Standard I. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness.

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

Mission:

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

All California community colleges are subject to the System’s mission as described in California Education Code §66010.4(a). In addition, CCSF has two local purpose statements, a Vision Statement and a Mission Statement:

[Remove the following if it is in the front matter]

Our Vision

City College of San Francisco values and fosters superior levels of educational participation and academic success among all students. Reaching out to and including all populations, we strive to provide an affordable and unparalleled learning experience in a supportive and caring environment that leads students to successfully complete their goals.

A Teaching and Learning Community

Our principal distinction will be the high quality of instruction. The educational experience will feature successful learning in areas as varied as basic skills, academic courses, advanced honors, career and technical courses, retooling of job skills, and preparation for transfer to other educational institutions. Learning opportunities will extend to a broad array of courses and programs to offer any student a pathway to educational and career success.

An Inclusive Community

We will continue to reach out to all people, especially to those communities that encounter barriers to education; develop sustainable campuses and sites to better serve students and neighborhoods; diversify and improve programs and services for the benefit of the community; build partnerships with public, private, and community-based agencies to better respond to educational, economic, environmental, and societal needs; foster the participation of our students and employees in community life; and welcome students from around the world. Committed to lifelong educational
opportunities for all, we will exchange expertise and innovation with colleagues in the state, the nation and the world.

**A Diverse Community**

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.

**Mission Statement**

CCSF provides educational programs and services to meet the following needs of our diverse community:

- Preparation for transfer to baccalaureate institutions
- Active engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizenship preparation, and English as a Second Language
- Achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Science
- Completion of requirements for the Adult High School Diploma and GED
- Acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace
- Promotion of economic development and job growth
- Lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment

To enhance student success, the college provides an array of academic and student development services that support students’ intellectual, cultural, and civic achievements. City College of San Francisco belongs to the community and continually strives to provide an accessible and affordable education as a part of its commitment to serve as a sustainable community resource.

The Mission Statement’s seven components describe in broad terms the sorts of programs we offer: transfer, degrees, certificates, workplace skills, civic engagement/citizenship, GED/adult ed, and lifelong learning. The State mandates that all California community colleges serve all state residents who have graduated high school or who are at least 18 and capable of profiting from the instruction offered. Thus, the components of the Mission Statement are intended to meet the needs of a diverse student body including young adults fresh out of high school, re-entry students, older adults, workers needing re-training, and immigrants. Because we feel each Mission component is equally important, we often minimize the appearance of a prioritized order by presenting the components in two columns. Our Vision Statement is a narrative that describes the students we hope to serve and how their education will help improve themselves and their communities. It describes also the environment we wish to foster at the College itself. The elements of the Vision Statement (e.g., the
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benefits of an informed electorate through civic participation) inform the components of the Mission Statement (e.g., citizenship). (I A1)

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

CCSF goes to great lengths to align our offerings with our purposes, character, and student needs. The College’s purposes as defined in the Mission Statement are common among the California community colleges. Ours is a large urban district serving over 100,000 students each year in both credit and noncredit modes at many neighborhood campuses (“centers” per Ed Code) and at hundreds of sites. Our “average” students are in their mid-30s and we serve slightly more women than men. Many of our students are immigrants or children thereof and so the plurality of our course sections is ESL and citizenship. An entire department, Transitional Studies, eases many precolligate students’ way into the collegiate credit curriculum. Our nearly 15,000 transfer-seeking students take courses that articulate with not only the California State University and the University of California but also with other destination institutions across the country (e.g., the Historically Black Colleges and Universities). Each year, over 1000 degree-seeking students choose from among nearly 60 AA and AS options. About half of our credit students choose from among our career and technical education certificates. Indeed, the College offers over 100 certificate curricula, both in credit and noncredit modes. The English and mathematics departments have significantly increased the number of their pre-transfer sections to accommodate better our ever-growing body of students requiring developmental education. (I A 2)

Student demographics and student needs vary among the neighborhoods. The neighborhood campuses and these sites usually focus on specific components of the mission. For example, the Downtown Campus focuses on noncredit business, the Evans Campus on career and technical education, John Adams on allied health, Fort Mason on art, and Castro on foreign languages. The Ocean Avenue Campus, the largest, has the full spectrum of CCSF offerings. Lifelong learners benefit from our continuing education and older adult offerings. Students interested in biotechnology can enter our Bridge to Biotech programs at the Mission and Southeast Campuses; students interested in college level biotechnology courses at the Mission and the Ocean Avenue Campuses. Math Bridge serves a cohort of developmental students who enroll together in Elementary and Intermediate Algebra.

