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The making of this self study is a story worth telling because it is a reflection of how the members of this institution work together to produce excellent outcomes. It is also the story of how members of a diverse complex institution can find common ground.

In February 2004, I asked a group of College leaders to sit down with me to discuss how we would address our self study. The conversation revealed that we had different conceptions of the study, and it took us a few hours of discussion to figure out what we should do. Some of us wanted to take the traditional standards-focused approach, while others argued for a radical departure, suggesting that we should analyze the College through a theme-based framework as suggested by the ACCJC.

We decided to adopt both study strategies: City College would conduct a traditional self study based upon the four primary standards during the Fall 2004 semester and then transform these standards committees into six theme-based committees to produce a series of essays based upon the ACCJC-recommended themes during Spring 2005.

We also agreed that we would establish an integrated self-study process. The traditional study based upon the standards would inform the development of our essays, and, consequently, the reader would attain a better understanding of our institution than from either a traditional study or a set of theme-based essays alone.

To accomplish this ambitious goal of producing, in effect, two inter-connected studies in less than a year, we established an organizational infrastructure consisting of standards committees (later to become theme-based committees) comprising faculty, classified staff, and administrators and a steering committee comprising the committee co-chairs plus representatives from the College organizations, the senior administrators, and a Board-appointed liaison. To ensure this entire process would work smoothly, efficiently, and inclusively for all College constituencies, I appointed a Work Group composed of three faculty members, two administrators, two classified staff, and a resource person.

The Work Group built the infrastructure upon which this self study rests, an infrastructure that extended across our campuses to ensure the participation of as many members of the College community as possible. They coordinated all of the committee meetings, the College listening sessions, and the discussions with College organizations. Special sessions were convened to speak with students about their concerns and their assessment of the drafts. The Work Group assembled close to 100 self study templates, each with a specific section addressing one of the standards, a set of study questions, a list of evidence to review, and a rubric to evaluate how well the College met the standard. The self study templates required committee teams to review evidence and write up their findings. The completed templates were then reviewed by the entire committee and were used by the co-chairs to write the standards reports contained in this self study. The Work Group also assembled hundreds of documents, reports, minutes, and other types of evidence to support the standards reports.
Beginning in September 2004, nine standards committees comprising 131 faculty, classified staff, and administrators reviewed the documents, reports and other types of evidence using a specific self study templates to guide their work. The standards committees had a weekly meeting date to discuss and review their work. By the third week of November, the co-chairs had completed a draft of their report which was then reviewed by the Steering Committee. Final drafts of the standards reports were completed before the end of the Fall semester.

During the intersession, the completed standards reports were read by the members of the newly organized theme committees; discussions among the six theme committees began in February 2005 focusing on how to use the evidence in the standards reports to respond to the six themes proposed by ACCJC. To insure that each of the themes reflected the realities of City College, the Steering Committee decided to use a case study approach to provide the readers with specific evidence of how the institution was working at the campus, program, and course levels. The Work Group provided a standardized format for the essays and coordinated the selection of case studies for each essay. The drafts of each of the six essays were completed, reviewed, and modified by May 2005 using campus-based listening sessions and both regular and special meetings of faculty, classified staff, and students. During the Summer, a three-person working group assembled the full draft of the self study.

Finally, we asked the entire College community to read and evaluate the full self study draft during the period of August through October 2005 and to provide feedback through listening sessions and meetings of College governance committees. Special sessions for the Board of Trustees and students at the various campuses were also used to harvest responses to the full draft.

We received many suggestions for improving the draft and, in the instance of the essay on student learning outcomes, we had to make significant modifications to accommodate a diversity of faculty voices on the issues related to student learning. This was not the first time we had to address a wide range of perspectives on an issue, but it was one of the more dramatic examples of how we found common ground to build a working consensus on a difficult issue.

After a year and a half of hard work, the self study is now complete, and, on behalf of the Board of Trustees and myself, I extend my thanks to all of us who participated in this extraordinary process. Furthermore, I welcome the Visiting Team who will read this study, visit our campuses, and provide us with their evaluation of our work. I invite you to read this study and learn about our institution, its programs, services, and most important, its commitment to student learning and success.

Dr. Philip R. Day, Jr.
Chancellor
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As of 2005, City College of San Francisco has served the educational needs of its city for 70 years. During that time, the College has evolved into a multicultural, multi-campus community college that is one of the largest in the country.

The College was founded in response to a demand from the citizens for a public institution to serve both the academic and the vocational needs of students as an integral part of the San Francisco Unified School District. It was first housed in temporary facilities at the University of California Extension Division building and at Galileo High School. Classes began on September 1, 1935 with an enrollment of 1,074 students and 74 faculty members. The enrollment rapidly increased, and, four years later, the College was holding classes in 22 locations. The San Francisco Board of Education approved a building plan for the College in 1937, which included a 56-acre site bordering Balboa Park at Phelan Avenue. The 1937 ground-breaking ceremony, conducted by Mayor Angelo Rossi, led to the 1940 opening of the Science Hall and the North and South Gymnasiums to approximately 3,200 students.

The once steadily growing enrollment was reversed when the United States entered World War II; however, the College provided educational training to the Army and Navy personnel. By 1947, the enrollment was on the rise again as returning veterans joined high school graduates pursuing their college degrees. To provide sufficient classroom space, the College acquired the adjoining U.S. Navy WAVES Separation Center across Phelan Ave., used Excelsior School as an annex, and scheduled its first evening classes. Federal and State grants and the passage of a school bond issue made funds available for the College to continue its building program. Cloud Hall was completed in 1954, Smith Hall in 1955, the Creative Arts Building and the Track and Field in 1961, Statler Wing in 1964, the Horticulture Center in 1965, and the Visual Arts Building and the Student Union in 1970.

In 1970, the College was separated from the San Francisco Unified School District, and a new entity, the San Francisco Community College District, was formed. This new entity included not only the College but also the Adult and Occupational Education Division of the unified district. Responding to the expressed community need, the College maintained these neighborhood education programs composed primarily of noncredit courses. Because of rapid growth, the College subsequently formed two separate divisions: one for credit courses located on the Balboa Park (Ocean) Campus; and one for noncredit courses offered throughout the City, under the umbrella of the San Francisco Community College District. This growth was also accompanied by additional building. The Arts Extension was completed in 1972, Conlan Hall in 1974, and Batmale Hall and the Downtown Campus in 1978.

The two divisions were merged in 1990, and a single City College of San Francisco, offering both credit and noncredit courses at 12 campuses and nearly 200 neighborhood sites, was created. The 12 campuses are Alemany, Castro/Valencia, Chinatown/North Beach, Downtown, Evans, Fort Mason, John Adams, Mission, Ocean, and Southeast. The College employs more than 700 full-time and 1,100 part-time faculty. Ninety-five (95) percent of faculty and administrators hold master’s degrees and approximately 200 hold doctorates. They teach over 98,000 credit and noncredit students annually.

The College adopted its first Strategic Plan in December 1997. The two-year process had broad participation from the College and the community and produced strategies and action plans in six major goal areas. Also in 1997 (June), a $50 million school bond measure was passed which paved the way for significant facilities upgrades.
The senior administrative structure of the College was reorganized in Spring 1999. The Chancellor proposed, and the Board of Trustees approved, three equal positions: Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration; and Vice Chancellor for Student Development. In addition to this reorganization, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, consisting of 19 administrators, was formed and meets twice per month.

To follow are updates on changes relating to administration and governance, new facilities and infrastructure upgrades, and changes promoting student success that have taken place since the last accreditation review in 2000.

**Administrative & Governance Updates**

- A new Strategic Plan was created in 2002 and adopted by the Board in 2003 through an inclusive process. Extensive discussions were held by the principal Shared Governance groups, the Academic Senate, Associated Students, Classified Senate, and the College Council along with listening sessions at various campuses. To ensure that the Strategic Plan became a living and driving force in the annual planning and budgeting process, Strategic Plan Implementation Schedules were developed that describe the timetable and identify the key staff members responsible for ensuring the success of the Plan.

- In the area of student support services, CCSF restructured its Counseling Department to better meet the needs of students, driven by a comprehensive assessment of the student services system and the Student Development Education Master Plan. Rather than a “one size fits all” approach, the once “General Counseling” Department is now divided into four basic departments: New Student Counseling, Continuing Student Counseling, International Student Counseling, and Transfer Student Counseling. In addition to the reorganization, the various counseling departments are beginning to utilize a case management approach better suited to meeting individual students’ needs.

- The Facilities and Maintenance Departments were reorganized and placed under the supervision of a new Associate Vice Chancellor of Facilities Planning and Management.

- The College’s Planning and Budgeting Council, which was reorganized in Spring 1999, has been fully operational since 2000 and includes the Strategic Plan, the Annual Plan, Cost Center Plans, the CCSF Budget, and the Assessment component, which includes Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment Reports and an annual College Performance Indicators Report. The College’s Planning and Budgeting System are fully integrated into the College’s Shared Governance System, and, with the leadership of the Chancellor, all College constituencies participate in the development and review of planning objectives and budgets. The Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) is the key College Shared Governance committee charged with providing guidance within the overall planning system.

- The City College of San Francisco Foundation’s Board of Directors has been restructured since the last accreditation review. There are now 17 directors and a new set of by-laws. The College has also increased its emphasis on competitive grant seeking by transforming the grant writing position in the Office of Research, Planning and Grants into an Associate Dean-level position in 2001 (staffed in January 2002). In addition to the new administrator, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants now has a Special Projects Coordinator who devotes significant time to grant writing and a Post-Awards Grants Manager to assist grant-funded projects with budgeting. The College has also developed an Advancement Plan that maps out a strategy for helping to “fill in the gaps” and provide funding for those items that go beyond basic operations.
The outcome of these changes has been a steady increase of nearly 50 percent in alternative revenues through scholarships and other funds raised by the Foundation and through competitive grants (comparing 1998-99 to 2003-04) from $19,233,962 to $28,682,390.

In September 2005, the Board of Trustees approved the Chancellor’s recommendation to establish a Division of Institutional Advancement led by a Vice Chancellor. This is a major step to bolster the College’s efforts to expand its resource base. The new division will integrate the College’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants with the Office of College Development as well as the CCSF Foundation guided by the College’s Advancement Plan.

New Facilities & Infrastructure Upgrades

- A successful bond initiative in 2001 earned the approval of 73 percent of San Francisco voters, earmarking $195 million for facilities over the next decade. This initiative was followed by a second phase for $246 million which passed in Fall 2005 with the approval of 64 percent of San Francisco voters.

- The bond initiatives of 1997 and 2001 allowed the College to embark on a major period of technological development and growth. During this period, the College engaged in a number of technology-related improvements, including the installation of a new VoIP phone system, a computer rollout through which faculty and staff received new or upgraded computers, and upgrades to the College’s enterprise database system, among others as detailed in the Self Study Report.

- In addition to critical maintenance and repair work needed at multiple sites across the District, local support for the 2001 initiative enabled the College to begin the planning for and/or construction of new campus facilities, including the Mission and Chinatown/North Beach Campuses, the Community Health and Wellness Center, a Student Health Services Center, a Child Development Center, and the second phase of the technology network and campus connectivity project are in the design stage.

Changes Promoting Student Success

- Immediately after the 2000 accreditation ended, City College of San Francisco embarked upon its own self study, titled “The Enhanced Self-Study” across five broad areas of CCSF programs and services: Pre-registration and Matriculation; Pre-Collegiate Learning; College-Level Learning; Enrollment Management Tools; and Student Outcomes. Its focus was on student success. More than 170 faculty, staff, administrators, and students participated in this one-year process, which resulted in 38 recommendations.

- In 2002, CCSF launched a Basic Skills Initiative to address the findings that a large percentage of new, first-time students place into pre-collegiate basic skills courses and often struggle to succeed in these courses. A variety of grant funds, including a Title III grant from the U.S. Department of Education, a grant from the Koret Foundation, and a grant from the Carnegie and Hewlett Foundations, have supported this effort (see the Theme I essay for more details). Guiding this effort is the Basic Skills Subcommittee, which began meeting in Fall 2003 to (1) address the CCSF Strategic Plan Priority focusing on Basic Skills; (2) read and discuss articles on basic skills and “best practices” at other community colleges, with the goal of forming recommendations for CCSF; and (3) address CCSF’s Enhanced Self-Study recommendations for Basic Skills.
• The Diversity Committee was revived in Fall 2002. Its meetings and discussions have targeted hiring practices, diversity of employees, and curricular issues. The Committee has also hosted a series of Diversity Institutes to address these issues in workshop and seminar settings. A critical outgrowth of the Diversity Committee has been the Multicultural Infusion Project, a professional development program that provides an opportunity for teaching and counseling faculty and staff. In addition, The Multicultural Resource Center, established in 2004 in the Student Union, provides an opportunity for students, as well as faculty and staff, to expand their appreciation of diversity through informal dialog as well as structured programming.

• In an effort to respond to the diverse economic and educational backgrounds of potential students, CCSF developed a “Bridge to Biotech Program” in 2002 that assists students transitioning into college-level studies as well as a feeder “On-Ramp to Biotech Program” that prepares low-income adults with skills at the 6th-9th grade levels for entry into the Bridge program. Both of these programs currently receive support from the National Science Foundation (NSF) totaling $1.1 million. This effort was built in large part upon the success of the College in its pursuit in 1998 of a $5 million Advanced Technological Education grant from NSF. This grant created Bio-Link, a national biotechnology center for the purpose of coordinating the training of students in community colleges with the needs of the rapidly expanding biotechnology industry. Bio-Link has received additional funding in recent years bringing total NSF grant funds to $6.5 million.

• In 2002, the Computer and Information Science Department split into two separate departments: Computer Networking and Information Technology (CNIT) and Computer Science. In Fall 2005, the CNIT Department was awarded a grant of just over $750,000 from NSF to develop a certificate program in Information and Communications Technology.

• As a result of the Enhanced Self-Study (ESS) recommendation that majors become a part of the College’s curricular offerings, the College has begun shifting toward offering specific majors (there are now 11).

• Another result of an Enhanced Self-Study recommendation—that was prompted by a 2000 accreditation site visit recommendation—is that the English and Math graduation requirements have been raised. Both of the new requirements have now been adopted through the Shared Governance process. In addition, the College has adopted an Information Competency graduation requirement, and a task force is currently working out the details of the implementation of this requirement, which is designed to assure a student’s ability to do research and manage information.

• The College also adopted an Associate in Arts Degree in University Transfer Studies as an option for students transferring to the California State University System. To achieve this degree, students must complete the California State University General Education requirements, including three units of approved diversity coursework.

Finally, of particular note during this period is CCSF’s receipt of the 2004 MetLife Foundation Community College Excellence Award. The MetLife award recognized CCSF’s accomplishment in the areas of innovation, institution-wide commitment, and improved outcomes based on careful assessment of strategies that promote access, retention, and completion for students from underserved populations. In particular, the brochure announcing the award commends CCSF’s strategic planning process, data collection and analysis (particularly through the Decision Support System), and its “sophisticated and varied education program [serving] the city’s immigrants.”
ORGANIZATION OF THE INSTITUTION

The following pages contain the organizational divisions of the College and the key reporting positions.
I. San Francisco Population

City College of San Francisco is located in the City and County of San Francisco, the fourth largest city in California with a current population of almost 800,000, but with little room to grow; the California Department of Finance projects that San Francisco’s population will increase by only 25,000 (3 percent) between now and 2010. San Francisco is a diverse city with substantial Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic/Latino populations; it is also a graying city with a median age approaching 45 (California’s median is 33). Among the larger U.S. cities, San Francisco has the lowest percentage of people under age 18: only 15 percent of the city’s population is 18 or under compared to the national average of 26 percent. Consequently, projections of the school-age population and high school graduation rates in the city and county between now and 2010 show decreases for the school-age population and only slight increases in high school graduation rates. Legal immigration to the city has also been decreasing since 1991.

San Francisco is a highly educated city. According to the most recent U.S. Census statistics, 51 percent of San Francisco residents have a college degree and almost 20 percent have advanced degrees. CCSF is used widely by San Francisco residents: according to a CCSF poll in June 2005, over one third of residents have taken classes at CCSF, and 72 percent have friends and family who took classes through CCSF.

GRAPH 1.1
San Francisco Population Changes and Projections 1992 to 2010

NOTE: This document presents data beginning as early as 1992 (and, in some cases, in 1991, based on the external data available) and projected forward to as late as 2010. At times, data for 1992 is not available and/or is incomplete; under these circumstances the report provides later data as necessary. Projections to 2010 are estimates and, while the Self Study is intended to be relevant until the next accreditation cycle (up to 2012), projections beyond 2010 are tenuous and, hence, not provided.

1 U.S. Census 2000.
TABLE 1.1
San Francisco Population Changes and Projections 1992 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SF Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>730,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>739,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>758,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>787,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>791,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>804,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>816,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


GRAPH 1.2
Ethnicity Changes in San Francisco 1992 to 2010
TABLE 1.2
Ethnicity Changes in San Francisco 1992 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>72,967</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>215,266</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>337,336</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>68,241</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>227,101</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>103,633</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>336,463</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>64,413</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>241,770</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,580</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>339,892</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>56,686</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>245,999</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>111,797</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>348,615</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>54,985</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>245,707</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>114,853</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>350,516</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>53,411</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>249,599</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>116,194</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>359,190</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>51,793</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>252,760</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>117,308</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>367,348</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This table does not include the category “Other”; thus, the categories presented here do not add up to the totals in Table 1.1. The percents are calculated based on the totals in Table 1.1.
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TABLE 1.3
Age Changes in San Francisco 1992 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0–15</th>
<th>16–19</th>
<th>20–24</th>
<th>25–29</th>
<th>30–39</th>
<th>40–49</th>
<th>50+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>122,275</td>
<td>37,522</td>
<td>61,295</td>
<td>75,519</td>
<td>140,137</td>
<td>105,180</td>
<td>189,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>115,796</td>
<td>37,306</td>
<td>68,087</td>
<td>75,487</td>
<td>138,911</td>
<td>112,629</td>
<td>191,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>103,248</td>
<td>30,525</td>
<td>69,188</td>
<td>91,677</td>
<td>145,178</td>
<td>115,265</td>
<td>203,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>99,103</td>
<td>25,522</td>
<td>50,056</td>
<td>93,069</td>
<td>174,853</td>
<td>116,460</td>
<td>228,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>107,617</td>
<td>24,286</td>
<td>35,105</td>
<td>65,886</td>
<td>188,603</td>
<td>126,877</td>
<td>242,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>114,951</td>
<td>25,646</td>
<td>32,270</td>
<td>45,446</td>
<td>188,654</td>
<td>139,427</td>
<td>258,158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GRAPH 1.4**

San Francisco Births 1992 to 2010

![Graph showing San Francisco Births 1992 to 2010](image)

**TABLE 1.4**

San Francisco Births 1992 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SF Births</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>9,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>8,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/NetBirth.HTM](http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/NetBirth.HTM)
GRAPH 1.5
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TABLE 1.5
School Age Population in San Francisco 1992 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total K–8</th>
<th>Total 9–12</th>
<th>HS Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>42,277</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>3,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>42,518</td>
<td>19,906</td>
<td>3,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>42,322</td>
<td>19,757</td>
<td>3,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>41,075</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>3,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38,819</td>
<td>20,354</td>
<td>3,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>37,491</td>
<td>20,547</td>
<td>4,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>37,143</td>
<td>19,353</td>
<td>4,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/repndat.htm
TABLE 1.6
Legal Immigration 1991 to 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>13,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>13,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>9,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7,551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/repndat.htm

NOTE: “Legal immigrants” are those residing in San Francisco and admitted by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services during the year specified.
II. San Francisco Economy

The City of San Francisco plays a critical role in the Bay Area economy with approximately 600,000 jobs, 40,000 employers, and a local Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of about $75 billion. The foundation of the city’s economy rests on industries such as finance, insurance, real estate, business services, tourism, and governmental administration. The city has one of the highest per capita productivity rates in the country and, also, a high per capita income.²
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**TABLE 2.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>31,243</td>
<td>21,750</td>
<td>19,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>32,569</td>
<td>22,635</td>
<td>21,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>36,035</td>
<td>24,161</td>
<td>23,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>39,458</td>
<td>26,490</td>
<td>25,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>48,201</td>
<td>29,828</td>
<td>27,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>56,141</td>
<td>32,877</td>
<td>30,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>55,720</td>
<td>33,415</td>
<td>31,472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, http://www.bea.doc.gov/bea/regional/reis/#download*

² Stange, K. (2003). 10 Things to know about San Francisco’s economy and employers: A publication to inform San Francisco’s workforce and economic development community. Research brief of the Workforce Investment San Francisco Board.
Nearly half of San Francisco’s workforce commutes into San Francisco from surrounding communities while 20 percent of its employed residents commute out. The city’s economy is primarily divided between high-wage professional jobs and low-paying service jobs, with comparatively few middle-income jobs. As the home of a large number of corporate headquarters (second in the nation only to New York City), business service firms and financial institutions, San Francisco employs relatively more highly paid lawyers, managers, computer scientists, and business operations professionals than the rest of the Bay Area overall. A major employment sector is public administration, which includes three higher education institutions, the San Francisco school district, and city and state governmental offices. Table 2.2 provides a picture of the income distribution in a city with one of the highest costs of living in the country.3

### TABLE 2.2

**Income Distribution of Families in San Francisco 2000 to 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Families</td>
<td>144,389</td>
<td>144,477</td>
<td>142,530</td>
<td>144,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>9.24%</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>8.35%</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>12.39%</td>
<td>12.22%</td>
<td>11.87%</td>
<td>11.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
<td>16.83%</td>
<td>16.96%</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>13.86%</td>
<td>13.36%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
<td>13.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>16.27%</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>17.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>6.81%</td>
<td>7.67%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median family income*</td>
<td>68,905</td>
<td>71,507</td>
<td>69,934</td>
<td>67,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean family income*</td>
<td>97,417</td>
<td>98,383</td>
<td>96,614</td>
<td>90,771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* in 2003 inflation-adjusted dollars

**Source:** [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Products/Profiles/Chg/2003/ACS/Tabular/001/A4000US0033.htm](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Products/Profiles/Chg/2003/ACS/Tabular/001/A4000US0033.htm)

---

3 Stange, K. (2003). *10 Things to know about San Francisco’s economy and employers: A publication to inform San Francisco’s workforce and economic development community.* Research brief of the Workforce Investment San Francisco Board.
III. Profile of CCSF Students

City College of San Francisco serves over 98,000 students a year at 12 campuses and nearly 200 sites. CCSF has the highest adult participation rate of any community college in the State (8.2 percent); one out of every 12 adults in San Francisco enrolls in one or more of the College programs. Some 80 percent of CCSF students are from the City and County of San Francisco; most of the rest commute to San Francisco from San Mateo, Marin, Alameda, and Contra Costa counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3.1</th>
<th>Participation Rate 2000–01 to 2003–04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Residents, Ages 18 and older</td>
<td>670,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Enrollment*</td>
<td>61,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Enrollment from within San Francisco</td>
<td>53,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSF PARTICIPATION RATE</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined and unduplicated credit and noncredit.

Source: All data from CCSF DSS, 10/17/2004, except Department of Finance estimates of San Francisco residents: State of California, Department of Finance, Race/Ethnic Population with Age & Sex Detail Sacramento, CA, May 2004
CCSF’s high participation rate is due primarily to the broad array of programs and services offered in a variety of delivery systems that include credit, noncredit, and not-for-credit formats. During the past ten years, enrollments in these programs have, for the most part, been increasing, reaching an all-time College high during the period 2001 through 2003.

### TABLE 3.2
**Annual Enrollment 1995–96 to 2004–05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>39,741</td>
<td>43,087</td>
<td>43,823</td>
<td>44,394</td>
<td>45,435</td>
<td>47,248</td>
<td>51,135</td>
<td>52,518</td>
<td>47,649</td>
<td>47,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>46,244</td>
<td>48,117</td>
<td>48,522</td>
<td>47,586</td>
<td>48,825</td>
<td>49,523</td>
<td>52,293</td>
<td>51,479</td>
<td>48,017</td>
<td>45,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credit &amp; Noncredit</td>
<td>79,337</td>
<td>83,790</td>
<td>86,454</td>
<td>88,971</td>
<td>91,156</td>
<td>93,773</td>
<td>99,966</td>
<td>99,827</td>
<td>92,626</td>
<td>89,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT/ Garment 2000</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College for Teens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>4,992</td>
<td>5,283</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>4,702</td>
<td>5,080</td>
<td>5,217</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>4,228</td>
<td>4,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Education</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for International Students</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Programs</td>
<td>6,749</td>
<td>7,619</td>
<td>7,301</td>
<td>11,859</td>
<td>6,513</td>
<td>6,771</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>6,593</td>
<td>6,702</td>
<td>8,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Enrollment</td>
<td>86,086</td>
<td>91,409</td>
<td>93,755</td>
<td>96,128</td>
<td>97,669</td>
<td>100,544</td>
<td>106,512</td>
<td>106,420</td>
<td>99,328</td>
<td>98,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Data in Table 3.2 starts in 1995–96 because data for “Other Programs” in prior years is incomplete.

**Source:** CCSF ISIS & Banner Extracts
City College of San Francisco offers 130 certificate programs, 34 awards of achievement and 11 majors. Approximate enrollments in 2004–05 at CCSF included:

- 40,000 student enrollments (duplicated) in occupational programs
- 31,000 student enrollments (duplicated) in ESL programs
- 900 international students
- 1,700 students in Extended Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS)
- 2,600 student enrollments (duplicated) in the Older Adults Program
- 1,800 students in CalWorks
- 2,900 students in Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS)
- 3,700 students in online and telecourses
- 8,700 students receiving tutoring

The demographic profile of both credit and noncredit student enrollments reflects the broad diversity of the population of the City and County of San Francisco. Students of Asian and Pacific Islander backgrounds represent more than 30 percent of credit and more than 40 percent of noncredit enrollments; Latino/Hispanic students are 15 percent of credit enrollments and 29 percent in noncredit; African-American students represent 9 percent of credit and 6 percent of noncredit enrollments (note that their number of enrollments in noncredit has decreased by 22 percent since 1994–95); and White/Non-Hispanic students are 28 percent of credit and 14 percent of noncredit students. It should be noted that the number of “Other Nonwhite” and “Unknown” students has been increasing.
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### TABLE 3.4

**Credit Ethnicity 1994–95 to 2004–05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>American Indian/Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Other Non-White</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994–95</td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>11,719</td>
<td>3,257</td>
<td>5,091</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>11,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>12,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>3,601</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>13,088</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>13,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>13,462</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>13,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>3,743</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>13,876</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>6,211</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>13,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>14,365</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>6,582</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>13,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>6,955</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>14,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>16,802</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>7,294</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>15,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>4,396</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>17,394</td>
<td>3,898</td>
<td>7,551</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>15,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>15,222</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>7,172</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>13,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>14,412</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>7,237</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td>13,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRAPH 3.5a

**Noncredit Ethnicity 1998–99 and 2004–05**
TABLE 3.5
Noncredit Ethnicity 1994–95 to 2003–04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>American Indian/Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Other Non-White</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994–95</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>16,166</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>10,007</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>9,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>3,318</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>17,525</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>12,014</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>10,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17,252</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>11,390</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>9,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>17,280</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>10,955</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>7,057</td>
<td>7,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>18,373</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>11,448</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>6,852</td>
<td>7,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>2,917</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>18,658</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>12,759</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>6,372</td>
<td>7,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20,369</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>13,791</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>19,811</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>13,711</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6,839</td>
<td>6,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>18,578</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>12,301</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>7,106</td>
<td>5,763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 3.6

Credit Gender 1994–95 to 2004–05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994–95</td>
<td>20,053</td>
<td>16,766</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>21,384</td>
<td>17,801</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>23,330</td>
<td>19,170</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>24,032</td>
<td>19,351</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>24,563</td>
<td>19,462</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>24,969</td>
<td>20,043</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>25,820</td>
<td>20,866</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td>22,304</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>28,945</td>
<td>22,441</td>
<td>1,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>26,486</td>
<td>20,418</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>26,436</td>
<td>20,257</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3.7
Noncredit Gender 1994–95 to 2003–04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994–95</td>
<td>24,807</td>
<td>17,674</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>25,980</td>
<td>18,547</td>
<td>1,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>26,885</td>
<td>19,062</td>
<td>2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>18,924</td>
<td>3,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>25,005</td>
<td>17,769</td>
<td>4,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>24,858</td>
<td>17,827</td>
<td>6,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>24,959</td>
<td>18,250</td>
<td>6,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>26,290</td>
<td>19,099</td>
<td>6,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>25,630</td>
<td>18,759</td>
<td>7,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>23,728</td>
<td>17,423</td>
<td>6,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflecting the aging trend within the San Francisco population, the CCSF student population is older than the population of most community colleges. The average age of a CCSF student is 33, slightly younger for credit students and older for noncredit.

**TABLE 3.8**

**Credit Student Age 1994–95 to 2004–05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>16–19</th>
<th>20–29</th>
<th>30–49</th>
<th>50+</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994–95</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 3.9
Noncredit Student Age 1994–95 to 2003–04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>16–19</th>
<th>20–29</th>
<th>30–49</th>
<th>50+</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994–95</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCSF’s noncredit programs play a significant role in enabling students to attain their goals. Noncredit programs in ESL, Transitional Studies and vocational areas such as Business provide a foundation for students to enroll in credit certificate and degree programs. Graph 3.10 and Table 3.10 show the annual number of students in credit with prior noncredit courses.

**TABLE 3.10**

Annual Total Enrollment of Credit Students with Prior Noncredit Courses 1994–95 to 2004–05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Credit Only</th>
<th>Prior Noncredit</th>
<th>Annual Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994–95</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A significant number of new first-time credit students taking the matriculation placement tests place into pre-collegiate level Mathematics and English courses (everything below Advanced Algebra and English 1A). The following table shows new first-time student placements in the pre-collegiate sequence overall (lower and upper levels). In 2004, of the students taking the placement exam, 80.2 percent placed into at least one pre-collegiate course.

**TABLE 3.11**

**Pre-Collegiate Placement of New First-Time Students 1998 to 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL TERMS</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One or two Lower Level Pre-Collegiate Placements</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or two Upper Level Pre-Collegiate Placements (no lower level placements)</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Students with Any Pre-Collegiate Placement(s) (upper or lower)</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Placements Only</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (No placements)</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of New First-Time Students</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>3,539</td>
<td>4,128</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>3,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCSF has one of the largest international student programs among the California community colleges. While Table 3.12 shows the percent of out-of-state students as more or less holding steady for the academic years 1998–99 through 2004–05, the most recent data from Fall 2005 suggest that the number of out-of-state students, while relatively small, is increasing significantly (by 53 percent when comparing Fall 2004 to Fall 2005, based on FTES, not headcount).

### Table 3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Out-of-State</th>
<th></th>
<th>International</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An increasing number of our students are receiving financial aid as displayed in the following figure.

**GRAPH 3.13**

**Financial Aid Recipients 1998–99 to 2004–05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students Receiving Financial Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>7,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>8,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>8,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>9,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>10,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>12,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>13,995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** CCSF Office of Financial Aid.
From 2002–03 to 2003–04, the number of credit students who received no matriculation services has decreased by 18.8 percent. The number of credit students receiving three services has increased slightly by 2.2 percent, while the numbers of credit students receiving one or two services have decreased by 9.7 percent and 10.1 percent respectively. With respect to noncredit students, the number receiving no matriculation services has increased by 2.3 percent from 2002–03 to 2003–04, while the number of students receiving three services has decreased by 24.4 percent. The numbers of noncredit students receiving one or two services has decreased as well, by 12.8 percent and 10.1 percent respectively.

**GRAPH 3.14**

**Credit Matriculation Services Received 1998 to 2004**

**TABLE 3.14**

**Credit Matriculation Services Received 1998 to 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>0 Services Received</th>
<th>1 Service Received</th>
<th>2 Services Received</th>
<th>3 Services Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>18,942</td>
<td>6,156</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>16,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>19,989</td>
<td>6,069</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>17,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>21,498</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>17,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>23,276</td>
<td>7,201</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>18,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>23,233</td>
<td>7,426</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>20,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>18,861</td>
<td>6,683</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>20,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18,401</td>
<td>6,237</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>21,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 3.15
Noncredit Matriculation Services Received 1998 to 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>0 Services Received</th>
<th>1 Service Received</th>
<th>2 Services Received</th>
<th>3 Services Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>36,595</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>8,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>31,178</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>12,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>28,572</td>
<td>4,227</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>14,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27,812</td>
<td>4,521</td>
<td>3,379</td>
<td>16,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>27,384</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>17,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25,379</td>
<td>3,793</td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td>15,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>23,842</td>
<td>5,526</td>
<td>3,783</td>
<td>12,411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Student Opinion of CCSF

A recent survey of credit students (2004–05) provides a picture of student opinion of the College (a survey of noncredit students will not be completed until Fall 2005). Students gave very high ratings to faculty, staff, and administrators at the College. Students also gave high ratings to College instruction and student services. In both cases, the level of ratings vary by age; the two age groups shown in the figures below represent the widest disparity in ratings.

NOTE: Based on responses from 3,000 credit students. The survey was administered to over 11,000 credit students.

Source: 2004–05 Survey of CCSF Credit Students
NOTE: Rated on a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, and 4 = excellent
Source: 2004–05 Survey of CCSF Credit Students
GRAPHS 4.4 & 4.5

Student Rating of Instruction and Related Services 2004–05

NOTE: Rated on a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, and 4 = excellent

Source: 2004–05 Survey of CCSF Credit Students
V. Student Performance

The following tables and charts provide a picture of student performance based upon some of the College’s performance indicators reported annually to the College community (see College Performance Indicators Reports, 2003–04; 2004–05; 2005–06).

Student course success rates in pre-collegiate English, ESL, and Math courses have varied over the years, but exhibit a generally increasing trend; however, the College remains behind the California community college system-wide average (now at 62 percent) in pre-collegiate basic skills achievement, with the notable exception of performance in 2002–03. CCSF overall course success rates, including transfer and vocational courses, are above the system-wide average. Occupational course success, in particular, has shown a significant improvement as of 2003–04.

### TABLE 5.1

**Course Success, Pre-collegiate (Upper and Lower)**  
**Math, English, and ESL, 1994–95 to 2004–05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994–95</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5,173</td>
<td>12,623</td>
<td>2,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5,213</td>
<td>10,880</td>
<td>3,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5,671</td>
<td>11,894</td>
<td>3,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6,034</td>
<td>11,767</td>
<td>4,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6,693</td>
<td>11,651</td>
<td>5,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6,707</td>
<td>11,204</td>
<td>5,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7,059</td>
<td>10,646</td>
<td>6,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7,521</td>
<td>11,351</td>
<td>6,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7,890</td>
<td>10,101</td>
<td>6,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8,377</td>
<td>9,220</td>
<td>6,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>8,786</td>
<td>9,011</td>
<td>6,041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Research, Planning and Grants, DSS, 7/19/05
TABLE 5.2
Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Course Success
(overall but not by subject matter area) 1995–96 to 2003–04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CCSF</th>
<th>CA Community College System Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5.3
All Course Success 1995–96 to 2003–04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CCSF</th>
<th>CA Community College System Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: District Performance on Partnership for Excellence Goals, Chancellor’s Office California Community Colleges, April 2005
**TABLE 5.4**

*Transfer Course Success 1995–96 to 2003–04*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CCSF</th>
<th>CA Community College System Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5.5**

*Occupational Course Success 1995–96 to 2003–04*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CCSF</th>
<th>CA Community College System Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* District Performance on Partnership for Excellence Goals, Chancellor’s Office California Community Colleges, April 2005
Since 1995, the number of students attaining associate degrees and certificates continues to increase; student transfers to UC campuses reached an all-time high of 311 in 2003–04. CCSF ranks among the top ten community colleges in the state in student transfers to CSU with over 1,000 per year. The performance of CCSF transfer students at CSU campuses is higher than native (i.e., non-transfer) CSU students.

**TABLE 5.6**

**Degrees and Certificates by Year 1995–96 to 2003–04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995–96</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–97</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–98</td>
<td>263**</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>1,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>1,285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

**Data problem recognized by both the State Chancellor’s Office & CCSF**

**Source:** http://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/awards.cf

**TABLE 5.7**

**CCSF Student Transfers: In-State and Out-Of-State Public and Private Transfers 1998 to 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Year</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Data-match with National Student Clearinghouse: Students were those who were not summer-only and who enrolled in 12 or more units and who left City College between 1998 and 2002. Data prior to 1998 from the National Student Clearinghouse is incomplete.
In 2004, the average time for a student to achieve a certificate was almost four years, or eight semesters, and over five years for an associate degree or almost 11 semesters. Students achieving both a certificate and a degree in 2004 took an average of 10.32 semesters compared to 13.62 semesters in 1993, a very positive trend.

### TABLE 5.8
**Success of CCSF to CSU Transfer Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Persistence Rate</th>
<th>Fall 2003 GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systemwide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** “persistence rate” is based on year-to-year persistence.

In 2004, the average time for a student to achieve a certificate was almost four years, or eight semesters, and over five years for an associate degree or almost 11 semesters. Students achieving both a certificate and a degree in 2004 took an average of 10.32 semesters compared to 13.62 semesters in 1993, a very positive trend.

### GRAPH 5.9
**Average Number of Terms to Degree, Certificate or Both, 1994 to 2004**
### TABLE 5.9

**Average Number of Terms to Degree, Certificate or Both, 1993 to 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Year</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Degree + Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>14.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>13.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>11.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of Research, Planning and Grants*
VI. CCSF Faculty, Staff and Administrators

City College of San Francisco currently employs 2,900 classified staff, faculty, and administrators, which includes over 700 full-time and 1,100 part-time faculty. The College has historically maintained a large core of full-time faculty and continues to report that over 70 percent of its credit hours are taught by full-time faculty. Since the mid-1990s, CCSF's administrator workforce has remained exceptionally low. Tables 6.1 to 6.5 provide a comparative ethnic profile of CCSF faculty, staff, and administrators for 2004 contrasted with 1998, in concert with the changing demographics in the city, the Bay Area, and the state.

TABLE 6.1
Full-time Faculty 1998 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL-TIME FACULTY</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Human Resources Department
## TABLE 6.2

**Part-time Faculty 1998 and 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART-TIME FACULTY</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CCSF Human Resources Department*
## TABLE 6.3
Full-time Staff 1998 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL-TIME CLASSIFIED</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Human Resources Department
### TABLE 6.4
Part-time Staff 1998 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART-TIME CLASSIFIED</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Human Resources Department
### TABLE 6.5
Administrators 1998 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Human Resources Department

### TABLE 6.6
Additional Demographic Data for CCSF Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Classified Staff</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: These figures are based on employee self reports collected by the CCSF Human Resources Department. Figures for faculty and classified staff are from Fall 2004; figures for administrators are from Fall 2005.
City College of San Francisco offers classes at 12 campuses, 21 additional principal sites, and nearly 200 other instructional sites.

A. Ocean Avenue Campus, 50 Phelan Ave.
B. Alemany Campus, 750 Eddy St.
C. Chinatown/North Beach Campus, 940 Filbert St.
D. Downtown Campus, 88 Fourth St.
F. John Adams Campus, 1860 Hayes St.
G. Evans Campus, 1400 Evans Ave.
H. Mission Campus, 375 Alabama St., 3rd Floor
I. Southeast Campus, 1800 Oakdale Ave.
J. Adult Learning & Tutorial Center, 31 Gough St.
K. Castro/Valencia Campus, 1220 Noe St.
L. Airport Campus, Bldg. 928, S.F. International Airport
Identified below are some of CCSF’s larger instructional sites.

1. San Francisco Senior Center
2. Marina Middle School
3. St. Mary’s CH/NB Annex
5. On Lok
6. Jewish Community Center
7. Laurel Hill Nursery School
8. Park Presidio Church
9. S.F. Human Services Department
10. Glide Memorial Church
11. Plumbing Apprentice Union
12. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Community Center
13. Mission High School
14. El Colegio de Mision
15. Mission Language Vocational School
16. Sunset Community Education Center
17. Stationary Engineers JATC
18. YMCA (Stonestown)
19. Recreation Center for the Handicapped
20. Jewish Home for Aged
21. Visitacion Valley Community Center
ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF STUDY

Accreditation Timeline

Fall 2003
1. Establish work group for self-study process

---

Spring 2004
1. Two-phased approach to Self Study identified
2. WASC Training Workshop (hosted by CCSF)
3. Call for Standards Committees Volunteers
4. Evidence Gathering
5. Board of Trustees Work Session
6. Standards Committees Orientations (2)

---

Summer 2004
1. Design and build web site as repository for templates, key documentation, evidence and reports
2. Gather evidence for fall committees to review

---

Fall 2004
1. Flex Day: Orientation/Team Meetings
2. Student Forums (focus groups at Student Union)
3. Board of Trustees Work Session
4. Call for Thematic Teams Volunteers
5. Draft Standards Reports

---

Spring 2005
1. Flex Day: Orientation on Thematic Essays
2. First draft Thematic Essays
4. College-wide Listening Sessions (open meetings)
5. Second draft Thematic Essays
6. Board of Trustees Work Session
7. Review and approval of Thematic Essays

---

Summer 2005
1. Editorial team meetings commence
2. Board of Trustees Work Session
3. Comprehensive Report Design/Layout
4. Catalog Evidence

---

Fall 2005
1. Flex Day: Project Status Report
2. Distribute draft Report to College community
3. College-wide Listening Sessions (open meetings)
4. Board of Trustees Work Session
5. Board of Trustees: Final Report Approval
6. Design Report
7. Print Report

---

Spring 2006
1. Logistical preparations for WASC Visit
2. WASC Visit
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PARTICIPANT LISTS

Standard I
Susan Lopez .................. Faculty ESL, Co-Chair
Bruce Smith .................. Dean, School of Liberal Arts/Castro-Valencia Campus, Co-Chair
Kristin Charles ............ Associate Dean, Grants & Resource Development
Steven Glick ............... Dean, Downtown Campus/School of Business
Augusta Goldstein ........ Faculty, ESL
Suzanne Korey ............. Acting Dean, Vocational Education
David Lisker ............... Faculty, ESL
Maureen Rooney ........... Faculty, ESL
Peter Stoffers ............. Faculty, Continuing Students - Counseling
Fred Teti .................... Faculty, Mathematics
Gary Tom .................... Dean, Alemany Campus
Ronald Young .............. Classified Staff, Student Automotive

Standard II.A
Brian Ellison .............. Dean, Office of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation and Tenure, Co-Chair
Raymond Gamba ........... Acting Department Chair, Behavioral Science, Co-Chair
Deanna Abma ............... Faculty, Office of Instruction/Articulation
Amy Conger ................ Faculty, Graphic Communications
Karen Cox ................... Faculty, English
Carlota Del Portillo ....... Dean, Mission Campus
Shama Hasib ................ Faculty, ESL
Veronica Hunnicutt ........ Dean, Southeast Campus
Paul Johnson ............... Department Chair, Disabled Students Programs/Services
Jeanne Kearsley .......... Faculty, ESL
Jill Kersey ................. Classified Staff, Audiovisual
Sami Kudsi .................. Faculty, English
Louise Louie ............... Department Chair, Institute for International Students
Albert Lozano .............. Faculty, Foreign Languages
Robert McAteer ............ Department Chair, Photography
Kitty Moriwaki .......... Faculty, Matriculation Office
Linda Reichman .......... Faculty, ESL
Maria Rosales-Uribe ....... Faculty, Transitional Studies
Andrea Sanelli ............. Faculty, English
Sharon Seymour .......... Department Chair, ESL
Elisa Shore .................. Faculty, ESL
Andrea Speraw ............. Faculty, Vocational Education
Kyle Thornton .............. Department Chair, Diagnostic Medical Imaging
Wing Tsao .................. Dean, School of Science and Mathematics
Sally Winn .................. Faculty, ESL
Gloria Yee ................. Faculty, English
Standard II.B

Ophelia Clark ................. Faculty, Business, Co-Chair
Jane Lualhati ............... Classified Staff, Student Activities, Co-Chair
Robert Balestreri .......... Dean, Admissions and Records Services
Jorge Bell .................... Dean, Financial Aid
Elizabeth Brent ............. Dean, Outreach and Recruitment Services
Brenda Brown ............... Acting Director, African American Scholastic Programs
Paula Cahill ................. Classified Staff, Student Health
Nicholar Chang .............. Dean, Matriculation Office
Christine Francisco ........ Faculty, Mentoring and Service Learning
Kathe German ............... Resource, Chancellor's Office
Karen Grant ................. Classified Staff, Institutional Advancement - Scholarship
Don Griffin ................. Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs/Student Development
Lorelei Leung ............... Faculty, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services
Marylou Leyba-Frank ........ Associate Dean, Admissions and Records
Scarlett Liu ................. Faculty, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services
Monika Liu ................... Classified Staff, Admissions and Records
James Macale ................ Classified Staff, Financial Aid
Lindy McKnight ............. Department Chair, Counseling
Maria Pena ................... Classified Staff, Financial Aid
Indiana Quadra .............. Department Chair, Career Development and Placement Center
Mark Robinson .............. Associate Dean, Student Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities
Lisa Romano ................. Faculty, New Students Counseling
Marvin Ruiz .................. Faculty, Outreach and Recruitment Services
Chris Shaeffer .............. Faculty, Transitional Studies
Sophia Toney ................. Classified Staff, Financial Aid
Marcia Van Dyke ........... Faculty, Student Health

Standard II.C

Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer ..... Faculty, Library, Co-Chair
Andrea Niosi ................. Faculty, Library, Co-Chair
Morris Bibliowicz .......... Faculty, ESL
Susan Hathaway ............. Classified Staff, Library
Rita Jones .................... Dean, Department Chair, Library
Robert Lam .................. Classified Staff, Information Technology Services
Brian Lym ..................... Faculty, Library
Nadine Rosenthal .......... Department Chair, Learning Assistance Program
Elizabeth Stewart .......... Faculty, Learning Assistance Programs
Annette Taylor .............. Classified Staff, Early Childhood Mentoring Program
Standard III.A
Lety Santana Sazo.........Classified Staff, Human Resources, Co-Chair
Elisa Dillahunty.........Classified Staff, Human Resources
Stephanie Duncan........Classified Staff, Human Resources
Linda Jackson ..........Associate Director, Affirmative Action
Amy Kern .................Classified Staff, Financial Aid
Angie Morgan ..........Classified Staff, Human Resources
Tyrone Navarro ..........Classified Staff, Financial Aid
Carolyn Norris ..........Classified Staff, Human Resources
Mia Rusali .............Associate Director, Human Resources
Clara Starr ..........Director, Human Resources

Standard III.B
Mamie How ...............Dean, Information Technology Services, Co-Chair
Julia Bergman ..........Faculty, Library
James Blomquist .......Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Planning
Ann Clark ...............Faculty, Music
Denton Crews ..........Resource, Chancellor's Office
Doretha Fuller-Evans ...Classified Staff, Custodial Services
Dana Galloway ..........Classified Staff, Broadcast Electronic Media Arts
Terry Hall .........Dean, Faculty Support Services, Course/Room Scheduling
James Keenan ..........Classified Staff, Buildings and Grounds
Michael Kelly ..........Faculty, Computer Science
Carl Koehler ..........Chief of Police, Campus Police
David Liggett ..........Classified Staff, Facilities Planning
James Lim ..........Faculty, Library

Standard III.C
Mamie How ...............Dean, Information Technology Services, Co-Chair
George Hearst ..........Classified Staff, Mail Services
James Lim ..........Faculty, Library
Doug Re .................Director, Information Technology Services
Glen Van Lehn ..........Classified Staff, Information Technology Services

Standard III.D
Lety Santana Sazo.........Classified Staff, Human Resources, Co-Chair
Peter Goldstein ..........Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration
John Bilmont ..........Controller, Interim Chief Financial Officer
James Kendrix ..........Chief Financial Officer, District Business Office
Bruce Leung ..........Faculty, Business
Donald Lind ..........Director, Payroll
Standard IV
Steve Kech ................ Classified Staff, Public Information, Co-Chair
Lawrence Klein .......... Interim Dean, School of Behavioral Science, Co-Chair
David Yee ............... Department Chair, Physics, Co-Chair
Ophelia Clark .......... Faculty, Business
Philip Day .............. Chancellor, Chancellor's Office
Alberto De la Rosa ...... Student
Skip Fotch .............. Associate Dean, Student Activities
Attila Gabor ............ Classified Staff, Research, Planning and Grants
Robert Gabriner .......... Vice Chancellor, Institutional Advancement
Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer .. Faculty, Library
Stephen Herman .......... Director, Administrative Services
Christopher Kox ........ Department Chair, Library Information Technology
Ronald Lee .............. Legal Counsel, General Counsel Office
Joanne Low ............. Dean, School of ESL and International Education
Marth Lucey .......... Director, Public Information
Milton Marks, III ....... Trustee, Board of Trustees
John Odell .............. Faculty, Broadcast Electronic Media Arts
Francine Podenski ...... Department Chair, Broadcast Electronic Media Arts
Allyson Satterlund ...... Special Assistant, Chancellor's Office
Leslie Smith ............ Dean, Government Relations
Jack Sparks .............. Faculty, Continuing Students Counseling

Theme 1
Kristin Charles .......... Associate Dean, Grants & Resource Development, Co-Chair
Raymond Gamba .......... Acting Department Chair, Behavioral Sciences, Co-Chair
Paul Johnson ............ Department Chair, Disabled Students Programs/Services
Jeanne Kearsley ........ Faculty, ESL
Sally Winn .............. Faculty, ESL

Theme 2
Robert McAteer ........ Department Chair, Photography, Co-Chair
Bruce Smith .......... Dean, School of Liberal Arts/Castro-Valencia Campus, Co-Chair
Karen Cox .............. Faculty, English
Augusta Goldstein ...... Faculty, ESL
Sami Kudsi .............. Faculty, English
Lorelei Leung .......... Faculty, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services
Marylou Massey-Henderson Faculty, Disabled Students Programs/Services
Lindy McKnight .......... Department Chair, Counseling
Andrea Niosi .......... Faculty, Library
Indiana Quadra .......... Department Chair, Career Development and Placement Center
Lisa Romano .......... Faculty, New Student Counseling
Maria Rosales-Uribes .. Faculty, Transitional Studies
Jessica Williams .......... Faculty, Social Sciences
Paul Wong .............. Department Chair, International Student Counseling
Theme 3
Ophelia Clark ............. Faculty, Business, Co-Chair
Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer .... Faculty, Library, Co-Chair
Carlota Del Portillo ........ Dean, Mission Campus
Kathe German ............. Resource, Chancellor’s Office
David Lisker .............. Faculty, ESL
Crima Pogge .............. Faculty, Biology
Wing Tsao ................. Dean, School of Science & Mathematics

Theme 4
Robert Gabriner ............ Vice Chancellor, Institutional Advancement, Co-Chair
Susan Lopez ............... Faculty, ESL, Co-Chair
Carolyn Escalante .......... Classified Staff, Admissions and Records
Shama Hasib ............... Faculty, ESL
John Odell ................. Faculty, Broadcast Electronic Media Arts
Gary Tom .................... Dean, Alemany

Theme 5
Brian Ellison ............... Dean, Office of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation and Tenure, Co-Chair
Sharon Seymour ........... Department Chair, ESL, Co-Chair
Deanna Abma ............... Faculty, Office of Instruction/Articulation
Mamie How ................. Dean, Information Technology Services
James Lim ................... Faculty, Library
Chris Shaeffer ............. Faculty, Transitional Studies
Fred Teti ................. Faculty, Mathematics
Ellen Wall ................ Faculty, English

Theme 6
Kitty Moriwaki ............. Faculty, Matriculation Office, Co-Chair
David Yee .................. Department Chair, Physics, Co-Chair
Veronica Hunnicutt ........ Dean, Southeast Campus
Hal Huntsman .............. Classified Staff, Mathematics
Lawrence Klein ............ Interim Dean, School of Behavioral Science
Monika Liu ................. Classified Staff, Admissions and Records
Brian Lym ................ Faculty, Library
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Darlene Alioto ............... Chair, Department Chairs Council
Kristin Charles ............... Associate Dean, Grants & Resource Development
Ophelia Clark ............... Faculty, Business
Dr. Philip Day ............... Chancellor, Chancellor's Office
Marilyn Dugyami ............. President, Associated Students
Dr. Brian Ellison ............. Dean, Office of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation and Tenure
Allan Fisher ................. President, AFT 2121 (2004)
Dr. Robert Gabriner ........... Vice Chancellor, Institutional Advancement,
                             Director of CCSF Self Study, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Raymond Gamba ............. Acting Department Chair, Behavioral Sciences
Dr. Kathe German .......... Resource, Chancellor's Office
Peter Goldstein .............. Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration
Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer ... Faculty, Library
Dr. Don Griffin ............. Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs/Student Development
Mamie How .................. Dean, Information Technology Services
Steve Kech .................. Classified Staff, Public Information
Lawrence Klein ............. Interim Dean, School of Behavioral Science
Veronica Lawrence .......... Student Trustee
Susan Lopez ................. Faculty, ESL
Jane Lualhati ............... Classified Staff, Student Activities Office
Milton Marks, III .......... Trustee, Board of Trustees
Robert McAteer ............. Department Chair, Photography
Kitty Moriwaki ............. Faculty, Matriculation Office
Edward Murray ............. President, AFT 2121 (2005)
Andrea Niosi ................. Faculty, Library
Lety Santana Sazo .......... Classified Staff, Human Resources
Sharon Seymour ............. Department Chair, ESL
Dr. Bruce Smith .......... Dean, School of Liberal Arts/Castro-Valencia Campus
Athena Steff ................. President, SEIU 790 – CCSF Chapter
Fred Teti .................. President, Academic Senate
Rose Vela ................. President, Classified Senate
David Yee ................. Department Chair, Physics
Ann Zinn ................. Classified Staff, Chancellor's Office
READERS' GUIDE TO
THE CCSF ACCREDITATION SELF STUDY

Warning: This Accreditation Self Study is different from most community college reports, and consequently we have developed this brief Readers’ Guide to help you navigate and understand what we have constructed here in these pages. The CCSF Self Study is neither a traditional examination of the evidence supporting the College’s alignment with the WASC standards, nor is it a series of essays constructed around a theme integrating all the evidence under each thematic topic.

The CCSF Self Study seeks to integrate the traditional analytical framework of describing and analyzing institutional evidence with a set of six theme-based essays that provide the reader with a deeper understanding of the College and its achievements. The net effect, we hope, is to portray the landscape of our institution with additional close-up views of some of the most significant advances that we have made since the College’s last accreditation visit in the year 2000. We strongly recommend that you read the standards reports before reading the theme essays.

I. Context
The report sets the context for the study with two brief reports: one on what the College has been doing to respond to the accreditation recommendations from the 2000 visit, and the other, an introduction to CCSF and the City of San Francisco using data from the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, and the CCSF Decision Support System.

II. Standards Reports
During Fall 2004, over 120 College participants studied and discussed hundreds of pages of evidence and then crafted a series of reports about how well the College is meeting the WASC standards. The reports were discussed within the larger College community, modified and revised, and finally approved by the Accreditation Steering Committee. The four major standards are broken into nine reports covering Standards I, II A, IIB, IIC, IIIA, IIIB, IIIC, IIID, and IV.

Each report contains extensive description and analysis of the evidence related to each standard. However, unlike the traditional self studies that contain a “Plan” section, the nine standards reports conclude by identifying strengths and areas for improvement developed by the standard committee and approved by the Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee. The recommendations for improvement identified in the individual standards reports are brought together in a separate section entitled Major Findings (see below).

III. Introduction to the Theme Essays
To keep the reader on track, we have written a short introduction to explain the context for the Theme Essays, the underlining assumptions that were used in developing the Theme Essays, and their relationship to the Standards Reports. Again, we recommend that you read the Standards Reports before reading the Theme Essays.
IV. Theme-Based Essays
During Spring 2005, the CCSF self-study standards committees were reorganized into six theme-based committees. Each committee produced an essay structured around the theme and an accompanying descriptive paragraph provided by the Accrediting Commission. The theme-based essays provide an institutional context and use case studies of College practice as exemplars of the way the institution is addressing:

- Quality education
- Student learning outcomes
- Dialog
- Continuous improvement
- Effective use of resources to promote student learning and success
- Honesty and integrity

The context section provides the reader with descriptions of selected, representative institutional processes, procedures, and practices that support the specific detailed case study(s) discussed in the essay. Each essay concludes by identifying strengths and areas for improvement that are also addressed in the Major Findings section.

V. Major Findings
At the end of the self-study report there is a separate section entitled Major Findings which is a distillation of all the improvement recommendations contained within both the Standards Reports and the Theme Essays. The Major Findings section provides the College with the broad issues that will require institutional action in the next period of time.
ABSTRACT OF THE SELF STUDY

Standards Reports

Standard I:  
Mission & Institutional Effectiveness

City College of San Francisco demonstrates its commitment to an ongoing evaluation of institutional policies and procedures by conducting periodic reviews of those practices and engaging in a reflective dialog on the effectiveness of its governance and administrative activities. The College has a system of Shared Governance which is stronger than that of many institutions and which provides for a great deal of reflective dialog on institutional processes and effectiveness. In addition to Shared Governance entities, the participation of employee unions and a Department Chairs’ Council contributes significantly to the amount of dialog that takes place among the constituencies and between the leadership and the Board. In that context, the College has developed a strong and responsive annual planning process that is based on a strategic plan rooted in the Mission and Vision Statements. The College conducts an assessment of progress on its Annual Plan twice a year and this assessment provides the executive administration, the Board of Trustees, and the general public with quantitative and qualitative information on the College’s progress in meeting its goals. However, the evaluation of this progress is not adequately incorporated into the existing institution-wide planning and budgeting processes.

The College has also developed a number of specific assessments of student outcomes and institutional effectiveness that provide College constituencies and the general public with strong and useful evidence of student achievement and program performance. Program Review is conducted by almost all of the academic and student services departments on a regular cycle, but a few Student Services, instructional, and administrative units have not adhered to the timetable, and the results of Program Review are not adequately incorporated into the other institutional planning and evaluation procedures.

The College has developed strong data resources that provide faculty, administrators, staff, students, and the community with detailed information on student access, retention, and success. In addition, administrators, department chairs, and other interested faculty have ready access to extensive student demographic information, productivity analyses, and student demand for courses.

The College demonstrates, in numerous ways, its strong commitment to continual institutional improvement and a mission that emphasizes student learning.

Standard II.A: Instructional Programs

This report rests on a careful review and assessment of eight primary elements of the institution’s instructional program including: the delivery of the instructional program and institutional integrity, the quality of the instructional program, the General Education curriculum, the associate degree programs, the vocational programs, the dissemination of information about instructional programs, academic freedom and responsibility, and instructional programs located in foreign countries.

The General Education Program reflects an appropriate breadth and depth. The instructional program planning and evaluation processes established since the 2000 Accreditation Self Study are effective and have promoted broad-based involvement across the institution. The College’s ability to disseminate print information to internal and external stakeholders is strong, although the College website is in need of
improvement. While the District has adopted and publishes policies and procedures on academic freedom and honesty, the Faculty Handbook should be revised to include information regarding academic freedom and the guidelines for course syllabi should include specific expectations for academic honesty and the sanctions for violation of the academic honesty policy.

The College has developed several recent initiatives related to student learning outcomes including the addition of student learning outcomes statements for some departments in the 2005-06 College Catalog. Institutional dialog has occurred among many Shared Governance bodies regarding the student learning outcome paradigm. However, support from the institution’s leadership, significant training and resources, and additional institutional discussion regarding all aspects of this paradigm will be essential if a paradigm shift is to occur. Since the last accreditation review in 2000, the College has raised both the Mathematics and English graduation requirements. In addition, the College has adopted a Transfer Associate Degree designed to promote degree completion by students transferring to the California State University system.

The College has engaged in a number of successful efforts to address student learning styles, although the dissemination of information about these efforts needs improvement to ensure as many faculty and students as possible can benefit from these initiatives. The College’s vocational programs have historically used student learning outcomes assessment in many programs, collaborate with advisory committees in the development and revision of curricula, and have a strong record of successfully preparing students for employment. However, the College needs to improve the tracking of vocational students once they leave the institution in order to ensure the curriculum reflects the needs of the labor market.

The College has a well-articulated procedure for academic Program Review. Yet the Standard II.A Committee found that the completion rates for programs scheduled for review were just over 70 percent for the period between 1999 and 2005. In addition, there is no systematic process for the review and revision of curricula when programs go through Program Review. The College needs to improve the completion rates and the effectiveness of its Program Review procedures by clearly defining and disseminating the goals, expectations, and benefits for Program Review. A process for institutional follow-up should be instituted to ensure that action plans are implemented. The Program Review procedures should include a systematic review of the curricula to assess the quality and currency of the course outlines and the programs that support those courses. The development of the Decision Support System has had a significant positive impact on the use of data in short- and long-term decision making at all levels of the institution.

**Standard II.B: Student Support Services**

Since the last accreditation review in 2000, the Student Development Division has undergone significant change. First and foremost, the Division was defined as an organizational unit and provided with leadership in the form of a Vice Chancellor of Student Development; this initiative resulted in the collaborative identification of a common mandate and the creation of the Division’s first Educational Plan describing a three-year program of development. Second, a comprehensive analysis of the unit resulted in a significant restructuring with particular attention to the area of student support services, an undertaking that provided the opportunity for increased leadership and collaboration, as well as enhanced innovation, and led to improved access and service delivery. Third, the Division collaborated on the development and implementation of its first Technology Plan, addressing eight critical priorities ranging from improvements in Banner to the development of an electronic educational plan linked with degree audit and web-based admissions and registration. Fourth, the Division embarked on the development of a comprehensive professional development program, resulting in the implementation of the student learning outcomes initiative as well as improved training and development at the departmental and divisional levels focusing, in particular, on Student Support Services. Lastly, the Division participated in the
development and implementation of externally funded projects such as Title III and Koret that advanced efforts to construct the systems that will ultimately ensure that the Division delivers on the promise of “Students First.”

Within this context, the assessment of Standard II.B revealed significant improvements in accessibility, coherence, and quality sustained through ongoing assessment and continuing development. Specifically, the analysis found:

• Considerable effort has been devoted to the redesign of programs and services and the refinement of accompanying delivery systems to increase accessibility throughout the District, efforts that are reflected in the analysis of Standard II.B.1. The College should continue to develop technology to augment the delivery of student support services while maintaining its strong commitment to the personal delivery of service by College personnel.

• Careful attention has been given to the accessibility, format, accuracy, and comprehensiveness of the Catalog and related information on the institution, its requirements and policies, as evidenced in the review of Standard II.B.2, a-d. The College should develop Board policies and procedures to govern the permanent maintenance of all student records, ensuring that they are secure and confidential with provisions for the backup of files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained.

• Special initiatives across the Division and beyond have contributed to the provision of equitable access, the learning environment, continued training and development, and multicultural understanding as reflected in the assessment of Standard II.B.3, a-f. The Division should sustain efforts to promote communication among programs and departments and increase visibility and accessibility with improved facilities. In addition, the Division should continue to refine its mission and define its outcomes at the Divisional, departmental, and programmatic levels, providing constituents with the opportunity to engage in a dialog and initiate the processes for assessing the learning environments within the Division.

• A comprehensive effort has been made to evaluate student support services and their impact on student achievement, persistence, and retention as indicated in the discussion of Standard II.B.4.

Significant changes have taken place in the Student Development Division since the last accreditation review and those changes have greatly improved the quality and accessibility of programs and services available to students.

Standard II.C: Library & Learning Support Services

Student learning and success are supported by the collections of materials; the curriculum offered by the Library and the Learning Assistance Department; and the services and facilities provided by Library and Learning Resources and other units constituting learning support services—the Learning Assistance Center (LAC), Broadcast Media Services, and student computer labs. The Committee found that the breadth and variety of library and learning support services across the District make important contributions to instructional and co-curricular programs. Outstanding examples include: (1) the Library’s exhibitions and programming that support the curriculum and enrich the College with intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities; (2) library reference/research assistance and service to off-campus students; (3) Language Center facilities and services; (4) student success courses/workshops and tutoring and learning support services offered by the LAC, including the leadership that LAC staff have provided on the Basic Skills Subcommittee to address the needs of basic skills students; and (5) the leadership taken by Library staff to establish an information literacy graduation requirement, as well as the Library’s information competency/research skills workshops and learning opportunities.

Several of the units of library and learning support services typically receive some of the highest ratings on student satisfaction surveys administered by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants. In addition, external reviewers have singled out some of the Library and Learning Support Services departments for awards, includ-
The institution has made significant progress in expanding the quantity of, variety of, and access to many library and learning support services by (1) collaborating with academic and vocational programs and other campus departments to plan and develop services (e.g., library faculty offering faculty technology training as part of the FLEX professional development days, the Technology Learning Center’s workshop series, etc.); (2) creating a distance learning library position; (3) providing more services and resources online with student-centered websites; (4) creating new facilities, such as computer labs with upgraded equipment and connections to the College network; (5) providing a dependable intra-campus library delivery system to facilitate access to library materials; and (6) planning for two new campus buildings that will contain libraries, computer labs, and tutoring centers, where either none or an inadequate number have existed. Concerted efforts have been made by staff in all of the library and learning support services units to better utilize their staff and resources to improve services for students and to focus on outcomes.

Several areas are in need of improvement. The College needs to develop strategies for more consistently providing adequate funding to maintain an up-to-date library collection, particularly in areas where the currency of information is crucial to the quality of the program (e.g., health and medical programs, computer science and technology, etc.). The continuing state budget limitations have also had a significant impact on the hours of operation for the Rosenberg Library and Learning Assistance computer labs as well as the maintenance and replacement of the equipment and furnishings in library and learning support services facilities. The College should establish a regular cycle for replacing computer lab equipment. While the library and learning support services departments have used evaluations by student and staff extensively, these programs should establish a regular cycle for assessing needs and satisfaction among faculty, students, and staff.

Standard III.A: Human Resources

The District has developed clear policies and procedures governing the employment, retention, evaluation, and professional development of its personnel. The institution demonstrates, through policies and practices, an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity and regularly assesses its effectiveness in this area consistent with its mission. The District has established procedures and guidelines to hire highly qualified individuals to respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse ethnic, socioeconomic, sexual orientation, disability, and educational backgrounds. The Human Resources Department, in conjunction with College constituents, has made a concerted effort through its hiring procedures to maintain the highest levels of commitment to academic excellence as well as to diversity and equity. Hiring processes for each employee category are aligned with institutional planning and budget cycles. Despite difficult restrictions on hiring resulting from funding limitations in recent years, the quality of educational services continues to improve and the number of students served continues to increase. This is a direct reflection of the quality of faculty, staff, and administrators employed by the College.

The College demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its employees and promotes a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration and improved levels of communication. The institution is committed to building effective staff development programs, ensuring healthy working conditions, and fostering an environment of respect and trust. Unfortunately, with the discontinuation of state funding, AB1725 travel funds were eliminated and the quality of FLEX day events were directly impacted. Through the efforts of the Chancellor and the leadership of the Office of Professional
Development, CCSF has been able to offer limited staff development programs and travel funding. However, there is still a substantial need for professional development programs that strengthen and improve academic programs and services, instruction, alternate delivery systems, and success in achieving student learning outcomes.

The evaluation of each category of staff is systematic and conducted at regular intervals. The criteria for evaluating administrators, faculty, and staff are defined in their respective collective bargaining agreements and/or District policies and procedures. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have as a component of their evaluation performance indicators linked to assessments of institutional effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. However, the faculty evaluation form should be reviewed through the Shared Governance process and in negotiations in the collective bargaining processes to ensure inclusion of the evaluation of effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. The recommendation by the 2000 WASC visiting team to evaluate all classified staff has been implemented, resulting in a complete revamping of the classified evaluation process.

Personnel policies and procedures are available to employees through a variety of sources. Personnel records are maintained with appropriate levels of confidentiality. Expectations for ethical behavior by employees of the District are covered in various District policies, employee handbooks, and collective bargaining agreements. The Administrators’ Association is currently working on a code of ethics for administrators. However, the District should review its policies pertaining to ethical behavior and develop a code of ethics for all employees.

Standard III.B: Physical Resources

There have been major changes and improvements in the College’s planning and implementation of physical resource projects since the last accreditation review. A successful bond initiative earned the approval of 73 percent of San Francisco voters in 2001, earmarking $195 million for facilities over the next decade. Under Proposition 39, the framework for which the 2001 bond was conducted, the College was eligible for $350 million. However, for a variety of reasons, the total amount sought was divided into two separate bond initiatives—the first phase (2001) for $195 million; the second (2005) for $246 million (this has been adjusted for increased construction costs). Prior to the 2001 bond initiative, the District’s only significant construction resource was $50 million from a bond passed in 1997. Those funds were earmarked for the purchase of the sites for the new Mission Campus and Chinatown/North Beach Campus and for a portion of the basic renovation and remodeling projects. In addition, the funds were also used to initiate the first phase of the technology network and campus connectivity project and the basic electrical upgrades needed to support it.

The local support for the 2001 initiative enabled the College to begin the planning for three new campus facilities: Mission and Chinatown/North Beach Campuses and the Community Health and Wellness Center, in addition to critical maintenance and repair work needed at multiple sites across the District. Construction of the new Mission Campus and the Community Health and Wellness Center commenced in August 2005. Plans have been completed and construction is underway for a Student Health Services Center and a Child Development Center. A Performing Arts Education Center, Advanced Technology Building, joint-use classroom building with San Francisco State University, Student Development Center, and the second phase of the technology network and campus connectivity project are in the design stage. The Facilities and Maintenance Departments were reorganized and placed under the supervision of a new Associate Vice Chancellor of Facilities Planning and Management. The restructuring allowed the Facilities Planning Department to hire perma-
nent, full-time project managers and reduce its prior dependency on construction management firms for project management services, with the goal of saving the District tens of thousands of dollars, streamlining project management, and improving the overall communications flow. Under the leadership of the Associate Vice Chancellor of Facilities Management, a District-wide sustainability and green building plan is being developed, which is leading to more energy-efficient buildings.

The College has integrated its facilities planning into its institutional planning process; fostering a strategic approach to prioritizing the physical resource needs of its students, faculty, and staff; and making effective use of the College’s Shared Governance System, including the planning and budgeting processes, to evaluate and act on the District’s priorities. A comprehensive Facilities Master Plan was developed with the participation and support of the College’s Shared Governance Facilities Review Committee. This is a 15-year plan for building, replacing, and renovating College facilities and was developed with the assistance of an outside facilities planning firm experienced in college master plan development. The District has multiple assessment mechanisms for evaluating the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services. For example, it utilizes its Banner administrative information system to annually review equipment needs, and an outside agency was hired to conduct an inventory and assessment of the physical condition of all buildings. The College has significantly improved communications related to facilities across institutional departments and offices. This has promoted more meaningful interactions between the Offices of Academic Affairs and Facilities Planning to assure the quality of programs and services as well as the health and welfare of students.

While the 2001 bond funding and the additional state dollars leveraged as a result of the bond have made it easier for the College to respond to the physical needs of the District’s many aging facilities, the resources are not adequate to cover the total costs of upgrades and repairs. At this time, the District plans to leverage additional state support through the second phase of the bond. Given the pressures of inflation and escalating construction costs, the District should continue long-range planning for the total cost of ownership for all of the new facilities and major equipment initiatives currently in the planning stages for construction or purchase.

