhaps the most significant change in planning since the last accreditation cycle is the newly redesigned Program Review process. At the time of the last accreditation visit, Program Review was not explicitly part of the annual planning system. Each District unit, including offices, departments, and programs, conducted a Program Review on a three-, four-, or six-year cycle. This occurred in a staggered manner; roughly 15 units were undergoing Program Review at any one time. Units tended to see Program Review as an opportunity to assert their needs and generally provided more than was requested. The Program Review templates were open-ended and invited lengthy, diffuse responses [I B-19].

To address this situation, the Shared Governance System overhauled the Program Review process, including the templates. Today, Program Review is driven by specific questions that keep the District units focused on their plans for the coming year. All units participate in Program Review simultaneously. The current format is much more quantitative in nature. District units receive the data needed to assess progress on their goals: revenue, expenditures, more detailed student demographics, and more detailed student success indicators. The new templates include a focus on assessment and improvement, not just allocation requests [I B-20]. The completed templates are publicly available online from the Office of Research & Planning’s Program Review webpage.

Because all units are scheduled to participate in Program Review concurrently, more opportunities for discussing and comparing responses take place within and across departments. In prior years, Program Review was a more isolated process in which District unit managers, sometimes, but not always in collaboration with others, would review data and respond to prompts. The Office of Research and Planning now hosts a series of meetings where
District unit representatives can come together to discuss their data and responses. Various deans and department chairs also host similar sessions [I B-19].

As a result of the changes to Program Review, a significantly greater number of departments are in compliance. In the past, it was typical for only two-thirds of the District units scheduled to submit program reviews actually to do so. During the 2010-11 academic year, the Office of Research and Planning confirms that 99 percent of all units submitted their Program Review reports [I B-21].

The Shared Governance Program Review Committee and its various workgroups collect the units’ reports. The Committee then makes recommendations to the College’s PBC for resource allocation based on the strength of the units’ defense of their needs and goals. In order to address specific funding requests for 2011-12, the PRC recommends the College consider the following filters/criteria in setting funding priorities: 1) projects that benefit the largest number of students; 2) projects that generate a short-term financial return (within one year); 3) projects that have not had access to other resources in recent years; and 4) requests consistent with the Educational Master Plan (student centered priority). To efficiently and effectively address some complex resource needs, preparation time is needed. After considering the funding priority criteria in conjunction with the most up-to-date version of the College’s proposed strategic priorities and major objectives, the two major recommendations the Program Review Committee has proposed for 2011-12 are a systematic replacement plan for computers to support both instruction and operations and a systematic replacement plan for equipment to support both instruction and operations [I B-22]. The current process is relatively new and the College’s PBC is still considering how best to receive and judge the Committee’s recommendations. Additionally, the Program Review Committee intends to assess the District’s satisfaction with the new process during the 2011-12 academic year [I B-22].

Self-Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The CCSF evaluation and planning process is exceptionally broad-based; the strategic planning process epitomizes this as does the new Program Review process. However, the College would like to increase student input during the strategic planning process.

Although students participate in the planning and evaluation cycle through representatives on Shared Governance committees, there are no students on the Strategic Planning Team, primarily because the substantial time commitment could affect the students’ academic performance.

If State laws and regulations allow, the College can explore ways to improve student participation in the strategic planning process by compensating them for their time either monetarily or with academic credit. The Strategic Planning Team may also decide to expand the scope and frequency of its visits to student governance councils.

Planning Agenda

None.
I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Descriptive Summary

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

Broad, College wide surveys include a student opinion survey [I B-24], an employee satisfaction survey [I B-4], and a technology use survey directed toward faculty and staff to be administered in Fall 2011.

Targeted surveys focus on a variety of topics, for example: the College’s Mission and Vision statements (in preparation for the renewal of the Strategic Plan) [I B-25, I B-26]; textbook affordability strategies [I B-27, I B-28]; and counseling services [I B-29]. Traditionally, the Office of Research and Planning 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 SurveyMonkey™. Examples of units that develop and conduct surveys for program improvement include Library and Learning Resources [I B-30], the Engineering Department [I B-31], and the Learning Assistance Center [I B-32].

The College also gathers qualitative data from the public through strategic planning listening sessions and industry advisory boards. The strategic planning listening sessions include panels comprising individuals from local industry, government, or the community who present their perspectives on the College’s areas of strength and need for improvement. A noteworthy feature of the listening sessions is a group of District personnel who are literally labeled as “Active Listeners” to assure the panelists that CCSF is paying attention [I B-33].

General data on student demographics, student success, and course demand is available through the online DSS which is also discussed in I.B.3. 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 the present. While the system has limitations, the ability of College faculty, staff, and administrators to have timely access to this information has begun to change profoundly the way the College makes day-to-day decisions. The DSS draws on the CCSF Banner system, which houses all student enrollment, financial aid, and budgeting information.

