Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that supports learning, enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

A. Instructional Programs

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this Standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

II.A. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.

II.A./II.A.1. Descriptive Summary. As described in the response to Standard I, the Mission and Vision statements provide overall guidance to the College and its decision-making processes. To ensure that all offerings align with the College’s mission, the annual Program Reviews, which now serve as the central decision-making mechanism, require units to explicitly state how their programs and services tie into the Mission Statement. At the same time, units must map their efforts and plans to the Strategic Plan and college priorities, both of which also stem from the Mission and Vision statements.

The institution ensures that its programs and services are of high quality and appropriate to an institution of higher education through a number of means, including review by the College’s Curriculum Committee, the Bipartite Committee, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, and other means as described in the following paragraphs.

The review, approval, revision, and deletion of academic programs and courses fall largely under the purview of the College’s Curriculum Committee, a quadripartite shared governance organization of faculty, administrators, students, and classified staff that reports to the Academic Senate. Departments wishing to create, modify, or delete academic programs must, as a first step, get Curriculum Committee approval. Using the standards provided by Title 5, the Curriculum Committee approval process ensures that programs are appropriate to the mission of the institution and to higher education. Once Curriculum Committee approval is attained, the Board of Trustees provides the final District approval of programs and courses.

Another body involved in upholding the institution’s integrity is the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. This committee consists of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and five administrators. The Bipartite Committee’s purview is the various requirements of the associate degree. Much of the Bipartite Committee’s work is in approving courses for inclusion in the various General Education areas, although the
Bipartite Committee has also approved larger changes, including the major structural changes to its associate degree in 2007-08.

Many of our programs require approval by the State Chancellor’s Office. The application process for State Chancellor’s Office approval addresses five main areas: appropriateness to mission, need, curriculum standards, adequate resources, and compliance. [Chancellor’s Office Program and Course Approval Handbook, 3rd edition, p. 54-64]

Within Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, industry advisory boards regularly review these programs to ensure breadth, depth, and rigor. Certain CTE programs such as Nursing, Diagnostic Medical Imaging, Dental Assisting, Drug and Alcohol, Administration of Justice (police and fire training), and Emergency Medical Technician and paramedic training must meet additional industry-specific accreditation standards.

Departments report on the quality of their programs in Program Review using SLO data as evidence.

**Selecting Fields of Study.** With respect to choosing the fields of study in which it offers programs, the College has a decentralized approach. Departments review their course and program offerings continually, and make programmatic changes to reflect shifts in student interest and shifts within the discipline. Career and technical programs hold regular industry advisory meetings to get feedback about their curriculum. These departments make regular adjustments to course and program offerings to reflect current industry needs.

The student achievement outcomes of the institution’s programs are provided in the tables below.

- Insert table showing transfer information
- Insert table showing degree and certificate completions
- Insert table or examples of job placement data

**Assessing Currency, Teaching and Learning Strategies, and SLOs.** With respect to assessing currency, discipline faculty are largely responsible for assessing the College’s non-CTE programs. Occasionally, articulation maintenance, or the development of a major, require updates. For example, the Behavioral Sciences Department recently created a course to support their proposal for an AA-T in Sociology. The College’s new policy prohibiting the offering of courses when outlines are more than six years old will also assist in ensuring currency of courses. As noted above, industry advisory boards, and, in some cases, external accrediting agencies regularly review CTE programs for quality but also for currency and relevance.

The assessment of course SLOs serves as an evaluation of the teaching/learning strategies and embodied in SLO attainment. These assessments are conducted by each department in ways that are most appropriate to a particular discipline.

Departments use a variety of means to assess program SLOs. In the past, CTE programs were the primary programs to have completed assessments of program SLOs. All programs now have assessment plans that are included on program/department websites. Program Review requires departments to report on how they have used the results of program SLO assessment in making curricular changes.
The institution ensures program currency by requiring departments to report on the assessment of learning outcomes in Program Review. In addition, course outlines cannot be more than six years old, and all departments must provide update plans in program review each cycle to show progress.

II.A./II.A.1. Self Evaluation. While the Mission and Vision statements provide overall guidance, we need to continue to make sure that we are making decisions based explicitly on the Mission and Vision. [Can we cite examples of how the recent revision of the mission statement has led to change as evidence?] In particular, given the recent development of Institutional Learning Outcomes, the College will need to ensure that the development of ILOs draws on the mission.

CTE programs and some other departments, notably English, have engaged in exemplary practices for ensuring that programs and services are high quality for some time. The College is making significant progress on extending those models to all programs. The College is currently working on extending those models to all programs, but this is a work in progress.

Although the decentralized approach to deciding fields of study works well, the linkage between the Annual Program Review system and planning and budgeting has been weak. As a result, the resources for developing new fields of study have typically been at the expense of other programs within a department. The College’s new, more tightly integrated Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting system should provide better results, but this remains to be assessed.

The current student achievement data is good; in particular, the number of certificates issued has been increasing. For purposes of better comparison, we need to be more systematic in the use of external assessment methods (e.g., transfer rates, job placement rates) in the assessment of programs. One example of external assessment could be local/state/national awards earned by programs like Radiology and our Speech and Debate team.

As of Fall 2012, the College has instituted promising processes for assessing course SLOs, which will also assist in assessing teaching and learning strategies, with the promise of yielding data that will inform program improvements.

The institution could do better at ensuring that programs and curricula are current for CTE programs by enhancing the questions asked in Program Review, and requiring programs to reflect on job availability, certificate/degree completion, and job placement rates.

Though SLO processes were currently in place and required, the College needed more effective accountability measures. The new policy requiring periodic update of course outlines will help ensure this. Though processes are in place to require currency, the College needed more effective accountability measures. The new policy requiring periodic update of course outlines will help ensure this. The ILOs were developed so recently that the College has not yet completed the mapping between the ILOs and the Mission Statement.

II.A./II.A.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>
</table>

-3-
We’ve now identified Program SLOs for all programs and mapped them to courses; need to work on broad-based Program SLO assessment that includes external assessment methods if the research warrants such external methods.

Piloting General Education SLO assessment in Spring 2013

Integrate required two-year assessment of CTE programs (job availability, certificate/degree completion, and job placement rates) into Program Review

Continue to integrate program review and resource requests

Implement the new policy requiring periodic course outline updates.

ILOs, currently under development, will connect to mission statement and be mapped to for all programs and courses. Plan for ILO finalization: Spring 2013 – with mapping to immediately follow

Identify NC student education goals to better integrate student progress into Program Review.

Survey students. Conduct focus groups with faculty and student leaders.

Fall 2013 and ongoing.

II.A.1.a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

II.A.1.a. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco regularly conducts research to inform its practices leading to student success. Research in its broadest sense utilizes data from program reviews, assessment of success in meeting prior strategic plan objectives, and input from the College community. Information is also obtained through listening sessions, planning retreats, student equity forums, and individual feedback.

Other student learning needs assessment is based on City College of San Francisco’s Environmental Scans, both Internal and External Data Trends reports, which include data on student demographics, student performance indicators, and community and labor market information [II A-7, II A-8]. The Internal and External Scans inform the Strategic Plan and support the development of specific strategic priorities. They also inform the Educational Master Plan, one that is being updated, and support the program planning priorities.

Over the last several years, ongoing research of educational needs by departmental faculty has led to joint efforts with local community and industry advisory committees. New courses meeting demands for educated workers in biomedical equipment technology, green economy, and health and safety include: Biomedical Instrumentation Maintenance; Solar Thermal Panel Installation; Green and Sustainable Organizational Practices; and Group Facilitation.
and Field Work in Health Education. These have led to new certificate programs in Biomedical Equipment Technician, Green and Sustainable Business, and Youth Worker. Other avenues to investigate how College curriculum reflects industry employment needs are available through advisory meetings and DACUM (Developing A Curriculum) research groups.

In addition, Perkins has funded student focus groups in certain areas (Architecture, Computer Science) to assist in curriculum design for those areas.

Many courses across fourteen disciplines integrate Service Learning into their curriculum connecting students to their communities, promoting experiential learning, and at times, becoming the spring board for future employment.

Assessing Students’ Educational Preparedness for Program Planning. As part of the Matriculation process preceding enrollment in credit and noncredit courses, students participate in mathematics, English, or ESL placement assessment. Determination of the appropriate levels of courses to take is a “multiple measures” process, which is based on a number of factors, including the placement testing, standardized test scores (e.g., SAT, AP), other college coursework completed, and counselor assessment of relevant indicators during individual interviews. Student course placement data are also useful to basic skills departments in determining the schedule of classes for these departments. In noncredit ESL, whose students often have very limited education, CASAS testing provides data used to identify students' most urgent basic skills needs so that curriculum can be tailored to address these areas.

Through the orientation and counseling components of the matriculation process, students receive valuable assistance in identifying their educational goals and the student services and academic resources available to them. Students are encouraged to meet regularly with a counselor to review their progress within their current courses as well as their progress towards certificate, graduation, transfer, and other educational goals.

Joint efforts with the San Francisco Unified School District enable the research office to prepare an annual high school report outlining the readiness of incoming students in the areas of English and mathematics [II A-9]. This report is shared with various SFUSD administrators, including principals at each of the high schools, and is distributed electronically to CCSF personnel. CCSF English and Mathematics departments use this report when making decisions regarding curriculum development, course design and revision, their basic skills programs, their accelerated course sequences, and the types of student support services needed. Additionally, the Gates Foundation recently funded a data-driven initiative to assess the preparedness of incoming high school graduates. The initiative convenes Mathematics and English faculty at CCSF with their respective counterparts in the San Francisco Unified School District to discuss any gaps in educational preparedness among high school graduates. Also, the English Department and New Student Counseling have collaborated for 25 years to offer the nationally-recognized Puente Program.

Research on the Achievement of Student Learning Outcomes. The assessment of learning outcomes is done by discipline faculty. While there has been some support from our Research office for faculty interested in assessing how well students achieve stated learning outcomes, the College has relied primarily on a decentralized approach to this assessment.

Comment [c3]: See the Office of Mentoring and Service-Learning website: http://www.ccsf.edu/~mentor/HTML_Pages/ServiceLearning.html
The College has not historically engaged in significant broader, multi-disciplinary approaches to assessing learning outcomes. However, as of Fall 2012, the approach to documenting SLOs, assessing SLOs, and utilizing SLO assessment results for program improvement has become more centralized, and an SLO coordinator now oversees these activities on an institutional level. The SLO Coordinator’s website displays the wealth of results gathered by faculty during Fall 2012.

II.A.1.a. Self Evaluation. The College has good research practices in place to inform the College of broad student learning needs, through environmental scans and assessments of internal and external data. In addition, the College has good processes for assessing educational preparedness for English, mathematics, and ESL, particularly through the use of multiple measures. Nonetheless, faculty find it difficult to acquire non-credit research data. With respect to program planning based on student needs, while there is some use of information derived from placement testing, the College could improve the incorporation of research into program planning.

For some time, the capacity of the Research Office to support faculty who wish to use research methods to determine if students are achieving stated learning outcomes has been limited due to its staffing and software limitations. This limited capacity inhibits the College’s ability to engage in broader, multi-disciplinary approaches to the assessment of learning outcomes.

II.A.1.a. 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>Continue to strengthen the Research and Planning staffing</td>
<td>Confirm appointment of Dean of Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire Director of Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire Research Analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.1.b. The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.