### Standard III.C: Technology Resources

Since the last accreditation review, the College has embarked on a major period of technological development and growth, primarily enabled by funds from two public Bond initiatives, one in 1997 and the other in 2001. Without these funds, it would not have been possible to achieve major improvements in the College using technology as the tool of opportunity. During this period, the College engaged in the following technology-related activities: major improvements to the College’s network infrastructure, desktops, and desktop applications; major upgrades to the College’s enterprise database system; extensive use of technology in providing online classes, and modernization of computer laboratories and multimedia classrooms; a significant increase in the use of technology in all phases of day-to-day operations; the development of an effective planning process in setting the technology priorities and matching priorities to its mission that included all segments of the institution through the Shared Governance process; and ongoing technology projects to position the College to use high bandwidth applications.

While the College has made major progress in its technology capabilities and the support of programs and services using technology, significant ongoing needs for improvement include: completion of inter-campus connectivity with voice, data, and video transmission; improvement of Banner functionality and usage; strengthened organization, policies/procedures, and support within the Information Technology Systems (ITS) Department; expansion and enhancement of educational technology including online instruction, video, and labs/classrooms; the procurement of funding to sustain faculty and staff training in technology; and updates to the Technology Plan, including equipment replacement strategies.
Standard III.D: Financial Resources

The College makes significant ongoing efforts to ensure that spending is tied to the institution’s core mission. The institution’s financial team, led by the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration and the Chief Financial Officer, provides realistic revenue estimates to the Chancellor to set the parameters for creating the annual operating budget. Through the Shared Governance budget planning process, strategic decisions are made each year to ensure that sufficient budgetary focus is placed on areas that directly and indirectly support student learning. Great care is taken to make sure there is wide dissemination of information related to that process. Cost center managers’ recommendations for resource allocation are tied directly to both the Strategic and Annual Plans, and decisions on these recommendations are made in a Shared Governance setting in consultation with the members of the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council. The results of this process are then forwarded to the Board of Trustees for consideration and approval.

The College has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability. The institution practices effective oversight of all of its finances and contracts. The College recognizes that a re-engineering review of all major business processes is needed to ensure that both internal and external customer service are given the attention they deserve. The institution considers its long-range financial priorities in making annual financial plans. However, to ensure its long-term fiscal stability, the College needs to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to match ongoing spending with ongoing revenue. In addition, the institution needs to address the cost of retiree health benefits, which represent a significant financial challenge for the future.

Standard IV: Leadership & Governance

City College of San Francisco has a robust Shared Governance System with broad-based participation that promotes collaborative efforts among the Board of Trustees and College constituencies. The Shared Governance System has reached a level of maturity and support from campus constituencies that reflects the transformation of the ideals under which the system was created into a working practical reality. The Shared Governance System has been evaluated several times and the most recent evaluation (October, 2004) indicated that constituencies have learned to feel confident in the strength of the system as the College’s methodology for dealing with new challenges as they occur. That evaluation also resulted in several recommendations for improving the system, including expanding participation in the Shared Governance System and continuing the biennial evaluation process.

The Board of Trustees maintains an appropriate level of independence and fulfills its obligation to represent the public interest. The Board has promoted and played an active role in the development of planning initiatives and the assessment of institutional effectiveness. The Board Policy Manual, Board By-Laws, and Board procedures are in compliance with local and state laws and regulations. However, the Board needs to adopt a calendar for the regular systematic review and updating of its policies. In addition, there are a few areas identified in this report that should be addressed in the Policy Manual. The Board has a strong code of ethics, is involved in the accreditation process, and provides leadership in the selection and evaluation of the chief administrative officer (the Chancellor).

The Board delegates authority and responsibility for the administration of the institution to the Chancellor. The Chancellor works effectively with administrative, faculty, staff, and student organizational structures—the means of communication with constituencies—in supporting the institution and delegates responsibility to appropriate administrative divisions. These administrative and governance processes facilitate decisions that support student learning and improve institutional effectiveness.
Theme Essays

Theme I: Institutional Commitment to High-Quality Education

This essay provides the institutional context for a case study that focuses on basic skills programs within the College as an illustration of the institution’s commitment to high-quality education. It first defines “institutional commitment” and “high-quality education,” providing an overview of how we achieve both. It then discusses the alignment of CCSF’s Mission with the planning process and describes how this process yields strategic priorities for the College that can readily be mapped back to the Mission. One of CCSF’s eight strategic priorities focuses solely on basic skills, and the need for attention to basic skills is referenced throughout the remaining priorities. This fact, along with the foundational importance of basic skills mastery for greater student success in subsequent coursework, underpins the rationale for selecting basic skills as a case study that illustrates how the institution demonstrates a commitment to high-quality education through this focus. The case study, then, chronicles the evolution of CCSF’s emphasis on basic skills generally, and describes, in particular, interventions implemented as the result of grant funding in the two areas of greatest need, English and Math; the ways in which the institution measures progress and uses that information to inform practice at the classroom, direct service, and administrative levels; and how the institution continues to promote and support this emphasis through resource development, policy changes, and structural modifications.

Theme II: Student Learning Outcomes

The dialog around student learning outcomes (SLOs) at City College of San Francisco has ranged from passionate advocacy to strong skepticism. The Theme II essay attempts to reflect the values of City College of San Francisco by highlighting some of the information the College gathers and describing how it responds to it within the institutional context. The essay has three sections. The first addresses the institutional context for student learning outcomes at CCSF. It shows the linkages among the College’s Mission Statement, its major institutional outcomes assessments, and selected examples of its efforts to assess and enhance outcomes. It demonstrates that the College is committed to the improvement of student learning, and, while the role of outcomes assessment in the institutional culture is still evolving, the value the College places on student success will provide the context for future work on SLOs. This discussion of the institutional context is followed by two case studies. The first describes the efforts of CCSF’s English Department to use common assessment instruments to restructure its reading and composition course sequence. This case study reveals that the assessment of student learning outcomes can influence specific objectives and methodologies used by a very large cohort of instructors across a sequence of courses. The second case study describes the work of the leadership from all of the units in the Student Development Division to create a comprehensive, division-wide SLO initiative. While this endeavor is still in the formative stages, it demonstrates the commitment of the leadership to the process. More importantly, the case study reveals a clear understanding of the benefits and challenges this type of assessment poses for the various student development units and a commitment to meet those challenges to improve student outcomes.
Theme III: College Dialog Promotes Institutional Improvements

College dialogs at CCSF are many and occur at all levels of the organization and among all College constituencies. Meetings and discussions about institutional issues are pervasive, and the dialogs that occur are critical to institutional growth and change and address many sections of the WASC standards. The institutional context described within the Theme III essay includes a description of the College’s Shared Governance System and brief descriptions of a sample of dialogs organized around four critical areas: (1) planning; (2) diversity and equity; (3) student success; and (4) teaching and learning. In reality there is often overlap between and among the dialogs that advance the programs and activities reflected by these broad areas. The essay then provides fuller depictions of four representative and important case studies of dialogs originating from four different sources: students, faculty, administration, and campus/program sites. The essay closes with suggestions for improving the role of dialog across the District.

Theme IV: Evaluation, Planning, & Improvement

City College of San Francisco has a cyclical planning, evaluation, and improvement process that increasingly focuses on student progress, achievement, and success. The Theme IV essay examines selected cases at CCSF, widely ranging from a re-engineering study of Admissions and Records and an Architecture Department Program Review, to an evaluation of noncredit ESL promotion testing and a re-organization of Financial Aid. These cases vary greatly in scope and focus, but each in its own way provides insight into the principal parts of the planning cycle and demonstrates how our system provides the climate, the expectation, and the structure for continuous improvement through both periodic and non-periodic means. First, the essay examines the institutional context; then, through review of selected cases, demonstrates that our planning and budgeting system is flexible, well-organized, and even nimble. It will be clear that the primary focus of the system is supporting the improvement of teaching and learning.

Theme V: Organization

The Theme V essay illustrates the organizational support the College provides to support student learning through two case studies, one of a department, Biological Sciences, and the other of a program, Biotechnology. Predictably, some of the organizational structure issues reported in these case studies may be unique to Biotechnology or Biological Sciences; however, the conclusion focuses on College-wide issues raised in these case studies related to staff, resources, and organizational structure.

The Biological Sciences Department case study gives a picture of a typical academic department. Several Biological Science courses can be used to satisfy the CCSF graduation requirement in Natural Sciences and can also be used to meet general education requirements for the California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) systems. The department chair, three faculty members, and the Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics were interviewed to gather information for this case study.

The Biotechnology Program was chosen because it meets the educational and training needs of students related to workforce, economic, and community development (CCSF Strategic Priority 3). This program illustrates how the College supports student learning through both its noncredit and credit programs. The College has successfully sought grant funding to support the program, and it has received regional, state, and national recognition. This program is a good example of the way the College develops community and industry partnerships to support programs that meet student needs. Interviews with the program coordinators of the biotech certificate programs, the coordinator of the Bridge to Biotech program, the director of Bio-Link, the coordinator of the new equipment clearinghouse, and the Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics provided the foundation for this case study.
Theme VI: Integrity and Honesty

Demonstrating integrity and honesty to all stakeholders is a cornerstone of the College's system of governance and permeates all College activities. It is the strengthening trust the stakeholders have had in the institution that has enabled the College to persevere during the fiscally poor situation of the state. The College is focused on improving its services to better serve its students. The Theme VI essay examines several case studies that exemplify the following: the College’s continual assessment of the appropriateness and usefulness of our policies, practices, and procedures; the College’s continual assessment of internal and external relations and the inclusion of all constituencies of the College in major assessment and decision-making processes; the College’s commitment to clarity, accessibility, and appropriateness in its communications with the community; and the College’s commitment to diversity.
RESPONSE TO 2000 RECOMMENDATIONS
RESPONSE TO THE 2000 ACCREDITATION TEAM’S RECOMMENDATIONS

Major Recommendation #1: Institutionalizing, Planning, Budgeting and Program Review

The team found a faculty and staff who were optimistic, enthusiastic, and increasingly committed to the new planning, budgeting, and program review processes. The team observed a growing acceptance of this culture of change which is dependent upon supporting evidence. To ensure that this progress continues and moves beyond the paper stage into the College’s operations, the team recommends the College institutionalize its planning, budgeting and program review processes.

Response (2005)

The Mid-Term Report to WASC in October 2002 reported that the College had completed the institutionalization of the College’s Planning and Budgeting System. Since 2002, the College has effectively utilized its Planning and Budgeting System to address all institutional resource and planning objectives. The annual process begins in the fall of each year with the development of an annual plan which is derived from the College’s Strategic Plan 2003-2008. The Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), a Shared Governance body, oversees the development of the annual plans which are ultimately approved by the Board of Trustees in January of each year. During the period February through May, unit and major cost centers develop planning objectives using the Annual Plan as a guide along with proposed budget augmentations to ensure the achievement of the objectives. The PBC reviews all proposed annual objectives and major cost center budgets in the spring and recommends a tentative budget with annual objectives to the Board of Trustees for final approval. To monitor the progress of major cost centers in achieving their objectives, Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment Reports are developed and disseminated throughout the College.

Since the successful establishment of the entire College Planning and Budgeting System, the College has added an annual College Performance Indicators Report. The CCPI provides longitudinal data on 30 performance measures that are linked to the eight strategic priorities of the College. These performance measures also provide a measure of the College’s institutional effectiveness. In addition, the College has produced a Comprehensive Planning and Budgeting Guide that provides a step-by-step description of all aspects of the College’s Planning and Budgeting System for members of the College community, especially for new members of the PBC as well as academic, student development, and administrative departments and offices.

During Fall 2004, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants conducted an online survey sent to all administrators, department chairs, program coordinators, and members of Shared Governance committees associated with the College’s Planning and Budgeting System, a total of 120 people. The objective of this survey was to gather feedback about the level of effectiveness and efficiency of the College’s Planning and Budgeting System, and whether it involved the appropriate College constituencies in the planning and budgeting processes as well as promoted an informed understanding of the College’s budget and planning priorities. Over 80 percent of the respondents agreed that the system effectively supports resources for College planning priorities (84 percent); decisions reflect a sound understanding of the College Mission and Vision (84 percent); the system is timely meeting calendar requirements for development, review, and final approval of the budget (88 percent).
Over 70 percent agreed that the PBC effectively coordinates college planning, budgeting and outcomes evaluation (74 percent); mid-year and end-of-year evaluations promote an accurate assessment of the achievement of institutional outcomes (76 percent); and the system involves appropriate constituencies when planning priorities and establishing budgets (78 percent).

One of the areas identified as needing the most improvement is providing sufficient opportunities to discuss planning objectives, budgets, and assessments so that College constituencies would have an informed understanding of budget priorities. A third of the respondents indicated a need to improve the College's planning and budgeting system in this area.

Based upon the information from the Fall 2004 survey, the College is now proceeding to make adjustments to the Planning and Budgeting System to provide additional budget, planning, and assessment information to the College community as well as venues for discussing budget and planning issues.

The CCSF Program Review is a regular part of the institutional assessment processes of the College. Beginning in 1993, the College required that all units undergo Program Review. During the first cycle of Program Review from 1993 through 1999, a total of 110 units submitted Program Review reports to the Program Review Committee, a Shared Governance committee, and to the senior administrators. From 1999 to 2005, the College conducted a second cycle of Program Review; during this period 94 units from instruction, student development, and administration submitted Program Review reports to both the Program Review Committee and to senior administrative staff (see Minor Recommendation #3 for more information). Currently, Program Review requires six-year plans from each unit, and these plans are utilized in the annual planning activities of the cost centers throughout the College.

The College’s Accreditation Self Study reviewed the current status of Program Review and concluded that, while the College has institutionalized Program Review as it has the Planning and Budgeting System, the College needs to identify additional mechanisms for integrating Program Review with the Planning and Budgeting System and with institutional evaluation (additional recommendations for Program Review appear in the section entitled “Strengths and Areas for Improvement” of both the Standard I and Standard IIA reports).
**Major Recommendation #2: Student Development**

Now that the College is committed to a multi-campus district, the team recommends that the College develop and implement a plan to ensure that all campuses and centers are provided with appropriate access to services and resources. Furthermore, the team recommends that the collegial governance processes include participation by campus constituencies throughout the District.

**Response (2005)**

Since the last accreditation, the College has implemented an educational planning process designed to ensure that appropriate access to services is available for all students at all locations. Within the newly created Student Development Division, the educational planning process provided the opportunity for the leadership of the unit to articulate its vision and mission, reflect on its program and service array, and assess its accomplishments and challenges in light of the expectations of the schools and campuses of the District as well as the recommendations of the WASC visiting team. As a result, six priorities were established with strategies to facilitate their implementation and annualized implementation plans to focus on specific objectives and activities. Units across the Division worked collaboratively to ensure the success of this venture, known throughout the Division as Students First—Striving for Excellence.

In concert with the Education Plan, the College implemented a series of initiatives to ensure that appropriate access to services is available for all students at all locations.

The College conducted a comprehensive assessment of the student services system, known as the System Review, and identified key strategies to increase access and impact across the District. Following the Review, the structure of the Division was reconsidered, resulting in the reorganization of the General Counseling Department into four discrete departments designed to increase student access and departmental responsiveness: New Student Counseling, Continuing Student Counseling, International Student Counseling, and Transfer Student Counseling. These departments, in combination with the Career Development and Planning Department and the Learning Assistance Department, currently form a comprehensive Student Support Services unit.

This new model systematically aligns the organization and delivery of services with the needs of the students as they develop from entry to exit, regardless of location, creating a student support services network. As a result, specific interventions targeted to the developmental needs of cohorts of students have been deployed, including those making a transition from noncredit to credit study, regardless of campus location. Moreover, the Departments are geographically located in proximity to the students and the additional services they need on all sites throughout the City. Subsequent assessments of the impact of the reorganization reflect significant improvements in the accessibility and quality of service to students as well as faculty and staff morale with efforts continuing to improve services on the campuses as the structure is refined.

Additionally, acknowledging the significance of the matriculation process, most campuses now have on-site admissions and enrollment services for credit and noncredit students. This development allows all students to traverse the College’s matriculation process involving post-admission assessment, orientation, and counseling. Moreover, as the growth of the student services system continues, Matriculation is expanding assessment services to include career interests and success strategies, information which is linked with student support programs and services through the intensified orientation, educational planning, and counseling services of New Student Counseling, particularly for underprepared, at-risk students. Disabled Students Programs and Services is expanding its services to students with disabilities at multiple campus locations through the addition of an Accommodations Specialist, and financial aid services are available at all campuses with eligible programs. Continuing credit students in jeopardy, likewise, are targeted for specialized support through Continuing Student Counseling in an effort to sustain enrollment to graduation and transfer or employment. Most campuses offer evening support services, with some also providing services on Saturdays.
One of the services critical to students is the Learning Assistance Center (LAC) on the Ocean Avenue Campus, which provides tutoring services to thousands of students each year and is vital to student success. Previously, these services have been available to students only on the main campus. Currently, two new LAC labs are funded and planned to open in the new campuses at Mission and Chinatown. Each lab will have computers and tutors available. The institution is also exploring the possibility of offering vocational education tutoring at the John Adams Campus.

Finally, the College has made a significant investment in the development of web-based admissions, application, and credit enrollment capabilities, ensuring access for anyone, anywhere, anytime. Online admissions processes support both credit and noncredit students, with initiatives underway to translate noncredit admissions processes into Spanish and Chinese to support student access. Credit students now use e-STARS to register via the Web, with noncredit student online registration under development. Additionally, thousands of students are oriented through the web-based orientation program, with many students availing themselves of the cyber advisor to check courses and programs, policies and procedures, as well as services using the e-mail system. A web-based educational planning system is under development which interfaces with the web-based degree audit system, e-CAPP, and will soon allow students and their counselors to monitor their progress toward graduation and transfer.

In concert with these developments, the Chancellor also organized a special task force to review student governance, an initiative which resulted in significant improvements in student access and participation. Previously defined by the Ocean Avenue Campus, the present structure of the Associated Students at CCSF is now modeled at other campuses and has improved representation of these campuses’ student bodies in policy decision-making processes. Likewise, the Student Trustee is chosen through a District-wide election, and is encouraged to get students from all of the campuses involved and participating on various College committees and student councils. Throughout the College, support for the expansion of student representation is significant. At the request of the task force and with the support of the Chancellor and his Cabinet, the presidents and vice presidents of Associated Students on each campus receive appropriate scholarship support to sustain their leadership contributions to the College through the Associated Students governance system. To strengthen student access, the Associate Dean of Student Activities collaborates with campus deans and faculty advisors, encouraging and supporting student activities on all campuses. In that spirit, the Concert and Lecture Series now supports events at many of the campuses, and the Office of Peer Mentoring and Service Learning funds programs at multiple sites.

Further information about the participation of all campus constituencies throughout the District can be found in the response to Minor Recommendations for Standard 10.

Much progress has been made during the past six years, with all members of the institution ever mindful of the continuing need to increase the availability and impact of services to all students throughout the District.
Minor Recommendations

2000 | Standard 3: Institutional Effectiveness (Part 1)

Given the importance of the program review system in assessing institutional effectiveness and that the findings of program reviews are an important consideration in the budget allocation process, the team recommends that the College ensure the institutionalization of their program review process by requiring that all units complete their program reviews in a timely and thorough fashion.

Midterm Response 2000–2002

The College ensures that all units complete Program Reviews in a timely and thorough fashion through the work of the Program Review Committee (PRC), a Shared Governance committee comprised of faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students. All College units are scheduled to undergo Program Review every six years in order to conform with the WASC cycle. Periodic updates are provided as necessary. Each year the Committee notifies the scheduled units and conducts an orientation for members of the unit. The Vice Chancellors, deans and the members of the Committee monitor the progress of each Program Review effort to ensure that reports are submitted in a timely manner and are complete. Each report is reviewed by the PRC and the appropriate Vice Chancellor and conferences are held, if needed, to address problems within a unit.

Response 2002–Present

During the period 1993 through 2005, the College conducted two cycles of Program Review for all units at the College. During the first cycle, 1993 through 1999, 90 percent of the units submitted Program Review reports (99 units out of a total 110 requested). Four units each in instruction and administration, and two units in student services did not submit reports.

During the second cycle, 1999 through 2005, 71 percent of the total units have already or are expected to submit Program Review reports by the end of Fall 2005 (80 out of 112 units). Nine instructional units, ten administrative units, and one student service unit have not yet submitted reports. The College expects to have a compliance rate for this period that exceeds 90 percent by the end of Spring 2006.

The data strongly suggests that most units at the College are responding to the requirement to submit Program Review reports. While not all units submitted reports on the scheduled date, most did, and those that were late usually submitted reports within six months of the deadline. During the second cycle, 1999 through 2005, virtually all reports were accepted by the Program Review Committee; only two reports required additional changes.
**2000 | Standard 3: Institutional Effectiveness (Part 2)**

The team recommends that the College develop an Educational Master Plan to provide integrated, comprehensive, and District-wide direction for all instructional efforts.

**Midterm Response 2000–2002**

The College produced an Education Master Plan for the first time in early 2002 after an extensive development effort with the campus deans, department chairs, and faculty. It is in the process of being updated and will be brought forward to the Board for approval in Spring 2003. The District regards this plan as a continuing work in progress and never a “final plan.” The plan includes both College-wide, school and campus plans. Included are an education technology plan, a library information technology plan, and a student development plan, as well as individual plans for seven schools and nine campuses. The Education Master Plan is being used to help construct the five-year Strategic Plan which is expected to be completed by January 2003. It will also be utilized to guide the development of each year’s Annual Planning Objectives particularly as it relates to new program development. It is further expected that under the leadership of the Office of Research, Planning and Grants and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the plan will be reviewed and reassessed each year and modified as necessary. It is important to note that all of these plans are works in progress; documents which are frequently revised in response to changes in the various communities we serve, as well as in funding opportunities which present themselves.

**Response 2002–Present**

The College completed an update of the Education Master Plan in February 2003 and planning objectives from the EMP were utilized by the College in the development of College Annual Plans from 2003 through 2005. The College is currently working on a new update of the Education Master Plan beginning in Spring 2005 with a completion date of Fall 2005.

---

**2000 | Standard 4: Educational Programs**

The team recommends that the College critically analyze the existent mathematics and written composition requirements for graduation to ensure that the demonstrated level of competence are suitable for recipients of a degree of Associate in Arts or Associate in Science.

**Midterm Response 2000–2002**

In Spring 2001, the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements formed a task force composed of two administrators and four faculty members to review the math graduation requirement. The Task Force met and was unable to reach consensus. The matter has been referred to the Academic Policies Committee for further review.

Through the Enhanced Self-Study process, the College Level Learning Ad Hoc Committee recommended that the College consider changing its English requirement to English 96, which is one level below 1A. The Coordinating Committee has accepted this recommendation and has forwarded it to the Academic Policies Committee for further review.

The Academic Policies Committee hopes to complete these reviews and make recommendations on the math and English graduation requirements by the end of the Fall 2002 semester. The next step will be for the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements to take up the matter.
Response 2002–Present
In response to the 2000 WASC visiting team recommendation regarding the College's Written Composition Graduation Requirement, the Enhanced Self-Study: College Level Learning Ad Hoc Committee made the recommendation that the College explore the possibility of making English 96 the AA/AS graduation level composition class. Given that English 96 is one level below English 1A, adopting this recommendation would ensure the College was in compliance with Title 5, Section 55805.5(c). From Fall 2001 to Fall 2004 a task force comprising the English and ESL Departments worked to develop an integrated curriculum that would provide students with two pathways to fulfilling the English Graduation Requirement. The result of these efforts lead to the creation of ESL 160 and ESL 170, a degree applicable course one level below English 1A, and the revision of English 92 and creation of English 93 to replace English 94. It should be noted that extensive collaboration occurred between these departments during this three-year time frame and represents one of several examples within the College of interdepartmental curriculum development.

During Spring 2004, new Title 5 compliant catalog language regarding the English Graduation Requirement was reviewed and approved by the Academic Policies Committee. During Fall 2004, the College Curriculum Committee reviewed and approved ESL 160, ESL 170 and English 93 with ESL 170 approved by the State Chancellor’s Office in November 2004. Also, during Fall 2004 the Academic Senate approved the concept of raising the English Graduation Requirement as did the Bipartite Committee; however, this committee requested a working group be formed to identify those courses that would fall one level below English 1A. In Spring of 2005, the Bipartite Committee reviewed and approved the new English Graduation Requirement that will appear in the 2005-06 College Catalog.

2000 | Standard 5: Student Support and Development
The team recommends that the College provide equal opportunity for access to student services throughout the entire College District.

Midterm Response 2000–2002
The College has made important progress in this area and is mindful of the need to continue the effort. (Please see Major Recommendation 2 for details.)

Response 2002–Present
See response to Major Recommendation #2.

2000 | Standard 6: Information and Learning Resources
Given the level of human and fiscal resources and the importance to the institution of this unit, the team recommends that the College address Information Technology Services as an information resource agency under this standard in the next self-study.

The College addresses the Information Technology Services in the report on Standard III C in the CCSF Accreditation Self Study for 2006.
2000  |  **Standard 7: Faculty and Staff**

The team recommends that the staff development needs of all categories of staff within the College community be addressed through appropriate needs assessment.

**Midterm Response 2000–2002**

A survey of all faculty and classified staff was conducted in 1999-00 and one is planned for 2002-03. Results of the surveys are considered when staff development activities are planned. Evaluations of individual workshops are conducted at every staff development event.

**Response 2002–Present**

Subsequent to the Mid-Term Report, the Office of Professional Development surveyed those participating in FLEX Day activities during 2001-02 and again in 2002-03. The 2001-02 survey was distributed as a part of the FLEX Day schedule. Approximately 200 questionnaires were returned to the Office of Professional Development and included faculty, classified staff, and members of the administration. The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with professional development activities in general and with the instructional development, professional development, or personal development workshops attended. The questionnaire provided an opportunity to include recommendations for future FLEX Day workshops. The most frequent recommendation was to increase the number of instructional workshops provided. During 2001-02, a FLEX Day was extended to the classified staff. The workshops provided during the classified FLEX Day are arranged and evaluated by SEIU 790.

During 2002-03, the Office of Professional Development again surveyed those participating in the faculty FLEX day activities via a questionnaire that asked about staff needs, distributed with the FLEX Day program. The response rate was low with only 20 questionnaires returned to the Office of Professional Development. Given the number of questionnaires returned, the collected data were of limited use for planning future FLEX Day workshops. However, all individual workshops were surveyed and these data were used for planning purposes. The Office of Professional Development included a questionnaire in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 FLEX Day programs to provide faculty an opportunity to make recommendations regarding the workshops and provide feedback regarding FLEX Day activities overall. The Office also distributed a survey in Spring 2005.

As a result of the cuts in state funding for FLEX activities in 2002 through 2004, many departments and programs have been conducting their own needs assessments and initiating limited programs for faculty development. These programs include the Reflective Teaching Project among noncredit ESL and Transitional Studies faculty; basic skills workshops offered through the Shared Governance Basic Skills Subcommittee; the Multicultural Infusion project; and the SCANS project. Finally, there has been an ongoing effort within the Student Development area to increase the availability of appropriate training and development within and beyond their departments. In 2003, a comprehensive needs assessment was conducted, resulting in programs each semester that showcased new initiatives, improved technical training, and expanded departmental professional development activity and divisional work on student learning outcomes.

The team recommends that the College explore all possible strategies for funding facilities, technology, and capital improvements.

Midterm Response 2000–2002

The College received overwhelming approval from local voters in November 2001 for its $195M bond proposal. This commitment represents Phase I of our long term plan. In Phase II, the voters will be asked to approve an additional $155M bond. We expect a strong and positive response from the voters. This $350M local commitment will help leverage and additional $150M in state funds that should be available for approved and eligible projects, and will enable the College to make dramatic improvements in many of its facilities as well as its technology network. In addition, the Chancellor and the Dean of Development are making consistent efforts to generate additional funding from individuals and foundations and have met with a high degree of success. The City College of San Francisco Foundation’s Board of Directors has recently been restructured. There are now 24 directors and a new set of by-laws. The directors are refining a Development Plan in concert with appropriate staff.

Response 2002–Present

In addition to the various bond measures noted above (see also the response to Standard III.D in this Self Study for updated information), the College has increased its emphasis on competitive grant seeking by transforming the grant writing position in the Office of Research, Planning and Grants into an Associate Dean-level position in 2001 (staffed in January 2002). In addition to the new administrator, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants now has a Special Projects Coordinator who devotes significant time to grant writing and a Post-Awards Grants Manager to assist grant-funded projects with budgeting.

The College has also developed an Advancement Plan that maps out a strategy for helping to “fill in the gaps” and provide funding for those items that go beyond basic operations. Priority areas for increased funding cluster into categories that include education programs, technology, and facilities, all aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan. The College has mapped out a variety of mechanisms for attracting resources, including major gifts, capital campaigns, annual giving, planned giving, academic improvement trust funds, competitive grants, non-cash gifts, and alumni resources. The Development Office and the Office of Research, Planning and Grants share primary responsibility for carrying out the activities of the Advancement Plan.

The outcome of these changes has been a steady increase of nearly 50 percent in alternative revenues through scholarships and other funds raised by the Foundation and through competitive grants (comparing 1998-99 to 2003-04) from $19,233,962 to $28,682,390.
2000 | **Standard 10: Governance and Administration**

The Team recommends that the College expand its collegial or “shared governance” processes to ensure participation and representation from all campuses and centers (Standard 10.B6, 10.B9, 10.B10)

**Midterm Response 2000–2002**

All constituent groups are aware of this recommendation and are attempting to follow through as recommended. One recent successful example was the task force which examined student governance and resulted in substantial changes in the structure of the Associated Students organization which now includes student government not only at the Ocean/Phelan Campus, but at the other major locations. The ultimate plan is to have all campuses have an Associated Students in place at an appropriate time in the future depending upon student needs and expectations.

An evaluation of the current Shared Governance process will take place in 2002-03 for the purposes of generating data which will assist the College in making improvements in this area.

**Response 2002–Present**

In 2000, only students on the Ocean Avenue Campus participated in Associated Student government organizations. Now, seven campuses have active Associated Student government organizations. District-wide elections for the student trustee have been held consecutively the last four years. The election process has shown increasing participation by campuses and the last three student trustees were from the Downtown and John Adams campuses. The Associated Student Executive Board, made up of representatives of all campuses, recently reviewed the student trustee election packet and made recommendations for broader participation. In addition, motivated student government coordinators have successfully encouraged greater participation on standing committees and in student activities on most campuses. The participation rate for the total number of available positions in the student government was 84 percent in 2005, compared to 77 percent in 1999-00.

The CCSF Academic Senate, the totality of all CCSF faculty, continues to be active and comprises credit and noncredit representatives throughout the District. The Senate hosts alternate meetings at different campus locations each month to encourage broader participation. Senate representatives continue to participate in open sessions of the College, including those related to strategic planning, facilities planning, listening sessions for special initiatives, and Board of Trustees meetings.

Participation rates have declined slightly for classified staff since 1999-00, attributable in large part to increased work loads as a result of budget cutbacks and calendar adjustments.

The College’s Shared Governance Coordinator provides information and training about the system and updates information on its website and in a weekly newsletter to all employees. In 2004 the College conducted an online survey to over 400 past and present participants in the governance system, plus hosted a series of listening sessions in three different locations open to all members of the College community. The results of the evaluation have been distributed in print and electronic format District-wide.

Many of the issues raised in the “Response to the 2000 Accreditation Team’s Recommendations” are discussed in further detail and, in many cases, repeatedly, throughout the Standards Reports and Theme Essays. In addition, a number of the recommendations included here are also highlighted in the section entitled, “Accreditation Self Study Major Findings.”
STANDARD I
Institutional Mission & Effectiveness
STANDARD I:  
Institutional Mission & Effectiveness

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

City College of San Francisco demonstrates its commitment to an ongoing evaluation of institutional policies and procedures by conducting periodic reviews of those practices and engaging in a reflective dialog on the effectiveness of its governance and administrative activities. The College has a system of Shared Governance which is stronger than that of many institutions and which provides for a great deal of reflective dialog on institutional processes and effectiveness. In addition to Shared Governance entities, the participation of employee unions and a Department Chairs’ Council contributes significantly to the amount of dialog that takes place among the constituencies and between the leadership and the Board. In that context, the College has developed a strong and responsive annual planning process that is based on a strategic plan rooted in the Mission and Vision Statements. The College conducts an assessment of progress on its Annual Plan twice a year and this assessment provides the executive administration, the Board of Trustees, and the general public with quantitative and qualitative information on the College’s progress in meeting its goals. However, the evaluation of this progress is not adequately incorporated into the existing institution-wide planning and budgeting processes.

The College has also developed a number of specific assessments of student outcomes and institutional effectiveness that provide College constituencies and the general public with strong and useful evidence of student achievement and program performance. Program Review is conducted by almost all of the academic and student services departments on a regular cycle, but a few Student Services, instructional, and administrative units have not adhered to the timetable. However, the results of Program Review are not adequately incorporated into the other institutional planning and evaluation procedures.

The College has developed strong data resources that provide faculty, administrators, staff, students, and the community with detailed information on student access, retention, and success. In addition, administrators, department chairs, and other interested faculty have ready access to extensive student demographic information, productivity analyses, and student demand for courses.

The College demonstrates, in numerous ways, its strong commitment to continual institutional improvement and a mission that emphasizes student learning.

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished. The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I.B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.
I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

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

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

City College of San Francisco’s Mission Statement addresses the core educational purposes of the College’s programs and services, including preparation for transfer, achievement of associate degrees, acquisition of career skills, engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizenship preparation, completion of GED and adult education, promotion of economic development, and lifelong learning and cultural enrichment. The Mission Statement is supplemented by a Vision Statement that describes the College’s commitment to high-quality teaching and learning across the full spectrum of educational offerings. It defines the College’s intended population as “the diverse communities and populations found throughout San Francisco,” and points to the creation of “an inclusive community with respect for and enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding, and a commitment to sharing educational resources and contributing to knowledge, expertise, and innovation in postsecondary education in the state, nation, and world.” [Ref. 4]

The Mission and Vision Statements provide the basis and context for strategic planning, annual planning, annual assessment, and the implementation of programs and services at all of the College’s campuses and sites. Since the last Self Study for Accreditation, the College conducted a comprehensive review of the Mission Statement, and developed a new Strategic Plan based on that review. The Strategic Plan articulates objectives that focus on each of the elements of the Mission Statement and specifically addresses each of the commitments posited in the Vision Statement. To ensure that the Strategic Plan became a living and driving force in the annual planning and budgeting process, Strategic Plan Implementation Schedules were developed that describe the timetable and identify the key staff members responsible for ensuring implementation of the Plan. [Refs. 6, 7, 9]

Each year, the Planning and Budgeting Council prepares the Annual Plan with the support of the Chancellor and the Office of Research, Planning and Grants. Related processes are set in motion for the development of annual objectives at the major cost center (department, division, and school) and institutional levels. [Refs. 1, 3, 8]

A system of mid-year and end-of-year assessment reports has been instituted to ensure that adequate progress is being made on stated objectives and to provide the basis for future planning and budgeting. The development of the current Strategic Plan and the creation of processes to ensure its effective implementation included very broad-based involvement by various constituencies within the College’s Shared Governance structure, as well as participation by the Board of Trustees and representative members of the community. [Ref. 2]

The integration of the Mission Statement, Strategic Plan, and the annual planning, budgeting, and assessment processes has been achieved progressively over five years of intensive effort. While many of the components of this integration have been employed for some time, the 2003-04 planning and budgeting cycle was the first time all of the elements were in place with clearly articulated interrelationships. Therefore, the full impact of this integration is just beginning to be realized and there are still significant improvements to be made. The number, size, and diversity of the programs, services, and educational sites at the College present certain challenges to the close coordination of the planning and budgeting process with the strategic
objectives. In addition, the College planning and budgeting procedures involve both “top down” and “bottom up” processes—an annual plan is designed to drive the development of objectives at the program, site, and cost center levels, while these units work toward developing objectives that meet specific needs of the students they serve. The annual planning process identifies operational and developmental objectives designed to stimulate initiatives articulated in the Strategic Plan; however, planning at the cost center and site level must take into account ongoing initiatives and produces the majority of the operational objectives. Therefore, the “top down” objectives in the Annual Plan are not always thoroughly integrated into the “bottom up” objectives created at the program and cost center level. However, this bi-directional planning process serves to adequately support ongoing initiatives while successfully maintaining a delicate balance between the establishment of a clear direction for all College units and the flexibility required for individual units to address specific needs identified in the field. The planning and budgeting process culminates with the development of an annual Management Plan that clearly articulates objectives and related initiatives at the major cost center and institutional levels. [Ref. 1]

The College has developed a system for comprehensively assessing the progress on its annual Management Plan at the program, site, cost center, and executive management levels. [Ref. 3] This system includes mid-term and end-of-year reports that provide specific evidence of progress and an evaluation of the amount of progress that has taken place. These reports provide the executive administration and the Board of Trustees a foundation upon which they can evaluate the effectiveness of the institution and provide a basis for guiding future planning and initiatives. However, the Standard 1 Work Group found that the evaluation of the end-of-year reports should be used to assess the extent to which the Annual Plan has been implemented and the objectives accomplished. In addition, the evaluation of the Annual Plan, based on the end-of-year reports, should be more thoroughly integrated into the Shared Governance planning and budgeting processes to promote a reflective dialog among campus constituencies and plan improvements as indicated by the evaluation.

In addition to the Strategic Plan, the Implementation Schedules, and the annual planning and budget cycle, the College has also developed an Educational Master Plan that contains Technology and Library Master Plans. [Ref. 7] Each of these plans is designed to operationalize long-term planning within their respective areas. The Educational Master Plan addresses instruction, learning assistance, library services and student development services. These plans represent the long-range objectives for each unit based on its mission and specific functions. [Refs. 11, 12] Broad-based reflective dialog is an essential feature of the College’s Shared Governance policies and procedures, as well as the institution’s approach to dealing with special initiatives and the assessment of institutional effectiveness. For example, the Academic Senate has responsibility for recommending institutional policies in academic and professional matters. Committees with broad-based membership from faculty, staff, and administration serve as forums for discussing and evaluating improvement initiatives and policies. Committees and subcommittees such as Academic Policies, College Curriculum, Student Preparation and Success, and Basic Skills debate issues and make recommendations in compliance with procedures established by the Academic Senate. The Senate may then make recommendations to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees. Other constituencies are also represented by deliberative bodies such as the Classified Senate, the Administrators’ Association, and the Associated Students.

There are also several College-wide committees, with representation from all campus constituencies, which provide a forum for the consideration of broad-based institutional issues. The College Advisory Council (CAC) and the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) are two influential College-wide bodies. The CAC acts as a clearinghouse to determine the appropriate process for addressing issues and then provides the final review for procedures, other than academic and professional matters, as defined by state code and local Shared Governance policy prior to implementation or submission to the Board of Trustees. The PBC is charged with developing the Annual Plan and making recommendations on budget allocations to
support that plan. The College Diversity Advisory Committee, which reports to the CAC and has broad-based representation, provides an avenue for a discussion of any topic related to diversity. For example, discussions in this committee related to improving the effectiveness of the College’s instructional programs in addressing diverse student populations led to the initiation of the Multicultural Infusion Project. That project has involved many faculty and administrators in various initiatives to improve classroom instruction using multicultural instructional methodologies and to increase the diversity of the teaching and support staff. [Refs. 5, 10]

“Listening Sessions” have become a regular part of the review and analysis of major documents and initiatives. The College Shared Governance leaders responsible for developing a document or initiative engage in a dialog with any interested members of the community who attend the listening sessions. There are usually several sessions scheduled at various sites throughout the District. These sessions are widely publicized and are open to all College faculty, students, and staff, as well as the San Francisco community as a whole. The discussions are carefully documented and the initiatives or documents under consideration are frequently modified based on these sessions. Two recent examples of this type of interactive dialog were the listening sessions held prior to the final approval of the Strategic Plan and the listening sessions conducted as part of the institution-wide review and evaluation of the College’s Shared Governance policies and procedures.

The Chancellor’s Annual Report to the Community is another excellent means through which the College communicates evidence of learning outcomes, as well as program and institutional performance. A quarterly Community E-Bulletin, which features important College accomplishments and news, has recently been added to the College’s efforts to communicate with external constituencies. These two avenues for advising the community about CCSF quality, funding, and activities are valuable additions to the successful strategies the College has been using for many years—including televising its Board meetings, sending the Schedule of Classes out to all residences in the City, disseminating many documents at Board meetings for the public to take home, and making a great deal of information available online. [Refs. 13, 14]

### Additional findings and analysis on Standards I.A.1-4

City College of San Francisco has established student learning programs and services that reflect the College’s purposes, character, and diverse student populations. CCSF serves over 98,000 students, split almost evenly between credit and noncredit instructional modes, in an urban, multi-campus institution at 12 major campuses and nearly 200 sites throughout the City and County of San Francisco. The student population has an average age of 33 (credit and noncredit combined) and includes more female than male students. The ethnic demographics of students in credit and noncredit programs includes a plurality of Asian students (35 percent), 20 percent non-Hispanic White, 20 percent Hispanic/Latino/a, 7 percent African-American non-Hispanic, 5 percent Filipino, and smaller numbers of other Pacific Islanders and Native Americans, as well as other non-identified students (approximately 10 percent). Campus programs are targeted to the needs of the populations in the surrounding community. Several of the campuses focus on specific components of the College’s instructional missions (e.g., Evans Campus addresses primarily vocational and occupational education and John Adams Campus is a center for health professions training and adult basic education). Many of the noncredit courses offered at the campuses address the language skills, basic skills, and specific vocational skills appropriate to local student populations. Credit offerings also vary by campus based on the needs of the student populations. For example, the Fort Mason Campus offers primarily studio art courses while the Castro/Valencia Campus offers a variety of general education courses with a heavy emphasis on foreign languages for an adult evening student population. Credit and noncredit business courses are offered at many sites including John Adams and Downtown. The Mission, Chinatown/North Beach, John Adams, and
Alemany Campuses offer extensive English as Second Language (ESL), literacy, and citizenship training and the Southeast Campus, serving the Bayview Hunters Point community, focuses on general education and several occupational specializations.

The College offers 46 degree programs as well as a wide range of occupational certificate and professional training programs designed to prepare students for direct entry into the job market. With over 14,000 students who declare their intention to transfer to a four-year institution, the College offers general education and lower-division major coursework that meets the California State University, University of California, and Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum requirements. In addition, the College has developed and actively maintains individual articulation agreements with public and private colleges and universities throughout the state as well as Hispanic-Serving Institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities nationally.

The population of the City of San Francisco is as diverse as any urban center in the United States, and that diversity demands that the College provide San Francisco’s population with the language skills and basic education necessary to thrive in our social and economic environment, and continue on to additional post-secondary education. Therefore, it is not surprising that the largest academic department at CCSF is ESL, offering credit and noncredit instruction throughout the City. The Transitional Studies Department provides the bridge between secondary and post-secondary education for both native-speaking and second-language students. Because of the very large cohort of second-language students in the credit programs at CCSF, the academic and vocational disciplines employ a variety of innovative and more traditional teaching strategies to reach students from diverse educational and ethnic backgrounds.

The College has a comprehensive array of vocational and occupational programs and courses ranging from Trade Skills and Culinary Arts to Graphic Arts and Business. Students can earn certificates in a wide variety of fields that will prepare them for entry-level employment with internship and work experience opportunities available in many programs. The Office of Workforce and Economic Development provides funding and support for new occupational programs that respond to new areas of opportunity, such as the recently developed programs and services related to the emerging biotechnology industry in the Bay Area. In an effort to respond to the diverse economic and educational backgrounds of potential students, CCSF developed a “Bridge to Biotech Program” that assists students transitioning into college-level studies as well as a feeder “On-Ramp to Biotech Program” that prepares low-income adults with skills at the 6th-9th grade levels for entry into the Bridge program. (See also the Theme V Essay.)

The College has an extensive fee-based continuing education program that provides members of the community with a broad range of cultural, business and finance, test preparation, skills development, and personal development opportunities. The Office of Contract and Continuing Education also works with local businesses, industries, and agencies to provide specific fee-based training through contract education. The Older Adults Department serves almost 3,000 students over the age of 55 at over 40 sites throughout the City. In addition, CCSF serves an international student population of over 600 students, who enroll on a tuition basis, studying in a variety of vocational and transfer programs.

The College has developed a broad range of support services to meet the needs of its different student populations. Beyond the usual student support services like counseling, financial aid, and various matriculation services, the College has an extensive array of specific student retention programs such as the African American Scholarship Program, the Latino Services Network, and the recently inaugurated Asian Pacific American Student Services Program. In addition, CCSF provides extensive learning assistance support ranging from tutorial services to learning laboratories designed to support classroom instruction. Since the last accreditation review, the College has made a concerted effort to increase the range and number of support services, as appropriate, to each of its major campuses. While significant progress has been made, budgetary constraints have limited CCSF’s ability to increase services for each site. There is still
more demand for services than the College is capable of providing at most locations. Recognizing these budgetary limitations, CCSF has actively sought more cost-efficient and student-friendly approaches to providing services. For example, a Title III grant is being used to computerize several matriculation-related services and learning support laboratories with the goal of making these computerized resources available at all campuses. The application and registration processes have been put online and students can also access their personal academic information through the Internet. The overwhelming majority of credit students use these web-based resources and the completion of the College's broadband infrastructure has provided students with computer access to information at most campuses.

Additional findings and analysis on Standards I.B.1-7

The College maintains an active, ongoing collegial dialog focused on improving student learning and institutional processes. As noted above, there are many regularly constituted committees with defined responsibilities for developing policies and initiatives that engage representatives from all campus constituencies in discussions of best practices and the assessment of institutional effectiveness. In addition, the College has a strong and productive history of developing “ad hoc” structures to focus more intensively on specific issues (or groups of related issues). These ad hoc initiatives are always carefully interfaced with the existing Shared Governance structure to assure that the results of the ad hoc processes are integrated into the “fabric of the institution.” (See also the Theme IV Essay and Standard IV Report.)

The Enhanced Self-Study (ESS) is an excellent example of an ad hoc process that provoked intensive dialog around a large set of core student outcomes issues and resulted in a set of recommendations that have been considered through the College’s Shared Governance process over the last four years. Over 170 faculty, staff, and students participated in five ad hoc committees that produced 38 recommendations ranging from raising the College’s written composition graduation requirement to early intervention strategies for pre-collegiate basic skills students; from creation of a transfer-oriented associate degree option and specific majors to the initiation of a degree audit reporting system that students can use to track their own progress. The Enhanced Self-Study was designed to initiate dialogs in five core areas of the College mission. These dialogs produced recommendations for specific initiatives for consideration through the Shared Governance procedures. Over half of the recommendations were approved and implemented and a number are still under consideration. The implemented recommendations ranged from the development of a computerized degree audit program to the revision of the written composition graduation requirement, from expanding the use of computerized placement testing to the creation of a transfer-oriented associate degree option. [Ref. 15]

The College has also used external grant funding to stimulate dialog about improved student learning. The “Bridge to Biotech Program,” funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation, brought together the Biology, Transitional Studies, and ESL Departments in discussions leading to program development designed to provide students who have basic skills deficiencies with specific courses and support services necessary for transition into training programs in the emerging occupations in the Bay Area’s biotechnology industries. The Title III and Koret Foundation grants have provided English, Mathematics, and ESL faculty with support to enable them to engage in dialog and collaborate on integrating laboratory activities with classroom instruction. For these three departments, this collaboration has led to significant changes in the structure and/or methodologies used in the basic skills courses.

As noted in the “Major Findings and Analysis” section above, the College has a well-articulated and robust system for setting annual goals and objectives linked to the Strategic Plan and Mission Statements, and for assessing the outcomes of those goals and objectives. The College also uses other forms of assessment to evaluate
its effectiveness in meeting its mission. College Performance Indicators have been established to measure progress in such areas as student access, retention, skills development, graduation, and job placement. These College Performance Indicators are rooted in the Strategic Plan, and an annual report tracks and publicizes the College’s performance using the indicators. In addition, the College initiates comprehensive studies related to specific strategic priorities, making available qualitative and quantitative data for planning, budgeting, and developing new initiatives. The recent Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Report is a good example of how these specific research efforts interface with planning. This two-part study first analyzed the progress of students through the College’s pre-collegiate basic skills programs in English, Mathematics, and ESL and then evaluated the effectiveness of the various student support and retention programs in promoting success among students in basic skills courses. These reports gave a newly rejuvenated Basic Skills Subcommittee the basis for a comprehensive analysis of best practices. The Chancellor subsequently initiated the consideration of establishing a Basic Skills Academy. In addition, each of the basic skills departments has used data in the report to evaluate and modify its instructional programs. [Refs. 16, 17]

Short- and long-term planning and decision making is supported by a sophisticated Decision Support System (DSS) that provides a broad range of data on institutional effectiveness and student outcomes, including demand for courses, student demographics, productivity analyses, and student persistence and success rates. It is a web-based system, interfacing with the Banner student information database, which permits the review of current data on specific student groups and characteristics (i.e., demographics) or program characteristics (e.g., student goals, educational backgrounds, etc.), as well as data on each of the College’s departments, schools, and campuses. The system allows the user to select and compare a variety of variables. The DSS can be accessed by members of internal or external communities through the use of a password that can be obtained from the Office of Research, Planning and Grants. While the system initially was used only by a small group of research-oriented faculty and administrators, recent usage statistics suggest significant increases in the “hits” on the system including substantial growth in off-campus users.

The College has a well-established systematic process for Program Review. While almost all of the academic and student services departments complete these reviews within a six-year cycle, some of the Student Services, instructional, and administrative units are seriously delinquent in completing Program Review. For many departments, Program Review is viewed as an opportunity to critically assess the status of the program, identify areas for improvement, and establish specific goals related to student learning and program effectiveness. However, Program Review is not integrated into the other aspects of institutional planning and budgeting and is only a marginal consideration in the few institutional processes that reference Program Review (such as the faculty position allocation process). In addition, beyond the review and acceptance of the individual reports by the Program Review Committee, the results of Program Review do not become part of the overall institutional assessment of effectiveness. In short, Program Review is presently a process in need of an agreed-upon purpose and incentives for participation.

The College conducted a systematic evaluation of its Shared Governance System during the 2003-04 academic year. [Ref. 18] This evaluation identified seven ongoing initiatives and made six recommendations for new initiatives to improve the effectiveness of Shared Governance policies and procedures. These recommendations are currently being implemented by the Shared Governance System. During the 2004-05 academic year, the College has also initiated an evaluation of its planning and budgeting practices.
III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. The College has done a commendable job developing a comprehensive planning, budgeting, and assessment process that establishes a direct relationship among the Mission and Vision statements, the Strategic Plan, and the annual planning and budgeting process. The College develops and revises these statements and plans through broadly inclusive, reflective dialogs among campus constituencies and representatives of the community. A biennial comprehensive assessment is undertaken of progress on the Annual Plan. However, the process for integrating the strategic planning initiatives into the Annual Plans and the evaluation of progress made each year on the Annual Plans should be more thoroughly integrated into the Shared Governance planning and budgeting procedures. Doing so would promote more reflective dialog among the campus constituencies, and that dialog is likely to lead to further improvements in student outcomes and institutional effectiveness.

2. While the College has a systematic procedure for Program Review, and Program Review reports are generally completed according to the prescribed cycle, the results of Program Review are not integrated into the planning and budgeting process and the overall assessment of institutional effectiveness. The College should undertake a comprehensive assessment of the goals and objectives of Program Review, the need to integrate Program Review into existing planning and evaluation procedures, and the role of Program Review in the establishment and assessment of student learning outcomes. In addition, this review should determine the appropriate role and processes for Program Review for administrative units and establish procedures that ensure timely participation.

3. The College has done an excellent job of providing usable data related to demand for courses, student demographics, productivity analyses, and student persistence and success rates for all students in credit programs. The establishment of College Performance Indicators and the annual assessments of progress on those indicators greatly enhance the College’s ability to provide evidence of its effectiveness to campus constituencies and to the communities that the College serves. In addition, the College has focused significant attention, research, and resources on the effectiveness of instruction and support services for basic skills in an effort to promote student success. Initiatives like the Enhanced Self-Study, the development of multiple targeted student retention programs, and the College’s aggressive and highly successful efforts to solicit external resources to support innovative program development all reflect the College’s active commitment to its Mission and Vision Statements.

4. Since the last Self Study, the College has made impressive strides in communications with external constituencies, both in terms of reaching out to the community to inform the public about the College’s quality and activities, and listening to the community regarding what needs the College should and can address. Although there is always room for improvement in communicating with the public, the many ways in which the College reaches out to the community is impressive, and continues to increase month by month. In addition, the College is making continual improvements in its internal communications. By rapidly expanding computer, email, voicemail and “voice over IP” access for employees at all campuses, the institution has created the infrastructure for significantly improved internal communication, promoting dialog, consensus, and innovations for learning across geographic boundaries.
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STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs & Services
STANDARD II:
Student Learning Programs & 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.
I. Overview of the Standard II.A Report: Instructional Programs

This report reflects a careful review and assessment of eight primary elements of the institution’s instructional program including: the delivery of the instructional program and institutional integrity, the quality of the instructional program, the General Education curriculum, the associate degree programs, the vocational programs, the dissemination of information about instructional programs, academic freedom and responsibility, and instructional programs located in foreign countries.

The General Education Program reflects an appropriate breadth and depth. The instructional program planning and evaluation processes established since the 2000 Accreditation Self Study are effective and have promoted broad-based involvement across the institution. The College's ability to disseminate print information to internal and external stakeholders is strong, although the College website is in need of improvement. While the District has adopted and publishes policies and procedures on academic freedom and honesty, the Faculty Handbook should be revised to include information regarding academic freedom and the guidelines for course syllabi should include specific expectations for academic honesty and the sanctions for violation of the academic honesty policy.

The College has developed several recent initiatives related to student learning outcomes including the addition of student learning outcomes statements for some departments in the 2005-06 College Catalog. Institutional dialog has occurred among many Shared Governance bodies regarding the student learning outcome paradigm. However, support from the institution's leadership, significant training and resources, and additional institutional discussion regarding all aspects of this paradigm will be essential if a paradigm shift is to occur. Since the last accreditation review, the College has raised both the Mathematics and English graduation requirements. In addition, the College has adopted a Transfer Associate Degree designed to promote degree completion by students transferring to the California State University system.

The College has engaged in a number of successful efforts to address student learning styles, although the dissemination of information about these efforts needs improvement to ensure as many faculty and students as possible can benefit from these initiatives. The College's vocational programs have historically used student learning outcomes assessment in many programs, collaborate with advisory committees in the development and revision of curricula, and have a strong record of successfully preparing students for employment. However, the College needs to improve the tracking of vocational students once they leave the institution in order to ensure the curriculum reflects the needs of the labor market.

The College has a well-articulated procedure for academic Program Review. However, the Standard II.A Committee found that the completion rates for programs scheduled for review were just over 70 percent for the period between 1999 and 2005. In addition, there is no systematic process for the review and revision of curricula when programs go through Program Review. The College needs to improve the completion rates and the effectiveness of its Program Review procedures by clearly defining and disseminating the goals, expectations, and benefits for Program Review. A process for institutional follow-up should be instituted to ensure that action plans are implemented. The Program Review procedures should include a systematic review of the curricula to assess the quality and currency of the course outlines and the programs that support those courses. The development of the Decision Support System has had a significant positive impact on the use of data in short- and long-term decision making at all levels of the institution.
II. Standard II.A Report: 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 in the name of the institution.

II.A.1. 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.

The development of all courses and programs constituting the instructional program involves a process of review and refinement to ensure the curriculum reflects the Mission Statement of the institution. [Ref. 21] For vocational departments, advisory committees may assist in the development of new curricula so that the needs of local industry are addressed. For all instructional departments, once faculty develop new curricula, the review process begins with the department chairperson and appropriate school dean. This review process ensures that new curricula are a logical extension of existing curricula offered by the department, addresses student needs, and can be offered based on the physical resources of the institution.

With approval of the department chairperson and school dean, new curricula undergo additional review by the Dean of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review or by the Chair of the College Curriculum Committee prior to being placed on the College Curriculum Committee agenda. This review process is known as "technical review" and is designed to ensure new curricula reflect the institutional mission and that materials presented to the College Curriculum Committee contain appropriate content and rigor and reflect current standards established by the Committee. In similar fashion, coursework presented to the College Curriculum Committee for the purpose of modification undergoes the same review process and is assessed based on the same criteria. This review process is also utilized for the development of new programs and the revision of existing programs. For new vocational programs, consisting of 18 or more units of coursework, once the College Curriculum Committee approves the program, the Bay Area Community College Occupational Planning Committee and then the California State Chancellor's Office review and approve these programs before they are offered. [Refs. 10, 31]

The institution ensures the quality and currency of its programs through the work of various committees. Again, the College Curriculum Committee is integral to the review of curricula to ensure quality and currency. The Program Review process also examines the quality and currency of the institution’s curricula. Each

---

1 City College of San Francisco's Mission Statement: “CCSF provides educational programs and services to meet the following needs of our diverse community: Preparation for transfer to baccalaureate institutions; Achievement of associate degrees of Arts and Science; Acquisition of career skills needed for success in the workplace; Active engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizenship preparation, and English as a Second Language; Completion of requirements for the Adult High School Diploma and GED; Promotion of economic development and job growth; Lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment. To enhance student learning and maintain a commitment to excellence, the College provides an array of academic and student services that support the development of students’ intellectual, cultural, and civic achievements. City College of San Francisco belongs to the community and continually strives to reaffirm its commitment as a resource for the community.”

2 Technical review is a component of the curriculum development process and is designed to assist faculty with the construction of course outlines and preparation of the forms required for submission to the College Curriculum Committee.
program develops a self-study report that assesses its level of learning and teaching excellence, establishes a six-year plan, and identifies, where appropriate, new costs for achieving planning objectives. Fundamentally, the self-study report provides programs an opportunity to self-reflect, discover strengths and weaknesses, and identify areas in need of improvement.

The DACUM process has also been utilized to ensure instructional programs are current and of high quality. Essentially, DACUM is a refined brainstorming process where a facilitator works closely with members of a program’s advisory committee to design new programs or revise existing programs.

Many vocational programs (e.g., Registered Nursing, Diagnostic Medical Imaging, and Licensed Vocational Nursing) are subject to additional review by external agencies. These reviews are primarily for program accreditation purposes and include a review process similar to the institution’s Program Review (e.g., an assessment of program currency is made). [Ref. 1]

The institution uses a variety of means to decide the fields of study in which to offer programs. Market trends and industry needs play a significant role in the development of new programs. For example, the institution recently received a $4.2 million grant from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. This grant represents a unique public-private collaboration between the institution and the California Pacific Medical Center and St. Luke’s Hospital. This collaboration will significantly increase the number of students admitted into the Nursing Program by augmenting the current program with afternoon and evening classes that are flexible in delivery and promote a learning environment that is competency-based and emphasizes problem solving.

On other occasions, the institution has partnered with community-based organizations in order to address labor shortages. The Mission Hiring Hall, for example, asked that a program be developed to train secretaries for the construction industry. The Hiring Hall recruits prospective students, secures student stipends and places these students into internships. The Hiring Hall also provides counselors in order to ensure the greatest likelihood of student success. These partnerships are examples of how the institution develops instructional programs that reflect the work needs of the community and serve the training needs of students.

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.

The institution serves a great diversity of students in a wide variety of programs in credit, noncredit, contract education, and continuing education that are designed to meet the varied needs of our students. Information on student demographics is readily available from reports such as the Environmental Scan Report produced by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants and the Decision Support System (DSS) that is maintained by the same office. [Ref. 22] It is important to note that a large number of basic skills students are served in the credit program.

---

3 DACUM is an acronym that stands for Designing A Curriculum. The DACUM process has been used for over 40 years to conduct job analyses in every field imaginable all over the world. It is primarily used to create and update training and education programs. It is unique in the sense that expert workers are used to determine curriculum, rather than having curriculum selected by instructors, college professors, or training managers. By making workers the experts, DACUM narrows the gap between what is typically taught in classes and what workers actually need to know to achieve excellence in the workplace.

4 The Decision Support System (DSS) was developed by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants in order to enhance access to institutional data pertaining to students, courses and programs. Available to the College community in 2001, the DSS is a web-based interface within the institution’s intranet that accesses a data warehouse. The DSS was shown to have a positive impact on user perceptions of data and the use of data in decision making (Decentralizing Data Through Decision Support Systems: The Impact of Increased Access to Data on Decision-Making).
According to a recent report, 43 percent of first-time students are placed into one or two lower-level pre-collegiate courses. Additionally, 33 percent are placed into one or two upper-level pre-collegiate courses. The Basic Skills Subcommittee and the Diversity Committee are working on proposals to increase the success rate of these students.

The creation and dissemination of data regarding the identification of student learning needs changed significantly when the Office of Research, Planning and Grants set the goal of creating an information-rich environment in the late 1990s. The DSS has provided highly accessible data to the College community regarding student demographics, enrollment trends, graduation rates, and other types of statistical data. A recent external study indicated that the DSS has not only changed the way research is used, but also the speed at which research is available. The study concluded that the DSS has democratized the dissemination of information, making it widely available to the College community. As a result, data are used more often to substantiate claims for additional resources, or to make decisions regarding the need for more class sections or the need to market a program to a larger audience. In addition, the study reported that pre-existing negative attitudes about the source of these data are being dismantled.

[Ref. 2]

The Office of Research, Planning and Grants now publishes numerous reports that are available on the website maintained by this office. A review of the December 2003 Mid-Year Summary Report from this office indicates a total of 183 requests for information were received and responded to during the Fall 2003 semester. [Ref. 23] Most of these requests for data originated from an administrative office or department. A survey was conducted in Fall 2004 to determine how the provided data were used and whether these data were used to identify student needs and assess student learning outcomes.

In addition, this office provides a Program Review Data Book to all departments when they undergo Program Review. [Ref. 24] These data books include student success data, demographic data, weekly student contact hours (WSCH), and faculty load data. Also included are student success data for the entire institution and sample registration outcomes data. The Office of Research, Planning and Grants also assists departments in creating student and faculty surveys for Program Review purposes.

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.

The institution comprises 12 primary campuses and nearly 200 sites located within San Francisco County. These campuses and sites provided instruction to approximately 100,000 students during the 2003-04 academic year. A day and evening instructional program is planned each year that includes a credit and noncredit program, a continuing education program, and an apprenticeship program. Given the diversity of the student body, the instructional program is tailored to meet the needs of those students served by each primary campus.

A diverse and flexible instructional delivery system has been developed to serve these students. While this instructional delivery system is primarily composed of the traditional in-class lecture format for credit courses and a lecture-practicum for noncredit courses, the institution also offers telecourses and online courses. Indeed, an increasing number of online courses have been developed subsequent to the 2000 Accreditation Self-Study Report. In addition to these technology-mediated courses, hybrid courses (i.e., courses that are primarily in-class, lecture-based but include a technology-mediated element) have also been developed. Perhaps one of the more significant activities in technology-mediated instruction has been the development of two certificate programs (i.e., Fundamentals of Networking and Wireless Networking), offered through the Computer Networking and Information Technology Department, in which all coursework can be completed online.

Given the growth in the number of technology-mediated courses offered, the Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction and the
College Curriculum Committee have worked together to refine the procedures used to ensure that courses taught in more than one delivery mode are equivalent in content and rigor. A product of this collaboration is the Technology Mediated Instruction form that is used by the College Curriculum Committee to review and approve new online courses and telecourses. [Ref. 3]

Typically, when a technology-mediated course is proposed, a dialog takes place between the department developing the course, the Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction, and the College Curriculum Committee. This dialog occurs prior to the course being placed on the College Curriculum Committee agenda in order to ensure the course can be taught within the guidelines imposed by the Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction. The College Curriculum Committee reviews the course to ensure compliance with Title 5, Section 55378. In order to assess whether technology-mediated courses are meeting student needs, the Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction surveys students taking both telecourses and online courses. These surveys provide valuable data regarding student satisfaction with these courses.

Beyond this collaborative effort between the Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction and the College Curriculum Committee, the institution has shown an ongoing commitment to technology-mediated instruction in the form of policy (i.e., the Strategic Plan, Priority 7) and, within the Shared Governance framework, the institution has created two committees that specifically focus on the relationship between technology and teaching and learning, the Teaching and Learning Technology Roundtable and the Distance Learning Advisory Committee.

The institution has also developed several modes of instruction directed toward serving specific student populations. Examples include the Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL) Immersion Program, the Welcome Back Program, Project Shine (which utilizes service learning as an additional mode of learning), and the Working Adults Degree Program. In recognition of this work, the institution received in 2004 the MetLife Community College Excellence Award in the amount of $30,000 specifically for reaching out to first-generation, immigrant, low-income, and working adults through the English as a Second Language (ESL) Department and community-based programs developed by the institution. Moreover, the institution also recently received two grants totaling $1.1 million from the National Science Foundation, one to support the On-Ramp to Biotech Program (which incorporates internships as an additional mode of learning) and the other to disseminate the Bridge to Biotech Program. These programs were created in response to community demand for training in biotechnology largely stemming from the development of the Mission Bay Campus owned by the University of California, San Francisco. Both programs are intended for historically underserved and underrepresented and limited-English residents of San Francisco County.

---

5 The MetLife Foundation, established in 1976 by MetLife, supports health, education, civic and cultural programs throughout the United States. The Foundation has contributed more than $90 million to education programs that facilitate change and cultivate effective learning environments at school and at home. Each year, beginning in 2003, the MetLife Foundation, in collaboration with Jobs for the Future, selects two community colleges for its MetLife Foundation Community College Excellence Award.

6 On-Ramp to Biotech is funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation. The institution has partnered with SFWorks which is a local CBO that assists low-income adults in San Francisco. On-Ramp to Biotech is a feeder program that prepares low-income adults with skills at the 6th-9th grade levels for entry into the Bridge to Biotech Program.

7 The Bridge to Biotech Program was created in 2002 and is designed to provide the necessary background to underserved students for entry into the Biotechnology Certificate Program and in some cases, directly into entry-level jobs and/or internships. The institution developed and implemented this program in response to community demand from two economically disadvantaged areas of San Francisco (i.e., Bayview Hunters Point and the Mission).
City College of San Francisco offers two degrees, 130 certificate programs, 34 awards of achievement and 11 specific majors. [Ref. 4] The certificate programs and awards of achievement cover a variety of vocational areas of study and prepare students for the local labor market. During the last two years, several departments have decided to replace their existing award of achievement with a major. In most cases, the coursework has remained unchanged with the conversion. The shift to majors represents a culmination of efforts that began with the Enhanced Self-Study (ESS)\(^8\) recommendation that majors become a part of the College’s curricular offerings. [Ref. 5]

The rationale for this recommendation included several elements. The sub-committee recommendation referenced the need to provide students a level of curricular depth and breadth within a specific discipline at the two-year degree level, the desire to better prepare those students who transfer to four-year institutions for upper-division coursework in a specific field of study, and the hope that those students completing a major would develop a greater sense of self-confidence and intellectual maturity. [Ref. 6] As of Fall 2004, 11 specific majors had been developed. The intended learning outcomes for each of these new majors are found in the College Catalog and are stated in the introduction preceding the coursework constituting each major.

Similarly, each award of achievement and certificate presented in the College Catalog includes an introductory statement that presents the learning outcomes for the program. Generally, these learning outcomes reference employment opportunities and skill sets associated with the field of study. For those programs in the allied health field and other programs where exams for licensure are taken upon completion of the coursework, the ability to sit for the stated exam is presented as a learning outcome for the program. Recently, there has been an effort to more clearly delineate learning outcomes at the program level. This effort includes revision of the style page for the Catalog with the inclusion of a new header “Learning Outcomes.” Department chairs have been asked to include a learning outcomes statement for their program(s) that will appear in the 2005-06 College Catalog. During the Fall 2004 semester, approximately 20 of 52 instructional departments submitted a learning outcomes statement for their program(s). [Ref. 7]

At the course level, learning outcomes have been the subject of much discussion. The College Curriculum Committee twice included learning outcomes as a topic of discussion during Fall 2004. Additionally, a work group, derived from the Committee, met twice during the same semester to address course-based learning outcomes and how to incorporate this idea into the course outline template. During the November 3, 2004 meeting, the College Curriculum Committee made the decision not to revise the existing method faculty employ when developing course objectives, as this method mirrors the method found in the research literature regarding the development of learning outcomes statements. Rather, the Committee decided to adopt a revised course outline template that included the new header, “Major Learning Outcomes.” This header replaces the longstanding header, “Course Objectives.” [Ref. 8]

Curriculum development is a faculty-initiated process. Frequently, those faculty developing new curricula are directly responding to the needs of their students. Learning outcomes are developed and embedded in the course outlines. Strategies for attaining learning outcomes are also embedded in the course outline under the Instructional Methodology section. Faculty involved in the development of course outlines are asked by the Office of Instruction to engage in the technical review process prior to submitting the materials to the College Curriculum Committee. While there are many goals associated with technical review, one of the primary goals is to ensure that the learning outcomes,

---

\(^8\) The Enhanced Self-Study began during Fall 2001 and was a joint project of the Chancellor’s Office and the Academic Senate. The study represented a detailed examination of the factors promoting and inhibiting student success at the College. The overall goal of the initiative was to increase our contribution to student achievement and persistence and increase levels of student satisfaction as a result. Thirty-four (34) recommendations resulted from this study.
course content, and instructional methodology reinforce and support one another. This ensures that learning outcomes align with specific course content, and that these elements align with specific instructional methodology (i.e., assignments and methods of evaluation).

Further evaluation of student learning outcomes and their relationship to course content and instructional methodology at the course level occurs within departments once a course has been offered. When necessary, a department will revise the course outline and resubmit it to the College Curriculum Committee for review and approval. This type of committee action represents a significant portion of the Committee's work. For example, during the 2003-04 academic year, the Committee reviewed and approved revisions to 67 course outlines. At the program level, revisions also occur based on an assessment of the program's effectiveness in relation to its learning outcomes. These revisions range from minor changes to significant changes regarding the program's coursework. Again, it is the faculty who initiate these revisions and it is the College Curriculum Committee that reviews and approves these changes. During the 2003-04 academic year, 24 instructional programs were revised. [Ref. 9]

Title 5, Section 55002 is the law governing whether coursework offered by the institution is at the collegiate level. The College Curriculum Committee, in conjunction with the Office of Instruction, has developed several submission forms for faculty who wish to develop new courses and programs. Course requirements as stated in Title 5, Section 55002 are included on these forms and are to be adhered to when developing the new course outlines. The College Curriculum Committee reviews these course outlines to ensure compliance.

