B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

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

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

I.B.1. Descriptive Summary. Dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes takes place through a variety of venues, including the Shared Governance structure that was in place through Spring 2012. While the College is currently implementing a new Participatory Governance system, the restructured system will likewise serve as a critical venue for these discussions.

The most current institutional dialogue has taken place primarily within the context of responding to the ACCJC’s show cause determination. In Fall 2012, 15 work groups assembled to draft the content of the October 15 Special Report and then reconvened to draft the content for this Show Cause Self Evaluation. These workgroups have engaged in extensive dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes throughout the course of the past eight months. Dialogue has also taken place through the Accreditation Steering Committee, which includes all constituent leaders and served as the temporary Participatory Governance Council during the governance system transition.

In prior years, dialogue about improving institutional processes has also taken place through the CCSF Board of Trustees’ Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which first met in March 2010 and last met in April 2012. Among its responsibilities, this Committee discussed items such as the Accreditation self-evaluation data, Accreditation Standards I.A. and I.B., and College Performance Indicators.

Adopted in September 2012, the modified and more integrated planning and budgeting system clarifies roles and delineates windows for specific discussions, relying more heavily on data such as the documentation and measurement of Student and Institutional Learning Outcomes to inform those discussions. These discussions are intended to focus on decision making regarding necessary programmatic and institutional changes. During August and September of 2012, for example, two meetings of the Board of Trustees culminated in the

[http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_committee_agendas0.html]
[http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/BOT/BOT_Comm_Mtgs_2011/May_24-2011-IE.pdf]
identification of Board Priorities for the College for the upcoming fiscal year (2012-13). The Board priorities then influenced the program review process in Fall 2012, which required that all departments and units of the College discuss, reflect on, and incorporate Board Priorities into unit plans.

[Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Timeline]

Departmental dialogue about effectiveness also occurs during FLEX professional development days and throughout the semester. Two large-scale events in Fall 2012 focused and augmented departmental activities. The first, an all-day event on September 12, included all faculty and focused on SLOs, including bringing in guest expert Bob Pacheco who presented on turning evidence into action. On November 21, 200 faculty participated in an accreditation workshop focusing on SLOs. The recently appointed SLO Coordinator’s primary responsibility is to facilitate continuing dialogue about establishing and measuring attainment of SLOs and utilizing SLO assessment results for course and/or program improvement. [http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/slo.html]

I.B.1. Self Evaluation. While structures are in place (e.g., Governance), continuous improvement has not been emphasized. For several years the College was in a reactive, crisis management mode. In addition, the inefficiencies of the previous Shared Governance system did not always allow for action-oriented dialogue. While discussions about improvements have existed, they have been limited and have not necessarily been tied to the planning and budgeting system. Reactive crisis mode is still the climate.

-It is hoped that [The modified planning and budgeting system and new annual calendar will create a framework to support systematic, regular, and ongoing discussions about improvement. In addition, the inefficiencies of the previous Shared Governance system did not always allow for action-oriented dialogue.]

In the previous Shared Governance system, significant, inclusive and very lively discussions and subsequent actions occurred regarding topics such as defining and narrowing the achievement gap, basic skills, placement tests. These discussions have been silenced during the transition into a new Participatory Governance System. An action plan is needed to ensure that open, inclusive and lively discussion returns to CCSF! More dialogue occurs during the planning stages (e.g., Strategic Plan) than at the implementation and assessment stages. Dialogue needs to occur during all phases of the assessment, planning, and budgeting process. Consistently building assessments into college-wide planning documents will make linkages more evident. For example, the draft Technology Plan includes summary assessments for each section. The Annual Plan for 2013-14 will include a section highlighting progress-to-date on the implementation of 2012-13 and showing the relevant linkages.

Events such as those that took place on September 12 and November 21 (described above) exemplify dialogue that engages the College at an institutional level as well as at a departmental/programmatic level. However, these types of activities need to occur more regularly and frequently, and plans for future events such as these are already in place for SLOs. [SLO website] The dialogue on improvement of student learning via the SLO process is frequent, robust, and greatly improved. The Academic Senate has made significant
progress in revamping committees to advise on instructional matters and relate their activities to accreditation standards and outcomes.