II.A.1.b. Descriptive Summary. Prior to offering a course, discipline faculty collaborate on the development of the Course Outline of Record, which is then reviewed and approved by the College’s Curriculum Committee. The standards for the Course outline of Record require faculty to define the following:

- Total number of hours of instruction
- Type of instruction (lecture, conference, laboratory, work experience)
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Instructional methodology, including in-class and out-of-class assignments and evaluation methods
While the College’s Curriculum Committee relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty in determining learning outcomes and the instructional methodology, Committee members are charged with examining the integration of these items as documented in the Course Outline of Record. As noted in Chapter 9 of the Curriculum Handbook, Curriculum Committee members examine a number of aspects of the course, including:

- Does the content justify the hours/units?
- Do assignments give students sufficient practice in achieving the learning outcomes of the course?

**Evaluation of Delivery Methods to Ensure Student Needs Are Met.** The College relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty to evaluate the delivery methods used. Faculty are engaged in the assessment of student learning outcomes for courses, and they update the Course Outline of Record as a means of adjusting the delivery methods to enhance student learning. In the case of distance education offerings, the Educational Technology Department routinely compares the effectiveness of these offerings against the effectiveness of traditional offerings of the same courses.

**Dialogue about Delivery Systems and Modes of Instruction.** The College’s Curriculum Committee routinely discusses modes of instruction. Departments proposing new courses, or substantial revisions to courses, present their course outlines to the Curriculum Committee, and in the ensuing discussion, departments answer any questions that Curriculum Committee members raise. While department chairs are required to attend Curriculum Committee meetings to support their proposals, chairs will often bring lead faculty to the meetings as support, further enhancing college-wide dialogue.

Departments wishing to make distance education versions of courses must submit a Distance Education Addendum to the College’s Curriculum Committee for approval. Part of the Distance Education Addendum asks the department to justify how the learning outcomes of the course can be supported and/or enhanced in the distance education format. As with course outlines, there is ensuing discussion at the Curriculum Committee meeting.

The College also holds professional development days where faculty engage in workshops to learn about and discuss modes of instruction. For example, the January 2013 FLEX day included workshops on:

- Improving Student Retention, Success and Persistence with Contextualized Basic Skills Courses
- Finding Student Voices Through Pedagogy: College Student Development

In addition to professional development days, the College supports several special initiatives that lead workshops on modes of instruction. For example, the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) has held a number of workshops on varied topics, including the use of rubrics, ways of closing the digital divide, and the MIP Accelerated Practice and Pedagogy Project. The ESL Department holds an annual colloquium in February in which Bay Area ESL faculty and students share pedagogy, methodology, research and current professional trends. ESL also holds an annual Tech Camp, which focuses on professional development in the ESL field.
Effectiveness of Delivery Systems and Modes of Instruction in Facilitating Student Learning. Given the scope of our institution, it is difficult to provide a single answer to how effective any given delivery system or mode of instruction is at facilitating student learning. Effectiveness of any particular mode varies from course to course and instructor to instructor.

II.A.1.b. Self Evaluation. The College has a well-defined Curriculum Committee process that ensures that delivery methods will support the objectives and content of the courses. The Curriculum Committee is a quadripartite committee of faculty, administrators, classified staff, and students, ensuring that a perspective of views is used in examining the delivery methods for proposed courses.

The College relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of delivery methods, and this evaluation is well integrated into the assessment of learning outcomes.

There is much College wide dialogue on modes of instruction and delivery methods. However, there is not now a central location for storing the evidence that this dialogue takes place. Even more dialogue can occur and the evidence thereof can be collocated, once the College re-creates its Shared Governance system and re-establishes a Coordinator position. While there is certainly discipline specific and some limited college wide dialogue on modes of instruction and delivery methods, the College could do more to promote more college wide dialogue, especially since the challenges faculty members face will often be common across disciplines. Some dialogue will naturally occur as the College gets better at discussing the results of learning outcomes assessment.

II.A.1.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation II.A.1.b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of professional development activities devoted to delivery methods and modes of instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.1.c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

II.A.1.c. Descriptive Summary. In July 2012, ACCJC recommended that “the college identify the intended student learning outcomes at the course, program, general education, certificate and degree levels, develop and implement assessments of student learning, and analyze the results of assessment to improve student learning. The results of ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes should foster robust dialogue and yield continuous improvement of courses, programs and services and the alignment of college practices for continuous improvement.”

In Fall 2012, the College responded by engaging in a massive effort to define SLOs for all disciplines, certificates, and majors that did not already have defined SLOs. The current online catalog contains this information.
Identifying, Measuring, and Utilizing the Results of SLOs. The development of curricula is a faculty-initiated and controlled process, which includes the development of new courses, majors, programs, certificates, degrees, and the revision of existing ones. This can be an individual or collective activity. Course-level learning outcomes and strategies for attaining them are stated in the course outline; outcomes are in the Major Learning Outcomes section and strategies are in the Content and Instructional Methodology sections. Faculty write course outlines; in some cases, a department-specific curriculum group reviews course outlines. Further review occurs by the respective department chairs and school deans prior to submission to the Curriculum Committee. Majors, programs, certificates, and degrees also have learning outcomes identified on their respective documentation that is submitted to the Curriculum Committee. Accredited programs in the career and technical education area are mandated to hold industry advisory meetings. Programs that receive Perkins funding are also required to hold meetings with their advisory group to ensure that curriculum reflects current industry needs. Noncredit course outlines are held to the same standard as credit courses in terms of formatting, SLOs, and evidence of assessment standards.

Faculty involved in these processes are encouraged to submit the outlines for technical review by either the Curriculum Committee Chair or the Dean of Instruction. While many goals are associated with technical review, the primary goal is to ensure that learning outcomes reinforce and support one another within the appropriate level of courses, majors, programs, certificates, and degrees. After technical review is completed, there is another review by the Curriculum Committee Chair, Dean of Instruction, Matriculation Prerequisites Officer, and Articulation Officer who meet to discuss the proposals and schedule them for discussion at the Curriculum Committee. Assessment of learning outcomes also falls under faculty purview. The specific assessment methods for courses are selected by the respective faculty, often in consultation with their department chairs, and exhibit the entire range of assessment modalities.

Course and program SLOs are assessed in many ways, by discipline faculty. For courses, content-specific assessment methods are indicated in course outline and SLO-specific extra assessments are described on department websites. Program SLO assessment methods are described on department websites. All program SLOs are mapped to component courses. Results are used for course and program improvement: examples include changes in course instructional methodology, creation of new courses, changes in the structure of certificates and majors, and even the deletion of certificates/majors.

Evidence: examples from departmental web pages that serve as examples of how results are being used.

Verification of the Appropriateness of SLOs. As noted above, SLOs are vetted by the Curriculum Committee, which ensures that the outcomes are appropriate to the level of the course (credit degree-applicable, credit nondegree-applicable, and noncredit).

Dialogue about SLOs. Department meetings held at FLEX events and scheduled throughout the semester include sessions devoted to SLO discussions. These are described on department websites. In Fall 2012, for example, faculty participated in three significant

Departments have begun using departmental web pages to facilitate dialogue among discipline faculty and across the college. Some departments even go beyond using the web pages: departments like English are discussing SLOs in often bi-weekly meetings to discuss, revise and assess student learning outcomes.

At the certificate level, faculty meet to discuss SLO alignment between courses and programs, and also SLO attainment. For example, the faculty teaching in the Trauma Prevention & Recovery Certificate (based in Interdisciplinary Studies and included faculty in Health Education, Women’s Studies and Child Development) have met once or twice each year since 2009 to discuss SLOs. Program SLOs were refined with input from the Community Advisory Committee; course-level SLOs were aligned to program-level SLOs in an interactive way that prompted deeper discussion of the SLOs; a cross-course assessment, an ungraded quiz, to measure attainment of program SLOs 1 & 8 (addressed in all 5 core courses of the certificate) was developed; data has been collected across courses for four semesters so far (Spring 2011-Fall 2012); and curriculum changes have been implemented as a result (for example, development of brief materials on trauma used across courses to reinforce; addition of service-learning component; revision of course SLOs to emphasize preparation for work with diverse communities). Several graduates of the program were interviewed in spring 2011 to gain further data on SLOs and program impacts.

II.A.1c. Self Evaluation. SLOs are now well defined for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. The College has good processes in place to define these SLOs and ensure they are at the collegiate level. Some course outlines are old, but we have established a process by which we will ensure that all outlines for currently-offered courses will be no more than six years old. The course-outline review process, begun in the mid-2000s, has ensured that nearly all (but not all) course outlines have been reviewed and updated within the last six years and will continue being reviewed every six years.

The College engaged in a major effort in Fall 2012 to develop program-level learning outcomes for all disciplines, certificates, and majors; the work now must focus now on carrying that energy forward into establishing routines of program learning outcome assessment. During that process, the College established a pilot reporting system for course and program SLO assessment activities. The College implemented a more extensive system for Spring 2013 that includes specific prompts for users to provide details about assessment activities beyond merely indicating that they are performing assessment activities. The College will continually assess whether the system is meeting the institution’s reporting needs and adjust as necessary.

The College has realized significant improvements within the last year in the understanding among faculty about the assessment of learning outcomes. As a result, the College has more broad-based participation among faculty who now share ideas online. Moreover, the College has appointed a College-wide SLO Coordinator (currently an interim appointment) and developed a series of professional development workshops in Spring 2013 to fill in gaps.
II.A.1.c. 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>Hire a permanent SLO coordinator.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build upon the pilot centralized reporting system and develop a more robust system to ensure that assessments continue to take place and to assist in tying course and program-level assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue working toward the Sustainable Continuous Quality improvement level of the ACCJC rubric for SLOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.

II.A.2. Descriptive Summary.

The College offers courses in all of the areas noted above: collegiate, developmental, pre-collegiate, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training, programs for international students; and contract education programs. Courses include developmental courses in noncredit ESL and transitional studies, pre-collegiate or basic skills courses in English, mathematics, and ESL, degree applicable and transfer level courses; short-term training in numerous career and technical fields, and contract education training/courses serving the needs of local business and industry.

Discipline faculty develop credit and noncredit courses and programs for review and recommendation by the Curriculum Committee to the Board of Trustees for final approval. Given the high numbers of students who enter the College in need of developmental and pre-collegiate coursework, and that is in the mission of the College to serve this need, the College has a long history of offering coursework at these levels. Placement data show no ebbing of this demand. Departments offering these pre-collegiate courses such as the English and Math Departments continue to assess the effectiveness of the course sequence and course delivery through the analysis of data and make changes accordingly.

Comment [khc6]: Throughout this standard, remove “well developed” language or reduce/modify.

Evidence: documentation relating to changes in the English sequence and Math E

Ensuring the High Quality of all Instructional Courses and Programs.

The evaluation of courses and programs is largely completed at the departmental level. Individual departments have used Program Review to improve their courses and programs. A timely example is the recent curriculum work noted above that the English and Mathematics departments have done to address the achievement gap. These departments have been revising the Course Outlines of Record for their developmental courses on an ongoing basis, ensuring that the expected learning outcomes are well defined and shared among departmental faculty. These departments are also experimenting with shorter sequences of developmental courses, and
have established assessment methods that will allow them to determine the effectiveness of these sequences in achieving the desired learning outcomes [II A-27 Sections 1 and 2].

Courses offered for credit under contract education are also reviewed and approved through the Curriculum Committee process. These courses are normally taught by current faculty and if new faculty teach them, the faculty must meet state minimum qualifications. The first time a course is offered, the course is evaluated via a questionnaire distributed to students during the last class meeting. If the course is repeated, assessment information is gathered directly from the client. Informal assessments of courses offered not for credit are obtained through email communications with the client who requested the course. Contract education delivers customized training so communications with clients are ongoing.

The Continuing Education program distributes a class evaluation at the end of the last session. Evaluations are reviewed by the Office of Contract and Continuing Education and if scores are weak, these are discussed with the faculty prior to offering the class again.

