MEMORANDUM

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mission:

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

Questions:

- What does the institution’s mission statement say about its educational purposes? Are these purposes appropriate to an institution of higher learning?
- Who are the college’s intended students? How does the institution determine its intended population? Is the identified population a reasonable match for the institution’s location, resources, and role in higher education?
- What processes does the institution use to foster college-wide commitment to student learning? Does the mission statement express this commitment?

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

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

Questions:

- Have discussions been held among key constituents regarding the relevance of the mission statement to student learning?
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• What statements about student learning are included in the mission statement? How do these statements make explicit the purposes of the institution?

• How does the institution know that it is addressing the needs of its student population?

• What assessments of institutional effectiveness are undertaken?

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

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

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

Many specific student populations have access to these resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Resource Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>veterans</td>
<td>Veterans R. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female students</td>
<td>Women’s R. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students managing families</td>
<td>Dr, Betty Shabazz Family R. C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGBTIQ students</th>
<th>Queer R. C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>homeless students</td>
<td>HARTS program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly incarcerated students</td>
<td>Second Chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future community leaders</td>
<td>PUENTE Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future scientists/engineers</td>
<td>STEM/MESA Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former foster youth</td>
<td>Guardian Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students at risk for HIV</td>
<td>Project SAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elders seeking naturalization</td>
<td>Project SHINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domestic violence survivors</td>
<td>Project SURVIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

Standard I.B: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness.

Improving Institutional Effectiveness:

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

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

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

Questions:

• How has the college structured its dialogue? How well does the college embrace and understand the purpose of the dialogue?

• When, how, and about what subjects has the college engaged in dialogue? What impact has the dialogue had on student learning?

• Does the dialogue lead to a collective understanding of the meaning of data and research used in evaluation of student learning?

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

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

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

**Questions:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

Areas for Improvement

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

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

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

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