The District’s services are organized so as to be responsive to our students’ diverse needs. We offer high school outreach, matriculation, financial aid services, an EOPS department, and a DSPS department, as almost all California community colleges do. We offer also four specialized counseling departments (for new, continuing, transferring, and international students) and four retention centers: the African American Scholastic center, the Latino Services Network, the Asian and Pacific American Student Success center, and, new since the last accreditation cycle, the Tulay Center for Filipino-American Student Success. Students wishing to demonstrate academic distinction may enroll in our Honors Program. Furthermore, we have an entire department, Learning Assistance, to help students achieve college success skills. Their offerings include the Writing Success Project, designed specifically to promote our students’ composition skills. (I A 18)

Many specific student populations have access to these resources, which assess themselves in multiple ways that depend on where they are housed and how they are funded:
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Our 21st-century students expect copious online programs and services. Prospective students can learn about the College before setting foot on campus through the Outreach and Recruitment Office’s Facebook page. They can then use our free “CCSF Guest” WiFi at about 50 hot-spots, apply for admission online (with CCC Apply), register or waitlist themselves online, and monitor their educational progress in their student accounts. All incoming credit students now receive CCSF email accounts courtesy of Google. Our online course offerings have more than doubled from 83 classes in 2005 to 170 sections in 2011 in the last six years, giving our students access to distance learning and scheduling flexibility. Indeed, two rooms in the Multi-Use Building are designated for distance-learning (details still being planned as of this writing). See also II.A.1.b and II.A.2.d for further exposition on CCSF programs and resources designed to meet our students needs and III.C.1.a for a list of technology-driven developments, almost all of which enhance the College’s service to students. [Ref 2, 8, 9, 17]

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

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

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

CCSF has a 6-year evaluation and strategic planning cycle, driven by the 6-year accreditation cycle. Our evaluation and planning cycle is steered by the Shared Governance council now known as the College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC). In advance of each Strategic Planning process, the CPBC calls for the various Shared Governance and other District groups (e.g., collective bargaining agents) to review the Mission and Vision Statements and propose appropriate modifications. In the most recent review, the entire College community, including students, were invited in November of 2008 to fill out a two-part survey addressing both the Mission and Vision, intended to determine appropriate focus and language for each component. There were 792 responses. This input resulted in significant modifications to the Vision in particular, as well as some modifications to the Mission. These modifications were proposed by the Research and Planning Office based upon the survey results, discussed within Shared Governance, then verified with the College community via a second survey, before being formally adopted through the final Shared Governance review and Board adoption. This report expands further on the evaluation and planning cycle below and in the Standard I.B. and IV responses.

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

An abbreviated overview of the CCSF planning process is in order here. Every six years (roughly), the College reviews the Mission and Vision Statements as noted above. These statements then drive the development of a Strategic Plan, a large-scale process involving a team of coordinators, listening sessions, numerous presentations, drafting and re-drafting, and the search for consensus. The Strategic Plan, once complete, articulates priorities for the College’s focused improvement and innovation efforts—as well as major objectives associated with these priorities—designed to move the College toward fulfilling our Mission and Vision. The Strategic Plan is explicitly connected to all other College-wide plans, including the College’s Annual Plan; this is one way by which all plans are continually linked back to the Mission and Vision. (Hereafter, “Mission” refers to both the Mission and Vision.)

Meanwhile, each College unit prepares a program review (annually from 2009–2011, biennial thereafter) which reports on the extent to which it has achieved its goals from the previous year and outlines its future goals. Units are asked to explicitly associate these goals with specific references to plans. The College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC), a Shared Governance council, and the Research and Planning Office use the elements of the Strategic Plan and the results of the program reviews to prepare the Institutional Annual Plan for the upcoming year. Other college-wide plans that inform the Annual Plan are the Education Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Student Equity Plan, the Sustainability Plan, and the Technology Plan. In addition, after each academic year the CPBC and the Research and Planning Office evaluate the District’s progress on the Annual Plan; they publish the outcomes of this evaluation in an End-of-Year Assessment which is also used to inform the development of the next Annual Plan.

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

Evaluation

1. CCSF has a well-developed Vision Statement in addition to its Mission Statement. Together, these form a robust articulation of the College’s education philosophy. Our Vision Statement informs the seven components of our Mission Statement and nearly all decisions can be traced to at least one and often more than one of those components.

2. To fulfill our mission, CCSF offers a tremendous variety of programs and services nonpareil, all developed to meet our students’ needs and promote their future success.

Planning Agendas

1. Although our mission includes civic engagement and lifelong learning, Federal law prohibits us from offering financial aid support to students seeking those goals. Furthermore, there are indications in Sacramento that within a few years our major source of funding may cease to cover courses in those areas.
   - CCSF will need to seek other sources for providing financial aid to students seeking civic engagement and lifelong learning.