Instructional courses offered overseas are evaluated in a variety of ways, and may vary slightly from one program model to another. Students are surveyed at the end of each program. Survey results are read and discussed with departmental faculty, overseas academic directors and the Study Abroad Coordinator. Changes are made based on student and faculty input and requests.

For study abroad programs focused on foreign language acquisition, the College has recently started giving students in some locations an exam twice, once at the start and once at the end of the program. Pre and post assessment provides a way of measuring student learning outcomes and helps guide the College to areas needing improvement.

CCSF faculty make periodic site visits to overseas sites to observe and critique program courses. Their observations and recommendations are then reviewed by the Study Abroad Program and the academic director overseas. Suggested changes are then discussed with individual faculty and/or the head of the program where they teach (for example, the Academic Director at the Scuola Leonardo da Vinci in Florence, or the Director of the Cours de Civilisation française at the Sorbonne in Paris). If the evaluation indicates that the program itself is no longer well suited to its students, the College may seek another academic partner overseas.

Academic center directors overseas continually evaluate the academic courses they offer based on both student feedback and their own observations. Revised CCSF syllabi are forwarded to the overseas academic directors and faculty to review, discuss, and implement the curricular changes.

Process for Establishing and Evaluating Each Type of Course and Program. Before a department can offer a new course or program, it must be reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee and by the Board of Trustees. All new noncredit courses and some credit courses and programs must also be approved by the State Chancellor's Office. When departments wish to make changes to courses or programs, the Curriculum Committee also reviews those changes.

The Curriculum Committee ensures that all courses and programs meet the standards of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, for credit and noncredit courses and programs [II A-14 p. 55-58]. Curriculum Committee reviews of proposed Course Outlines of Record include careful consideration of the number and type of hours (lecture, lab, conference) and the
Instructional methodologies specified. In addition, courses that are to be taught via distance education require separate review and approval by the Curriculum Committee, which considers factors such as course suitability for distance education, student-instructor contact, and distance evaluation integrity [II A-14 p. 59-66].

_Determination of the Appropriate Credit Type, Delivery Mode, and Location of Its Courses and Programs_. Departments propose the credit type and delivery modes for courses, which the Curriculum Committee then reviews, and the Board of Trustees ultimately approves. Some courses, as noted above, require further approval by the State Chancellor’s Office.

Department chairs, school and center deans, and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs jointly determine the location of courses and programs. In some cases, the choices for locating courses and programs are limited by the available facilities (for example, new credit programs in construction trades are at the Evans campus because it houses the appropriate space and equipment for construction training). In other cases, center deans consult with counseling, Admissions and Records staff, and other student support staff to solicit input on student course demand. This information is given back to school deans and department chairs during the schedule preparation process.

**II.A.2. Self Evaluation.** The College has well-defined processes for deciding the various types of programs to offer and also uses well-defined processes for ensuring program quality. Although a number of departments have utilized the assessment of learning outcomes for program improvement, it wasn’t until Fall 2012 that the College embarked on a College-wide effort to do this and is improving. At this juncture it is too soon to know on an institutional level whether the College is using the evaluation of courses and programs effectively for improvement. The College will need to develop a way to evaluate this going forward.

The College has well-defined processes for determining the appropriate credit type and delivery mode of its courses and programs.

The process that the College has used for determining the location of programs that are not location-bound (e.g., not auto or HCT) is evolving. Part of the reorganization of the Academic Affairs division is to redefine the roles and enhance the authority of center deans. This reorganization is designed to provide more thoughtful approaches to program scheduling at the various locations.

**II.A.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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College needs to continue the momentum it has started in the use of learning outcomes assessment for program improvement, so that we can reach the sustainable continuous quality improvement level. While the focus of efforts has been on traditional academic courses and programs, we need to ensure that this continues on to non-traditional offerings, like study abroad and international student programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the intents of the Academic Affairs reorganization is to enhance the authority of the school and center deans, especially as it pertains to course and program offerings at the various College locations. The College needs to work to ensure that the reorganization meets this intent.

II.A.2.a. The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

II.A.2.a. Descriptive Summary. The College’s policies and institutional processes for the development of courses, programs, certificates, and degrees are explained in great detail in the Curriculum Committee’s Curriculum Handbook. The role of the faculty is paramount in the review and improvement of the quality of CCSF courses and programs. Faculty are involved at every level of the assessment process from the development of learning outcomes to their applications and evaluation. Faculty in each department are responsible for creating, reviewing, and assessing course and program outcomes within its offerings. Delivery and assessment are the responsibilities of classroom faculty, who are supervised by their department chair. Student learning outcomes are spelled out in the course outlines and program learning outcomes are published in the College Catalog (e.g., the Diagnostic Medical Imaging SLOs are on p. 366 of the 2011-12 Catalog).

Detailed guidelines in the Curriculum Committee Handbook relevant to the development process include recommendations for mapping courses to program outcomes [II A-14 p. 75-76, 82-83].

The Curriculum Committee conducts a rigorous peer-review process of every course and program proposed [II A-28]. The Committee consists of 18 faculty, six administrators, one classified staff, and two students. After a course and/or program has Curriculum Committee approval, it is referred via the Academic Senate to the Board of Trustees for its approval, and in certain cases, (programs with 18 or more units, noncredit courses, noncredit programs, etc.) the State Chancellor’s Office as well.

Assessment of Quality and Improvement. Due to the efforts of the SLO Workgroup and faculty departmental leadership, there is now a wide and shared understanding of how the assessment of SLOs can provide a framework for course and program creation and improvement. The College requires discipline faculty to use the assessment of learning outcomes to evaluate courses and programs. Beginning in Fall 2012, departments were required to report on the assessment activities for all courses that were being offered. The College extended this requirement to all programs in Spring 2013 and will continue to enforce this requirement beyond Spring 2013. Departments report on how the assessment of learning outcomes have led to course and program improvement as a part of the Annual Program Review system.

The frequency of evaluation varies from course to course and program to program, related to a variety of factors, including the frequency of course offering, the number of sections of a
particular course, other priorities within the discipline, etc. The College has recently established a timeline to so that course outlines for currently offered courses will be updated at least every six years. The results of evaluation vary and are hard to capture for an institution as large as City College of San Francisco.

Sample Improvements. There are a variety of improvements to courses and programs that have occurred as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes. For example:

- The Mathematics Department has created a course (MATH 45X) designed as an alternative pathway to their statistics class, and is engaged in an assessment of this course, comparing the success of students who took this course vs. those that took the traditional prerequisite sequence.
- Earth Sciences is increasing its use of the iClicker technology, especially in larger classes, to increase student interaction.
- Cinema has created and/or updated course readers for a number of different courses.

More examples of improvements can be found on individual department’s SLO web pages, available from the College’s SLO web site (www.ccsf.edu/slo).

II.A.2.a. Self Evaluation. The College has well-defined processes for the development of courses and programs. These processes rely primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty. The College’s requirement for centralized reporting of course and program assessment activities will be effective in ensuring that courses and programs are assessed regularly; however, the College’s central reporting requirement is fairly new, and the College will need to work to maintain its momentum in this area. The College has not yet developed a way to evaluate whether these processes relating to assessing student learning outcomes effectively promote program improvement.

The College has not done well at ensuring that all course outlines are updated on a regular basis, however, a new timeline and policy have been put into place to resolve this.

The College’s required reporting on the assessment of learning outcomes in its Annual Program Review system is another helpful method in ensuring that programs and courses are routinely reviewed. The College needs to integrate more specific review requirements for CTE certificate and degree programs.

II.A.2.a. 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 College has put into place a policy for ensuring that course outlines are updated regularly. It needs to ensure that this new policy is followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College needs to integrate more specific review requirements for CTE certificate and degree programs into its Annual Program Review cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an evaluation of the processes relating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.

II.A.2.b. Descriptive Summary. Discipline faculty have the primary role in determining the competency levels and SLOs for courses and programs. New courses and programs are reviewed by the College’s Curriculum Committee, which reviews the SLOs for the course or program. CTE programs use advisory committees to perform regular review of their programs, including the learning outcomes.

The Curriculum Committee process for submitting certificates and majors for approval requires departments to map the learning outcomes of the program to the courses contained within that program. The mapping document asks departments to identify whether the course addresses the learning outcome at an introductory, developmental, or mastery level for program completion. (See Chapters 4 and 5 of the Curriculum Handbook). Curriculum Committee guidelines for approval require that students are able to obtain the mastery level of every program learning outcome regardless of elective course options.

Students have a clear path of achieving the SLOs required of courses and programs:

- All courses are taught in accordance with a course outline of record. The Curriculum Committee expectations for course outlines, as documented in the Curriculum Handbook, require integration between the learning outcomes of the course, the content, and the instructional methodology. This integration ensures students have a clear path to achieving the SLOs of the course.

- For certificate and degree programs, the Curriculum Committee expects an identification of the SLOs for the program and a mapping of SLOs to the required courses of the program. Curriculum Committee expectations state that students should be able to master the learning outcomes of the program regardless of any course options they may take.

- The English department chairperson requires her faculty to list SLOs on their syllabi so students are clear at the outset of the course what the objectives are. All syllabi are collected at the start of each semester.

- The English department (and perhaps other disciplines) follows a schedule for revising and reviewing course outlines. Every 4-6 years cycle we revise and update our course outlines to meet current State guidelines and changes in education. All English department faculty are required to follow the outlines; this compliance is part of the evaluation during normal instructor evaluation cycles. Course outlines are available both digitally and in hard copy.

The College has established a centralized system by which the assessment of learning outcomes is reported. This centralized reporting system ensures that learning outcomes
assessment is the institution’s way of monitoring the progress that faculty are making in using the assessment of learning outcomes to improve courses and programs.

II.A.2.b. Self Evaluation. The College has a long-standing mechanism for determining the competency levels and SLOs for courses and programs. The College relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty, and the College’s Curriculum Committee provides a sound means of ensuring quality.

The College also has a well-developed mechanism for integrating the learning outcomes expected at the course level with those expected of students completing certificate or degree programs.

Finally, the College has made great strides in establishing institutional ways of monitoring the assessment of learning outcomes work that is necessarily done at the faculty level. The centralized reporting system, begun in Fall 2012 and improved upon in Spring 2013, promotes dialogue among and across discipline faculty, and provides administration with means of ensuring that this work is being done. However, the College will need to maintain the momentum begun in Fall 2012 and continue to make improvements to the centralized reporting system. These improvements will assist faculty in their learning outcomes assessment work and will continue to provide the institution an ability to ensure that that work is taking place.

II.A.2.b. 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>Continue to make improvements to the centralized reporting system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2.c. High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.

II.A.2.c. Descriptive Summary. The College has a well-developed process for the creation of new courses and programs. All certificate and degree programs are developed by faculty and presented by departments to the Curriculum Committee for approval using the Committee’s formal review process, as detailed in Standard II.A.2.a. Program proposals are prepared in accordance with the standards published in the Curriculum Handbook, which includes identification of the proposed program’s overall learning outcomes and an identification of whether the program is credit or noncredit [II A-14 p. 5-58]. The Curriculum Committee reviews program proposals against these standards, ensuring that all instructional programs meet the standards of high-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The Office of Matriculation works closely with department faculty to ensure that all course and program prerequisites and corequisites are in compliance with applicable Title 5 requirements. These prerequisites and corequisites are then reviewed and are approved by the Curriculum Committee. Relevant student success data are provided by the Office of Research and Planning to assist in the identification of appropriate communication and computation prerequisites. Approved programs are forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final local approval.
External approval by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office is required of all of the College’s degree programs, all of its noncredit certificate programs, and many of its credit certificate programs. The California Community College Program and Course Approval Handbook establishes the criteria for State Chancellor’s Office approval of programs. To gain approval, the College must demonstrate that the proposed program meets curriculum standards that show the integration of courses in the program, so that students fulfilling program requirements will meet program goals and objectives.