However, discussion between administrators and others on institutional processes has been very limited in Fall 2012 and early Spring 2013. Communication and discussion was expected to flow through very few individuals, very rapidly, with inadequate notice of meetings and robust documentation of discussion and efforts. Although the October 15 report for the ACCJC was detailed, but, some sections relating to institutional processes represented the input of very few people.

The Participatory Governance General Council is new and limited in membership. While a revised Participatory Governance system may have great potential for some improvement of functions, the size and scope of participation is unsettled. With administrative duties residing in fewer people and fewer forums in Participatory Governance as currently proposed, the potential for creating communication bottlenecks about institutional processes is significant. This should be taken into account as the system is fleshed out to improve the current lack of communication. A survey of employees about communication on institutional processes should be done very soon in order to find out where communication works well and not so well.

The Priorities set by the Board in Fall 2012 were not linked to program review findings or the six year plan. For instance, reduction of non-instructional time was listed as a Board priority but the priority ranking was not linked to programmatic findings.

In future annual cycles, data and information used to inform Board Priorities will first be discussed by the new Participatory Governance Council to garner input, solicit clarifications, and prompt dialogue. This is built into the new Annual Timeline but was not possible in Summer 2012. [Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Timeline]

### I.B.1. Actionable Improvement Plans

The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the annual calendar to foster timely dialogue about improvement which includes all stages of the assessment, planning, and budgeting process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently build assessments into college-wide planning documents to make linkages more evident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule college-wide events for all employees to engage in robust discussions about student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

I.B.2. Descriptive Summary. An extensively vetted, longer-range, six-year Strategic Plan last adopted in December 2011 has primarily guided the annual planning cycle. The College last updated its Education Master Plan in 2006 and has developed a schedule for updating the Education Master Plan during 2013-14. Since 2000 or before, the Annual Plan has served as the mechanism for translating longer-term strategic priorities into measurable, near-term objectives. The March 15, 2012 evaluation team found that “many,” though not all, of the most recent Annual Plan objectives were stated in measurable terms (p. 21 of Evaluation Report).

http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_budget.htm

In prior years, the College required that all departments and units link resource requests to one or more College plans in their annual program review. During the program review process, the Office of Research and Planning provided a list of approved plans to which units might link. Most prominent on the list was the Annual Plan.

http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_college.htm

In September 2012, the College modified its annual process to facilitate clearer Board direction and to more clearly relate program reviews, which reflect the work of individual units, to College-wide objectives. In September 2012, the Board delineated Planning Priorities for 2013-14 which were widely publicized during College Council (now Chancellor’s Forum) and on the program review website. Several Board Priorities for 2013-14 are quantitatively measurable (e.g., increase productivity, decrease non-instructional). The first Annual Plan to be impacted by this new process will be that of 2013-14.

During Fall 2012, program review prompts asked all departments and units to refer to priorities throughout their review: “As you complete the form, please cite linkages to Board priorities and/or Board-approved college plans.” Per this new process, the results of program review will form the basis of the Annual Plan rather than the inverse. Beginning in December 2012 through early Spring 2013, program review objectives will be ranked by the administrative chain, reviewed via Participatory Governance, and distilled into an Annual Plan reflective of affirmed objectives in line with College plans and Board Priorities. In the newly created Rubric for Ranking Resource Allocation Requests, nearly all rating categories foster connection to priorities and prompt for measurability: Linked to Board Priorities and Approved College Plans, Cost/Benefit, Data Based Rationale, and Measurable Outcomes.

The End of Year Assessment (EYA) has been the primary mechanism for evaluating achievement of Annual Plan goals. However, in recent years the College did not produce it consistently. The most recent EYA was published last spring in May 2012. Despite the significant simplification of the EYA—19 pages long compared to prior versions which were often well over 200 pages—the CPBC and the Board only briefly discussed the assessment.

http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_budget.htm

Comment [AcadSen3]: Missing is a description of institutional planning efforts during Dr. Day’s tenure. The college used to plan extensively and these plans were linked closely to the Planning and Budget Council's annual budget hearings. Departments met with School Deans and reported progress, objectives, etc. related to other plans along with budget proposals. End of year reports were submitted describing how well we achieved department and program level goals and objectives that were linked to annual plan objectives. Why was this process discontinued?
For seven years or more, College Performance Indicators (CPI) Reports tracked performance on a variety of measures associated with the Strategic Plan. CPIs were last reported in April 2010 and included data through academic year 2008-09. As with the EYA, the last CPI Report was 19 pages long compared to lengthier versions of 80 pages or more from prior years. However, it similarly had a limited audience.

http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/planning_strategic.htm

Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) data trends have been presented to the Board every year, as legislatively required, but these data have not been used to set goals and have not been widely discussed.