The Office of Research and Planning communicates quality assurance matters by issuing written reports on analyses of the data collected. Annual reports include the High School
Report (which documents first-time student placement within the College), the College Performance Indicators, and the End-of-Year Assessment reports. Reports such as these are available on the Division of Research and Policy website [I B-11, I B-12]. The High School Report [I B-34] is the most widely disseminated. At one time, representatives from the Office of Research and Planning met individually with selected local high schools to discuss the findings. Today, the College mails out letters, which include the report’s URL link, to all San Francisco high schools, public and private, and San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) administrators. Significant demand for the report has been generated both among local schools and within SFUSD. The Office of Research and Planning receives regular requests for the report.

Program Review reports, as discussed earlier in this document, incorporate a variety of data sets (revenues, expenditures, student success, demographics, and enrollment trends) for each unit and are made public through the CCSF website.

CCSF also develops and disseminates regular reports, including environmental scans and special topic reports such as the Equity Report issued in 2010. As with all reports, these are available online [I B-9, I B-11].

In addition to making written reports available through the website, CCSF also circulates reports internally via email to the relevant stakeholders, even College wide when appropriate. The College also responds to state and federal reporting requirements on such programs as Extended Opportunity Programs and Services, Disabled Students Programs and Services, CalWORKs, and the Puentes Program [I B-35, I B-36, I B-37, I B-38].

Although CCSF does not have in place a formal process to assess the effectiveness of communications to the public about institutional quality, Board of Trustee meetings can serve as a venue in which the public has the opportunity to comment on the quality of communications about data.

The College internally and informally assesses the effectiveness of its communications. The Program Review process serves as an example of how this is done. The College has engaged internal stakeholders in an ongoing dialog regarding the quality of data provided and the meaning and relevance of these data. After the initial pilot of the new Program Review format, the Office of Research and Planning issued a survey that led to changes in the format and content of Program Review [I B-39].

**Self Evaluation**

The College partially meets this standard.

The CCSF Office of Research and Planning collects large amounts of documented assessment results. The Office then communicates quality assurance matters by issuing written reports on analyses of the data collected. The CCSF Office of Research and Planning has been successful in publishing College reports online, especially considering reductions in its office staffing. The Office will continue to make availability of online reports a priority.
Although an opinion survey of credit students was conducted in Fall 2010, the College has not yet found the resources to conduct a more labor intensive broad noncredit student survey, which must be conducted in several languages. The last comprehensive survey of noncredit students was conducted several years ago in 2005-06 [I.B-40]. A Technology Survey of employees will be conducted in Fall 2011. The End-of-Year Assessments and their successor reports have not recently been presented to the Board of Trustees.

Planning Agenda
The Board (or one of its committees) will receive presentations on the College Performance Indicators Report annually.

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.

Descriptive Summary
At the end of each evaluation cycle, the Program Review Committee, the College’s PBC, and the Board of Trustees consider the merits and effectiveness as well as the results of the current evaluation and planning process. They then propose modifications for improvement. This was how the College improved the Program Review process so that it could be firmly integrated into the evaluation and planning cycle. It is also why the College began the discussion about how to replace the End-of-Year Assessments with a more easily read College Performance Indicators Report.

The formal mechanism by which CCSF assesses the effectiveness of its 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 2006-07, a small workgroup of committee members met with the Shared Governance Coordinator to produce a list of guidelines intended to help improve the effectiveness of the committee chairs. This list, approved by the College Advisory Council, is now included as an addendum to the annually published Shared Governance Handbook [I.B-2, p. 35].

Self Evaluation
The College partially meets this standard.

CCSF systematically reviews and modifies its planning and resource planning processes to assure their effectiveness.

However, it is time for a District wide, highly coordinated review of the Shared Governance System, complete with listening sessions at the campuses.
Planning Agenda
The Shared Governance Coordinator, in collaboration with the College Advisory Council and the Academic Senate Executive Council, will schedule a District wide review of the Shared Governance System, to include a College wide survey (see also IV.A.5) and listening sessions, at least two of which should be at non-Ocean campuses.

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.

Descriptive Summary
The most important means by which CCSF assesses its evaluation mechanisms concerning the effectiveness to improve instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services is through the Program Review reports, described earlier in this Standard and elsewhere in this report. Specifically, the new Program Review templates require that each unit with student contact describe its progress on developing, achieving, and assessing student learning outcomes [I B-20]. Furthermore, the Program Review Committee recruited volunteers from the College community to assist with the final review of the Program Review documents. In 2010-11, eight subcommittees were established and the program reviews were divided amongst the subcommittees. Reviews were clustered by categories to ease the workload. Example categories include Campuses, Schools, Student Development, Chancellor Direct Reports, Instructional Support, and Finance and Administration. The subcommittees and the PRC discussed the findings using the subheadings of: 1) Areas of Commendation; 2) Areas of Challenge; 3) New Resources Needed. and 4) Subcommittee Concerns, to frame the discussion [I B-41]. The themes which emerged were presented to the College’s PBC and can be used for further evaluation of the effectiveness of Program Review.

Self Evaluation
The College meets this standard.

CCSF’s new Program Review process sets up a systematic review and assessment of the effectiveness in the programs and support and learning services for CCSF students.

Planning Agenda
None.
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