With specific reference to learning outcomes, the Curriculum Committee Handbook provides much detail regarding the development of learning outcomes. For example, Bloom’s Taxonomy, which includes a list of appropriate verbs for the development of student learning outcomes, is presented along with several examples of learning outcomes statements that reflect collegiate-level work. [Ref. 10]

It should be noted that those departments with external regulatory oversight continue to discuss student achievement assessment results and the impact of those results at the course and program level. The College’s distance learning programs, inclusive of both online and telecourse instruction, have maintained the practice of surveying students enrolled in these courses in order to improve delivery. The review of these data frequently leads to discussions between those administering the distance education program and participating faculty regarding the format and delivery of these courses.

An example of institutional level discussion regarding the use of student achievement assessment results to improve courses offered is the recent effort to revise the English Graduation Requirement. This effort began with a recommendation from the visiting team during the 2000 accreditation process and was reaffirmed by the College’s Enhanced Self-Study. During Fall 2003, the English and ESL Departments began a discussion regarding how to align the English Graduation Requirement with applicable Title 5 language and continue to serve the College’s diverse student population. As of Fall 2004, new coursework had been created and existing coursework had been revised in order to achieve these goals.

Finally, while difficult to document with formal evidence, discussions occur within many departments regarding the relationship between courses, programs, and student achievement. From these discussions, courses and programs are revised and new curriculum is developed.

II.A.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all 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.
The institution utilizes a variety of criteria to decide on the different courses and programs offered throughout the 12 primary campuses. These criteria include the institution’s Vision and Mission Statements, student need, labor market demand and the needs of specific communities served.

Collegiate courses are offered as part of the institution’s effort to implement our mission and commitment to equal access to post-secondary education. The institution has utilized community listening sessions, community focus groups, student focus groups and student surveys to identify student educational needs. Programs and courses that address these needs are offered at the campuses.

Pre-collegiate courses include basic skills, non-credit courses, credit non-degree applicable courses, and credit degree applicable courses specifically designed to prepare students for the academic rigor of general education credit courses. The institution defines basic skills coursework as a subset of the pre-collegiate course sequence. Each college has identified a limited number of pre-collegiate courses as “basic skills” courses. Coursework at the beginning of the credit English, Mathematics and ESL sequences as well as a collection of noncredit courses in ESL and Transitional Studies have been identified as basic skills courses.

Student need drives the number of pre-collegiate courses offered. In a recent survey, 75 percent of first-time students enrolling in credit coursework required pre-collegiate coursework in order to acquire the foundational skills necessary to complete general education coursework. Consequently, pre-collegiate courses comprise a significant number of course offerings in English, Mathematics and ESL. Indeed, over two-thirds of English courses and approximately half of all mathematics courses offered each semester are pre-collegiate courses. [Ref. 11]

The Continuing Education Program is the extended learning program of the institution. This program is not-for-credit, fee-based, and self-supporting. Short-term classes and workshops are offered in a variety of areas. The decision to offer continuing education courses is based on the following rationales:

- Student interest.
- Developmental workshops or short-term classes that do not fit the mandated lower-division credit or noncredit areas.
- Courses proposed by guest lecturers.
- Courses that can be offered at no cost to the institution under the Education to Go Program. [Ref. 12]

As a matter of policy, the institution attempts to build partnerships with business, industry, government, trade unions, and community agencies. The result of this policy has been the development of not-for-credit and credit contract education courses. These courses respond to the unique needs of external entities such as private companies or public agencies. These courses are the result of contact with the local business community and are usually short-term customized courses that are offered either in the workplace or at one of the campuses.

The quality assessment of contract education courses occurs through interviews with employers and student surveys. The frequency of requests for services from the local business and public sector entities attests to the quality of these courses.

The International Education Program comprises an Intensive English Program (IEP) offered through the Institute for International Students, the Academic Program for International Students, and the Study Abroad Programs. The institution offers these programs to promote cultural diversity within the student population and to encourage communication and intercultural awareness within the College community.
The Intensive English Language Program was developed as a result of a feasibility study conducted during the 1991-92 academic year. This noncredit program is designed for international students with F-1 visas and prepares these students for further academic study and taking the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) exam. The Academic Program for International Students serves approximately 300 students annually and is designed to provide access to international students who wish to enroll in degree-applicable coursework. [Ref. 13]

The Study Abroad Programs provide students an opportunity to study and live in another country while receiving college credit. These programs are intended to enable students to experience the host country’s culture, language and history and develop a global perspective through their experiences. [Ref. 4]

Short-term training courses are also offered through various vocational education programs. These credit courses are designed to satisfy immediate labor market demands of business and industry. The focus is on serving incumbent or displaced workers. Outcome data for these programs are found in the Vocational and Technical Education Act (VTEA) Core Indicator Report produced by the California State Chancellor’s Office. The quality of the credit and noncredit courses and programs offered as short-term training through the institution’s vocational education program is evaluated through the Program Review process, the Core Indicators Report, and faculty evaluations. Low enrollment has forced some programs to reflect on ways of improving course offerings. Programs that require licensing by an outside agency provide information on student success rates that are used to assess program effectiveness. [Ref. 14]

The institution offers a General Education Development (GED) Program. This program is designed for students who wish to obtain a GED certificate in lieu of a high school diploma. The coursework for this program has been developed by the Transitional Studies Department and is offered at several sites. Students who successfully complete the coursework may sit for an examination developed by the American Council on Education. During the 2003-04 academic year, 793 students sat for the exam with 435 students passing the exam. [Ref. 15] A High School Diploma Program is also offered to those students who have completed a significant portion of their high school coursework and wish to complete the remaining credits necessary to acquire their diploma.

II.A.2.a. The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes, 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.

The institution identifies areas of need with regard to courses and programs in several ways. Based on placement testing in Mathematics, English, and ESL, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants provides the institution with a profile of incoming students. In addition, this office collects data on other student characteristics as well as economic and population data for the Bay Area. Community needs are brought to the attention of the institution through listening sessions that are incorporated into the Strategic Plan. Many vocational programs and most campuses have advisory boards that provide feedback regarding the needs of specific communities served. This feedback is incorporated into the decision-making process affecting the administration, mode of delivery, and evaluation of courses and programs offered. Moreover, the Chancellor participates on the Executive Committee of the local Workforce Investment Board that is charged with identifying workforce needs.

Once curriculum needs are identified, the curriculum development process begins. In order to assist faculty in the development of new curriculum, the College Curriculum Committee, with the support of the Office of Instruction, has provided numerous workshops that focus on curriculum development. These workshops are offered to faculty semiannually during FLEX Day activities. Additional resources include the
College Curriculum Committee Handbook and the Office of Instruction and College Curriculum Committee websites. [Ref. 10] These websites provide faculty access to all necessary forms for submitting new curriculum or revising existing curriculum to the College Curriculum Committee. The Handbook and other related documents are also found on these websites. In particular, the Office of Instruction website provides faculty access to all course outlines of record maintained by the institution. Currently, this database includes approximately 3,000 course outlines.

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.

Student learning outcomes and competency levels are measured by the ability of students to successfully complete a course, pass into higher levels of academic study, enter a licensed profession, advance in a current profession, or move from noncredit coursework to credit coursework.

All vocational departments are required to collaborate with an advisory committee when identifying those competencies that graduates need to have in order to enter the labor market. Many also use these committees to help determine how student learning outcomes should be assessed. This partnership between the faculty and an advisory committee is required among those programs accredited by an external agency. For example, the Diagnostic Medical Imaging Program uses an advisory committee to measure success in areas such as on-the-job competency and the professionalism of its graduates. [Ref. 16] Moreover, some vocational programs have undergone the DACUM process in order to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes in their curriculum.

While assessment of student learning outcomes has not occurred at the institutional level, there are several examples of this type of assessment that should be noted:

a. The Photography Department has worked to determine standards and evaluation techniques for assessing student competency based on established student learning outcomes.

b. The English Department has developed a common exam for English 94. This exam is not required to pass the class, but is used by faculty to serve as a reference point to judge student competency regarding course-level learning outcomes. The department, in deciding to raise the English Graduation Requirement, used data collected from the common exam. (See also Theme II Essay in this Self Study.)

c. The English as a Second Language Department assesses outcomes in both credit and noncredit programs. Credit ESL has end-of-semester tests in reading, writing and grammar for their core courses (i.e., ESL 110-150). This division also has a composite final for ESL 82. In the area of noncredit ESL, there are end-of-semester reading and listening tests for ESLN 3200, 3400 and 3600. The CASAS test is also used to assess a student’s attainment of life skills and competencies. Instructors use the results of this test to decide which competencies need to be emphasized in class.

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

The institution has a formal review process in place to ensure all instructional programs include the appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing and can be completed within an acceptable time frame. The College Curriculum
Committee is the mainstay of this review process. Indeed, the mission of the College Curriculum Committee is “to promote academic excellence and rigor by means of careful study and discussion and by the application of state regulations and policies of the District.” [Ref. 10] The Matriculation Office is also a part of this review process and ensures that all course prerequisites and co-requisites are reviewed and approved in conformance with applicable Title 5 requirements.

Many departments partner with governmental agencies, community-based organizations, business, labor, and industry as well as prospective employers to develop and review instructional programs in order to ensure relevancy and quality. For example, the Business Department has worked with the Job Development Group to survey prospective employers to determine the skills these employers require of their employees. Student input is also sought by many departments through surveys in order to determine their needs and skill levels.

The SCANS Project (described in more detail in the following section) and the Asian Infusion Project (now Multicultural Infusion) also contribute to the quality of courses and programs by providing faculty innovative teaching strategies and course content that is culturally diverse. It should be noted that many faculty, both full-time and part-time, are actively engaged in the subject matter they teach or are professionals working in the field.

With regard to the synthesis of learning within the instructional program, the institution increasingly uses data generated by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants to make informed decisions regarding additions and modifications to the instructional program. These data include success, retention and persistence rates as well as institutional enrollment patterns, job placement and transfer rates. Some departments have gone an additional step and have developed curricula that integrate the resources of student service programs. For example, the Mathematics Department has developed a relationship with the Learning Assistance Center (LAC) that enhances the learning experience for its students. Peer tutorial sessions are provided by the LAC in which students tutor students in mathematics. Additional examples include the Bridge to Biotech Program that works with students as learning cohorts, internships, and work experience courses.

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

See response to Standard II.A.1.b. for details about delivery modes. With respect to teaching methodologies, all course outlines include reference to the instructional methodology employed. Typically, written exams and quizzes are used, although a variety of other methods, inclusive of journals, online assignments, research papers, group projects, presentations, demonstrations, and portfolios are also employed.

The discussion of student needs, learning styles, and different teaching styles primarily occurs within the College community on an informal basis. Since Spring 2000, several FLEX Day workshops have addressed student learning styles (e.g., the Asian Infusion Project) and alternative teaching strategies (e.g., Service Learning). Perhaps the best evidence of the institution’s commitment to these issues is the Basic Skills Subcommittee which meets on a regular basis to discuss how faculty can improve their teaching of basic skills subjects (e.g., English, ESL, Mathematics, Transitional Studies, and Learning Assistance), as well as student learning styles. Those students with special learning needs or

---

9 The Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) began with a series of initiatives launched by Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole in November of 1989. Fundamentally, SCANS is intended to integrate eight basic skills into the curriculum, including five workplace skills and three personal qualities. At the time of this writing, SCANS is undergoing a transition to the Learning Outcomes/Learning Assessment Faculty Professional Development Project (LOLA). The primary objective of LOLA is to explore the use of assessment as a tool to improve student outcomes.
who have enrolled in basic skills coursework have an impressive array of services to access (e.g., ADA-compliant websites, closed captioning videos and broadcasts, the DSPS test facility and lab, and tutoring services). These services are offered through the Disabled Students Programs and Services Office, the Learning Assistance Center, and the Broadcast Electronic Media Arts Department.

With regard to institutional initiatives, one project that has been very successful is the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). This project is devoted to integrating vocational skills needed in the workplace into the curriculum. The SCANS Project is funded by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (VTEA) and has been utilized by the institution since 1995. The project has been a model for the institution with regard to improving the dissemination of teaching strategies among both vocational and academic faculty, providing professional development for best practices, and integrating academic and vocational skills in the classroom. During the past nine years, over 100 instructors from every instructional department have been involved with the SCANS Project and over 10,000 students have benefited from this project. All instructors and counselors are eligible to participate. Student and instructor satisfaction surveys are conducted each academic year and the most recent survey has indicated that approximately 90 percent of those students surveyed would recommend a SCANS-infused class to other students.

Another institutional initiative is Project Voice, a grant-funded program by the California State Chancellor's Office designed to increase the level of participation in the classroom setting. Two successful examples of this initiative are found in the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Studies Department and the ESL Department where techniques to enhance classroom participation have been launched. The EL Civics grant issued by the California Department of Education has benefited the institution's immigrant population with ESL noncredit programs that empower students to participate more actively in the community. Finally, the Asian Infusion Project allowed participating faculty the opportunity to incorporate pedagogy sensitive to various student learning styles into their teaching activities and infuse their curriculum with Asian culture. More recently, the Asian Infusion Project has been transformed into the Multicultural Infusion Project which encompasses a variety of cultures.

II.A.2.e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency and future needs and plans.

Program Review is an ongoing, systematic process that instructional departments undergo every six years. The objectives of Program Review are to promote student learning and teaching excellence. Instructional departments establish a six-year plan and use their goals and objectives as a basis for annual budget requests. Program Review may be conducted before the normal six-year cycle to address exigent internal or external forces impacting a program. [Ref. 17]

Operationally, the review process is conducted as a self study and includes an evaluation of departmental activities toward improving classroom instruction, the appropriateness of course offerings to the discipline and to the students served, support of the institution's transfer mission, enhancement of outside classroom learning experiences, flexibility of delivery systems, and expansion of institutional partnerships. Moreover, the review process evaluates the program's student demographics, mean faculty load, program WSCH and FTES, faculty FTE, and student success and persistence rates. Collectively, these data are used to assess a program's relevancy, appropriateness, currency, and future needs and plans. [Ref. 17]

While Program Review provides a clear and comprehensive framework to evaluate the overall effectiveness of an instructional program, it does not include a comprehensive curriculum review process. In fact, curriculum review is not a required element of Program Review. However,
some departments (e.g., Journalism, Architecture, and Automotive Technology) have incorporated facilitation techniques such as a SWOT\textsuperscript{10} analysis or the DACUM process while undergoing Program Review to evaluate the effectiveness of their instructional programs.

At this time, assessment of student learning outcomes within the Program Review process occurs through the review of several indicators. These indicators include: completion rates for all instructional programs, the number of students that transition from basic skills to degree applicable coursework, rates of transfer to four-year institutions, the number of associate degrees, awards of achievement, and certificates granted, the number of students acquiring external licensure, and the number of students who complete internships.

Based on the 2000 Accreditation Self Study Report, the visiting team stated, “given the importance of the program review system in assessing institutional effectiveness and that the findings of program reviews are an important consideration in the budget allocation process, the team recommends the College ensure the institutionalization of their program review process by requiring that all units complete their program reviews in a timely and thorough fashion.” [Ref. 18] At this time, approximately 70 percent of the program reviews due from instructional units, with deadlines ranging from 2000 to 2003, have been completed. In contrast, the completion rate for the non-instructional departments during the same timeframe is 40 percent. [Ref. 19]

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.

The institution engages in planning at many levels which is manifested through a variety of documents. Overarching planning documents include the Strategic Plan, the Management Plan and the Educational Master Plan. Planning also occurs on an annual basis and includes the Annual Plan and the Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment Reports. The College Performance Indicators Report is an annual publication and serves to provide a set of performance indicators aligned with the eight priorities of the Strategic Plan. This report is published and made available to the residents of San Francisco.

The systematic review of instructional programs primarily occurs through the Program Review process and is supplemented by the College Curriculum Committee. Program Review is designed to provide faculty the opportunity to engage in a self study that encompasses several aspects of their program including a review of student learning outcomes and program improvement.

Another process used to evaluate instructional programs is the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (VTEA) of 1998. For many years the institution has used a formal and systematic method for the allocation of VTEA funds. The Office of Vocational Education administers this evaluation process that begins with an annual election of an allocation committee. To access VTEA funds, a vocational department must submit a proposal. A VTEA Development Team must be established within the department and receive training from the VTEA Coordinator regarding the effective development of proposals that fulfill departmental needs and the criteria established under Federal legislation. These proposals must demonstrate

\textsuperscript{10}SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) is a device used to bring to light opportunities and threats and for ongoing assessment of strengths and weaknesses within an organization or program. A SWOT exercise usually lasts between 20-60 minutes and involves group participation.
how departmental needs were evaluated (e.g., use of focus groups, advisory committee recommendations, or institutional data) and how the department will meet the eight Requirements of Uses of Funds. Proposals also must demonstrate the use of College Performance Indicators data in the proposal planning process and in the assessment of performance outcomes.

There are also faculty-initiated efforts to evaluate instructional programs. For example, beginning four years ago, several departments and one program (i.e., Architecture, Art, Graphic Communications, Photography, and Multimedia Studies) began a collaborative effort to develop courses that could be taught in any of the participating departments. After review of the course offerings for each department, a common instructional need was discovered that was not adequately addressed by any of the departments involved. As a result of these initial discussions, the Design Collaborative was established. Those courses developed by the Design Collaborative have now been offered for two years and have been evaluated by participating faculty with regard to the learning outcomes and student competency.

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.

During Fall 2004, all instructional departments were surveyed in order to assess the number of departments using common course examinations. The following courses were found to have common exams:

- Accounting 1 and 2
- Broadcasting 120
- Chemistry 101A and Chemistry 32L
- English 94

English as a Second Language (Credit Courses) 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, and 82

English as a Second Language (Noncredit Courses) N3200, N3400, and N3600

Spanish 1A and French 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 2B

Math E1

As a part of this survey, department chairpersons were also asked to provide information about the validity and reliability of the testing instruments employed, steps taken to avoid cultural bias in the construction of the test questions, and to provide any information regarding culturally biased questions if applicable.

Results from this survey indicated that departments ensure validity of their test instruments with a variety of means. The Business Department engages all faculty in the development of test questions used in their Accounting 1 and Accounting 2 courses. The Broadcasting Department also relies on those faculty teaching Broadcasting 120 to review the test questions and revise when needed. Faculty teaching Chemistry 101A collaborate when writing test questions, consult past instructors about student performance and often consult other instructors about test questions. The English Department compares student performance in the English 94 common exam to student performance in class. The ESL Department compares student scores to the instructor’s expectations regarding the student’s proficiency in the subject. Credit ESL final exam scores for students are compared to their scores for previous tests in the course and final course grades. Foreign language instructors have adopted national examinations to evaluate their students. The Math Department uses Math E1 as a predictor of success for Math 840. Some of these departments use statistical data to establish validity and reliability of their test instruments.

A variety of methods are also used to avoid cultural bias in the development of test questions. Some departments make a conscious effort to ensure that faculty developing test questions represent diverse cultural backgrounds. Other departments have provided faculty involved in developing test questions workshops on the topic of cultural diversity, and specifically, how to eliminate cultural bias from test questions.
Most departments reported that when a test question is discovered to have a cultural bias, the question is either removed or modified. All departmental exams reviewed are included in the grading process and, therefore, are included in the determination to award credit.

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.

As recorded in the course outline of record, faculty present the content of the course with the goal of accomplishing the learning outcomes as stated. Moreover, faculty evaluate students based on their mastery of the stated learning outcomes and award credit based on student performance.

The connection between the evaluation of student performance and course objectives is expressed in the Curriculum Committee Handbook, “Once the intent of a course has been determined and expressed in the form of a list of topics and possibly some methodology in the catalog description, it becomes the purpose of the Objectives, Content and Methodology sections of the course outline to support that intent. To this end, it is important that these sections of the course outline be related (integrated) to one another in ways that are defined in the following sections and various appendices.” [Ref. 10]

The faculty evaluation process includes an assessment of whether the course outline of record is adhered to in the classroom setting. This assessment item is found in all Peer and Peer-Management faculty evaluation forms under Section B.1.c. and reads, “The class segment visited and any materials furnished were pertinent to the course outline.” The evaluator is to rate the extent to which instructional materials provided are relevant to the course outline.

This assessment is also covered in the Faculty Self Evaluation Form under Section B.1.c. which reads, “Materials used are pertinent to the course outline.”

With regard to whether credits are awarded based on accepted norms within higher education, the institution is in compliance with all applicable Title 5, Section 55002 regulations pertaining to the review and approval of course outlines of record as well as the archiving of course outlines and their availability to faculty.

II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of the stated learning outcomes.

Degrees and certificates are awarded when students complete a program of required coursework. Each course has specific learning outcomes (i.e., course objectives) established by the originating department and submitted to the College Curriculum Committee for review and approval. Student achievement of those learning outcomes is primarily shown through grades or credit received for a course.

Program requirements for the awarding of degrees and certificates are clearly stated in the College Catalog. Degrees and certificates are awarded based on successful completion of these requirements with success measured by a cumulative grade point average. The minimum grade point average (GPA) varies according to the program, although all programs require at least a 2.0 GPA per course or as a cumulative GPA for all courses constituting the program. Additional program requirements may include minimum hours of attendance or minimum skill proficiency. In all cases, program requirements are presented in the program description found in the College Catalog.
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 the catalog. The institution, relying on expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.

II.A.3.a. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including the following: 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.

General Education\textsuperscript{11} (GE) coursework is required in eight different areas: proficiencies in written and spoken communication as well as critical thinking; an introduction to the humanities and to the social, natural, and behavioral sciences; a basic understanding of U.S. history and government; general study in health and physical wellness; and an appreciation of ethnic and gender studies. This commitment to a general education program is reflected in the institution’s Vision and Mission Statements and found in several College publications including the College Catalog. Title 5, Section 55806 provides the criteria for the content and methodology found in the institution’s general education coursework.

When developing or revising specific content for traditional GE courses, faculty members typically confer with their colleagues through departmental curriculum committees, \textit{ad hoc} work groups and the college-wide curriculum development components. Of particular note, faculty leaders actively participate in curriculum discussions with their colleagues at the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), private universities, and other California community colleges via meetings of professional organizations, regional articulation groups, and the statewide Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) project.

For a new course to be included in the GE requirements it must first be approved by the Curriculum Committee, which assesses each submission in accordance with Title 5, Section 55002 (et. seq.). After approval from the Curriculum Committee, the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, which is made up of Academic Senate Executive Council members and select administrators, must confirm the addition of the course to the General Education Breadth Requirement coursework. It is difficult to determine how well students are able to apply their understanding of general education. Our institution has yet to develop a way to isolate the outcomes of the GE program; therefore, this is an area that requires further investigation. Nonetheless, a recent survey of students who petitioned to graduate in 2000 and 2001 reported an overall good rating for courses they experienced through the GE program as well as skills-based courses reviewed in Standard 2.A.3.b. [Ref. 20]

\textsuperscript{11} Goals of the General Education Program: “Through its general education program, the College intends to graduate students who have developed: a. skills in the principles and applications of language toward logical thought, clear and precise expression, and critical evaluation of communication in whatever symbol system the student uses; b. English language skills so that they can communicate clearly, both orally and in writing, and can evaluate what they hear and read; c. an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method, of the achievements of at least one of the natural sciences, and of the relationships between the natural sciences and other human activities; d. an appreciation and understanding of the methods of inquiry used in the social and natural sciences and of the ways people act and have acted in response to their societies; e. an appreciation and understanding of the ways in which people throughout the ages and in different cultures have responded to themselves and to the world around them through artistic and cultural creation, and have developed aesthetic sensitivity and skills as well as an ability to make informed value judgments; f. an appreciation and understanding of American history and government so that they can be responsible and active citizens; g. an appreciation and understanding of the physical skills and health knowledge essential for mental and physical well-being; and h. an appreciation and understanding of the history, culture, and perspective of diverse ethnic groups, of women and of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals.”
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.

Title 5 establishes the standards for the skills-based areas of general education, much like they are for the traditional areas of general education. These courses are reviewed by the department, Curriculum Committee, and the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. The general areas covered by these courses include communication and analytical thinking, language and rationality, and written composition.

Student skills are first measured when students enter the institution and take the English or ESL and Math Placement Exams. These exams have been validated as a tool for placing students in appropriate course levels. Student skills are later assessed in individual courses through a variety of methods including written exams, research papers, oral presentations, class projects, and portfolios. The ESL Department has established specific course completion standards for courses within their sequence of skills-based courses. This department also uses a common exam for all sections of specific courses to determine if the student has obtained the skills listed in the course objectives.

In a recent study of pre-collegiate basic skills students, the institution found that students who placed at the upper level of pre-collegiate course sequences achieved substantially higher rates of success in college-level courses (72 percent) than those who placed at the lower level of pre-collegiate sequences (57 percent). [Ref. 11] Likewise, transfer students, who complete ENGL 1A and ENGL 1B demonstrate writing skills comparable to their university counterparts. [Ref. 32]

Discussion and planning regarding information competency has progressed since the 2000 Accreditation Self Study. The Academic Policies Committee developed an implementation strategy that involved identifying coursework that requires an appropriate research paper. Specific learning outcomes and options to satisfy the requirement have been approved by the Academic Senate and the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements. Work continues on this project through a work group derived from the Bipartite Committee with an effective date for the requirement expected by Fall 2006.

In a direct response to a recommendation from the 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team Report, the institution has raised the Math Graduation Requirement and is currently moving toward raising the English Graduation Requirement. In particular, the Enhanced Self-Study helped propel the English Graduation Requirement through various College committees including the Academic Policies Committee and the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.

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.

Title 5, Section 55806(3) provides that the College’s General Education Breadth Requirements include required coursework in ethnic studies. The College is unique in that Area H not only includes coursework in ethnic studies but also coursework in women’s studies and gay, lesbian, and bisexual studies. Collectively, these courses total more than 160 and provide students with the opportunity to develop a respect for the cultural diversity that is characteristic of CCSF and the City of San Francisco. Additionally, these courses address the need for students to understand their civic, political, social, and ethical responsibilities and how these responsibilities impact those topics covered by coursework found in Area H. Students are required to complete at least three units of coursework in this area.
With regard to effective citizenship, Area F of the GE Breadth Requirements covers United States History and Government and includes coursework covering the following topics: Political Science, Labor and Community Studies, History, Economics, African American Studies, American Civilization, and Asian American Studies. These foundation courses are intended to provide students with an appreciation of the history of the United States, not only from a traditional historical perspective, but also from an economic, labor, political science, and cross-cultural perspective. As with Area H, students are asked to consider the ethical issues surrounding the topics covered and are required to complete at least three units of coursework in this area.

Beyond Areas H and F, Area E, which includes coursework that is cross-cultural in nature, is the repository for all courses covering the humanities. This area includes over 300 courses from a variety of disciplines. From architecture and the classics to Italian and public speaking, this area provides students the opportunity to develop a sense of aesthetic sensitivity, civility, and appreciation for the languages and the arts.

II.A.4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

A student may be graduated from the institution with the degree of Associate in Arts (A.A.) or Associate in Sciences (A.S.) by satisfying the requirements established by the Board of Governors of the Community Colleges, the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District, and the faculty. The institution offers two degree options: the traditional associate degree or the recently developed associate degree in University Transfer Studies, which are both clearly stated in the print and online versions of the College Catalog. The associate degree requires a minimum of 18 units of coursework, which must be completed in one area of focused study or interdisciplinary core. For the newly developed transfer degree, rather than requiring one area of focused study or interdisciplinary core, the institution requires students to complete the California State University General Education requirements, including three units of approved diversity coursework. The degree awarded is an Associate in Arts Degree in University Transfer Studies.

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.

The institution offers 130 certificate programs, 34 awards of achievement, and 11 specific majors, the vast majority of which are vocational in focus. Any new certificate or degree program must complete a rigorous review process established by the applicable law. The process involves obtaining labor market research, input from advisory boards, and approval from the College Curriculum Committee, as well as endorsement of the Bay Area Community College Occupational Planning Committee. These activities, along with Program Review conducted by each vocational program, contribute to the standards demanded by employers and external licensing agencies.

The institution currently does not track graduates who pass external licensure or certification exams. However, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants is beginning to collect data for licensure pass rates for individual departments. There is a need to rely upon licensing agencies for the data and in some instances this office has experienced difficulty retrieving the data. Each vocational program that prepares students for external licensure or certification must adhere to program standards as required by the applicable licensing agency. Individual departments handle data collection of external licensing data differently. While many do not collect data, several programs assure that students meet employment standards by receiving external agency approval or accreditation.
Other institution-wide efforts promote the goal of meeting employment standards. One vital component is that occupational programs are required to meet with industry advisory boards. Many programs rely on their part-time faculty, who bring to the students their direct, relevant and current experience in the field, which results in an ongoing dialog with full-time faculty and the eventual revision of curriculum to reflect industry practices and standards. Additionally, many faculty are active members, or even board members of industry or professional associations, such as the American Association for Paralegal Education, the Professional Aviation Maintenance Association, the American Institute for Floral Designers and several professional health associations. These relationships strengthen connections to industry and enhance the curriculum development process.

The DACUM process (described in the response to Standard II.A.1.) is another means by which the College meets the needs of industry in the curriculum that it offers.

There is no institution-wide mechanism for measuring student job placement. However, the VTEA Core Indicator Report demonstrates how many graduates who have received a vocational degree or certificate are covered by the State Unemployment Insurance program. Unfortunately, this Core Indicator Report does not reflect how well the institution’s graduates meet employment standards nor does it measure those “student completers” who find employment out-of-state, become self-employed, or join the military.

Many vocational programs include a work-based learning component through internships, work experience or clinical experience. Often students find employment as a result of their work-based learning experience, but no formal tracking system measures the frequency of this occurrence.

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 objectives consistent with those in the institution’s official 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, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.
The College Catalog, Class Schedule, and website are the primary sources of information regarding the instructional programs offered and transfer policies governing the institution. [Refs. 4, 25] A description of each degree and certificate program inclusive of its purpose, coursework, and, for some programs, learning outcomes is found in the print and online versions of the College Catalog.

Specific information regarding transfer policies is available to students through the Transfer Center. Additional opportunities to learn about transfer institutions are provided by the Transfer Center and include the annual Transfer Day College Fair and university campus tours. The institution’s articulation agreements between both public and private colleges and universities are extensive and can be found at the Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) and the institution’s Office of Articulation websites. This information is frequently updated in order to ensure accuracy. [Ref. 33]

From the Enhanced Self-Study, a recommendation was made to place at every primary campus a Student Information Office. [Ref. 5] This recommendation was based on the tremendous amount of information the institution provides its students and the realization that navigating this information can be overwhelming. This recommendation has yet to be implemented.

In reference to the dissemination of course syllabi, the Faculty Handbook indicates that during the first week of instruction, faculty are to give students pertinent written information including course objectives, required materials for field trips, subject matter to be covered, prerequisites/co-requisites, nature and frequency of the assignments and examinations, grading systems, and attendance regulations. [Ref. 26] Ideally, a copy of the course syllabus is filed with the department chairperson.

In a recent survey of 2,726 students enrolled in credit coursework, 68 percent reported they always received a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives, 28 percent reported they usually received a syllabus, 5 percent sometimes and 0.8 percent rarely. In the same survey, 22 percent of the students reported the clarity and accuracy of information regarding courses, educational programs and services was excellent, 51 percent reported it was good, 23 percent fair and 5 percent poor. [Ref. 27] Currently, there is not a policy regarding the distribution of course syllabi to students enrolled in noncredit courses.

The institution publicizes its transfer information in the College Catalog, Class Schedule, website and additional publications provided by the Transfer Center and Articulation Officer. [Ref. 35] Upon enrollment, students are provided with transfer information during an orientation to the institution. Students who transfer to the institution must submit a transcript from the previous institution(s) attended if they desire to have those courses counted toward a certificate, degree program or for fulfillment of General Education Requirements. If the submitted coursework was completed at a California Community College or California State University (CSU) or University of California (UC) campus, ASSIST is utilized to determine course equivalency. If the course was completed at a private California university or out-of-state university, course equivalency is determined through alternative methods. Once equivalency is established, the course is entered into the Banner system. As for coursework completed at the institution, students must request that this coursework be sent to the transfer institution. The institution has entered into an arrangement with nearby universities in which student transcripts are electronically submitted for review by the transfer institution. This is a recent occurrence and has facilitated the transfer process for students and Admissions and Records staff.
The Transfer Center provides information regarding transfer and sponsors an annual Transfer Day College Fair at the Ocean Avenue Campus. The Transfer Center also sponsors tours of several transfer institutions. The Articulation Officer maintains all UC and CSU general education and elective credit transfer agreements, along with 1,659 agreements by major and 1,018 agreements by discipline. Additionally, 25 articulation agreements with private colleges and universities are maintained and reviewed on a regular basis. [Ref. 34]

The California Education Code, Section 78016 provides for the review and termination of vocational programs that do not meet established criteria. Board Policy 6.14 further establishes the institution will terminate vocational programs in accordance with applicable law. Since 2000, the institution has terminated two vocational programs. Both the Court Reporting Program and the Dental Technology Program were terminated based on the criteria established in Section 78016. In both instances, the institution was sensitive to the needs of the students and faculty and ensured, through offering selected courses after the programs had been terminated, that impacted students were able to complete the coursework required for the certificate of completion.

The institution utilizes both print and electronic media to inform prospective and current students, the public and the College community. The award-winning College Catalog is produced under the supervision of the Office of Instruction and is updated and reprinted annually. The Catalog serves as the primary source of regulations and policies for students and staff. The Catalog may be purchased at all primary campuses and is available in a print version, CD-Rom, and online. The Web version of the Catalog is updated throughout the academic calendar. The institution employs a full-time editor to ensure accuracy and consistency of the information contained in the print and online versions of the Catalog. [Ref. 4]

Another major publication is the Class Schedule, which is printed three times a year and contains the instructional program and all mandated information regarding programs and services. In addition, each campus publishes its own schedule of classes. These publications are frequently translated in order to reflect the languages spoken by the students served. The Fall and Spring Class Schedules are mailed to each residence in San Francisco County. In addition to the 334,874 residential copies of the Spring 2005 Class Schedule that were mailed, 6,000 copies were sent to the San Francisco Public Libraries and 80,000 copies were sent to the institution’s campus bookstores. The Class Schedule is also distributed to all San Francisco public high schools through the Office of Outreach and Recruitment Services. Finally, in order to ensure accuracy, the online Class Schedule is updated regularly each day during the academic year.

The San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual and the Faculty Handbook apprise the faculty of policies, rules, regulations, and other information essential to the proper functioning of the District. The Policy Manual is updated as needed and is currently being reviewed. An ethics policy for all constituent groups is being considered as part of this review, as is a statement on academic freedom. The Rules of Student Conduct have been revised to include a clear statement of academic honesty and appropriate student behavior. The institution’s policies and procedures regarding equity and diversity are also regularly reviewed and revised when appropriate. [Refs. 4, 26, 28]

The Office of Public Information was established in 1997 with the primary mission of providing accurate information to the community regarding the entire College District. In 1999, the Chancellor expanded the name of the office to include “Marketing” as well as “Public Information.” The Office of Public Information and Marketing (OPIM) responds to all press inquiries and oversees the accuracy of publications of individual departments, campuses, and
neighborhood sites. The OPIM is also responsible for distributing press releases regarding the instructional program, events, and the achievements of its faculty, staff, and students. When disseminating information to the press, the OPIM maintains accurate records and accountability by utilizing the News Release Distribution Form. [Ref. 35] This form requires dates as to when a news release was proofed by the source of the information, whether it is CCSF faculty, staff, or administrators. The OPIM is also responsible for the preparation of internal and external publications such as City Currents and the Chancellor's Annual Report to the Community. The weekly in-house newsletter, City Currents, features detailed coverage of departmental activities and employee achievements. Official announcements and essential District information are also disseminated through City Currents. The newsletter is distributed campus-wide and is available online.

In compliance with applicable state and federal law and Board Policy 5.11 the institution, on an annual basis, provides information regarding student achievement to current and prospective students as well as the public. This information is made available through the Chancellor's Annual Report to the Community, which is mailed in October to all residences in San Francisco County. [Ref. 29]

Increasingly, the institution’s website has becomes a primary vehicle for the dissemination of information. Given the increasing importance of the website, consideration should be given to its construction. Historically, the institution’s website has been developed with limited institutional involvement. As a result, the website, while useful, is rather idiosyncratic and lacks a consistent visual theme. Moreover, the navigation element is inadequate, making searches difficult and time consuming.

The Communications Committee is currently addressing this situation and has indicated that a Request for Proposals (RFP) will soon be issued to identify a consultant who will work to correct this situation. A prototype website will be developed for the International Student Program and Chinatown-North Beach Campus. The goal will be to create a prototype website that would eventually become the basis for reconstructing the entire website. As part of this renovation of the website, guidelines have been developed to ensure the website will be ADA compliant.

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 and worldviews. These policies make clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

II.A.7.a. Faculty distinguish between personal convictions and professionally accepted views in a discipline.

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

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

Faculty members have print and online access to the San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual that includes Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Freedom.” This policy clearly defines academic freedom with its rights and responsibilities. In addition, the policy also contains guidelines for textbook and library selections. The Faculty Handbook of 2003-04 references the AFT 2121/SFCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement article which encompasses the basic premise of Article 6.06 but also further
expounds the principles of academic freedom. [Refs. 26, 36] The Faculty Handbook is maintained by the Human Resources Department and is handed out to all faculty members every two years. Faculty members also receive a copy of the collective bargaining agreement, which can also be accessed online. While these documents are used as training tools in the new full-time tenure track instructor orientation, the part-time faculty orientation does not include the topic of academic freedom. As noted in the 2003 Mid-Term Report to WASC, no guidelines have been established to guide faculty in distinguishing between personal conviction and professional judgment.

Also noted in the 2003 Mid-Term Report to WASC, the “Rules of Student Conduct” have been revised to include a clear statement of academic honesty and appropriate student behavior. This information can be viewed in the College Catalog and the Student Handbook. Although student conduct is addressed in these documents, there is no policy or standard practice that requires the inclusion of these issues in the course syllabus. However, individual departments, such as English and ESL, do reference Student Academic Honesty in their syllabi or in a handout given to students during the first week of class.

The institution’s Policy Manual, College Catalog, and both the Student and Faculty Handbooks clearly delineate specific codes of conduct. [Ref. 30] At the institutional level, the Mission Statement professes the desire “... to build an inclusive community where respect and trust are common virtues, and where people are enriched by diversity and multi-cultural understanding.” This statement is found in several publications and is posted at the entrance of every campus.

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.

The Office of Contract Education offers customized fee-based, short-term training to overseas countries for non-U.S. nationals. The standards delineated in the Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Program for Non-U.S. Nationals were adhered to in the College’s recent efforts to develop an aircraft maintenance training program in Shanghai, China. However, the institutional commitment to offering instructional programs in foreign locations appears to be in flux. The College’s Mission Statement does not address programs offered in foreign countries for non-U.S. nationals and the institution should review this practice further before the institution embarks on another effort of this nature.
III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. City College of San Francisco offers high quality instructional programs that meet the needs of a highly diverse student population leading to degrees, certificates, transfer, and employment competencies consistent with its Mission Statement and strategic priorities. The College has been actively engaged in improving the developmental and pre-collegiate programs and services as well as continuing to offer a broad range of continuing, community, and specialized education courses and programs that meet community needs. Courses reflect an appropriate level of rigor, breadth, and sequencing, and student achievement is generally measured based on learning outcomes established in course outlines of record. Significant emphasis is placed on addressing the differing learning styles of the College's student populations; however, the College needs to improve the dissemination of information on effective instructional pedagogies and evaluation techniques related to students' diverse learning styles. Course outlines are carefully developed and rigorously reviewed; however, in the evaluation of faculty, more emphasis should be placed on the alignment of course syllabi and instructional materials with outlines of record. Most departments that use standardized testing give appropriate consideration to validity, reliability, and potential for bias, although some departments should use the resources of the Offices of Research, Planning and Grants and Matriculation to assure appropriate methodologies.

The assessment of student needs plays a vital role in the development of courses and schedules of classes. The Decision Support System has provided valuable data for faculty, department chairs, and administrators, although the institution needs to raise the awareness among staff of the information that is available and the ease with which the data can be accessed. In addition to assisting with operational decision making, this information can be particularly useful in the preparation of program reviews. Under the leadership of the Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction, the College has substantially increased the number of online and hybrid courses in a variety of disciplines.

2. All degree programs require a well-structured general education component consistent with the standards for accreditation. Since the last reaffirmation of accreditation, the College has revised and raised both the Mathematics and Written Composition requirements. In addition, an Information Competency requirement has received preliminary approval and an ad-hoc team is working on the implementation of the requirement. The College has adopted a process for the delineation of study majors by departments and students may complete a specific major or select from two clearly defined focused areas of study to meet degree requirements. In addition, the College has adopted a Transfer Associate Degree as an option for students transferring to the California State University System. Since the last accreditation review, the College has substantially improved its ability to acquire information regarding students' performance on external vocational examinations and employer assessments of students' readiness for employment. However, some data is difficult to acquire from external sources, and a more systematic method of tracking the employment histories and the success of students who have completed vocational programs will require significant additional resources.

3. The College provides students with clear and accurate information on programs, courses, degree and certificate requirements, transfer, and relevant policies and procedures. Historically, the College has relied on print media (e.g., Catalog, Class Schedule, etc.). While most of the traditional major print resources are available online, the College website could be used more effectively to
provide students with information. The overall design and user-friendliness of the website need significant improvements. The Communications Committee is reviewing the website issues. Information about academic freedom and student academic honesty is included in appropriate College publications; however, since course syllabi are one of the few documents that are actually distributed to all students in all classes, the guidelines for course syllabi contained in the Faculty Handbook should be revised to include student academic honesty and the consequences for noncompliance.

4. Educational planning and regular assessments of progress on strategic priorities have become core elements in the institution’s annual planning and budgeting cycles. The primary method for assessing instructional programs and student services is Program Review, conducted on a six-year cycle. While the completion rates for program reviews have increased substantially since the last accreditation reaffirmation, a significant number of these reviews are not completed in a timely manner. Many of the participants in the Program Review processes do not know how the program reviews interface with planning and budgeting activities and there are no clearly articulated follow-up procedures for programs that have completed their reviews. Criteria for assessing program quality and viability should be established and programs should be provided assistance in developing improvement plans, when appropriate. In addition, there is no mechanism for the comprehensive review of course outlines on a regular cycle, although plans for addressing this have been initiated as of Fall 2005. The review of course outlines should be incorporated into the Program Review procedures. Finally, the College has worked diligently to minimize the impact on students and staff in the rare circumstances when programs have been eliminated; however, the College does not have a formal procedure for terminating programs.

5. The College has made a good faith effort to begin the process of assessing current practices regarding student learning outcomes (SLOs). In addition to workshops for faculty, staff, and administrators, the Academic Senate and the College Curriculum Committee have been actively engaged in these discussions. A student learning outcomes assessment plan has been added as an option in the Program Review procedures. Departments have been encouraged to develop program outcomes statements for inclusion in the College Catalog. There are a number of individual initiatives within departments that specifically address SLOs. However, there is no institution-wide process for evaluating the effectiveness of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. The College should develop a plan through the Shared Governance process to address the development, implementation, and assessment of SLOs. The institution faces many challenges as it works toward developing a more comprehensive approach to the assessment of student learning outcomes. The assessment of SLOs is an academic and professional matter that clearly falls within the domain of faculty. Faculty will have to be provided with training and, in some cases, institutional support for assessment activities. The process must be flexible enough to adapt to the specific needs of individual departments, programs and services. Faculty must have confidence that the outcomes from these assessments will be used for program improvement and not in a punitive manner. Finally, since students will benefit from the impact of improving student learning outcomes, students should be involved in the discussions and planning of SLO assessments. These efforts will require strong leadership from faculty and administration.
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REPORT TAB II.B
I. Overview of the Standard II.B Report:  
Student Support Services

Since the last accreditation review in 2000, the Student Development Division has undergone significant change. First and foremost, the Division was defined as an organizational unit and provided with leadership in the form of a Vice Chancellor of Student Development; this initiative resulted in the collaborative identification of a common mandate and the creation of the Division’s first Educational Plan describing a three-year program of development. [Ref. 1] Second, a comprehensive analysis of the unit resulted in a significant restructuring with particular attention to the area of student support services, an undertaking that provided the opportunity for increased leadership and collaboration, as well as enhanced innovation, and led to improved access and service delivery. Third, the Division collaborated on the development and implementation of its first Technology Plan, addressing eight critical priorities ranging from improvements in Banner to the development of an electronic educational plan linked with degree audit and web-based admissions and registration. Fourth, the Division embarked on the development of a comprehensive professional development program, resulting in the implementation of the student learning outcomes initiative as well as improved training and development at the departmental and divisional levels focusing, in particular, on Student Support Services. [Ref. 2] Lastly, the Division participated in the development and implementation of externally funded projects such as Title III and Koret that advanced efforts to construct the systems that will ultimately ensure that the Division delivers on the promise of “Students First.”

Within this context, the assessment of Standard II.B revealed significant improvements in accessibility, coherence, and quality sustained through ongoing assessment and continuing development. Specifically, the analysis found:

• Considerable effort has been devoted to the redesign of programs and services and the refinement of accompanying delivery systems to increase accessibility throughout the District, efforts that are reflected in the analysis of Standard II.B.1. The College should continue to develop technology to augment the delivery of student support services while maintaining its strong commitment to the personal delivery of service by College personnel.

• Careful attention has been given to the accessibility, format, accuracy, and comprehensiveness of the Catalog and related information on the institution, its requirements and policies, as evidenced in the review of Standard II.B.2, a-d. The College should develop Board policies and procedures to govern the permanent maintenance of all student records, ensuring that they are secure and confidential with provisions for the backup of files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained.

• Special initiatives across the Division and beyond have contributed to the provision of equitable access, the learning environment, continued training and development, and multicultural understanding as reflected in the assessment of Standard II.B.3, a-f. The Division should sustain efforts to promote communication among programs and departments and increase visibility and accessibility with improved facilities. In addition, the Division should continue to refine its mission and define its outcomes at the Divisional, departmental, and programmatic levels, providing constituents with the opportunity to engage in a dialog and initiate the processes for assessing the learning environments within the Division.

• A comprehensive effort has been made to evaluate student support services and their impact on student achievement, persistence, and retention as indicated in the discussion of Standard II.B.4.

Significant changes have taken place in the Student Development Division since the last accreditation review and those changes have greatly improved the quality and accessibility of programs and services available to students.
II. Standard II.B Report: Student Support Services

The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.

II.B.1. The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.

City College of San Francisco serves one of the largest student populations in the nation and is committed to the provision of services that are accessible, inclusive, and sensitive to the needs of its diverse student body. A vast range of programs and services seeks to increase student access, retention, satisfaction, opportunity, and achievement. Counseling Services includes both departments and special programs—New Student Counseling; Continuing Student Counseling; International Student Counseling; the Transfer Center; the Career Development and Placement Center; Extended Opportunity Programs and Services; the Gay, Lesbian, Bi-Sexual and Transgender Counseling Program; African American Scholastic Programs; the Latino Services Network; and the Asian Pacific American Student Success Program. Additional student support services include the Admissions and Records Office, Financial Aid Office, Matriculation Office, Veteran’s Education Benefits Program, Outreach and Recruitment, Student Health Services, the Learning Assistance Center, and Disabled Students Programs and Services. A plethora of special programs addressing the unique needs of the students contributes significantly to the quality of the learning environment. By offering one of the most comprehensive networks of student services in the nation—across multiple campuses and College divisions—the College strives to meet the challenge of offering quality services to a diverse population of students.

The College establishes and implements strategic priorities that identify key areas of responsibility, action, and outcomes in the area of student success through an integrated set of planning and budgetary assessments. Thereafter, the Student Development Division emphasizes quality in student support services through its Annual Plan Objectives, providing high-quality educational programs and integrated support services that complement the mission of the College. [Ref. 3] For example, the Office of Outreach and Recruitment, which was established four years ago to ensure access and opportunity, today serves over 12,000 students annually. [Ref. 4] Likewise, the Financial Aid Office was reorganized and relocated during the same period to increase both the numbers of students served and the amount of aid provided. Additionally, counseling services were reorganized to improve both student access and program quality, while the Admissions and Records Office continues to pursue the development of new, more accessible service delivery systems.

An active Office of Research, Planning and Grants conducts ongoing inquiries into the effectiveness of the Division’s programs and services in relation to the institutional mission and the quality of support provided to increase student success. Specific research initiatives such as the “Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Report, Part 2: Retention and Success Programs” help ensure the vitality of programs and services, while an intensive program review process highlights areas of strength and provides direction for future improvements. [Ref. 15] Finally, a continuing student learning outcomes initiative
promotes departmental collaboration and participation in defining the ways and means of increasing student success. The Student Development Division is highly invested in efforts to assure the quality of its services throughout the District to support student learning and institutional effectiveness.

II.B.2.a-d. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: (a) general information, (b) requirements, (c) major policies affecting students, and (d) locations and/or publications where other policies may be found.

The College produces an annual, academic-year Catalog inclusive of all general information required of the students, including relevant policies, rules and regulations, credit and noncredit programs, student services and administrators, full-time faculty and part-time faculty. The Catalog is clear, concise, user-friendly, well-structured, and is available in hard copy, online at www.ccsf.edu and on CD-ROM. Catalog information is maintained and reviewed for currency and accuracy by the Office of Instruction, assisted by the Communication Committee, a component of the Shared Governance structure.

The requirements for admission and enrollment fees (Catalog, 15-22), graduation (47-54), and transfer (55-66) are easily accessible. Degrees, Awards of Achievement, and certificate programs are listed alphabetically in the Programs and Courses section of the Catalog (67-306). [Ref. 5] Students are informed of additional financial obligations or optional fees at the time of registration, at program orientation, on the website, or on the first day of class by the instructor.

Major policies affecting students can be found in three sections of the Catalog. College Rules and Regulations address academic regulations, including academic honesty (Catalog, 315), sexual harassment and nondiscrimination (308), and grievance and complaint procedures (316-318). The acceptance of transfer credits is defined in Academic Policies and Procedures (328), and regulations concerning the refund of fees are addressed in the Admission to the College section (19). [Ref. 5]

A complete set of contact numbers for campuses and sites and all contact numbers and locations for academic and student service departments can be obtained through the central college telephone exchange and online at www.ccsf.edu. Information, including campus directories and maps, is posted throughout campus sites, a host of employees readily provide information, and the College website is easily accessed on campus and beyond. Our free CCSF Student Planner, developed since the last Self Study, provides an easy reference to important information about CCSF policies, procedures, and practices; highlighting important dates throughout the academic year. [Ref. 16] Departmental and/or divisional workshops, along with informational outreach events, are regularly conducted for the CCSF student community.

Finally, each campus has a central office where students and the general public can obtain information about the College’s policies provided directly by College personnel and/or published materials. Moreover, coordinators for individual programs produce flyers for distribution and display on bulletin boards, in carousels, at public libraries, in classrooms and the Student Union, as well as other strategic locations. Key locations where policy publications beyond the Catalog are easily accessible include: the Financial Aid Office; Counseling Departments; the Offices of Admissions, Outreach and Recruitment; and Research, Planning and Grants. Many departments conduct orientations and information sessions to ensure that students are informed of policies and procedures, as well as services that relate specifically to their departments. The Schedule of Classes, which is published every semester including summer sessions, also provides information about policies and procedures. [Ref. 6] Additionally, many departments have specific information pertaining to their policies on the CCSF website. Thus, within the CCSF community, students can access policy information that supplements the College Catalog from various locations and publications. Overall, CCSF has worked diligently to provide quality information for its public.
II.B.3a. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.

Two of the five imperatives for the College’s Strategic Plan address the institution’s commitment to equitable access, addressing the “… consistent application to both credit and non-credit programs and structures at the College, particularly as relating to student support services, retention activities, career pathway assistance, and transfer assistance …” while strengthening “… to the maximum feasible extent the concept of an integrated, one-college, multi-campus district, particularly with relation to the distribution of resources and services.” [Ref. 7]

Students, both credit and noncredit, follow the matriculation policies, including basic skills assessment and career guidance, orientation to all CCSF programs and services, counseling and advisement, educational planning, and academic progress mentoring. [Ref. 17] CCSF also forms part of the San Francisco Consortium, which allows students to study at the College while studying at the California College of Podiatric Medicine, Golden Gate University, San Francisco State University, and/or the University of San Francisco.

The Office of Outreach and Recruitment Services provides information, counseling/advising, workshops, and special events for both prospective and new students throughout the Bay Area, ensuring equitable access both geographically and linguistically through English and bilingual versions (Spanish/English and Chinese/English) of the Parent Handbook for parents of prospective students. [Ref. 4, 8]

Financial Aid, with financial aid counselors located at the Ocean Avenue Campus, provides services at seven campuses—Alemany, Chinatown/North Beach, Downtown, Evans, John Adams, Mission, and Southeast—and offers assistance in completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and Loan Entrance/Exit interviews online. CalWorks provides individual counseling as well as classes focused on balancing multiple roles of student/worker/parent, and the Scholarship Office assists students who need help meeting the basic cost of their education through numerous workshops to assist students in the application process for both CCSF and outside scholarships.

Counseling Services was recently reorganized to provide improved services more responsive to student needs. New Student Counseling coordinates integrated services including assessment, orientation, and academic counseling for students at nine campuses, monitoring student success through the first and second semesters. Thereafter, Continuing Student Counseling assists students with 25 credit units or more, providing both academic and transfer assistance on four campuses and several community centers with increased visibility in major classroom buildings throughout the District. The Transfer Center also provides a lab with resources for students seeking information regarding all matters related to transferring as well as a Calendar of Events promoting ongoing college visits, college tours, and Transfer Day. The International Student Counseling Department provides personal and academic counseling for foreign students attending CCSF with F1 visas. Finally, Career Development and Placement offers career and job success counseling, classes, and workshops. A comprehensive Scheduling and Reporting System (SARS) supports all counseling departments and programs to ensure student access throughout the District.

The reorganization has made it easier for the various counseling departments across the College to work more effectively to provide multiple opportunities for students to benefit from personalized services as well as group learning experiences. Through these varied opportunities to engage in academic and personal enrichment, students are able to identify their values, explore their aspirations, and progress toward their goals. With personalized counseling support, students are learning to cope with and to overcome obstacles as preparation to engage in a more enriched life.
Many special programs respond to the needs of our diverse population to ensure equity. Three specific retention programs, the African American Scholastic Programs (AASP), the Latino Services Network (LSN), and the Asian Pacific American Student Success Program (APASS) provide specialized classes, tutoring, counseling, and enrichment activities for interested students. Extended Opportunity Programs and Services and Re-entry to Education assist students returning to school to complete their education, learn new job skills, or prepare for a professional career change. Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) offers assessment, counseling, career development services, and classes for students with a broad range of disabilities.

Homeless at-Risk Transitional Students Services (HARTS) provides access, advocacy, resources, and support for homeless, formerly homeless, and at-risk students within the College. Other programs, such as the Associated Students Book Loan Program, Childcare Services, Dr. Betty Shabazz Family Resources Center, Multicultural Resource Center, Peer Mentoring and Service Learning, and the Puente Project help CCSF ensure access and equity. [Ref. 18]

Student Health Services, the only independently licensed student health clinic among all California community colleges, provides services that address students’ physical and emotional health. Funded through the Student Health Fee paid by students enrolled in credit classes, Student Health Services reaches out to the noncredit students and the larger community through presentations, health fairs, student services fairs, and other events. Its Psychological Services unit serves increasing numbers of students and its Medical/Nursing unit promotes health education, as well as assessment, diagnosis, treatment, and referral, through its Ocean Avenue Campus clinic with targeted services provided at the Airport, Castro/Valencia, Downtown, John Adams, Mission, and Southeast Campuses.

Finally, the Rosenberg Library, with its Learning Assistance Center, is one of the largest throughout the California community college system. The Library and Learning Resources website provides one-stop access to all online resources 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Students not on the Ocean Avenue Campus, as well as community groups, can familiarize themselves with services through virtual tours. The needs of disabled users are met through special equipment and ADA-compliant computer workstations, and over 100 computers, including 24 new stations designated for ESL classes, support student access. The Library and its special features are consistently rated highly by students. [Ref. 9]

All student services departments, programs, and services have increased their collaboration to ensure the timely and responsive delivery of counseling and educational services to all CCSF students regardless of location. Each of these departments, programs, and services strives to reach all credit and noncredit students through their brochures and fact sheets, the Catalog and schedule of classes, various workshops and classes, as well as their websites. Moreover, the College continues to recruit multilingual faculty and staff representative of our student population to further student access to programs and services.

II.B.3.b. The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all its students.

City College of San Francisco has made a significant effort to address the development of an enriched learning environment through a large-scale transformation as well as a series of special initiatives and new programs since the last self study. At the most fundamental level, the Student Development Division focused on its mandate—“Students First”—through the development and promulgation of student learning and development, realigning its units and refocusing its programs and services. As a result, the Student Development Division has not only expanded opportunities for faculty and peer support, but has also worked to clarify and intensify its contribution to student learning. This evolution has strengthened collaboration between departments, improving the focus, coordination, and delivery of programs and services and strengthening the quality of the learning environment.
An Office of Mentoring and Service Learning, established in 2000 to augment the efforts of the Associated Students’ peer mentoring program, provides support for academic and vocational peer-mentor programs and service learning projects, some of which are linked with national initiatives, such as Project SHINE and AmeriCorps, and others which are independent projects, such as Lessons in Tolerance and Project VOICE. Beyond the Office, the College also supports a wide range of opportunities for students to develop their personal and civic goals through the formal channels of Shared Governance Committees, academic and student services departments, student government, and the Work Study and Lab Aide programs. For example, students are very actively engaged in the development of academic policies and programs. Students sit on many key committees of the Shared Governance System, including Academic Policies, Basic Skills, Communications, Concert and Lecture Series, Continuing Education, Curriculum, Diversity, Grades and Files, Facilities Review, Financial Aid, Grading Policies, Graduation/Scholarship, Health and Safety, Information Technology Policies, Parking and Transportation, Planning and Budgeting, Sexual Harassment, Teaching and Learning Roundtable, Transfer Issues, and Works of Art. Their input is heard as evidenced in the recent evaluation in which four of 13 recommendations addressed by the College Advisory Council emerged as a result of student advocacy. [Ref. 10]

Additionally, in Fall 2003, the Student Development Division embarked on an initiative to design student learning outcomes which will guide the continued refinement of its programs and services. [Ref. 2] A series of documented workshops and presentations provided essential information on the nature of student learning outcomes focusing specifically on student services. Thereafter, a study group formed to develop a mission statement focused on student learning; identify the anticipated contributions of Divisional programs and services related to intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development; and identify expected measurable student learning outcomes, an effort that was underscored with an inventory of current departmental outcomes relating to personal, intellectual, and civic development. By restructuring and tailoring programs and services to support student learning, the Division seeks to increase its contribution to student success and institutional effectiveness, an effort that will continue over the next several years. (See also Theme II Essay in this Self Study.)

II.B.3.c. The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

Considerable effort has been devoted to the development of counseling services over the past few years, and the improvements have been noticed as evidenced in the recent Employee Survey (2004). [Ref. 11] Following reorganization, New Student Counseling faculty redesigned its services, redesigning the initial counseling conference, and refining the orientation to strengthen support for student development and success. In line with recommendations from the 2000 Self Study, counseling faculty in all departments have implemented the case loading of at-risk students, whether they are in basic skills, on probation, or simply in need of intensified support, and developed a caseload protocol to closely monitor student progress and help ensure their success. Counselors in the New and Continuing Student Counseling Departments as well as EOPS assist students with the preparation of educational plans with web-based educational planning under development. Counselors working with specialized programs address the needs of EOPS, AASP, LSN, and APASS students as well as foreign students, responding to the changing needs of their students and programs. Counselors working with career development and planning as well as the transfer process have incorporated many new web-based tools into the transfer counseling process, promoting continued study through an expansive articulation program that includes agreements with 32 Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), as well as with Hispanic American Colleges and Universities (HACUs).
Professional development and training represents a major initiative among all Student Support Services departments. The Division has developed two annual showcases: the Academic Showcase implemented in the fall focuses on curricular developments, while the Student Development Showcase implemented in the spring focuses on enhancements in student services. Additionally, the counseling departments host professional development academies and retreats through which they focus both on changes in academic programs as well as developments in their own areas. Finally, many counseling faculty attend local and regional conferences, workshops, and presentations hosted by institutions and associations in their discipline. Counseling faculty have been intensely involved in opportunities to expand their knowledge and refine their skills, including training initiatives addressing technological improvements.

The evaluation of counseling is an ongoing process underscored with select special initiatives. A Student Services System Review, conducted in 2000 with counseling faculty as well as teaching faculty and students, provided an overall assessment of counseling services from various perspectives. [Ref. 12] Additionally, the counseling departments work with the Office of Research, Planning and Grants to develop survey and assessment tools to obtain objective feedback from both students and counselors on a regular basis, and student peer advisors provide input from a student's perspective. Through the cyclical Program Review process, the annual Mid-Year and End-of-Year assessments, and localized examinations of student access, counselors evaluate their activities, build on their successes, and design and implement plans for improvement.

II.B.3.d. The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.

The College demonstrates its commitment to diversity in the broadest sense through programs and services designed to promote and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. The annual College Performance Indicators Report, our student and employee Satisfaction Surveys, and our self studies have assisted in the development and support of these programs and services. Longstanding programs, such as Puente, AASP, EOPS, and DSPS have strong records of success in supporting diversity and promoting understanding. More recently, however, these programs have been joined by the Gay, Lesbian, Bi-Sexual and Transgender Counseling program, the Latino Services Network and, this year, the Asian Pacific American Student Success Program, extending the concept of culturally enriched programming. Coupled with the rich menu of ethnic studies courses and programs infusing the curriculum, the College's retention programs have, historically, promoted multicultural understanding and development. However, several new multicultural initiatives have significantly enhanced the institution's awareness of and engagement with the concept of diversity:

The Multicultural Infusion Program created two years ago provides an opportunity for teaching and counseling faculty and staff to increase their understanding of the issues inherent in the development of a multicultural society, infuse increased awareness across the curriculum, and design teaching strategies that meet the needs of a diverse student body. [Ref. 19]

The Multicultural Resource Center established this year in the Student Union provides an opportunity for students, as well as faculty and staff, to expand their appreciation of diversity through informal dialog as well as structured programming. [Ref. 20]

Lessons in Tolerance engages students in exercises that ask them to analyze diversity, cope with stereotyping and prejudice, and develop tolerance in the midst of diversity. [Ref. 21]
Additional activities and programs related to diversity include, but are not limited to, Heritage Month events hosted by the Library, the Concert and Lecture Series, the Asian Coalition, the African American Council, the Latino Education Association, and Project Survive.

Finally, the College has intensified efforts to respond to the linguistic diversity of its students and the general public both in its hiring practices and through the production of a variety of critical materials in multiple languages, most notably Spanish and Chinese. Taken together, these initiatives both respond to the needs of the students and provide an opportunity to expand our collective understanding of and appreciation for diversity, a hallmark of the CCSF community.

II.B.3.e. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

All assessment instruments used to recommend placement into CCSF English, ESL, and mathematics courses are approved by the California Community College State Chancellor’s Office. To obtain this approval, the College ensures that all tests meet specific standards regarding content validity, criterion/consequential validity, reliability, bias, cut-score validity, and disproportionate impact. CCSF sends validation studies for all new tests to the State Chancellor’s Office as required, and submits tests for re-approval every six years. The State Chancellor’s Office then forwards validation documentation to the Center of Educational Testing (CETE) at the University of Kansas for psychometric review of validation data and the Center recommends approval or disapproval to a statewide review panel known as the CCCCO Assessment Workgroup.

The local data collection process for test validation requires that the College convene a diverse panel representative of the student population to review test items and instructions for possible cultural and/or linguistic bias. Scrutiny of test content for bias also occurs throughout the test construction process under the coordination of the Matriculation Office and the Coordinator of Assessment. Finally, test result data are collected for systematic review and disproportionate impact on groups based on gender, age, ethnicity, and disability. The availability of resources to fund the development of test items including the expertise and cooperation of the instructional departments in creating the test items and conducting extensive field testing, the expertise of the Coordinator of Assessment, and the researchers of the Office of Research, Planning and Grants contribute significantly to the College’s strong record of obtaining approval from the State Chancellors’ Office for placement tests.

Complementing the College’s open admissions process, the rigor of the test validation process effectively minimizes the potential for bias.

II.B.3.f. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

Student academic records are maintained in Banner. Information Technology Service (ITS) has implemented adequate security and has provided for recovery in case of emergencies. The Dean of Admissions and Records must approve access to student records. Access to levels of student record information is authorized and monitored by an employee’s individual admittance password and computer entry code. Select staff members within the Offices of Admissions and Records are authorized to change student records, and the Dean approves these corrections through appropriate access security code levels. An audit trail of all student record transactions is available and reviewed on a scheduled basis. All administrative systems are protected by password security, as well as by a high-level layer of network security, and the Banner/Student segment is separated by hardware and software filters with system firewalls installed for added security.
Students no longer need to use social security numbers as their student identification numbers. Students can enter their social security number; however, it is interchangeable and replaced with their identification number on Banner and on all documents. Further, credit and noncredit admissions applications have been developed, incorporating options for students to request that their directory information be kept confidential. Once the request is made, a “confidential flag” is placed on the student’s admissions record, insuring complete confidentiality from third-party requests.

In the past, magnetic tape, microfiche, microfilm, optical disc, and CD-ROM technology were used on some student records to ensure that they were permanently, securely, and confidentially maintained. More recently, since essential resources necessarily were redirected, student records have been placed in cardboard boxes and stored in available space. Currently, more than 500,000 student records (credit) and 650,000 student records (noncredit) are stored in this manner and have yet to be imaged. These figures do not include records at the campuses, such as the John Adams Campus high school records.

Additionally, the following offices and departments maintain their own student records, which are kept in hard copy and/or database form and stored in cardboard boxes, file cabinets, and binders.

Financial Aid
Scholarship Office
Continuing Student Counseling
New Student Counseling
Transfer Center
Student Health Center
Adult Learning Center
Institute for International Students
Foreign Student Admissions
Extended Opportunity Programs & Services (EOPS)
Disabled Students Programs & Services (DSPS)
Office of Student Advocacy, Rights, & Responsibilities
Career Development & Placement Center
CalWorks of Education & Training
Administrative Services/Business Services
Matriculation & Assessment Services
International Student Counseling
Veteran Affairs/Educational Benefits Program

The institution does maintain and publish policies relative to the release of student records, which conform to standard practice.

II.B.4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

An annualized comprehensive reporting process linked to the goals and objectives of the College’s Strategic Plan (2002) initiates comparative analyses of anticipated demand and service provided, of responsiveness to identified diverse student needs, and of impact on student achievement, persistence, retention, and goal attainment as reflected in the composite Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment (2002-2005). These comprehensive systems provide institutional support for continuous development and serve as the primary vehicle for the continuation of services provided. Additionally, a cyclical Program Review system in concert with localized assessments of access, responsiveness, impact, and satisfaction ensures regular and continuous assessment of each program. These reviews are directly linked to departmental and programmatic planning through accompanying development plans and a modest institutional investment. Finally, special assessments and regular research reports provide focused assessments of quality and impact with direct linkages to student success. The Student Services System Review (2000),
the Re-organization Report (2001), the Enhanced Self-Study (2001-2003), and the A&R Re-engineering Report (2004) as well as the recent Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Report, Parts 1 and 2 (2004) represent such initiatives. [Refs. 12, 13, 14, 15]

One of the most recent initiatives within Student Development relates to the assessment of student learning as the Division has begun to develop linkages between the service array and identified learning outcomes. Professional development initiatives provided essential background information and served to engage representative administrators, faculty, and staff in an ongoing dialog relating student support services to student growth and development, refocusing the Divisional mission from the delivery of services to their impact on student learning. Concurrent departmental inventories identified related student learning outcomes and assessment strategies, establishing a baseline for continued development. Now the relationship between our learning outcomes and the goals of the general education core has emerged with an emphasis on knowledge, skills, and values.

Throughout this process it has become increasingly clear that efforts to engage students in the learning environment through co-curricular activities such as mentoring and service learning; work study roles such as Outreach Ambassadors, peer advisors and tutors, or lab aides; as well as leadership opportunities in student government and related cultural activities enrich student growth and development beyond the traditional classroom environment. Qualitative assessments of these efforts have begun to describe their impact on student learning as we continue to explore and evaluate our contribution to student learning and development.

Through all of these mechanisms, the institution evaluates student support services, continuously working to meet the needs of the students by contributing to their growth and development. It is the vision of Student Development to continue to value and foster superior levels of educational participation and academic success among our students.
III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. The Student Development Division of the College has worked diligently over the past four years to increase the quality of the services provided. Major improvements have occurred in the organization, development, delivery, and assessment of student support services prompted primarily by the multi-leveled evaluation systems initiated by the institution since the last Self Study. The improvements have been supported and augmented by the development of new technological applications which have further increased access, responsiveness, and impact. These improvements have been recognized throughout the College community as evident through the most recent Employee Survey (2004). To ensure the continued quality of the services provided throughout the District, improvement should continue, allowing advancements in technology to augment the delivery of student support services while maintaining a strong commitment to the personal delivery of services by College personnel.

Since the last accreditation, the College has made a concerted effort to improve the accessibility of appropriate services across the District. Most departments and programs provide access to students throughout the District, and some have established offices and maintain special hours at each campus. To continue the effort to ensure equitable access, the College must expand innovative methods to increase service delivery through special hours, classes, workshops, and/or smaller offices or units at all campuses as well as enhance the availability of online services to provide interactivity. However, funding and facilities limitations continue to impact the full implementation of programs and services including the delivery of counseling services and the implementation of recommendations emanating from the A&R re-engineering initiative. As funding improves statewide and facilities development continues college wide, the College should work to address the funding and facility needs of the Student Development Division.

2. Access to information plays a crucial role in student success and the Student Development Division has accepted its responsibility to ensure information access and improve information accuracy for its students throughout the District as well as the general public. To enhance the availability of information, the College should continue to improve its Catalog by including an academic freedom statement and providing contact information and site locations for all campuses and educational departments. In addition, the College should publicize the modest cost of the printed Catalog as well as the availability of the Web version of the Catalog that contains information that has been updated since the last printed edition of the Catalog. Additionally, the College might consider providing a planner to all students annually, reflecting current updates and changes and expanding the number of languages in which critical information is provided.

3. Counseling services have improved significantly over the past few years. The reorganization has provided opportunities for expanded leadership, increased access, and intensified service delivery. To continue the development of counseling services the Division should sustain efforts to promote communication among counseling programs and departments, to increase visibility and accessibility with improved facilities, to improve technological applications, and to provide overall leadership through the appointment of a Dean of Student Support Services.
4. As the College continues to expand its investment in the development of the learning environment and the assessment of student learning outcomes, the emphasis of its programs and services on personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual and aesthetic development will continue to grow. To that end, the Division should continue to refine its mission, its contributions, and its outcomes at the divisional, departmental, and programmatic levels, providing regular opportunities for its constituents to engage in dialog and begin the process of assessing its impact on the learning environment. The College provides an impressive array of programs, practices, and services that support and enhance our students’ understanding and appreciation of diversity. To continue our effort to promote diversity, the College should expedite the integration of multicultural perspectives into the curriculum and intensify coordination and outreach across the District.