### 2010-11 Credit Student Opinion Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Quality of Instruction</th>
<th>Content of Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is some natural institutional dialogue that occurs between the Curriculum Committee, department chairs, and discipline faculty as courses and programs are brought to the Curriculum Committee for approval.

The College relies primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty to decide the breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, synthesis of learning breadth of each program it offers. Again, see previous descriptions of the Curriculum Committee process, and the criteria that the Curriculum Committee uses when reviewing courses and programs, as identified in Chapter 9 of the Curriculum Handbook.

The Curriculum Committee uses the requirements of Title 5 section 55002 when reviewing courses. This section sets different standards for different types of courses (and, by extension, programs), and provides several criteria to identify depth and rigor.

For degree-applicable courses, the Curriculum Committee uses the following:

- **Intensity.** The course treats subject matter with a scope and intensity that requires students to study independently outside of class time. 55002(a)(2)(C)

- **Difficulty.** The course work calls for critical thinking and the understanding and application of concepts determined by the curriculum committee to be at college level. 55002(a)(2)(F)

- **Level.** The course requires learning skills and a vocabulary that the curriculum committee deems appropriate for a college course. 55002(a)(2)(G)

For nondegree-applicable courses, the Curriculum Committee uses the following:

- **Intensity.** The course provides instruction in critical thinking and generally treats subject matter with a scope and intensity that prepares students to study independently outside of class time and includes reading and writing assignments and homework. In particular, the assignments will be sufficiently rigorous that students successfully completing each such course, or sequence of required courses, will have
acquired the skills necessary to successfully complete degree-applicable work.  
55002(b)(2)(C)

There is no parallel language for noncredit courses.

The Curriculum Committee review of programs involves a review of the courses in a 
particular program. Nearly all credit programs (certificates and degrees) consist solely of 
degree-applicable coursework.

The Curriculum Committee review of courses compares the learning outcomes, content, and 
methodology to the Title 5 requirements for courses, as noted above.

II.A.2.c. Self Evaluation. The College has a well-defined Curriculum review and approval 
process that ensures that all courses and programs are designed to have appropriate breadth, 
depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The criteria used by 
the Curriculum Committee are derived from various sources; including Title 5.

The College relies primarily on faculty to make specific determinations based on their 
subject matter expertise. The judgment of the faculty is balanced with the review of the 
College’s Curriculum Committee.

While the Curriculum Committee process is robust, there is limited evidence of institutional 
dialogue that has “occurred to enhance understanding and agreement about the quality and 
level of its programs.” The dialogue that occurs at Curriculum Committee meetings is good, 
but is focused on the matters at hand, and does not promote good cross-disciplinary dialogue.

II.A.2.c. 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>Provide additional opportunities for institutional dialogue to enhance understanding and agreement about program quality and level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2.d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

II.A.2.d. Descriptive Summary. Through the application to CCSF and the information forms completed during placement testing, the institution collects information about student needs that may affect their learning. Faculty are responsible for identifying the learning styles of their students and responding accordingly in the way they deliver and conduct classroom instruction and activities. The institution has not engaged in a centralized or systematic effort for identifying and/or documenting learning styles at regular intervals. However, faculty use a variety of teaching techniques and delivery modes to best serve the diverse needs and learning styles of their students. These methodologies are discussed campus wide in the College Curriculum Committee as course proposals are reviewed for approval. Discussions about appropriate delivery modes and teaching methodologies begin at the department and program levels at department curriculum committees or workgroups and various faculty forums. These discussions often lead to changes and innovative practices, as documented in the approved Course Outline of Record.
thus does not capture information on an institutional level about the extent to which this
preliminary assessment takes place.

With respect to acknowledging that learning needs vary and delivering instruction that meets
these varied needs, certain initiatives have provided professional development workshops to
faculty to develop their understanding of the diversity of students’ learning needs and
responsive pedagogical approaches. For example, every year, the Multicultural Infusion
Project (MIP) helps selected instructors modify their teaching methods to increase their focus
on culturally relevant pedagogy. They share these concepts within their departments to
encourage other faculty to do the same. To date, 165 faculty have been trained and 24 faculty
have received mini grants to implement project ideas [II A.44].

In addition, start of semester FLEX workshops include sessions on multiple learning styles
and diverse pedagogical approaches. Various departments have hosted other periodic
workshops that are open to all faculty for sharing of best practices and new pedagogies. For
example, the science departments have led workshops on using iClickers, mouse tablets, and
reaching D and F students. Web pages for these workshops have allowed for dissemination
to those who couldn’t attend.

With respect to online and hybrid courses, the Education Technology Department offers
workshops on the use of Moodle as well as workshops on the use of Google apps for
improved student learning.

**Determination of Delivery Modes for Instruction.** The College relies primarily on the subject
matter expertise of discipline faculty to determine the delivery modes that are appropriate for
students. Basic delivery modes (lecture, lab, conference) are documented in the Course
Outline of Record, which is approved by the College’s Curriculum Committee.

In addition, when a department wishes to explore a Distance Education delivery mode, it is
subject to separate review and approval by the Curriculum Committee via the Distance
Education Addendum. This addendum (a) requires the department to justify why the
Distance Education mode is appropriate for the course, (b) has the department detail the
changes in the instructional methodology including the frequency and mechanisms of
student-instructor contact, and (c) has the department detail how evaluation integrity will be
maintained.

**Teaching Methodologies.** Courses vary in their main delivery mechanism, including lecture,
laboratory, practicums, field work, internships, work experience, and conference. Within
the general category of lecture or conference there is latitude for the use of in-class
discussions and small group work. There are a small number of internship/work experience
courses as well. Teaching methodologies vary by department and instructor and include a
range of techniques from 100% lecture to 100% hands-on projects and activities. Faculty
share practices at FLEX events and in informal brown bag lunch discussions, such as this
past semester’s start of the “Teaching Sustainability across the Curriculum” brown bag
series.

Discipline faculty **select determine** the methodologies they deem appropriate for the
discipline and the content of the courses they are teaching, and they document these
methodologies in the Course Outline of Record, which the Curriculum Committee reviews
and approves.
A primary focus of Curriculum Committee review of proposed course outlines is the adequacy and “fit” between Instructional Methodology (Assignments, Evaluation, Instructional Materials) and the major learning outcomes and content of the course.

The majority of instructional programs and departments regularly discuss the effectiveness of current delivery modes and instructional methodologies. Evidence of this is seen in the numerous proposals for revisions to the Instructional Methodology section of course outlines that are approved at every College Curriculum Committee meeting (documented on the Curriculum Committee website). Revisions to Instructional Methodology requires discussion and consensus among the department chair, faculty who teach the course, and school dean.

With respect to acknowledging that learning needs vary and delivering instruction that meets these varied needs, certain initiatives and departmental workshops have helped to faculty to develop their understanding of the diversity of students’ learning needs and responsive pedagogical approaches. For example, every year, the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) helps selected instructors modify their teaching methods to increase their focus on culturally relevant pedagogy. They share these concepts within their departments to encourage other faculty to do the same. To date, 95 faculty have been trained and 24 faculty have received mini grants to implement project ideas.

In addition, college-wide, professional-development FLEX workshops at the start of each semester include sessions on multiple learning styles and diverse pedagogical approaches. Various departments have hosted other periodic workshops that are open to all faculty for sharing of best practices and new pedagogies. For example, the science departments have led workshops on using iClickers, mouse tablets, and reaching D and F students. Web pages for these workshops have allowed for dissemination to those who couldn’t attend. With respect to online and hybrid courses, the Education Technology Department offers workshops on the use of Moodle as well as workshops on the use of Google apps for improved student learning. In addition there are two faculty online discussion boards titled, “Tool Tips and Tricks - share any tips on how you’ve used a tool in your course” and “Instructional Tips and Tricks - share any tips and ideas you have for setting up your course or things you’ve addressed with students in your course that may assist other instructors.” Finally, the DSPS program will also work one on one with faculty to meet the specific needs of disabled students. While there have been some efforts made by discipline faculty to match methodologies to the particular needs of students’ learning styles, the College does not have a systematic way in which it centrally assesses changes in student learning styles and promotes delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

Assessing Student Learning: Faculty use a variety of ways to assess the level of student learning that takes place as a result of instruction, as documented in the Instructional Methodology section of the official Course Outlines of Record.

Learning assessment methods include:

- Quizzes, tests, and exams
- Essays and papers
- Projects
- Oral presentations
Assessment of in-class discussions

[Course Outlines provide examples; guidance for this section is included in Section 2.3.8 of the College’s Curriculum Handbook]

Effectiveness of Delivery Modes and Instructional Methodologies. Although there has been no College-wide collaborative effort to investigate the effectiveness of delivery modes or instructional methodologies generally, faculty conversations about student learning outcomes resulting from particular delivery modes or instructional methodologies have, in some cases, ignited a desire among faculty to try new strategies. Examples of new strategies include the “accelerated course” options offered in the English and Math program sequences, which provide students an intensified learning experience. Adoption of this methodology was a data-driven decision, based on the College Researcher’s findings that intensity of study in a discipline leads to increased success.

Moreover, a number of faculty attend national meetings on new teaching delivery modes identified elsewhere as effective, which they have embedded in their classrooms. An example of this is “flipping” classes, a delivery method that engages students in learning content outside of the classroom through videos and other online or print resources and then focuses classroom time on applying that learning. This method has been in existence for some time and employed in a number of classes across the College. Faculty currently using this process offered a January 2012 FLEX workshop on this topic.

At the department level, the effectiveness of specific teaching methodologies and modes of delivery is directly observed and evaluated through the regular evaluation process of full-time and part-time faculty (every three years, and for six consecutive semesters for faculty undergoing tenure review). These team observations provide important opportunities for the faculty reviewing team, the department chair, and evaluator to engage in frank, constructive dialog about techniques, assignments, materials, and other pedagogy that are working or which need improvement. The instructor evaluation process is also an opportunity for the department to observe and evaluate, across classes and instructors, the merits of a variety of teaching methodologies and modes of delivery.

The College has also paid particular attention to the effectiveness of its distance education delivery mode. The Educational Technology Department routinely compares retention rates and success rates of the College’s online offerings to more traditional offerings, and also compares with other community colleges. The College also participates in the State Chancellor’s Office assessments of students who withdraw from online courses to gather additional information.

II.A.2.d. Self Evaluation. The College has conducted limited centralized assessments of student learning styles. In addition, while there have been some departmental level discussions of matching methodologies to learning styles, these discussions have not occurred consistently across disciplines, system-wide, been broad-based. Any assessments that have taken place are those that individual faculty members or small groups of discipline faculty workgroups have performed. Such assessments should be expanded and collegewide and discussions should be documented, has not occurred.

The College uses a well-developed process to determine delivery modes for courses, including Distance Education. Although the College has diverse ways of assessing student
learning, and while faculty increasingly use the results of those assessments to improve teaching, the College has not systematically investigated the effectiveness of delivery modes or instructional methodologies using assessment results institutionwide. An exception, however, is in the realm of Distance Education, on which the educational Technology Department does perform ongoing assessment.

The College has relied primarily on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty to develop instructional methodologies that are appropriate to students. In many all cases, faculty successfully link their content expertise to pedagogical methods; it is assumed, however, that faculty all possess this “pedagogical content knowledge,” yet the College has never verified that this is true. The demanding CCSF hiring process, our professional development requirements, and the faculty evaluation process in the faculty contract Article 9 ensure that the faculty’s pedagogical content knowledge is current and extensive.