Enrollment management has been revamped and more systematically implemented beginning in Fall 2012. Goals were set for each department with follow up by School Deans to determine whether targets are being met.

I.B.2. Self Evaluation. While the College has institutional-level plans with largely measurable objectives (most notably the Annual Plan), the College lacks goals with explicit targets except in the area of enrollment management where department-specific targets have been set for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013.

I.B2... Six year plan and Master Plan have not been utilized and regularly revisited. While they were referenced in program review, opportunities to ensure that they are living documents were scarce. Follow up and revisions need to be continuous. They should both be linked to this document and the indicators of institutional health described within. Limited opportunities exist for cross curricular and cross-program discussions to occur around progress and goals stated within master plan and six-year plan.

Having multiple institution-level reports (EYA, CPI, ARCC) leads to confusion about measures and goals. The difference between the EYA and CPI has been unclear to most members of the College. Moreover, the lengthy reports have had a limited audience. To date, the College has not used any of these reports to set targets, only to track trends or to report progress in a given year. The forthcoming ARCC 2.0 provides an opportunity for the College to focus on state-specified targets for improvement.

Several years back [need date] the administration committed to include financial data related to restricted funds in program review documents provided to departments. Financial data remains incomplete despite 4 years of requests. Program review needs to be inclusive of all areas of departmental activities, financial data needs to be provided and it needs to be complete.

The College does not have a current Education Master Plan to guide departments toward specified, longer-range goals. Once created, the Education Master Plan must explicitly integrate with the Strategic Plan.

I.B.2. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Standards 1A/1B – page 5
Produce a summary level dashboard of annual indicators that is widely understood during Spring 2013 in order to reach a broader audience and more clearly inform the upcoming planning cycle.

Design and implement a benchmarking process for setting targets for each of the annual indicators.

Move forward toward creating a new Education Master Plan.

Update the Strategic Plan prior to its expiration in 2016 to reflect changes in mission and explicitly integrate with Education Master Plan. A revised graphic was developed by WG 2 to reflect the integration of new Education Master Plan with an updated Strategic Plan. [http://www.ccsf.edu/ACC/Group_2/IntegratedPlanning2.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/ACC/Group_2/IntegratedPlanning2.pdf)

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.

I.B.3. Descriptive Summary. Prior to 2008-09, Program review was done …… The annual program review process, which began in 2008-09, integrates facilities, staffing, and technology. Unit-level needs are clearly identified by resource categories (e.g., staffing). However, since its reinvigoration in 2008-09, no resources have been allocated as a direct result of program review. Moreover, until Fall 2012 the program review process included only augmentations; it excluded reductions.

As an example of the lack of connection to resource allocation, the Budget for 2012-13 was not based on program review and contained no direct connections to it. In fact, the Budget for 2012-13 was created with less connection to systematic processes than the budgets for previous years. The Board adopted the Final Budget in September 2012 with these changes: a larger summer session in 2013, a reduction in wages for all employees ranging from -2.85% to -5.2% depending on the employee group, and reductions in spending for non-instructional assignments of -$875,000. While critical for the College’s solvency efforts, these changes had no direct relationship to program review. As has been the custom for many years, the associated Annual Plan for 2012-13 was included as an appendix to the 2012-13 Budget; however, it contained only “cost neutral” objectives.

Some limited summaries of the program review process were created in Spring 2011, updated in Spring 2012, reviewed by PRC, and shared with CPBC both years. Resource recommendations corresponded with, but did not directly influence, budget items. 


In the newly revamped process adopted in September 2012, annual program reviews due in December 2012 include for the first time a question requiring units to discuss possible reductions. In addition, for the first time, the process includes a rubric to prioritize resource allocations. These program reviews and rubrics will form the basis of the Annual Plan for 2013-14 which will in turn inform the Budget for 2013-14.