5. The California community college system maintains an open-admissions policy and a stringent set of standards relative to the approval of placement instruments for all member institutions. CCSF has consistently met—or exceeded—all of the requirements for the tests that it has created as well as the commercially available tests that it has adopted, and has consistently obtained unconditional approval from the State Chancellors’ Office. The resources of the Office of Matriculation should continue to contribute to the development of the institution’s admissions and placement program, ensuring the effectiveness and fairness of the program.

6. The College has strong policies and procedures governing the release of student records, but does not have an approved Board policy governing the permanent maintenance of student records to ensure their security and the maintenance of confidentiality with provisions for secure backup regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. To improve the handling of student records, the College should develop Board policies and procedures to govern the permanent maintenance of all student records, ensuring that they are secure and confidential with provisions for the backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The guidelines published by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, “Retention of Records: A Guide for the Retention and Disposal of Student Records,” and the Family Education Rights and Protection Act (FERPA) provide appropriate standards and practices.
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REPORT TAB II.C
I. Overview of the Standard II.C Report: Library & Learning Support Services

Student learning and success are supported by the collections of materials; the curriculum offered by the Library and the Learning Assistance Department (LAD); and the services and facilities provided by Library and Learning Resources (LLR) and other units constituting learning support services—the Learning Assistance Center (LAC), Broadcast Media Services (BMS), and student computer labs. The Committee found that the breadth and variety of library and learning support services across the District make important contributions to instructional and co-curricular programs. Outstanding examples include: (1) the Library’s exhibitions and programming that support the curriculum and enrich the College with intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities; (2) library reference/research assistance and service to off-campus students; (3) Language Center facilities and services; (4) student success courses/workshops and tutoring and learning support services offered by the LAC, including the leadership that LAC staff have provided on the Basic Skills Subcommittee to address the needs of basic skills students; and (5) the leadership taken by Library staff to establish an information literacy graduation requirement, as well as the Library’s information competency/research skills workshops and learning opportunities.

Several of the units of library and learning support services typically receive some of the highest ratings on student satisfaction surveys administered by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants. In addition, external reviewers have singled out some of the Library and Learning Support Services departments for awards, including the prestigious Association of College and Research Libraries (a division of the American Library Association) Award of Excellence in 2002 and the ACRL-EBSCO community college award for excellent programming (June 2005), awards to the Language Center’s website, and the 2002-03 Learning Support Centers in Higher Education Award for Excellence to the Learning Assistance Center for its website.

The institution has made significant progress in expanding the quantity of, variety of, and access to many library and learning support services by (1) collaborating with academic and vocational programs and other campus departments to plan and develop services (e.g., library faculty offering faculty technology training as part of the FLEX professional development days, the Technology Learning Center’s workshop series, etc.); (2) creating a distance learning library position; (3) providing more services and resources online with student-centered websites; (4) creating new facilities, such as computer labs with upgraded equipment and connections to the College network; (5) providing a dependable intra-campus library delivery system to facilitate access to library materials; and (6) planning for two new campus buildings that will contain libraries, computer labs, and tutoring centers, where either none or an inadequate number have existed. Concerted efforts have been made by staff in all the library and learning support services units to better utilize their staff and resources to improve services for students and to focus on outcomes.

Several areas are in need of improvement. The College needs to develop strategies for more consistently providing adequate funding to maintain an up-to-date library collection, particularly in areas where the currency of information is crucial to the quality of the program (e.g., health and medical programs, computer science and technology, etc.). The continuing state budget limitations have also had a significant impact on the hours of operation for the Rosenberg Library and Learning Assistance computer labs as well as the maintenance and replacement of the equipment and furnishings in library and learning support services facilities. The College should establish a regular cycle for replacing computer lab equipment. While the library and learning support services departments have used evaluations by student and staff extensively, these programs should establish a regular cycle for assessing needs and satisfaction among faculty, students, and staff.
II. **Standard II.C Report: Library & Learning Support Services**

Library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the institution’s instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.

II.C.1. The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.

II.C.1.a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

II.C.1.b. The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.

II.C.1.c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.

II.C.1.d. The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services.

II.C.1.e. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution’s intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.

Library and learning support services directly contribute to the educational, cultural, and aesthetic offerings by means of the **collections of information resources, services, courses and facilities** provided by Library and Learning Resources (LLR), the Learning Assistance Center (LAC), Broadcast Media Services (BMS), and student computer labs. Organizationally, the LLR is one library composed of nine units on five campuses. On the Ocean Avenue Campus is the Alice Statler Library, serving the Culinary Arts and Hospitality Studies Department in the Statler Wing of Smith Hall, and the Rosenberg Library, the Media Center, the Audiovisual unit, and the Language Center, all located in the Louise and Claude Rosenberg Jr. Library and Learning
Resources building. Collections on other campuses include the John Adams Campus library, the Downtown Campus library, the Southeast Campus library and the Teacher Resource Center (TRC) collection at the Gough Street Campus.¹

Services, resources and facilities directly supporting student learning include: (1) courses, workshops and learning support services provided by the LAD and Library; (2) library exhibitions and programming; (3) the facilities and services of the Language and Media Centers; and (4) delivery and broadcasting of videos and films and teaching support services provided by the Broadcasting Media Services and Audiovisual unit at the Ocean Avenue Campus, all briefly described below.

Library Instructional Services/Information Competency: The LLR Information Competency and Curriculum Committee reviews the “Library Instructional Services Plan” which is revised every two years. [Ref. 4] Specific information competencies have been defined and approved by the Academic Senate’s Academic Policies Committee and the College’s Bipartite Graduation Requirements Committee and are posted on the library’s website. [Ref. 5] Library staff members are committed to teaching these competencies using a variety of learning opportunities: (1) a series of five information competency/research skills workshops (174 workshops per year serving about 3,330 students) at the Rosenberg Library, and equivalent workshops and/or orientation at the other campus libraries; (2) specific course-related and course-integrated instruction and orientation sessions at all campus libraries, which reach about 3,500 students per year; (3) distance learning offerings, including an online tutorial with assessments for students in approximately 20 sections of three Speech courses, reaching between 350-400 students per year and web-based tutorials at the Library’s website for any remote user; (4) presentations made by the Distance Learning librarian covering library services and resources, as well as assignment-related instruction provided at campuses without on-site libraries, reaching 635 students between Spring 2003 and Fall 2004; and (5) a one-credit LIS 10 “Use of Information Resources” course, which reaches about 150 students per year in an online section and one to two classroom sections per term.

Learning Assistance Department (LAD) faculty and staff assist students in achieving their academic, vocational and personal goals through five learning support offerings on the Ocean Avenue Campus: (1) College Success courses, LERN 50 and 51, serving 300 students/semester; (2) LERN 10, a peer tutor/mentor training course that trains 50-100 tutors per semester using an outcomes-based approach; (3) Study Strategies workshops serving 340 students/semester and small groups serving 80 students/semester; (4) Peer tutoring, 125 peer tutors serving 6,150 students/semester and 72,150 hours/semester; and (5) Open access computer labs serving 7,500 students/semester and 88,200 hours/semester. [Ref. 2] The Learning Assistance Department collaborates with numerous departments and programs to provide comprehensive learning support services College-wide. [Ref. 3]

Exhibitions and programs are planned and coordinated by a LLR committee. Attendance data records over 18,000 students and other attendees per year. They all involve collaboration and co-sponsorships with various departments, student groups on campus, and even neighborhood community organizations. Many of the exhibits travel to other campuses so that classes of students can attend, and most include a librarian-prepared bibliography or webliography that ties the themes, issues, and images to the curriculum and library information resources. For examples of exhibitions, see http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/exhibits/exhibits.html.

¹ For examples of library programs and other activities, see the library home page at http://www.ccsf.edu/Resources/Learning.html.
The **Language Center** supports the curriculum of the Foreign Languages Department and its 70+ faculty members, serving over 6,000 students per semester at the Ocean Avenue Campus. With 100 audio and video stations and 20 Internet-accessible computers, the open lab facility provides audio-visual materials, language-learning software, and word-processing software for Asian and European languages—all essential for students fulfilling the foreign language curriculum requirement of at least two hours lab use per week. The Language Center’s award-winning website has extensive links to language resources and a password-protected online language lab that provides student access to textbook-keyed sound files. The Language Center also supports access to material at both the Marina location and the Downtown Campus.

The **Media Center** on the Ocean Avenue Campus provides a wide variety of audio, visual, and multimedia materials and the equipment to utilize them, serving 52,623 students (reflects daily count for 2003-04 academic year) in approximately 125 academic and vocational program courses. The collection contains about 6,000 audiocassettes, over 1,700 videocassettes, and over 1,800 CDs with about 200 videos placed on reserve by individual instructors every semester. An ESL computer lab is also housed in the Media Center.

The **Audiovisual unit and Broadcast Media Services (BMS)** directly support teaching and learning by providing services to faculty, principally on the Ocean Avenue Campus. The Audiovisual unit provides faculty with graphic and instructional materials production services, audio and projection delivery service on the Ocean Avenue Campus, comprehensive audiovisual repair and maintenance support services, and assistance with film/video rental and media previewing. Ocean Avenue Campus students and faculty also benefit from the multimedia classrooms managed by Audiovisual staff. Demand for these facilities often exceeds availability. BMS provides teleproduction facilities, equipment and personnel for instructional and promotional video projects; project management for video projects; digitization of video clips for web pages; single or multi-classroom video distribution to classrooms through the Ocean Avenue Campus closed-circuit television system; on-site videotaping for classes, meetings, and evaluations; international video conversion; off-air recording and duplication of videotapes within copyright guidelines; and technical support for Educational Access Cable Channel 27 and KCSF Radio, Cable 90.0 FM. Access to audio-visual and broadcast media services continues to be reviewed so that the coordination of media services, equipment, and deliveries for Ocean Avenue Campus classrooms is more efficient. A revised Media Services chart is provided on the LLR and BMS websites, in the faculty handbook, and at various other locations to inform faculty about available classroom services, hours of operation, and where and how to request services (see http://www.ccsf.edu/Library/mediaservices.pdf).

District-wide, the issue that remains problematic is which department is responsible for maintenance and repair of equipment.

**Selection and Sufficiency of Collections and Instructional Equipment:** Nine collections centers support the College’s academic and vocational programs, with the Ocean Avenue Campus supporting the largest number of academic/vocational programs. The selection of library and audio-visual resources is based on curricular and student learning needs and is guided by information obtained by the librarian subject liaisons from departmental/program faculty. Each library and learning support unit (e.g., Media Center, AV unit, BMS, LAC) documents instructional equipment needs and proposes equipment upgrades and replacements in consultation with department chairs, faculty, and administrators. The number of book titles received in the 2003-04 academic year compared to the 2000-01 academic year represents a 75 percent decrease in purchases for new titles. For some courses, currency of the book collection is very important and use of outdated material could detrimentally affect student learning. Analysis of book publication dates in the online catalog found that, of the 140,698 book titles in the online database, only 7,604 (5.4 percent) were published between 2000 and 2004. Using just one example for the health/medical subject area, only 157 books (2.4 percent of the 6,516 books classified for that subject) were published between 2002-2004. These numbers by themselves may not be convincing, but when
combined with qualitative data that students provided in the Spring 2004 survey, a solid case exists for making improvements. [Refs. 5, 9] Costs of nearly all types of materials have increased, but no additional funds have been allocated to the library to allow for inflation; therefore the purchasing power has eroded. The California higher education economic crisis compounds this situation. The library faculty and staff acknowledge the important financial support provided by the Friends of the Library, who over the years, have supplemented the materials budget and other library services such as exhibitions and programs.

Access to physical and online resources and services has greatly improved because library and learning support services has concentrated on increasing and improving its online resources and delivery of instructional services so that neither building hours nor location limits access. Since 2002, major developments include: (1) a reliable intra-library materials delivery service between the campus libraries; (2) a distance learning and electronic services librarian position; and (3) continual modifications to the LLR web pages resulting in a 24/7 gateway to information resources and services. The intra-library van service runs twice a week between campuses with libraries, and expansion of this service is desired for campuses that do not have libraries on-site. Expansion of the service depends on funding a full-time dedicated driver and locating space and oversight for delivery and pickup of materials. Access has been expanded to campuses without on-site libraries and to all remote users by the activities of the Distance Learning and Electronic Services librarian. He conducts instruction and orientation sessions to classes, provides assistance to faculty at campuses that lack libraries, as well as to online faculty in support of hybrid and fully online courses, and develops online information and research training tutorials.

Additionally, the Library’s new integrated library system, launched in Fall 2005, expands access significantly, including Chinese and Spanish language access. Once all modules are operational, the plans call for instructors to place digitized course materials on reserve, allowing multiple simultaneous users with 24/7 access. In-person reference and circulation services facilitate access to library collections by one-to-one instruction in the use of search tools and use of online and on-site information resources. The number of reference questions has quadrupled since the 1999-00 academic year. Students value reference/research assistance and rated it very highly on the Spring 2004 survey. Circulation staff retrieve materials on reserve for courses, which has also increased: from 2000-01 to 2003-04, reserve materials borrowed rose by 26 percent. The demand for course textbooks on reserve has increased sharply in proportion to the rising cost of textbooks and tuition. [Ref. 5]

Services to disabled students are a priority at all library and learning support service desks. Disabled students may ask for assistance in retrieving an item from the shelf, accessing the elevators, and using special equipment. Equipment includes: (1) a computer workstation for people with visual and/or motor disabilities; (2) a CCTV reader that magnifies print copy onto a screen for the visually impaired; and (3) a magnifying reading lamp that can be checked out from the Reference Desk. Collaborations between Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) and the Library, Language Center, Media Center, and LAC are ongoing. One example involves the close captioning of videos. Librarians from the Media Center, AV unit, and campus libraries are in the fourth year of working with DSPS staff in a project to caption existing videos within the collections, and purchase closed-captioned or DVD equivalents. Closed captioning not only addresses access issues for hearing-impaired students, but also helps students who are not fluent in English. This grant-funded project has provided a way for the library to augment the video collections throughout the District during the time that materials budgets have not increased.

Each library and learning support services unit strives to maintain the maximum number of open hours as budget and staffing levels permit. The Spring 2004 student survey provided similar results as previous surveys in which students expressed the need for more library evening and weekend hours. [Ref. 9] The use of computers and borrowing of materials is restricted to
current CCSF students, faculty, administrators, and staff members. San Francisco residents may obtain a free community card which entitles them to check out materials and use designated computers in the libraries. LAC extends its access to other locations by collaborating with retention programs, academic departments, and other academic support locations as noted in the College Catalog [Ref. 3], through its website (http://www.ccsf.edu/lac), and through LAD online courses.

Student access to computer labs varies depending on staffing availability and location. Across the District, the number of student computer labs has increased as more courses involve the use of computer information technologies. A Fall 2004 inventory documented a total of 72 instructional labs with over 2,200 computers. [Ref. 6] Most are department/program multi-purpose labs for scheduled classes. They also provide some open lab hours, either limited to students pursuing courses in that department/program or open to any CCSF student. However, students would benefit if these labs could increase the number of open access hours to the entire college community. The Title III Fall 2002-Spring 2007 grant resulted in three new labs on the Ocean Avenue Campus for students taking basic skills courses in ESL, English, and Math, two of which are already operational. In addition to department and program labs, open access labs may be used by any CCSF student. All of the campus libraries have clusters of computers and/or open access labs available for all students to use, and the Ocean Avenue Campus houses six open access computer labs. The largest open access lab is maintained by the LAC in Rosenberg 207, consisting of 71 computer stations with Internet access and more than 50 software programs supporting about 20 different courses for students 66 hours/week The two specially equipped computer labs on the Ocean Avenue and John Adams Campuses, maintained by DSPS, reserve priority for serving disabled students, but allow access to any CCSF student when space permits. DSPS staff add equipment and software to computer labs across the District as needs are established and requests are made.

Overall, electronic and physical access to library and learning support services has greatly improved since the last WASC review and plans are in place that will continue to address access issues across the District, such as the remodeled Downtown Campus library/media center and the new Chinatown-North Beach and Mission Campuses, which will house new libraries, learning assistance centers, and computer labs. Moreover, various committees and workgroups evaluate and propose new technologies that facilitate access, such as the Convergence Work Group, which is currently discussing the logistics of installing a server in the Rosenberg Library that would hold video media used in classrooms. Furthermore, when the new fiber optic ring that connects all campuses is operational, faculty will be able to order classroom videos/DVDs online. They would then be sent via the network to the District video head-end in Broadcast Media Services and be distributed through the network to classrooms throughout the District.

The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services. The LAC, Media Center, Audiovisual unit, Language Center, and each library location employs a 3M security system to secure materials within the facility. Video cameras are used in the Rosenberg Library to monitor the three floors, and a camera shows activities in the parking lot behind the Rosenberg building. Campus police respond quickly when called for an emergency.

Library Automation Services (LAS) and Information Technology Services (ITS) provide an excellent level of maintenance and security for library equipment and computer systems throughout the District. LAS is responsible for ordering, configuring, installing, securing, upgrading, troubleshooting, maintaining, and replacing all LLR student and staff hardware and software at multiple locations. The number of computers supported by LAS is approximately 600. ITS supports some department/program multi-purpose labs and all of the campus computer labs. The computers and printers in the Library and Learning Assistance Center are six years old and need to be replaced. Because funding for furniture and equipment replacement is difficult to secure, a need exists to re-establish an
equipment line item to address replacement cycles for computers and furniture. LAC and the Library have documented threadbare and broken furniture; in some cases the furniture is over 30 years old. All units commented on the need for a general fund media equipment budget.

None of the library and learning support services are contracted out to external entities, but formalized agreements and licenses with outside organizations exist. The Library, as a participating library in the Online Computer Library Center, in addition to cataloging agreements, maintains an agreement through its Interlibrary Loan Policy (ILL) to borrow and loan materials. An agreement also exists for the provision of services and maintenance with Innovative Interfaces, Inc., the vendor for its integrated online catalog. Standard licensing agreements are in place with software vendors and online databases such as the Eureka career system. Photocopy service contracts with the College include the LLR and LAC.

II.C.2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Evaluation of Library and Learning Support Services: Library and learning support services are evaluated by a variety of methods to assure adequacy in meeting student needs, such as student and faculty surveys, annual data surveys, mid-year assessments and annual plans, program reviews, and informal anecdotal feedback from the College community. Assessment of student learning includes faculty and student evaluation of workshops, pre- and post-testing within specific programs/courses, and classroom assessment of assignments and portfolios. Moreover, the College includes several items on its annual student satisfaction survey about library and learning support services. The most recent student surveys reveal that the library and learning support service units receive very good ratings. [Ref. 7] Informal faculty assessment of library and learning support services is ongoing via dialog between librarian subject liaisons and instructors who suggest new materials and provide input about curricular needs. The LAD employs a similar structure that adds reflective discussions among faculty.

Each library and learning support service generates usage statistics that are monitored to track patterns and assist in the planning process. Mid-year assessment documents track progress. Annual planning reports provide an overall assessment of accomplishments and identify problems and needs. Findings and recommendations are included in budget requests, strategic plans, and program reviews. Library and Learning Resources employs a departmental committee structure enabling librarians and classified staff members to come together to review library procedures and discuss plans for improvement.

Library instructional services are evaluated by several methods described in the Library Assessment Plan. [Ref. 8] Librarians adjust their delivery style and/or workshop content based on comments provided on workshop feedback forms. Additionally, librarians at the John Adams and Alice Statler libraries conduct pre- and post-testing of students in the Culinary Arts and Hospitality Management and Health Information Technology programs. The first cohort group will be post-tested in 2006-07. In this manner, the librarians expect to show progress in information competency levels which positively affect student learning. If successful, this pilot project can be used as a model for pre- and post-testing within other programs. LIS 10, the one-credit information competency course, uses pre- and post-testing, along with course tests and graded assignments to evaluate student learning. Students also complete an online survey, which for Spring 2004 indicates that 85 percent of the students strongly agree or agree that “I am better able to learn at my own pace than I would in a more traditional format.” [Ref. 9] LIS 10 student outcomes such as GPA and transfer/graduation rate are now monitored to determine how they compare to the general student population.
Using a variety of assessment methods, library and learning support services attempt to evaluate the relationship of the services and resources to intended student learning, student access to services, and usage of services. These methods yield useful data, but it is when results from various methods are combined and discussed within a department or committee framework that needed improvements are documented in planning documents, such as program reviews and annual plans. A few examples are offered below to illustrate how library and learning support services units evaluate services to gain this information about use, access, and relationship to student learning.

The Spring 2004 student survey findings connect learning and academic success with library and learning support services. Findings from the 829 surveys, of which 683 (82.4 percent) included write-in comments, reveal that students make heavy use of LLR services and resources and are satisfied with them, especially the staff assistance. Some of the concerns about having a quieter study atmosphere in the Rosenberg Library resulted in new signs in the group study rooms and the development of a cell phone policy with proactive enforcement. Other issues, such as maintaining Sunday hours, depend on funding. Noteworthy are the findings about how the LLR contributes to student learning and success. On survey item #19, “How important is your use of library resources to your academic success in college?” 729 (93.8 percent) indicated either “very important” or “important.” Also, 367 write-in comments make a strong case for this relationship, as evidenced by these comments [Ref. 9]:

- “Most important and necessary to my education. The support and research available at hand is great.”
- “Library services are vital to my participation in class and the difference of pass or fail. I have improved because of the help I have received here.”
- “The library is crucially important to my academic success. The reference desk and reserve sections of the library have been an ease [sic] for locating academic information and resources.”
- “I really enjoy the library exhibitions and learn from them and find them intriguing.”
- “I enjoyed the research skills workshops in R414 because those were very helpful for my research projects I have to do.”
- “The online resources have not only helped me with my assignments but have improved my study habits.”

Information competency/research skills workshops require completion of an assignment before students can receive proof of attendance, which they remit to their instructors. While these assignments are not graded, the librarians at the Reference Desks correct these assignments, and it is this direct interaction which generally reveals how well students understood the concepts and can apply them. The increased number of faculty who are requiring students to complete the workshops is an indicator of how they support student learning and are viewed as an important component to student success. Moreover, faculty often provide comments about the relationship of library research workshops to student learning, such as [Ref. 13]:

- “The entire class loved your presentation and said they really benefited from the research tips.” (Speech instructor)
- “Many students commented later that the presentation helped them so much with their projects.” (Health Science instructor)
- “I can tell the difference when I grade their papers ... the research information presented at the workshop makes a big difference.”
Moreover, annual student feedback forms evaluating these workshops provide useful information that has resulted in librarians using more visual aids in their presentations and using active learning techniques. Library staff monitor workshop attendance so that access can be maximized, and new workshops have been scheduled for evenings and Saturdays.

The Learning Assistance Center staff’s analysis of enrollment trends, such as data showing that student use of the programs has quadrupled since Spring 1996 [Ref. 10], has led to an expansion of services, such as new student workshops and small groups. Usage, access and relationship of services to student learning are addressed in semester and annual reports [Refs. 1, 2], the Fall 2002 LAC Program Review [Ref. 10], and institutional reports such as the “Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Report: Part 2: Retention and Success Programs.” [Ref. 11] Faculty teaching the college success courses assess learning with practical examinations, portfolio development, and pre-post testing. [Ref. 12] Study strategy workshop leaders survey their students to compare actual student learning outcomes with stated instructional objectives. Students who use the LAC’s services and programs complete degrees and certificates and transfer to four-year institutions at a significantly higher rate, and their GPA is higher than those who use no college retention or support services. [Ref. 11]
III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. There are many strengths in the current practices and activities related to the sufficiency (i.e., “sufficient in quantity, currency, depth and variety”) of the library and learning support services to support the institution’s educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery. There is clear evidence of the involvement of departmental and program faculty in the selection of materials, development of tutoring and student success and retention services, and the provision of library research skills/information competency workshops. Significant progress has been made in developing a variety of information competency and research skills learning opportunities to train students how to effectively use information resources.

However, based on an analysis of the current book collection, the Spring 2004 student survey findings, and an analysis of several years of funding for purchasing materials, there is evidence that the book collection is not current in many areas. For certain subject areas the library book collection is less than satisfactory to support certain instructional programs for which up-to-date materials are critical, such as health and medical programs, computer science and technology programs, and others. To address these weaknesses, the College should:

- Prioritize establishing a consistently adequate level of funding for materials that factors in student FTEs and the rate of inflation;
- Standardize a process for informing and involving departmental faculty in the selection of materials and increase communications and publicity to all members of the campus community about services and resources;
- Explore “best practices” for certain types of data and develop an effective management information system to track data, such as currency and quantity of the collections by academic/vocational program;
- Investigate reciprocal arrangements with appropriate San Francisco academic libraries (e.g., San Francisco State University) that could expand CCSF’s student access to information resources; and
- Make plans to secure funding to purchase core collections for the two new campus libraries (Mission and Chinatown-North Beach) and for developing learning assistance centers in these locations.

2. The Library and Learning Support Services units have significantly expanded access for students to many library and learning support services such as online and distance learning resources and services, increased research skills and information competency educational offerings, increased tutoring and learning support for student success and retention programs, and expanded the intra-library delivery of materials to campuses with libraries. The College should examine strategies to improve staffing levels for technical support of the computer labs and as funding permits: (1) maintain Sunday hours at the Rosenberg Library and increase open access hours at student computer labs; and (2) replace damaged carpeting and threadbare/broken furniture in library and learning support services departments. In addition, developing a coordinated system for providing, maintaining and tracking use of audiovisual/media services should be a priority.
3. There is significant evidence that the library and learning support services units use a variety of evaluation methods to assess how well their services, resources, and facilities contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. Departmental and program faculty, students, and other staff are involved in these evaluations. There are many examples of how the results of these evaluations are used to improve services and programs, especially the information competency and research skills and the student retention and success instructional offerings. However, the College should establish a regular cycle for evaluating student computer labs and establish a standard replacement cycle for instructional computers and peripherals. In conjunction with the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, a regular cycle for administering faculty, staff, and student surveys should be established to assess needs and satisfaction with LLR services.
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STANDARD III
Resources
STANDARD III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.
REPORT TAB III.A
I. Overview of the Standard III.A Report:
Human Resources

The District has developed clear policies and procedures governing the employment, retention, evaluation, and professional development of its personnel. The institution demonstrates, through policies and practices, an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity and regularly assesses its effectiveness in this area consistent with its mission. The District has established procedures and guidelines to hire highly qualified individuals to respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse ethnic, socioeconomic, sexual orientation, disability, and educational backgrounds. The Human Resources Department, in conjunction with College constituents, has made a concerted effort through its hiring procedures to maintain the highest levels of commitment to academic excellence as well as to diversity and equity. Hiring processes for each employee category are aligned with institutional planning and budget cycles. Despite difficult restrictions on hiring resulting from funding limitations in recent years, the quality of educational services continues to improve and the number of students served continues to increase. This is a direct reflection of the quality of faculty, staff, and administrators employed by the College.

The College demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its employees and promotes a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration and improved levels of communication. The institution is committed to building effective staff development programs, ensuring healthy working conditions, and fostering an environment of respect and trust. Unfortunately, with the discontinuation of state funding, AB1725 travel funds were eliminated and the quality of FLEX day events were directly impacted. Through the efforts of the Chancellor and the leadership of the Office of Professional Development, CCSF has been able to offer limited staff development programs and travel funding. However, there is still a substantial need for professional development programs that strengthen and improve academic programs and services, instruction, alternate delivery systems, and success in achieving student learning outcomes.

The evaluation of each category of staff is systematic and conducted at regular intervals. The criteria for evaluating administrators, faculty, and staff are defined in their respective collective bargaining agreements and/or District policies and procedures. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have as a component of their evaluation performance indicators linked to assessments of institutional effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. However, the faculty evaluation form should be reviewed through the Shared Governance process and in negotiations in the collective bargaining processes to ensure inclusion of the evaluation of effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. The recommendation by the 2000 WASC visiting team to evaluate all classified staff has been implemented, resulting in a complete revamping of the classified evaluation process.

Personnel policies and procedures are available to employees through a variety of sources. Personnel records are maintained with appropriate levels of confidentiality. Expectations for ethical behavior by employees of the District are covered in various District policies, employee handbooks, and collective bargaining agreements. The Administrators’ Association is currently working on a code of ethics for administrators. However, the District should review its policies pertaining to ethical behavior and develop a code of ethics for all employees.
II. Standard III.A Report: Human Resources

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

Position allocation is aligned with institutional planning and with the budget process. Position allocation (via the Faculty Positions Allocation Committee) for all employees is a Shared Governance process aligned with College goals, strategic priorities, and financial resources. [Ref. 15] The institution employs hiring processes that assure that qualifications for each position closely match programmatic needs. For each category of employee, hiring criteria (job announcements, paper screening criteria, and interview questions) are established by the hiring departments, reviewed by key personnel, and approved by the Human Resources Department and Affirmative Action Office to ensure that results yield knowledgeable and effective hiring of personnel. Moreover, City College of San Francisco has established inclusive procedures (Administrative Hiring Procedures, Faculty Hiring Procedures, and Classified Employee Hiring Procedures) and guidelines to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds, sexual orientation, or disability. [Refs. 1, 2, 3] The institution serves a great diversity of students in a wide variety of programs in credit, noncredit, contract education and continuing education, which places greater emphasis and responsibility on understanding current issues pertaining to equity and diversity.

The faculty and administration of City College of San Francisco are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The College employs more than 700 full-time and 1,100 part-time faculty. Ninety-five (95) percent of faculty and administrators hold master's degrees and approximately 200 hold doctorates. [Ref. 35] They bring to the students extensive backgrounds gained through years of study, research, and extensive experience in business, industry, education, the arts, and government service. Many are prominent in the life of the community. Others are officers and policy makers in professional organizations. A number are authors of nationally and internationally used texts in their fields, and a large number have done pioneer work in developing special courses and curricula. [Ref. 36]

Pursuant to Education Code 88137, the District’s employment of classified employees is governed by the City and County of San Francisco’s merit system, overseen by the Civil Service Commission. All non-exempt District classified positions have been reviewed and classified by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR) according to their duties and responsibilities. If a classified position is new or an additional position is to be added to a College department, a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) must be completed. The JAQ serves as the survey instrument designed to elicit complete and thorough information for a specific position, such as major functions, essential duties and responsibilities, etc.
III.A.1.a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for the selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

The Human Resources Department oversees the hiring processes for all District personnel ensuring that the established hiring procedures are equitably and fairly administered. The formation of hiring search committees is an established participatory process outlined in the employee hiring procedures. [Refs. 1, 2, 3]

For example, in accordance with faculty hiring procedures, the background of committee members should reflect the diversity, range of interests, philosophies, and programs in the department. The composition of the committee is consistent with federal and state guidelines on race and sex. The Human Resources Academic Hiring Unit, along with the Affirmative Action Office, ensures that search committee members are oriented on the hiring procedures, employment regulations, and on the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 12 – Upgrading provisions. [Ref. 25] Criteria established by the hiring departments result in knowledgeable and effective hiring of faculty, administrators, and classified employees. Academic job announcements, paper screening criteria, interview questions, and teaching demonstration criteria are developed by the search committee and are reviewed and approved by the Human Resources Director. Job announcements list the required employment qualifications, the state-mandated minimum qualifications, and the desirable qualifications established by the hiring search committee. Job announcement drafts are reviewed by the Search Committee/Department Chair, Associate Director of Affirmative Action, Academic Senate, and appropriate Dean/Vice Chancellor/Chancellor. The Human Resources Academic Hiring Unit is responsible for ensuring that applicants meet the state-mandated minimum qualifications, including verification of degree(s) from accredited institutions, and relevant work experience. Procedures are in place for determining equivalency (Academic Senate Equivalency Committee) and for evaluating foreign degrees where applicable. Prospective candidates are required to provide evidence of effective teaching and show their potential for contributing to the institutions’ mission by providing such evidence in their application materials, including letters of interest and the diversity statement, and/or during the interview or teaching demonstration.

III.A.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The purpose of evaluation for all segments is to identify strengths and special qualities of the evaluatee, and to define areas where it is determined that improvement might be beneficial. At all levels, a criterion that effectively measures and evaluates an employee’s work performance is incorporated. The evaluation process includes performance
indicators that are linked to institutional effectiveness and improvement. At all levels, where employees receive a less than satisfactory rating, a remediation process has been implemented.

The Board of Trustees adopted the new Administrative Evaluation and Contract Renewal Procedures at the November 2, 2002 regular Board meeting. [Ref. 4] The new process was implemented during the fiscal year 2003-04. The Administrative Evaluation process was revamped to ensure a more direct relationship between the evaluatee and his/her direct supervisor. All administrators evaluated during this cycle received ratings of satisfactory and above, and as a result thereof, received three-year contracts effective July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2007. In general, administrators are evaluated on their performance relating to program planning, problem solving, professional relationships, job knowledge and application, human resources skills, communication skills, organizational leadership skills, personal leadership skills, and teamwork. The Administrative Evaluation Oversight Committee found that the evaluation process was conducted appropriately and that reasonable input was received by the various College constituencies. For information on how the College evaluates the Chancellor, please see Standard IV.

Department Chairs are evaluated in regard to the performance of their supervisory duties and responsibilities in accord with Article 8 – Evaluation of the DCC/SFCCD CBA. [Ref. 7]

The Faculty Evaluation process is administered by the Office of the Dean of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation, and Tenure Review in accordance with AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 9. [Refs. 5, 8] In general, faculty are evaluated on: (1) professional qualities, including keeping current in their discipline; (2) professional contributions (i.e., contributions to the discipline/department/District); (3) performance—classroom instruction; and (4) classroom presentation, including demonstrating sensitivity to the learning difficulties of the student. Student evaluations are a crucial component of every evaluation of every classroom instructor. They are weighed seriously, and may serve as a revealing indicator of potential areas of concern. The “job performance” component consists of an in-depth evaluation of course content, subject knowledge and classroom presentation for classroom faculty. For librarians, job performance is evaluated in areas such as promoting student access to and use of the library, providing students with materials that are appropriate to their needs, and striving to maintain an environment conducive to study, research, reading, and learning. Counselors’ job performance is evaluated in part according to the extent to which they are able to: help students define problems, support counselees in seeking solutions to problems, provide opportunities for counselees to express concerns, etc. Resource instructors’ job performance is evaluated to a certain extent on the basis of how effectively they develop instructional resources and demonstrate sensitivity to working with faculty/students of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds and sexual orientations. More specific evaluation components are outlined in the Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review document available from the Office of the Dean of Curriculum, Faculty Evaluation, and Tenure Review. [Ref. 5]

The Classified employee evaluation currently follows the Performance Appraisal System of the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR). [Ref. 6] The purposes of the performance plan and appraisal are to: (1) evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the employee’s work; (2) communicate these to the employee; and (3) set goals for performance, improvement, and career development. New permanent classified staff are evaluated after three months and on the anniversary date of employment. The current appraisal/evaluation process does not provide for a specific rating on dedication to professional growth as made evident in an employee’s contribution on District-wide committees, organizations, and/or projects (e.g., Classified Senate, Accreditation, etc.). A new SEIU Local 790/SFCCD CBA provision, Article 42.D – Impact of Provision Service on
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1 The second cycle, conducted during academic year 2004-05, was equally successful. The administrators received satisfactory or better ratings, and their contracts were extended from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.
Probationary Period, initiated the inclusion of an evaluation process for provisional classified employees. [Ref. 26] Having met the recommendation by WASC in its 2000 accreditation visit to evaluate all classified staff, the Human Resources Department took the initiative to review and develop its own classified evaluation process for all classified employees. In addition to the performance indicators listed above in the DHR performance plan, this new process is structured to serve as a means of dialog between supervisor and evaluatee, and as a progressive work plan.

III.A.1.c. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

The evaluation process also includes a student evaluation component for all classroom instructors, and, if applicable, for non-classroom faculty as well. Classroom and/or formal work site visits/observations may also be conducted if faculty are undergoing management-initiated evaluations.

III.A.1.d. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel.

City College of San Francisco promotes a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration and improved levels of communication. Policies and procedures are in place that ensure healthy working conditions and foster an environment of respect and trust. District Policy 1.15 Code of Ethics and Responsibilities, approved by the Board of Trustees on December 21, 1989, states in part, “The Board of Trustees shall: Represent all segments of the community in advocating for their particular needs; Function as a team seeking to stay well-informed and to act objectively; [and] Recognize that the Board of Trustees exercises power through the decisions it makes as a group. Individual Board members have no legal standing. Trustee powers cannot be utilized in any individual manner.” [Ref. 27]

While a specific code of professional ethics does not currently exist for administrators, faculty, or staff, several documents cover the aspects of expected professional behavior. Currently the Administrators’ Association is working on developing a Code of Professional Ethics for administrators.

The Faculty Handbook, pp. 17-21, addresses instructors’ responsibilities in classrooms and laboratories. [Ref. 9] Additionally, Article 8 of the AFT/SFCCD CBA speaks to Academic Freedom, Duties, and Responsibilities. [Ref. 10] Article 8.D. specifically addresses faculty-student relationships. The Classified Handbook, pp. 16-17, outlines the requirements of classified employees at the time of hire, such as fingerprinting, mis-representation or falsification of information, the arrest and conviction policy, and security clearance. [Ref. 11] District Policy 4.09 – Use of
Slurs is included in the handbook on p. 12 and as Appendix B. [Ref. 12] All new employees are provided with a handbook at the time of their new-hire processing. The handbooks are updated regularly and are distributed via an interoffice mailing to all employees, as well as made available on the Human Resources website.

SEIU Local 790/SFCCD CBA Article 9 – Discipline covers the discipline process for represented SEIU classified employees. Article 9.C. – Causes for Discipline outlines circumstances under which unit members may be disciplined for cause. [Ref. 8]

The Workplace Violence Policy was adopted by the Board of Trustees on June 10, 2004. A Workplace Violence Policy and Procedure Brochure for distribution to all employees was developed and reviewed through the Shared Governance procedure during the Fall 2005 semester. The policy is included in the latest versions of the faculty and classified employee handbooks.

The Affirmative Action Office disseminates information to all employees pertaining to the District’s Sexual Harassment and Unlawful Discrimination policies and procedures for filing complaints. Additional information is available on their website.

District Policies and procedures may also be found in the College Catalog, as well as the College’s website at www.ccsf.edu/Admin/policy.html.

III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.

In normal budget years, the District has been able to maintain a sufficient number of qualified employees to maintain the integrity of its services and programs. In recent years, the entire College has suffered from the effects of budget restrictions resulting from the lagging state and local economy, which required the College to implement strategic spending reductions throughout, including a hiring freeze in the classified unit. Because of this, many departments did without clerical support, and existing staff were stretched to maintain the quality of service. Despite difficult setbacks, the reduction in spending was constructed to ensure the continuance of core educational programs and student services. Increased efforts by faculty and staff resulted in an increase in student enrollment and the continued delivery of efficient and effective programs and services. This is a direct response to the quality of faculty and administration employed by the College. Additionally, the College, with respect to the “seventy-five percent law,” has consistently exceeded 71 percent. [Ref. 14]

The Human Resources Employee and Hiring Data Report 2003-2004, shows employee demographics, based on a total active workforce count of 2,802 consisting of administrators and faculty (full and part-time), as follows: Female, 1,030 (54 percent); Male, 869 (46 percent); Disabled, 91 (4.7 percent); Veteran, 126 (6.6 percent); Gay/Lesbian, 102 (5.3 percent); African American 152 (8 percent); Asian/Pacific Islander 334 (17.5 percent); White/Non-Hispanic, 1,139 (59.9 percent); Filipino, 51 (2.6 percent); Hispanic, 159 (8.3 percent); Native American, 9 (0.4 percent), and Other/Unknown, 55 (2.8 percent). Faculty and staff are also diverse with respect to their age. [Ref. 13]

As noted in III.A.1., the faculty and administrators of City College of San Francisco are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence (please refer to III.A.1. for more details about the types of degrees held by faculty and administrators and their breadth of experience). The Chancellor’s administrative structure is highly efficient, yet one of the
smallest per employee within the California community college system. Approximately 40 administrators are responsible for overseeing the nearly 3,000 employees (active adjunct faculty fluctuate from one semester to the next) and more than 98,000 students served throughout the College’s campuses.

Staffing needs are directly linked to departmental objectives and responsibilities, which in turn are linked to institutional priorities. The relationship between the planning and budgeting process and employee positions allocations is aligned with the District’s End-of-Year Assessment Report and the Management Plan. [Refs. 41, 42] The Annual Plan is used as the basis for developing specific unit plans prepared by administrators and other supervisory personnel. [Ref. 43] The unit plans and respective budget requests are incorporated in the annual budget review and the allocation process. As a component of planning, administrators and supervisory personnel are required to indicate resources needed for completion of their objectives, including staffing. Positions allocation for all employees is a Shared Governance process aligned with College goals, strategic priorities, and financial resources.

Once the allocation of resources is identified, administrators, supervisory personnel, department heads, and other staff responsible for hiring work with the Human Resources Department to fill their staffing needs as indicated in the respective hiring documents. [Refs. 1, 2, 3] As an example, the Faculty Positions Allocation Committee (FPAC) plays the key role in setting the priorities for the hiring of new faculty. FPAC is a Shared Governance committee comprised of three administrators and three faculty. Departments submit their FPAC requests (FPAC request form) as per the criteria and procedures established by the Committee. [Ref. 16] The Committee utilizes the Decision Support System (DSS) data to assess faculty position requests. The DSS consists of four database modules: (1) student demands for courses and sections; (2) enrollment productivity; (3) student headcount and characteristics; and (4) student success. FPAC prioritizes the requests using the DSS as indicators of supply and demand for a particular course/subject and presents the list to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) who determines the total number of full-time positions to be filled College-wide. The PBC recommendations are subject to the Chancellor’s approval.

The Chancellor has primary responsibility for the allocation of the Administrative structure. If it is determined that an administrative position is needed to ensure the effective operation of College services, top administration consults with the Academic Senate. If the position is new, the Human Resources Department will be called in to conduct a job analysis survey, determining in consultation with the Chancellor and/or Vice Chancellor the appropriate job duties and responsibilities, as well as the respective salary and benefits. After the availability of funds is determined, a request accompanied by a justification and a job description is sent to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate for review. The Executive Council of the Academic Senate is empowered to make its own recommendations on the request and job description. If the Senate and Administration cannot agree on the job description, the final determination falls to the Chancellor. Recommendations for amendments to the hiring procedures are made by the Chancellor in consultation with the Academic Senate and taken before the Board of Trustees for review and adoption.

Faced with a slow state recovery and impending budget restrictions, the District sought, among other things, to impose a hiring freeze in the classified unit. The approval for filling classified vacancies shifted from the Classified Positions Allocation Committee (CPAC), a Shared Governance committee, to the Vice Chancellors, who determined filling vacancies on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, the job analysis and comparison analysis components (District-wide analysis comparing a requested job’s duties/functions to positions essentially similar in type, difficulty, and responsibility of work performed) were temporarily inactivated. Much discussion about the need to re-implement this process of analysis has taken place in the Joint Labor

---

2 This analysis does not include classified managers.
Management Council meetings, and as a response and in light of a slow, yet hopeful financial state recovery, the Vacancy Review ad hoc committee was implemented effective October 2004, and charged with the initial task of assessing the impact the hiring freeze had on classified staffing.

III.A.3. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

III.A.3.a. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

Personnel policies are governed by District policy and procedures, the California Education Code and Title 5, union contracts, and state, federal, and local labor laws. [Ref. 17] For example, Education Code Section 87359 and Title 5 Section 53430 regulations specify minimum qualifications for faculty and administrative hiring. The employment of classified employees is governed by the City and County of San Francisco’s Civil Service Commission.

Personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered. Personnel policies are reviewed regularly through the Shared Governance process. Employee needs and concerns are voiced and addressed via the Joint Labor Management Council, the Diversity Committee, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the Academic Senate, and through the unions. Additionally, the Human Resources Committee meets every other week to address pertinent personnel issues, employee concerns, new and updated employment laws, and personnel policies. The Human Resources Committee is comprised of the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, Legal Counsel, the Employee Relations Officer, the Director and Associate Director of Human Resources, the Affirmative Action Officer, and the Human Resources Supervisors. Recommendations for adoption of new and/or amended personnel policies are taken before the Board of Trustees. Personnel policy manual amendments and additions go through two readings before the Board of Trustees prior to adoption. As an example (noted previously and described in more detail in II.A.1.d.), the Board of Trustees adopted policy 1.16.–Workplace Violence Policy on June 10, 2004. [Ref. 28]

The Human Resources Department communicates updates and new personnel policies, procedures, and/or laws by disseminating the information to employees through institutional mailings and making the information available via the Department’s website. Moreover, employment policies and procedures are stated in the Policy Manual (P.M.3.02), the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA, the SEIU 790/SFCCD CBA, and in the Faculty and Classified Handbooks, as well as posted on job announcements and on the Department website. [Ref. 29] The institution establishes and adheres to written policies to ensure informational brochures to all employees pertaining to unlawful discrimination. Employee handbooks contain as an appendix the San Francisco Community College District Policy and Procedures for Handling Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination under Title 5 Sections 59300 et seq. The Human Resources Department and the Affirmative Action Office orient faculty and administrative hiring committees on the hiring procedures, employment regulations, and on the AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 12 – Upgrading provisions. [Ref. 25] The process has been improved to include samples and forms on paper screening criteria, interview questions, and teaching demonstrations. An Affirmative Action monitor attends every hiring search committee meeting and participates in the interviewing process to ensure compliance with all state and federal labor rules, regulations, and laws. The Human Resources Department and the Office of Instruction hold new employee orientations once yearly to educate all incoming employees on the District’s policies and to inform employees about their responsibilities. Additionally, the Human Resources Department is involved in the Department Chair Workshops organized by the Office of Instruction to train their chairs on pertinent District procedures. The Employee Relations Officer is responsible for ensuring that College constituents are educated on new contract language.
The Human Resources Department is responsible for developing and distributing employee handbooks that serve to inform employees of the principal rules, regulations, practices, and procedures that are essential to their role in the operation of the District. The handbooks are updated every two years. The first administrative handbook is, at the time of this writing, nearly complete.

Student College Rules and Regulations are contained in the College Catalog and in the Faculty Handbook.

It is important to note that, with regard to the maintenance of all of the District’s policies and procedures, the District entered into an agreement with the Community College League of San Francisco in November 2004, to provide an ongoing and comprehensive policy and procedure service to the College for the period November 1, 2004 through October 30, 2007. [Ref. 37]

III.A.3.b. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

In accordance with the District/SEIU 790 Contract, the District/AFT 2121 Contact and District policy, there must be only one official District personnel file for each academic and classified employee. [Ref. 18] Each personnel file consists of District employment records, educational advancement, and other work experience that relates to employee service. The following items are considered part of a classified and academic personnel file but are maintained separately: time rolls, attendance records, payroll records work orders, TB records, history cards, salary cards, credential records, schedule files, and assignment files. The District may add similar categories of routine personnel record-keeping as long as both the AFT 2121 and SEIU 790 Unions are notified respectively as described in the contracts. Medical records and investigative reports are not filed in an employee’s personnel file.

Additionally, the ITS Department takes great measures within its technical infrastructure to secure employment records in the Banner information system. Users have their own Oracle logon and password. Within Banner, each user is given permissions only to view or update areas appropriate for their job duties. Moreover, only select staff members in the administrative area of the College are granted access to the College’s Banner information system.

In accordance with the District/SEIU 790 Contract, the District/AFT 2121 Contact and District policy, there must be only one official District personnel file for each academic and classified employee. [Ref. 18] Each personnel file consists of District employment records, educational advancement, and other work experience that relates to employee service. The following items are considered part of a classified and academic personnel file but are maintained separately: time rolls, attendance records, payroll records work orders, TB records, history cards, salary cards, credential records, schedule files, and assignment files. The District may add similar categories of routine personnel record-keeping as long as both the AFT 2121 and SEIU 790 Unions are notified respectively as described in the contracts. Medical records and investigative reports are not filed in an employee’s personnel file.

Additionally, the ITS Department takes great measures within its technical infrastructure to secure employment records in the Banner information system. Users have their own Oracle logon and password. Within Banner, each user is given permissions only to view or update areas appropriate for their job duties. Moreover, only select staff members in the administrative area of the College are granted access to the College’s Banner information system.

III.A.4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.

The College fosters an appreciation for diversity. In recent years, the recruitment efforts of the College have been focused and funded through the Human Resources Department. The Human Resources Department, in conjunction with College constituents, has made a concerted effort through its hiring procedures to maintain the highest levels of commitment to academic excellence as well as to diversity and equity. The Human Resources Department actively recruits underrepresented populations and participates in
the California Community College Affirmative Action Job Fairs. In January 1999, Partnership for Excellence funds were allocated to Human Resources for additional advertising to help broaden the pool of applicants. With this budget, job announcements were placed in additional publications, newspapers, trade journals, and websites, targeting specific populations.

The advancement of diversity at City College of San Francisco is also at the forefront of the instructional and student services sectors of the College. Indicative of the high performance and accomplishments that the College has reached, the following examples are a sampling of recent and significant initiatives undertaken across the institution. Throughout the institution, faculty have made concerted efforts to revamp their curriculum by infusing a multicultural content and perspective. The Multicultural Infusion Project, the Asian Infusion Project, and the On-Ramp to Biotech Program are a few examples of the dedication toward a climate of inclusiveness. Additionally, two other exemplary programs deserve mention, the “Lessons in Tolerance Program” and the “Grow Your Own Program.” The leaders of the Lessons in Tolerance Program have created lessons to use across a variety of disciplines to engage students in exercises that ask them to analyze diversity, cope with stereotyping and prejudice, and develop tolerance in the midst of diversity. [Ref. 38] The Grow Your Own Program is designed to inspire currently enrolled students to teach at the community college level. The students participate in a special support program, receive scholarships to pursue advanced degrees, and serve as teaching interns at the College. This initiative is crucial toward the goal of increasing the extent to which faculty are representative of our student populations.

In addition to these efforts, the College has an active Diversity Committee. The Diversity Committee is a Shared Governance committee that meets regularly to ensure that diversity remains on the College’s agenda for continuing and future curriculum, students, and employees. This committee has been very effective in implementing and changing practices to increase knowledge and understanding of diversity. Most recently their recommendation to update the faculty application procedure was implemented by the Human Resources Department through the following requirement, “Discuss how your course content and teaching methods (counseling methods) meet the needs of culturally and academically diverse learners. (Please include a listing of any classes or professional development activities you have participated in that directly relates to working with diverse student populations).” The Diversity Committee members participate annually in the National Conference on Race and Ethnicity (NCORE).

Moreover, strides have also been made by the retention/success programs and centers throughout the College (i.e., the African American Scholastic Programs, the Disabled Students Programs and Services, the Extended Opportunity Programs, the Latino Services Network, the Writing Success Project, and the newest center, the Asian Pacific Islander Student Success program). These programs reach out to the students who are at the highest risk of not succeeding and provide them with supplementary instruction and counseling. In this way, the District is looking to continue to improve the delivery of services and to better accommodate more students.

The institution’s policies and practices in promoting understanding of equity and diversity issues are effective and are linked to the allegiance of the institutional Mission Statement. The College’s student population is very diverse, and this places greater emphasis and responsibility on understanding current issues pertaining to equity and diversity. The College is also very involved politically to ensure that all students are given equal access to educational opportunities. The institution evaluates the effectiveness of policies and practices by analyzing student enrollment in underrepresented categories and student participation. [Ref. 39] The effectiveness can also be evaluated by the interest level shown by prospective applicants. Our growing applicant pools certainly reflect a positive response to recruitment and advertising efforts. [Ref. 13] Effectiveness in promoting understanding at the institution is evident from the board room to the classroom. Still, to ensure excellence in this area in the future, policies and practices are reviewed regularly (see also III.A.3.).
III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.

The College determines the kind of support its personnel needs through various forums such as College Council, the Joint Labor Management Council, the Diversity Committee, the Human Resources Committee, employee unions, and various Shared Governance advisory committees, as well as through the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and the Administrators’ Association. The management team of the institution, under the leadership of the Chancellor, is very involved and sensitive to the needs of personnel. As such, the institution administers a periodic Employee Satisfaction Survey through the Office of Research, Planning and Grants which serves as a tool to identify the kind of support personnel needs. [Ref. 22] Professional development surveys are also requested on a semester basis through the Office of Professional Development to provide another avenue for faculty and staff to disclose their professional development needs. An administrative retreat is held each semester for the administrators and management staff.

Union and Senate representatives, in consultation with the Chancellor and management, are instrumental in ensuring that programs and services are designed to provide for the range of personnel needs. In addition, the institution networks with local and state community colleges to stay abreast and on the competitive edge of retention. The institution has been very cooperative in accommodating classified personnel who have not historically been afforded the level of services desired as identified per the Joint Labor Management Council.

The College offers programs and services to support its personnel. FLEX Days continue to be an integral part of the institution’s support of faculty. While funding for the programs has been discontinued on a state level, the institution, in consultation with the Human Resources Department, continues to fund this program. Classified FLEX Day was established in 2001-02 for all classified employees to ensure that the more specific needs of support staff, which may be significantly different from academic staff, are addressed (see also III.A.5.a.). In addition, a non-represented management team has also been established with the same goal in mind. The programs are a very effective forum to invite outstanding speakers/lecturers on campus to address current institutional needs such as diversity training. The institution is also committed to providing all personnel the opportunity to stay abreast of technology trends by regularly offering courses through workshops given by the Technology Learning Center. [Ref. 44]

III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

At the request of the Board of Trustees, the Human Resources Department of the institution prepares an annual Employee and Hiring Data Report (see also III.A.2.). [Ref. 13] This document provides an extensive summary of the institution’s hiring record and is used as a reference and educational tool for the institution’s hiring needs/goals. The history of the data reports show that the institution is committed to hiring people with varied backgrounds and experiences. This is reflected across the District, and, as a result, the College’s diversity statistics remain at or near the 40 percent level.

In an attempt to foster diversity within the faculty ranks, the institution has implemented a Grow Your Own program in which current employees will be afforded an opportunity of mentorship and success in areas where they have historically been overlooked/unrepresented (see also III.A.4.). Additionally, the Human Resources Department, in collaboration with the Chancellor’s Office and department representatives, held City College of San Francisco’s first job fair in January 2005.
III.A.4.c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff, and students.

The integrity of the Human Resources Department is maintained by adherence to a number of regulatory policies and laws, including union contracts, the State Education Code and Title 5, the City and County of San Francisco’s Civil Service Charter, District personnel policies and practices, and federal, state, and local labor laws. The institution has established procedures and guidelines to enable it to hire highly qualified individuals who will respond effectively and sensitively to the educational needs of students of diverse ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds, sexual orientation, or disability. Furthermore, the institution has an Equal Opportunity Statement that addresses the institution’s policy on equal employment and educational opportunities. The compliance officer/coordination for purposes of this policy is the District Affirmative Action Officer. The Affirmative Action Officer is responsible for disseminating informational brochures to all students and employees regarding District policies and procedures pertaining to Sexual Harassment and Unlawful Discrimination. This information may also be found in the Affirmative Action website and via the employee handbooks.

As noted previously and described in more detail in II.A.1.d., the Board of Trustees adopted policy 1.16 – Workplace Violence Policy on June 10, 2004. [Ref. 28]

As stated in III.A.4.a, the FLEX events have served as an exemplary forum for addressing the institution’s commitment to diversity through the offering of workshops, trainings, and prominent keynote speakers.

Moreover, the institution and its Board of Trustees have shown their commitment to, understanding of, and concern for issues of equity and diversity by: (1) subscribing to, advocating, and demonstrating integrity in the treatment of its employees; (2) promoting a supportive work environment; (3) fostering collaboration and improved levels of communication; and (4) promoting healthy working conditions. The Board of Trustees has taken an active role in fostering an environment of respect and trust as exemplified in the adoption of resolutions such as Resolution No. 030130-S3 whereby they voiced their opposition to a preemptive strike or act of war against Iraq, and Resolution No. 020530-S3 opposing the state’s Racial Privacy Initiative. In this resolution the Board showed its commitment to ensuring fairness and equal access to education for all, understanding that the compilation of race and ethnicity data assists educational institutions toward this effort. Following the events of September 11, 2001, the Board also adopted Resolution 010920-S5 which remembered the victims of 9/11 but also engendered discussion among Board members of the need for sensitivity toward Muslim communities.

The District has identified the Associate Dean of the Office of Affirmative Action to the State Chancellor’s Office and to the public as the single District officer responsible for receiving all unlawful discrimination complaints filed pursuant to Title 5, section 59328, and for coordinating any investigation. [Ref. 34] As required by law, sexual harassment training for employees serving in management and supervisory ranks is scheduled to commence Fall 2005.

The Office of the Dean of Student Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities is responsible for student conduct. Student College Rules and Regulations are also contained in the College Catalog and in the Faculty Handbook.

III.A.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.
With the discontinuation of state funding, AB1725 travel funds were eliminated and the quality of FLEX day events was directly impacted such that funding is not currently available for guest keynote speakers. However, through the efforts of the Chancellor, the Office of Professional Development, and the Staff Development Committee, the College has continued to offer a limited program, one day per semester (1/2 day, since the other half is devoted to departmental meetings). Prior to 2003, the fall semester event was held over three days, and the spring semester events were two days. This allowed for a varied and quality offering of workshops as indicated in the FLEX event programs.

The institution provides all personnel with opportunities for continued professional development. Faculty, classified staff, and administrators are provided varied opportunities for professional development through FLEX day activities/workshops, conferences/ conventions (funding permitting), sabbatical leave awards, and individual professional development (refer to collective bargaining agreements).

The Office of Professional Development plans annual FLEX activity programs for faculty and staff. Professional development requirements for faculty are outlined in the Faculty Handbook on page 16, on the Office’s website, and in the FLEX day programs. The FLEX day programs are consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

Opportunities afforded through contractual agreement with the AFT 2121 include sabbatical leave awards (AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 17.N), which allow 4 percent of the faculty to be on sabbatical during an academic year. [Ref. 30] The awarding of faculty is administered by the Sabbatical Committee. In the Fall 1999 semester, AFT 2121 and the District agreed to grant salary column movement to non-Ph.D. faculty. To date, the parties have, through the negotiation process, continued to implement phases of the salary column movement. In brief, faculty wishing to take college courses to accumulate units for salary column movement may: (1) take undergraduate courses, requiring prior approval from their respective School Dean and Vice Chancellor; (2) take graduate courses; or (3) develop a long-term professional development plan (AFT 2121/SFCCD CBA Article 20, Attachment 3 Professional Development Plan). [Ref. 31] The evaluation of faculty coursework is administered by the Human Resources Department.

Administrative sabbatical awards are granted at the Chancellor's discretion. In accord with the Sabbatical Leave for Administrators, two sabbatical leaves are granted per academic year and the award may be for one semester, one year, or a split (two non-consecutive semesters). Approval is based on seniority, benefit to the institution, and benefit to the individual, and consideration is given to the timing of the leave and its consistency with institutional priorities. Administrators who have not previously been awarded a sabbatical will be favored, granted the seniority rules are applied. Administrators may also be granted a short-term paid leave for professional development and unpaid leaves. [Ref. 40]

In cooperation with the leadership of the classified employees (SEIU and the Classified Senate), the Office of Professional Development and the Chancellor’s Office sponsor a classified employee FLEX day once a year, as noted in IIIA.4.a. The District provides release time for training and/or presenting during FLEX days. The Classified Senate, in its purpose to be supportive of the classified staff, established the Joan McClain (founding member of the Classified Senate) scholarship to aid classified employees pursuing academic goals.

The following educational opportunities are also available to classified SEIU members: (1) enrollment fee waiver program; (2) Book Loan Program; and (3) the SEIU Enrollment Fee Reimbursement Grant. Specific information about each of the aforementioned programs is available in the Classified Handbook on page 35 and in Article 13 – Staff Development of the SEIU/SFCCD CBA. [Refs. 32, 33]
The Technology Learning Center (TLC), a component of the Education Technology Office within the ITS Department, provides technology training programs to faculty and staff through regularly scheduled and FLEX workshops in GroupWise email, general orientations to the CCSF network, and MS Office applications. The TLC lab is located at the Ocean Campus in Batmale 313. Training is delivered in a variety of modes that meet employee needs. The TLC offers workshops, online training and tutorials, or sessions created specifically for a department’s needs. Additionally, the TLC website contains information on accessing CCSF network(s), email, and/or web accounts, and information on current projects, educational technology resources, etc. Additional funding is available for technology training not offered by the TLC.

An example of a rather extensive professional development effort for classified personnel is currently taking place within the Financial Aid Office. The Dean and his staff are participating in team-building work sessions to promote professional communication, a healthy work environment, personal accountability, and to create a more complete and coherent work-flow process with the optimal goal of improving the quality of student services.

III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

The Office of Professional Development conducts an annual staff development evaluation. [Ref. 20] Administrators, department chairs, faculty, and staff are asked to rate their satisfaction on 67 questions pertaining to the following: (1) overall professional development activities; (2) instructional development; (3) professional development; and (4) personal development. The survey also provides space for faculty to make suggestions/recommendations. Additionally, the FLEX Workshop Evaluation form is distributed to participants during FLEX.

While attendance at FLEX is mandatory, faculty may select which of various events to attend and participate in. As such, raw data (e.g., number of participants) is difficult to assess. Moreover, with the elimination of state funding, the event is limited to one day per semester, some of which is devoted to departmental meetings. The reduced schedule makes it difficult to schedule a wide range and varied offering of workshops. Therefore, the annual staff development evaluation and the FLEX workshop evaluations serve as the sole source for assessing attendees’ satisfaction and for determining future event planning. [Ref. 21] Professional Development Annual Evaluation for 2004 results indicate that attendees vary in their professional development goals. [Ref. 20] Where some attendees seek more workshops pertaining to institutional/developmental education, others are solely interested in personal development (e.g., health and wellness, stress management). Survey results also show that attendees are satisfied with workshops pertaining to financial planning, and retirement planning.

Additionally, the College’s Fall 2004 Survey Series shows a 2.825 mean rating (4.000 score = Excellent) for employee satisfaction with professional development days, and a 2.789 mean rating for professional development support, specifically travel. [Ref. 22] It is important to note that survey results for professional development show a direct response to the limited professional development events and elimination of travel funds, resulting from the elimination of state funding.

III.A.6. Human resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.

The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Each organizational unit is responsible for developing a unit plan based on the College’s Annual Plan and submitting the unit plan to its respective major cost center manager for inclusion in
the College’s annual Management Plan. The Annual Plan is linked to the College’s overall Strategic Plan. Human Resources planning is integrated with institutional planning in two ways. First, the FPAC makes position recommendations to the PBC each year. The PBC then makes overall decisions on funding positions based on the College’s Strategic Priorities and financial position. The second way that Human Resources planning is integrated with institutional planning is through the Department’s efforts to address Strategic Priority 8, “To continue to promote a dynamic and supportive organizational climate including improved communication among students, faculty, and staff, development of the talents of faculty and staff, and promotion of diversity at all levels of the College.” [Refs. 23, 24] Towards this effort, the Human Resources Department has worked collaboratively with College constituents to maintain a commitment to diversity and equity through the hiring procedures. Recruitment efforts aimed at broadening the reach to diverse populations, attendance at local and state job fairs, as well as organizing the College’s first job fair in January 2005, as noted previously. The Human Resources Department has also worked to implement the recommendations made through the Diversity Committee to review and assess the faculty hiring procedures to ensure responsiveness to diversity hiring. As an example, the administrative application process was expanded to include an applicant statement attesting commitment to and listing experiences serving/working with diverse student/employee populations. Moreover, prospective faculty applicants are asked to express in writing how their course content and teaching methods meet the needs of culturally and academically diverse learners. They must also supply a list of any classes or professional development activities they have participated in that directly relate to working with diverse student populations. The Diversity Committee’s review and dialog is ongoing and essential to the progress and success of the College’s recruitment and hiring efforts.
III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. City College maintains a highly qualified faculty and staff to support its diverse programs and services. The College has well-articulated procedures for hiring faculty that emphasize the application of clearly articulated criteria and a rigorous review of all applicants. Faculty have the primary role in recommending candidates for faculty positions to the Board of Trustees. The hiring of classified staff is subject to the rules of civil service for the City and County of San Francisco and the College has clearly established procedures for hiring classified staff that also emphasize equity and use job-related criteria. The procedures for the creation of new positions and the priorities for the filling of existing positions in both the certificated and classified staff are integrated into the College’s Shared Governance procedures. The Human Resources Department (with support from the Affirmative Action Office) provides training and oversight of hiring procedures and is committed to streamlining the hiring procedures in response to concerns expressed in the 2004 staff survey. Recent budgetary restrictions have challenged the College’s ability to maintain adequate staffing levels. However, the College has not only maintained almost all of its programs and services for students, it has also accommodated increased enrollments during this period.

The College is committed to having a diverse faculty and staff reflective of the communities the College serves. The Human Resources Department has worked to implement the recommendations made through the Diversity Committee to review and assess the faculty hiring procedures to ensure responsiveness to diversity hiring. The College should continue to focus on strategies for increasing diversity and work toward resolving internal issues and departmental differences that are deterring improvement.

2. Personnel policies and procedures are available to all employees through a variety of sources (e.g., handbooks, policy manuals, etc.). Personnel records are maintained with appropriate levels of confidentiality based on District policies and collective bargaining agreements. The evaluation of each category of staff is systematic and conducted at regular intervals based on District policies and collective bargaining agreements. Based on a recommendation by the 2000 WASC visiting team, classified evaluation procedures have been extensively reviewed and revised. A new administrative evaluation policy has been adopted providing for an annual review with a more direct interaction between the supervisor and administrator being evaluated. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes do have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. However, the faculty evaluation form should be reviewed through the Shared Governance process and in negotiations in the collective bargaining processes to ensure inclusion of effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes.
3. The elimination of state funding for professional development activities such as travel and FLEX professional development days has had a serious impact on the District’s ability to provide adequate professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. However, the College has continued to fund limited FLEX programs, a small number of staff development programs (some funded by external grants), and some travel. The District views professional development as an essential component of its Strategic Plan and should continue to support professional development activities that strengthen and improve academic programs and services, courses, instruction, alternate delivery systems, and success in achieving student learning outcomes.

4. The Board of Trustees has a formal Code of Ethics and Responsibilities. Expectations for ethical behavior by employees of the District are covered in various District policies, employee handbooks, and collective bargaining agreements. The Administrators’ Association is currently working on a code of ethics for administrators. However, the District should review its policies pertaining to ethical behavior and develop a code of ethics for all employees.
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I. Overview of the Standard III.B Report: Physical Resources

There have been major changes and improvements in the College’s planning and implementation of physical resource projects since the last accreditation review. A successful bond initiative earned the approval of 73 percent of San Francisco voters in 2001, earmarking $195 million for facilities over the next decade. Under Proposition 39, the framework for which the 2001 bond was conducted, the College was eligible for $350 million. However, for a variety of reasons, the total amount sought was divided into two separate bond initiatives—the first phase (2001) for $195 million; the second (2005) for $246 million (this has been adjusted for increased construction costs). Prior to the 2001 bond initiative, the District’s only significant construction resource was $50 million from a bond passed in 1997. Those funds were earmarked for the purchase of the sites for the new Mission Campus and Chinatown/North Beach Campus and for a portion of the basic renovation and remodeling projects. In addition, the funds were also used to initiate the first phase of the technology network and campus connectivity project and the basic electrical upgrades needed to support it. [Refs. 8, 9, 10, 11]

The local support for the 2001 initiative enabled the College to begin the planning for three new campus facilities: Mission and Chinatown/North Beach Campuses and the Community Health and Wellness Center, in addition to critical maintenance and repair work needed at multiple sites across the District. Construction of the new Mission Campus and the Community Health and Wellness Center commenced in August 2005. Plans have been completed and construction is underway for a Student Health Services Center and a Child Development Center. A Performing Arts Education Center, Advanced Technology Building, joint-use classroom building with San Francisco State University, Student Development Center, and the second phase of the technology network and campus connectivity project are in the design stage. The Facilities and Maintenance Departments were reorganized and placed under the supervision of a new Associate Vice Chancellor of Facilities Planning and Management. The restructuring allowed the Facilities Planning Department to hire permanent, full-time project managers and reduce its prior dependency on construction management firms for project management services, with the goal of saving the District tens of thousands of dollars, streamlining project management, and improving the overall communications flow. Under the leadership of the Associate Vice Chancellor of Facilities Management, a District-wide sustainability and green building plan is being developed, which is leading to more energy-efficient buildings. [Ref. 23]

The College has integrated its facilities planning into its institutional planning process; fostering a strategic approach to prioritizing the physical resource needs of its students, faculty, and staff; and making effective use of the College’s Shared Governance System, including the planning and budgeting processes, to evaluate and act on the District’s priorities. A comprehensive Facilities Master Plan was developed with the participation and support of the College’s Shared Governance Facilities Review Committee. [Ref. 1] This is a 15-year plan for building, replacing, and renovating College facilities and was developed with the assistance of an outside facilities planning firm experienced in college master plan development. The District has multiple assessment mechanisms for evaluating the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services. For example, it utilizes its Banner administrative information system to annually review equipment needs, and an outside agency was hired to conduct an inventory and assessment of the physical condition of all buildings. The College has significantly improved communications related to facilities across institutional departments and offices. This has promoted more meaningful interactions between the Offices of Academic Affairs and Facilities Planning to assure the quality of programs and services as well as the health and welfare of students.
While the 2001 bond funding and the additional state dollars leveraged as a result of the bond have made it easier for the College to respond to the physical needs of the District’s many aging facilities, the resources are not adequate to cover the total costs of upgrades and repairs. At this time, the District plans to leverage additional state support through the second phase of the bond. Given the pressures of inflation and escalating construction costs, the District should continue long-range planning for the total cost of ownership for all of the new facilities and major equipment initiatives currently in the planning stages for construction or purchase.
II. Standard Report III.B: Physical Resources

Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

III.B.1.a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

III.B.1.b. The institution assures that the physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

The District owns and leases facilities throughout the City. Most of the classes offered are offered at 13 sites. The Ocean Avenue, John Adams, Downtown, Alemany and Evans Campuses and the District Offices at Gough Street are all owned by the District. Mission, Chinatown/North Beach, Southeast, Fort Mason, Castro/Valencia, and the airport site are all leased. In addition, classes are offered at over 100 other rented sites. Since the last accreditation, facility improvement work has been undertaken at every site.

The Associate Vice Chancellor of Facilities Management is responsible for directing and coordinating all projects relating to physical resources; this includes planning new facilities as well as undertaking major maintenance and renovation projects each year. This office also oversees the Maintenance, Buildings and Grounds Department, which is responsible for maintaining facilities and undertaking minor repair projects. The Maintenance, Buildings and Grounds Department also includes Custodial Services, responsible for keeping the facilities clean and operational. In addition, security is provided by the Campus Police Department.

The College has an extensive strategic planning process for the building of new facilities and the upgrading and maintenance of existing facilities. Each year the Shared Governance Facilities Review Committee recommends to the Board of Trustees the priority of projects to be submitted to the California State Chancellor's Office for capital project funding. The Five Year Construction Plan is submitted to the state each spring. [Ref. 3] In addition, annual scheduled maintenance and hazardous material abatement grant applications are submitted to the state in accordance with yearly application funding cycles.