2. The College’s noncredit certificate programs are well-known in the San Francisco area and attract many students. The other noncredit certificate curricula (e.g., culinary arts) are less well-known.
   - If resources permit, the College can promote its noncredit certificate programs more heavily.
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Standard I.B: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness.
Improving Institutional Effectiveness:

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

See the responses to Standard I.A.4 and Standard IV for summaries of the CCSF evaluation and planning cycle. Also, the CCSF Board of Trustees has its own Institutional Effectiveness Committee. This Committee’s agendas have included a broad range of issues, especially search and hiring procedures.

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

Nearly all collegial dialogue at CCSF takes place in over 40 Shared Governance committees. They operate under an extensive Board policy called the Shared Governance Agreement. This Agreement creates an extremely robust participatory governance structure headed by three councils. The committees reporting to the Academic Senate Executive Council are the ones most attentive to our students’ learning needs. The committees reporting to the College Advisory Council and the College Planning and Budgeting Council are concerned more with institutional processes. Occasionally, there are inevitable overlaps among the Councils’ concerns and thus many issues will come to two or all three of them. Each Shared Governance body has a purpose statement that defines its responsibilities for developing policies and initiatives. Indeed, all committees are charged somehow with the search for best practices and the assessment of the District’s effectiveness. Nearly all Shared Governance bodies are quadripartite, i.e., they have representatives from all four campus constituencies: the administrators, the classified staff, the faculty, and the students. Each constituency has an appointing agent that tries to ensure broad, democratic representation. A casual glance at the CCSF Shared Governance brochure will reveal the breadth of the system: all academic and professional matters, sustainability, public relations, and many, many more. The District maintains a Shared Governance Office with an attendant Coordinator charged with facilitating communications to ensure that the committee structure operates smoothly. In the Spring 2011 Employee Survey, the average response to a question about satisfaction with College dialog about data and research on student learning was 2.68 on a scale from 1 to 4 (N = 415).

CCSF has also a strong, productive history of “ad hoc” work-groups that focus more intensely on specific issues. A particularly salient example is the Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee, the body charged with producing the drafts of this very document but which then is approved for publication by the Shared Governance Council and the Board. Also, the Chancellor convened his Student Equity Task Force so that the District and the Board could examine 8 areas (including
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English and math sequences, placement testing, financial aid, student employment) in which we might better serve all our students. Proposals from the Equity Task Force are supposed to go to various committees, thus tying the ad hoc bodies to the existing Shared Governance structure. The SLO Task Force meets regularly and has made recommendations to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Program Review Committee, and the Curriculum Committee. Other examples are the Strategic Planning Team, the Basic Skills Ad Hoc Task Force, and the “Cost Savings” group.

In addition to these District-wide bodies, there are countless committees, groups, and teams within each department. Indeed, each department holds official Department Meetings on flex days (cf. III.A.5) and, in some cases, throughout the semester (the English Department call some of these “retreats”). Career and Technical Education departments have industry advisory groups to ensure that course content matches industry needs and expectations. Curriculum, scholarship, equity, and learning outcome assessment are just some of the many issues that are discussed at the departmental level as well as at the institutional level. It is here, at the departmental level, that collegial dialog most strongly shapes our students’ learning. The outcomes of that dialog include certain math and English offerings in compressed timeframes and the inclusion of major learning outcomes in all course outlines. (I B 11–16)

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

CCSF has a 6-year cycle for strategic planning and a 1-year cycle for annual planning. Each Strategic Plan lists a wide variety of long-term goals. The current Strategic Plan has six major Strategic Priorities ranging from academic excellence to inclusiveness to facilities planning. Within each Priority are 10–15 Objectives which CCSF intends to employ in order to make substantial and measurable progress over the next six years.

Each year, the College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) consults the Strategic Plan, the most recent Program Review recommendations, the most recent End-of-Year Assessment, the Chancellor’s Objectives, and the current year’s Annual Plan to select specific goals for next year’s Annual Plan. The selection process varies but the CPBC’s very broad membership ensures input from all College constituencies. The Annual Plan goals are often separated into “operational” and “developmental” and then prioritized within each subset. The many unit plans and Program Review reports inform the prioritization. The End-of-Year Assessments show that, on the whole, the District makes satisfactory progress each year on achieving that year’s goals.

The Strategic Planning Team and the College Planning and Budgeting Council both strive to communicate the goals thus developed to the College community—including, indeed, we urge the entirety of the community to contribute toward the goals’ development—and to solicit as much participation as possible in achieving them. The Strategic Planning Team members bring drafts of the plan to dozens of committee meetings to explain the Plan and ask for feedback. Unit managers (administrators and department chairs) also share the drafts with their units (staff and faculty) so that input from all College employees may inform the Plan’s development. The CPBC conducts listening sessions to inform its decisions. Initiatives are directed to appropriate Shared Governance
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bodies for deliberation and possible action. For further exposition of the CCSF evaluation and planning cycle, see II.A.2.f and III.D.1.a.