**Standards 1A/1B – page 6**
The Perkins allocation process is now officially connected to program review as stated in the program review guidelines. Other restricted revenue funding streams (e.g., basic skills) need to be similarly addressed.

The College has never had a formal staffing plan. The College created a ten-year facilities plan in 2004. The last technology plan was updated and approved in Spring 2010; a first draft was developed during Fall 2012 and is currently being discussed and reviewed. A final version is expected to be created in Spring 2013 and formally adopted before the end of that semester.

The College does not have a current Education Master Plan which incorporates these areas but has plans in place as outlined in the response to Standard I.B.2.

Program review is data-based. Initial questions on the form require units to address trend lines on the following provided data:

- For all units (instructional, student services, and administrative units) staffing and budget data are provided for the last five academic years. However, these data are not always corrected after personnel move from one department to another, as a result, their accuracy is often questioned and expenditure data is not accurately attributed. Also, the College still does not provide information about restricted revenue; instead, units are encouraged to provide data from their records.
- Data for instructional units also include five-year trend lines for student enrollments, student headcounts, FTES, FTEF, FTES per FTEF ratio, student demographics, and course success by student demographics. Degree and certification totals by program are also provided. Additional data such as demand for courses is available via the Decision Support System (DSS). Departments are also prompted to include other relevant data and to discuss SLO assessment results.
- Data for student service areas also include trend information about student contacts and student demographics when available (primarily available for counseling units). Student and employee survey ratings are also provided when available.
- Data for administrative units also include student and employee survey ratings when available.
- When possible, additional data are provided upon request. For example, data about online sections and student success was provided to the Education Technology Department.
- As departments complete their program reviews, the quantitative data provided by Research and Planning is supplemented by the departments with additional data, both quantitative and qualitative. [List some specific examples as evidence; need to identify these]

The DSS is a dated system developed locally in 1998. The College is in the process of replacing this system with ARGOS, a new data management tool that provides easily produced, accurate reports for enrollment management and educational planning. The use of ARGOS will modernize the provision of these data as well as expand the range of data available.
I.B.3. Self Evaluation. Connections between program reviews, the Annual Plan, and the Budget have been weak and indirect at best. Connections need to be much clearer and more direct. Proposed budgets were produced and activities of the college justified based on perception, access, and relationships. Board members and administrators made micro-decisions around which projects and programs were funded ... each year, rather than providing leadership to ensure that systems were in place where college-wide priorities would be statistically and systematically revealed. The College has not practiced data driven decision making where college-wide needs were ranked as priorities, student and program needs described via program review and enrollment data were ranked and prioritized and then the budget dollars allocated.

It is hoped that the 2013-14 Budget developed during Spring 2013 will demonstrate some strong, transparent connections given a successful implementation of the new process, however some department chairs and other faculty have not found the process so far to be transparent.

Via the program review form, individual units identify requests as related to facilities, staffing, or technology. However, requests have not been subsequently arrayed and aggregated by category for appropriate review by relevant offices and participatory governance processes. Such information will be used to prioritize facilities, staffing, and technology needs. For example, it will be used to modify and update the initial draft of the Technology Plan (drafted Fall 2012, scheduled for review and approval in Spring 2013). Similarly, categorized priorities will inform and be clearly integrated into the update of the Education Master Plan to be drafted during 2013-14.

The prompt that requesting units are asked to cite progress in the current Program Review states as follows: “Summarize your department’s progress to date on the major planning objectives identified in the last program review.” Some units respond with summaries, others clearly delineate progress on each objective. The College will fully devise and implement a system that tracks individual objectives. Funded objectives will be clearly identified and monitored for impact and related outcomes.

Although several pages of data are used in program review, more data is needed. For instructional units there is scant data tracking student progress beyond the course level. The data for other units also has not been augmented for many years. The implementation of ARGOS provides an opportunity to investigate how this newer, modern tool might expand the provision of data to units. To inform this investigation, the Office of Research and Planning, as a member of the ARGOS Implementation Team (AIT), will poll program review units to find out what additional data would best inform their program reviews. During Spring 2013, AIT will evaluate the feasibility of responding to these requests via the new ARGOS tool.