Departments and 25 major cost centers during Program Review state their facilities needs and goals. The College’s major planning and facilities documents are linked with the Education Master Plan and the Strategic Plan. [Refs. 13, 15] For long-range facilities planning, the Committee feels that the regular Program Review process, which garners feedback directly from the programs and departments themselves, should be more strongly linked with the Facilities Master Plan, with clear statements about the need for and the impact of new facilities and major renovations on their departments and programs. All College programs and departments participate in a six-year cycle of Program Review which provides an opportunity for physical resource needs and equipment to be addressed. [Ref. 16] Integrating these processes would help complete the planning and assessment “feedback loop,” which would ensure effective support of the College’s academic programs and student support services.
The College actively seeks input from the general public on major facilities projects. The College specifically sought public input and support for the District Facilities Master Plan by conducting multiple public hearings as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and by offering multiple community outreach meetings that were not required by CEQA. [Refs. 1, 12] The College works with many neighborhood groups and city agencies to integrate its facilities plans with the City’s General Plan and neighborhood planning goals.

From June 2002 to June 2004 the District undertook a major effort to create a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan, the College’s comprehensive 10-year plan for building, replacing, and renovating its facilities. The College has begun implementing some of the projects in the Plan, including construction of facilities to replace the Mission Campus and the Chinatown/North Beach Campus. [Refs. 1, 17, 18] Ground is to be broken for the new Student Health Center/Classroom Building, which will include an additional ten classrooms on the second level, a Child Development Center, and the new Community Health and Wellness Center in 2005. These two new buildings will replace the aged gym buildings and the student health center currently housed in portables. In addition, 14 new classrooms, which will replace very old bungalows, will be constructed on a site adjacent to the Ocean Avenue Campus, which was acquired with local bond funds.

The District has secured state approval for a new Academic Classroom Joint-use Building with San Francisco State University. The building for shared classroom space will be under design in 2005 and is intended to replace most of the remaining bungalows. The District is aggressively seeking state approval for a new Performing Arts Education Center. [Ref. 20] This will be the first building designed and constructed on the new West Campus, which will be located on the site of the original reservoir now serving exclusively as student, staff, and faculty parking. The Committee feels that this kind of activity demonstrates the College’s commitment to providing a state-of-the-art environment for student learning programs and services, in addition to improving access, safety, security, and a healthy learning and working environment. All of these projects are being developed to support and advance student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.

In addition to these new large facilities, major renovation and maintenance projects are undertaken every year on the Ocean Avenue Campus specifically to support academic programs. A “Fit-Links Cardiovascular Wellness” workout center was designed and constructed in the North Gym at the Ocean Avenue Campus, for example. [Ref. 19] This added a facility to provide an entirely new academic program. Student services initiatives are also supported. A new Latino Services Network (2002) and Asian Pacific American Student Success Center (2004) were designed and constructed to support services targeted for student retention success. A new artificial turf playing field was installed. Additional student parking was created in the reservoirs.

Projects are also being undertaken to improve accessibility. Ramps, accessible doors and improved signage are produced incrementally every year. Finally, work is undertaken every year to maintain the quality, safety, and function of the buildings. All the elevators have been renovated and improved, all the windows in Science Hall have been replaced, mechanical systems in many buildings have been refurbished, and new code-compliant fire alarm systems are being installed throughout the District to provide code-compliant protection.

Completed, current, and planned activities by the District to upgrade, improve, or replace existing facilities include [Refs. 17, 18]:

**John Adams**
- Renovation of gym
- Renovation of restrooms (upgraded and made accessible)
- Addition of elevator (handicapped accessible)
- Modernization of main building
- Parking lot paving
Downtown
- Replacement of entire fire alarm system
- Renovation/upgrade of existing HVAC system
- Replacement of elevator controls (completed)
- Remodel of ground floor (completed)
- Remodel of second floor library (completed)
- Upgrade of restrooms throughout the building (handicapped accessible)

Alemany
- Addition of new elevator (handicapped accessible)
- Remodel of ground floor entrances and central hallway (handicapped accessible)
- Renovation of building, including entire mechanical and electrical systems

Gough Street (District Offices)
- Renovation of restrooms on the main floor
- Replacement of desks, partitions and other equipment at work stations in the Human Resources’ and Controller’s Offices

Evans
- Purchased by the District in 2000 and remodeled in 2002 to bring the facility into compliance with California State Architect standards (Field Act), including seismic work, new roofing and new HVAC units

Mission
- Design and construction of new campus, representing the District’s intent of providing facilities throughout San Francisco neighborhoods

Chinatown/North Beach
- Design of new campus to replace a rented facility so classes now scattered throughout a variety of facilities can be housed together in the new building

Southeast, Castro/Valencia, Fort Mason, Airport
- Renovation and upgrades were undertaken at each of these locations to improve educational access

The College uses its Shared Governance process to review maintenance needs. Shared Governance groups involved with maintenance issues include: the College Small Projects Group, which meets monthly; Building User Groups, which meet as building issues arise; the Health and Safety Committee; and the Planning and Budget Council. [Ref. 5] In addition, the Disabled Students Programs and Services Department ensures that the facilities needs of students with disabilities are addressed. Many of the College’s buildings are old and while they were code compliant when constructed, they require substantial reconstruction in order to meet current code and provide access for disabled students. The College has been taking steps to improve accessibility, replacing/installing automatic doors and ramps; installing elevators in Science Hall (Ocean Avenue Campus), Alemany Campus, and John Adams Campus; and renovating restroom facilities. Accessibility is taken into account in all new construction projects.

III.B.2. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

III.B.2.a. Long range capital plans support institutional goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

III.B.2.b. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.
In cooperation with the State Chancellor’s Office, the College undertook a major effort to inventory and assess the condition of all of its buildings during fiscal year 2002-03. The result was a comprehensive report on the physical state of all existing facilities (the 3DI District Facility Condition Assessment Report). This report is the basis from which the College submits applications to the state for funding maintenance and renovation projects. The College has begun to undertake maintenance and renovation projects cited in the report. [Ref. 2]

The 2003 3DI Report showed that the existing District facilities were in generally poor condition. The overall Facilities Condition Index, or “FCI” was found to be 21.59 percent. An assessment of 10 percent or greater is considered poor and a score of 5 percent or lower is considered good. The report noted that this is to be expected considering that of the 32 buildings assessed, 20 were constructed prior to 1975. As a result of these findings, the District set a higher priority on plans for renovating or replacing facilities in the worst condition. Of the four buildings that exceeded an FCI rating of 50 percent, all are slated for replacement. Other buildings, such as the John Adams Campus main building, with an FCI of 27.95 percent, are in the planning stage for major renovations. While the 2005 bond will provide some of the needed funds, a complete funding strategy is not yet in place for the extensive work that will eventually be needed for the Science Building with an FCI of 48.47 percent and more than $50 million of required renovation work.

The 3DI report would suggest that in a ten-year period from 2004 through 2013, the District will need to expend more than $112 million to maintain or replace existing facilities just to maintain the FCI rating of 21.59 percent. The District would need to expend $200 million over this same period to achieve the desired overall District FCI of 5 percent. It is important to note that this assessment and calculation is for District-owned facilities and does not include the currently leased Mission and Chinatown/North Beach Campuses. It can be concluded that significant expenditures beyond the amounts that will be available in the 2005 bond measure need to be allocated to some of the District’s older buildings, such as Science Hall and Alemany Campus, or these facilities will continue to deteriorate.

The College has in place a fixed assets inventory as part of its Banner administrative information system. Review of annual equipment needs and decisions concerning equipment purchases are generally made by departments and major cost centers. Where efficiency can be obtained, such as the decision to centralize the purchase, maintenance and monthly photo-copying equipment expenses, the District has moved equipment from department to District management and budgeting.

In the past, the College’s efforts to provide for the total cost of ownership, a concept that seeks to measure not just the cost of planning and construction but the cost of operating a facility over its expected lifetime, have been limited. In response, the College established a user’s group for design review and total cost of ownership in the planning for the new Performing Arts Education Center. [Refs. 20, 22, 23]

The College is also looking to become more proactive with respect to environmental issues surrounding new construction. In all of its current projects, the College has directed its architectural teams to incorporate conservation of resources in their final designs. Sustainable design, planning, architecture, indoor/outdoor environment, and Leadership in Energy and Building Design (LEED) Green Building standards are addressed in the 2004 Facilities Master Plan approved by the Board. [Refs. 1, 12, 23]

Physical resource planning is a fully integrated component of the College’s institutional planning process. [Ref. 21] There are Shared Governance committees that meet at regular intervals throughout the semester to discuss and evaluate facilities needs. There are regular reviews, such as the biannual safety report; six-year cycles of academic department and program reviews that focus on facilities needs; and special reports such as the annual space inventory report and facilities condition report that assess the use of College facilities. [Ref. 4]
Integrated planning is accomplished through the planning, budgeting and assessment system. The planning process begins with the Strategic Plan which is supplemented by the College Education Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and the Institutional Advancement Plan. From the Strategic Plan are developed the Annual Plan, Cost Center Plans, Budget Plan, and Assessment Reports. This system-wide evaluation, planning and implementation process fully integrates physical resources as a component. This process assures that physical resources are designed and used to meet the College's educational mission. [Refs. 1, 14, 15]

The Facilities Review Committee (FRC), a Shared Governance committee, makes recommendations on both long-range and short-range facilities plans for all College campuses based upon the College's priorities. The Projects Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, meets on a regular basis to solicit ideas from faculty, staff, and students for major and minor facilities projects. The Parking and Transportation Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, meets to advise on parking and traffic and other forms of transportation relevant to the College District. The Health and Safety Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, recommends policies pertaining to the safety of students and college employees.

The Works of Arts Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, works to obtain, maintain and enhance the many works of art associated with the College. [Ref. 6] The College recently was given a gift of a replica of one of the monumental Olmec heads ("El Rey") by the Governor of the state of Veracruz of the Republic of Mexico. The Olmec "El Rey" is sited in a sunken garden next to the lobby of the Diego Rivera Theatre (Ocean Avenue Campus) which houses the Pan American Unity mural completed by the Mexican artist Diego Rivera in 1940 as a gift to City College of San Francisco. [Ref. 7]
III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. The College has effectively integrated physical resources into the District’s institutional planning system and developed a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan. With an influx of resources from the 1997 and 2001 bond measures and related state dollars leveraged as a result, the District has engaged internal and external constituencies in open dialogs, planning retreats, public forums, and ongoing committee meetings about project priorities that best promote student learning and achievement. There has been significant participation in the facilities planning processes through regular Shared Governance activities as well as “user groups” for design and remodeling of specific facilities. Bond funds have been used to support the development of major new facilities for two campuses as well as improvements of existing facilities at other campuses. The College has successfully secured state funding for additional projects and another bond initiative is planned to secure funding to meet the objectives of the Facilities Master Plan.

2. The physical resources at all locations where the College offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluations as the basis for improvement. Since the last accreditation review, significant improvements have been made in the organizational structure that supports facilities planning, construction, and maintenance. However, the District should implement long-range planning for the total cost of ownership for all of the new facilities and major equipment initiatives currently in the planning stages for construction or purchase. In addition, significant expenditures need to be allocated to some of the District’s older buildings such as Science Hall and the Alemany Campus, or these facilities will continue to deteriorate.
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REPORT TAB III.C
I. Overview of the Standard III.C Report:
Technology Resources

Since the last accreditation review, the College has embarked on a major period of technological development and growth, primarily enabled by funds from two public bond initiatives, one in 1997 and the other in 2001. Without these funds, it would not have been possible to achieve major improvements in the College using technology as the tool of opportunity. During this period, the College engaged in the following technology-related activities:

• major improvements to the College's network infrastructure, desktops, and desktop applications;
• major upgrades to the College's enterprise database system;
• extensive use of technology in providing online classes, and modernization of computer laboratories and multimedia classrooms;
• a significant increase in the use of technology in all phases of day-to-day operations;
• the development of an effective planning process in setting the technology priorities and matching priorities to its mission that included all segments of the institution through the Shared Governance process; and
• ongoing technology projects to position the College to use high bandwidth applications.

While the College has made major progress in its technology capabilities and the support of programs and services using technology, significant ongoing needs for improvement include:

• completion of inter-campus connectivity with voice, data, and video transmission;
• improvement of Banner functionality and usage;
• strengthened organization, policies/procedures, and support within the Information Technology Systems (ITS) Department;
• expansion and enhancement of educational technology including online instruction, video, and labs/classrooms;
• the procurement of funding to sustain faculty and staff training in technology; and
• updates to the Technology Plan, including equipment replacement strategies.
II. Standard Report III.C: Technology Resources

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.C.1. The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.

III.C.1.a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.

The College's technology responds to the needs of the institution. Following a period of scarce resources in the 1980s and early 1990s, the College laid careful plans identifying the most important project priorities for technology spending between 1996 and 2001, during which time two citizens' bonds were approved, making available the substantial sum of $24 million for technology development. Enormous results from this investment have been realized, especially since the time of the last self-study team visit in the year 2000, leading the technology committee to report that technology has indeed enhanced institutional operations and effectiveness. This subsection highlights some of the ways in which technology has achieved substantial results and also suggests what remains to be accomplished. [Refs. 6, 7, 8, 21]

Simultaneous to the construction of the network, the College began a major project called the “Desktop Rollout” project. New desktop computers were acquired and some of the existing later-model PCs were upgraded so that over 2,500 employees—trained in the new software and password security procedures—could work with standardized operating systems and applications, share documents and data, communicate with a fully functional email system, and have access to the College's Banner database system. In addition to all of this, the 20-plus-year old expensive and outdated telephone system was replaced with a new system that operated not over the old copper wiring but rather over the new fiber optic network, using the technology called Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP). These projects were huge undertakings, involving the planning and participation of professional staff, contractors, and, most important, the cooperation of the many College users. [Ref. 12]

The most important priority for investment has been the development of the college-wide network. Until this project was undertaken, CCSF had a mainframe-based network with terminals and stand-alone computers, each with different operating systems and applications. The database system had previously been hosted remotely and required dumb terminals, until finally the College invested in a new database system for mission-critical applications such as student records, financial records, etc. However, even this new database system needed connectivity in order to be accessible and useful. Thus, the College began constructing a fiber optic network, wiring each building on the Ocean Avenue Campus as well as the remote campuses, floor by floor, room by room. Then the buildings themselves were connected on the Ocean Avenue Campus, pulling cable through underground conduits and into buildings, where wiring closets linked the campus electronically. However, the campuses were not connected, except by dial-up communications and T-1 phone lines, so the College awarded a multi-million dollar contract to the City's Department of Telecommunications and Information Services to connect the campuses throughout the city using underground conduits along the rail transit lines, a project that is now more than 50 percent complete. [Refs. 20, 21]
The administrative systems were also upgraded and made significantly more functional. During this time, the whole Banner system was converted to the current version, the web-based applications were installed, and user teams worked to operationalize new functionalities in their areas of operation. In Finance and Administration, payroll was finally and fully migrated to the new system. Assets management was installed and made operational; budgeting was accomplished online. In Admissions and Records, online admissions applications were processed. Registration was converted from walk-in and telephone registration to web-based registration. Financial Aid began to make use of packaging and awarding capabilities. New student orientation is now available online, and computerized testing is operational. In addition, a degree audit system coupled with educational planning is now being implemented. In the Learning Resources Center, a new catalog system is being implemented. Behind the scenes, the Information Technology Services team has upgraded processors, installed network management systems, and expanded its technical support and help desk operations. Within administrative units and departments, staff groups have begun to examine business processes in light of the tools of technology, exploring ways to re-engineer and improve services and operations—a process underway in Admissions and Records as well as Finance and Administration. [Refs. 3, 15]

In the area of educational technology, much has also been accomplished. The College has over 70 computer labs, and the lab support team has been reorganized to support these labs while at the same time supporting desktop computers and applications. Workstations in computer labs have been upgraded when funds have become available, and a major laboratory is currently being renovated as a state-of-the-art facility. A couple of classrooms are slated to become multimedia classrooms under the current bond funding program. In addition, the College has expanded its online course offerings from eight courses in 2000 to more than 65 courses in Fall 2005, and the program continues to grow. The College won several awards from the California Virtual Campus (CVC), two awards from Merlot, and one award from the State Chancellor’s Office for its online courses. In addition, the Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction, having worked initially with a remote hosting service, has upgraded to an in-house system that uses WebCT. Finally, the Office continues to provide professional development and training in technology to faculty as the ongoing means of encouraging greater use of technology in the classroom. [Refs. 2, 5, 10]

Has technology enhanced operations and institutional effectiveness? It is the conclusion of the Technology Committee that the return on investment has increased by several orders of magnitude. Technology is now modernized, standardized, and ubiquitous. Communications are now instantaneous and efficient. Data transactions and reports are managed from the desktop in real time and without delay. Students register easily and efficiently, and faculty/staff handle much of their work electronically. Students can now take courses online and complete course assignments in computer laboratories. The transformation of the institution with a significant investment in technology has enabled the College to serve students more effectively and efficiently, while making work processes more productive. It has also saved money—the investment in the VoIP phone system has reduced the College’s annual telephone system cost from $600,000 to less than $200,000 per year. However, converting from a “manual” environment to a “cyber” environment has not been easy or without setbacks. Nevertheless, it has been accomplished successfully and it has produced a far more effective institution, with respect to both its services to students and its internal operations. [Ref. 13]

By way of assessment, it is important to note that there is much more to do. The Technology Committee recognizes that the most significant “return on investment” may be ahead. First, there is a need to complete the College’s network connectivity between campuses and fully utilize the College-wide network for voice, data, and video functions. The network, given its speed and its substantial bandwidth, has the potential to support many new uses, such as videoconferencing, shared courses via video, online counseling and advisement, etc. Second, there is also a need to significantly improve the way
the Banner database application is developed, managed, and utilized. Many new functions and features need to be developed and made available to users. In addition, some functions need to be better utilized by College personnel, including especially the human resources functions and the budget/fiscal management functions. The Information Technology (IT) staffing system and the user involvement processes need to be reviewed and strengthened. There is also a need for increased documentation and systematic procedures within IT, both for Banner and for information technology in general. Third, there is a need for enhancing educational technology and promoting the increasingly important role it can play in teaching and learning. The current success of instructors providing online courses is evidence of the potential of this technology for growth. The use of video instruction, whereby courses can be taught across campuses, needs to be developed. Finally, there is a need to expand the re-engineering activities currently underway in order to revamp outmoded practices, make better use of staff, and better serve students and the community. [Refs. 2, 4, 6, 7, 8]

III.C.1.b. The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.

In-house training for faculty and staff in technology is provided by the Technology Learning Center (TLC) through its ongoing workshops and also at FLEX Day workshops. This training is supplemented by the use of grant funds and general funds to obtain training outside the College, the use of the training funds from the State Chancellor’s Office, and the use of online training. One major source of funding, from the Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP), has been cut and will need to be replaced in order for adequate training to be provided. Online instructors are given extensive training and support by the staff in the Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction. Whenever a system-wide technology upgrade has occurred, the College has provided system-wide training for all employees as part of the Desktop Rollout Project and also the Telephone Replacement Project. The College also provides technical assistance to faculty and staff through the Help Desk. [Refs. 1, 10, 14]

Training students in the use of technology is generally the purview of the instructional departments when the departments decide that the use of technology is an integral component of their course content or when they decide that the use of technology is needed for students to complete assignments. Outside of the classroom, other support departments train students in using technology. The Library, the Batmale Instructional Computing Lab on the Ocean Avenue Campus, the Disabled Students Programs and Services computer lab staff, the Learning Assistance Center, and the Language Center in the Rosenberg Library all provide some student training in use of technology. The Student Development Division also provides computer training to students in the areas of information competency so that students can research educational and career options. [Refs. 17, 24]

As with technology training for students, the need for technology training for College personnel also exceeds what the College is currently able to provide. There is a serious need for alternative funding to sustain the program. In the area of student training, the Committee believes that the departments and laboratories do a reasonably good job in technology training but that the training is not always consistent or systematically provided. There is a need to encourage more consistent efforts in this area. [Refs. 1, 10, 11, 24]

III.C.1.c. The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.
The College does systematically plan, acquire, maintain, and upgrade or replace technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs. The College has been able to vastly improve its level of technology by completing a series of major projects funded by the bond initiatives. In addition to system-wide upgrades, the College uses grant funds such as VTEA and Instructional Block Grants to keep computer labs/classrooms upgraded. [Refs. 12, 23]

With regard to maintaining equipment, CCSF purchases both hardware and software support, and, in most cases, with a four-hour response time. For less critical applications, the service level agreement is the next business day. [Ref. 18]

CCSF has built its network infrastructure with the long-range view in mind, installing the fastest and broadest bandwidth available at the time, Gigabit Ethernet and fiber. The long-term view helps ensure long-term operability. [Ref. 19, 20]

III.C.1.d. The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.

The College uses the Shared Governance process in making decisions about the use and distribution of technology resources. The Information Technology Policy Committee sets policies regarding technology usage. The allocation of funds for technology projects follows the Strategic Plan, the Technology Plan, and the Annual Plan and is approved by the Planning and Budgeting Council. Technology resources for administrative functions are allocated through a user group and administrative staff. Technology resources for academic support are allocated through the instructional departments and their respective school deans. [Refs. 6, 7, 15, 22]

The College provides for a robust and secure technical infrastructure via a robust firewall, the physical separation of the network infrastructure into an administrative side and an instructional side, account passwords, use of switch ports, use of standardized anti-virus and anti-spam software, and secure logon and passwords into the enterprise information system. In addition, all enterprise servers are backed up on a regular basis. Enterprise level software is kept up-to-date to ensure vendor support.

The College keeps its infrastructure up-to-date by establishing standards for its cabling infrastructure to be applied to all new construction, by purchasing technology products early in the product life cycle, assuring that equipment will have a maximum lifespan of use before becoming obsolete, and by making cost-effective design decisions to extend the usability of the new network infrastructure. [Refs. 19, 20]

III.C.2. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

The College’s technology decisions are driven by the College’s institutional plans: the Education Plan, the Enhanced Self-Study, the Strategic Plan 2003-2008 and Annual Plans. All major technology projects are integrated with the institutional planning process. The seventh priority in the Strategic Plan is the following: “To significantly upgrade and expand the utilization of technology systems that enhance learning, optimize institutional resources, and contribute to improved levels of communication and organizational effectiveness.” A number of objectives and strategies are listed within this priority. [Refs. 6, 7, 9]
In addition, the College develops each year an Annual Plan to guide the departments and administrative units in their development of unit plans. The seventh objective in the FY05 Annual Plan is the following: “To significantly upgrade and expand the utilization of technology systems that enhance learning, optimize institutional resources, and contribute to improved levels of communication and organizational effectiveness.” This objective, along with suggested initiatives, serves to encourage each department to align its plans with overall College plans and the implementation of technology initiatives. The departmental plans contain budget requests coupled with their planning initiatives. However, most of the funding for enterprise-wide technology is included in the budgets and plans submitted by the ITS Department. In this manner, the technology planning process is integrated with institutional planning. [Refs. 15, 16]

The College also relies on its Shared Governance process to review and provide input into its plans, including technology decisions. Throughout the year, there are meetings of the Information Technology Policy Committee, which is the overall Shared Governance committee providing direction for technology; the Administrative Services Subcommittee, which oversees Banner applications and network services; and the Teaching and Learning Technology Roundtable, which looks at the technology needs of learning and teaching. These Shared Governance groups review and recommend plans, review and recommend policies for the use of technology, and evaluate progress and results. With respect to evaluation, all departments, including ITS, submit mid-year and annual assessments, which document progress in accomplishing objectives, ensuring that evaluation is accomplished regularly and systematically. [Refs. 2, 3, 4, 23]
III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. The College provides technological support to meet the needs of teaching, learning, College-wide communications, research, and operations systems. The College has made a concerted effort to determine future technology needs and to efficiently and effectively use bond funds to meet those projected needs. Major upgrades to the network infrastructure have allowed for the implementation of services to meet wide-ranging needs. The College is committed to improving the functionality and usage of its Banner information systems. Work on intercampus connectivity continues with the goal of providing voice, data, and video transmission. The College has improved network services and provided up-to-date standardized computers to all full-time employees and computer access to all part-time employees. The College has strengthened its network security and reliability. The ITS Department has significantly increased the services it provides without increasing staffing. However, the College still has unmet needs in the area of technical support staff, training for technical staff, and access to computer labs for students. In addition, insufficient electrical power in the computer room in Batmale Hall hampers the College’s use of technology and upgrading the power should be a high priority.

2. The College has a comprehensive technology planning process within its Shared Governance structure that informs decisions on technology services, facilities, hardware, and software consistent with the College Strategic Plan and the annual planning and budgeting cycles. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluations as the basis for improvement. The College has developed construction standards to ensure that new construction will be integrated into the new network infrastructure. These planning and evaluation activities have produced significant improvements. The current Technology Plan, adopted in November 2002, should be reviewed and updated. Students are not currently being surveyed regarding how they use technology and their technology needs. The College should develop and administer a College-wide student survey for all computer labs.

3. The College provides ongoing technology training to faculty and staff through the Technology Learning Center. However, cuts in the TTIP funds will severely limit the ability of faculty and staff to obtain technology training outside the College. The College should provide regular, ongoing Banner training and find resources to replace the TTIP funds for technology staff development. In addition, there is insufficient training provided to students on use of general applications such as MS Office and Internet tools. More training should be given to students on the use of general applications and Internet tools.

4. The College has made significant progress in developing online courses and improving the quality of technology-mediated instructional programs, as evidenced by the success of the online curriculum offerings and the awards various TMI courses have won. The College will continue to expand and enhance the use of technology for online instruction and other forms of technology-mediated instruction both in the classroom and for distance education.
IV. References

Ref. 1  Biennial Employee Technology Survey Report, 2003
Ref. 2  TLTR Minutes, 2000–04
Ref. 3  ITPC Minutes, 2000–04
Ref. 4  Banner Manager’s Group, 2000–04
Ref. 5  Distance Learning Course Offerings and Attendance, Fall 2000–Spring 2005)
Ref. 6  Strategic Plan, 2003–2008
Ref. 7  Education Master Plan, 2003
Ref. 8  Technology Plan and the Library Technology Plan, 2002
Ref. 9  Enhanced Self-Study Report, 2002
Ref. 10 Technology Learning Center Annual Report, 2000–04
Ref. 11 Technology Learning Center Surveys of Workshop Participants, 2000–04
Ref. 12 Desktop Rollout/Computer Installation, 2003–04
Ref. 13 Telephone Installation/Phone Conversion, 2003–04
Ref. 14 FLEX Calendars
Ref. 15 Institutional Annual Plans, 2000–04
Ref. 16 Telecommunication Technology Infrastructure Plan Reports, 2000–04
Ref. 17 Student Development Tech Plan, 2003–04
Ref. 18 Service Contracts for Hardware and Software, 2000–04
Ref. 19 Educational Technology and Campus Communications Systems Infrastructure: Implementation Standards (Low Voltage Standards, April 2004)

The College makes significant ongoing efforts to ensure that spending is tied to the institution's core mission, as the analysis contained in the following subsections shows. The institution's financial team, led by the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration and the Chief Financial Officer, provides realistic revenue estimates to the Chancellor to set the parameters for creating the annual operating budget. Through the Shared Governance budget planning process, strategic decisions are made each year to ensure that sufficient budgetary focus is placed on areas that directly and indirectly support student learning. Great care is taken to make sure there is wide dissemination of information related to that process. Cost center managers' recommendations for resource allocation are tied directly to both the Strategic and Annual Plans, and decisions on these recommendations are made in a Shared Governance setting in consultation with the members of the College's Planning and Budgeting Council. The results of this process are then forwarded to the Board of Trustees for consideration and approval.

The College has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability. The institution practices effective oversight of all of its finances and contracts. The College recognizes that a re-engineering review of all major business processes is needed to ensure that both internal and external customer service are given the attention they deserve. The institution considers its long-range financial priorities in making annual financial plans. However, to ensure its long-term fiscal stability, the College needs to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to match ongoing spending with ongoing revenue. In addition, the institution needs to address the cost of retiree health benefits, which represents a significant financial challenge for the future.
II. Standard Report III.D: Financial Resources

Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.D.1.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

The College’s unrestricted general fund has an annual operating budget of approximately $170 million. [Ref. 1] The true cost of serving the current number of students in a near-optimal manner would require a much larger budget. This situation is even more challenging due to the inadequate level of financial support the state provides for noncredit education. [Ref. 2] To make informed and intelligent decisions related to the distribution of relatively scarce resources, the College has implemented a comprehensive budget planning system that integrates financial planning with institutional planning. [Ref. 3] There is a strong connection between the priorities contained in the Strategic Plan 2003-2008 and the Annual Plan that the Planning and Budgeting Council recommends to the Board of Trustees each year. All significant expenditures for each major cost center are tied directly to one of the College’s planning objectives during the development of the annual budget. Specifically, the Annual Plan serves as an operational version of the College’s plans for a one-year period; it consists of a set of institutional objectives that are to be achieved by the College through the efforts of the College’s organizational units—departments, schools, and administrative operations. [Ref. 4] Thus, the unit plans are linked to the Annual Plan, just as the Annual Plan is linked to the College’s overall Strategic Plan. [Ref. 5] While this does not guarantee that all objectives are funded, it does help to ensure that resources are spent in ways that support planning objectives.

The Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), a Shared Governance committee, reviews this information at a set of open meetings conducted each spring. Requests to the PBC for funding must demonstrate a direct connection to the College’s Strategic Plan. This system ensures that all of the institution’s major constituency groups have a say in how available resources are used to achieve the goals and objectives in the College’s Strategic Plan. The role of the PBC has gained a great deal of acceptance across the College as a key part of a fair process for creating the annual budget and for ensuring that longer-term efforts that require additional funding are phased into the budget over a series of years. While these documented connections between planning and budget are shared with the Board of Trustees prior to their adoption of the final budget, an earlier more concise presentation of the information would be valuable. [Ref. 3] This approach has enabled the College to continue to make steady progress in its efforts to address the needs of its students. At different times, funding for increasing the Class Schedule, backfilling student services budgets in the face of state funding cuts, and improving basic skills education have all been accomplished using this approach.

III.D.1.b. Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.
The College’s annual budget development process begins with an assessment of the expected resources for the new fiscal year. This assessment is done in collaboration with the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Student Development and the College’s Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, Chief Financial Officer, and Director of Budget and Accounting. Information is gathered from a variety of sources including the State Chancellor’s Office, the College’s representative in Sacramento, legislative staff, and, for local revenues, the City Controller’s Office. This information is then incorporated into an overall resource projection and presented to the College’s PBC as a parameter for the budget for the new fiscal year. [Ref. 6]

As detailed in the annual set of budget instructions, each cost center manager’s budget request is submitted to the respective Vice Chancellor for review. [Ref. 7] After the Vice Chancellor concurs that the cost center budgets are a realistic plan for continuing ongoing operations, the budgets are forwarded to the members of the PBC. The documents PBC members review directly connect budget requests with specific strategic goals and objectives. The PBC then ensures that available resources are squarely framed around the College’s efforts to support student learning outcomes and the overall needs of the local community. As a further check on this process, the Chief Financial Officer runs multiple iterations of the operating budget using Banner to certify that the College’s budget will be balanced. When the Board of Trustees votes on the final budget, it authorizes multiple levels of spending contingent on final state budget allocations. [Ref. 8]

In September 2005, the Board of Trustees approved the Chancellor’s recommendation to establish a Division of Institutional Advancement led by a Vice Chancellor. This is a major step to bolster the College’s efforts to expand its resource base. The new division will integrate the College’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants with the Office of College Development as well as the CCSF Foundation guided by the College’s Advancement Plan. The College’s Advancement Plan maps out a strategy for helping to “fill-in the gaps” and provide funding for those items that go beyond basic operations. [Ref. 9] For example, priority areas for increased funding in the Advancement Plan include basic skills, workforce training, access to student services, and improved technology for classrooms. In addition, both the College’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants, as well as its Workforce Development Office, have been highly successful in attracting new sources of funding through the competitive grants process. The College currently receives more than $20 million per year in this area. Examples of this include $8,414,306 received from the National Science Foundation for various Biotechnology training programs (including Bio-Link, the National Advanced Technological Education Center for Biotechnology Education) and grants totaling $403,000 from the Koret Foundation for basic skills programs. [Ref. 1] Furthermore, the Chancellor has successfully forged new partnerships with groups such as the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and San Francisco State University, thereby increasing the College’s ability to leverage resources in the grants arena.

III.D.1.c. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

The College’s Strategic Plan contains eight strategic priorities, one of which is to “identify and promote strategies to ensure stable funding,” an essential part of the College’s fiscal planning process. [Ref. 5] This process begins with the review and adoption of the Annual Plan, which includes detailed operational and developmental objectives. These objectives are used by each major cost center and its respective departments to develop annual budget requests for submittal to the Vice Chancellors. Requests that are supported at the Vice Chancellor level are then placed presented in the Management Plan. [Ref. 6]
The lagging state and local economy yielded insufficient revenues for the College during fiscal years 2002-03 and 2003-04, requiring the College to implement strategic spending reductions, including: negotiating a two-year wage freeze for all employees; reducing spending for supplies, maintenance, and equipment; reducing the number of classes offered during the summer term by approximately 50 percent; and reducing the number of classes offered during the fall and spring semesters by approximately 4 percent. [Ref. 1] All reductions in revenue and spending were discussed in multiple venues such as College Council, the Department Chairs Council, the Chancellor's Cabinet, the Planning and Budgeting Council, and Board of Trustees’ public meetings. The cooperative negotiations that allowed these decisions to be implemented were absolutely critical for ensuring the College's financial stability. At the same time, these reductions in both planned and actual spending were constructed in a manner that allowed the College to maintain its core educational offerings and student services. Furthermore, increased and sometimes heroic efforts by faculty and staff combined with the increased use of technology resulted in more students enrolled and served in 2003-04 than any prior year. [Ref. 10]

In anticipation of reductions in state funding for 2002-03, the College intentionally built its Board Designated Reserve up to a level of $5.5 million by the end of 2001-02. During the two succeeding fiscal years (2002-03 and 2003-04), the College, in a planned manner, used a portion of its Board Designated Reserve to fill the gap between revenue and expenditures. As a result, the Board Designated Reserve was lowered from $5.5 million on June 30, 2002 to $3.775 million as of June 30, 2004. [Ref. 11] The College's objective is and has been to try to maintain a 5 percent available unrestricted general fund balance as recommended by the State Chancellor's Office. The College's careful approach to budgeting is reflected in the College's bond ratings for the September 2004 sale of $110 million in General Obligation Bonds. Both Moody's and Standard & Poor's rated the College more favorably than the City and County of San Francisco. [Ref. 12]

During fiscal year 2004-05, the College resumed paying salary increases to its workforce, including both step increases for eligible employees as well as a 4 percent across-the-board increase for all employees. The College also began rebuilding the number of class sections it offers during the summer semester. At the same time, the cost to the College for providing fringe benefits to its workforce increased substantially, particularly in the areas of health insurance and retirement. During the same time period, the College witnessed a significant decline in one of its larger revenue sources, non-resident tuition, and the College did not reach its enrollment growth cap, resulting in no basic skills funds. The combination of these factors led to a dramatic decline in the “unreserved undesignated ending balance” which dropped from $3.5 million to about $660,000 on June 30, 2005.

To balance its 2005-06 budget, the College needed to include the transfer of an additional $800,000 from the Board Designated Reserve, lowering the expected amount that would remain in the reserve as of June 30, 2006 to $2.975 million. Other one-time measures taken to balance the 2005-06 budget provided more than $1 million in relief. To ensure its long-term fiscal stability, the College needs to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to match ongoing spending with ongoing revenue. Therefore the College’s Planning and Budget Council will be reviewing proposals for ongoing savings during the Fall 2005 semester in anticipation of the need to reduce spending during the 2006-07 fiscal year.

The College covers its property and liability insurance needs through its membership in the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), a joint powers authority. The College retains the first $25,000 of liability for each claim and is covered by SWACC for the balance of any claim. SWACC in turn is a member of the School Excess Liability Fund (SELF), a larger joint powers authority. SWACC also sells a portion of its risk to reinsurance firms. Through a combination of SELF membership and reinsurance, the College has coverage for claims up to $16 million for liability and $150 million for property damage. [Ref. 13]

1 This figure does not include $2.4 million in rents collected from District-owned properties.
The College is self-funded on a “pay as you go” basis for Workers Compensation, with annual expenditures ranging between $800,000 and $1 million. The annual cost for this item has not generated substantial budgetary pressure and periodic reviews of the cost-effectiveness of switching to a fully insured program have consistently shown that such a change would be more expensive.

The College also funds the cost of retiree health benefits on a “pay as you go” basis, with estimated total expenditures of approximately $4.5 million in fiscal year 2004-05. The cost of this benefit has nearly quadrupled since 1992 while the College’s total operating budget has increased by approximately 60 percent for the same time period. [Ref. 14] A combination of factors has led to this increase in costs, including the general increases in health care premiums since 2001, demographic factors, and an initiative passed by San Francisco voters that improved retiree health benefits. The College has not identified a separate source of funding for the long-term liability associated with the cost of retiree health benefits. The Government Accounting Standards Board requires an actuarial study of the unfunded liability in this area. The College expects to have an actuarial study for these benefits completed before December 2005.

When state revenues slumped, the institution managed its reserve funds in an intelligent manner to meet the goal of protecting direct spending for students. While the College needed to transfer an additional $800,000 from its reserve for the 2005-06 budget, the administration is committed to working within the framework of the Planning and Budgeting Council to identify ongoing strategies for containing the College’s cost structure during the remainder of 2005-06, as it prepares for fiscal year 2006-07. This strategy also needs to include a timeframe for rebuilding the reserve. The area of funding retiree health benefits represents a significant financial challenge in the future.

III.D.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget.

The financial planning and budget process is documented in an annual planning and budget guide that is distributed to all cost center managers. This guide for budget submittals contains instructions that are discussed and reviewed on an annual basis by the College’s PBC. The Chief Financial Officer incorporates feedback from both the PBC as well as individual cost center managers to modify and improve the annual guide. [Ref. 3]

The College’s annual audit reports, quarterly financial reports, and annual budget are all posted on the College’s website. In addition, the financial information, including the annual budget, is widely distributed via the PBC and public meetings of the Board of Trustees. The College’s Budget and Accounting Office distributes financial reports on an annual, quarterly, and monthly basis to the Board of Trustees, the public, and representatives of the College’s constituency groups, who are members of the Planning and Budgeting Council. [Ref. 15]

III.D.2.a. Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

The Annual Budget document reflects the cost of carrying out the District’s annual operating objectives. The final budget incorporates the availability of state and local funding, and includes a summary of the activities the budget will support. [Ref. 1] This typically includes information related to the hiring of new and
replacement full-time faculty, improvements in salary schedules, net increases for additional salary step movement, the cost of fringe benefits, and all budget requests approved for funding through the PBC. This approach has enabled the College to continue to make steady progress in its efforts to address the needs of its students. At different times, funding for increasing the size and distribution of the class schedule, backfilling student services budgets in the face of state funding cuts, and improving basic skills education have all been accomplished using this approach.

The annual 311 Report required by the state documents the College’s compliance with the “fifty percent law” for direct instructional spending. Historically the College has compared quite favorably with other districts on this measure. [Ref. 16] In addition the College’s level of compliance with the “seventy-five percent law” related to the number of full-time faculty compares quite favorably with other districts. [Ref. 17] The College ranks as one of the highest among California community colleges for salaries for part-time faculty. These three items are evidence of the high priority the College places on supporting student learning. Furthermore, during the recent multi-year period of state fiscal distress, a two-year, across-the-board wage freeze was agreed to by all College employees in an effort to save jobs and protect direct spending for student needs. This unprecedented level of cooperation was critical to safeguarding students’ access to educational opportunities.

All audit findings are presented directly to the Board of Trustees by the independent auditor in an open advertised public session. The District’s Business Office responds to all audit recommendations in as timely a manner as feasible. Those recommendations that can be effectively implemented within the next audit cycle are identified and changes are implemented. Typically, audit findings are brought to the College’s attention in December; therefore some recommendations require a longer time horizon for completion than the next audit year. The District is currently working on one such recommendation involving accounting policies. [Ref. 11] The Business Office is moving forward with implementation and expects that changes needed in accounting policies (primarily documentation) will be completed by the end of 2005.

The annual budget, the annual audit report, and all quarterly financial reports are available on the College’s website.

III.D.2.b. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.

The institution distributes financial information in several forms to a variety of groups in a timely manner. The College’s annual budget is widely distributed via the PBC, the College’s website, and public meetings of the Board of Trustees. Each year the PBC conducts an open hearing on the proposed annual budget, which includes presentations from the Vice Chancellors and some of the College’s cost center managers. The College’s Business Office distributes financial reports on an annual, quarterly, and monthly basis to the representatives of the College’s four major constituency groups via the PBC and directly to the Board of Trustees and the public. The Board of Trustees holds an open public hearing on each quarterly financial report at the closest monthly work session. In addition, the College’s Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration and Chief Financial Officer present a monthly financial report at each regular open session meeting of the Board of Trustees. The College’s annual audit report for 2004-05 was completed in a timely manner, with wide distribution. [Ref. 8] Furthermore, all audit findings are presented directly to the Board of Trustees by the independent auditor in an open advertised public session.

III.D.2.c. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.
All of California’s community colleges have weathered a recent series of difficult financial years. The economic downturn that accompanied the burst of the “dot com bubble” had a major impact on state revenue that in turn affected funding for community colleges. This situation was even more challenging for CCSF due to the historically inadequate level of financial support the state provides for non-credit education.

As noted in the response to III.D.1.c., in anticipation of the fiscal downturn that began in 2002, the College intentionally built its Board Designated Reserve up to a level of $5.5 million by the end of 2001-02. During the two succeeding fiscal years (2002-03 and 2003-04), the College, in a planned manner, used a portion of its Board Designated Reserve to fill the gap between resources and expenditures. As a result, the Board Designated Reserve was lowered from $5.5 million at June 30, 2002 to $3.775 million as of June 30, 2004. [Ref. 11] The College’s budget for fiscal year 2005-06 included the transfer of an additional $800,000 from the Board Designated Reserve, lowering the expected amount that would remain in the reserve as of June 30, 2006 to $2.975 million.

The College’s objective is and has been to try to maintain a 5 percent available unrestricted general fund balance as recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office. During fiscal year 2002-03 the unrestricted general fund balance was slightly below the 5 percent level for a short period of time. This situation was remedied by shifting $2.4 million in rents collected from district owned properties into the unrestricted general fund. The College has requested and received a legal opinion indicating these funds may be treated as unrestricted and are therefore available for any legal purpose. However, the combined total in the reserve of $5.4 million would need to be supplemented by an additional $3.1 million to meet the state’s recommended minimum fund balance of $8.5 million or 5 percent of unrestricted general fund expenditures. It is not likely that the College’s “unrestricted unreserved ending balance” would provide much of that difference. Instead, the difference would be made up by the remaining value on a long-term prepaid lease.

The College has generally been able to maintain an ending balance of at least 5 percent in the unrestricted general fund as recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office. The chart below shows the actual unrestricted general fund ending balance as a percentage of relevant expenditures for each of the past five fiscal years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Ending Unrestricted General Fund Balance</th>
<th>% of Unrest'd General Fund Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000–01</td>
<td>$7,968,671</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>$8,772,000</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>$7,248,109</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>$10,580,146*</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05 est</td>
<td>$11,900,000*</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes long-term prepaid ground lease for the site of the new Mission Campus
While the College needed to transfer an additional $800,000 from its reserve for the 2005-06 budget, the administration is committed to working within the framework of the Planning and Budgeting Council to identify ongoing strategies for containing the College’s cost structure during the remainder of 2005-06, as it prepares for fiscal year 2006-07. This strategy also needs to include a timeframe for rebuilding the reserve exclusive of the long-term prepaid lease.

The College's careful approach to budgeting during 2003-04 was reflected in the College's bond ratings for the September 2004 sale of $110 million in General Obligation Bonds. Both Moody's and Standard & Poor's rated the College more favorably than the City and County of San Francisco. [Ref. 12] This was also noted in the response to III.D.1.c.

Because property tax payments comprise about one-third of the College’s unrestricted revenue but are received in two semiannual payments, annual planning for cash needs is quite important. The primary method the College uses to deal with cash needs is its participation in the annual Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANS) pool sponsored by the California Community College League. The College typically borrows between $10 and $13 million in the TRANS pool to deal with all cash needs during the upcoming fiscal year. [Ref. 18] Finally, in an emergency, such as very late passage of the state budget, the College has access to short-term borrowing for cash via the City and County Treasury. This emergency procedure is convenient and helpful but it does come at a price equal to the rate the County Treasury is earning on deposits at the time.

As noted already in the response to III.D.1.c., the College covers its property and liability insurance needs through its membership in the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), a joint powers authority. The College retains the first $25,000 of liability for each claim and is covered by SWACC for the balance of any claim. [Ref. 13] SWACC in turn is a member of the School Excess Liability Fund (SELF), a larger joint powers authority and also sells a portion of its risk to reinsurance firms. Through a combination of SELF membership and reinsurance, the College has coverage for claims up to $16 million for liability and $150 million for property damage.

III.D.2.d. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration is responsible for financial oversight for all monies held by the College, including its auxiliary bookstore. To accomplish effective oversight, the Vice Chancellor is supported by the College's Chief Financial Officer, the Director of Budget and Accounting, and their staff. The College uses SCT's Banner integrated management information system to track and process all financial transactions, including financial aid and grants. All financial transactions are subject to formalized approval queues. The College’s Director of Budget and Accounting and his staff employ several different “approval queues” to ensure that financial transactions are legitimate and within any particular departmental budget. All of the College’s revenues are invested by the San Francisco County Treasurer. These investments are overseen by an independent review committee.

The Chief Administrative Services Officer has lead responsibility for overseeing the College’s entry into contractual relationships for a wide variety of services and for clinical placements of students. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities has lead responsibility for overseeing the College’s entry into contractual relationships with architects and builders. Both of these individuals have access to attorneys whenever they are needed.

The College's bookstore is run by a full-time, on-site manager who reports directly to the College's Chief Administrative Services Officer who has primary responsibility for overseeing its operations. The financial activities of the Foundation of City College of San Francisco are overseen by its Board of Directors, which includes the College's Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration as members. [Refs. 20, 21]
The District received an unqualified audit opinion for fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004 in its Annual Financial and Single Audit report. Furthermore, the most recent report, issued for fiscal year 2004, did not identify any material weaknesses. The District tracks progress toward resolution for all annual audit findings and works directly with its auditors to resolve such findings.

The annual audit report for the College includes an audit of the auxiliary bookstore. A separate audit report is issued for the College’s Foundation. [Ref. 19] There have been no significant audit findings for either of these two entities. [Ref. 11]

III.D.2.e. All financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

The College uses its financial resources with integrity and in a manner consistent with the missions and goals of the institution, including all financial resources from auxiliary activities, fundraising efforts, and grants.

The grants application process is administered by the District’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants. This Office works closely with the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the Chief Financial Officer, and the Chief Administrative Services Officer during post-award grant administration on both the development of contracts and accounting issues related to grant-funded expenditures.

The Vice Chancellor of Finance, with the assistance of the accounting and administrative services departments, ensures that grant-related financial reporting and contract terms are in full compliance with all the terms required by the granting agency. All financial transactions for grant-funded activities are processed through the College’s Banner management information system, and are subject to annual audits by awarding agencies.

The Foundation of the City College of San Francisco has a separate Board of Directors and maintains a separate general ledger system. Policy is implemented through the Executive Director of the Foundation. Fiscal management is currently handled by College staff. During the next few years, as the Foundation’s assets and returns increase, the accounting functions for the Foundation will be shifted to Foundation-funded staff. The Foundation has been quite successful in its fundraising efforts the past few years, primarily in generating support for student scholarships, basic skills programs, and the child development program. All funds raised by the Foundation have been spent in a manner that is consistent with the College’s mission and goals. [Refs. 19, 20].

III.D.2.f. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.

The College enters into a wide variety of contractual agreements including but not limited to the following:

1. Personal services contracts less than or equal to $10,000, referred to as limited services contracts, which are reported to the Board of Trustees as “Information Only”;

2. Professional services contracts for more than $10,000, which require higher levels of insurance, complete descriptions of deliverables/timetables, and Board of Trustees approval before being awarded;

3. Grant and sub-recipient contractual agreements;
4. Informal construction contracts less than or equal to $15,000, which are informally bid and go to the Board of Trustees as “Information Only”;

5. Formal construction contracts greater than $15,000, which are subject to public bid requirements and must be approved by the Board of Trustees before being awarded;

6. Construction-related professional services, such as architecture and engineering, which are awarded through a fair and competitive process and are approved by the Board of Trustees before being awarded;

7. Rental agreements for classroom space, which are approved by the Board of Trustees;

8. Vendor agreements that produce revenue for the College and the Associated Students and are subject to approval by the Board of Trustees;

9. Master Agreements with the Foundation and Bookstore Auxiliary approved by the Board of Trustees; and


The integrity of District contracts is maintained by adherence to regulatory codes including the Public Contract Code, the Education Code, the Business and Professions Code, the Labor Code, and the Government Code as they relate to specific types of contracts. The District’s ongoing control over contracts is administered by the Chief Administrative Services Officer. Contracts may be terminated by the College for convenience or cause. It should be noted that College policy requires any services contract in excess of $54,000, an annually indexed amount tied to inflation, to be awarded only after a competitive process has been conducted. This policy acknowledges that factors other than price may be included as selection criteria. [Ref. 22]

III.D.2.g. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems.

On the operating level, the College uses the annual external audit report as well as feedback from key user groups to assess the effectiveness of its financial management systems. While service to internal and external customers is a priority, so are safeguards against fraud and abuse. Internal requirements for processing transactions are streamlined whenever such changes do not reduce important checks and balances. At the Chancellor’s direction, the College Business Office has started a re-engineering review of all major business processes. This review will involve both College staff and external consultants and will be completed in 2006. [Ref. 24]

The College’s management team treats all external audit findings seriously. Such findings are addressed in both a short- and long-term manner, depending on the nature of the appropriate remedy. The District’s Business Office responds to all audit recommendations in as timely a manner as feasible. Those recommendations that can be effectively implemented within the next audit cycle are identified and changes are implemented. Typically, audit findings are brought to the College’s attention in December; therefore, some recommendations require a longer time horizon for completion than the next audit year. The District is currently working on one such recommendation involving accounting policies. The Business Office is moving forward with implementation and expects that changes needed in these areas will be completed by the end of 2005.

On the macro level, the relative scarcity of resources requires the College to continually examine how well it is planning for both current and future needs. While the preliminary annual budget is adopted in June and the final budget is adopted in September, both the PBC and the Board of Trustees are updated regularly by the
College's lead financial administrators regarding how well the annual financial plan is or is not tracking. [Ref. 23] Information regarding revenue can change during the course of a fiscal year, leading to necessary adjustments to budgets and spending. During the past few years, such adjustments to spending have been necessary concerning both personnel and non-personnel items as more information has become available regarding how much revenue the College will receive from both state and local sources.

While financial safeguards appear to be adequate, the re-engineering review of all major business processes as called for in the College Strategic Plan is needed to ensure that both internal and external customer service is given the attention they deserve. Such a review would include a detailed survey of key users of the financial management system to evaluate user satisfaction with financial services at the College.
III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. The College has implemented a comprehensive budget planning system that integrates financial planning with institutional planning. There is a strong connection between the priorities contained in the Strategic Plan 2003–2008 and the Annual Plan that the Planning and Budgeting Council recommends to the Board of Trustees each year. The institution clearly defines, widely distributes, and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budgeting on an annual basis. Financial information is provided throughout the institution, both on paper and electronically, to a variety of groups in a timely manner. The institution is committed to a budget planning process that relies on realistic assessments of available resources and strategic efforts for attracting additional resources. The College has been successful in its efforts to generate financial support from both grant agencies and private donors.

The institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability in making short-range financial plans. When state revenues slumped, the institution managed its reserve funds in an intelligent manner to meet the goal of protecting direct spending for students. To ensure its long-term fiscal stability, the College needs to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to match ongoing spending with ongoing revenue. Therefore, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council will be reviewing proposals for ongoing savings during the Fall 2005 semester in anticipation of the need to reduce spending during the 2006-07 fiscal year. In addition, the institution needs to address the cost of retiree health benefits which represents a significant financial challenge in the future.

2. Financial documents, including the budget and the independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. The College focuses spending on student learning as evidenced by its history of high numbers related to the “fifty percent law” and the “seventy-five percent law.” While resources for the support of student learning programs and services are not optimal, the institution has made informed and intelligent decisions in a Shared Governance setting related to the distribution of these relatively scarce resources.

3. The College has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. The institution has made concerted efforts to meet the State Chancellor’s guidelines for a 5 percent fund balance and acknowledges how difficult that is during under-funded years. While the College needed to transfer an additional $800,000 from its reserve for the 2005-06 budget, the administration recognizes the need to rebuild the reserve exclusive of the value of its long-term prepaid lease over the next several years.

The cash flow needs of the District have been supported through the issuance of TRANS, and risk management needs are handled through SWACC.

4. The institution practices effective oversight of all of its finances. Its most recent audit report, issued for fiscal year 2004, was unqualified and did not identify any material weaknesses. The findings of that external audit were addressed promptly. The institution monitors finances not only for the College itself but also for the auxiliary bookstore and separate foundation as well. The institution makes extensive efforts to connect spending with planning, and has consistently done so with
the highest level of integrity. Financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution. The institution emphasizes extensive front-end efforts to ensure that contract language is in the best interest of the institution, and goes beyond statutory requirements for competitive processes. While financial safeguards appear to be adequate, the College should complete the re-engineering review of all major business processes to ensure that both internal and external customer service receive the attention they deserve.
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STANDARD IV
Leadership & Governance
STANDARD IV: Leadership & Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.
I. Overview of the Standard IV Report: Leadership & Governance

City College of San Francisco has a robust Shared Governance System with broad-based participation that promotes collaborative efforts among the Board of Trustees and College constituencies. The Shared Governance System has reached a level of maturity and support from campus constituencies that reflects the transformation of the ideals under which the system was created into a working practical reality. The Shared Governance System has been evaluated several times and the most recent evaluation (October, 2004) indicated that constituencies have learned to feel confident in the strength of the system as the College’s methodology for dealing with new challenges as they occur. [Refs. 4, 11, 12] That evaluation also resulted in several recommendations for improving the system, including expanding participation in the Shared Governance System and continuing the biennial evaluation process.

The Board of Trustees maintains an appropriate level of independence and fulfills its obligation to represent the public interest. The Board has promoted and played an active role in the development of planning initiatives and the assessment of institutional effectiveness. The Board Policy Manual, Board By-Laws, and Board procedures are in compliance with local and state laws and regulations. However, the Board needs to adopt a calendar for the regular systematic review and updating of its policies. In addition, there are a few areas, identified in this report, that should be addressed in the Policy Manual. The Board has a strong code of ethics, is involved in the accreditation process, and provides leadership in the selection and evaluation of the chief administrative officer (the Chancellor).

The Board delegates authority and responsibility for the administration of the institution to the Chancellor. The Chancellor works effectively with administrative, faculty, staff, and student organizational structures—the means of communication with constituencies—in supporting the institution and delegates responsibility to appropriate administrative divisions. These administrative and governance processes facilitate decisions that support student learning and improve institutional effectiveness.
II. Standards IV.A & IV.B Report: Leadership & Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

IV.A. The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

   a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

   b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

The CCSF Vision Statement calls for “a working environment for all faculty, staff, and administrators where everyone is valued and the climate is supportive, positive, and productive.” [Ref. 1] This vision is embodied in the College’s Shared Governance System adopted in September 1993 by the CCSF Board of Trustees. [Ref. 2] Over the past ten years, the College’s Shared Governance System has demonstrated its durability by successfully meeting numerous educational and fiscal challenges facing the institution. The level of trust and collaboration has grown each year as faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students sit together in numerous Shared Governance venues to discuss issues, resolve problems, and recommend policies for adoption by the Board of Trustees. Evidence of the level of mutual respect and collegiality can be found in the Shared Governance Evaluation Report of 2004 where participants in the Shared Governance System affirmed that “their committee environment encourages honesty among the participants.” [Ref. 4] In that same report, 91 percent of respondents felt that their opinions were usually or always respected.

The CCSF Shared Governance System developed from a series of conversations between the administration and representatives of the major College constituencies during the 1992-93 academic year in response to AB 1725. The resulting
agreement was brought before the Board of Trustees as a set of policy recommendations for the operation of the Shared Governance System at City College of San Francisco and approved in September 1993. Accompanying the policy document was an appendix listing the College’s Shared Governance committees, their role and function, and the membership composition. An office to coordinate the Shared Governance System was established soon after the Board’s approval of the new policy. Also included was a provision for the periodic review and evaluation of the work of the College Shared Governance System.

The College Shared Governance System has three parts:

1. The Collegial Governance system, in which the College relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate and its representatives. The membership of the Shared Governance committees and subcommittees in this area include all College constituent organizations but with at least a plurality of faculty sitting on each of the four major committees—Academic Policies, Curriculum, Student Preparation/Success, and Staff Development. Recommendations from the Collegial committees are forwarded to the Academic Senate for review and approval before being sent to the Vice Chancellors, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees.

2. The College Advisory system, in which the College obtains advisory recommendations in key operational areas from committees including Information Technology Policy, Communication, and Diversity. The committees report directly to the College Advisory Council (CAC) and are composed of representatives from all the major College organizations—students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators. The CAC is chaired by the Chancellor.

3. The Planning and Budgeting system is an integrated system of college-wide planning and budgeting for the College. Included in this system is the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), composed of representatives from each of the College constituencies—students, faculty, administrators, and classified staff. The PBC is also chaired by the Chancellor. The PBC oversees the development of the College’s Strategic Plan (every five years), the Annual Plan (each year), the annual College budget, and the annual Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessments of the achievements of the Annual Plan. [Refs. 29, 31, 32, 33] The PBC also oversees the annual College Performance Indicators Report. Additional committees reporting to the PBC include the Facilities Review Committee, Program Review Committee, Faculty Position Allocation Committee, and Classified Position Allocation Committee. Recommendations from these committees are advisory to the Chancellor.

The depth and specificity of the Shared Governance section in the Policy Manual (section 2.07) is considerable, and is one of the most developed areas of College policy. [Ref. 3] The Board Policy Manual (Revised September 29, 1998) gives the College’s constituent groups—students, faculty, classified, and administrators—the right and responsibility to serve on committees and to address all facets of the College’s mission. [Ref. 2] It delineates the committees of the Shared Governance System, including the number of representatives of each constituency, and provides for continuing evaluation by those constituent groups, which is to be summarized by the Chancellor and passed through to the Board of Trustees with recommendations for improvements.

Implementation of the Shared Governance System has seen changes over time. The documents attesting to the nature of the Shared Governance System, such as the Shared Governance Handbook(s) and related literature, are numerous and have been developed at considerable effort. [Ref. 5] The Shared Governance Handbook takes the process much further than the Policy Manual, providing an organizational chart of how the committees fit within the system. The Handbook defines the charter of each
committee as well as the numerical membership of each constituent group, including a directory with committee name, the chair’s name, and contact information.

California’s laws and administrative regulations provide that students, classified staff, and administrators play an advisory role to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. [Refs. 6, 7] The faculty role is more specific. The provisions say that the College will “rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the faculty in academic and professional matters.” Title 5 regulations include 10 specific areas of academic and professional matters and a provision that other areas may be included if they are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the Academic Senate. [Ref. 7]

The CCSF Shared Governance System is organized in compliance with this Title 5 regulation. [Ref. 7]

Two examples of the level of trust and collaboration that infuses the College’s governance system illustrate how far the College has progressed since the Shared Governance System was established in 1993. To alleviate the growing financial strain on the College due to state cuts in the College’s budget, College constituency groups within the Planning and Budgeting Council as well as the College Advisory Committee discussed and resolved to support the decisions of the College’s unions (AFT 2121 and SEIU 790) to defer all contractual and step increases for all CCSF employees for 18 months starting in 2002. This collective decision was a critical factor for the College to avoid layoffs and cutbacks in class offerings. This collective decision saved the College millions of dollars during one of the worst downturns in funding the College had experienced in a decade. A second example of the commitment to collaboration and trust within the College is the 2004 agreement to support the Administrators’ Association as a Shared Governance organization representing the interests of the administrators within the Shared Governance System.

College-wide discussion and communication is facilitated in committees and subcommittees throughout the Shared Governance System. The College’s Shared Governance Coordinator provides information and trainings about the Shared Governance System and updates information on its website and in City Currents, the CCSF weekly newsletter distributed to all employees. Information is readily available regarding roles of constituent groups and committee mission statements on the College’s Shared Governance website. The Shared Governance Office posts on the website information it receives from constituent groups and committee chairs regarding committee membership updates, meeting schedules, meeting agendas, and approved meeting minutes.

IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

City College of San Francisco has a continuing history of integrity and honesty in its relations with the accrediting commission. CCSF achieved a six-year re-accreditation in 2000 as a result of its Self Study and its productive working relationship with the accrediting visiting team. [Ref. 8] Since the last Self Study, CCSF has provided annual reports to the commission in a timely fashion, specifically in its annual audit and a report on new programs at the College. [Ref. 9] CCSF submitted a mid-term report in a timely fashion in 2002 and since that date continues to submit reports to the commission as requested. During the 2002-03 and 2003-04 academic years, CCSF hosted two different workshops on the new accrediting standards and student learning outcomes sponsored by the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges in collaboration with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.
The College’s communications are handled by the Office of Public Information and Marketing. Checking on the accuracy of a given communication to the community, whether it be a brochure or a news release, continues to be a matter of honesty, integrity, and professionalism in the College’s relationships with external agencies. For example, the Office uses a “News Release Distribution Form” which requires documentation as to when a news release was proofed and by the source of the information, whether it be CCSF faculty, staff, or administrators. The media uses CCSF press releases without inquiry as to the accuracy of content and, on occasion, will run the story exactly as it is provided to them.

The College’s relationship with the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) primarily involves the Financial Aid Office and the Office of Workforce and Economic Development. Since the last accreditation, the relationship between the USDE and the CCSF Financial Aid office has been excellent. For example, the CCSF Financial Aid office established a staff development training program four years ago with the training specialist for Region IX and also participates in regular other USDE training opportunities. The Program Participation Agreement with USDE, which is similar to an accreditation approval, has been approved through June 30, 2009.

City College of San Francisco’s Office of Workforce and Economic Development’s relationship with the USDE has been excellent as well. The Office regularly reviews USDE publications regarding current and future policies and legislation, particularly as it relates to Carl Perkins/VTEA; it also subscribes to Vocational Training News and Education Weekly, and staff attend national and state conferences. All information is communicated to CCSF’s Career and Technical Education Department Chairs, faculty, Vocational Education Advisory Subcommittee, Academic Policies Committee, and the Executive Council of the CCSF Academic Senate. Input from CCSF is provided via surveys generated from both the State Chancellor’s Office and the U.S. Department of Education on VTEA Reauthorization and reporting requirements. Various departments within CCSF have also applied for and received a number of grants from the USDE, and former Assistant Secretary in the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Carol D’Amico, came to the College to discuss basic skills activities at CCSF.

Since the last accreditation visit in 2000, all of the recommendations have been addressed. Among these are the reorganization of the counseling departments and formation of a College-wide and campus-by-campus Associated Students structure. Also, the College has institutionalized its planning, budgeting, and program review processes. [Ref. 22]

IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Since its inception by the Board of Trustees in September 1993, the Shared Governance System has been evaluated three times. Each time the evaluation process has been improved. The initial evaluation in 1994 used a survey of participants to assess and improve the Shared Governance System; another survey was conducted in 1997 with modifications. [Refs. 11, 12] In 2004, the College conducted its most comprehensive examination and evaluation of its Shared Governance System. [Ref. 4] Overseen by the College Advisory Council, a Shared Governance body representing all of the major College constituency organizations, the evaluation included an online survey to over 400 past and present participants in the CCSF Shared Governance System and a series of Listening Sessions in three different locations at a variety of times and open to all members of the College community to hear concerns about the Shared Governance System. Based upon a common set of agreed-upon study questions, each College organization produced its own assessment and recommendations of the Shared Governance System using the data from the survey and listening sessions. The results of the evaluation
have been distributed in print and electronic format to various groups throughout the College. In addition, the evaluation and its website location have been placed in *City Currents*, the College-wide newsletter.

The report contains many written comments from surveys about the valuable community building function of the Shared Governance System. Respondents indicated how positive connections between different employee groups and students were made possible with shared governance. In the survey for the 2004 Shared Governance Evaluation, 84 percent of the respondents (faculty, administrators, and staff) indicated that the Shared Governance committee work is usually or always interconnected to other College decisions and events. More than 75 percent of the respondents indicated that their opinions are valued and respected.

Based upon the surveys and the self studies of each of the organizations, the College Advisory Council developed a set of recommendations for improving the Shared Governance System. These 13 recommendations included provisions for reviewing and clarifying the role of each Shared Governance committee, establishing a simple clear system for tracking recommendations, and improving communications to all College constituencies as well as the efficient operation of the committees. To ensure the continuing commitment to promote a college climate of inclusiveness, the Chancellor will make an annual call for full participation in the system for students and College employees, especially classified staff.

**IV.B.** In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

**IV.B.1.a.** The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

The San Francisco Community College District is governed by a Board of Trustees, consisting of seven members elected at large by the voters of the City and County of San Francisco. The Board has one student member elected at large by the Associated Students of City College of San Francisco. The student member casts only an advisory vote in Board meetings. The Board in its conduct lives up to its Policy Code of Ethics (PM 1.15) which states, “The Board of Trustees shall: Represent all segments of the community in advocating for their particular needs; Function as a team seeking to stay well-informed and to act objectively; [and] Recognize that the Board of Trustees exercises power through the decisions it makes as a group. Individual Board members have no legal standing. Trustee powers cannot be utilized in any individual manner.” [Ref. 2] Since the last accreditation in 2000, the Board has increased its commitment and its workload with the establishment of monthly working sessions supplementing the Board’s monthly meetings and regular Board retreats to identify and discuss Board priorities. [Refs. 15, 16, 17]

**IV.B.1.b.** The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

**IV.B.1.c.** The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.
The Board reviews, evaluates, and periodically commissions studies, reports, and other documents related to the quality of student learning programs/services and how District resources are allocated to support learning programs. The Board reviews programs and budgets at regular meeting and work sessions, and Board members pose thoughtful, detailed, and at times, critical questions to gather information, analyze current issues, and apply Board policy to meet the mission of the College. [Refs. 13, 14] Their questions demonstrate interest in, attention to, and acceptance of responsibility for the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. Moreover, the Board has always assumed full responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The Board demonstrates its own commitment to accountability to the College’s mission through an appropriate delegation of tasks to the Chancellor and through the ongoing oversight of the financial and academic goals of the District.

Since the 2000 accreditation, the Board has reviewed and adopted a College Strategic Plan, an Education Master Plan, and Annual Plans for each fiscal year. The Board has also reviewed and approved plans for facilities, technology, and educational programs. The Board also receives the annual Management Plan, the Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment Reports and the annual College Performance Indicators Report and is currently considering a regular review process. The Board also reviews and discusses reports prepared by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants related to improving student success and student learning in areas of pre-collegiate and multi-cultural infusion into the College curriculum. [Refs. 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33]

The Board also reviews and adopts modifications and revisions to the College Catalog containing all of the College’s courses and programs. [Ref. 34] The annual budget is reviewed and approved by the Board as well. [Ref. 35]

The Board is the ultimate authority for City College of San Francisco (California Education Code 70902 as well as Board Policy Manual sections 1.07, 1.09, 6.01, 6.02, 6.03, 6.04, 6.06, 6.12, 6.14, 6.15, 8.01, 8.02 and 8.03), and uses that authority to create broad policies to insure the integrity of the institution in fulfilling its mission. The City and County Election Code sets the terms, timing and eligibility of Trustees to serve on the Board.

IV.B.1.d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

The Board of Trustees Policy Manual is published and available throughout the District. The Board Manual addresses the Board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures (see PM 1.01 – 1.15). [Ref. 3] Dates of approval and the number of revisions indicate that the Board has revised and adopted policy revisions on a regular basis.

IV.B.1.e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

The Board actions are consistent with the CCSF Board Policy Manual and bylaws. There is no evidence that Board actions are not final or that they are subject to the actions of any other entity. The Board addresses policy changes based upon shifts in federal, state, or local laws and regulations, or when a recommendation is presented through the College’s Shared Governance System. The Board does not currently have a schedule for review of all policies guiding the College contained within the Board Policy Manual. However, the Board has recently decided (December 2004) to subscribe to the Community College League of California Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service, which will enable the Board and the administration to establish a regular review of the CCSF Policy Manual.
IV.B.1.f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

The seven publicly elected Trustees serve four-year terms; the terms are staggered so that some board members must face the electorate every two years. This ensures that the Board continues to be responsive to community concerns. However, since Board members are chosen by the public and not by their colleagues, the Board as a whole has no control over its composition or the expression of dissenting opinions by individual members. Currently, the Board consists solely of Trustees who have served more than one four-year term. The Student Trustee serves a one-year term; although he/she is eligible to run again, only one student trustee has been elected more than once.

The Board does not have its own system for orientation and development; instead, the Chancellor has taken on that role. Each Board member receives a personal orientation, involving the Chancellor, leadership of all College constituencies and senior administrators. Issues such as Shared Governance and the Planning and Budgeting System are discussed, and all pertinent information, such as the Policy Manual and the League’s New Trustee Orientation binder, is distributed. [Ref. 36] The Chancellor serves as an ongoing resource to the new Board member.

Board members are encouraged and provided with many different opportunities to attend both internal and external events, conferences, and other functions to improve and increase their understanding of policies affecting both the San Francisco Community College District and the state community college system.

IV.B.1.g. The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

There is no codified self-evaluation processes for the governing board since the Board feels that the elections themselves act as a de-facto evaluation; however, the Board recently met and reviewed its current practice of self-evaluation and has decided to establish a written policy (December 2004). [Ref. 18]

The current practice of the Board is to schedule periodic retreats with an external facilitator in which discussions are conducted about the work of the Board and where improvements can be pursued. The retreats also enable the Board to identify three annual priorities.

Additional practice includes the sharing of information and knowledge that Trustees gather at any external conferences or functions to help promote the collective development of the Board.

IV.B.1.h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

The Board has adopted a District Policy Manual which contains a Code of Ethics (PM 1.15), as noted in the response to Standard IV.B.1.a. [Ref. 3]

Because City College of San Francisco is a public institution, all of the governing board members are non-owners of the institution. However, voting members of the Board are required by California state law to make public their financial interests. To quote the District Policy Manual (PM 1.07B): “Designated employees shall file statements of financial interest with the Chancellor of the District, who shall serve as the filing officer for the District and who shall retain the original of all statements filed in his or her office, unless otherwise directed by law.
or regulation to the contrary.” However, this language pre-dates the creation of the San Francisco Ethics Commission which now is the repository for each Board member to file a Statement of Economic Interest. Each year, the CCSF Chancellor’s Office sends each Trustee a memorandum and forms packet. The College never has physical custody of the completed Statements; they are filed directly with the San Francisco Ethics Commission by each Trustee.