**II.A.2.d. 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>We should have a regular survey of our students to ask about learning styles they find to be effective. Obtain student descriptions of their learning styles and the teaching methodologies and delivery modes that best facilitate their learning.</td>
<td>Regularly survey our students about their learning styles and the teaching methodologies and delivery modes that best facilitate their learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the College’s commitment to the assessment of learning outcomes, the effectiveness of new and existing teaching methodologies and delivery modes will be evaluated.</td>
<td>Regularly survey our students about teaching methodologies and delivery modes they find to be effective/ineffective. Can include this question on the teacher evaluation that is given to students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden our SLO assessment efforts to include discussion of and professional development opportunities for sharing new teaching techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create professional development opportunities on a more regular basis (in Spring we plan to have one every week at a variety of time and campuses and across a variety of topics).</td>
<td>Develop electronic forums for sharing best practices. Such as the distance learning discussion boards: “Tool Tips and Tricks - Instructional Tips and Tricks.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage on-house talent to share Expand the sharing and adoption of best practices across the college through workshops and web resources.</td>
<td>Create an online reporting system to facilitate participation in professional development requirements for new and continuing faculty (at least full-timers) to learn about learning styles and pedagogy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would also be great to make Achieve 100% participation in professional development requirements for new and continuing faculty (at least full-timers) to learn about learning styles and pedagogy.</td>
<td>Create an online reporting system to facilitate the requirement that faculty submit evidence of participation to the office of the Dean of HR in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II.A.2.e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an ongoing systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.**
II.A.2.e. **Descriptive Summary.** The responsibility for course and program assessment lies with discipline faculty, who determine appropriate learning outcomes, develop assessment methods and criteria, administer assessments and evaluate the results, and plan and implement curricular changes.

Course assessment methods include assessments that are part of the instructional methodology of the course and used for student evaluation (e.g., exams, papers, quizzes) and other in-class assessments used solely for learning outcomes assessment (e.g., pre- and post-tests, student surveys). Faculty also use external assessments, such as licensure examination pass rates, job placement data, and transfer data.

Plans for outcome assessment and overall results are now posted on departmental web pages. The use of departmental web pages also helps promote dialogue among discipline faculty, across disciplines, and college-wide. The College monitors outcomes assessment through the use of a centralized reporting system, which the College first piloted in Fall 2012, and has implemented an updated system for Spring 2013. The updated system requires faculty to report on plans for assessment activities for courses and programs in the coming semester, and to report on the results of outcomes assessment for the previous semester. Reporting is required for all courses offered in a given semester and for all programs. Prior to this, there was no centralized requirement for documentation. As such, the faculty focus on assessing SLOs to evaluate courses and programs with an eye toward program improvement varied. With the new centralized, online reporting system, the institution as a whole will have a more comprehensive sense of effectiveness.

Moreover, the College’s Annual Unit-level Program Review, followed by all units at the College, requires units to:

- **Reflect on data trends** (Program Review form, Question #2). For units that offer courses and programs, those data trends include program award data.
- **Reflect on internal and external trends** (Program Review form, Question #3). Units can use this section to discuss the relevancy, appropriateness, and currency of their program and external needs to update courses and programs.
- **Summarize overall directions taken as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes** (Program Review form, Question #4).
- **Set planning objectives for the coming year** (Program Review form, Question #6).

To respond to Program Review prompts, units with courses are provided with the following data:

- Student success data, including grade point average and percentage of units passed. This data is reported for departments as a whole, and is also disaggregated by age, ethnicity, BOGG waiver status, and gender.
- Program Award data (number of certificates and degrees issued by the College).
- Demographic Data, again by age, ethnicity, BOGG waiver status, and gender.
- Enrollment data, including the demand for courses and sections.

Note: while the data on student success noted above is reported for the department as a whole, the data noted here allows departments to drill down on the same data to
subjects and courses. In addition, the student success data is available for drill down via the College’s Decision Support System, which will soon be replaced by ARGOS which will modernize this process. For example, departments have been able to investigate course success overall and by various student demographics including age, gender, ethnicity, basic skills level, new first time status, returning student, educational goal, etcetera. With ARGOS, departments will have easier access to this information.


With respect to the appropriateness of program offerings as part of the overall college curriculum, the annual program review requires units to provide a description of the program services and locations (Program Review form, Question #1). In the guidelines for this question, units are directed to identify how the unit’s services align with the College’s Mission. In addition, the question about resource allocation requires units to tie requests to the Board’s priorities and/or to overall College plans (Program Review form, Question #8).

**Program Relevance and Learning Outcomes.** The responsibility for determining program relevancy lies primarily with discipline faculty. Faculty have identified SLOs for all certificate programs, degree programs, and the General Education program. Work on identifying program-level learning outcomes was largely concluded in Fall 2012. Assessment of program-level learning outcomes has been in progress for some of the programs at the College for a number of years. As noted above, the College has set an expectation of reporting every semester on assessment plans for all programs. The achievement of learning outcomes varies from program to program: the SLO website documents learning outcomes by program.

[evidence: www.ccsf.edu/slo]

**The Link Between Program Evaluation Results and Institutional Planning.** As noted above, the annual program review system is directly connected to institutional planning, particularly through the revised Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting timeline and process.

Some notable examples of changes/improvements made as a result of the program review system are (insert items that we can collect by the end of January when we have departments report extensively on program-level SLO assessment results).

Examples of program changes made as a result of outcomes assessment are shown on departmental web pages.

II.A.2.e. Self Evaluation. The College has well-developed processes for course and program assessment, and has recently developed ways in which the institution ensures that these processes are done across the College. Reporting on the processes for course and program assessment (i.e. program review) are included in the College’s Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting cycle. The criteria used in the annual program review system is evenly applied across the College and includes relevancy, appropriateness, achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, and planning for the future. Although the annual program review system includes a wealth of data, challenges continue in the interpretation and use of this data.
The College should more obviously tie the evaluation of CTE program relevance into the annual program review system, by including labor market information and asking CTE programs to comment specifically on the trends in the labor market, on the number of program completers, and the impact of the program on completers.

The College recently received data from the RP Group’s completer/leaver survey. The annual program review process should include these data to assist in evaluating program relevance.

II.A.2.e. 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 College needs to continue integrating the annual program review system into planning and budgeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to enhance the data used in examining the relevance of CTE programs to include labor market data and the RP Group’s Completer/Leaver survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College is going to transition to using ARGOS reporting to allow better use of data during Program Review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2.f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

II.A.2.f. Descriptive Summary. The College has an integrated annual cycle of evaluation and planning that includes Unit-Level Program Review. The Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Cycle is part of a larger process of Planning, derived from Strategic Planning and the Board’s periodic review of the College’s Mission and Vision statements.

Assuring Course and Program Currency through Integrated Planning. The unit-level program review process asks units to reflect on overall departmental directions that have occurred as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes. While reporting on major directions taken as a result of the assessment of learning outcomes has been included in the annual program review process since 2008-09, and while the assessment of learning outcomes has taken place since before then, the College has more recently (Fall 2012) embarked on a more thorough centralized system of planning and reporting on SLO assessment work. The College uses the SLO web site to centralize information about this process, to collect data, and to report on the results.

The Fall 2012 centralized reporting system asked departments to report on learning outcomes assessment efforts for every course being offered. The Spring 2013 system is more widespread, and requires reporting on both efforts that occurred in Fall 2012 and plans for efforts in Spring 2013:
- 1st DRAFT January 18, 2013 – Update 5 with change requests Acad Sen

- Academic Departments report on every course being offered and every program, including certificates, majors, and disciplines that do not have a major or certificate.
- In General Education, we are embarking on a more widespread pilot for CCSF General Education Area C.
- The expanded system also involves student development and other services. It is truly the College’s one central system.

**Improving Outcomes and Making Results Available.** The College systematically strives to improve outcomes by requiring reporting on assessment work, both in a macro sense through the annual program review system, and on a more micro sense through the every-semester reporting and planning system. Much of the work for improvement is done at the unit level, and does not require additional resources. For those improvements that require additional resources, the integration of the reporting on major directions taken into the annual Program Review process affords units the opportunity to tie resource requests to those improvement efforts. The SLO web site and the departmental web sites are the central locations for making the results of learning outcomes assessment available to appropriate constituencies.

**II.A.2.f. Self Evaluation.** The College has a well-developed system of integrated assessment, planning, and budgeting. The annual Program Review process is the centerpiece of the annual cycle, and has been going on in its current form since 2008-09. Throughout Summer and Fall 2012, the College has further refined the planning and budgeting system along with the Program Review template to ensure that it is a fully integrated system.

While the College has asked about learning outcomes assessment in the annual Program Review system since 2008-09, it was not an effective way of ensuring that learning outcomes assessment was widespread. The College has made great strides in the last year in creating a separate centralized reporting system. In addition to ensuring that outcomes assessment is widespread, this system has been very effective in making outcomes assessment work visible and promoting intra- and inter-departmental dialogue.

The annual Program Review system is the main vehicle by which departments can make resource requests. While this system provides the framework by which outcomes improvement efforts that require additional resources can be funded, it is too early to determine how effective this will be.

**II.A.2.f. 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>An evaluation of the 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the College continues its efforts to improve its centralized reporting system on learning outcomes assessment work, it must also</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.A.2.g. If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.

II.A.2.g. Descriptive Summary. During Fall 2010, all instructional departments were surveyed to assess which departments were using common examinations and assessments. The following courses were reported to have common exams or common assessments:

- Broadcasting 119, 120
- Chemistry 101A, 101B
- Fire Science 111
- English 90, 91, 93, 95X, 96, 961A
- English as a Second Language 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, 160, 170; Noncredit Levels 2, 4, 6
- Spanish 1, 1A and French 1, 4A, 1B, 2, 2B

Departments making use of cross-section assessments were asked how the validity of these measures had been established, and how cultural and linguistic biases were avoided in the creation and administration of the tests.

Departments have approached these questions in different ways. Fire Science, for example, uses a common test bank for Fire Science 111, with computerized randomization of questions from a database. Broadcast Electronic Media Arts uses common midterm and final exams in addition to common lab projects. Examination questions are continually vetted and refined during faculty meetings, and lab projects are all graded using a common rubric [II A-56 p. 2, 4].

The CCSF ESL Department maintains a promotion test program that is administered to noncredit students in Levels 2, 4, and 6 (matching the California State Department of Education’s Model Standards levels) to determine achievement of course SLOs and readiness for advancement. The exams utilized in the program were developed by CCSF faculty and are both valid and reliable. Testing is standardized and carefully monitored, and records kept of student results.

In credit ESL courses, students take common final examinations at each level assessing reading, grammar, and writing [II A-57 p. 8]. Predictive validity for reading and grammar questions was demonstrated through significant correlations between test scores and subsequent success in general courses. The writing components, graded holistically, are grounded by the use of rubrics and anchor papers. All questions are panel-written by diverse faculty to avoid cultural and linguistic biases, and revised during a final editing process.

The English Department uses a variety of common assessments in its courses. English 90 and 91 require a common portfolio for promotion into subsequent courses. These portfolios, based on essays, annotated readings, and a cover letter, make use of one essay and one reading common to all sections. The English faculty use a common rubric for grading and
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grade portfolios as a group, using two raters to minimize differences between instructors and a third reader in the event of discrepancies. English 92, 93, 96, 1A, 1B, and 1C go through cycles of evaluation for assessment purposes and to guide the three-year course revision process. These may be common summaries, common essays, specific targeted strategies, reading, testing, et cetera. The new accelerated/intensive courses, English 95X and English 961A, will be going through a three-year assessment process from Spring 2011 to Spring 2013, using many of the above-mentioned practices [II A-23 p. 6, 13-14].

In French and Spanish courses, instructors make use of a common bank of test sections to minimize differences in assessment between instructors, and work is currently underway in Foreign Languages courses to incorporate common elements into final examinations.