Department Chairs report that program review data often has significant errors. The institution corrects errors and the reports then often reflect new and different data errors. Although errors are corrected as requested in reports, the needed changes are not made in the source data or data extraction tools, so the errors return with subsequent reports, and the process of requesting corrections must be repeated. The incorrect data makes it difficult for departments to accurately assess their programs.
Data concerning restricted funds are problematic. The integrity of some of the program review data needs to be reviewed and appropriate corrections made. ARGOS will be a useful tool in this process since it can allow units to see record-level data. For example, record-level “exception reports” will be created in Argos which will make it easier to identify errors.

The College will need to ensure that departments become familiar the ARCC data used in the dashboard (see I.B.2.), understand how it relates to measures for their individual units, and know how to use related components of the CCCCCO Data Mart.

I.B.3. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2013-2014 Annual Plan will explicitly connect program reviews with the 2013-2014 Budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create breakouts of prioritized program review needs by category (facilities, staffing, and technology) for further use during college-wide planning activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via program review, closely monitor the outcomes of funded objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Argos is implemented, expand the array of Banner data to which programs have access and develop procedures for correcting errors to improve data integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage the CCCCCO Data Mart to provide more data related to newly developed dashboard based on ARCC 2.0.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

I.B.4. Descriptive Summary. One primary mechanism for participation in planning is Participatory Governance (previously Shared Governance). During Fall 2012 this occurred via several work groups including planning and program review. These workgroups included all constituents—faculty, administrators, staff, and students—although student attendance and participation varies. Board members were also included in work groups.

Unit-level planning, which takes place through program review, includes all units of the college (student services, instructional, and administration).

The new annual timeline is designed to ensure that the College’s Annual Plan and related plans (e.g., Technology Plan updates) are directly informed by unit-level planning. In the annual program review form, units must “certify that faculty and staff in your unit discussed
the unit’s major planning objectives.” In Fall 2012 a new “Key Dates” document outlined intermediate deadlines to further facilitate dialogue within and across departments.

http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Research_Planning_Grants/Program%20Review/ProgRevKeyDatesFall2012.pdf

Various constituencies provided feedback on long-range plans such as the Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, and Sustainability Plan, and these plans went through extensive governance processes. For documentation regarding strategic planning conversations:

See pages 18-20 at


One notable exception is the Education Master Plan which was last adopted in 2006. Two concerted attempts were made to substantially update the document but failed to reach an adequate conclusion and were not circulated for discussion.

For the last three years, School-level summaries were written by the School Deans based upon program review. These were provided to CPBC at the culmination of the 2009-10 and 2010-11 annual program review cycles. They were updated in 2011-12 and presented again to CPBC.


The CCSF Board of Trustees formally adopts the College’s Annual Plan each year which provides an opportunity for public comment.

As noted in the response to Standard I.B.3., annual Budget allocations to date have not been made on the basis of program review.

For the past several years, the budgeting process was centralized in such a way that unit-level budgets were rendered less meaningful. This will change with the 2013-14 budget development process.

Each year within program review, units reflect upon their effectiveness vis-à-vis the prior year’s objectives, quantitative and qualitative data, and the results of SLO assessments. (See I.B.3.)

Although there has been an inadequate connection between planning and budgeting at a college wide level, only a few units have used the program review process to make improvements. Review results in SLO assessments, make decisions about changing programs and courses, add new programs and certificates, etc. The program review report reflects the work done by departments. Especially Career Tech Ed Departments program review data, plans, reports from Industry Advisories, etc. to propose Perkins grant allocations for equipment upgrades and development of new curriculum. We use existing budget for revision of existing curriculum, deletion of courses no longer relevant etc. This is an ongoing process that integrates SLO assessments, industry advisories, student input and discussion with our School Deans. [provide as evidence, examples from of program review reports that have been used to improve programs of how existing budgets have been used to...]

Standards 1A/1B – page 10
I.B.4. Self Evaluation. Department chairs and deans need additional professional development on program review production. Faculty need training on faculty role in PR and administrators need training on facilitating planning process. Additional training needed on budget development and budget, finance office needs to provide budget templates, data, budget development procedures and technical support. Communication between instruction and finance is almost non-existent in the planning process.