Included in the SFCCD Policy Manual is a Code of Ethics and Responsibilities section (Number 1.15, p. 2) which states, “A violation of the Code of Ethics shall be subject to written censure charges by a Board member, a hearing held by the Board’s Personnel Committee and a resultant finding of recommendation to the full Board.” [Ref. 3] No such actions have had to be taken to date; therefore, no track record exists.

**IV.B.1.i.** The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

The Board receives information and updates regarding the accreditation process, status and documentation. The Board has previously reviewed WASC visiting team reports and reviewed and endorsed the 2002 CCSF Mid-Term Report. [Refs. 9, 10] The Board of Trustees has been informed about, and involved in, the current accreditation process since February 2004 when two of the WASC Commission staff conducted an orientation workshop at the College about the new standards and their emphasis on student learning outcomes. In March 2004 at a Board retreat, the WASC Self Study was on the agenda as one of the Board priorities. [Ref. 17] The Accreditation 2006 website (http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/study.html) has been a major source of ongoing and detailed information to keep the Trustees informed about the structure, timelines and progress. Moreover, the Work Group (the organizing/planning group) of the Self-Study process attended two Board of Trustees meetings in 2004 to provide documentation and make brief presentations about the process and progress of the Self Study.

Also significant is the appointment of a Board of Trustees member to serve on the Standard IV Committee as well as serving as the liaison from the Board to the Self-Study Steering Committee. As Board liaison this trustee is a member of the Self-Study Steering Committee and attends Steering Committee meetings. At the October 12, 2004 Board Work Session, the trustee-liaison to the Self Study involved the trustees in a dialog by facilitating a discussion of the content and potential responses to those standards that relate to the Board of Trustees. [Ref. 13] This discussion increased their awareness not only of the WASC standards and the Board role, but also of how specific standards relate to areas of Board operations and policy that are, or need to be, formally documented.

**IV.B.1.j.** The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

The Board hires a Chief Executive Officer, with the title of Chancellor, and delegates to him/her the day-to-day operation of the District and the drafting of the multi-year plans required for the future of the College. The documents attesting to the search, hiring, and retention of the Chancellor demonstrate that the Board takes the ability and autonomy of the Chancellor very seriously, and that in so doing it considers the many community stakeholders in the selection process. Documents such as the Board Self Evaluation show how Board responsibility is delineated from executive authority through workshop, retreat, instruction, and acculturation. [Ref. 18] Second, documents from the Policy Manual and the Employment Agreement show full delegation of authority to the Chancellor.
[Refs. 3, 19] Third, documents from the annual Management Plan and the Chancellor’s Monthly Reports to the Board indicate that the Chancellor bears full administrative responsibility for setting goals, objectives, performance standards, and evaluation for all segments of College instruction, services, operations, finance, and management. [Refs. 21, 31] Fourth, evidence from the Chancellor’s Self Evaluation and from sample instruments used by faculty and administrators, shows that the interests of the Board, community, faculty, classified staff, and administrators have been incorporated into the assessment of the Chancellor, his goals, objectives, and performance. [Refs. 22, 23] The documentation reflects how seriously CCSF accepts the appointment of its chief executive, how carefully it examines the executive’s performance, and how valued to the enterprise the principal of executive authority is within the Shared Governance System. The evidence presented clearly demonstrates that CCSF has a superior track record in meeting or exceeding both demands of this standard. In the future, the Board’s selection process for new chancellors will be described in its Administrative Regulations. [Ref. 3]

IV.B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

IV.B.2.a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

IV.B.2.b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

- establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
- ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;
- ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and
- establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

IV.B.2.c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

IV.B.2.e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

The Chancellor has shown considerable leadership, both philosophical and executive. The Chancellor’s responsibility and authority are apparent, as is the delegated administrative, faculty, staff, and student structures supporting the institution, the means of communication with constituencies, and the delegation of responsibility to appropriate administrative divisions that, in turn, effectively integrate educational and resource planning.

Chancellor Philip R. Day Jr. arrived at City College of San Francisco in September 1998. During the ensuing six years, he has provided effective leadership for the College in all aspects of the operations of CCSF. The following is a summary of the evidence of his exemplary leadership:
The Chancellor established a comprehensive and integrated budgeting, planning, and assessment system which is led by the Planning, and Budgeting Council, a Shared Governance organization of which he is chair. The PBC comprises representatives from students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators. The PBC includes all the leaders of the College organizations. The College maintains an integrated system of planning development on an annual basis that is directly linked to budgeting and assessment. The College produces Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment Reports on the status of its objectives each year. [Refs. 32, 33] Consistent with the requirements of the planning and budgeting system, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants produces a College Performance Indicators Report that assesses the progress of performance indicators linked to the eight strategic priorities of the College. [Ref. 25] The College is also guided by an annual management plan that is comprised of the College budget and the operational and developmental objectives for each of the 32 major cost centers in the College. [Refs. 20, 24]

The Chancellor has also established an extensive array of planning initiatives that includes an Education Master Plan, Technology Plan, Facilities Master Plan, and a Strategic Plan. Each plan has been developed in collaboration with all College constituencies.

Led by the Chancellor, the College’s strategic planning process involves all College constituencies as well as representatives from the community, business, and other educational institutions. The planning process was informed by an extensive set of environmental scanning reports on both the internal and external realities of the College. The Chancellor led the planning process through an extensive series of conversations that resulted in the development of a revised Mission Statement, a new values statement and eight strategic priorities with supporting objectives that are now the core of the College’s planning and performance evaluation system.

The Chancellor oversees the research function of the College, which produces a series of annual reports and assessments for the College Planning and Budgeting System. The Office of Research, Planning and Grants also maintains an online Decision Support System that enables members of the College community to access the College database for information about student enrollments and registrations, student success, and department productivity.

The Chancellor’s administrative structure is highly efficient. Fewer than 40 administrators (not including classified managers) are responsible for oversight of 2,900 employees and more than 98,000 students in 12 campuses. The Chancellor relies upon three administrative chains, in addition to his own, to ensure that all annual operational and developmental objectives are achieved; these chains are student development, academic affairs, and finance and administration. Coordination and leadership is managed through direct contact with the Vice Chancellors as well as bi-weekly meetings of the Chancellor’s Cabinet, monthly meetings of the College Council—comprised of all administrators and department chairs—and the College Advisory Council, a Shared Governance unit comprised of the leadership of all the College organizations: Academic Senate, Department Chairperson Council, Classified Senate, SEIU 790, AFT 2121, the Associated Students, the Administrators’ Association, and the Vice Chancellors. The Chancellor also meets at least once a month with the leadership councils of each of these respective constituencies. In addition, the Chancellor is in daily contact with his senior staff on all issues related to budget control and expenditures as well as key College projects authorized by the College’s annual plan.

The Chancellor also communicates with a quarterly e-bulletin to the community and with periodic messages to CCSF employees through the wide area email system, City Currents, and a monthly report to the Board of Trustees.
In 2001, City College of San Francisco received an overwhelming endorsement from the voters in the City and County of San Francisco when they approved by 72 percent a facilities bond issue. The endorsement of CCSF by the electorate is part of the growing amount of evidence of the success of the College in reaching a great diversity of constituencies in the city. Among the outreach activities directed by the Chancellor are regular meetings with City and County officials, participation on the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and the Workforce Investment Board, direct communication with local community organizations, and regular meetings with leadership of other educational institutions in the region. The Chancellor also distributes an annual report on the College to all residents of San Francisco. [Ref. 30]
III. Strengths & Areas for Improvement

1. The College has an effective Shared Governance System that clearly articulates the roles and responsibilities of all members of the College community. While the system was formulated in 1993, the ideals around which it was created have progressed into a working practical reality in the years since the last accreditation review. The Chancellor’s leadership efforts have been crucial in bringing about a fully functioning governance system which is supported by and informed by a structured system for planning based on research, inclusive communication, and consensus building. The system has been evaluated at regular intervals and the most recent evaluation (October, 2004) provides significant evidence that Shared Governance at City College of San Francisco is valued and respected by all constituencies. That evaluation resulted in several recommendations that focus on expanding participation in the Shared Governance System and continuing the biennial evaluation process. Those recommendations should be implemented.

2. The College has clearly delineated the responsibilities of administration and the role of the Board of Trustees in the governance of the institution. The Board has enriched its oversight of the institution by creating regular monthly study sessions to supplement the regular meeting schedule at which the mandated business of the Board is conducted. The Board has actively participated in the development of planning documents and has initiated several studies to assess the effectiveness of the College in meeting its mission. The College is guided by the Board Policy Manual; however, the Board should adopt a calendar for regular systematic review and the updating of its policies. In addition, the Board should update the Policy Manual in regard to Statements of Economic Interest and annual Board evaluation, improving the connection between Program Review and other College planning processes, and having the Board accept reports by means of a formal resolution process. The Board delegates responsibility and authority for governance of the institution to the Chancellor. The Chancellor works with the delegated administrative, faculty, staff, and student structures supporting the institution, the means of communication with constituencies, and delegates responsibility to appropriate administrative divisions that, in turn, effectively integrate educational and resource planning.
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THEME ESSAYS
INTRODUCTION TO THE THEME ESSAYS

In Spring 2004, the College Advisory Council and the Chancellor agreed that this Accreditation Self Study would be conducted in two phases: first, an assessment of the College’s compliance with the standards of the Accrediting Commission, culminating in a set of co-chair reports; and second, the development of a set of six Theme Essays based on the themes identified by the Accrediting Commission. The College had extensive experience developing traditional self studies in a shared governance environment; however, the creation of coherent and insightful essays around conceptual themes posed new challenges. The traditional structure of standards committees with co-chairs could be used as the model for standards co-chair reports that focused on the institution’s comprehensive response to the standards. However, the effectiveness of the Theme Essays in communicating the more ephemeral aspects of institutional culture and values would require more emphasis on the perspective that the essay presented rather than on the comprehensiveness of its content. Therefore, each theme committee had a lead writer and a primary reader. The committees gathered, reviewed, and evaluated evidence. The lead writer and primary reader developed the essay drafts that were then reviewed and revised by the committee and eventually approved by the Steering Committee.

Since the College was in “uncharted territory” developing a self study in two phases (Standards Reports and Theme Essays), the Accreditation Work Group (the Steering Committee’s leadership council) provided templates and guidelines for both the Standards Reports and the Theme Essays, that were modified as the self-study process progressed. The primary guidance for the focus of the Theme Essays was drawn from the Accrediting Commission’s description of the themes. While each theme committee was given considerable discretion over the specific content and style of their essay, a basic format was established. Each essay would have four major components: (1) an overview of the essay itself; (2) an institutional context designed to provide insights into the institutional culture and values related to the theme using selected examples of processes and practices across the College; (3) one or more detailed case studies that serve as exemplars of the College’s “pursuit of institutional excellence and improvement, [and] an ‘ongoing self-reflective dialogue’”¹ related to the themes; and (4) a conclusion and future directions section designed to assess strengths and areas for improvement.

The Work Group and the Steering Committee had an active dialog throughout both phases of the Self Study on how much the Standards Reports and the Theme Essays should cross reference each other. The original Standards Reports contained a section on the relationship of each of those reports to each of the themes. Most of the original Theme Essays contained selected references to the standards, but did not attempt to directly address the standards comprehensively. While these efforts to cross reference the two phases were a productive part of the development of the Self Study, it was determined that their inclusion in the final report made the document unnecessarily repetitive and long. Therefore, the final self study document provides the Standards Reports, with comprehensive evidence that the College meets or exceeds the standards established by the Accrediting Commission, and the Theme Essays, that provide insight into the way the College functions, the values it holds, and selected examples of good practice related to themes found within the standards.

The Theme Essays utilize informal case studies to focus on our processes: “What do we do? How do we do it? Why do we do it that way? How effective are these processes?” Each essay tries to capture not only what we have accomplished, but also the values that motivate us and the culture that supports (and sometimes inhibits) these accomplishments. Several of the essays, for example, use our efforts to address basic skills issues as examples of our commitment to quality education and student learning outcomes.

These essays show how activities that started in a few departments (Math and English) spread to other departments (ESL, Transitional Studies, Learning Assistance) and eventually found a voice in a renewed institution-wide effort to address the needs of students with basic skills deficiencies (the Enhanced Self-Study and the revitalized Basic Skills Subcommittee). At the same time, the Chancellor made basic skills a central part of the strategic planning process, and the Office of Research, Planning and Grants developed resources to fund a variety of initiatives that grew out of these institutional dialogs on basic skills.

Dialog is the topic of one of the Theme Essays but descriptions of institutional dialog are found throughout the essays. For example, the Planning and Evaluation essay (Theme 4) describes how the dialog around the Program Review in the Architecture Department led to a rethinking of not only the Architecture program but also the need to collaborate with related departments and disciplines. The English as a Second Language Department uses a promotional testing model to not only assess individual students’ progress in a specific course, but also as the basis for departmental dialog on the effectiveness of the program’s structure and courses. The dialog essay (Theme 3) shows the different ways we dialog with each other and how each College constituency (faculty, staff, administrators, and students) can either initiate the dialog or become an active participant in it.

As with dialog, every essay provides a reflection on the organization of the College. There are references to both the formal organization (departments, administrative offices, and shared governance bodies) and the informal organization (cross departmental collaborations, peer contacts, developmental initiatives such as SCANS and the Multicultural Infusion Project). The essay on organization focuses on two different aspects of a large academic department (Biology), looking first at the way the department functions within the formal and informal structures of the College, and second, at the impact of a major, primarily externally funded, initiative (Biotechnology) on the department and the services it provides to students.

Similarly, issues of integrity and honesty, while the focus of Theme 6, can be found in all of the essays. The validity and usefulness of common testing instruments is a central issue for English and ESL in Theme Essays 1 and 2. A major study on student success in basic skills courses and retention programs provides useful information about outcomes, but the real integrity of the institution relies on how that information is used. The discussion of the initial efforts of the Student Development Division to develop measures of student learning outcomes portrays a group of faculty and administrators working to create true and useful assessments of effectiveness in producing outcomes that are difficult to measure and attribute to a specific department or service. Truly productive dialog can only occur in an atmosphere of trust and respect among the internal members of the College community and between the College and communities it serves, as illustrated in Theme 3. Good planning requires valid evaluations of programs and services. As Theme 4 suggests, when the participating parties are actively involved in the rigorous evaluation of their mission and accomplishments, the planning and program development has integrity. The essay on integrity and honesty, Theme 6, focuses on the way we govern ourselves, evaluate our institutional effectiveness, and communicate our findings to the College community and the San Francisco communities we serve.

As noted in the “Reader’s Guide to the CCSF Accreditation Self Study” in the introduction to this document, this Self Study has been organized around the assumption that the Standards Reports will be read before the Theme Essays. Once the reader has assessed the institution’s comprehensive compliance with the standards from the Standards Reports, the Theme Essays will give the reader a more effective and affective understanding of the institution’s values and culture. The conclusions from both the Standards Reports and the Theme Essays are then brought together in a section that addresses the Major Findings, providing the reader with a clear picture of what we do, why we do it, how we do it, and where we want to go from this point forward.
THEME TAB I
THEME I: Institutional Commitment to High-Quality Education

The institution demonstrates a commitment to student learning by providing high quality education congruent with institutional mission. The entire institution participates in reviewing institutional performance and participating in the college’s planning process for improvement of student learning outcomes to help the institution sustain its commitment to student learning. The institution regularly reviews and reflects upon its mission statement and modifies the mission whenever appropriate.
I. Overview

This essay provides the institutional context for a case study that focuses on basic skills programs within the College as an illustration of the institution’s commitment to high-quality education. It first defines “institutional commitment” and “high-quality education,” providing an overview of how we achieve both. It then discusses the alignment of CCSF’s Mission with the planning process and describes how this process yields strategic priorities for the College that can readily be mapped back to the Mission. One of CCSF’s eight strategic priorities focuses solely on basic skills, and the need for attention to basic skills is referenced throughout the remaining priorities. This fact, along with the foundational importance of basic skills mastery for greater student success in subsequent coursework, underpins the rationale for selecting basic skills as a case study that illustrates how the institution demonstrates a commitment to high-quality education through this focus. The case study, then, chronicles the evolution of CCSF’s emphasis on basic skills generally, and describes, in particular, interventions implemented as the result of grant funding in the two areas of greatest need, English and Math; the ways in which the institution measures progress and uses that information to inform practice at the classroom, direct service, and administrative levels; and how the institution continues to promote and support this emphasis through resource development, policy changes, and structural modifications.

II. Institutional Context

The Meaning of Institutional Commitment to High-Quality Education. WASC, through Standard I.B., suggests that an institution exhibits “commitment” when it “demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning [through measuring, assessing, and adapting learning as necessary] ... [and] organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning.” Similarly, “high-quality education,” as defined by the contents of WASC Standard II, centers around the extent to which programs are “systematically assessed in order to ... improve teaching and learning strategies and achieve stated student learning outcomes” and the extent to which the college “identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics and economy of its communities” through the use of appropriate “delivery modes and teaching methodologies,” recognizing throughout the “central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.” This definition encompasses instruction, student support, and other services.

A Bird’s-Eye View of CCSF’s Commitment to High-Quality Education. CCSF is committed to high-quality education (including academic programs, student support, and other services) at all levels through 130 certificate programs, 34 awards of achievement, and 11 formal majors. One of CCSF’s largest programs (second to English as a Second Language, as indicated below), is its School of Business, employing roughly 150 faculty. Up to 60 percent of all students who transferred to San Francisco State University from CCSF began their college education in the School of Business; this statistic serves as an indicator suggesting that the School of Business’ educational programs are of high quality. While CCSF continues to deliver and assess its traditional academic programs, often on a large scale as in the case of Business, it also explores new frontiers in response to industry need in other areas of study. For example, the innovative “Design Collaborative” brings together faculty from Architecture, Art, Graphic Communications, Multimedia Studies, and Photography to develop design-related courses, leading to a formal major in design that addresses the needs of the local design community by virtue of promoting collaboration across design-related disciplines.
In the area of student support services, CCSF recently restructured its Counseling Department to better meet the needs of students, driven by a comprehensive assessment of the student services system and the Student Development Education Master Plan. Rather than a “one size fits all” approach, the once “General Counseling” Department is now divided into four basic departments: New Student Counseling, Continuing Student Counseling, International Student Counseling, and Transfer Student Counseling. In addition to the reorganization, the various counseling departments are beginning to utilize a case management approach better suited to meeting individual students’ needs.

Of particular note, given its relationship to basic skills, is CCSF’s success in reaching out to immigrant students, primarily through English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, as supported by its recent receipt of the 2004 MetLife Foundation Community College Excellence Award. Through both noncredit and credit instruction, the ESL Department provides access to the English-speaking world and to the diverse cultures of the United States. It enables students to gain the language skills necessary to move into vocational- and academic-track coursework, transfer to four-year institutions, live and work in the United States, and succeed in English-speaking environments. ESL is the largest department at CCSF with over 130 course offerings (with multiple sections) and more than 360 faculty members.

The MetLife award recognized CCSF’s accomplishment in the areas of innovation, institution-wide commitment, and improved outcomes based on careful assessment of strategies that promote access, retention, and completion for students from underserved populations. In particular, the brochure announcing the award commends CCSF’s strategic planning process, data collection and analysis (particularly through the Decision Support System), and its “sophisticated and varied education program [serving] the city’s immigrants.” This brochure concludes that:

CCSF has channeled its remarkable entrepreneurial energy by using data to assess progress and identify service gaps and by soliciting input from community leaders and residents. Its commitment to improvement and to serving an incredibly diverse community is evident across both the credit programs and the non-credit, pre-college programs that make up a large proportion of CCSF offerings. (MetLife Foundation 2004 Community College Excellence Award brochure)

CCSF’s Mission and Planning Process: The Mechanisms for Committing to High-Quality Education. All of CCSF’s instructional and support programs, such as those cited above, flow from its Mission and Vision Statements. The Mission Statement addresses the core educational purposes of the College’s programs and services, including preparation for transfer, achievement of associate degrees, acquisition of career skills, engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizenship preparation, completion of GED and adult education, promotion of economic development, and lifelong learning and cultural enrichment. The Mission Statement is supplemented by a Vision Statement that describes the College’s commitment to high-quality teaching and learning across the full spectrum of educational offerings. It defines the College’s intended population as “the diverse communities and populations found throughout San Francisco,” and points to the creation of “an inclusive community with respect for and enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding, and a commitment to sharing educational resources and contributing to knowledge, expertise, and innovation in postsecondary education in the state, nation, and world.”

The Mission and Vision Statements provide the basis and context for strategic planning, annual planning, annual assessment, and the implementation of programs and services at all of the College’s campuses and sites. Since the last Self Study for Accreditation, the College conducted comprehensive strategic planning sessions involving over 50 participants from the College community (both internal and external to the

---

2 See Definition of Basic Skills within the section entitled “Institutional Commitment to Basic Skills: Rationale for the Case Study.”
College), and refined the Mission Statement based on that review. The Strategic Plan articulates objectives that focus on each of the elements of the Mission Statement and specifically addresses each of the commitments articulated in the Vision Statement. To ensure that the Strategic Plan became a living and driving force in the annual planning and budgeting process, Strategic Plan Implementation Schedules were developed that describe the timetable and identify the key staff members responsible for ensuring implementation of the Plan.

Short- and long-term planning and decision making is supported by a Decision Support System (DSS) that provides a broad range of data on institutional effectiveness and student outcomes, including demand for courses, student demographics, productivity analyses, and student persistence and success rates. It is a web-based system, interfacing with the Banner student information database, that permits the review of current data on specific student groups and characteristics (i.e., demographics) or program characteristics (e.g., student goals, educational backgrounds, etc.), as well as data on each of the College’s departments, schools, and campuses.

Using the DSS as a vehicle for harvesting data, the College uses various forms of assessment to evaluate its effectiveness in meeting its Mission. College Performance Indicators have been established that address such areas as student access, retention, skills development, graduation, and job placement. These College Performance Indicators are rooted in the Strategic Plan, and an annual report is generated that tracks the College’s performance using the indicators. The College also initiates comprehensive studies related to specific strategic priorities, making available qualitative and quantitative data for planning, budgeting, and developing new initiatives. In addition, the College has a systematic process for Program Review (for a qualitative analysis of Program Review, please refer to the Standards Reports). Academic and student services departments complete these reviews within a six-year cycle.

Institutional Commitment to Basic Skills: Rationale for the Case Study. Of the eight Strategic Priorities set forth in the Strategic Plan, one entire priority is dedicated to basic skills instruction and support based on the College’s recognition that mastery of basic skills is critical for college success, in essence serving as a gateway to further education. The aim of this strategic priority is: “To ensure student access, progress, success and transfer readiness through an effective and expanded approach to improving basic skills, remediation, and transitional studies including instruction, academic and student support services, and other services as necessary.” Moreover, references to the needs of basic skills students, both direct and indirect, appear throughout the remaining Strategic Priorities. Indirect references include, but are not limited to: sharing data with local high schools about student needs (such that, in particular, students entering from high school are better prepared for college-level work); identifying and publicizing practices that promote student success (including contextual and experiential learning strategies); assuring a full range of student support services across all campuses; expanding retention programs for historically underserved and underrepresented students; recognizing and teaching to diverse learning styles; incorporating multicultural perspectives into the curriculum where appropriate; and exploring high-pay, high-skill jobs in communities such as Mission Bay and the Third Street Corridor (both areas in which residents tend to be historically underserved and underrepresented and of low socioeconomic status).

As this summary implies, issues of diversity and student support are critical to the success of basic skills students given that students who place into the pre-collegiate basic skills course sequence are more likely to be historically underserved and underrepresented and are more likely to succeed with additional support, whether financial or academic, as substantiated in the “Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Reports” issued by CCSF’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants. This summary also underscores the
need for professional development of faculty and staff to address these issues. The Strategic Plan 2003-2008 also sets forth five imperatives “that must permeate the execution of each and every priority in the plan.” Two of these imperatives in particular relate to basic skills instruction and support; one that insists that “all Strategic Priorities must address and guide the whole College, with consistent application to both credit and noncredit instructional programs and structures at the College, particularly as relating to student support services, retention activities, career pathways assistance, and transfer assistance” and another that requires that all Strategic Priorities “provide for and promote diversity at all levels of the organization, purposefully contributing to a climate which fosters high morale, improved performance, and greater connectedness for all College constituencies and the community.”

**Definition of basic skills.** Several key disciplines within the College encompass basic skills. These are: ESL, Transitional Studies, English, and Math. The College generally divides its educational courses in these areas into two categories, pre-collegiate and college-level. Students entering CCSF take placement tests that determine whether they are prepared to enter college-level courses (the range of courses one normally associates with higher education that qualify for college-level credit at the California State University and University of California campuses). If not, they place into the pre-collegiate course sequence, which includes all courses below college level. Within this sequence, “basic skills” courses are a lower-end subset of courses in English, Math, ESL, and Transitional Studies (which offers free, noncredit instruction in Adult Basic Education, including adult high school diplomas and preparation for the General Education Development, or GED, test). The English, Math, and selected ESL basic skills courses are credit courses while another selection of ESL and all Transitional Studies basic skills courses are noncredit. Basic skills courses are not degree applicable. CCSF is unusual in that it offers a large number of noncredit programs that provide greater access to postsecondary education, often for the most economically and educationally disadvantaged; in fact, 59 percent of associate degree recipients appear to have enrolled in noncredit courses or programs at some point along the way.3

**Importance of basic skills to student success.** Mastery of basic skills is vital for students to continue on and succeed in college. In essence, pre-collegiate basic skills courses serve as a gateway for students; if they persist through the sequence, they are more likely to succeed as measured by rates of degree attainment, transfer, and employment. Of interesting note is an analysis presented within CCSF’s “Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Report, Part 1.” This analysis (contained in Table 10 of the report) suggests that students who place into the pre-collegiate sequence—but at the same time enroll in college-level courses—perform at lower levels than those students who place into college-level courses. Specifically, lower-level pre-collegiate (basic skills) students exhibit a success rate of 56.7 percent in college-level courses, whereas those in the upper-level pre-collegiate sequence exhibit a success rate of 72.4 percent in college-level courses, and those who place initially into college-level courses succeed at a rate of 86 percent in those courses. Thus, it appears that the lower the level of basic skills mastery, the less likely students are to succeed in college-level courses, supporting the claim that basic skills courses serve as a gateway for students.

**Student placement and success in basic skills: Research findings as an instigator of change.** It is disheartening then, to discover the large percentage of students who place into basic skills courses at CCSF, and the large percentage of students who do not successfully complete those courses. In Fall 1999, for example, 48.3 percent of all new, first-time students placed into basic skills courses. Of particular concern to the College is the fact that African American, Filipino, and Latino students are more likely to place into basic skills courses and are even less likely to succeed in those courses than other students (for more information, please see the “Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Report - Part 1: Demand, Supply and Student Success”).

---

These findings called attention to a significant problem that has become of foundational importance to the College and is worthy of closer examination as an example of CCSF’s institutional commitment to high-quality education. The case study below focuses on the College’s struggle with the lowest end of the basic skills continuum in Math and English. Because of this struggle, the College has in recent years dedicated significant time and resources to addressing these issues, demonstrating significant commitment to delivering high-quality education. The case study below focuses on the struggle the College has faced with respect to basic skills instruction in these two areas in particular; although the case study calls out various student support services available to students, it does so only to provide context rather than to examine these additional services in depth.

III. Case Study

The Evolving and Deepening Focus on Basic Skills. CCSF’s institutional focus on basic skills began taking shape with the award of a Title III, Strengthening Institutions, grant from the U.S. Department of Education in Fall 2002, the need for which emerged in part because of the findings of the Enhanced Self-Study and the subsequent strategic planning activities conducted in Spring 2002 that called out a need for focusing on basic skills programming (as noted above). At that time, CCSF began a journey to revamp the systems and activities relating to basic skills success, including the development of enrollment systems, from electronic educational plans and early alert systems to academic progress reviews and degree audits. In addition, Title III activities have focused on improving ancillary academic support for students in basic skills such as enhanced laboratory support.

At the same time, CCSF’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants reported that a significant proportion of students entering from high school place in basic skills courses (at that time 45 percent placed into basic skills English while 35 percent placed into basic skills Math, rising to 50 percent in Fall 2003 for basic skills English with basic skills Math placements holding steady), requiring substantial remediation before attempting college-level courses. Thus, in Spring 2003, CCSF pursued and received a $143,000 grant from the Koret Foundation. With an additional $50,000 gift, the College launched an initiative to improve basic skills instruction in Mathematics and English (termed the “Basic Skills Initiative”), leveraging the work in Title III.

During initial implementation and funding of the Basic Skills Initiative, as expected, CCSF found that creating a community for basic skills students at CCSF generates student success. That is, when faculty and staff increase time for contact among and between students, tutors, and instructors, add structure to courses, and foster community, students are more likely to succeed. In English, this translates to a more integrated curriculum, more interaction among instructors, and additional time with tutors. In Mathematics, this translates to a move toward more guided instruction and an overall time-on-task increase for students. (See also the section of this case study entitled, “Results and Outcomes of the Basic Skills Initiative” for more details.)

To build on these very encouraging improvements, and to deepen its understanding of best practices, the College requested and received additional funding from Koret in the amount of $160,000. However, funds had not been available for formal professional development, a component essential to advancing the College’s work in basic skills. Thus, CCSF submitted a proposal to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, at their invitation, for support of professional development along with the ultimate goal of increased, ongoing collaboration among key departments and initiatives within the College. The College received this grant in January 2005. The
need to synchronize the activities and findings of the Mathematics and English Departments with those of Transitional Studies, ESL, the Basic Skills Subcommittee and Diversity Committee is critical at this juncture. However, instruction and student support in English and Math have been the primary target of the Basic Skills Initiative for reform with grants, and, while other departments within the basic skills realm have, to a greater or lesser degree, also sought grants for improvement, the efforts of all departments had not been coordinated with each other on a larger scale until recently. That is, the College is only now starting to see the coordination among all basic skills areas and, on a very small scale, the transfer of basic skills considerations to other disciplines, in large part through the activities of the Diversity Committee and Basic Skills Subcommittee, the activities of which have begun to overlap (described in the following section).

**Expanding and Enhancing the Focus on Basic Skills throughout the Institution.** Through the Diversity Committee and Basic Skills Subcommittee of CCSF’s Shared Governance System, faculty, staff and administrators have begun expanding and enhancing the focus on basic skills. That is, both committees include faculty and staff from a variety of disciplines and service areas (for example, the Basic Skills Subcommittee includes roughly 50 faculty and staff from departments such as English, ESL, Math, New Student Counseling, Continuing Student Counseling, Learning Assistance, EOPS, and the targeted student retention programs described in the section “Beyond Instruction: Additional Support for Basic Skills Students”).

The Diversity Committee was revived in Fall 2002, when a group of CCSF students expressed their feelings that CCSF curricula generally placed too little emphasis on content and pedagogy that reflected the rich diversity of the San Francisco Bay Area, let alone the world at large. In response to this concern, the Chancellor convened a working group to consider the ways in which CCSF could incorporate and/or enhance multicultural perspectives in its curricula. A critical outgrowth of the Diversity Committee has been the Multicultural Infusion Project, a professional development program that provides faculty with the incentives, time, and resources to revamp their curricula and teaching methods to increase their focus on multicultural issues. The project focuses on helping faculty to not only infuse multicultural content and perspectives into the curriculum, but also expand teaching strategies to meet the needs of a diverse student population. The Committee has also hosted a series of Diversity Institutes to address these issues in workshop and seminar settings.

The Basic Skills Subcommittee began meeting in Fall 2003 to (1) address the CCSF Strategic Plan Priority focusing on Basic Skills; (2) read and discuss articles on basic skills and “best practices” at other community colleges, with the goal of forming recommendations for CCSF; and (3) address CCSF’s Enhanced Self-Study recommendations for Basic Skills.

In the past, these committees had generally operated on parallel but separate paths; however, the College has recognized that the multiple factors that influence teaching and learning in socially and culturally diverse classrooms cannot be separated from the content and pedagogy of those classrooms.

Another emerging (but not yet existing) resource to support the dissemination of information on basic skills is a teaching and learning website for faculty, to be developed with Title III funding. The website will provide faculty and staff throughout the College with centralized access to a variety of resources in basic skills instruction and link to the Multicultural Infusion Project’s website to support the infusion of multiculturalism across the curriculum.

**Using Data to Inform Practice.** As referenced earlier, a significant event was the release of a “Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Report” (Parts 1 and 2). This report was first issued in April 2004 by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants in response to a request by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to produce an annual review of student progress through pre-collegiate courses in English, Math, and ESL, and of related retention/success programs. Part 1 focuses on demand, supply, and student
success (analyzing the progress of students through the College’s pre-collegiate programs in English, Mathematics, and English as a Second Language); Part 2 focuses on retention/success programs and the extent to which they foster greater achievement levels. Together, they provide information about (1) the scope and size of the student population needing pre-collegiate competencies (including basic skills); (2) support programs the College provides for these students; and (3) the level of success of these programs.

These reports are also a good example of how research efforts interface with planning that maps back to the College Mission. In particular, they gave the then newly rejuvenated Basic Skills Subcommittee a basis for a comprehensive analysis of best practices. In addition, each of the involved departments has used data in the report to evaluate and modify its instructional programs, as discussed below.

Within the Koret-funded efforts in particular, involving all members of the Koret team in a data-driven process of decision making has played a key role in fostering conversations among faculty and administrators that have allowed faculty and staff to take a hard look at quantitative and qualitative data collected and analyzed by an external evaluator, connect the data findings to differences in practice, identify the elements that appear to be most successful and those that need improvement, and modify our approach accordingly. In essence, it is the reflection on evaluation findings that has provided the greatest amount of professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators alike, helping the College to identify and promote best practices.

Results and Outcomes of the Basic Skills Initiative. This section of the case study focuses in particular on instructional practices relating to basic skills, primarily funded by the Koret, Carnegie, and Hewlett Foundations, with less attention to other aspects of the Basic Skills Initiative such as those funded by Title III.

To date, the Initiative has focused on 26 Math sections and 17 English sections, serving a total of 1,251 students (850 in Math and 401 in English; see descriptions of activities below). Overall, 93 percent of those served were non-White. Latinos comprised the largest group of participants at 29 percent (357 students) followed by African Americans at 25 percent (312 students). The Initiative is currently targeting six English (six paired English 9 and 90 sections) and eight Math sections, which altogether serve nearly 500 students.

Faculty and staff members from English and Math have traveled to the Kellogg Institute during summer (one in 2002 and two in 2003) for faculty development with the National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE). The participation of these three individuals in the NCDE program has had a significant influence on the activities of each Department, which we describe below.

English activities past, present & future. In 1997 (a year prior to the institutional focus on basic skills) the English Department initiated an effort to better understand the progress and success of their students. A commissioned study showed that students concurrently enrolled in both a reading course and a writing course passed more frequently than students enrolled in just one of these courses. In response to these results, in 1999 the English Department created the Learning Communities Program (later dissolved due to funding shortfalls) in which related courses would be linked through content, ideas, and activities.

Based on these earlier developments, the Koret-funded English improvement strategy in basic skills as of 2003 has focused on the integration of reading (English 9) and writing (English 90). Specifically, the English Department has linked sections of each (when possible, scheduling the courses back to back so that instructors have a longer block of time with students). In doing so, the English faculty have worked on creating a more integrated curriculum that features increased interaction among instructors and additional time with tutors. Linking the courses has required faculty to meet weekly to discuss how they can connect the activities of one course section with those of the other. For example, students in the reading
course read an article supplemental to the topic they later write about in the writing course. While reading the article, students learn how to annotate and practice doing so. When students are learning to write thesis statements and to write main points in the writing course, they identify the thesis statement and main points in the supplemental article to further reinforce their learning.

Evaluation of these efforts showed greatly improved student performance by Spring 2004, particularly for Latino/a students (measured by successful completion rates). In general, students who passed the linked reading/writing courses have been able to successfully skip over the subsequent course in the English curriculum. Yet student progress in writing skills has been greater than that of students in reading. Given this finding, faculty are now targeting reading as an area for improvement. However, the Department has found it difficult to find qualified reading instructors for adult students, and thus has identified a need to train more instructors in reading in order to continue to expand linked course offerings and to improve reading instruction more generally.

In addition, during a Summer 2004 retreat, English faculty began creating entry and exit maps for students in which they have identified the level of knowledge and skills that students must possess in order to enter English 9 and 90 and those that they must possess in order to succeed to the next level. These entry/exit maps will also help them standardize the content of English 9 and 90 curricula to ensure that students are receiving instruction conducive to gaining these skills and knowledge.

At this stage, the Department has begun to redesign the basic skills English curriculum by rewriting the course outlines for English 9 and 90 based on the entry and exit maps described above. As noted, the linking of courses has yielded promising results. However, preliminary results suggest that an intensive, blended reading and writing course (that would ultimately replace at least some current linked courses) may be an even more powerful approach to supporting student learning. Thus, while the Department is refining the linked courses, it will simultaneously explore how best to design and offer a blended “megacourse.”

Accompanying the effort to create exit and entry maps (referenced above) has been a recognition that current placement tests do not sufficiently distinguish student abilities at the lower levels; in light of this, the English Department plans to develop more accurate testing instruments. That is, students who place into basic skills do not represent one level of skill, nor do they all exhibit the same learning styles. Thus, the College has determined that it needs to develop an assessment tool or tools to better distinguish among students who place into basic skills in order to design more intensive, tailored support for those students who may not benefit from the standard basic skills interventions that it has been developing.

In addition, the English Department is eager to fill the gap in their evaluation of students’ needs by creating new assessment strategies to better evaluate and aid student progress. Included in their plans is devising a way to measure affective changes in students with respect to reading and writing. Faculty have recognized that, often, negative student attitudes toward these subject areas create barriers to success, and determining how classroom activities can help shift these attitudes will improve student success. Faculty have targeted portfolios as one assessment strategy that they believe will better allow them to measure student learning outcomes; they will implement this strategy and explore others as appropriate.

English Department faculty have also developed a standardized grading rubric that promotes consistent evaluation of student outcomes. The next year will include a focus on implementing and refining these rubrics so the expectations and grading will be uniform throughout the Department.

Tutors, through the Koret grant, have begun to participate in classroom instruction, but they have generally done so in a passive manner (observing the class) rather than by actively supporting students one-on-one during class. During the coming semesters, faculty will work with tutors to design better
methods for their participation. Many of the current tutors are students, which results in high turnover. Given this, and the positive experience of the Math Lab in employing professional tutors (see “Math activities past, present & future”), one of the goals of the English Department will be to hire more professional tutors (classified employees) who will remain employed for longer periods and form a learning community that addresses long-term change in the same way that the Math Lab has.

With Title III funding, the English Department is also working to improve lab instruction, which, in the past, was unstructured and not sufficiently integrated with classroom work. Students go to the lab on their own time (students in Koret-supported sections are required to spend 32 hours in the lab per semester) and can select from a variety of activities that are becoming increasingly linked, with Title III funding, directly to classroom outcomes. That is, English faculty are beginning to devote time to identifying lab activities that correspond best to each week of classroom instruction such that they can give students specific assignments for the lab.

Math activities past, present & future. Math activities in the realm of basic skills have focused primarily on determining the best format for delivering instruction, as well as on tutoring and workshops to accompany classroom teaching. In the realm of formal classroom instruction, the Basic Skills Initiative has targeted courses at the E level, a grouping of courses at the same basic skill level that are offered in a variety of formats. The traditional format for these courses has been self-paced over the course of 17 weeks (one semester). The Math Department subsequently realized that the 17-week model was not producing the desired pass rates and began offering several 7-week self-paced sections in addition to the 17-week sections in Fall 1992. Then, in Fall 2002, in response to the fact that pass rates were still not optimal, the Department opened up a new, lecture-based variant of E level courses which became known as E3 while the “traditional” 7- and 17-week courses became known as E1. Over time, in part with Koret funding as of Spring 2003, the College has been testing these different models, including another variant on E1 that includes workshop tutoring support as well.

To date, the College has found that students in the E3 classes (both with and without an associated workshop) pass at significantly higher rates than students enrolled in the E1 self-paced class (again, the “original” basic skills course). The E1 pass rate has remained relatively steady from Spring 2003 through Fall 2004. Performance in fall semesters is generally higher than in spring for E3 courses, but the general trend is that E3 student pass rates are not only much higher than performance in E1, but also are increasing modestly when comparing Fall 2004 to Spring 2003. Based on these findings, the College is in the process of reducing the number of traditional E1 sections available and replacing most of them with E3 sections until the time that an optimal balance between the two is achieved. This is not without caution; the Department has found that a certain number of students will always prefer the self-paced model (e.g., those who test into basic skills Math but in reality have enough Math background to quickly pass into the next level of Math, 840). The Department has also initially found that students who enroll in Elementary Algebra after passing E3 have not exhibited pass rates as high as those who enroll in Elementary Algebra after passing E1. The College is continuing to examine these differences.

In addition to the Department’s exploration of how best to structure classes, faculty have begun collectively investigating specific pedagogies and activities to engage students, based on their realization that the materials (e.g., worksheets) used in the E sections, although designed to promote learning, have not radically improved student success rates. An informal group of roughly 10 faculty now meet on a regular basis to discuss not only how to support the 10–15 percent of students at the lowest end who are not likely to pass in one semester, but also the basic skills Math curriculum more generally. Questions they are exploring include, “Are certain topics more important? Less important? Are exercises and activities appropriately suited to promote learning?” One outcome of these discussions has been the decision to incorporate more manipulatives into classroom activities.
Concurrent with experimental approaches to structuring classroom instruction, one of CCSF’s pre-collegiate basic skills Math tutoring programs, the Math Lab, embarked on a journey of training, self-reflection, and professional development in order to better address student needs in Math (largely relying on Koret funding). The first step toward this improvement was to hire additional teaching assistants and increase hours for current instructors and staff. This adjustment made possible a weekly meeting during which tutors could discuss problems, collaborate on solutions, and cultivate knowledge in the field of teaching and learning. Activities have included, but were not limited to: (1) exploring learning styles and discussing classroom implementation; (2) improving and systematizing the peer-tutor training program; (3) coordinating with the Learning Assistance Center for tutor training; (4) crafting a mission statement with explicit goals for the Math Lab; (5) increasing knowledge of learning disabilities through research and discussions with presenters from the Disabled Students Programs and Services at CCSF; (6) discussing and researching issues of race, class, gender, and other cultural differences; and (7) investigating other key topics such as instructional best practices, assessment, and techniques to improve study skills.

At this time the Math Lab comprises a group of highly motivated and engaged professional tutors and teaching assistants. They are specially trained, in part through the Learning Assistance Center, to work with a population of diverse and underprepared students. Functioning as a team, they share ideas about how to improve student success, from classroom techniques to large-scale structural reform.

As with English, professional development will serve as the basis for many of the activities that the Math Lab staff have been undertaking during Spring 2005-Fall 2005, with support from the Carnegie and Hewlett Foundations. In particular, they are exploring issues relating to some of the work they have already done surrounding learning disabilities, multicultural education, assessment techniques, collaborative learning, and metacognition.

In the near future, Math Lab staff members will augment their current exploration by bringing in experts in these fields to further educate the tutors and the Math Department faculty. Using their existing framework for collaboration and self reflection as a base, the Math Lab staff will gather new information on these topics and investigate how to implement their knowledge to improve student learning and success, connecting with Math faculty activities as feasible.

The Math Lab will also focus on developing a philosophy of teaching and further refining their mission statement, a process that will be informed by the professional development sessions. In addition, they will develop ways to train and educate new tutors so they can be fully effective members of the instructional team, in collaboration with the Learning Assistance Center.

In addition, the Math Department will explore a more efficient use of counselors. This past year, Math Lab staff, with Koret funding, piloted two different methods of counseling involvement that were less effective than hoped. In one case, counselors attended workshop sections and gave mini presentations with the goal of encouraging students to sign up for classes. In the other case, counselors met with 8-10 students at a time two times throughout the semester (also during the workshop sessions) to focus on time management, study skills, and basic college success. Counselors and students alike felt that having the counselors in the classroom took too much time away from learning. The current plan is to offer and test a half-semester class in which students focus on the same topics discussed above, but without taking them away from their Math instruction.

Note that the Math Lab focuses on Math E (arithmetic) tutoring whereas the Learning Assistance Center provides tutoring for Math 840 and above. Also, the Math Department, with Title III funding, is developing a new Math E computer tutorial lab that will focus on academic support.
Beyond Instruction: Additional Support for Basic Skills Students. While this case study has focused primarily on instructional practices, the support that students received through a variety of support structures outside of the core focus on basic skills has also been found to impact student performance. Such support structures include the following support programs: African American Scholastic Programs, Disabled Students Programs and Services, Extended Opportunities Programs and Services, the Homeless/At-risk Students Program, the Latino Services Network, the Learning Assistance Center, Math Bridge, the Puente Project, and the Writing Success Project. As documented in the “Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Report, Part 2,” students enrolled in support programs almost always achieved higher rates of course success in both lower- and upper-level pre-collegiate courses when compared to students who did not enroll in these programs. Program impact varied by subject and course level. This finding suggests that forging stronger ties between these programs and instruction may prove beneficial. This in part underlies the College’s justification for an interdisciplinary approach that not only encompasses the traditional academic areas of English and Math but also connects to College-wide initiatives such as the Basic Skills Subcommittee and Diversity Committee whose membership includes representatives from the support programs listed above.

In addition, the reinstatement of caseloads within the New Student Counseling and Continuing Student Counseling Departments shows great promise of supporting basic skills students such that they are less likely to “slip through the cracks.” In particular, a “Back on Track Initiative” now targets students who are in their fourth semester of academic or progress probation and requires that they sign a contract that provides the College with greater enforcement power to limit the number of units a student on 4th-semester probation can enroll in or to refer them to noncredit courses. Emerging alongside initiatives such as this is greater two-way collaboration between counselors and instructors, including the integration of a counseling component into coursework.

Where Do We Go from Here? In general, a greater focus beginning in 2005—in addition to the activities noted above within English and Math, primarily funded by Koret—will be placed on synchronizing the activities of the English and Math Departments with those of the ESL Department, Transitional Studies Department, Learning Assistance Department, and the Basic Skills Subcommittee and Diversity Committee, in large part through funding from the Carnegie and Hewlett Foundations as noted earlier. The Transitional Studies Department offers free, noncredit instruction in Adult Basic Education, including adult high school diplomas and preparation for the General Education Development (GED) test. The Learning Assistance Department offers peer collaborative tutoring, college success courses and workshops, and an open-access computer lab. Basic skills instruction has been somewhat fragmented, and the College’s aim is to bring all parties responsible for basic skills instruction and support into closer alignment. What the Carnegie/Hewlett application did not specifically address was the integration of these activities with ESL, and this is an oversight requiring attention.

Professional development will become a key mechanism for integrating activities among departments from this point forward. With Carnegie/Hewlett support, faculty and staff will participate in a series of monthly conversations that utilize external and internal resources to address classroom learning, tutoring support, and diversity. In this way, faculty and staff from all basic skills-related departments (English, ESL, Learning Assistance, Math, and Transitional Studies) and the two Shared Governance committees (the Basic Skills Subcommittee and Diversity Committee) will come together to address issues common to all disciplines. In particular, these issues include teaching and learning in an increasingly multicultural environment given the ties between race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and basic skills, as referenced earlier in this essay.

5 Note that a new support program, the Asian Pacific American Student Success Center (APASS) emerged after this study was conducted. APASS will need to be included in the effort to align support program activities with those of classroom and lab instruction.
One form of professional development will center on structured, interdisciplinary conversations using CCSF’s Reflective Teaching Project of its ESL and Transitional Studies Departments as a way to facilitate discussion. These conversations will provide a setting in which faculty and staff across disciplines can grapple with how to implement what they learn through all professional development experiences in the student learning environment. Participants will also receive encouragement to visit each others’ classrooms (both within and across disciplines) to provide feedback to each other and to learn from each other. All conversations and interactions will have the overall goal of improving student success in basic skills so that students can better advance to college-level courses.

The faculty, Chancellor, Trustees, and the entire administration are committed to continue researching basic skills issues to document progress and identify areas for improvement, including organizational changes.

The level of commitment to basic skills at CCSF is unusually high, and it arises from the College’s recognition that changes it makes now, when grounded in the analysis of data, will have effects far into the future for generations of students to come. CCSF administrators, faculty, and other staff dedicate significant energy and time to resolving issues related to basic skills.

IV. Conclusion & Future Directions

While the College has not solved the problem of basic skills, this essay has attempted to demonstrate that the College is committed to delivering high-quality education at all levels of the institution, using basic skills as an example. The choice of basic skills for the case study rests on the fact that issues relating to basic skills are not confined to the basic skills sequence. That is, students entering the basic skills sequence most often have the goal of continuing on to college-level work, whether to attain a certificate, degree, or transfer to a four-year institution. At the same time, some students who place into basic skills courses do not actually enroll in those courses, instead electing to enter college-level courses directly. To demonstrate a genuinely substantive commitment to high-quality education, the College must now tackle how issues relating to basic skills impact the entire curriculum at all levels and in all areas. Given these factors, the institution’s commitment to high-quality education is a commitment to addressing not just basic skills courses but basic skills students wherever they are in the institution—and addressing not just their cognitive needs but also their affective needs. Doing so will require that the College find ways to make resulting interventions and changes sustainable and far-reaching, without having to rely heavily on external funding as it has in the past.

The College’s goals and objectives should embrace plans that highlight professional development (supporting the direction taken with the Carnegie/Hewlett grant); improved and new programs and services targeting basic skills students accompanied by efforts to raise awareness of available services (through greater communication and collaboration between counseling and instructional faculty to widen the range of student learning outcomes in both the cognitive and affective areas of student development); and the creation of administrative structures and departmental resources to synthesize and support basic skills College-wide. An emerging set of recommendations by the Basic Skills Subcommittee is, in fact, following this line of thought, the seeds of which are contained within the College’s Strategic Plan.
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THEME II: Student Learning Outcomes

Student learning outcomes and student achievement are central to the work of the institution. To ensure successful student learning outcomes, the institution establishes feedback loops from students to college practitioners (faculty and others) that lead to improvement of courses, programs and student development activities. Faculty identify learning outcomes at the course, program, and degree level and assess learning outcomes to assure the effectiveness of their educational programs. Faculty engage in discussions using assessment data to improve ways to deliver instruction to maximize student learning. Student development faculty develop learning outcomes and assess how well students are able to utilize college programs and services to achieve their educational goals. The college places student learning outcomes at the center of the institution’s planning, review and allocation processes.
I. Overview

The movement to infuse student learning outcomes into every aspect of the evaluation of institutional integrity and effectiveness has provoked responses in higher education across the state and the nation ranging from enthusiastic affirmation to outright rejection. The dialog around student learning outcomes (SLOs) at City College of San Francisco has also ranged from passionate advocacy to strong skepticism.

CCSF faculty are dedicated to excellence in teaching, a value that is promoted through a rich environment and strong commitment to student success. That said, the question of student learning outcomes assessment has prompted a great deal of discussion that has revealed a significant diversity of views within the faculty. Since 2000, many discussions about SLOs have occurred at meetings of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate. During the listening sessions and dialogs about the draft Self Study, differing perspectives and concerns have been shared regarding the role and value of student learning outcomes assessment. Stated concerns included such critical questions as, “Might the SLO paradigm require that we teach to the test?”; “Does the SLO model emphasize the accountability approach of the business world instead of the student-centered approach of the academic environment?”; “Are SLOs more relevant and appropriate for vocational/technical skill-based courses and less applicable to some liberal arts courses?”; “Does the emphasis on SLOs at the course level infringe upon the professional rights and responsibilities of the faculty in the classroom?”; “What about academic freedom … is that statement of principles being eroded?” Faculty agree that there is a need to communicate and educate all faculty so that they can better understand the SLO movement and how it might be implemented within an institution like CCSF.

Therefore, the College community expects more faculty-driven dialog about student learning outcomes. As work on SLOs broadens, the established dialog regarding student success will assist in integrating the expectations of the new accreditation standards into the traditions of the College.

To that end and setting the stage for this dialog, Chancellor Philip Day, in his Opening Day speech in August 2005, noted that “... careful consideration of all that we have done to date has made it clear that we need to build for the future by designing a College-wide plan to address the continued development, implementation, and assessment of student learning outcomes.”

While the dialog around the assessment of student learning outcomes continues, CCSF has a strong record of gathering data and using that information to improve student outcomes. Alexander Astin, in Assessment for Excellence, The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, notes that:

An institution’s assessment practices are a reflection of its values. In other words, the values of an institution are revealed in the information about itself that it gathers and pays attention to … assessment practices should further the basic aims and purposes of our higher education institutions.1

The essay that follows attempts to reflect the values of City College of San Francisco by highlighting some of the information the College gathers and describing how it responds to it within the institutional context. The essay has three sections. The first addresses the institutional context for student learning outcomes at CCSF. It shows the linkages among the College’s Mission Statement, its major institutional outcomes assessments, and selected examples of its efforts to assess and enhance outcomes. It demonstrates that the College is committed to the improvement of student learning, and, while the role of

---

outcomes assessment in the institutional culture is still evolving, the value the College places on student success will provide the context for future work on SLOs. This discussion of the institutional context is followed by two case studies. The first describes the efforts of CCSF’s English Department to use common assessment instruments to restructure its reading and composition course sequence. This case study reveals that the assessment of student learning outcomes can influence specific objectives and methodologies used by a very large cohort of instructors across a sequence of courses. The second case study describes the work of the leadership from all of the units in the Student Development Division to create a comprehensive, division-wide SLO initiative. While this endeavor is still in the formative stages, it demonstrates the commitment of the leadership to the process. More importantly, the case study reveals a clear understanding of the benefits and challenges this type of assessment poses for the various student development units and a commitment to meet those challenges to improve student outcomes.

II. Institutional Context

The Information the College Gathers and Pays Attention to. The Standard I Report on the Mission Statement and Institutional Effectiveness clearly delineates how the goals of the Mission Statement are translated into a comprehensive Strategic Plan and how that plan is connected to the annual planning and budget cycle as well as semi-annual assessments of progress. The Mission Statement establishes that “the quality of success in learning will permeate all levels of the educational experience.” While all of the major priorities in the Strategic Plan are designed to support “success in learning,” four of those strategic priorities directly address student learning outcomes (see Strategic Priorities 1, 2, 3, and 5).

As Astin suggests, the value the College places on these broadly stated institutional priorities is reflected in the information it gathers about our effectiveness in achieving those goals. Therefore, in 2003, at the request of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants developed a set of 29 College Performance Indicators (CPIs) that “measure College performance within the eight priorities delineated by the CCSF Strategic Plan.” Each year, a report on these 29 measures is provided to the College community. By definition, these performance indicators give us only the broadest information about institutional effectiveness, particularly as they relate to student learning. For example, Priority 1 indicators for basic skills show “overall student success rates in pre-collegiate courses” and “completion rates for students in pre-collegiate programs.” However, these indicators do just that—indicate areas for further assessment, analysis, and program development in the College’s efforts to improve student outcomes.

The CPI reports suggested that the College’s efforts to develop students’ basic skills deserved a much more focused and comprehensive analysis. With over 75 percent of our first-time students placing into one or more pre-collegiate courses, and with a broad range of programs and services designed to promote student learning within these basic skills courses, the College needed better information on what works, what does not add value, and, eventually, how the College can best use its resources to assure the highest level of student learning outcomes. Therefore, in Spring 2003, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants embarked on the development of the “Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Report” in collaboration with faculty and administrative leadership involved in the basic skills programs and services. The two-part report published the next spring provided a comprehensive assessment of the demand, supply (i.e., access),

---

3 Only 2.2 percent of entering students place into college-level English and Math. Twenty-two (22) percent of the first-time students were not assessed.
and student success in basic skills courses in the English, Mathematics, and ESL Departments as well as providing an analysis of the “value added” by a variety of retention and student success programs. While the findings of these reports are not the focus of this essay, the way the College used this information is central to this theme. The Chancellor had identified the improvement of basic skills outcomes as a primary goal of his tenure at the College from the time he assumed leadership in 1998. As the drafts of the Basic Skills Reports circulated among campus constituencies, it became clear that the College needed a more unified and coordinated effort to address student outcomes in basic skills. In Fall 2003, the dormant Basic Skills Subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee was activated and took on the challenge of developing an institutional response to the coordination and collaboration of basic skills programs and services. At the time of this essay, Spring 2005, the Basic Skills Subcommittee was formulating a proposal that eventually will be submitted to the Academic Senate. In addition, external and District resources have been used to establish a number of other new initiatives to improve the effectiveness of instruction based on the findings of the Basic Skills Report (e.g., the Koret English and Math initiatives and Title III supplemental instruction in English, Math, and ESL).

Long-term comprehensive assessments play an important role in formulating institutional policy and stimulating broad-based change, but every day classroom faculty, counselors, librarians, department chairs, and administrators are faced with practical decisions that have an impact on student learning outcomes. Information about scheduling effectiveness, student success rates in specific courses, and comparative data based on a host of demographic variables is essential to practical decision making that promotes student outcomes. Therefore, in 2001, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants initiated the development of the Decision Support System (DSS), an online data processing engine that provides any member of the College community—and members of the outside community who request access—instant statistical information on a wide variety of student characteristics, demand for and access to courses and sections, and various student success data. While the system certainly has its limitations, the ability of College faculty, staff, and administrators to have timely access to this information has begun to profoundly change the way the College makes day-to-day decisions.

**Institutional Efforts to Improve Student Learning Outcomes.** The evolving institutional focus on student learning outcomes at the College has contributed to a broad range of initiatives designed to improve student learning. This essay can only present a few selected examples of these initiatives. Following the last accreditation review, the Chancellor’s Office and the Academic Senate launched an Enhanced Self-Study (ESS), an effort to examine factors promoting and inhibiting student success across five broad areas of CCSF programs and services: Pre-registration and Matriculation; Pre-Collegiate Learning; College-Level Learning; Enrollment Management Tools; and Student Outcomes. Over 170 faculty, staff, students, and administrators participated in five task forces that produced 38 recommendations, of which at least 11 directly addressed SLOs. Many of these recommendations have been implemented, some are in the process of implementation, and others are still under consideration or have been rejected.

The visiting team report from the last accreditation review had urged the College to seriously consider the appropriateness of its written composition and mathematical reasoning graduation requirements. As a result of an ESS recommendation, the English graduation requirement has been raised. An independent task force was charged with reviewing the math requirement and making recommendations. Both of the new requirements have now been adopted through the Shared Governance process. In addition, the College has adopted an Information Competency graduation requirement, and a task force is currently working out the details of the implementation of this requirement, which is designed to assure a student’s ability to do research and manage information.4

---

4 The Information Competency requirement was not part of the Enhanced Self-Study. Work on the requirement began before the ESS and final approval occurred during the 2003–04 academic year.
City College of San Francisco also has a number of faculty development programs that help instructors improve students’ knowledge and skills in targeted areas. For example, the SCANS project (Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills) seeks to integrate workplace skills development with instruction across disciplines. The Asian Infusion Project conducted from 1999-2003 helped faculty infuse Asian perspectives into their curricula to increase students’ understanding of and sensitivity to cultural differences and similarities. In Fall 2003, the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) was initiated, using the model established by the Asian Infusion Project. MIP is designed to give faculty incentives, time, and resources to revamp their curricula and teaching methods to incorporate multicultural perspectives and to address the variety of learning styles found in CCSF’s extremely diverse student population. The MIP seeks to develop a group of resource faculty who can assist larger numbers of faculty in developing their curricula and diversifying their instructional methodologies to improve student learning outcomes.

The College has also devoted significant human resources to the use of DACUM (Designing A CurriculUM) as a methodology for improving outcomes primarily in vocational programs; of particular note is the Automotive Department’s use of DACUM to strengthen its programs to meet the needs of industry. DACUM is a highly structured facilitation process designed to use “expert workers” to identify specific knowledge and skills required for success in a specific job as the basis for developing new, or revising existing, courses and programs to specifically address student abilities to perform these tasks. The resulting set of knowledge and skills readily translates into student learning outcomes and provides the basis for building a curriculum to provide students with the opportunity to master those learning outcomes.

**SLOs at the Course and Program Level.** Any consideration of SLOs at the course and program level must start with the course outlines and program proposals. The Standard II Report clearly articulates the procedures of the College for the development and approval of courses and programs. An essential component of every course outline is the inclusion of measurable outcomes related to the course content. Similarly, program approval involves clearly stated rationales for the anticipated student outcomes of those programs. During the 2004-05 academic year, the College Curriculum Committee reviewed its course outline format in light of the new accreditation standards and determined that the “Course Objectives” serve to guide the “Major Learning Outcomes” for each course and modified the outline format accordingly. In addition, departments have been encouraged to develop program-learning outcomes to be published in the College Catalog, and 18 departments have developed those outcomes for the 2005-06 Catalog.

However, the accreditation standards clearly establish that colleges not only clearly identify “student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees,” but also “assess student achievement of those outcomes” and use the “assessment results to make improvements.” The Standard II Report notes that this aspect of the SLOs at the course level has “been the subject of much discussion,” discussion which continues to this day. As a beginning step, the College hosted workshops by both the Accrediting Commission and the statewide Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges that were designed to help the campus community fully understand the role of assessment in the new standards and the differences and similarities among the traditional forms of assessment (e.g., grading, major educational outcomes like graduation and transfer rates, etc.) and the assessments suggested by the new accreditation standards.

An important step toward College-wide processes that address learning assessment and learning outcomes is the decision of the College’s Program Review Committee (PRC) to add new language within the Program Review framework that enables instructional and student services programs, as well as administrative units, to describe plans and activities related to assessment of student learning outcomes for courses and/or programs. The PRC’s language was approved by both the Department Chair Council and the Academic Senate during the Spring 2005 semester for implementation beginning in the 2005-06 academic year.
The Program Review framework is a very significant step toward the development of an institutional response to the new accreditation standards on student learning outcomes. However, the framework presents outcomes assessment as an option for departments, and the Standard II Report concludes that there is still considerable work to be done before the College has a fully implemented process for the assessment and evaluation of SLOs. This essay has already discussed a number of areas in which assessment is playing a crucial role in the improvement of College programs and services. Moreover, faculty in all departments and academic programs assess student learning in their courses using a variety of methods, even if they do not describe it as the “assessment of student learning outcomes.” Faculty in many departments and programs rigorously conduct assessments of student learning outcomes to improve program effectiveness. For example, faculty in the allied health programs and a number of other vocational training programs that use licensure criteria or other forms of external assessment have incorporated the use of these assessments as a basis for revising curriculum and improving instructional methodologies. There are also selected examples of individual departments that have developed common assessment instruments not only to determine individual student progress but also to assess the effectiveness of courses and programs in producing student learning outcomes. For example, the noncredit ESL program has used “promotion examinations” for many years to assess the overall outcomes produced by its course sequence and the evaluation of program effectiveness. The credit ESL program is in the process of developing a similar model to assess the effectiveness of a major curriculum overhaul completed three years ago. However, the Standard II Report points out the need to develop a more comprehensive institution-wide response to the use of assessment as a central component of determining effectiveness at the course, program, and institutional levels, a challenge that may prove to be more difficult in the academic than vocational fields.

The two case studies that follow provide insight into the benefits and challenges that this institution-wide effort is likely to produce. These two case studies are not intended to serve as models for all departments nor are they necessarily representative of all assessment efforts across the College. They were chosen as select examples of significant, well-documented work in a department and a division that reflect a concentrated effort. The first describes an effort to determine what students were learning in a pivotal course in the reading and writing skills sequence. The second traces the efforts of the leadership of the Student Development Division to lay the groundwork for an initiative to fully address the establishment of the student learning outcomes paradigm across all of the units within the Division. These two case studies suggest how focusing on student learning outcomes can improve student success at City College.

III. Case Studies

The English Common Exam and an Evolving Culture of Assessment. Late in the Fall 2004 semester, City College of San Francisco was selected as one of 11 California community colleges to participate in a new initiative sponsored by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, “Strengthening Pre-Collegiate Education in Community Colleges” (SPECC), a project that focuses on improving pre-collegiate basic skills instruction. At a retreat for the participating colleges in February 2004, each college presented an overview of its student demographics and the major basic skills initiatives that brought the college to the SPECC project. Many of the colleges had discovered the fallacy of using pass rates for basic skills courses as the only measure of success since institutional research showed that large portions of students passing one class ended up failing the subsequent course. As a result, each campus, in its own way, had attempted to assess more accurately what the student had learned in the prerequisite class and what the student needed to learn to succeed in the subsequent class, thus embracing the core distinguishing characteristics of the student learning outcomes paradigm.

Over half of the colleges reported that one of the first steps they took was the development of some type of common examination administered to students enrolled in a specific sequential basic skills class. To develop these assessment tools, the faculty focused on the core skills and competencies that students needed to succeed in the subsequent course. In effect, the faculty dealt with learning outcomes for two classes to assess the effectiveness of instruction in one class. While no single assessment instrument can be expected to fully measure the learning outcomes for an entire course (let alone predict with complete accuracy student success in a subsequent course), the act of developing these assessment tools produced much clearer delineations of the intended outcomes for courses, insights into how to assess those outcomes, and, most important, how to improve those outcomes through course modifications and improvement in instruction. These were not efforts to “teach to the test.” They focused on the faculty’s use of the results of the assessment to improve their students’ learning. As Carnegie Foundation resident senior scholar Lloyd Bond, a highly respected expert in assessment, summarized this phenomenon, “You start with the test, and work backwards to what goes on in the classroom.” The experience that the CCSF English Department had with the implementation of its common exam for English 94 is an excellent example of this process and its potential consequences. While the English Department started with a single purpose—assessing a limited set of outcomes in a crucial course in the reading and composition sequence—the results of that assessment led to a thorough revision of the course and a reassessment of the other courses in the sequence.

Many community college English departments use holistically graded essays or portfolio reviews as a significant exit measure for a course. While state regulations specify that California community colleges cannot have “exit tests” for courses, these exams or portfolios frequently are so heavily weighted in calculating the term grade that the exam or portfolio has been, de facto, a kind of exit test. These holistically graded exams or portfolios are supposed to reflect the validity of a course’s objectives. The variations in student success on these exams are generally attributed to the expected variations in student achievement, differences in instructional quality, or, in some cases, the variability or the quality of the exam or portfolio evaluation process. Rarely does the assessment seem to reflect back on the validity of the essential objectives of the course itself. The CCSF English Department, through a combination of serendipity and strategy, found that when such assessment tools are chronologically distanced from the end of term and their impact on individual student’s success or failure is minimized, they can much more effectively direct faculty attention to the integrity of a course outline and their own classroom practices.

The context. English 94 is an integrated developmental reading and writing course in the middle of a five-course composition sequence ending with English 1A. English 94 is two levels below 1A. Given the size and diversity of the College’s student population, English 94 accounts for approximately 20 percent of the composition offerings, with between 37 and 44 sections scheduled every semester. Historically, English 94 has been the “problem class” in the College English composition sequence. Because students enter English 94 through one of three pathways—English 92, the previous course in the sequence; ESL 82, the final course in the ESL sequence; and directly from testing and placement—the course presents faculty with a challenging heterogeneous student population with highly varied linguistic, writing, and thinking skills compounded by deficiencies in college success skills. In addition, over the years, the English sequence has undergone many transformations that range from abolishing an old de facto tracking system, designed to distinguish between transfer and vocationally oriented students, to efforts to maximize students’ ability to use a broad range of sequential courses to meet transfer institutions’ general education written communication requirements. As a result, some of these sequential course outlines have what one faculty member typifies as an “everything but the kitchen sink approach” to defining the expected outcomes. This, in turn, provides for extremely divergent interpretations of the course’s priorities by the many faculty teaching the very large number of sections.
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6 This description of the English 94 initiative at CCSF is partially adapted from a Listserv essay titled “Course-Based Assessment as a Catalyst for Curricular Change.” Learning Assessment Listserv. Published 19 May 2004. Accessible at <listserv.cccnext.net/archives/learningasment.html>
There were significant indicators that the Department needed to do something about this situation. Pass rates were not only lower than desired, but varied considerably by section and instructor; there were serious retention issues; and there was a common perception supported by some statistical evidence that significant numbers of the students coming out of English 94 were not adequately prepared to be successful in subsequent courses. In Fall 1999, a few faculty proposed a common, holistically graded in-class essay for English 94 as the first step in determining what was going on in this “problem class.” From the outset, one important and unusual feature of the proposal was that this exam was not to be given in lieu of a final exam or account for a large portion of a student’s course grade. This was in response to the Department and College’s collective memories of a common exit essay test given in English 1A some 15 years earlier that resulted in much lower pass rates and negatively affected graduation and transfer rates for the several years it was in place. The English 94 common exam proposal specified that the exam was to take place during week 12 of the semester and was not to be a final, summative, “barrier” exam.

The proposal still galvanized several different factions among the 100+ faculty in the English Department. However, the faculty proponents of the common exam found that very few of the opponents were actually teaching English 94. The English 94 instructors knew that what was happening at the 94 level—both in class and with regard to student outcomes—was not working well. They were losing 43 percent of their students over the course of the semester; even after first census, the classes lost 29 percent of their enrollment. In addition, the success rates for students who did complete the class were in need of improvement, ranging from 54 percent to 65 percent. The faculty responsible for teaching English 94 felt compelled to come together to determine what needed to be prioritized in the course and then work together to make the course a more effective bridge to future success for the students.

The process and the lessons. In Spring 2000, a pilot of the common exam was conducted by a limited number of volunteer faculty. They carefully developed protocols for administering the exam and developed a holistic rubric grounded in the outcomes established in the existing course outline of record. The results of this first effort were startling. Only 32 percent of the students taking the common exam were judged to have met the threshold for success established in the rubric. However, in that same semester, over 64 percent of the students received passing grades. It was clear to the faculty that they needed to revise the rubric downward; that is, the rubric set the expectations too high. More significantly, it was also clear that the existing course outline did not reflect what students were capable of learning when they entered English 94. A second pilot was undertaken in the Spring of 2001. This time all sections of English 94 were tested and some of the procedural problems were rectified. While the pass rates were still only 32 percent, a follow-up survey revealed that faculty and students found the common exam process to be positive and valuable. The dichotomy between the common exam pass rates and the overall course pass rates could be partially attributed to the limitations inherent in using a single writing sample, particularly a timed in-class writing sample. However, it was also clear to the faculty that the course outline did not provide a reasonable set of expectations and, as a result, each teacher was creating his or her own set of outcomes expectations.

The response to this single effort to develop a more useful assessment of student learning has been profound for the English Department. The most obvious immediate implication was the need to thoroughly review and revise the course outline for English 94 to make it consistent with what students are capable of accomplishing in a single course at this level of their developmental process. However, English 94 sits in the middle of a sequence of five levels of reading and writing classes designed to prepare students for college-level, university transfer writing, and critical thinking coursework. If English 94 were going to be revised, and the primary objective of this revision was to provide more clearly articulated and realistic
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7 Approximately 65 faculty are full-time and 35-40 are part-time; about 75 percent of the sections are taught by full-time faculty.