Chemistry 101A sections use common, team-written questions for the midterm examination, and all students in these courses take the same final examination. Chemistry 101B sections share common portions of the final examination. These common materials have been developed by faculty consensus over time, and faculty conduct regular revision, looking for flawed or biased items and taking into account how different student populations are performing.

Many departments responding to the survey indicated some reliance upon nationally-vetted textbook question banks written by experts in the respective fields, or norming to criteria of professional organizations, as ways to help minimize bias in tests. There is, however, recognition that these materials, though they minimize differences between college instructors, have inherent biases. Departments therefore take full advantage of CCSF’s diverse faculty to attenuate these problems. Faculty indicate that when an exam item is deemed to demonstrate bias, it is removed from examinations through faculty consensus.

Although not linked to exiting a course, placement testing is worthy of mention since it is an assessment of knowledge of skills prerequisite to courses in the College’s Mathematics, English, ESL, and Chemistry curricula. The purpose of course placement testing is to determine the correct level course in which a student should begin his/her studies in order to increase the likelihood of success.

All College placement testing in these subjects has been validated by the Matriculation Office and the Office of Research and Planning for predictive validity, reliability, and bias as stipulated by Title 5 placement assessment standards. Furthermore, these tests are continually reviewed and refined in order to maintain content and cut-score validity and to watch for disproportionate impact. During the assessment process multiple measures are used to produce initial placement in the Mathematics, English and ESL curricula. Counselors and Mathematics, ESL and English department faculty use placement test results to recommend appropriate course enrollment. Other tests and student assessments given by instructional departments advise students of curricula and course sequences in their respective departments.

II.A.2.g Self Evaluation. Some academic programs, such as credit and noncredit ESL, which move large numbers of the College’s students through well-defined sequences, are making use of common examinations that are statistically validated. Many more departments and academic units are moving toward common examinations, when appropriate, as a way to help gauge attainment of student learning outcomes. In these cases, effort is made to minimize biases and increase the validity of the results.
II.A.2.g. 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2.h. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

II.A.2.h. Descriptive Summary. Each course has a set of learning outcomes identified on the official Course Outline of Record. The Course Outline of Record also specifies the hours and units associated with the course. In its review of course outlines, the Curriculum Committee examines the content, hours, and units, and ensures that they are justified (see Curriculum Handbook, Chapter 9, Table 9-2).

The College awards credit in accordance with Title 5 Section 55002.5 and Title 5 Section 55256.5. This definition is in accordance with the Federal definition of a credit hour as stated in 34 CFR 600.2. The ratios of hours to units are specified in the Curriculum Handbook, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.4.

II.A.2.h. Self Evaluation. The College awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes and awards units of credit in a manner consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

II.A.2.h. 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.

II.A.2.i. Descriptive Summary. The institution ensures that achievement of stated programmatic learning outcomes are the basis for awarding certificates and degrees. Specifically, in the case of certificates:

- All certificates have an identified set of learning outcomes, as required by Chapter 5 of the Curriculum Handbook, and as shown in the College Catalog.
The Curriculum Committee requires that departments show how the learning outcomes for the certificate map to the required courses, and requires that students are able to show mastery of the stated learning outcomes through this coursework (measured at the classroom level via assignments, surveys, exams and so on as specified in Standard II.A.2.e.) regardless of any course options the student may have in satisfying certificate requirements. Details are in the Curriculum Handbook.

In the case of degrees:

- Students getting an Associate Degree must satisfy a set of requirements, as outlined in the “Associate Degree Graduation Requirements” section of the College Catalog. These requirements include General Education requirements and Major requirements.

For General Education:

- Students completing the AA or AS degrees meet local CCSF GE requirements, which have a set of learning outcomes determined by the College. Each of the courses that meet CCSF local GE requirements has been mapped to those outcomes.
- Students completing the AA-T or AS-T degrees meet the GE requirements by satisfying the CSU GE or IGETC patterns. While learning outcomes have not been identified in the College for these patterns, the inclusion of courses into these areas is determined by the UC and CSU systems, using the courses’ SLOs as noted in the course outlines.

For majors:

- Regardless of the type of degree pursued (AA/AS vs. AA-T/AS-T), students must also satisfy the major requirement.
- For majors specified by a department or for the Areas of Emphasis of the Liberal Arts and Sciences Degree, learning outcomes have been identified and mapped to the required courses, in accord with Chapter 4 of the Curriculum Handbook.
- As with certificates, students must show mastery of the stated program learning outcomes regardless of course options used in satisfying the major requirements.

In Fall 2012 the College reviewed all of its certificates and majors, and departments were required to show how the courses required for these programs mapped to the program learning outcomes. The College’s Curriculum Committee reviewed the mapping documents. In its review, the Curriculum Committee developed an initial set of institutional expectations for the learning expected of students completing certificate or major requirements.

The College first established the learning outcomes for its local General Education pattern in 2008. In Fall 2012, the College reviewed all of the courses applicable to the General Education areas, mapping them to the learning outcomes. This process generated significant discussion about the learning outcomes, some updates to the outcomes themselves, and updated processes regarding the inclusion of courses in the General Education areas (see minutes of October 2012 Bipartite Committee meeting).

[Evidence: Minutes of the October 2012 Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.]
Identification of Learning Outcomes. For certificates and majors, the College relies on discipline faculty to determine the learning outcomes. These learning outcomes are presented along with the required courses when a certificate or major is presented to the Curriculum Committee for approval.

The learning outcomes for the College’s local General Education pattern were developed by faculty from the relevant GE areas and approved by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements in 2008. These learning outcomes were assessed in Fall 2012 via a process of mapping individual courses to those learning outcomes and a self-assessment of the alignment between these courses and the learning outcomes.

II.A.2.i Self Evaluation. The College’s Curriculum Committee has well-defined processes for ensuring that learning outcomes are identified for certificates and majors and for ensuring that students have opportunities to master each one of these learning outcomes regardless of course options used in satisfying major or certificate requirements. The College’s process for identifying student learning outcomes relies on the subject matter expertise of discipline faculty, and, where relevant, industry input through advisory groups.

The process undertaken in Fall 2012 of mapping courses to the learning outcomes of the local General Education pattern generated robust dialogue about these outcomes, as shown in the minutes of the October 2012 Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. This dialogue included updates to the General Education outcomes themselves and some updated processes for inclusion of courses into the GE areas.

[Evidence: Minutes of the October 2012 Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.]

The College has been required to offer Associate Degrees for Transfer, which has different General Education course requirements. Legislation mandates the General Education pattern used in Associate Degrees for Transfer, and the decision on the inclusion of courses into the CSU GE and IGETC patterns is largely outside of the control of local faculty. The College has not identified SLOs for this GE pattern since changes to this pattern are enacted externally.

[The College also allows students to satisfy the major requirement of the Associate Degree by taking 18 units in a field of study when a major has not been specified by the department. In these cases, learning outcomes have not been identified for the set of courses a student might take in satisfying the major requirement. However, learning outcomes have been identified for these disciplines, those learning outcomes have been mapped to discipline coursework, and that mapping has been reviewed by the Curriculum Committee.]

II.A.2.i 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 College needs to examine its practice of allowing students to satisfy the major requirement by taking 18 units in a particular field of study when no major has been specified by the department. While learning outcomes have been identified for those disciplines, there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.A.3. The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.

General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including the following:

II.A.3.a. An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

II.A.3.b. A capability to be a productive individual and life-long learner: skills include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means.

II.A.3.c. A recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen: qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally.

II.A.3. Descriptive Summary. Students completing the Associate Degree have two different options for satisfying General Education requirements:

- Those completing the Associate in Arts or Associate in Science degrees follow the College’s locally developed General Education pattern
- Those completing the Associate in Arts for Transfer or Associate in Science for Transfer follow either the CSU GE or IGETC patterns

See the “Associate Degree Graduation Requirements” section of the College Catalog for details.

As the General Education pattern for the Associate Degrees for Transfer have been dictated by legislation, there is not a local faculty-developed rationale for that pattern per se, but the areas largely overlap the College’s local areas. The legislation for the Associate Degrees for Transfer (SB 1440) prevents the College from establishing additional graduation requirements beyond what is stated in the Catalog. As such, it is somewhat difficult to show certain elements of the accreditation standards (e.g., II.A.3.c, regarding ethics and citizenship).

The local General Education requirements have been developed in accord with Title 5 Section 55061 et seq., which require some of the elements noted in the Accreditation Standards.

Evidence for a faculty-developed rationale for the local General Education pattern includes:

Comment [AcadSen11]: Need to Check Title 5, Pretty sure this option for students is required by Title 5.
Page 46 of the 2012-13 College Catalog contains “Goals of the General Education Program.” These goals are taken from the Academic Senate.

In addition, each of the General Education areas has its own set of learning outcomes, also printed in the Catalog.

The procedures of the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements require departments submitting courses for inclusion in a general education area to show how the course meets the goals and the learning outcomes of the requested area.

New rules adopted in Fall 2012 by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements require departments submitting courses for consideration for inclusion in general education to show how the course maps to the area under consideration. (we need to update the Bipartite Committee Handbook to reflect this change)

The Catalog includes not only the local General Education goals but also information about the inclusion of courses, which is also part of other student publications, including the 32,000+ CCSF GE/grad worksheets that are produced and disseminated annually.

The General Education philosophy is reflected in the degree requirements by virtue of requiring all students seeking the Associate Degree to meet the General Education requirements.

II.A.3.a. Descriptive Summary. Discipline faculty, who are subject matter experts in their fields, develop courses in these areas. The College relies on these discipline faculty to determine the basic content and methodology of these areas. Before a course is included in one of the General Education areas it is reviewed and approved by the College’s Curriculum Committee and the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.

Departments submit courses to the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. The submission process requires departments to show how the course meets the Goals of the General Education program, the related inclusion criteria, and the learning outcomes of that area. The members of the Bipartite Committee review the application and the approved Course Outline of Record to make their determination about course inclusion.

The College has had limited pilot efforts at assessing the General Education learning outcomes. In Fall 2012 the College reviewed all courses applicable to General Education, mapping the learning outcomes of the courses to the learning outcomes for the applicable GE area and assessing the fit between them. With this mapping process completed, a more robust effort at assessing the GE SLOs is planned for Spring 2013.

It is useful to also note that faculty are evaluated by students, both for tenure and in three-year cycles, for, among other abilities, how well they connect course material to other courses and disciplines, which speaks to the college’s concern that students make connections between disciplines and learn to recognize and acquire knowledge through a variety of means. Many faculty also take this feedback and adjust their course designs for improvement based on student feedback.

At this time, the College does not have a system for evaluating how well students who have completed general education coursework are able to apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors.
II.A.3.b. Descriptive Summary. The assumption is that, by requiring GE students to complete coursework in different GE areas where achievement of these capabilities and skills is assessed, they will attain the skills to be productive individuals and life-long learners.

The College’s local General Education Program includes required coursework in areas that are applicable to becoming a productive and life-long learner:

- Area A: Communication and Analytical Thinking
- Area B: Written Composition
- Area C: Natural Sciences, which includes a learning outcome on communicating scientific ideas and theories effectively
  - Area D, E and F should be added—these areas teach us how to be good citizens, community members and human beings.
- Area G: Health Knowledge and Physical Skills
- Area H: Ethnic, Women’s, and LGBT Studies

For quantitative reasoning, there is also a Mathematics graduation requirement. The College’s Written Composition requirement is satisfied by taking English 1A. This English course requires students to take workshops in the library, developing student’s information competency and their ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means.