Governance structures and work group structures have provided venues for discussion and input. However, various student groups, e.g., SMAC, have voiced concerns about the limited participation of students in the planning processes. Student groups can and do attend public meetings (committees, work groups, and Board meetings), and the College supports a student government system.

There is broad, “bottom up” input into planning at the unit level and college level, especially for annual planning via program review. Mechanisms for broad input on college-wide planning, particularly in resolving competing priorities coming from program review, are not fully developed. However, the quality and depth of program review activities vary by department. The delineation of “Key Dates” within the planning system was intended to prompt conversations and lead to improved overall quality; however, emphasizing and making time for these broader conversations is still new for the College.

Long-range plans also receive substantial input, yet the Education Master Plan is outdated. Two concerted attempts were made to substantially update the document but failed to reach an adequate conclusion, particularly because the plan needs to be fundamentally reconceived; the 2006 version has never served the College well. To fill the gap, School Deans provided summaries and Centers completed program reviews, but these mechanisms have also been insufficient. A fully supported, systematic effort is required. This will begin in Summer 2013 with expansive environmental scan data and will build upon program reviews completed in Fall 2013. The updated 2013-14 Education Master Plan will explicitly consider the following:

- Center level planning needs more structure and formalization. It is included in the Education Master Plan, but this is outdated. The annual program review format has not worked as well for Centers which differ in many respects from other College units. See also section entitled, “Special Focus: Centers and Sites.”
- School level planning also needs more structure and formalization. The format of the School Dean summaries has been too limited both in terms of format and discussion.

Current institutional practice is still based on crisis and response that leaves little time or energy to engage in planning and thoughtful, meaningful disclosure. Dismantling current leadership structures further weakens institutional ability to repair broken areas. Responses that are meaningful require student faculty and classified participation facilitated by Chairs, then Deans, then VC’s, then Chancellor and informed by Board. The crisis management climate leaves no time or energy to plan, and the volume of crisis, problems and issues distracts administrators and prevents planning. In order to produce the required reports, update the Master Plan, ensure by-in and participation time must be allocated to discuss and improve student learning and institutional program effectiveness, and in other ways that were not based on budget, or that depended on grants.
review. Constituents must be given access and input forums. Time must be set aside for discussion and digestion.

The new Annual Timeline delineates a clear window for the development of unit-level budgets. These budgets will include accurate budget expenditure and revenue information, including restricted revenue, to show the appropriate funding of resources. (See I.B.3. for more about accuracy and comprehensiveness of unit-level budgets.)

Unit-level objectives in program review should be reported more clearly so that we “close the loop” on each funded objective. (See I.B.3.) As administrative restructuring goes forward, it is necessary to ensure the quality and continuity of this oversight.

I.B.4. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify mechanisms for student input, e.g., participatory governance and student government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build upon the “Key Dates” document to ensure dialogue takes place within units and across Schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an annual planning and evaluation format for Centers via WG 15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new Education Master Plan which builds upon program reviews (as well as other planning and evaluation activities) and provides direction for Schools and Centers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I.B.5. Descriptive Summary. For both internal and external audiences, a variety of College-level reports and assessments are available online at the Research and Planning website. This includes ARCC, internal scan data, topical research reports, survey results, EYA and CPI Reports. The dashboard (see I.B.2.) will also be available via the Research and Planning website.

An outdated College-wide factsheet is available via the Marketing and Public Information website.

http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/Fact_Sheets/ccsf.pdf

Information about programs and departments is also online. Program reviews have been publicly available online since 2009 at the Research and Planning website. Previously only hardcopies were available—and only upon request.

SLO information is now available online. An “Outcomes & Assessment” link has been prominently placed within the “About City College” menu. Departmental webpages include SLO information and the most recent program review.
www.ccsf.edu/slo

Internally, the locally-developed DSS query tool (soon to be ARGOS) contains information about course and program achievement outcomes. See I.B.3. for more information about internal data.

The College complies with required reporting (75/25, IPEDS, various categorical programs, Student Right To Know, MIS).