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

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

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

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

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

Perhaps the most significant change in planning since our last accreditation cycle is the newly redesigned program review process. At the time of our last accreditation visit, program review was not explicitly part of the annual planning system. Each District unit (office, department, program—any entity with a budget) conducted a program review on a three-, four-, or six-year cycle. This occurred in a staggered manner; roughly 15 units were undergoing program review at any one time. Units tended to see program review as an opportunity to assert their needs and generally provided more than was requested. The program review templates were open-ended and invited lengthy, diffuse responses.
To address this situation, the Shared Governance system overhauled the program review process, including the templates. Today, program review is driven by specific questions that keep the District units focused on their plans for the coming year. All units participate in program review simultaneously. The current format is much more quantitative in nature. District units receive the data needed to assess progress on their goals: revenue, expenditures, more detailed student demographics, and more detailed student success indicators. The new templates include a focus on assessment and improvement, not just allocation requests. The completed templates are publicly available online.

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

As a result of the changes to program review, a significantly greater number of departments are in compliance. In the past, it was typical for only two-thirds of the District units scheduled to submit program reviews actually to do so. Now, the Research Office confirms that almost all units have been submitting their program reviews. The Program Review Committee intends in 2011–2012 to assess the District’s satisfaction with the new process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition to making written reports available through the website, we also circulate reports internally via email to the relevant stakeholders, even College-wide when appropriate. The College responds also to state and federal reporting requirements on such programs as EOPS, DSPS, CalWORKs, and Puente.

Although CCSF does not have in place a formal process to assess the effectiveness of our communications about institutional quality to the public, Board meetings can serve as a venue in which the public has the opportunity to comment on the quality of our communications about data. However, we continually assess internally and informally the effectiveness of our communications.
The program review process serves as an example of how we do this. We have engaged internal stakeholders in an ongoing dialog regarding the quality of data provided, the meaning of these data, and the relevance of these data. After the initial pilot of the new program review format, the research office issued a survey that led to changes in the format and content of program review. (I B 7–9, 14)

I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

At the end of each evaluation cycle, the Program Review Committee, the College Planning and Budgeting Council, and the Board continue to consider the merits and effectiveness as well as the results of the current evaluation and planning process. They then propose modifications for improvement. For example, this how we developed the improved Program Review process, to be firmly integrated into the evaluation and planning cycle. It is also the way the College decided to replace the End-of-Year Assessments with a more easily read document on College performance. (I B 13)

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

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

The most important means by which CCSF reviews its effectiveness to improve instruction and services is its program review cycle, described earlier in this Standard and elsewhere in this report. Specifically, the new program review templates require that each unit with student contact describe its progress on developing, achieving, and assessing student learning outcomes. (I B 7)

Evaluation

1. Collegial dialog takes place primarily within an expansive participatory governance structure, described in the District’s Shared Governance Agreement and coordinated by a dedicated classified staff member. Administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students all play appropriate roles within that structure.

2. Our collegial dialog has brought about much progress in the development of course-level SLOs (required in the new course outline review cycle) and institutional-level SLOs, namely, the SLOs for our G.E. areas
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3. The new program review process allows College units the opportunity to communicate the results their own assessments.

4. The CCSF Research and Planning Office has been magnificently successful in publishing College reports online, especially considering reductions in its office staffing. The Office will continue to make online availability of reports a priority.

Planning Agendas

1. Although our program review process has been re-designed and better integrated into the evaluation and planning cycle, it is difficult to produce evidence that it is having a salutary effect on resource allocation. Indeed, more generally, CCSF does not produce evidence of its assessments of its evaluation mechanisms.
   - The College Planning and Budgeting Council should begin requiring from the Program Review Committee regular reports that include the effects of resource allocation.

2. The most recent Shared Governance reviews have not been comprehensive in nature. It is time for a District-wide, highly coordinated review complete with listening sessions at the campuses.
   - The Shared Governance Coordinator, in collaboration with the College Advisory Council and the Academic Senate Executive Council, will schedule a District-wide review of the Shared Governance system, to include at least two listening sessions at non-Ocean campuses.

3. CCSF uses student demand as an informal means of assessing the effectiveness of our communicating institutional quality to the public. Developing a formal process for doing so would require substantially enhancing the staffing in the Research and Planning Office.

4. Although students participate in the planning and evaluation cycle through their representatives on Shared Governance committees, there are no students on the Strategic Planning Team. This is primarily because of the onerous time commitment which could affect the students’ academic performance.
   - If State laws and regulations allow, the College can explore ways to improve student participation in the strategic planning process by compensating them for their time either monetarily or with academic credit.

5. The End-of-Year Assessments and their successor reports have not recently been presented to the Board.
   - The Board (or one of its committees) will receive presentations on the College performance indicators at the end of each academic year.
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