The Noncredit Division of the ESL Dept. prepares students to be productive individuals and life-long learners through their course offerings which encompass oral and written communication. The General ESL courses (ESLN) 1-9 include both oral and written communication in the course outlines. The ESL Focus classes (ESLF) focus on individual skill areas. For example, ESLF 3789- Intermediate High Writing, ESLF 3584- Pronunciation, or ESLF 3347- Beginning High Speaking. The ESL Vocational Courses (ESLV) teach communication skills in the workplace (ESLV 3801) and specifically for Healthcare workers (ESLV 3844). Computer literacy is also offered to non-native speakers through the ESL Bridge to Computers course (ESLB 3821). Please refer to the CCSF website and check the City College Noncredit ESL course outlines.

Each of the GE areas mentioned above has its own inclusion criteria and learning outcomes. The same Curriculum Committee and Bipartite processes are used for these courses as well, assuring that the skill levels meet collegiate standards and are included in course outlines. Measurement of student skills varies from course to course, and is reflected in the Evaluation section of the approved Course Outline of Record. The College’s Curriculum Committee processes ensure that the measures are effective.

As noted in the answer to II.A.3.b, the College has had limited pilot efforts in assessing the learning outcomes of General Education coursework—some pilots (and their cumulating assessments) including the English Department’s Accelerated program and course offerings of English 92/93 and English 96/1A and the Health Education Department’s Metropolitan Academy program—a learning community joining GEs with Public Health and Social Justice courses and facilitates CCSF student transfer to SFSU—for five years. Recently, the Metro Academy program has branched out to include Early Childhood Development majors. Again, despite these pilot programs that have been assessing student learning outcomes, the...
College does not have a comprehensive approach to evaluating how well students who have completed General Education coursework are able to apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors.

**Descriptive Summary II.A.3.c.** The College included learning outcomes related to ethics and effective citizenship with the creation of GE areas that went beyond the requirements of Title 5 Section 55063:

- The College’s local General Education pattern includes Area F, United States History and Government. As noted in the learning outcomes for this area, courses satisfying this requirement allow students to “examine and understand the importance of participating in civic duties and responsibilities based on historical and political precedent”

- In addition, the College’s local GE pattern includes Area H, Ethnic/Women’s/LGBT studies. This local requirement reflects the College’s commitment to graduating students that have an appreciation and understanding of the history, culture, and perspective of diverse groups.

- It is noteworthy that faculty are hired and evaluated for tenure (also by the students) based on the questions regarding how well they demonstrate sensitivity in working with students, faculty, and staff from diverse backgrounds and how well their curricula represents contributors of various perspectives and backgrounds.

**II.A.3.a-c. Self Evaluation.** The College has a faculty-developed rationale for GE that serves as the basis for course inclusion. The College has a well-defined process for course inclusion in General Education that takes learning outcomes into account. The rationale for GE is well communicated, and accurately reflected in degree requirements for those students pursuing the Associate Degree.

Those students pursuing the Associate Degree for Transfer satisfy their General Education requirements by completing either the CSU GE or IGETC patterns. While there is no faculty-developed rationale for this GE pattern per se, there is much overlap in the structure of these GE patterns. The legislation that created the Associate Degrees for Transfer prohibits the College from including any other requirements. As a result, there are elements of the local philosophy of GE that are not reflected in these requirements.

The College has a well-defined process to determine the basic content and methodology of traditional areas of knowledge and to ensure that all GE courses include this content and methodology. The College needs to build upon the work being conducted in Spring 2013 and develop sustainable assessments of GE outcomes. This process needs to also capture external assessments of how well students apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors.

Students following the College’s local GE pattern have a well-defined path to learning about ethics and effective citizenship. Those students pursuing an Associate Degree for Transfer do not necessarily take courses in these areas, but the legislation that created the Associate Degree for Transfer does not allow us to create any additional local requirements.

**II.A.3. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:
II.A.4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

II.A.4. Descriptive Summary. The College offers four associate degrees: the Associate in Science (AS), Associate in Arts (AA), Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T), and Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T). The Associate Degrees for Transfer are relatively new additions.

For the AS and AA degrees, students are required to satisfy the Major requirement in one of several ways:

- Completion of 18 or more units in an Area of Emphasis of the Liberal Arts and Sciences program
- Completion of 18 or more units in a curriculum specified by the department and approved by the State Chancellor’s Office
- Completion of 18 or more units in a particular field of study when a major has not been specified by the department

For the AS-T and AA-T degrees, students are required to satisfy the Major requirement by completing the curriculum specified by the department and approved by the State Chancellor’s Office. These majors are developed in accordance with statewide Transfer Model Curricula. As of December 3, 2012, City College of San Francisco has three majors approved for the Associate Degree for Transfer: Psychology, Communication Studies, and English. Several other majors have been approved by the Curriculum Committee in Fall 2012 and are in the process of approval.

There has been no significant change in this standard since the 2012 report. Details of the major requirement for AA/AS degrees are on pages 51-52 of the 2012-13 College Catalog. Details of the major requirement for AA-T/AS-T degrees are on page 52 of the 2012-13 College Catalog.

II.A.4. Self Evaluation. All of the College’s degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. For the AS-T and AA-T...
degrees, students are required to satisfy the Major requirement by completing the curriculum specified by the department and approved by the State Chancellor's Office. These majors are developed in accordance with statewide Transfer Model Curricula, and as such include both focused study in one area of inquiry and an established disciplinary core.

II.A.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>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.5. Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.

II.A.5. Descriptive Summary. The Research and Planning Office collects data for licensure pass rates for individual CCSF departments. The Office must rely upon licensing agencies for the data and in some instances has experienced difficulty retrieving them. However, the Office was able to obtain licensure exam data for 2009-10 and found the following pass rates for CCSF students: Radiation Therapy Technology (86 percent); Diagnostic Medical Imaging (100 percent); Licensed Vocational Nursing (94 percent); Registered Nursing (89 percent); Cardiovascular Tech/Echocardiography (100 percent); Emergency Medical Technician (81 percent); Pharmacy Technician (100 percent); Health Information Technology (92 percent); Medical Assisting (100 percent); Paramedic (100 percent); and Phlebotomy (92 percent) [II A-68]. Students completing the Real Estate program are eligible to sit for the Real Estate Salesperson and Broker exams and students who complete the Aeronautics program are eligible to sit for the Federal Aviation Administration’s exams in Powerplant and Airframe.

The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office furnishes annual reports that reflect Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA) Core Indicator data uploaded from the College to the State Management Information System. Core Indicator #4 measures placement by matching the number of student completers to the California Employment Development Department Unemployment Insurance wage database. The most recent data available, 2008-09, show the College aggregate match rate of 87.3 percent. [II A-5 p. 2] This reflects an increase of almost 9 percent from the last report. These data, however, are not entirely conclusive in that they do not capture all student placement data, such as the number of graduates who become successfully self-employed or move out of state for employment.

The College also participated in the RP Group’s CTE Employment Outcomes survey and recently received the results.

Some individual departments are piloting their own tracking of program completers using social media (e.g., LinkedIn).

II.A.5. Self Evaluation. For those programs that have distinct licensure exams, the College has a well-defined process for collecting this data and passing it back to discipline faculty for use in continuous quality improvement. The use of Core Indicator data is helpful, but is
incomplete (as noted above), and was only fully integrated into the College’s Perkins Allocation process.

The College’s participation in the RP Group survey will help evaluate outcomes. The College has committed to continuing its participation in this survey, which will continue to provide valuable information for CTE programs.

Although individual departments use social media to maintain contact with program completers, the lack of an institution-wide effort to gathering post-educational employment data needs to be addressed.

In Fall 2012, the College went through a process of identifying program-level SLOs for all programs, and also asked about external assessment methods that departments would like to use. A large number of the CTE programs expressed interest in having reliable job placement information.

II.A.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>The College needs to allocate resources to develop a more robust system of tracking the employment of program completers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College needs to infuse the analysis of post-educational employment information into the assessment of program-level SLOs and the program review process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.6. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution’s officially approved course outline.

II.A.6.a. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

II.A.6.b. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

II.A.6.c. The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications,
II.A.6. Descriptive Summary. Information about programs is reviewed by the Curriculum Committee when programs are created or revised. The annual Catalog publication process also allows departments an opportunity to review and update information about their programs. The description of certificates, majors, and other programs in the College Catalog includes student learning outcomes. The Catalog is published in print and online, helping serve distance education students.

Students and faculty are periodically surveyed about the College Catalog. This information is used in the Program Review process for the Catalog Office. The Catalog Office has also recently developed administrative unit outcomes to help assess the clarity of information published in the Catalog.

Assurance that Students Receive a Course Syllabus with SLOs. Article 8 of the District/AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement requires faculty to abide by applicable provisions of the Faculty Handbook. Section 4.7 of the Faculty Handbook requires all faculty to provide students with pertinent written information, including the learning outcomes of the course. This section of the faculty handbook also requires faculty to provide a copy of their course syllabi to the department chairperson.

Students enrolled in distance education courses also receive course syllabi information that includes learning outcomes. Many faculty teaching distance education courses require students to certify that they have read the syllabi before beginning the course.

SLOs for all courses are found on assessment websites for all departments, making them publicly available to students and faculty.

The English Department is very systematic in handing out SLOs to students and providing a copy of course syllabi to the department chairperson. All English department faculty are required, by their chair, to include a list of SLOs on their syllabi and many faculty use SLOs as a reference when conferencing with students at midterm and before finals. This ensures that both faculty and students are working toward and reaching the course goals.

Adherence to the Course Objectives/Learning Outcomes. The Faculty Evaluation process, as detailed in Article 9 and related Exhibits of the District/AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement, is the mechanism by which the College ensures that individual faculty members are teaching courses in accordance with the approved course outline, including the course learning outcomes. Faculty are evaluated on the following criteria:

- The course content is up to date and appropriate.
- The course content is taught in an approach that is acceptable to the discipline/department.
- The class segment observed and any materials furnished were pertinent to the course outline.
Course SLO assessment plans and results are entered each semester into an online report by one Course Manager who gathers information from all instructors and facilitates the discussion and sharing and reviewing of data.

II.A.6.a. Descriptive Summary. Information about transferring coursework is detailed in the “Transfer Information” section of the College Catalog. The Catalog is available in printed version in the Bookstore and is also available online. The College has policies regarding transfer of incoming coursework. This policy is published in the “Academic Policies and Procedures” section of the College Catalog.

Transfer information is also provided to students by department chairs or their proxy (such as the English Eligibility Coordinator), who regularly meet with students who have questions or need transcripts evaluated for transfer. Transfer policies and determinations are regularly reviewed in conjunction with departmental curriculum committees, the Matriculation Office and the Articulation Office.

Transfer of coursework from CCSF to other institutions is detailed in the myriad articulation agreements the College has with the University of California, the California State University, California independent colleges and universities, and out-of-state public and private colleges. These agreements are continually expanded and updated as curriculum information and student needs and interests change. Articulation information is listed in the Catalog, which is available in print and online. Additional tools include general education worksheets for students, time schedule transfer information pages, the statewide ASSIST website, the College articulation website [II A-80], and a student transcript report generated from the Banner database. Updates are delivered through meeting presentations, end-of-year mailings, workshops, and emails. Listings in the CCSF Catalog routinely and consistently indicate whether courses articulate to UC or CSU.

The College supports an Office of Articulation with a full-time articulation officer and a half-time clerical assistant. The Office is responsible for the development and maintenance of articulation agreements and the dissemination of all information related to articulation.

The College participates in statewide efforts to streamline articulation through common course numbering and model curricula programs. Currently, it is engaged in the statewide Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) and Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) efforts. College faculty and an articulation officer have participated in statewide meetings to discuss C-ID and TMC, have provided input via the C-ID website, and have submitted several courses for C-ID review. Three transfer associate degrees based on TMCs were submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office for review; two of these have been approved as of June 2011 and the third one is still under review [II A-81].