In 2009 the College implemented a systematic and sustainable process for regularly reviewing all MIS data submitted to the CCCCO for quality and completeness. MIS data populates the CCCCO Data Mart and is the basis for ARCC Reports. http://advancement.ccsf.edu/MISProcedure.htm

The Accreditation website will remain active as a communication vehicle and central location to inform internal and external constituencies about the quality of the institution in the context of the Accreditation Standards.

I.B.5. Self Evaluation. Overall the website has become more student-focused with more “public information” readily available, particularly with the development of the Accreditation website.

The College-wide factsheet available under Marketing and Public Information should be updated and modified to include the dashboard (see I.B.2.) as a mechanism for more transparent quality assurance for the general public.

I.B.5. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicize major programmatic improvements and highlight successful programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop targeted communications to internal and external constituencies from the Research and Planning Office using the dashboard as the primary tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Public Information Office should develop regular means of communication to internal and external communities for the dissemination of Research and Planning findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

I.B.6. Descriptive Summary. The College conducts regular evaluations of annual program review, focusing on it as a key component of the planning cycle. Evaluations were conducted in 2009 and 2011, and will be conducted again in 2013.
Evaluation results from 2009 were discussed by the Program Review Committee (PRC). As reflected in 2010-11 program review archives, changes were made to improve transparency through feedback loops to individual units (see “Committee Comments” documents). Also, the Program Review Committee formalized its reports to CPBC in an attempt to improve the connection between program review findings and the College’s budget. However, per the fall 2011 evaluation ratings which were generally lower than 2009, these changes were insufficient. In Fall 2011 the PRC discussed the results and possibilities for further improvements. In Fall 2012, the Special Report workgroup responsible for Recommendation 2 made further modifications to address these concerns.

Program review evaluation responses also highlighted concerns about data quality, especially unit-level expenditure and restricted revenue data. Some modifications were made following the 2009 evaluation (e.g., intermittent data workshops, greater access to record-level data upon request for verification). Currently, data quality concerns are being addressed most pointedly through the implementation of the Argos data reporting tool which will allow users to navigate between record-level data and aggregated data. See I.B.3.

Link to 2011 evaluation of program review with 2009 comparison


Links to two formal reports to CBPC
http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/PRC_Resources.pdf and

Minutes reflecting PRC discussion of evaluation results:

The 2013 evaluation will be even more comprehensive in scope. In Fall 2012, the Special Report workgroup responsible for Recommendation 2 reviewed and recommended several modifications to the annual planning system; these modifications will be reviewed for effectiveness. The workgroup recommendations (formalized in the new Annual Timeline adopted by Board in September 2012) clarified roles, specified activities, and delineated timeframes for each activity. Built into the timeline, the workgroup stated: “An evaluation of entire Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting process will be conducted in Fall 2013 via program review. Changes will be determined in Spring 2014 for implementation in Fall 2014.”

An Employee Survey conducted in Spring 2011 included several overarching questions about institutional effectiveness. These new questions (or similar questions) will be included in future surveys. Nearly all items were rated between 2.0 (Below Average) and 3.0 (Good). Survey results were discussed during and included in the last self-evaluation process. Per the survey, satisfaction levels with several aspects of institutional effectiveness include the following:

- College dialogue regarding data and research about student learning 2.68
- College Advisory Council (CAC) as a channel for employee and student ideas regarding institutional decision-making, especially District policies 2.51
College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) as a channel for employee and student ideas regarding institutional decision-making, especially planning and budgeting.


In addition, the Office of Research and Planning is periodically evaluated via the Employee Survey. Below are results from 2011 (previous results in 2004 and 2000 ranged from 2.74 to 3.12):

- Institutional Advancement - Planning Services 2.80
- Institutional Advancement - Research Services 2.96

I.B.6. Self Evaluation. The College began evaluating program review biennially in 2009. The biennial process should be made systematic. However, comprehensive evaluations should encompass the entire planning and budgeting system. The Fall 2013 evaluation will be comprehensive. The Fall 2013 evaluation is scheduled so that it can include and reflect upon the entirety of the new process for developing the Annual Plan and Budget; the latter receives final approval in September 2013.