8 Spring semester pass rates tend to be higher than fall semester pass rates and fluctuate considerably from year to year.
learning outcomes for all students passing through this course, then the English Department would have to initiate a comprehensive revision of its entire writing and reading sequence. Clearly, the courses that come before and after English 94 were going to have to be revised based on the changes in this crucial transitional class that connects basic skills with collegiate and transfer-level writing classes.

Therefore, in Fall 2002, the English Department launched a comprehensive effort to revise all of the courses in the reading and composition sequence. There are eight reading and writing courses below English 1A.9 For several of these courses, between 30 and 40 sections are offered each semester. Even for a very large department, this is a daunting task, and everyone involved recognized from the outset that this would take a number of years to complete. Based on the lessons learned from the common exam pilot projects, the English Department Curriculum Committee charged each of the “level workgroups” with developing specific maps of students’ entry characteristics and realistic delineations of learning outcomes that could be effectively accomplished and accurately measured. While there was common agreement that English 94 required immediate attention, one of the challenges the Department faced was the “ripple effect” that one set of outcomes would have on the courses above and below the target class. At the same time, there was reasonable apprehension among some faculty that this effort to match the skills taught to the capabilities of the students at each level might result in a “dumbing down” of the sequence, creating a gap between the pre-collegiate coursework and the transfer-level classes.

The Department was mindful of a lesson of the Carnegie retreat: “You start with the test, and work backwards to what goes on in the classroom.” That is, the process of trying to carefully define the outcomes and conceptualize the assessment of those outcomes while simultaneously developing the revised course outlines provides an interactive dialog that results in improvements in the teaching and learning process. The leaders of these initiatives quickly realized that assessment was going to play a significant long-term role in both the development of these course revisions and the active, ongoing maintenance of the effectiveness of the course sequence. However, there still was not broad-based support in the Department for adopting common assessments across the curriculum. That would take time and evidence that the common assessments would produce something other than a short-term tool for standardizing outcomes expectations. The members of the department most committed to common assessments also recognized that assessment would have to be embraced by the faculty working on the courses, not imposed from the outside by advocates of SLOs.

At the time of this essay, Spring 2005, the English Department is just a little over two years into this revision process. English 94 has been revised into a new course, English 93, with much more precisely defined learning outcomes and with a periodic broad-based common assessment of those outcomes written into the course outline of record. The discussion of incorporating a learning assessment mechanism into all of the Department’s sequential courses has “come out of the closet” and is an active part of the discussions at every level of the course revision process.

There are currently two additional pilot projects in the English Department using common assessments as a tool for evaluating instructional effectiveness. The first involves the lowest level composition course, English 90. Over the last two years, many of the English basic skills faculty have been involved in a project funded in part by the Koret Foundation designed to integrate the teaching of reading with writing by developing a learning community model that involves students registering for team-taught sections of English 90 and its companion reading course, English 9. This project is based on institutional research that demonstrated that students who had taken both classes concurrently were more likely to succeed in subsequent English courses.
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9 Four are sequential composition classes; two are developmental reading courses that some students must complete prior to entering the lowest level writing class; two are independent reading classes that students may elect to take based on placement results.
In an effort to facilitate student progress, the Koret project has experimented with allowing students who successfully complete the linked courses to skip over the next level of composition (English 92) and move directly into English 94. An assessment of the success of these students in English 94 has shown mixed results. Some students are clearly ready for the more advanced class, while others clearly need the additional development provided by English 92. At the same time, the effort to assess the outcomes of the Koret project itself has been difficult and not as productive as anticipated. That assessment has used both traditional outcomes measures (e.g., success rates for students in Koret classes compared to students in regular sections of English 9 and 90) and extensive use of focus groups of students, faculty, and even tutors involved in the project. While the faculty and students clearly value the Koret experience and believe it is having a positive effect, the hard data is not as convincing. The combination of the need to better assess the readiness of individual students for more advanced classes and the desire to develop more accurate skills-based assessments of the Koret program itself has led to the development of a pilot portfolio review project (see the Theme I essay for more information about this project).

The second pilot assessment project involves English 96, the last course in the sequence before the transfer-level 1A. One of the primary goals of the curriculum redesign has been to orient the pre-collegiate reading and writing courses to specific skills required for academic success as students transition into both the transfer-level writing courses and their other college-level studies. The Department has developed expectations for the types of readings that will be used at each course level in an effort to integrate the teaching of reading and writing and to ensure that students develop their abilities to master the type of reading assignments they will encounter in college-level classes across disciplines. Therefore, in Spring 2005, the Department piloted a common reading assessment in nine sections of English 96 to assess the students’ independent reading comprehension, using a combination of objective questions and essay responses. This is a very focused and limited assessment that the Department hopes it can use to more effectively determine the various levels of comprehension that can be expected of students as they prepare to enter the transfer-level sequence, and, eventually, to help the Department to develop interventions throughout the sequence to improve those skills and measure those outcomes.

**Are grades enough?** During the workshops conducted on the new accreditation standards, many faculty and administrators questioned the need for expanded assessments related to the SLO paradigm, stating that grades given by faculty are adequate for assessment. Grades are certainly one of the tools faculty can use in assessing instructional effectiveness. However, grades are the evaluation of progress by individual students, not an overall assessment of instructional effectiveness and aggregate student learning. Grades can be used as a basis for SLO assessment (in addition to other types of assessment) when they are coupled with strategies for improvement. However, in the discussion of the need for other types of assessment, the discussion inevitably came around to “show me the evidence.” That is to say, if we are going to become actively engaged in a major effort to assess learning outcomes beyond the methods we currently use, said the workshop participants, then you are going to have to convince us that this effort will produce meaningful outcomes other than simple compliance with the Accrediting Commission’s new standards. In some ways, the workshop participants were asking for evidence of effectiveness in much the same way the new standards require institutions to provide evidence of effectiveness. As the College-wide discussion about outcomes assessment continues, it will be important for faculty to guide professional development opportunities that focus on their learning about different ways to assess outcomes and how that can improve teaching and learning. The experience of the English Department suggests some evidence of the benefits for certain types of outcomes and programs promoting those outcomes.
The English Department’s various SLO initiatives are still in the early stages of development and implementation. Only the English 94 common exam has been used long enough to produce preliminary evidence of its effectiveness. But the preliminary evidence is significant. Comparing Fall 1999 to Fall 2003, student retention increased from 70.6 percent to 77.2 percent, and success rates increased from 53.8 percent to 61.4 percent. Not only are more students staying in the classes, but more students are succeeding in those classes. During this same period, there have also been positive changes in the retention and success rates for the courses that lead into and follow English 94. While it is not possible to attribute all of these positive developments to the implementation of the English 94 common exam, it is quite clear that the changes that the common exam effected in the Department are having a substantial impact on teaching and learning.

Why is this single assessment intervention having such a major impact on teaching and learning and the redesign of the curriculum? There are many potential explanations. First, it is not surprising that outcomes assessment will improve as faculty more clearly define what those outcomes should be. Second, outcomes assessment is an effective way of monitoring the consistency across multiple sections of a single course. However, the ability to monitor outcomes is also one of the most controversial aspects of the SLO movement. Some teachers fear that outcomes assessment will be used in the evaluation of faculty (in fact, the accreditation standards include such a requirement in III.A 1.c), and that faculty who cannot produce adequate student performance on common assessments will be negatively evaluated. Other faculty contend that common outcomes assessments will encourage faculty to “teach to the test.”

The experience of the CCSF English Department may point to a middle ground in this often polarizing dialog. The English 94 common exam has demonstrated that faculty can actively engage in common assessment procedures without using those procedures as a punitive evaluation criterion. Most faculty want to improve their performance and increase retention and success rates. The English common exam experience provides evidence that faculty will have tools to improve their performance when they are given clear objectives and methods for assessing their effectiveness in accomplishing those objectives. Most reading and writing instructors believe that developing a student’s reading and writing skills is as much about developing a student’s ability to use processes as it is about arriving at a correct answer. Therefore, it is not possible to “teach to the test” under these circumstances. The test merely evaluates the student’s mastery of the process and provides evidence that the instruction is effective. The most significant lesson of the English 94 initiative is the impact that outcomes assessment can have on a program and department.

Student Development SLO Initiative—A Context for Identity and Identifying. To fully appreciate the Student Learning Outcomes initiatives in the Student Development Division, it is important to place this effort in the context of the development of the Division itself. Until 2001, all of the programs and services currently in Student Development were organized under the supervision of the Provost, who had responsibility for overseeing all instructional programs, student services, and all campuses. In Spring 2001, a new Vice Chancellor of Student Development position was created and a new division was defined that included all counseling services, learning assistance, matriculation, admissions and records, and several targeted student retention programs. This was the first time in the College’s recent history that the programs and services in student development had an independent identity and leadership with full-time responsibility for addressing the goals of the Division.

Soon after establishing the new Vice Chancellor’s office, the College undertook a careful examination and evaluation of the organization of the Student Development Division that led to the reorganization of counseling programs and services. Prior to the restructuring, almost all of the counseling services
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10 Fall comparative data has been used for these comparisons since students tend to perform at lower levels during the fall vs. spring semesters. Success rates are determined as completing the course with a “C” or better and include withdrawals as unsuccessful.
were handled through one department, General Counseling. The reorganization created four separate departments, each with a specific domain: New Student Counseling, Continuing Student Counseling, International Student Counseling, and Transfer Student Counseling. In addition, the targeted student retention programs, such as the African American Achievement Program and the Latino Services Network, were recognized as individual entities with administrative directors overseeing each unit. The reorganization led to an effort among faculty leaders and administrators to define the mission of each unit within the Division and to develop clearly articulated learning outcomes related to those missions.

In Fall 2003, a FLEX presentation, entitled “Student Learning Outcomes and Student Development,” was offered to initiate the Division’s SLO initiative. About 20 of the participants from that workshop formed the core work group for the initiative. They immediately identified three key questions:

- How do we identify desired learning outcomes or competencies for courses and programs?
- What kind of assessment tools are used to measure whether students have learned the desired outcomes?
- What are the general skills and competencies that all students should have acquired and internalized when they use services and complete our programs?

However, the work group quickly recognized that the dramatic changes in the organization of the Division over the last several years required the development of a mission statement for the Division as a whole which would, in turn, guide the development of a mission statement for each of the newly formed and existing units within the Division. These mission statements would provide guidance in the development of student learning outcomes and appropriate tools for the assessments of those outcomes.

Over the course of the Spring and Fall 2004 semesters, the work group met regularly to craft the Divisional mission statement with input from the departments and administrative units. Simultaneously, several of the units within the Division initiated the development of departmental mission statements, promoting an active dialog regarding the mission of each program and service and the role each program plays in the overall effectiveness of the Division. As the mission statements evolved, it was clear that if the Division were going to make Student Learning Outcomes a core value that informed its mission, it needed to undertake a preliminary assessment of the current status of SLOs across the Division. During Spring 2004, a simple inventory of present practices was conducted by 12 department chairs and administrators with their faculty and staff to answer four basic questions:

1. What are the general skills and competencies that all students should have acquired and internalized when they use our services and/or complete our programs?
2. How have we identified these desired learning outcomes, competencies, or objectives for our Department/Program?
3. What kinds of assessment tools do we—or could we—use to measure whether students have learned the desired skills and competencies?
4. What impact have prior assessments of our impact on student learning and development had on the work of the Department/Program?
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11 Career Development and Placement, Matriculation, and Admissions and Records were already separate units.
12 “Student Learning Outcomes and Student Development: A Synopsis of the Forum for Practitioners,” Fall FLEX 2003, p. 2.
The responses to this inventory provide a snapshot of where the Student Development Division was at the start of its efforts to implement the Student Learning Outcomes paradigm. More important, these preliminary analyses provide insights into the benefits and challenges this paradigm poses for the diverse programs and services represented in the Division. The discussion in this essay seeks to reflect on the work done thus far as a guide to work that will be done in the future.

**Defining the skills and competencies.** Defining measurable outcomes has been an essential component of curriculum development in California community colleges for over 20 years. Behavioral or performance objectives for courses attempt to define learning in terms of cognitive outcomes that can be measured using a variety of traditional assessment devices such as tests, written assignments, and group presentations, etc. However, many of the services and programs in student development are not delivered through traditional instructional modes. More importantly, the name given to the Division—Student Development—suggests that while the desirable outcomes for these programs should include measurable cognitive competencies, they also must include affective changes and personal development that are not easily measured, particularly in the relatively short time some students spend at a community college.

The initial feedback on skills and competencies from the departments and offices, completed in Spring 2004, reflects a mixture of traditional cognitive learning outcomes and more abstract developmental goals. For example, the Continuing Student Counseling Department (CSCD) developed a list of 14 skills that provide insight into the complexity of this issue for all counseling services. They start with a simple, obvious, and measurable outcome: “Students achieve their goals within their expected timeline.” Education plans are a core part of the counseling services provided to students, and each student’s progress, as well as the aggregate progress of groups of students, could be used as a measure of this outcome. However, CSCD’s second competency is much more complicated, but no less important: “Students are confident in their academic abilities.” If community colleges are going to prepare students for academic success, then developing a student’s confidence in his or her academic abilities is a crucial component of the student’s community college experience. However, “confidence” is a personality characteristic that can be difficult to gauge in individual students and even more challenging to assess across groups of students as a measure of departmental effectiveness.

The Continuing Student counselors define several “enabling” skills that are crucial to student success. For students to “achieve their goals within their expected timeline,” students must “successfully navigate through the educational system and bureaucracy” and, more significantly, “reproduce the decision-making process in other areas such as career, academic, and life planning.” These outcomes for counseling services reflect learning that may mirror the cognitive processes involved in the higher levels of the taxonomy of traditional course-based learning skills. However, these competencies involve the students applying critical thinking and reasoning skills to themselves rather than to the issues and concepts presented in traditional college-level courses. Thus, it embodies the core mission of the Division: student development. The challenge that CSCD and other departments and programs will face as they continue to develop their SLO initiatives is how they can systematize the development and assessment of these skills.

A brief look at the outcomes established by other departments reveals a similar mixture of specific enabling skills with profound personal development. Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS) calls for students to be able “to anticipate needs and make requests for accommodation in a timely manner” but also to develop the “ability to advocate for themselves.” The African American Scholastic Programs call for “understanding the educational planning process and relevance to their [students’] successful matriculation through CCSF” as well as “development and dedication to their own academic, career and personal goals.” The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) addresses the “use of computers to complete assignments
and assist with information literacy skills,” but also seeks to help students “apply study and life manage-
ment skills toward the realization of academic, vocational and personal goals” and “communicate assertively with members of our diverse communities.” Clearly, the initial efforts of the Student Development Division to define skills and competencies have produced a wealth of goals that range from clearly defined cognitive skills to ambitious efforts to transform students’ views of themselves and their place in society.

Measuring the outcomes: Assessing effectiveness. While the instructional programs are grounded in testing and assessment (at least as they relate to individual student achievement), student services have not traditionally been in the business of formal outcomes assessment. This is not to say that there are not traditional measures of student success related to student development. Transfer rates usually have a direct correlation with the extent to which the College provides effective counseling and other support services to students with four-year transfer aspirations. Specific retention strategies, such as early alert programs and “wrap-around” counseling and support services for targeted student populations, can be credited with specific improvements in student outcomes. However, measuring a department’s success in developing students’ “confidence in their academic abilities” or their “ability to advocate for themselves” presents significant challenges. In fact, even the assessment of more traditional learning skills like “extrapolating prior knowledge to new situations” (CSCD) and students’ ability to conduct “informational interviews that will assist them in clarifying interests and goals” (New Student Counseling) can be difficult given the way student support services are delivered to and used by students. While a counselor may engage a student in an “informational interview” or the application of a previous experience to a new problem, the counselor does not give a test that establishes the individual student’s mastery of these skills nor does the counselor accumulate longitudinal data on many students repeating this process as evidence of the efficacy of the counseling office.

The responses of the 12 service areas to the initial SLO inventory suggests that our Student Development Division is well aware of these challenges and is committed to developing useful assessment tools. The assessment tools identified thus far fall into three categories: information provided directly by students, e.g., surveys, anecdotal evidence, etc.; indirect measures of effectiveness; and direct measures of outcomes. CSCD provides a constructive framework for the use of surveys: “Ask students directly what counselors did for them—how they were affected and how counseling services supported and enhanced student learning.” Thus, if a counseling department wants to assess whether their services have contributed to students’ “confidence in their academic abilities,” surveys may provide useful data and point toward improved outcomes. Similarly, DSPS might survey students and faculty to assess whether their students are demonstrating “the ability to advocate for themselves.”

Survey information relies upon students accurately reporting the impact of a particular service on an outcome. Indirect measures attempt to use student behaviors (and the statistical analysis of those behaviors) and other related outcomes as a reflection of student learning. For example, Admissions and Records (A&R) establishes the students’ “ability to read, comprehend and interpret … the content of the College Catalog” as a major learning outcome. The indirect measure of this outcome might be “a decrease in the number of students being denied graduation due to incomplete coursework as a result of not reading and comprehending the CCSF graduation requirements and utilizing the [soon-to-be-operational] Degree Audit [program].” Similarly, DSPS wants its student clients “to anticipate needs and make requests for accommodation in a timely manner” and proposes using the DSPS office’s records on documented requests as a tool for assessing improvements in students’ timeliness and evidence that students are improving their ability to “advocate for themselves” and “fully participate in the college community,” two of the DSPS program’s most significant SLOs.
While indirect measures can provide useful information about the effectiveness of services, they are also fraught with challenges that need to be addressed. For example, “a decrease in the number of students being denied graduation due to incomplete coursework” may not be a direct result of students “reading and comprehending the CCSF graduation requirements and utilizing the [soon-to-be-operational] Degree Audit [program].” It might be the result of more effective use of the degree audit program by counselors and other staff or some other intervention provided by an office other than Admissions and Records. Similarly, DSPS faces significant challenges in developing and assessing students’ self-advocacy. If counselors and staff develop strategies to promote more timely requests for accommodations (e.g., better publicity of deadlines, direct requests to students, etc.), does this undermine the students’ development of independence and self-advocacy? While this question is a classic example of one of the underlying struggles that DSPS professionals grapple with in the design and implementation of student development programs, it is also a significant question to be addressed by these professionals as they attempt to assess the effectiveness of their programs and services.

Clearly, direct measures of student learning are the most effective means for assessing the effectiveness of programs and services in developing SLOs. Several of the departments in Student Development have programs that are consistent with traditional learning assessment tools used in other instructional departments (e.g., tests, essays, etc.). For example, the Learning Assistance Department, the Career Development and Placement Center, and DSPS offer courses and workshops that can use testing and other traditional assessment tools to determine the extent to which these offerings are producing specific student outcomes. A few departments propose tracking specific student behaviors that are directly related to the desired developmental outcomes as a means for directly assessing program effectiveness. For example, Student Health Services suggests a review of students’ medical history documents to determine the extent to which students followed medical advice or implemented suggested healthy activities.

Continuing Student Counseling proposes the use of a classic “input-treatment-outcomes” model for assessing some of its SLOs. They suggest that a random sample of students could be surveyed at the time they become eligible for CSCD services, i.e., completed one year of college or more than 24 units of college credit. Then students could be surveyed again at the time they are leaving the institution. These surveys could include information about shifts in students’ attitudes such as academic confidence, goals, and achievements, as well as information about the amount and type of services that students used during their time within the CSCD’s period of responsibility for advising the student. This “input-output” data might produce a useful assessment of the “value added” by Continuing Counseling. However, the CSCD’s response to the initial inventory questionnaire contains significant cautionary notes about the validity of this type of assessment. Since students served by Continuing Student Counseling have already been affected by other student development programs and services, it is difficult to distinguish between the direct impact of CSCD and the delayed effect of other services. In addition, factors such as age and maturity must be considered. Therefore, the assessments of these outcomes will require fairly sophisticated research and analyses.

Such cautionary statements reflect a Division that is not only aware of the need to develop direct measures of effectiveness, but is also sensitive to the research complexities of confounding variables. This is the type of thinking, planning, and development that the new accreditation standards seek to encourage. By directly confronting the challenges of assessing student learning outcomes in student development the Division is operationalizing its mission statement and defining its programs in terms of effectiveness. As the process continues it will also reap the benefits of these assessments.
At the time of this essay, Spring 2005, the Student Development Division is just beginning to grapple with the multiple challenges and opportunities the new standards present to all of the College’s educational programs and services. The accomplishments cited in this essay are primarily the result of work by the various unit leaders including department chairs, selected interested faculty, and administrators; the broad-based involvement of faculty and staff varies considerably by department. However, these preliminary efforts have attracted faculty, staff and administrators willing to explore student learning outcomes as an avenue for program improvement.

IV. Conclusion & Future Directions

This essay has presented strong evidence that, as Alexander Astin contends in *Assessment for Excellence*, the values that City College of San Francisco embraces are revealed in “the information about itself that it gathers and pays attention to.” The College is committed to articulating clear student learning outcomes and working to improve the programs and services that support these outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels.

The College has made great strides in producing useful data on a wide array of major student outcomes and some faculty, staff and administrators have been actively engaged in reflective dialog on that information that has led to the development of new and the revision of existing programs and services. The College has many ongoing initiatives designed to promote student success and provides faculty and staff with the support and tools needed to improve student learning outcomes. This essay has cited examples of programs and services that exhibit portions of the SLO model and two case studies that address this model.

However, as the Standard II Report notes, “there is no *institution-wide* process for evaluating the effectiveness of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level.” That Report goes on to say that “faculty will need support and training regarding the development and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program level” and proposes the development of a group of faculty who can act as resource people for departmental initiatives.

The Standard II committee suggests two sources of concern. First, faculty must be assured that *when an assessment produces less than desirable results, those findings will not be used in a punitive manner but instead will be focused on program improvement.* In fact, one of the motivating forces behind the movement of accrediting commissions toward embracing SLOs as a central component of their standards, has been a commitment to use assessment for program improvement rather than the type of “carrot and stick” models proposed by some legislatures and government agencies. However, because the discussion of outcomes assessment and what it really means is still in progress at the College, it is premature to make broad generalizations about the acceptance and impact of assessing student learning outcomes. While many educators view the accountability movement with skepticism, it is important to recognize that student learning outcomes can provide us with useful information to promote student learning—while giving our communities clear evidence that we are effective and valuable.
“Another potential source of resistance to student learning outcomes,” notes the Standard II Report, “is the perception that development, implementation, and assessment of student learning outcomes is a monolithic process that cannot be tailored to the needs of individual programs.” The two case studies in this essay suggest there is an alternative viewpoint. The examples cited here are initiatives that have developed out of a sincere desire to improve student success by using a combination of clearly stated outcomes and carefully crafted assessment to evaluate effectiveness. In each case, the effort has been tailored to the specific needs of programs and services.

The infusion of SLO expectations into every aspect of the accreditation standards has provoked considerable controversy. The statewide Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been a significant adversary in this debate. In Fall 2004, the Senate adopted “The 2002 Accreditation Standards: Implementation.” That document clearly articulates the objections that many academic professionals have with the SLO paradigm. At the same time, the Senate also clearly articulates how institutions can use a variety of methodologies to assess SLOs for the broad spectrum of academic offerings in California community colleges. Equally important, the Senate points to models that have appropriately placed faculty at the center of defining the goals, establishing the standards, and developing the implementation of SLOs.

At City College of San Francisco, faculty views on SLOs are similarly diverse, requiring continued discussion and improved integration with our traditions to increase ownership. The effort to learn more about and experiment with the assessment of SLOs will require the participation of both faculty and administrative leadership across the institution. The College will have to develop human and financial resources to provide programs and services as well as the expertise and technical support necessary to fully implement SLOs. This is a long-term process that will have to evolve over years. However, this essay also demonstrates that significant progress can be made with limited resources over a relatively short period when the effort evolves from faculty-driven goals and processes. Speaking to the centrality of faculty in this process, Chancellor Day in his Opening Day speech (August 2005) proposed that “… it is my intention to confer with the Academic Senate and hopefully with their support convene a special committee of interested faculty, staff, students and administrators to … recommend a course of action to ensure that we support the assessment of student learning outcomes at all levels of the institution along with a corresponding commitment to assist through the provision of leadership and professional development.”

---
14 Fall comparative data has been used for these comparisons since students tend to perform at lower levels during the fall vs. spring semesters. Success rates are determined as completing the course with a “C” or better and include withdrawals as unsuccessful.
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THEME TAB III
THEME III: College Dialog Promotes Institutional Improvements

The institution engages in inclusive, informed, and intentional dialogue about institutional quality and improvement. All members of the college community should participate in this reflection and exchange about student achievement, student learning, and the effectiveness of its processes, policies, and organization. To ensure that dialogues are well informed, the college depends on reliable data—both quantitative and qualitative—that is responsive to important institutional issues, meaningfully interpreted, and broadly communicated. The institutional dialogue results in ongoing self-reflection, bringing improvements to college programs and services.
I. Overview

College dialogs at CCSF are many and occur at all levels of the organization and among all College constituencies. Meetings and discussions about institutional issues are pervasive, and the dialogs that occur are critical to institutional growth and change and address many sections of the WASC standards. Section II of this essay presents the institutional context—a description of the College's Shared Governance System and brief descriptions of a sample of dialogs organized around four critical areas: (1) planning; (2) diversity and equity; (3) student success; and (4) teaching and learning. In reality there is often overlap between and among the dialogs that advance the programs and activities reflected by these broad areas. Section III provides fuller depictions of four representative and important case studies of dialogs originating from four different sources: students, faculty, administration, and campus/program sites. Section IV, “Conclusions and Future Directions,” comments on ways to improve the role of dialog across the District.

The increase and ease of access to data, reports, and evidence have greatly informed and improved the quality and results of College dialogs. Thanks to the Office of Research, Planning and Grant’s development of the Decision Support System (DSS), any member of the College community can access a wealth of current and historical data and many reports that analyze student surveys and performance indicators. Other tools that facilitate dialog across the District are: email exchanges; listservs; City Currents, the College's weekly newsletter; department/program newsletters; the various Shared Governance and other organizational committees and groups conducting regular meetings for the discussion of issues and plans; the Chancellor’s semi-annual presentations to the College community during FLEX days; the Chancellor's Midsummer Report; and listening sessions for all stakeholder groups. Listening sessions have become a regular part of the review and analysis of major documents and initiatives. The College Shared Governance leaders responsible for developing a document or initiative engage in dialogs with interested members of the community who attend these sessions. The listening sessions, scheduled at various sites throughout the District, are widely publicized and are open to all faculty, students, staff, trustees, and San Francisco community residents. Three fairly recent examples were the listening sessions held prior to the final approval of the Strategic Plan 2003-2008; sessions conducted as part of the institution-wide review and evaluation of the College's Shared Governance policies and procedures in 2004; and sessions scheduled at various locations in the District for reactions and comments to the current Self-Study report.

The participants in the examples of dialogs selected for this essay have used some of the institutional data, as well as information and data they created by engaging in committee and group discussions with community members, advisory boards, students, faculty, and others. Most of these dialogs have focused on improving College services and operations to better support teaching and learning.

II. Institutional Context

The three-part College Shared Governance System (Collegial Governance System, College Advisory Systems, and Planning and Budgeting System) is the major conduit for formal institutional dialogs. It has been evaluated three times since its adoption and has been improved greatly over the years. The most recent and comprehensive evaluation contained several findings that relate to dialog. The online survey of 140 participants, of whom nearly two-thirds were full-time faculty and department chairs, found that 78 percent of the respondents reported that their experience with governance committees encourages honesty among the participants and 91 percent said that their opinions were usually or always respected (Evaluation of Shared Governance, 2004, p.25).
Considerable effort has been made to promote College-wide dialog over the past six years with four critical themes emerging: planning; diversity and equity; student success; and teaching and learning. The strategic planning process involves a large number of participants, is based on intentional use of relevant institutional data, and is solidly focused on institutional improvement and responsiveness to student needs. During the 2002 strategic planning process to update the Strategic Plan, three phases occurred. In the preliminary phase, representatives from all constituent groups and from the Board of Trustees participated in a two-day, off-site retreat. During the planning phase, two planning sessions with the Planning and Budgeting Council, Trustees, community members, and alumni were held. Also, dialog with the Office of Research, Planning and Grants was necessary to complete reports and compile study materials. In addition, the most recent planning process for the Strategic Plan 2003-2008 involved more dialog among campuses and schools in order to integrate the Education Master Plan of 2003. During the dissemination and adoption phase, drafts were reviewed and discussions held by the principal Shared Governance groups, the Academic Senate, Associated Students, Classified Senate, and the College Council. Hearings were also conducted at various campuses in order to obtain broad-based comments and include all constituencies.

Facilities planning also includes many different groups and individuals in dialog. The 2000 bond measure illustrates how dialog across the institution was critical in accomplishing College improvements. The College initiated a bond measure in early 2000 and took its proposal to the Facilities Review Committee, a Shared Governance committee, for its review and input. Discussion also occurred in the Executive Council of the Academic Senate. The College voluntarily submitted its proposed bond measure to the San Francisco Mayor’s Office and the Board of Supervisors, resulting in a series of meetings at different community sites to encourage the public comments. In addition, the College’s Board of Trustees’ Committee on Facilities held open forums to insure widespread input. More than 25 speakers offered input at the Board meeting at which a unanimous vote was taken to go forward with the bond measure of $195 million. The result was approved by 72 percent of San Francisco voters, an indication that the College’s efforts to inform and involve the community in discussion were successful.

Likewise, dialog dealing with diversity and equity, a hallmark of the institution, has proven essential to the responsiveness of the College community to the changing needs and expectations of our students. The driving force for many improvements is the Diversity Committee, a Shared Governance committee composed of all College constituencies. Since 2003, its meetings and discussions have targeted hiring practices, diversity of employees, and curricular issues. Dialogs related to hiring practices have focused on identifying obstacles to the hiring process and the applicant pool. The Diversity Committee initiated several discussions with Human Resources staff, resulting in changing the language on job announcements from the difficult-to-measure “sensitivity to diversity” to more measurable criteria focusing on skills and knowledge. Addressing ways to improve the applicant pool, the Diversity Committee revitalized the innovative program, “Grow Your Own.” This program, scheduled to start in Fall 2005, will help subsidize the education of CCSF students interested in becoming instructors, with the idea that they will be encouraged to apply for teaching positions at CCSF after their studies. By actively recruiting from the diversity of our current students, CCSF is investing in the future diversity of its faculty. Two other directions that the Diversity Committee’s dialogs have pursued relate to diversity issues in the curriculum of critical transfer courses and possible ethnic/racial disparity in basic skills courses. These dialogs with some department chairs and faculty revealed that faculty are willing but not sure how to improve their teaching and courses in these areas. Thus, the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP) was created to provide faculty multicultural professional development. Since Fall 2003, the MIP has trained 65+ faculty members in diversity issues and related pedagogy. In fact, the meetings and dialogs of the Multicultural Infusion Project brought together a variety of instructors, counselors, librarians, and other staff from across the District. One faculty member in Transitional Studies credits these dialogs as being “very important to building community and making more staff aware of the various programs and services” (Lillian McDaniel, Listening Session, April 21, 2005).
Dialogs regarding student success, aspirations, and expectations, as well as College contributions and limitations, are systemic across the institution and have involved virtually all constituents and resulted in observable change, fueling further dialogs on teaching and learning which have only begun to have additional effects on student performance. Particular projects have been dialog intensive, such as the Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS), peer-mentoring, the Multicultural Infusion Project, the National Institutes of Health’s Science Scholars program for underrepresented groups, the African-American Achievement Programs, the Latino Services Network, the Asian Pacific American Student Success Program, and the Basic Skills Initiative, spearheaded by the Basic Skills Subcommittee. This two-year plus initiative has involved monthly large-group discussions of 50 or more instructors, counselors, and other academic support staff, in addition to smaller work group dialogs focused on specific areas related to curriculum and support services for basic skills students. A set of recommendations was drafted in May 2005 for review by the Collegial Governance System.

Since the last WASC Self Study, a noteworthy dialog on student success was initiated during Fall 2000 with a Student Services System Review, a project involving faculty and staff within the offices of Student Development to document and analyze service delivery and to identify best practices and areas for improvement. These discussions, augmented by focus groups with students and teaching faculty, provided a foundation for continued dialog. The next year, the Chancellor initiated a conversation on the organization of Student Development which continued over a two-year period through a series of working papers and dialogs among counseling faculty. By Spring 2002, a new organizational structure was implemented with successive yearly assessments. In 2003 the departments involved in the reorganization began to develop, emphasizing continued dialog within each unit to increase the accessibility, utility, and impact of their services, efforts which resulted in concrete enhancements in all areas. Additionally, the Admissions and Records (A&R) Office embarked on a re-engineering project involving a team of A&R staff in an extensive dialog designed to map, analyze, and assess service delivery; a project which continues to result in improved enrollment systems. Finally, a team of counseling faculty and staff interested in student learning outcomes established a continuing discussion of the mission and role of the Student Development Division with emerging outcomes aligned with outcomes identified within each of the programs and departments. Each of these conversations has contributed to improved access and service delivery in the Student Development units/departments.

Dialogs focusing on teaching and learning primarily occur among faculty in specific departments/programs on an as-needed basis, such as curriculum changes, department governance, facilities, and program planning and review. However, collaborative, cross-disciplinary instructional initiatives are emerging, such as the Biology Department’s collaboration with the Art Department to develop the new course, “Natural History Field Observation and Illustration”; regular presentations about nutrition made by a biology instructor in a physical education course; and the course development work underway between the departments of Biology and Computer Science to develop a bioinformatics course and between Biology and Engineering to develop a bio-electrical-mechanical repair course. All of these examples reflect a culture of collaboration that is based on both informal and formal opportunities for faculty and deans to share information and discuss their ideas for instructional improvements.

The following two examples briefly illustrate self-reflective dialogs representing broader-based involvement. The Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) grant-funded project has a 10-year-plus history at CCSF. Over the years, it has served about 10,000 students and can be viewed as a model process for engaging credit and noncredit faculty across the District in discussions about teaching methods and assignments, encouraging the use of a variety of teaching strategies, providing professional development for best practices, and integrating academic and workplace skills in the curriculum. Over 100 instructors from every instructional department have had the opportunity to be paired with a mentor-colleague to listen, observe and be observed in the classroom, and to engage in discussions both with the mentor and with an entire group at monthly meetings.
Another example is the English as a Second Language (ESL) and Transitional Studies Departments’ Reflective Teaching Project (RTP), initiated in response to requests by ESL faculty for a venue to discuss classroom issues in a structured and supportive environment. RTP is based on the reflective cycle of learning documented by John Dewey. Commensurate with the goals of student engagement, reflective teaching promotes critical thinking skills and encourages instructors to find ways to involve students as active participants in their own learning. This grant-funded project has allowed ESL and Transitional Studies instructors to meet once a month at several campuses to discuss a specific classroom issue of concern to them. The participant-led agenda and confidential nature of the dialogs have encouraged instructors to raise issues freely among their peers in a structured and prescribed manner, focusing on finding solutions to staff-development concerns. The project has been very successful and in response to increased faculty interest, plans are underway to find ways to expand it.

III. Case Studies

These examples of dialogs were selected for the quality of involvement by a larger number and/or variety of participants, use of information/data, and the significance of the resulting and ongoing effects on institutional improvement and responsiveness to student needs. They reflect the voices of the initiating source of the dialog:

- from faculty—Design Collaborative
- from administration—Enhanced Self-Study (ESS)
- from students—service learning (SL) and the student election process
- from campus/program sites—campus/site advisory committees and community-based organizations (CBOs)

Design Collaborative—Faculty-Initiated Dialog. The Design Collaborative is an interdisciplinary initiative that to date has involved discussions and curriculum planning among faculty from the departments and programs of Architecture, Art, Graphic Communications, Multimedia Studies, and Photography, along with the deans of the School of Science and Mathematics and Liberal Arts, and administrators from the Office of Research, Planning and Grants. There is no formal administrative structure; it is a true collaborative effort among department chairs, instructors, and deans, whose common interest and dedication to their professions and to student learning have created the momentum and outcomes. Right from the start the chairs and deans encouraged this innovative collaboration. The initiative has moved through many stages, all involving dialog and consensus-building, to identify ways to better serve students, discuss challenges, and find solutions.

Discussion started in Spring 2000, when the chairpersons of Photography, Graphic Communications, Art, and Architecture began to explore the possibility of teaching courses collaboratively. The Dean of Science and Mathematics supported the idea and had a conversation with Chancellor Day about how a collaboration might fit the then-developing animation industry. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs called a meeting of the founding departments and the Dean of Liberal Arts during which the project goals and plans were discussed and clarified, resulting in a VTEA grant proposal submitted in March 2002. The following academic year (2002-03), more dialog, planning, and review of data occurred. Those activities that involved significant discussions included:
• DACUM (Designing A CurriculUM) sessions involving seven faculty from five departments and over 12 representatives from industry, resulting in a summary of findings.

• A two-day retreat attended by seven faculty and administrators to review and discuss research findings that had been provided by a project consultant, and determine implications for course finalization.

The Design Collaborative team has effectively developed and obtained Curriculum Committee approval for three initial courses since the 2003–04 academic year: Design Fundamentals, Rapid Visualization, and Color in Design. Faculty members began testing two of these courses during the Spring 2004 semester. The collaboration has involved several faculty who have met to discuss the syllabi and classroom activities. The Color in Design course debuted in Spring 2005, and a Design History course will be ready for Fall 2005, resources permitting. The next goal is to fully develop the Associate of Arts Degree in Design, which will entail more dialogs for developing the final two courses, Orientation to Design and the Design Practicum. This project, driven by faculty committed to dialog and finding ways to improve the learning experience for students, appears to be on its way to success.

Enhanced Self-Study – Institution-Wide Dialog. The Enhanced Self-Study illustrates perhaps the most intensive, broad-based, informed, and intentional institutional dialog in the College’s history. Following the 2000 WASC Self-Study, the Chancellor proposed that the College undertake an Enhanced Self-Study Project (ESS) to “reach deeply and incisively into the critical areas of the College where students are served and success is achieved, to discover what we are doing that works and what is needed, and to recommend the various vital changes which, taken together, can transform this educational enterprise” (Opening Day Address, Fall 2000). His proposal was elaborated in the form of a handbook and disseminated to various individuals and groups, including the Academic Senate Executive Council and the Department Chairs Council for review and comments. After much debate and discussion among the officers of the Academic Senate, some revisions to the proposal were made and the project moved forward.

In Fall 2000, members of the College community began organizing and meeting. From the beginning the goal was to use the College Shared Governance System to ensure the broadest involvement of the community. The basic structure of the ESS rested on five ad hoc committees: Pre-Registration and Matriculation; Pre-College Learning; College Level Learning; Enrollment Management Tools; and Student Outcomes. Orientation sessions were attended by more than 125 faculty, staff, students, and administrators during the fall semester, and these volunteers joined one of the five ad hoc committees. Initial meetings involved a lot of brainstorming and frank discussions about problems and concerns that committee members believed to be barriers to student learning and success. When a committee finally drafted a recommendation, the co-chairs brought that recommendation to the Ad Hoc Coordinating Council (AHCC) for more discussion and acceptance, if appropriate.

The co-chairs of the five committees regularly provided progress reports to the AHCC, co-chaired by the Chancellor and the President of the Academic Senate, and composed of the co-chairs of the committees, the Vice Chancellors, a Department Chairs Council representative, and an Associated Students representative. The sessions consisted of co-chair updates and presentations of recommendations coming out of the committees. After more discussion and questioning from the AHCC, the co-chair(s) took the recommendation(s) back to their committees for further work before resubmitting them. During this interactive discussion process with the AHCC, two recommendations were merged, three others were not approved, and the AHCC discovered that two original recommendations could be readily implemented without being a part of the ESS recommendations.
The recommendation process demanded extensive dialog. After each recommendation was completed and deemed ready by the AHCC, it was then sent to the appropriate Shared Governance committee for more discussion and recommended action. Many of the recommendations had to be discussed and approved by more than one Shared Governance committee, so this process sometimes required additional dialogs.

The Board of Trustees and the community were kept abreast of the progress of the Enhanced Self-Study through several information-sharing venues and some dialogs: through the Chancellor's addresses at FLEX day each semester and his report to the Board; through actual participation on committees; and through the Academic Senate President's report. Regular updates on the ESS were provided to the College community through articles in *City Currents* and through the College website. Comments and questions were encouraged throughout the process. Three critical College Shared Governance committees also provided valuable input during their discussions of the ESS recommendations: the College Council, composed of all department chairs and head administrators; the Department Chairs Council, composed of all department chairs; and the Chancellor’s Cabinet, composed of all head administrators.

At the end of the Enhanced Self-Study, a questionnaire was distributed to 170 participants for feedback about the process. The findings revealed that interest in improving student success was the prime motivating factor for participation and that most participants felt that the process of identifying priorities was comprehensive and effective, with ample opportunity to share ideas and to hear differing points of view. They also indicated that because of the experience with the ESS, institutional awareness of the issues affecting student success had been raised.

Outcomes from the ESS are significant and still underway. Thirty-four (34) recommendations came from the five ad hoc committees, 27 of which have been either approved and implemented or approved but put on hold for various reasons. Three examples of improvements resulting from this dialog-intensive process are:

- extending matriculation support by changing the criteria by which students receive matriculation services, to ensure that a wider range of basic skills students avail themselves of these services;
- identifying the need for a College assessment plan and implementing an ongoing program of student outcomes research, dissemination, and response; and
- providing early intervention for pre-collegiate basic skills students by identifying pre-collegiate basic skills students as those whose placement test scores place them in Math E or an English or ESL course that is non-degree applicable. The purpose of the identification is to improve their access to proper counseling services.

Service Learning and Associated Student Elections—Student-Initiated Dialogs. Students sometimes initiate dialogs related to their learning and issues of importance to them. There are many inspiring examples of how service learning has transformed the learning experience for students, but only two examples can be described here: an environmental education experience and one of Project SHINE’s initiatives. Both of these examples are coordinated through the Office of Mentoring and Service Learning, using its advisory group and ongoing dialogs with faculty, students, and community organizations.

Students in Biology 20 (Introduction to Ecology) approached their instructor in 1998 requesting more hands-on experience in ecology. After discussion with the students, the instructor put them in contact with the site stewardship coordinator of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy (GGNPC) and agreed to offer extra credit points to all students for a Saturday morning spent restoring critical habitat in the national parks around San Francisco. After the instructor and the GGNPC site coordinator agreed to organize the habitat restoration mornings so that there would be about an hour of instruction to three hours of work, students and the instructor met with the GGNPC site coordinator to learn more about the...
needs of both. As a result of these dialogs, students have participated in redefining both the structure and content of the class. Other outcomes of the discussions between students, the GGNPC, and the instructor are an in-class module tailored to provide a larger context to the service learning experience, a new course offering—an ecology laboratory with a service learning component—and a more local emphasis in the Biology 20 course. Several instructors in the Biology Department are now participating in this program with the GGNPC. Since establishment of the program over the past seven years, approximately 1,000 students have spent 4,500 hours of service-related work. The experience also promotes community building among the students. Frequently students share in group discussions and in their journals their feelings about how unique and important it was for them to spend time together and get to know other students better, something they cannot do in the classroom. Students also recognize self-growth and other benefits of the experience by journal entries such as this one: “Throughout the semester, we have been focusing on how to save and protect our environment, but it was this experience (habitat restoration service learning) that has made me realize that it takes only a little effort to help save our parks and how important that is for years to come” (Michelle Yee, Fall 2004).

Another service learning project is Project SHINE, started in 1997 with collaboration between City College of San Francisco and San Francisco State University to address the needs of elderly immigrant students studying for citizenship and to help build intergenerational relationships. About 150 CCSF credit students per year participate in SHINE and serve more than 200 immigrant/noncredit ESL students from all over the world. At the end of a semester/year, students reflect on and discuss pre- and post-survey comments about their learning experiences. One example of an outcome of these reflective discussions was student interest in the development of a leadership program. They appealed to the Project SHINE staff, who then applied for a grant to fund the leadership program. With grant funding, they began collaborating with Coro Northern California, an institution offering experiential leadership training. Although Coro’s focus had been on business leadership, as a result of several discussions with Project SHINE’s staff, it tailored a training program focusing on the needs of CCSF students. This program is designed to provide students with ethical and effective leadership skills they can apply in college, the community, and the workplace. A component of the leadership training reinforces communication skills through group discussions and problem-solving activities.

Student government is an important voice in institutional dialogs. In order to strengthen this voice, several years ago the Associated Students worked with administrators and student groups on various campuses to improve their governance structure and elections process. With the merger of the credit and noncredit divisions between 1990 and 1992, one institutional issue that had remained unresolved was the student governance structure. During the Spring 2001 semester at the Ocean Avenue Campus, student elections had a ballot initiative for all campuses, and it included the ballot of officers for the Ocean Avenue Campus. The students at the Ocean Avenue Campus contested the ballot distribution, contending that officers should only be elected on the Ocean Avenue Campus. The ballot boxes and ballots were withdrawn from the campuses and the students from the other campuses challenged the overall election process for the District. The issue was brought to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor initiated a Student Governance Study Group that was charged with reviewing the entire area of student governance and to make reports to him and the Board of Trustees regarding the progress. The Student Governance Task group was composed of Associated Students Council representatives from five campuses, four faculty, a dean from one of the campuses, the Dean of Student Affairs, the Associate Dean of Student Activities, and the Board’s Student Trustee. The study group reviewed District policy, education code, and Associated Students Constitution and by-laws, meeting frequently in the 2001-02 and 2002-03 academic years. The study group progressed from dialogs of misperceptions and issue clarification to discussions that were better informed and structured. Subgroups were formed in which discussions addressed specific topics such as the student trustee election, state guidelines for the legality in collecting the student representation fee, and the overall structure of student representation in College governance.
The Student Governance Study Group’s recommendations resulted in a process for electing a student trustee, clearly defined operating guidelines, funding for campus leadership scholarships, and funding to compensate Associated Students officers and student members on Shared Governance committees. These changes have resulted in increased participation in student government at most of the campuses. However, at some campuses, such as the Alemany Campus, the formation of a student council and a process for student elections are still in the developmental stage. To build support, the Associated Students at the Ocean Avenue Campus have allocated some start-up funding to pay for field trips and cultural events, but a regular allocation for student activities is needed.

Campus/Site Advisory Committees and CBO-Initiated Dialogs. The neighborhood campuses/sites each have some type of discussion-communication structure to discuss and plan campus services and curriculum needs and to update faculty, staff, and students about events and activities. For example, at the John Adams (JAD) Campus and Mission Campus these monthly meetings (called a Site Council at the JAD Campus and a Coordinating Committee at the Mission Campus) comprise all constituent groups, including a Student Council representative. At the Chinatown/North Beach Campus, the Campus Dean meets regularly with the on-campus coordinators for ESL, Business, Counseling, and the Admissions and Enrollment Office. In this forum, issues around the enrollment process, student and community needs, trends, and course offerings are discussed and resolved. Student input at the Chinatown/North Beach Campus is also obtained from periodic focus groups and short surveys conducted in selected courses. All of this information is then used for discussion at campus faculty meetings.

Dialogs about curriculum and student services are also initiated by community groups and individuals at campuses where the community brings its needs directly to the attention of the campus dean and the campus/site advisory committee. All campus deans concur about the importance of community input and feedback to help them shape and design programs and curricula to serve community needs. Discussion and debate primarily occur at the campuses within the advisory council structure, composed of CCSF faculty/staff and representatives from community organizations; or in site councils, which are composed of campus coordinators, deans, faculty, and student representatives. The following examples from several neighborhood campuses reveal how campus/site advisory committees/councils and community-based organizations (CBOs) shape these dialogs and help contribute to improvements and institutional change.

The Southeast Campus (SEC) has built many relationships with and sought input from the community, as it has been a critical force in the economic development and job skills training for the residents in the southeast corridor of San Francisco. This input typically begins with discussions with members of the Southeast Advisory Board, the Southeast Associated Students, community-based organizations, churches, and public and private organizations. Two examples of outcomes resulting from a series of meetings and discussions with the various stakeholders are the Bridge to Biotech program, described in more detail in the Theme V essay, and the Hekima program. The idea for the Bridge to Biotech program began during regular meetings with the community and SEC students, when the SEC Dean realized that community residents and students needed a bridge class, comparable to the College’s excellent Math Bridge program, to access biotechnology courses. She shared this idea with administrators and the Board of Trustees, where further discussions ensued. The Hekima program resulted from another series of dialogs at the SEC Campus between the SEC Dean and some of the faculty and staff, high school and CCSF students, members of the San Francisco Police Department, and mental and public health professionals to discuss the need for an after-school, college preparatory program for young adults at risk of involvement in the criminal justice system. As a result of these dialogs, the Hekima program was developed to address this need.
At the Mission Campus, input from CBOs typically relates to workplace and employment needs in the community. One example illustrates how the Mission Campus Dean, collaborating with the Business Department coordinator, responded to a request from the Mission Hiring Hall. Staff from the Hiring Hall had asked the Mission Campus leadership for help solving employment needs in the community. After a series of meetings and discussions, a partnership, solidly built on trust and dialog, sparked the new Construction Administrative Assistant Program.

The other neighborhood campuses also have relationships with community-based organizations. For example, the Chinatown/North Beach Advisory Committee, composed of community leaders, CCSF program coordinators, and the Campus Dean, meets quarterly to discuss issues and provides input on the needs of the community and students. Their input has resulted in new course offerings and changes in scheduling. Another example is the Alemany Campus, located in the Tenderloin neighborhood. The Campus Dean there was approached by the executive director of the Bay Area Women’s and Children’s Center, who requested that the campus become involved in the development of adult classrooms in the school to allow parents to pursue ESL and computer classes after dropping their children at school. After a series of several meetings and discussion, the Alemany Campus faculty provided advice on the classroom design and construction, student computers and software, and classroom furniture. The results of this partnership are still being evaluated, as scheduling the classrooms at a convenient time for parents and security concerns need to be addressed.

IV. Conclusion & Future Directions

The College community and its external audiences can be proud of the broad-based involvement, intentional use of data and information, and generally cooperative and reflective dialogs that have shaped important improvements in College programs and services. Innovation typically requires collaborations fueled by dialogs that cross department/program areas. The types of dialogs at CCSF about teaching and learning have primarily been initiated by faculty in certain departments or on certain campuses, responding to student needs, community input, and external demands, such as compliance with Title 5 or accreditation requirements. This essay’s examples of SCANS, Reflective Teachers Project, the Design Collaborative, Service Learning projects, and collaborative projects between campus leadership and CBOs all illustrate the dynamic pockets of dialog coming from faculty or faculty-administration reactions to student needs, as well as from students. The examples of the Enhanced Self-Study, strategic planning, the improvements made in hiring issues related to diversity, and the Student Development Division provide evidence of institutional dialogs carried out primarily via Shared Governance committees. Indeed, the experiences and results of this current Self Study have been overwhelmingly dependent on the quality of the dialogs in the various Self-Study committees, work groups, and listening sessions—all based on a great deal of evidence about how the College is addressing the WASC standards and themes.

A culture of institutional dialog about student learning outcomes and assessment is still emerging. How does such a complex and large institution become a reflective learning community that actually makes the time to discuss and digest the research reports and data related to improving student success and learning? What organizational mechanisms might promote effective information sharing and discussions about the variety of student success services and programs across the District, allowing more involvement of staff at all instructional sites, as well as inter- and cross-disciplinary dialogs about teaching and learning? While this essay has illustrated many examples of effective dialogs to advance institutional priorities and respond
to student needs, what seems to be needed is more institutional support to create mechanisms that promote broader-based dialogs about learning outcomes and assessment. Also needed are ways to increase participation by more members of the College community. The Office of Research, Planning and Grants generates many useful reports and data on student satisfaction, success, and achievement, but what is lacking are more opportunities for dialog and questioning by a larger number of constituents about what these reports and data suggest, or how they might guide institutional change. How might more opportunities for dialog become part of the institutional culture? The suggestions below are offered for consideration.

A thread running through several institutional dialogs relates to the need for more attention to professional development for all levels of staff. Some of the following ideas relate to professional development and its connection to increasing the opportunities and time for faculty to engage in dialog and self-growth, which in turn should contribute to institutional growth:

- Explore the feasibility of returning to an “open-space”/college-hour time when no classes are held, so that discussions about research reports, data, and activities related to teaching and learning could be attended by more participants.

- Dedicate a no-conflict time during FLEX days for workshops and dialogs on specific themes related to improving and assessing student learning.

- Promote College-wide discourse about teaching and learning, perhaps through a Teaching and Learning Center. This center could house professional development materials on teaching and learning and support professional development opportunities.

- Increase the use of technology to facilitate discussion and information-sharing directed at institutional improvement throughout the District (e.g., online communities using online threaded discussion boards, chat, and video-conferencing or streaming video presentation of best practices related to basic skills instruction or enriching teaching materials with multicultural learning opportunities).

- Stimulate cross-disciplinary dialog to provide students with more integrative learning opportunities.

For such a large and complex institution, the College has begun to develop and expand its ability to host significant and meaningful dialogs, a process that has increasingly begun to integrate essential information into the conversation. Through formal governance structures as well as informal structures, the College community has collectively engaged in the generation of ideas, the development of innovations, and the growth of collaborative relationships that often result in specific proposals to intensify teaching and learning across the District. Still, given the academic calendar, we struggle to find the time to devote ourselves to the task and need to continue to work at creating dedicated venues for the sharing of information and deepening of dialogs on specific topics, such as student learning and development. This challenge begs increased attention.
V. Resources

Res. 1  Listening Sessions: Strategic Plan 2003–2008
Res. 2  Listening Sessions: 2006 Accreditation Self Study
Res. 3  Shared Governance Evaluation document
Res. 4  Student Services System Review
Res. 5  Basic Skills Recommendations, May 2005 Draft
Res. 6  Chancellor's Opening Day Address, Fall 2000
THEME TAB IV
THEME IV: Evaluation, Planning, & Improvement

The institution relies upon an integrated evaluation, planning and budgeting system for continuous improvement. The planning cycle begins with evaluation of student needs and college programs and services. Evaluation focuses on student achievement, student learning, and the effectiveness of processes, policies and organization. This evaluation in turn informs college planning objectives about needed improvements, and resources are distributed to implement these objectives. The college pursues alternative resources to ensure the achievement of its objectives. Once planning objectives have been implemented, the college evaluates how well it has achieved its goals.
I. Overview

City College of San Francisco has a cyclical planning, evaluation, and improvement process that increasingly focuses on student progress, achievement, and success. This essay examines selected cases at CCSF, widely ranging from a re-engineering study of Admissions and Records and an Architecture Department Program Review, to an evaluation of noncredit ESL promotion testing and a re-organization of Financial Aid. These cases vary greatly in scope and focus, but each in its own way provides insight into the principal parts of the planning cycle and demonstrates how our system provides the climate, the expectation, and the structure for continuous improvement through both periodic and non-periodic means. First, the essay examines the institutional context; then, through review of selected cases, demonstrates that our planning and budgeting system is flexible, well-organized, and even nimble. It will be clear that the primary focus of the system is supporting the improvement of teaching and learning.

II. Institutional Context

City College of San Francisco uses both formal and informal processes to evaluate and improve its programs and services. Since the 1992-93 academic year, the College has used the current Program Review System to evaluate programs and services and to assess strengths and areas needing improvement. Since 2000-01, the College has benefited from a comprehensive planning and budgeting system with mid-year and end-of-year assessments that provide key information about the progress of College units in meeting their annual objectives. The third process for evaluating College programs and services takes place at the operational level of the institution, among faculty, staff, and students, who identify problems and seek institutional support to find and implement remedies. All three of these processes are part of a growing “culture of evidence,” enabling administrators, faculty, staff, and students to address issues based upon College data. Such data may be generated through surveys or the College’s Decision Support System, which is accessible to everyone in the institution.

Program Review. The Program Review System requires most instructional, student development, and administrative units to conduct a self study once every six years. Each College unit must conduct a comprehensive examination of its mission, role, and function, and assess how well it is carrying out its goals and objectives. The Office of Research, Planning and Grants provides relevant data, including statistics on unit productivity, student performance, and student satisfaction. Each unit is expected to review and analyze its datasets, and address how the unit’s work aligns with the College Strategic Plan. All units must create a six-year plan for review by the Program Review Committee, a College Shared Governance committee, and senior administration.

Planning and Budgeting System. The second College process for evaluation and improvement is the College Planning and Budgeting System. This has been fully operational since 1999-00 and includes the following five components: (1) the Strategic Plan 2003-2008, adopted in February 2003, which includes eight strategic priorities for improvement and is supplemented by the College Education Master Plan (adopted in February 2003), the Facilities Master Plan, the Technology Plan and the Institutional Advancement Plan; (2) the Annual Plan, which derives its objectives primarily from the Strategic Plan and a companion document, the Strategic Plan Implementation Schedule, which, taken together, provide priorities and timetables for the annual plans of the College; (3) Cost Center Plans, which are the means for programs, departments, and offices to identify one-year objectives and activities that support the objectives of the Annual Plan; (4) the CCSF Budget, which is a one-year fiscal plan detailing the resource
requirements necessary to achieve the cost center plans; and (5) the Assessment component, which includes Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment Reports, and an annual College Performance Indicators Report. In addition, the College publishes an annual Management Plan, the compilation of the cost center plans and budgets, the annual plan and the College budget. The Management Plan is a source document and reference for the College during the fiscal year.

These five components of the College’s Planning and Budgeting System are fully integrated into the College’s Shared Governance System, and, with the leadership of the Chancellor, all College constituencies participate in the development and review of planning objectives and budgets. The Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) is the key College Shared Governance committee charged with providing guidance within the overall planning system. The Board of Trustees is ultimately responsible for approval and adoption of both the plans and budgets. In addition, the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees also contribute to the planning process, monitor implementation, and assess results and outcomes.

Improving and supporting student learning is the central focus of this system. Several features of the College’s planning and assessment process focus upon program and service improvements. During the review and discussion within the strategic planning process, improvement issues are identified and discussed. When the objectives for the annual plan are discussed and identified during the fall semester, improvement issues are part of the conversation, as they can be again when the cost center plans and objectives are developed in the spring semester. Finally, the Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment Reports, as well as the annual College Performance Indicators Report, provide opportunities for discussion of progress toward goals.

Faculty, Staff, Administrative, and Student Initiatives. Not all significant improvement initiatives originate within the formal Planning and Budgeting System. CCSF is evolving toward a more self-reflective and keenly focused organizational culture. The institutional emphasis on planning has been an enabling factor promoting initiatives to improve programs and services. Consequently, there are increasing numbers of faculty, staff, administrative, and student initiatives that must be addressed by the Planning and Budgeting System. At times, initiatives of this kind may involve a non-periodic (that is, unscheduled) review, study, or evaluation of the current situation and options for improvement.

This essay covers four case studies in depth: (1) the Admissions and Records case study; (2) the Financial Aid case study; (3) the Architecture case study, perhaps the most traditional of all four in terms of the Department’s effective use of Program Review, but also demonstrating elements of initiative; and (4) the Noncredit ESL Promotion Testing case study, an example of a faculty-led improvement initiative. It starts by examining the first two, which are examples of how non-periodic evaluations may be used at CCSF to jumpstart and accelerate the rate of improvement when there are compelling reasons to do so.

III. Case Studies

Admission and Records Re-Engineering Study: Visualizing New Realities. Efforts to improve processes related to admissions, registration, enrollment, and records at CCSF have been ongoing for many years. Incremental changes typically consisted of refining or modernizing processes and, from time to time, implementing new technology. In 2002, senior administration saw the need to further improve organizational effectiveness, particularly in the four areas of Human Resources/Personnel, Payroll,
Finance/Accounting, and Admissions and Records. This intent was reflected in the Strategic Plan 2003–2008. Of those four areas mentioned, it was felt that Admissions and Records (A&R) would be the best place to start a pilot effort because its effectiveness so directly impacted the quality of service to students.

Various issues needed to be addressed. There were long lines at most campuses during registration times, even after telephone registration was implemented for credit classes. Student complaints still abounded about “being given the runaround,” as did problems in areas such as grading and transcripts. Time-consuming, inefficient processes which relied too heavily on manual paperwork were seen as sources of many delays. In an attempt to begin to address these issues, the Strategic Plan 2003-2008 included ambitious objectives and plans for making improvements in A&R. Those plans, originating in various sections of the Strategic Plan, called for a re-organization and re-engineering of the unit, with a streamlining of processes. Paper-based systems were to be converted to electronic systems at all campuses, and more efficient systems were to be implemented for both credit and noncredit. Transcript, transfer, and degree audit issues were to be addressed. In Spring 2003 the effort began to re-engineer A&R.

The word “re-engineer” should not be taken lightly in this context. “Re-engineering a process” is often understood as a total re-design. The sweeping, assume-nothing nature of a re-engineering initiative is probably the most challenging aspect of it, while the fact that ideal or optimal results are at least envisioned is also one of the main benefits of the process. The A&R Re-engineering initiative was typical in that it was a creative endeavor to stimulate out-of-the-box solutions.

The Chancellor first discussed with administration the idea of doing a re-engineering study of A&R to see how to eliminate student frustration and complaints. The study process was set up, with consultants working with two CCSF teams assembled from teaching and counseling faculty and classified and administrative staff. Separate teams were established for credit and for noncredit. While steps toward re-engineering had begun prior to the study, the study advanced current steps and expanded into new developments. For example, the credit team identified various problems such as: lack of sufficient student service computers, multiple forms of storage used for records, Banner problems that delayed registration, late student payments, and occasional unacceptable delays in mailing transcripts. Examples of problems pointed out by the noncredit team included: paper intensive processes that did not make use of available technology, duplicate student records, enrollment and attendance that sometimes preceded admission, use of forms that varied by campus, and students enrolling in classes that were already full. The Dean of Admissions and Records sums it up: “The issue was to get rid of bottlenecks. How could we get students through this maze in a seamless fashion?” All information provided by the teams was carefully documented and flow-charted by the facilitators. Both teams suggested changes and solutions. Dozens of recommended solutions ranged from a one-stop student services facility at Ocean Avenue Campus, to electronic mailing of transcripts, better enforcement of payment policies, and use of a smart card for automated noncredit attendance reporting. The final report was then followed up by a list of ten Top Priorities for Implementation.

---

1 Re-engineering typically involves engaging direct participatory input from the field; describing problems with the current process; analyzing the functions which are to be retained, assuming absolutely nothing based on past practice; determining the role that new technologies might play in improving the efficiency, cost, and effectiveness; designing a new process or flow which is optimally streamlined and better serves the organizational mission; implementing the re-engineered process; evaluating the functioning of the process; and adjusting the process in a cycle of continuing improvement. (Hammer, 1993)
The Steering Committee for A&R Re-engineering has continued to meet during the 2004-05 academic year. Here is a brief list of what has been done with the ten Top Priorities for Implementation:

- **Improved Communication** continues to be one of the official departmental objectives. The internal communications issues among IT, Matriculation, and A&R have basically been resolved. There continues to be an emphasis on improving communications with students. An example is the revision of letters and forms sent to credit students.

- **Payment by students** was an area in which staff, faculty, students, and administration had differing perspectives. Ultimately, imposition of a stricter payment policy was an idea not only opposed by students, but deemed financially counter-productive, since student fees do not make up the bulk of funding that the College receives.

- **Blocks, holds, and repeats** continue to be an issue in that the Department Chairs Council wanted some control of these, and overrides to them, to remain at the departments’ discretion. A&R would prefer uniformity with fewer signatures required, because they are concerned about students fruitlessly hunting down department chairs for a signature during the summer months. Fact-finding is currently taking place on the overrides question.

- **Grading** was another area in which recommendations were made, primarily by staff, about an issue that falls under faculty purview according to the law. Some of those proposals did not find favor among faculty, although web grading was implemented in 2002. Because some faculty have not made the change, A&R has to track both old and new modalities and is unable to realize fully the projected efficiencies of the technology.

- **Records storage** remains a loaded topic, literally, with loads of boxes piled up as A&R tries to keep everything under the sun, until they receive a legal opinion as to what can be destroyed. That legal opinion is being developed as of Spring 2005. Meanwhile, A&R is impacted by the loss of much-needed office space. Document imaging will be implemented within three years or so to modernize the archiving of records and go “paperless.”

- **Banner support** has been improved through a restructuring of the user group and a new linkage with the Information Technology Policy Committee along with the upgrade to the latest version of Banner.

- **Integration of credit and noncredit** was to occur in the work processes to the degree practicable, with the idea of increasing efficiency by avoiding duplication. That goal remains a key interest of the team but was demoted to a secondary priority due to feasibility issues.

- A **one-stop center** for registration, Financial Aid, and other student services, such as the one at San Francisco State University (SFSU), is widely considered to be an effective (“co-location”) strategy for improving student service at CCSF. It is part of the District’s Facilities Master Plan and will be in the next bond initiative. Students will greatly benefit from such convenience, availability, and coordination of services.

- The **degree audit** has been implemented, so that students can see online what requirements they already meet, or need to meet, for degrees, certificates, or awards. This is expected to be a much faster and more consistent process than the manual one that preceded it.

- **Tech support** for students is being very successfully implemented through alternative funding for hardware and web-based applications. Block grants were used to install several computers in Conlan Hall, which students now use constantly to access their records, and additional computers will be installed in the Student Union for similar purposes. In noncredit admissions, an online application form is being piloted at the Downtown Campus and is being translated into Spanish and Chinese.
**Informal improvements.** The Re-engineering Study was a formal process that helped to trigger a whole series of what the Dean of Admissions and Records calls “informal improvements.” These have led to streamlined processes and the removal of barriers for students. Perhaps the most outstanding accomplishment in recent years has been streamlining registration to the point where students no longer have to go to A&R in person to get a registration appointment. Manual entry of application and matriculation data used to get so backed up that the appointments that students were given were of no use, because they had to wait for the paperwork to go through before they could actually register. It became a process that took students days to accomplish. Now, with the implementation of the online application process, matriculation data is entered instantly and students can get an appointment online within minutes. The lines at Conlan Hall registration have continued to get shorter and shorter, particularly as phone registration has been supplanted by web registration.

Use of the Internet has brought numerous benefits. Web registration has become so popular at CCSF that phone registration has been eliminated as an option. Reviewing best practices at other colleges, CCSF also decided to implement an online application form for credit admissions. Students now get a registration appointment right after submitting an online application. To solve the problem in noncredit of enrollment forms being sent back because of delays in getting the student officially admitted, A&R is piloting a process at the Downtown Campus whereby students get assistance from counselors and A&E² staff in filing online applications. Piles of transcripts that used to be mailed to SFSU, Cal State Hayward, and San Jose State are now sent electronically. A&R is particularly pleased with improvements they have made, working in cooperation with the Transitional Studies Department, to serve students who are getting the adult high school diploma. Issues with missing units and incomplete transcripts, previously commonplace, are now very rare because of improved coordination.

Noncredit attendance accounting, however, is one area in which progress towards automation has been on hold. Noncredit is not benefiting as much as credit by the increased efficiency in A&R. The Positive Attendance Rosters are a manual operation from the teachers’ perspective. While teachers take responsibility for accurately completing and submitting the rosters, the vacant slots of “open entry/open exit”³ are tallied manually by staff who walk class to class, counting students or seats. One legislator has seized on the proposal of noncredit attendance accounting by census, and progress towards automation is delayed while the District again waits to see whether that initiative results in changes to state law. The first time that concept made it as far as the State Department of Finance where it was defeated. Meanwhile, most areas targeted by the Strategic Plan for noncredit streamlining (“waiting lists, registration, transfer between classes, class counts, no-show follow up, and attendance accounting”) wait on the back burner while the census issue is pending resolution.

Has the re-engineering effort led to a radical transformation of Admissions and Records? That would be an overstatement. As of this time, the Re-engineering Study is regarded by some as more of a platform for change than a precise roadmap to it. The steering committee has discussed increasing staff involvement in the future and the development in Spring 2005 of a structured initiative for improvements in 2005–06. For now, A&R identifies a principal challenge as the inability to get classified positions filled due to budget constraints.

---

² Admissions and Enrollment

³ Noncredit classes are offered on an open-entry, open exit basis, meaning that students can enroll or withdraw at any time in the semester. Funding is based on daily attendance, so that vacancies must be filled as they occur.
Many of the recommendations of the study are being implemented and will be documented in the End-of-Year Assessment Report, Program Review, and the Self Study. The Admissions and Records Department has achieved an impressive level of ongoing improvements, whether or not each of those resulted from the re-engineering study, pre-dated it, or was associated with a series of discussions by A&R and the consultants. The bottom line is that these improvements have facilitated student learning by stripping away “red tape” and allowing students better access to all that the College has to offer.

Financial Aid: Focusing Institutional Attention. In the structure of the College, Financial Aid is part of the Student Development Division. Financial Aid has an impact directly affecting over 10,000 students per academic year. The Financial Aid story begins in the early 1990s with a department that by all accounts was in a state of crisis.

That crisis had many dimensions. Without belaboring the negatives, suffice it to say that the Financial Aid Office at that time fielded a constant litany of student complaints, suffered from extremely low staff morale, was not making use of all available technologies, and experienced a very heavy backlog of cases. The flexibility of the College Planning and Budgeting System, in putting outside resources to the service of internal improvement, has been responsible for a considerable turnaround in this area. A complete redesign of services was stimulated by student satisfaction survey data, followed by a performance audit by an outside entity, all with the full support of the College Planning and Budgeting System. Improving Financial Aid was a top priority.

The Chancellor describes Financial Aid as “a tangible and critical part of the City College welcome mat—an essential element of the College’s role in access and equity in higher education.” There is data to support that claim: ongoing surveys by CCSF of local high school juniors and seniors indicate that about 25 percent of local students aspiring to college see finances as a significant barrier, one that actually causes them not to enroll. Providing information about available financial aid greatly helps to level the playing field for low-income students, including many in underrepresented groups.

In the early 1990s, CCSF was not succeeding in leveling the playing field as well as it hoped to. In fact, as early as 1995, Financial Aid at the College was acknowledged as an office in deep trouble, although the path to improvement was far from clear. Student and employee surveys showed low levels of satisfaction with the Office, which had been put on Watch Status in its 1995 Program Review. There was concern that students were not getting timely and complete information about the availability of financial aid, and were not getting the high-quality service they had a right to expect when applying for aid. There were unsuccessful attempts to improve the situation; these apparently did not address the multiple roots of the dysfunction.

Planning. In 1998, under the Chancellor’s leadership, the College began to take a more systematic approach to resolving the problems in the Office. While the 1997 Strategic Plan was still in force, a routine review of the implementation status of the Plan resulted in a planning update document, including plans for improvements to Financial Aid. Strategic planning seemed the best vehicle in terms of the internal planning system for making key improvements in the Office, but it was felt that seeking outside advice to inform strategic planning in this area would be the smart thing to do.
The College contacted the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) for guidance in addressing the Financial Aid challenge in a systematic fashion. In 1999, NASFAA pulled together a team of financial aid professionals from various colleges who spent a couple of weeks at CCSF, doing a complete review of all aspects of the operation; essentially a performance audit. In 2000, goals were identified in the Student Development Education Plan, effectively serving to operationalize the decision to revamp Financial Aid services.