Articulation agreements are based on course outlines that are reviewed and approved by the College Curriculum Committee. Courses that are intended for statewide UC transfer and UC/CSU general education are further reviewed by the College CSU/UC Breadth Committee before they are submitted to the UC Office of the President or the CSU Chancellor’s Office. Course-to-course articulation, usually intended to meet requirements for the major at the university, is initiated by the articulation officer working with discipline faculty, particularly department chairs. Articulation requests are sent to transfer institutions for review. When articulation agreements are approved, the information is shared with the College community.

Comment [c15]: The English Eligibility Coordinator maintains a website that provides students with transfer and contact info: https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/eligibility/
II.A.6.b. Descriptive Summary. The College is currently engaged in developing a program closure policy. The Academic Senate has had this on the agenda on the October 24, November 7, and November 28, 2012 meetings.

The College has a “Catalog Rights” policy to protect student rights. This policy is published in the “Associate Degree” section of the College Catalog, and allows students, when changes to a program take place, to follow the requirements of a certificate or degree program as it was published at the time of original enrollment as long as the student maintains continuous enrollment.

Primary responsibility for advising students when programs are modified rests with department chairs. While the Catalog Rights policy allows students to follow the original program requirements, there are times when the underlying courses are changed or eliminated. College practices give department chairs wide latitude in allowing substitutions or waivers of program requirements, allowing departments to accommodate affected students.

II.A.6.c. Descriptive Summary. City College of San Francisco represents itself to students, personnel, and the public through a range of publications and statements. The College Catalog contains descriptions of all courses, information about programs of study, and statements of the College’s regulations, rules and policies. The Catalog is produced, updated, reviewed for accuracy, and reprinted annually under the supervision of the Office of Instruction, and is available in both print and electronic forms. Updates to program and course information are done based on Curriculum Committee actions—any new courses, modifications to courses, or course deletions are done through the Curriculum Committee.

Other sections of the Catalog (e.g., Library and Learning Resources, Academic Policies) are reviewed by the owners of that section. The Office of Instruction asks for such updates each year in the late fall/early spring, and incorporates all reported changes into the next printed version of the Catalog. Additionally, when policies are updated via the Shared Governance process, changes are made to the appropriate sections of the Catalog. These changes are highlighted in a Policy Update document on the online Catalog [II A-82].

The Office of Instruction also maintains two versions of the Catalog on the College website: the first is a PDF version that matches that year’s printed Catalog exactly, and has all sections of the Catalog; the second contains just course and program information, and is updated continuously throughout the year, based on Curriculum Committee actions. In addition to publishing the Catalog on the College website, the Office of Instruction gives paper copies to counselors and key offices. Students may also purchase a paper copy of the Catalog at the CCSF Bookstore.

When the Office of Instruction receives notification of approval of new certificate or degree programs after the Catalog has been published, it includes this information in an online Catalog addendum [II A-83]. Such programs are typically listed as “pending state approval” in the printed version of the Catalog, and the addendum gives details of these programs once approval has been gained.

The College Class Schedule is published online three times a year. This schedule provides detailed information about each semester’s course offering and includes links to campus maps, and information about programs and services the College offers. With each
publication, the Schedule is reviewed for accuracy, currency, and completeness by the Office of Marketing and Public Information.

The Office of Marketing and Public Information publishes a biweekly newsletter *City Currents*, which features faculty and staff accomplishments, Board news, student achievements, and current events at the College.

The Faculty Handbook informs CCSF professional staff of the principal rules, regulations, practices and procedures that are essential to their role in the operation of the District. It is produced by the Human Resources Department, is distributed to all faculty members and is available on the College website.

Academic policies are reviewed in response to identified issues and opportunities, Title 5 changes, and legislative or regulatory changes. They are revised through the Shared Governance System. Major changes to programs and policies are disseminated via Shared Governance committee meetings, trainings, email dissemination, College publications and the College website. The Board of Trustees, through its Policy Implementation Committee, is currently updating Board policies, which are made available to the public on the College website [II A-84].

The College website provides information on the College’s mission, instructional programs, support programs, and administration, and can be translated into a number of languages. In 2007, after a public bidding process, City College of San Francisco contracted with Earthbound Media Group to redesign its website. By 2009, Earthbound had completed the overhaul, creating a unifying visual motif, organizing information for easier access, dramatically improving its search engine capabilities, and bringing the site into compliance with ADA standards. The College now has a “Webcred” working group that has been reviewing the transition from old to new formats and providing support for improving webpages.

Most recently, the Outreach Office started a City College Facebook page offering information about upcoming scholarship applications, registration deadlines, job opportunities, and campus events, as well as links to in-house videos about the College counseling programs, student achievements, and international student assistance programs.

The Research and Policy webpage found under Employee Services presents information on student achievement, both recent and archival reports. It posts Program Review reports, which contain current student achievement data for each academic department. Other posted reports include Accountability Reporting for the California Community College, College Performance Indicators, Basic Skills Accountability, The High School Report, and additional focused reports on student performance.

In addition to the information published on the Research and Planning website, the College publishes information required by Federal Gainful Employment requirements for certain of its CTE certificate programs. This information includes the number of program completers and the number of students that complete the program within the normal time to completion. This information is published in the online section of the College Catalog near the relevant certificate programs.

After receiving the Show Cause determination from ACCJC, the College immediately posted the ACCJC letter and College response to the accreditation website. Given the resulting
media attention on the College, the College has proactively provided information about its accreditation status and its impact on students in addition to responding to the negative press and media attention. For example, the College mailed a postcard to all residents of San Francisco highlighting that City College’s doors are still open. Shortly after Interim Chancellor Fisher was hired, the College also hired a public spokesperson to centralize media communications in anticipation of the negative news that would ensue as a result of the fiscal crisis and accreditation findings. This was necessary given that the Dean of Public Information and Marketing position had been vacant since Summer 2010. In late Fall 2012, the College also hired a consulting firm to reverse its declining enrollment given concerns that the College would not make base for 2012-13. This firm has concentrated its efforts on print and online advertising and social media, including Facebook and Twitter.

II.A.6. Self Evaluation. The College has made significant strides in the development of program-level Student Learning Outcomes, helping to assure that students receive clear and accurate information about programs.

The College has good policies and practices in place to assure students receive syllabi with information regarding course outcomes and that individual course sections adhere to those learning outcomes.

The College has a robust system of working with incoming and outgoing transfer of coursework, including the development and implementation of articulation agreements.

The College policy on Catalog rights helps to ensure students are able to complete work towards program completion in the face of program modification. This policy has been updated and clarified in recent years, addressing, for example, students who begin their studies in a summer session. However, the college needs to complete its work on developing a program discontinuance policy.

With respect to representing itself in Catalog and publications, the College has good practices in place for updating the printed and online versions of the College Catalog and Time Schedule, but could use better practices for ensuring the accuracy of other elements of its web presence. With respect to representing itself in statements, individuals affiliated with the institution have at times made statements in the wake of the Show Cause determination that have been captured in news articles and other media and have not accurately represented the College’s status or activities. The College instituted a media protocol when media attention increased that required that any individual contacted by the media channel communications to the Office of Marketing and Public Information and/or to the public spokesperson. Individuals have not always adhered to this protocol.

II.A.6. 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>Complete development of Program Discontinuance Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to communicate media protocols widely to the College community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.A.7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or world views. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

II.A.7.a. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

II.A.7.b. The institution establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty.

II.A.7.c. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.

II.A.7. Descriptive Summary. The College has clear policies that illustrate its commitment to the free and creative pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. Accessible through the SFCCD Board Policy Manual in print and online, Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Freedom” clearly defines academic freedom with its rights and responsibilities and contains guidelines for textbook selection, library selections, and public forums [II A-85]. Board Policy 6.06 includes language describing both the rights and responsibilities of faculty—“the right to exercise any liberty implies a duty to use it responsibly.”

The “Student Rights and Responsibilities” section of the CCSF College Catalog (“College Rules and Regulations”) contains Board-approved policy (Board Policy 6.11) on student academic honesty [II A-58 p. 401-402]. This document is available on line and in hard copy at the CCSF Bookstore. The policy is also in the Student Handbook, distributed at the start of each semester, and also available online [II A-87].

II.A.7.a. Descriptive Summary. The College communicates its expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views through many references in Article 8 of the SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement. For example, section C.4 states, “Faculty cannot, however, expect academic freedom to be unlimited, for the right to exercise any liberty implies a duty to use it responsibly. Academic freedom does not give faculty freedom to engage in indoctrination. Nor can faculty invoke the principle of academic freedom to justify non-professional conduct” [II A-86 p. 20 Lines 12-16].

A component of faculty evaluation (including tenure review) is an anonymous survey of students in one or more classes taught by the instructor being evaluated. Different surveys are used for credit, noncredit, ESL, and library courses. Each of these surveys include a question about instructor’s biases. For example:

- Survey Item Relating to Credit Students: Does the instructor seem to be free of racial, sexual, religious and political prejudices?
- Survey Item Relating to Noncredit Students: Shows respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups.
- Survey Item Relating to ESL Students: The teacher respects the students.
The data from recent evaluations show that faculty score well in this regard. In Spring 2012, faculty under regular evaluation scored as follows:

- Credit faculty: 4.8 out of 5.0, which compares well with the overall student evaluation question rating of 4.58.
- Noncredit faculty: 4.88 out of 5.0 on this question, comparing well with the overall average of 4.77.
- ESL faculty: 4.83 out of 5.0, comparing well with the overall average of 4.81.

[Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review web pages]

This survey mechanism is also used for students engaged in distance education courses. In the English Department, which includes several published authors and poets, the English Curriculum Committee and Department decided that instructors not “teach” their own books, or require students buy those books as texts for a course. That decision was made three years ago (2009–2010) and has been enforced by the current department chairperson. The English Courses of Study (aside from Creative Writing) build students' ability to discern and distinguish information for themselves; the writing is argumentative—presenting a view and supporting it.

Our English 96/1A classes, which are organized by instructors around a theme or focus as far as unifying reading, stress the idea of supporting argument.

II.A.7.b. Descriptive Summary. The College utilizes the following mechanisms to inform students of policies relating to academic honesty:

- The College publishes policies on academic honesty in the print and online versions of the College Catalog. Again, the online versions help serve our distance education students.
- Academic honesty is also noted in the CCSF Student Handbook.
- Some departments have had further discussion on academic honesty and have published additional information for students (see 2012 report).
- Students who take Library Skills Workshops get additional information about plagiarism (see 2012 report).

The College utilizes the following mechanisms to enforce academic honesty:

- The College has a well-defined process for resolving violations of student rules and regulations through the Dean of Students office (see details in College Catalog).

The English Department provides a standard hand-out for all students; it includes instructions on M.L.A. format for essays, as well as plagiarism, what constitutes plagiarism, and what its consequences are.

II.A.7.c. Descriptive Summary. Not applicable—the College does not have conformity to a code of conduct.
II.A.7. Self Evaluation. The College has well-defined Board Policies on Academic Freedom and Academic Honesty.

The faculty evaluation and tenure review processes are an effective means of ensuring that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. Data from student evaluations shows that, on average, faculty are doing well.

While publication in the Catalog is an effective means of disseminating information about College policies, it would be good to also include language about college rules and regulations in the Time Schedule, and to require a section on Academic Honesty in course syllabi.

On a Collegewide level, it does not appear that conversations regarding the distinctions between personal conviction and professionally accepted views take place. The College should consider engaging faculty in such discussions.

II.A.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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include section on College Rules and Regulations in the Time Schedule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Faculty Handbook to require discussion of Academic Honesty in course syllabi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College should include discussions on academic freedom in its flex day activities and in the orientation for new tenure-track faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.8. Institutions offering curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals operate in conformity with Standards and applicable Commission policies.

Not applicable.