Additional, interim evaluations can be useful, especially when large-scale changes have occurred. Given the number of changes currently taking place, a preliminary evaluation will be conducted in early Spring 2013. The interim evaluation will include a focus on the new program review guidelines (Did all departments use them? What was useful? What was unclear? What was missing?) and the new rubric (How was it used? How could it be modified?). The interim evaluation will also provide an opportunity to reflect on how current work group activities have differed from previous Shared Governance activities. These findings will be provided to the new Participatory Governance Council which will take on oversight of the assessment, planning, and budgeting cycle.

Interim and comprehensive evaluations should document the culture shift currently occurring so that these changes can be tracked and evaluated longitudinally. Assessment, planning, and budgeting procedures and processes have been modified to emphasize the concept of “ongoing continuous quality improvement.” This includes a focus on assessing SLOs (not just “having” SLOs). Also, program review has historically been viewed by many departments as a place to identify “wish lists” and connection to Budget was viewed as augmentations only. To combat this extremely limited view, nearly all program review documents now include the new tag line “Looking at last year to plan for next year.” The new program review guidelines were developed to underscore the need to focus on all questions thoroughly, not just the question related to requests for augmentation. Evaluations are needed to see whether these types of changes are impacting the culture and orientation of the College.

Similarly, evaluations should include questions on whether and how assessments of SLOs and college-wide discussions of achievement and performance indicators are leading to improvements.

I.B.6. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

Standards 1A/1B – page 15
Develop the instruments to be used for the Spring 2013 interim evaluation and the comprehensive evaluation in Fall 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop the instruments to be used for the Spring 2013 interim evaluation and the comprehensive evaluation in Fall 2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

I.B.7. Descriptive Summary. The College uses several mechanisms to gather evidence about the effectiveness of programs.

Program review is the primary means by which the effectiveness of individual units (instructional, student services, and administrative) is assessed.

Individual departments can and do use program review and SLO processes as a mechanism for identifying needed improvements, delineating objectives to make changes, and subsequently evaluating the impact of those changes. Some departments were cited as exemplars by the last visiting team.

The College also uses custom reports and surveys to evaluate effectiveness. As one example of a custom survey, the College participated in the first ever rigorous, Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges-sponsored Career and Technical Education (CTE) survey about job changes after leaving and/or graduating. CTE departments were convened and aggregated results were discussed on December 7, 2012. In early Spring 2013, program-level results will be distributed for further discussion. CTE departments will address the implications of the data in their next program reviews.

The College has just begun to engage in serious discussions about whether and how our implementation of program review and SLOs can be used to create college-wide culture of continuous quality improvement. During Fall 2012, the Special Report workgroup responsible for addressing Recommendation 2 met eight times to discuss planning and evaluation. The group consistently raised the themes for transparency, looping, and integration so that progress can be discussed more meaningfully. On November 30, 2012, the discussion was broadened to include WG 2, 3, 4, and 5. The broader group emphasized the need for a tool that has practical implications for improvement. The new dashboard, built upon ARCC 2.0, will be responsive to all of these concerns since many of the measures connect program-level activities to college-level indicators.

I.B.7. Self Evaluation. The program review process has been meaningfully used by several departments to reflect on program effectiveness in terms of student learning and to identify areas for improvement. [provide exemplars from visiting team as evidence; need to identify which ones].

Within the program review template, this documentation is solicited (“Summarize your department’s progress to date on the major planning objectives”). However, some units provide delineated objectives; others do not itemize objectives clearly.
In general, the quality of program reviews has varied from unit to unit. The Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting system was modified to address this. Per the Annual Timeline, immediate supervisors now have a greater role in reviewing and discussing program review content. In addition, guidelines were created to prompt more complete and introspective responses to the questions. The guidelines include sample responses from a range of units (instructional, student services, administrative).

http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Research_Planning_Grants/Program%20Review/ProgRevGuidelines.pdf

The institution actively evaluates the overall program review process to assess its effectiveness. The evaluation instrument includes questions about “transparent and rational planning,” and “unit-level [self] reflection.” The revised evaluation instrument will include questions about the guidelines and the new role of the supervisor.

Also, the current instrument focuses almost exclusively on program review (see I.B.6.). The revised instrument will encompass the entire assessment, planning, and budgeting system.

**I.B.7. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update the evaluation instrument per I.B.6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the documentation within program review by requiring units to explicitly delineate progress on each objective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>