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 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?
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• 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
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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.

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
goals.
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 restriction 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
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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 website.

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:
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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.
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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Native American | 0 percent | 1 percent | 0 percent | 0 percent
Other/Unknown  | 7 percent | 5 percent | 6 percent | 4 percent
Gay/Lesbian    | 7 percent | 9 percent | 5 percent | 2 percent
Veteran        | 5 percent | 4 percent | 4 percent | 3 percent
Disabled       | 2 percent | 6 percent | 3 percent | 5 percent
Total number:  | 43        | 760       | 1090      | 700

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 known 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
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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 web site.

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. [REF]

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.
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.
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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?
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
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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.

### IV. References

(NOTE: references will be finalized and ordered after final edit of document)
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Ref. 2 3DI District Facility Condition Assessment Report, August 29, 2010 (??)
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Ref. 5 Works of Arts subcommittee meeting minutes
Ref. 6 November 1997 General Obligation Bond Election Book list of projects, project schedules and current Controller’s report on budgets, encumbrances & expenditures, (August 2004)
Ref. 7 November 2001 General Obligation Bond Election Book list of projects, project schedules and current Controller’s report on budgets, encumbrances & expenditures (August 2004)
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Ref. 11 Strategic Plan, 2011–2016
Ref. 12 Program Review Files
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Ref. 14 Drawings for projects for construction projects currently under design and scheduled for future construction (on file in the Facilities Planning Department)
Ref. 15 Documents relating to the Mission Campus
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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
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
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.
• 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, web site 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
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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 web site 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?
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 $XX million per year in grants. Examples of this include $XX 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 $XX 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
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 throughout 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 website. 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 Co-chairs for Standard III: Beth Cataldo and Peter Goldstein
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.

Co-chairs for Standard III: Beth Cataldo and Peter Goldstein
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.
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