In 2000, when the current Dean of Financial Aid, Jorge Bell, came into his position, the improvement process further accelerated. At that time, the backlog of financial aid paperwork was still considered to be at unacceptable levels, with students having to wait practically all semester before their aid came through. In July of 2001, administrators and staff came in evenings and weekends to get rid of the backlog of some 3,000 student applications, ensuring students would have their aid in place by the beginning of the semester. The Dean of Financial Aid is emphatic in his characterization of that period: “We resolved never to go through that again!”

In 2002, during the drafting of the Strategic Plan 2003-2008, expanding and promoting Financial Aid was highlighted as the first plan under Strategic Objective 5. In the implementation of that Plan, references to improving Financial Aid were transferred into several subsequent College Annual Plans. (Financial Aid goes through an annual financial audit and a periodic CAL Grant audit, but these, although stringent, are compliance-based rather than focused specifically on improving service.)

Implementation. Part of the strategy for turning that situation around in a lasting way was training. Staff development activities began to take place as often as every week. The Office continued to seek available outside advice. Reports the Dean, “The experts from Region 9 of the U.S. Department of Education spent a whole day with us.” The Dean also coached a number of managers himself on an ongoing basis. In addition, a branch of the California Student Aid Commission, the Ed Fund, has provided staff with free customer service training. In 2001, a group of consultants was hired and a two-day staff development retreat was held. Among other improvements, it was suggested that staff form internal workgroups for addressing problems, such as the need that staff had identified for cross-training.4 As a means of implementing ongoing improvements, the Office later developed its own evaluation tool, which it uses to assess the level of student satisfaction, determine work flow issues, and redeploy personnel within the Office. With the aid of technology, processes were streamlined, so that instead of being batched, data was entered with the student present at the counter. Also very importantly, the Financial Aid Appeals Process is no longer carried out by staff, but by counselors who can advise students on ways to stay in school without aid if need be, and who can set up an education plan with them.

Funding. Financial Aid, through the Student Development Division, received increased funding during the years in question. From 2000 to the present, a high priority has been given to the improvement of student services as a whole, and Financial Aid has been further emphasized as a high-impact service. In addition, as California community college student fees have continued to rise, the state has diverted former Partnership for Excellence funds into funding for increased financial aid outreach. The Office began to work very closely with other departments in the Student Development Division, such as Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Outreach and Recruitment, and the retention programs. It also worked more closely with Public Information and Marketing. In 2004, state funding for financial aid outreach financed bilingual marketing efforts to inform students of available financial aid and included 1,200 cable and ethnic TV spots and the mailing of 380,000 postcards featuring outstanding graduates of the College. Budgeting has been responsive to the Financial Aid case. Where

---

4 Other internal staff workgroups addressed flow processing, absenteeism, internal evaluation.
appropriate, College funds have been reallocated as necessary to fulfill some Financial Aid Office goals. Financial Aid has been allocated some necessary positions (three academic counselors, four classified staff) despite the very tight budget situation at the College, reflecting the high institutional priority given to this area.

A worthwhile expense was incurred when Financial Aid was moved from a crowded, tucked-away bungalow into a spacious, remodeled, and more centrally located area in Cloud Hall. That dramatic change had a noticeable impact on staff morale, as well as serving to make Financial Aid more visible, convenient, and accessible to students. Additionally, the Department opened up a Financial Aid Resource Center next door, where students now use computers and other resources to research scholarships or file their FAFSA\(^5\) online, alone or with assistance.

A key strategy the College undertook in improving access and services to students and enabling their continued learning, has been to encourage qualified students to apply for Board of Governors’ Fee Waivers. As a result, many more students are applying for BOG waivers than did so before.

**Results.** Altogether, the number of students receiving aid is up 20.5 percent between February 2003 and March 2004—rising 33 percent from 2002 to 2004. Besides improved morale, outreach, recruitment, and marketing efforts were all factors in this increase. Employees and students alike have been surveyed on their satisfaction with the Financial Aid Office. In the College Performance Indicators report for 2004, the Employee Satisfaction Rates data show the following: on a scale of 1-4 (poor-excellent) Financial Aid Services was rated 2.987 by faculty, staff, and administration in Spring 2004, up a full quarter point (0.25), a significant improvement from Fall 2000. Students also acknowledged improvement. In the online Student Opinion Survey of credit students in various student categories, Financial Aid was rated from 2.57-2.79 on a scale from 1-4, with 4 being the highest. While the student rating leaves room for improvement, these numbers show improvement from the situation before the re-organization.

Today, City College of San Francisco remains strongly committed to continuing to remove barriers and demystifying financial aid for many potential CCSF students. While improvements in morale are cited by administration as very noteworthy, the rebuilding of trust on the part of both students and employees continues to be an ongoing effort and, according to its Dean, is never taken for granted by the Financial Aid Department. In terms of streamlining departmental processes, document imaging—a necessary technology to increase efficiency and effectiveness—is in the Request for Proposal stage as of Spring 2005. Finally, a challenge for the Department is meeting the informational needs of students who are not at the main campus; however, Financial Aid personnel do spend four to eight hours weekly at each of the principal neighborhood campuses.

**Evaluation.** Many of the improvements have already been documented in the End-of-Year and Mid-Year Assessment Reports, since the NAFSAA recommendations were absorbed into various elements of the College Planning and Budgeting System, as noted above. In the future, the Chancellor has said he would like to see another NAFSAA audit done in conjunction with the Office’s Program Review cycle.

**Architecture Department—Getting Our House in Order First.** The Architecture Department case revolves around a series of improvements to increase student success and promote positive learning outcomes. It is an excellent example of how a CCSF department has used the institutional review system to help it focus on a plan of improvement. The Architecture Department Chair described how all this came about.

---

\(^5\) Free Application for Federal Student Aid, the standardized financial aid application form.
The Chair says he was initially “very blunt coming in,” when he was interviewed for a faculty position in 2002. He was very frank in stating that there was a great deal of room for improvement in the Department at that time and was pleasantly surprised not to be sent packing forthwith, but instead to have his enthusiasm for change warmly received by long-time department faculty and the Department Chair at that time.

**Needs assessment.** The many changes that followed were deemed necessary based on various types of needs assessments. For example, a student survey in Spring 2004 found that only 1 percent of students were interested in Design Firm Management. As a result, that program was eliminated. In spite of its small size, the Department still offers three programs: Architecture, Interior Design, and Construction Management.

In September 2004, the Department completed a Program Review, and the “Discussion of Working Environment” section of that Review provided an excellent summary needs assessment (personnel, facilities, equipment, networking support). In addition, this review, as is the case with all Program Reviews, included relevant data on student demand, student success (GPA, course success percentage, term persist\(^6\)) relative to School and College, demographics, and productivity. The 2004 Program Review evaluated progress since the last review and also contained an evaluation of current functioning. The Department Chair has found the departmental Program Review to be essential to him as a planning guide and continues to refer to it weekly. He describes multiple changes as having been set in motion by faculty in the Department, with administration saying, “How can we help?” The Chair has found the School Dean to be quite supportive. In fact, the Chair’s experience has been that people at CCSF have “moved the world to make whatever you asked for happen.”

**Planning.** To facilitate its internal planning activities, the Architecture Department looked for models from outside, posing in its Program Review the following questions, “What are others thinking and doing? How are others achieving student success? What are the related needs of others and how are they being satisfied? How can we better integrate with others through our classroom instruction and pedagogy to increase student success?” In order to ensure that students succeeded in transitioning to universities, Architecture has also paid close attention to the curriculum of universities to which its students transfer.

In the Program Review, the Department set 18 goals under the College priorities related to (1) improving teaching and learning and improving the transfer rate; (2) continuing to improve community networks; (3) improving facilities and equipment; and (4) acquiring and managing resources. From these, they developed 62 action plans.

**Funding and collaboration.** The Architecture Department makes use of alternative funding, purchasing most equipment through Instructional Block Grants.\(^7\) The Department did a VTEA\(^8\)-funded DACUM\(^9\) review of its Interior Design program, completing phases one and two in March 2004. The Department is constantly applying for grants, and hopes to obtain alternative funding to set up a photo studio so that students can create portfolios.

---

\(^6\) “term persist” is the variable for term persistence, i.e., retention of students from one semester to the next.

\(^7\) Instructional Block Grants are State grant funding for equipment. The funding is allocated among CCSF departments based on proposals submitted.

\(^8\) Vocational and Technical Education Act.

\(^9\) DACUM stands for Designing A CurriculUM and is a structured brainstorming process that has been used to conduct job and educational program analysis. Experts from the workplace are asked to discuss the skills, competencies and knowledge needed for specific jobs in the workplace.
Collaboration has allowed the Department to leverage the resources they do have to maximum benefit. Participation in the Design Collaborative, a partnership with four other departments, is an obvious plus for a department that has suffered from many problems related to its small size. The Collaborative allows participating departments and programs (Architecture, Art, Graphic Communications, Multimedia Studies, and Photography) to achieve what one department acting alone would not be able to do. For example, the Collaborative has created Design courses that address the needs of students in participating departments.

The Architecture Department’s collaboration goes beyond participation in the Design Collaborative. Collaborating with Engineering, Architecture can now offer drafting classes several hours a day in a much more user-friendly Engineering Department lab. This enables them to remove the drafting tables from the CAD lab and turn it into a fully functional technology lab. In addition, their collaboration with Multimedia Studies has enabled Architecture to use the software from that program while letting them use ARCH hardware. This exchange gives ARCH students a chance to learn 3-D modeling and animation. Multimedia, in turn, has waived a class pre-requisite for Architecture students, recognizing that they have acquired equivalent skills.

**Supporting learning.** The many collaborations have greatly supported student learning. In fact, student success was cited by the Department Chair as an overarching departmental goal. One of the most important current initiatives has been a transfer and articulation guide. The new guide is seen as essential in helping students (especially the limited-English-speaking) navigate the seemingly mysterious labyrinth of procedures leading to transfer.

In order to improve learning, the Department has taken steps to make facilities more useful. Many of these modifications required no funding. One strategy was to open up spaces to new functions; for example, converting storage areas to pin-up space, so that student work could be critiqued; creating private spaces where faculty could confer in confidentiality with students; and setting aside large work areas for part-time faculty to grade student work. Thoughtful redesign and redeployment have supplemented available funding as a way of achieving goals. Much of the facilities redesign occurred as part of the process of Program Review. The Program Review Committee was struck by the large number of basic facilities needs in the document. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities was invited to a meeting with the Committee and the Department Chair. Ultimately, these individuals cooperatively established a structure for meeting facilities goals and committed to their achievement.

In other instances, there may be budgetary constraints that do not lend themselves to mitigation through creativity or alternative funding. A major funding disappointment for Architecture has been the lack of funding for classified staff. In terms of serving students, a significant problem has been that the Department office is often not staffed. The other funding disappointment for the Department has been that only $500 a year is available for all supplies. All CCSF departments are struggling with similar limitations due to statewide cutbacks in recent years.

Evaluation of the degree to which the Department’s goals have been met will be included in the next Program Review, just as the current one started with an assessment of what had been accomplished from the previous review. Departmental achievements will be summarized in Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessment Reports.

**ESL Promotion Testing – Fine Tuning the Assessment Process.** The evaluation that was conducted in Fall 2004 of noncredit ESL promotion testing forms the basis of this case, which was selected because it addresses student learning issues at the College within a noncredit context.
Departmental profile. The ESL Department is the College’s largest, with over 22,000 students and approximately 375 instructors at nine campuses and a hundred smaller sites. Many ESL students enroll to improve their English in order to be more successful at work, more effective as parents, and more active in their communities. Still others enroll because they intend to achieve an associate degree or transfer to a baccalaureate institution.

The ESL curriculum is composed of courses in both the noncredit and credit modes, with numerous levels to accommodate students who range from the emerging literate to those who are better prepared academically, and whose knowledge of English ranges from “absolute zero beginning” to advanced. Many classes integrate the learning of speaking, listening, reading, writing, and grammar skills.

In addition to these obvious benefits in terms of the breadth of offerings, one expects a certain economy of scale in a large department, making it possible to “pool” (as it were) the human and financial resources in order to pursue high goals. That is certainly true of CCSF’s ESL Department. The Department has been able to maintain its own Noncredit Curriculum Committee, its own Personnel Committee, and various other working committees. There are not only many very active committees at the department level, but within the ESL Department, faculty at the various campuses may set up campus curriculum committees to address issues of teaching and learning at their particular campus.

Assessment and learning. Assessment is one of these areas in which ESL benefits from economies of scale. The Department has its own Assessment Resource Instructor, who oversees the use of standardized tests, such as those used for placement or for promotion. ESL students need to be tested as they come into the program to find their English skill level, in order to be placed in the classes that are neither too difficult nor too easy for them and that will best allow them to learn. Once they are in classes and have nearly completed a course, they need to be assessed to see if they have met the criteria for course completion and advancement to a higher level.

Assessment challenge and response. In typical form, given its commitment to excellence and its past leadership, CCSF was one of the first colleges in the state to respond to the State Model Standards by developing a Noncredit Curriculum Guide based on these standards and began revising the ESL program. Faculty relied upon the Noncredit Curriculum Guide for direction, and at that time ESL was already doing standardized placement and promotion testing. When the noncredit ESL program was redesigned for alignment with these standards, the effective promotion testing program had to be scrapped and a new series of tests developed. The redesigned CCSF noncredit ESL program would essentially split each of the state model curriculum levels into two, for a total of 8-9 levels. For efficiency and alignment with the state, tests were developed only for even-numbered levels. They were also developed only for the skills—reading and listening—which could be most easily tested and scored. Although the previous assessment system had included testing speaking and writing skills at the midpoint of the noncredit ESL program, this provision initially was not carried over into the new assessment system. However, over the years, faculty increasingly felt that common assessment instruments should be developed for speaking and writing.

---

10 For example, 87 noncredit ESL courses are recorded in the State Chancellor’s Office for use at CCSF, more than twice those of any other California community college.

11 The Department is currently in the process of revising its course outlines to conform with the revised ESL Model Standards that are forthcoming from the California Department of Education. In addition, student surveys conducted in Spring 2005 led to innovations such as more weekend classes, and surveys have been conducted in the past few years to identify curricular objectives for EL Civics-funded classes. In addition, faculty conduct informal assessments in their classrooms to determine life skill areas that would be especially useful to students.
**Continuous improvement.** The ESL Assessment Resource Instructor produces reports each semester on the results of noncredit promotion testing. In order to promote wider discussion of how promotion test results might inform instructional and curricular practices, the ESL Department Chair worked with the ESL Noncredit Curriculum Committee to establish faculty forums in Fall 2004 for discussion of promotion test results. ESL faculty surveys were also used in conducting the evaluation. Faculty found that student success varied over the years in somewhat predictable fashion by campus. This is widely considered to be due to linguistic and age differences in student populations studying ESL at the various campuses, not to differences in pedagogy.

Recommendations were included by the Noncredit Curriculum Committee as part of its evaluation of the promotion assessment program. One recommendation is for teachers working with the same levels to meet (in “level meetings”) to discuss how to help students at all campuses reach optimal levels of learning. Also as a result of the recommendations, the Department has started developing tests for speaking and writing, and students will again face a battery of four tests at the midpoint of the curriculum, noncredit Level 4. It is felt that this “gateway” (to upper levels) approach is a good compromise between the desirability of testing students in all skills at all levels and the challenging logistics and economics of administering tests of spoken and written language.

These logistics may be formidable. The administration of common-instrument speaking and writing assessment involves extra faculty time compared to other types of testing. The resources that would be required to implement this assessment for every student in every section every semester are decidedly prohibitive. Having a “gateway” in place at a particular level of the program will serve to alert both students and faculty to the fact that the oral and writing skills will be tested and that students must be gradually prepared for that through the integration of those skills into the routines of teaching and learning.

**Funding.** With the use of faculty volunteers in the evaluation and improvement of noncredit testing, no special funding was necessary. Although the ESL Assessment Resource Instructor’s position is partially funded by the 231 Grant, she says that many of the assessment improvement activities do not receive any funding.

**Evaluation.** The evaluation of effective implementation and goal attainment for ESL will occur in the next Program Review. Documentation of test development will be included in the End-of-Year Assessment Report.

---

12 Level 4 at CCSF corresponds to the more challenging parts of Beginning High in the Statewide Model Standards.

13 The 231 Grant is supported by funds from the federal Workforce Investment Act, Title II (Adult and Family Literacy).
IV. Conclusion & Future Directions

This essay shows how City College of San Francisco addresses and supports continuous improvement of its programs and services through its integrated Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System. The four cases selected for the in-depth case study accurately reflect many elements of typical institutional practice, and provide evidence of how flexible and adaptable the College’s Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System has become, allowing the College to “refine its key processes and improve student learning.” We have demonstrated how our system provides the climate, the expectation, and the structure for continuous improvement.

This essay portrays many of the strengths of the College, including the removal of barriers to student learning. Examples of the focus on learning can be found in all of the cases. For example, by ensuring that students who pass into the upper levels of ESL will have a minimum level of verbal and writing skills in English, the ESL Department is putting in place an assessment device that will help to ensure that students will be taught critically important skills in the level where they can learn the most.

The College also does a great job of augmenting the normal, systematic processes of improvement in cases that are particularly challenging. The College has achieved excellent results by implementing constituency-led or administrator-led initiatives that accelerate change, as in Financial Aid and A&R. Bringing in outside advice or facilitation is something that the College has done to its advantage as well. That strategy extends also to seeking alternative funding, as has been shown by the many grant-funded projects mentioned above. Once a situation is headed in the right direction—A&R is a fine example of this, as it is still meeting regularly to assess progress on goals—the College admirably sustains its attention to the issue until major concerns are resolved, whether that is just a few weeks, or several semesters.

There is a productive and generally cooperative climate at CCSF, which encourages the engagement of all sectors of the institution in finding remedies to obstacles facing students. A widespread degree of agreement on major issues is very frequently achieved through broad review and inclusive, democratic processes, including some that are part of the Planning and Budgeting System. That is not to say that the College has eliminated diversity of opinion—far from it! However, the many venues for expression of those opinions, and a strong system of Shared Governance, have led to a certain degree of dispersion, or sharing, of power at the College. With the essential support of a significantly high level of leadership by the Chancellor in the years since the last Self Study, this institutional dispersion of power—built into our system and guarded by the constituencies—has made for a positive and relatively harmonious climate at CCSF in comparison to many other colleges, or even our own historical record.

While the City College of San Francisco improvement system has shown itself to be both flexible and inclusive, it also faces many challenges. It has sometimes been said that the CCSF system, in an effort to consider all sides of each question until some consensus is achieved, is very deliberative. Each of the cases in this essay contains some examples of problems that took some time to be fully addressed and resolved. It is a very common occurrence at the College that an issue takes time to make its way to the top of the action agenda. There are so many concerns at any one time that are equally pressing. It can take time for key individuals and groups to identify a problem as needing immediate attention.
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Once the problem has been identified—here Financial Aid is a good example—the College is not always as quick as we would like to be in selecting from among the various promising solutions and refining one of them to make it workable. Sometimes it takes a while to broadly mobilize the will necessary to take bold action. A&R might be seen as an example of that. Precisely because the situation never reached a crisis point, it took a while to reach the decision that big changes were warranted. Once there is consensus for change, it can still take time to identify and obtain human, financial, and other resources essential to the solution and to actually set a timeline or trigger an intervention or initiative of some kind. For example, ESL knew it wanted to institute speaking and writing tests again at some point—there was a developing consensus about that need—but there were other assessment issues that always took priority until such time as the evaluation conducted by the Noncredit Curriculum Committee placed the speaking/writing test issue squarely on the immediate action agenda. In summary, there are various challenges that the College faces in trying to address problems in a timely fashion and some of those challenges seem unavoidable in an institution of this size. When the goal is continuous improvement, as it is at the College, there will always be more concerns than can be addressed at one time.

The College can take various steps to enable the institutional improvement system to work more effectively and efficiently. These suggestions are intended to support the continued development of a problem-solving culture at the College—a solution-focused approach.

First, the College should implement a data dialog initiative for the purpose of greatly increasing among all members of the College community (1) exposure to College data, both qualitative and quantitative; (2) experience and knowledge about accessing, interpreting, and using data; and (3) the amount of College discussion about the implications of data.

Second, all Shared Governance groups and College organizations should be notified that, if they have not already done so, they are being requested to proactively identify a list of priorities and formulate an action plan (for the internal use of their committee), starting in Fall 2005, and continuing on at least an annual basis. As their work is valued and important, setting priorities and plans will help to focus the activities of their group for maximum effectiveness, enhancing the benefit to the College, the students, and the community. Their plans should: (1) reflect their commitment to student learning; (2) be informed by College data; (3) seek to resolve issues within their scope of responsibilities; and (4) be informed by and congruent with the Strategic Plan.

Finally, the plans and recommendations from the Standards Reports as well as the Theme Essays should be integrated into the Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System. The College should ensure that they are used in drawing up Annual Plans, in the revision of the Strategic Plan, in revision of the Program Review process, and in revision of any other relevant plans such as the Education Master Plan. Moreover, the implementation of the plans must be evaluated.
V. Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res. 1</th>
<th>Program Review System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Res. 2</td>
<td>Mid-year Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 3</td>
<td>End-of-Year Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 4</td>
<td>College Performance Indicators Report, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 5</td>
<td>CCSF Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 6</td>
<td>Cost Center Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 7</td>
<td>Shared Governance System document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 8</td>
<td>Decision Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 9</td>
<td>Strategic Plan, 2003–2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 10</td>
<td>Admissions and Records Reengineering Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 11</td>
<td>Strategic Plan Implementation Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 12</td>
<td>Facilities Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 13</td>
<td>Education Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 14</td>
<td>Institutional Advancement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 15</td>
<td>Technology Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 16</td>
<td>Institutional Annual Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 17</td>
<td>Program Review (Architecture Department, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 18</td>
<td>Financial Aid Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 19</td>
<td>Student Opinion Survey, 2004–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 20</td>
<td>National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NAFSSA) Performance Audit (1999) and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEME TAB V
THEME V: Organization

The standards require colleges to have inclusive, informed and intentional efforts to define student learning, provide programs to support that learning, and to evaluate how well learning is occurring. This requirement means that the institution must have in place the organizational means to identify and make learning outcomes public. This requirement for adequate staff, resources and organizational structures (communication and decision making structures) is not new to accreditation standards, but the new expectation is that these be oriented to produce and support student learning. Consequently, the staff, resources, and structures will be evaluated in part by how well they support learning.
I. Overview

This essay illustrates the organizational support the College provides to support student learning through two case studies, one of a department, Biological Sciences, and the other of a program, Biotechnology. Predictably, some of the organizational structure issues reported in these case studies may be unique to Biotechnology or Biological Sciences; however, the conclusion focuses on College-wide issues raised in these case studies related to staff, resources, and organizational structure.

The Biological Sciences Department case study gives a picture of a typical academic department. Several Biological Science courses can be used to satisfy the CCSF graduation requirement in Natural Sciences and can also be used to meet general education requirements for the California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) systems. The department chair, three faculty members, and the Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics were interviewed to gather information for this case study.

The Biotechnology Program was chosen because it meets the educational and training needs of students related to workforce, economic, and community development (CCSF Strategic Priority 3). This program illustrates how the College supports student learning through both its noncredit and credit programs. The College has successfully sought grant funding to support the program, and it has received regional, state, and national recognition. This program is a good example of the way the College develops community and industry partnerships to support programs that meet student needs. Interviews with the program coordinators of the biotech certificate programs, the coordinator of the Bridge to Biotech program, the director of Bio-Link, the coordinator of the new equipment clearinghouse, and the Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics provided the foundation for this case study.

II. Institutional Context

Commitment to student learning is core to the Vision Statement the College has adopted. The CCSF Mission Statement describes the educational programs the College provides to ensure that students reach their educational goals. The first three of the eight priorities the College has identified in its Strategic Plan 2003-2008 address our intentional plans to support student learning:

1. Increase student success through expansion and improvement in the areas of basic skills, remediation, and academic support services;

2. Strengthen and improve academic programs, student learning outcomes and alternative systems of delivery; [and]

3. Expand programs meeting educational and training needs related to workforce, economic, and community development.

The Vision and Mission Statements of the College provide the basis and context for strategic planning, annual planning, annual assessment, and the implementation of the programs and services at all of the College's campuses and sites. The College follows a Shared Governance approach in its planning process.
The College has a variety of organizational means to identify and make student learning outcomes public. The Office of Instruction and the College Curriculum Committee determined last year that the course objectives section of each course outline clearly spells out intended student learning outcomes for the course, and that section is now labeled “Major Learning Outcomes.” The Office of Instruction and the College Curriculum Committee developed a Technical Review process several years ago to provide departments with a means of getting assistance in course outline development, including how to align the objectives, content, and evaluation sections of the outline. This process gives course outline developers the opportunity to consult with the Dean of Instruction, Curriculum/Tenure Review or with the chair of the College Curriculum Committee before submitting the outline to the Curriculum Committee. In addition, the Office of Instruction is now requesting that departments provide descriptions of major program outcomes that will be published in the Catalog. The Catalog is available online to the public and is for sale at College bookstores.

The Office of Public Information and the College website provide information to the community about College programs. The research support to help identify student needs and learning outcomes is provided by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants. Departments maintain websites with information about their programs as well.

The College has a variety of organizational means to provide programs to support student learning. The College’s departments are the main organizational means we have to provide instructional programs in both credit and noncredit. Additional instructional programs are offered by Contract Education. The College’s hiring procedures support the hiring of diverse, qualified faculty, administrators, and staff for programs that provide student learning. The Faculty Positions Allocation Committee (FPAC) invites departments to submit requests for replacement or new faculty positions each year. Departments must justify the need for the hiring. The Planning and Budgeting Council then determines which positions that have been approved by FPAC can be funded. For the past few years, most hiring has been to replace faculty who have retired, with very few new positions being funded.

There is a close coordination between the planning and budgeting process and the College’s Strategic Priorities, as stated in the Strategic Plan. The College planning and budgeting processes are designed to provide a means for departments and schools to identify objectives and seek funding for their programs. Department Chairs submit objectives to deans, and the deans prepare Annual Plan Objectives reports. The objectives and the needs spelled out in the annual plan reports can then be used as justification for budget requests or requests that departments make for grant funding. The College has received a variety of grants through major support from the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, such as the Title III grant that supports the College’s efforts to improve programs and student support services for basic skills students, the Koret Grant that supports basic skills programs in the English and Math Departments, and several National Science Foundation Grants that support the Biotechnology Program, among others. The College provides opportunities for departments to request block grant funding, when available from the state, to fund equipment needs.

The recent changes in counseling have been extensive and have improved services. The College has a great variety of student retention/success programs to support student learning, as well as services and resources provided by the Library and Learning Resources programs. The College provides student computer labs as technology resources to support student learning. After a few years of zero funding, very limited funding for professional development activities was available to faculty in 2004-05 through the Academic Senate. The Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) Project is an example of a professional development program that the College supports to improve faculty teaching.
The College supports programs’ facilities needs through its physical resources planning process, which is integrated with institutional planning. The planning and budgeting processes have led to capital improvement projects that are aligned with the Mission of the College.

The Shared Governance System and the Board of Trustees both have a role in providing programs to support student learning. For example, the Board reviews and discusses reports related to improving student success and student learning. The Chancellor established the integrated planning and budgeting system and several years ago launched the Enhanced Self-Study process, which developed various proposals to implement programs that support student learning.

The College’s Program Review process is the primary organizational means we have to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in producing student outcomes and to make improvements. The College’s Program Review process asks departments to review indicators of student success including completion rate, number of students that transition from basic skills to degree-applicable coursework, rates of transfer to four-year institutions, and number of students completing internships, among other data. Programs also have the opportunity to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses and make plans for the future. Faculty evaluations assess job performance in the areas of course content and classroom presentation. Administrators are evaluated annually on their management skills and on management objectives, which are individually developed for each administrator. Similarly, department chairs are evaluated on an annual basis.

The College has a variety of organizational means for evaluating student learning. The Office of Research, Planning and Grants produces a variety of reports and data that document student learning, retention, and success, such as the College Performance Indicators Report and data provided for Program Review reports. The Decision Support System, which was created several years ago by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, provides easily accessible data on student success indicators, such as mean GPA, units successfully passed, transfer units successfully passed, and vocational units successfully passed. Various departments, such as Photography, English, and ESL, have developed assessments to measure the achievement of student learning outcomes for their courses/programs and use the results of these assessments to make program improvements.

III. Case Studies

**Biological Sciences Department.** The Biological Sciences Department offers courses in Anatomy, Anthropology, Biology, Biology of HIV, Biotechnology, Botany, Cell and Molecular Biology, Ecology and Field Biology, Human and Organismal Biology, Genetics, Microbiology, Nutrition, Physiology, and Zoology. The number of students it serves has steadily grown in the past few years from 2,285 in Fall 1998 to 3,129 in Fall 2003, and many courses, especially those serving Allied Health students, have had waiting lists of over 100 students in the past few years. The Department serves biology majors, a large percentage of non-majors satisfying general education requirements, and students who are taking courses that satisfy pre-requisites for Allied Health programs at CCSF, such as Nursing. Biology 9, the introductory human biology course, is the “breadwinner” for the department, with 17 lecture/lab sections as of Spring 2005. Recently added electives include courses in emerging diseases, marine biology, ecology laboratory, and a scientific illustration class. All courses offered have a lab component with the exception of Nutrition, Anthropology, HIV, and Emerging Diseases. The Department also offers Biology Seminars each semester, voluntarily organized in 1997 by the department chair at that time. These seminars, which are popular with students, faculty, and the public, host a variety of speakers and expose the audience to cutting-edge research in biological disciplines. The success of the series is in part due to the support of the Concert and
Lecture Series, which provides honoraria and publicity. The College and the Department also support the Center for Habitat Restoration, which sponsors academic and research internships with agencies in the Bay Area. The Department has 52 instructors, 20 full-time, eight of these hired within the past ten years, and 32 part-time. A majority of the faculty started in the 1960s and 1970s and are either in the process of, or can be anticipated to be, retiring in the next few years. The chair, new to the position in Fall 2004, and the faculty who met with us were all relatively recent new full-timers and could be viewed as the “new wave” of instructors who bring enthusiasm and a strong commitment to improving the Department.

Organizational means to identify and make public student learning outcomes. The Department seeks feedback from CCSF Allied Health faculty and administrators on what students who are taking their pre-requisite courses in Biological Sciences need to know when they move into Allied Health programs. Biological Sciences instructors would like to have College support to give them more time to meet with Allied Health instructors. The instructors we interviewed stated they mostly use resources outside the College to help identify learning outcomes students need to achieve. Allied Health students from CCSF feed into the Nursing programs at San Francisco State University (SFSU), the University of San Francisco (USF), and the University of California-San Francisco (UCSF), and some students transfer to out-of-state programs. The Department would like College assistance to track the success of these and other transfer students. Some of the more recently hired instructors in the Department still have professional ties with the SFSU and UC systems and are able to get feedback on what students need to learn. They also look at comparable courses elsewhere and at recommendations from professional association guidelines to help identify desired learning outcomes for their courses. Instructors have also attended state Intersegmental Major Preparation and Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) meetings and are participating in developing uniform statewide curriculum standards for Biology. Instructors feel they need more training in understanding the articulation process.

The Nutrition instructor has recently developed new course outlines and is impressed with the help for developing outlines available from the College Curriculum Committee’s website. The Department is currently working on getting all Department outlines updated to the current format. The Department finds the technical review that the Office of Instruction provides for reviewing outlines before they are submitted to the Curriculum Committee helpful and the chair reports it has saved them from a lot of unnecessary errors and additional preparation. There is some frustration with the frequency with which the outline formatting guidelines change, but overall it is not seen as a big problem.

The Department does not currently have a professionally produced brochure but would like to develop one for attracting students to programs and one for attracting new faculty. The Chair would like more help from the College for developing professionally appealing materials. She has asked the Graphic Communications Department, which designs and produces brochures for many departments and programs at CCSF, for help, but that Department is often overloaded with requests. Instructors in the Department often resort to using their own resources and designing their own materials to advertise classes and wish the College had a budget to provide for such. The Office of Public Information has provided some help in advertising classes but the Department Chair would like more support from the College for advertising new or low-enrolled classes. The Department has a website that includes links to the Catalog descriptions for all the Department offerings, the seminar program co-sponsored by the Department, the Center for Habitat Restoration, job opportunities, faculty links, and scholarships. As of Spring 2005, nine instructors had their own web pages with course syllabi. The webmaster received some release time to develop the Department website but now maintains it voluntarily. The chair feels that each department should have a webmaster but that it is difficult to maintain a website without some way to compensate a webmaster.

1 Founded in 1997, the Center for Habitat Restoration (CHR) provides opportunities for students and volunteers to participate in local habitat restoration. Through City College of San Francisco (CCSF) and the Department of Biology, CHR sponsors academic and research internships with several agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area.
Organizational support for providing programs to support student learning. Each year the Dean of Science and Mathematics asks the Chair to provide Department goals and objectives and these are incorporated in the annual plan report for the School of Science and Math. The Dean recently applied for a Hewlett-Packard grant for laptop computers for the Department. He found this grant announcement in a publication that lists grant opportunities and that is periodically prepared and sent via e-mail to the College community by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants. This Office has also been very helpful in seeking other grants for the Department, including a Department of Labor grant for a Medical Lab Tech Program. The Dean and instructors note that it is helpful that mailings of grant opportunities are targeted to specific departments that might be interested. Through Instructional Block Grant funding, the Department has received some funds to purchase microscopes and equipment for the physiology lab.

The Department finds some problems with the faculty hiring process. One concern is that the process is so lengthy. Science teaching posts are very competitive and they feel that they have lost some very good candidates due to the long process at CCSF. Also, they find the interview process too rigid and rote and wish it could allow for more spontaneity and dialog with candidates. They have found the Human Resources Department helpful in writing job announcements.

The Department has used the small Academic Senate Travel Funds allotment they have received but wishes there were more funding available for professional development activities. The difficulty of finding a time when all faculty are available to get together was raised and they expressed a wish that there could be an identified college hour during the week when no classes are scheduled, to provide a time for such things as department faculty meetings, meetings with faculty from other departments, or professional development.

The Department has one chair who receives 12 units per semester of reassigned time from the College to coordinate the Department. The demands on the Chair, faculty, and classified staff have grown significantly in recent years due to the high student demand for the majority of biology classes, increased lab sections, and expansion of the Biotechnology Program, an inter-disciplinary program which is housed in the Biology Department. The chair reports that the Biology Department and the Biotechnology Program, which has its own coordinators, are “trying to find their way together” but are finding some structural problems. Five years ago there was no clerical support, but the Department now has a secretary for 20 hours a week. They feel they need a full-time secretary and additional student clerical support such as is provided to the Chemistry Department. They have only one full-time classified technical assistant to oversee the running of approximately 90 lab sections each semester and have repeatedly requested a second full-time assistant in recent years. They have a handful of student lab aides but they come and go, and it takes considerable time and effort to train new aides. The Department reports that the Dean of Science and Mathematics has been very supportive of all their endeavors.

The Department is very pleased with the support that students receive from the Learning Assistance Center and the Disabled Students Program and Services Department. There is some concern that students sometimes do not get the correct information from their counselors about the appropriate sequence of courses they should be taking and the Department Chair plans to meet with counselors to review their program. For many years, the Department has had a Biology Resource Center where students can study. Reference books and resources are available, and the room is staffed at all times by an instructor who can assist students and offer some tutoring services. They feel some students do not have sufficient English and math skills to succeed in their courses and feel it would be helpful to have, for example, services that would aid students in learning how to do scientific writing.
The Department needs more equipment and space for labs but is not able to meet its needs because College resources are extremely limited. Microbiology, for example, needs a new lab. The current lab only has enough equipment for 24 students. There are eight sections offered and hundreds of students are turned away each semester. There have been some communication problems with the Purchasing Department, resulting in equipment being ordered that does not meet the Department needs. There is some frustration with not being able to get some vendors they prefer on the approved College vendor list. Computers in student labs are getting old and the Department wishes more support were available from Information Technology Services for maintaining them.

The Department collaborates with SFSU on a National Institutes of Health grant that has developed Health Paths for moving students into Biological Sciences, Allied Health, and graduate school programs. CCSF instructors identify students who are given priority enrollment in Biological Sciences and Allied Health programs at SFSU. Some CCSF Biological Sciences faculty conduct weekly seminars with their counterparts at SFSU to discuss a variety of issues including counseling and tutoring needs of students. CCSF, SFSU, and UC Berkeley also collaborate on a Bridges Program that is designed to enhance the success of students in the biomedical field. Students participate in a summer research program and receive a small stipend. Organizational means to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in producing student learning outcomes, and to make improvements. The Department was in the middle of its Program Review when interviewed for this essay in Spring 2005. The Department has found the Decision Support System, developed by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, easy to use and helpful for finding data for Program Review on such things as enrollment figures and success rates of their students. The Department would like to conduct the optional faculty and student surveys but would like to modify the survey forms provided by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants to tailor them for the Department. Unfortunately, due to work overload and lack of extra funding, that Office was unable to provide support for doing this or to provide Scantron forms for the Department to conduct the surveys in classes rather than online. Fortunately, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs agreed to provide the needed funds to complete their surveys. As the Department reviews the goals and objectives from their last Program Review, they find that some identified needs for improvement have been met, such as replacement of windows in the Science Building and the College-wide computer roll-out, but that little progress has been made with other needs, such as increased needs for lab and clerical support, remodeling and painting classrooms, and improved maintenance of restrooms. Most of the Department offerings have been severely impacted in the past several years and they hope that this Program Review will help them make the case for the need for more classes.

The Department representatives expressed some dissatisfaction with the faculty evaluation process. They feel that instructors do not get sufficient training on how to evaluate their peers and that more professional development should be provided to train instructors in effective evaluation methods.

The Biological Sciences student success rate has risen from 67.89 percent of students passing with a C or higher in Fall 1998 to 73.32 percent in Fall 2003. The average GPA for students in all Biological Sciences courses has risen slightly from 2.67 in 1998 to 2.75 in 2003. Although these figures are slightly lower than the College-wide GPA, the Department feels that they have “set the bar high” and are pleased that the overall success rate for the Department has been higher than the overall College success rate. The Department has asked the Office of Research, Planning and Grants for transfer data to help them determine how well their students do after leaving the College. They do not at present see a need to develop common exams for courses or other means to evaluate student attainment of learning outcomes. They see their increased enrollment as an indication that they are developing a good reputation for offering a quality program that is drawing students to CCSF. Instructors voiced their desire for students to come more prepared for biology courses and noted that students are often deficient in English and math skills. The Department desires and seeks interaction with the Math, ESL, and English Departments to help students with scientific terminology and computational skills.
Biotechnology Program. Biotechnology is one of the fastest-growing industries in the nation, with a high demand for entry-level workers. The San Francisco Bay Area continues to be a leading biotechnology center. The Biotechnology Program is under the Biological Sciences Department and was created to meet the need for entry-level workers in the industry in the Bay Area. The first component of the program to be developed, the Biotechnology Certificate program, started in 1993. Currently, the program has four components: the Biotechnology Certificate program, the Biomanufacturing Certificate program, and two recent additions, the On-Ramp to Biotech program, and the Bridge to Biotech program. The number of students served has increased significantly in the past few years from 28 students in 2001 to 454 students in 2003.

The Biotechnology Certificate program is a two-course, ten-unit program that includes Bio 65, Recombinant DNA Technology, and Bio 60, Molecular and Cell Biology. It is a more advanced certificate and is designed to prepare students to work at a biotech company as a technician in quality control, research and development, or biomanufacturing.

The Biomanufacturing Certificate Program is currently a 16-unit program that will soon increase to more than 18 units. It includes one year of chemistry (CHEM 32-33), and one semester of Biology (BIO 11), Elementary Algebra (MATH 840 or higher), and Industrial Biotechnology (BTEC 101).

In Spring 2002, the College, in partnership with SFWorks, determined that we needed to reach out to the southeast sector of the City, given the development of the UCSF Mission Bay Campus there, to develop multiple entry points into our biotechnology programs. The On-Ramp to Biotech program and the Bridge to Biotech program were developed to meet this community need. The On-Ramp to Biotech program, offered in partnership with SFWorks, is designed to target low-income, under-skilled students with no prior science or math background. It offers an integrated ten-week course for 15 hours a week that includes instruction in math, the language of biotech, and resume writing to adults who are at the 6-9th grade level to give them the basic skills they need to enter the Bridge and Certificate programs. Paid internships at UCSF and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) are offered to the students. The Bridge to Biotech program is a learning community composed of three classes, a credit course, Biology 72B, a noncredit Vocational ESL (VESL) course, and a noncredit Transitional Studies Math course. It is designed for students who have no Biology background and are at the 7-9th grade level of math and English skills. CCSF ESL and Transitional Studies students are targeted in recruitment efforts for this program.

In addition, short courses are offered as electives on such topics as U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations, Mammalian Cell Culture, Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA), Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR), High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC), Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (GCMS), and capillary electrophoresis.

All four Biotechnology Programs emphasize a hands-on approach to prepare students to work in lab and manufacturing jobs in the biotechnology field throughout the Bay Area. More and more students are now getting both certificates. Many students who have completed the programs are now employed in a variety of industry, academic, and government research and manufacturing settings, including for example at Genentech, Bayer, UCSF, JSCA, Chiron, Epitomics and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Some return to take more courses as they realize the need for more education.

---

2 Founded in 1997, the Center for Habitat Restoration (CHR) provides opportunities for students and volunteers to participate in local habitat restoration. Through City College of San Francisco (CCSF) and the Department of Biology, CHR sponsors academic and research internships with several agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area.
A fifth program, the Stem Cell Research Certificate Program, will begin in Fall 2006 with a grant from the Governor's Discretionary Funds. This program will provide participants with the advanced skills needed to find jobs in the lucrative and rapidly growing field of stem cell research.

Organizational means to identify and make public student learning outcomes. The support of the Office of Research, Planning and Grants has played a key role in identifying student learning outcomes for the Biotechnology Program. The Dean of Research, Planning and Grants was a moving force in creating the Biotech program at CCSF. Seeing Tech Prep as a funding source for programs for high-skill occupations, the Dean made initial contacts with people involved in the biotech industry and worked with the Biological Sciences and Chemistry Departments to get the program started using Tech Prep funding. Industry needs are the basis for the program. Student learning outcomes were initially established based on formal meetings that included industry representatives, high school personnel, university personnel, and CCSF Biological Sciences and Chemistry faculty. As the program has evolved, it has received continued support through a variety of grants that facilitate keeping in close touch with industry to refine student learning outcomes goals. Such grants include a State Chancellor's Office Economic Development grant, which supports the Northern California Biotechnology Center (NCBC) and a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant which supports Bio-Link, a National Advanced Technological Education (ATE) Center for Biotechnology, both of which are described later.

The intended student learning outcomes for courses offered in the Biotechnology programs are spelled out in the course outlines. For example, one of the major student learning outcomes for Bio 65, one of the two courses required for the Biotechnician Certificate, is: “Employ proper methods of laboratory report documentation and presentation including use of a computer for data analysis and report generation.” The Biotechnology faculty reported appreciation for the support they have received from the Office of Instruction for developing course outlines and the certificate programs. The Biotechnology Certificate Catalog description states that “The biotechnology certificate program is designed to prepare students to work at a biotech company as a technician in quality control, research and development, or Biomanufacturing.” The Catalog description for the Biomanufacturing certificate states that “The requirements for the certificate in Biomanufacturing described here will prepare students for entry into the field as a bio-process technician, media prep technician, pharmaceutical materials specialist, or pharmaceutical manufacturing technician.” A Biotech Hotline number that prospective students can call for more information is also listed in the Catalog.

The Biotechnology Program coordinators and the Dean of Science and Mathematics have developed a brochure advertising the Biotechnology and Biomanufacturing Certificate programs. The Biotech Career Chart that is in this brochure is one of the most clearly defined career ladders the College currently has. The coordinator of the Bridge program produces flyers, brochures, and other information materials to advertise the program to prospective students. He has made concerted efforts to contact faculty in the ESL and Transitional Studies Departments to provide materials for them to use to introduce students in their classes to the program. Although receiving information in class from the instructor in theory is an effective way of reaching students, the Bridge to Biotech Coordinator has found that instructors often find it difficult to take time away from coursework to advertise the Bridge program and wishes there were other ways to advertise the program to CCSF students. The On-Ramp to Biotech program is advertised through community outreach efforts. A new website is being planned for the Biotech Program and is intended to be operational in Spring 2005, but College support is needed to help revamp the website.
Organizational support for providing programs to support student learning. One of the operational objectives in the 2003-04 Annual Plan for the School of Science and Mathematics, which houses the Biotechnology Program, is “To provide high quality educational programs and courses for associate degrees, transfer to baccalaureate institutions, career education and workforce training …” and the Operational objectives include “Continue to develop the College initiative in workforce education and economic development …” The Biotechnology Program is cited in the Annual Plan as one of the school’s strong workforce training programs. Several needs of the Biotechnology Program are noted in the “assessment of problems and needs” section of the Annual Plan. One is the need for more sections of classes: “With strong demands for BIO 11 and CHEM 32, many of the beginning biotech students could not find spaces in these classes.” As a result, they were able to add more sections of these courses in Spring 2005. Also this report notes that “In terms of equipment, ASTR, BIO, BIOTEC and ENGN have long lists of equipment to keep their courses up-to-date.” Further, “Space for labs and offices are major problems in BIO, BIOTECH, CNIT, and PHYC.”

The need for constant updating of curriculum, faculty retraining, equipment, supplies, and facilities to keep up with a rapidly changing industry make the Biotech program expensive to maintain. Fortunately, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants has been instrumental in seeking and receiving major grant funding to sustain the program. Half of the salaries of the two coordinators of the biotechnology program are grant funded. VTEA funded the original Bridge to Biotech program and has provided crucial support in launching numerous other vocational programs at the College. The Bridge to Biotech program currently has a $500,000 grant from NSF’s Course, Curriculum and Laboratory Improvement Program (CCLI), and the On-Ramp to Biotech program has a $600,000 grant from the NSF Partnership for Innovation Program and also receives VTEA funding. These grants fund curriculum development and expansion of these programs. An NSF ATE grant for $815,000 has funded a project entitled Fix-a-Gene that trains students to work in gene therapy. A Genentech grant is supporting the development of an equipment clearinghouse. The College also has a Center for Applied Competitive Technology (CACT) grant, which, along with some funding from other grants, supports the new equipment clearinghouse, Bio-Link, and NCBC. Bio-Link originated in 1998 as the NSF Advanced Technological Education Center for Biotechnology, and, over the years, has received $6.5 million from NSF. Bio-Link’s primary purpose is to improve biotechnology education throughout the United States, providing professional development for instructors, promoting partnerships with industry, and creating a network of educators who share resources and information. Bio-Link draws on a network of regional centers located in community colleges throughout the nation, including NCBC, funded by the State Chancellor’s office, which also resides at CCSF. NCBC, like Bio-Link, supports workforce and economic development in biotechnology through curriculum development, professional development for faculty, and industry partnerships, but at a local level.

Through Instructional Block Grant funding, the Biotechnology Program has received some funds to develop a lab at the Southeast Campus, but the Biotechnology Program has mainly relied on other grant funding to meet its needs and in fact has been able to provide the Biology Department with some supplies. Since the program is mainly sustained by outside funding, it has not needed to make a lot of requests through the College’s budgeting process for the limited College funds available. If grant funding diminishes, finding alternate ways to fund the program will become a serious concern. The Buildings and Grounds Department has provided support to the Department in getting equipment donations from industry. Equipment worth about $250,000 has been received from companies such as Amersham Bioscience, Bayer, Chiron, and Genetech. The program has been challenged to find ways to collect the large equipment and sort, store, catalog, and establish processes for checking out equipment. Fortunately, a grant has funded a position to coordinate the development of this equipment clearinghouse.
Several years ago, the Dean of Science and Mathematics recognized the need for a new full-time instructor for the Biotechnology Program and he helped win support for hiring one of the current coordinators of the program. The Biotechnology Program invites representatives from industry to teach short-term courses or give lectures in courses and fortunately is able to fund them as consultants through grant money. Biotechnology is one of the academic programs requiring a master’s degree in the field or an equivalency as a minimum qualification for teaching. This state requirement will make it difficult to hire some industry representatives, who have up-to-date knowledge of the field but do not have a master's degree, if the program loses grant funding to hire these instructors on a consultant basis. The program needs to explore how the equivalency process will help them hire these experts if grant funding diminishes.

Constant retraining of faculty is essential to enable them to stay current in the biotechnology field. Bio-Link funding supported sending one of the program coordinators for training in Summer 2004, but more professional development funding is needed.

The Biotechnology Program is an interdisciplinary program. In addition to courses in the Biology Department, the program also includes courses offered by the ESL Department, the Transitional Studies Department, the Math Department, and the Chemistry Department. The Biomanufacturing certificate program began with a collaboration between Chemistry and Biology and will eventually collaborate with Engineering and Computer Technology as well. Collaboration among these departments has been very good so far, but the College's main organizational structure for offering instructional programs is through departments that are grouped into schools. For example, departments make budget requests via their school, and departments make requests for hiring faculty. Interdisciplinary programs such as Biotechnology may need extra support to learn ways to request supplies, equipment, faculty, and reassigned time for coordination and so forth.

A lot of coordination is needed to manage the grants that the program receives and to keep the program going. Departments have chairs and also have the opportunity to ask for reassigned time from teaching duties for faculty to coordinate programs. Fortunately, so far grant funding is supporting the Biotech program coordinators so the Biology Department has not yet needed to request coordinating units for Biotechnology. Grant funding has also supported the coordinator of the Bridge to Biotech program, who is responsible for recruiting, assessing, advising and providing orientation for students, and for general administrative duties.

The coordinator for the Bridge to Biotech program has invited financial aid and Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) representatives to speak to students in the program. Other than this, those we interviewed were not aware of how much biotechnology students use Counseling, Learning Resources, and other support services at the College.

The need for equipment, labs, and offices for Biotech has been reported in the Annual Plan report. Currently, most biotechnology courses are offered at the Ocean Avenue Campus. The Bridge to Biotech program courses are offered at the Southeast and Mission Campuses, and the On-Ramp to Biotech program is offered at the Southeast Campus. Block grant funding was used to develop the lab at the Southeast Campus. Space has been allocated for the Bridge to Biotechnology Program in the planned new Chinatown Campus and Mission Campus buildings. The program has support from the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for developing a Biotech Center in the Science Building.
Administrative support for the Biotech program has been strong. The program has received major support from the Dean of Research, Planning and Grants, who was instrumental in getting it started and continues to support it through supervising preparation of grant funding proposals with the Associate Dean of Grants and Resource Development and serving as administrator with oversight of Bio-Link. The Associate Vice Chancellor of Workforce Education serves as Principal Investigator of the National Science Foundation Partnership for Innovation grant. A former Vice Chancellor of Instruction was instrumental in starting the Bridge to Biotech program by recognizing that the Biotechnology certificate program was an opportunity that should be made available to ESL and Transitional Studies students but that many would need a support program to gain the language and math skills needed to enter the certificate program. The Dean of Science and Mathematics has provided support through such activities as finding space for the equipment clearinghouse at the Airport Campus, supplying a display case in the Science Building to advertise the program, and seeking a Biotech Center in the Science Building and describes himself as the “glue that keeps everything together.” The Campus Dean at Southeast and Associate Vice Chancellor at Evans provide support for the programs offered at those campuses. Administrators were also willing to support classes with low enrollment in the first years of the program, recognizing that time was needed to build it. The Chancellor and a Board member have been strongly supportive of the program. The Chancellor’s Office nominated the program for the two awards it received from the Association for Community Colleges.

As noted, CCSF collaborates with SFWorks to offer the On-Ramp to Biotech program. CCSF provides the instructors and the space for the classes and SFWorks recruits the students and coordinates the program. The links between the CCSF Biotechnology Program and Bio-Link and the Northern California Biotechnology Center are outstanding examples of successful collaborations. CCSF can take pride in the regional, state, and national leadership it provides through its participation in Bio-Link and NCBC.

Organizational means to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in producing student learning outcomes, and to make improvements. Since the Biotechnology Program is interdisciplinary, the department-based Program Review process has not yet easily served as a means to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. However, the reports required by the various grants the program enjoys provide the program with an opportunity to evaluate its effectiveness.

The College’s faculty evaluation process works well for most departments but is somewhat challenging for Biotechnology, not only because of the interdisciplinary nature of the program but also because biotechnology is a relatively new and rapidly changing field. One of the coordinators of the program reported that one instructor assigned to her evaluation team did not think he had the knowledge and skills to evaluate her properly.

The Biotechnology Program recognizes a huge need for authentic assessment techniques to measure student attainment of identified student learning outcomes. Measuring how well students can apply techniques and perform lab procedures in a consistent manner is time-consuming and difficult without instructor-reassigned time to design and conduct the assessments. Data from such an assessment would provide the program with valuable information that could be used to adapt instruction and curriculum to improve student attainment of learning outcomes. The coordinator of the Bridge to Biotech program plans to work with the Office of Research, Planning and Grants to develop an effective mid-semester assessment tool. Although information on student success by course and department is easily available through the Decision Support System, this system is not currently set up to show data for programs that are within departments or are developed through collaborations with several departments, like the Biotechnology Program.
Former students who have gotten jobs have been invited to return to speak to students in the program. Through these speakers, students and teachers learn more about the essential skills students need in the workplace. The Northern California Biotechnology Center advertises student employment rates. There is currently no College-supported systematic method used to collect information on the success of graduates of the program. Fortunately, two of the grants the program receives provide some support to track students after they finish the programs to record job placements and job success.

Faculty report great satisfaction in seeing many disadvantaged students move from being under-skilled and often under-motivated, to successful, enthusiastic employees in the biotech field. They see the program as a successful vehicle for getting more students interested in science and math and report that many return to CCSF to take additional coursework. Bio-Link and NCBC facilitate sharing among colleges on effective curriculum and instruction and foster a culture that promotes continuous improvement at all of the participating community colleges.

IV. Conclusion & Future Directions

The cases of Biology and Biotechnology highlight several areas in which the College has made significant strides in the past six years in improving organizational structure to support student learning. For example, the College has made notable advancements, through the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, in the pursuit of grant funding to support programs and has had a high rate of success in receiving grants, including major support for Biotechnology and improvement of basic skills instruction. In addition, the College administration has provided significant support for developing new programs, particularly interdepartmental collaborative programs such as the Design Collaborative and the Biotechnology program. Furthermore, major improvements have been made in providing more easily accessible data to administrators, faculty and staff via the Decision Support System (DSS) and the reports and research studies that are now available on the College website. Moreover, faculty, department chairs, and staff feel that the construction of a data-rich environment that is easily accessible has been a notable achievement but also caution that the Office of Research, Planning and Grants should remain responsible for meeting the information needs of faculty and staff and providing rigorous checking of the accuracy of the data that is reported. Finally, the Office of Instruction has significantly increased the support it provides to departments in developing course proposals with the technical review process. This optional technical review of course outlines and certificate and degree proposals, prior to submission for College Curriculum Committee action, eliminates many common problems that cause delays in obtaining final approval.

The case studies contained within this essay also point to several areas for improvement. The College has made outreach and recruitment a priority in the current Strategic Plan. However, the College has very limited resources to support advertising for recruitment of students into the great variety of programs at CCSF. The College website is generally a good source of information for many programs but can be overwhelming and difficult to navigate; especially for the many non-native English speakers that CCSF serves. The Communications Committee is currently reviewing possible improvements to the website. CCSF has hundreds of programs spread out all over the city at different campuses and other locations. The College needs to do a better job of reaching out not only to people who are not yet CCSF students but also to those who are already students to make them aware of the opportunities available to them at CCSF. Additional efforts are needed to assist new students in navigating the application, matriculation, and registration processes.
The College is committed to maintaining a diverse faculty and has recently improved the documentation required of applicants regarding their preparation for meeting the needs of culturally and academically diverse learners. However, the length and complexity of the hiring process for faculty and administrators can have a negative impact on the quantity and quality of the pool of applicants, particularly in areas where there is significant competition for these staff from other Colleges or from the private sector. The College should also investigate ways to provide more flexibility in the interview process without compromising the integrity of the hiring procedures.

Some improvements have been made in the integration of Program Review with institutional planning and curriculum development and revision. Programs now have the option of addressing plans and activities related to the assessment of student learning outcomes in their Program Reviews. During the 2004-05 academic year, plans were initiated to tie the review and revision of course outlines to the six-year Program Review cycle. The College should have a fuller discussion of how the Program Review process could be used to institutionalize efforts to assess student learning outcomes and make improvements in the teaching and learning process. In addition, the College should develop stronger methods for assessing how students are performing after completing and/or graduating from programs and that information should be used to improve student learning outcomes.

While CCSF has a consistent and carefully administered faculty evaluation procedure, there are problems in the continuity of those procedures. The strengths and weaknesses that an evaluation committee identifies in one evaluation are not reported to the subsequent evaluation team. In addition, there are no formal provisions for mentoring and other professional support for faculty who receive evaluations indicating a need for improvement. Improvements in these procedures would strengthen instructors’ abilities to foster student learning. The College also needs to address funding for professional development, especially in light of the loss of state funding for development activities.

Counselors face significant challenges in maintaining current accurate information on the hundreds of programs at CCSF and advising students appropriately. The College needs to develop better organizational structures for counseling and instructional programs to communicate and collaborate to insure that students are given the best available information.

The College has made informed and intelligent decisions related to the distribution of the relatively scarce resources over the last few years. In addition, the College has been quite successful in securing grants and other types of additional funding. However, there are significant needs for additional resources. The College should continue to explore all possible avenues to improve financial resources that support the evaluation and improvement of student learning.
## V. Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res. 1</th>
<th>Interviews with select staff and faculty (no notes recorded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Res. 2</td>
<td>Biological Sciences website <a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/ed_programs.html">http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/ed_programs.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 3</td>
<td>Program Review for Biological Science Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 4</td>
<td>Biotechnology course outlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 5</td>
<td>Brochures for Biotechnology and Biomanufacturing Certificate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 6</td>
<td>CCSF Mission Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 7</td>
<td>CCSF Vision Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 8</td>
<td>Strategic Plan, 2003–2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 9</td>
<td>Institutional Annual Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 10</td>
<td>Major Learning Outcomes: new course outlines (samples online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 12</td>
<td>College Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 13</td>
<td>Performance Indicators Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 14</td>
<td>Decision Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. 15</td>
<td>Departmental assessments reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEME VI: Integrity & Honesty

The institution demonstrates its concern with honesty and truthfulness to all stakeholders, internal and external. The college regularly assesses its policies, practices, and procedures and its relations with students, employees, and its publics. College publications reflect the institution’s commitment to clarity, understandability, accessibility, and appropriateness; college faculty provide for open inquiry in their classes and demonstrate a commitment to an honest appraisal of student performance based upon clear faculty standards or rigor and academic honesty on the part of students. The institution demonstrates a strong commitment for issues of equity and diversity in its hiring and employment practices as well as to its relationship with the Commission and other external agencies. The institution is self-reflective and honest with itself in all its operations.
I. Overview

Demonstrating integrity and honesty to all stakeholders is a cornerstone of the College's system of governance and permeates all College activities. It is the strengthening trust the stakeholders have had in the institution that has enabled the College to persevere during the fiscally poor situation of the state. The College is focused on improving its services to better serve its students. In this essay we will examine several case studies that exemplify the following: the College's continual assessment of the appropriateness and usefulness of our policies, practices, and procedures; the College's continual assessment of internal and external relations and the inclusion of all constituencies of the College in major assessment and decision-making processes; the College's commitment to clarity, accessibility, and appropriateness in its communications with the community; and the College's commitment to diversity.

II. Institutional Context

City College of San Francisco is a vital and integral part of the communities of San Francisco, in the truest sense, a college of the people. We have the ability and the responsibility to do what the local four-year colleges and universities cannot do—to reach out directly into the neighborhood communities to provide residents of San Francisco and surrounding communities with relevant, high-quality educational programs and services that address their diverse educational needs. The scale and reach of our operations demonstrate our commitment to bringing education to the people. CCSF serves over 98,000 students at 12 main campus locations and nearly 200 neighborhood sites (including churches, middle school campuses, senior centers, converted military facilities, and a San Francisco airport facility) that reflect the multicultural diversity of the city. CCSF offers over 140 programs of study in 75 academic and vocational fields. Each year, the College offers 7,000 sections of credit courses (over 100 of which are offered online), and over 3,000 sections of noncredit courses that meet the specific needs of a student population not currently pursuing college credit coursework, such as new immigrants, older adults, or students finishing their high school education. In addition, CCSF has offered over 500 contract education classes designed for workers seeking professional development and continuing education classes for students in pursuit of personal enrichment. Over 750 full-time and 1,200 part-time faculty provide instruction and services to students with the support of a classified staff comprising over 600 full-time and 300 part-time employees, and approximately 40 administrators, along with a number of classified managers, who provide oversight and leadership to ensure the College meets its operational objectives.

With the size and complexity of our operations comes the challenge of ensuring the integrity with which the College provides for and interacts with its students, as well as with its faculty, staff, administration, and public. While the College continually monitors the efficiency and accuracy with which all segments of the institution—the employees, departments, credit and noncredit programs and services, schools, and campuses—conduct their operations, the College community looks to the institution’s system of governance to be trusting and inclusive of all constituencies in the major assessment and decision-making processes. This system of checks and balances, demonstrating the College’s shared commitment to maintaining a strong, high-quality institution, is described in this essay.
III. Case Studies

Assessment of Policies, Practices, and Procedures

Continual assessment of the fairness, relevance, and usefulness of our policies, practices, and procedures is necessary and never-ending given the enormity of CCSF’s programs and services and the infrastructure that supports them. We seek answers to basic questions: Do our policies and practices reflect the intent of state and federal regulations? Do they reflect current realities? Can students access their curriculum of choice at CCSF without having to jump unreasonable hurdles? At times, the answers appear to conflict with each other, and, when they do, we attempt to find solutions that balance the different concerns.

Operational Practices and Procedures. While District policies do not undergo regular major changes, operational practices and procedures of individual departments or divisions are reviewed and updated regularly as their frequent use quickly and clearly points out what works and what does not, leading to more relevant, streamlined processes. Such assessment often occurs informally, based on discussion within and between departments. When problems and solutions are not easily identified, data are collected and analyzed to arrive at strategies for improvement. Such was the case in 1999, when Student Development offices were concerned by the large numbers of students who participated in English/ESL and Math placement testing, but did not follow up with enrollment in courses. Of particular interest was whether the Matriculation process itself (placement assessment, orientation, counseling) somehow deterred enrollment. Earlier studies conducted by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, however, had demonstrated that students who had participated in the Matriculation components experienced higher rates of success in their first-semester basic skills coursework than students who had chosen not to participate in the services. In addition, retention and persistence rates of matriculated students were higher than those of non-matriculants. It was suspected, then, that enrollment had less to do with the delivery of the services than it did with the lack of follow-through. To investigate the issue, Matriculation went directly to the source of information—the very students who had participated in placement testing (and possibly other Matriculation components), but had not enrolled. In structured phone interviews, staff asked why students did not enroll, if they had experienced any problems during each of the steps of the Matriculation process, and what the College could do to make it easier for them to enroll next time. Survey results revealed that lack of enrollment was primarily due to personal issues (e.g., scheduling conflicts or change of life plans) and lack of availability of classes. Very few students complained of negative experiences at the College, though many students complained that having to return to campus several days after testing in order to complete the remainder of the Matriculation activities was inconvenient, if not difficult. This issue was further explored during the Student Services Systems Review in 2000 and then later taken up during the Enhanced Self-Study process, from which a recommendation was generated for the development of a technology-enhanced Matriculation process to enable same-day delivery of services. Today, computerized delivery of placement testing and online delivery of orientation enables most students to complete the Matriculation process in one visit to the campus.

On another, related front, the Student Services Systems Review (SSSR) was an impressive and ambitious examination of institutional operations; an evaluation process that catalyzed important changes that would be discussed and implemented through subsequent processes. This comprehensive review of the student intake process and student support services examined the operations of the Offices of Admissions and Records, Matriculation and Assessment, Counseling, Registration, and other student support offices “from the perspective of the student clientele.” The purpose of the review was to analyze the clarity and cohesion of the student services operations with attention to: (1) student-centered delivery of services; (2) accessibility and accuracy of information and assistance; and (3) the quality and availability of resources needed to adequately provide services. The SSSR was completed in two phases—first, the evaluation of the Matriculation intake services (admissions, placement testing, orientation, counseling,
registration), and second, the evaluation of support services (e.g., counseling, learning assistance, early alert and intervention) available to students as they embarked on their studies with sights towards certificate completion, graduation, and/or transfer. The data collection methods invited wide participation. The first phase utilized faculty, staff, and student focus groups, which, through structured interviews and surveys, provided candid information regarding the steps of the intake process. This information was later charted and accompanied by a narrative of the findings, both of which were verified by affected office staff, whose comments were incorporated into a final draft of recommendations. The integrity of the review process was ensured through the consultation of a “cross-functional” team of faculty and staff representing the different Student Development offices, who worked with the project leader. The second phase of the process utilized the input of all student support offices providing counseling services, mentoring, and learning assistance. Focus groups also included instructional faculty input. The success of the Student Services Systems Review can be attributed to its clearly defined purpose, buy-in from the Student Development offices, meticulous structure for data collection and analysis, use of anecdotal and research data, monitoring of quality by the cross-functional team, and the usefulness of its findings. Important recommendations emerged from the SSSR such as the reorganization of counseling, re-engineering of Admissions and Records operations, and the computerized delivery of placement testing and orientation—recommendations that laid the groundwork for subsequent College-wide discussions of these issues during the 2000-01 Enhanced Self-Study process. The ESS process was an even more ambitious review of academic, as well as student development, policies, practices, and procedures. Many of the recommendations generated from the ESS process provided the evidence needed, in part, to earn CCSF a coveted Title III grant from the U.S. Department of Education. This five-year grant provides direct support for enhancements to the student intake processes and student support services directly addressing the needs of the large basic skills student population at CCSF. These needs include computerized placement testing, electronic educational plans and degree-audits, tutoring, and basic skills learning communities.

**Institutional practices and procedures.** In addition to assessing its operational practices, the College also reviews and updates its institutional practices on a regular basis, as the need arises. An interesting process of evaluation and change that has had broad ramifications not only for students, but also for practices in both the academic and student divisions, was the raising of the associate degree requirements for Mathematics and Written Composition. With the 2000 Accreditation team’s strong encouragement that the College scrutinize the alignment of CCSF associate degree requirements in Mathematics and Written Composition with Title 5 standards, the CCSF Math, English, and ESL Departments and the Academic Policies Committee re-examined the standards, eventually shifting their previous interpretations of the Title 5 graduation requirements. The reinterpretations did not come about instantaneously, however. Both standards were to undergo the most rigorous of Shared Governance scrutiny: the Math standard addressed by a special Math Graduation work group of the Academic Policies Committee and the Written Composition standard taken up for discussion during the Enhanced Self-Study process, from which raising the standard eventually emerged as an ESS recommendation. Semesters of intense discussion ensued after the issues reached the Academic Policies Committee. Concerns about the Math requirement change included whether students graduating with Elementary Algebra would necessarily possess basic arithmetic skills, whether acceptable equivalencies to CCSF’s Elementary Algebra course could be easily determined, and again, whether Title 5 clearly specified Elementary Algebra as the minimum math course level. Discussion regarding the Written Composition requirement included the possible loss of a graduation-level course in ESL and, if so, the mechanism for ESL students to enter the general English curriculum in order to complete the Written Composition requirement. An additional issue for discussion regarding both standards was the possible disproportionate impact of the changes on students of color. By 2003, the raising of the Math graduation requirement was approved by the Bipartite Graduation Requirements Committee, and an ad hoc implementation committee set about determining acceptable equivalencies and developing official language to be included in all future College publications and disseminated to all affected departments. As the target academic year for implementation approached, however, it was found that actual operational implementation details had not been fully defined, including whether the raising of the Math...
graduation standard would take effect at some inflexible point in time (e.g., during the summer or right before the beginning of the Fall semester) or whether continuing students would maintain rights to the old standard. This generated a necessary discussion about catalog rights, the definition of which was not readily at hand. A crash course in the significance and determination of catalog rights took place at the administrative level and a definition was included in the new Catalog. However, the definition and procedures took longer to make their way down to the office personnel who had the arduous, if not confusing, task of determining which graduation standard a petitioner was required to meet, based on his catalog rights. Now, a year later, with the recent raising of the graduation standard for Written Composition, the College is careful to “see the process through,” to be inclusive of all affected levels of personnel in order to prevent the disconnect that can easily occur between academic and student development divisions, and between administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Another institutional issue of academic integrity that is pervasive and challenging is the tenuous balance between the concern for sound educational standards and the concern for enrollment and student access, especially to coursework needed to meet graduation and transfer goals. At the heart of this issue is the validity and implementation of course and program prerequisites. CCSF’s process for establishing course and program prerequisites, in accordance with Title 5 standards, relies on faculty with expertise in their fields and the College Curriculum Committee to evaluate the need for prior academic preparation for credit courses and to propose prerequisites accordingly. Instructional departments and the Curriculum Committee, a Shared Governance committee, are charged with evaluating the learning outcomes and content of proposed credit courses in order to determine whether students will need prerequisite skills—in the subject area or in communication or computation—to successfully undertake assignments in the course. Statistical evidence (e.g., correlation between completion of a proposed prerequisite course and performance in the target course), readily provided by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, is sometimes necessary to determine the need for the prerequisite and the justification for its enforcement. The same process is used when the department conducts its periodic review of established prerequisites for possible revision. This triangular effort of instructional departments, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, and the Curriculum Committee towards the common purpose of determining prerequisite validity is one of our finest demonstrations of professional integrity and excellence at CCSF. However, while the prerequisite validation process is an academic and research endeavor, the enforcement of prerequisites is not. Implementation of prerequisites is sometimes viewed by students and the College community as posing undue delays or even barriers to student access even though an appeals process exists, as mandated by CCSF and Title 5 prerequisite policy. When these conflicting interests surface, the College must turn again to the validation process to investigate the appropriateness of the prerequisite in light of the Title 5 standard that a prerequisite be established and enforced if students without the preparation would be “highly unlikely to succeed in the target course.”

**District policies.** As an institution that promotes continual evaluation and assessment, the College is making strides in the systematic review and update of the District (Board) Policy Manual, though the task has been, admittedly, a slow one. Documentation of policy revisions has not consistently been collected centrally. In addition, some obsolete policies that reside only in the Board Policy Manual have not been regularly reviewed. However, in preparation for the 2000 Accreditation, the Policy Manual was restructured and reformatted in an effort to make it more usable and reader friendly. In addition, over 40 policies were found to be outdated, and were revised or discarded. Last year, a plan to systematically review the Board Policy Manual was drafted, indicating responsibilities of senior administrative staff, Shared Governance committees, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees. The plan for review was quite comprehensive and included a review of Board, Institutional, Student, Instructional, Student Development, Facilities, and Fiscal/Budget policies. The plan has not yet been implemented. Of great assistance is the College’s recent subscription to the Policy and Procedure Service website developed by the Community College League
of California. The service provides colleges with regular updates that include legal opinions, questions from other subscribing colleges, and new and revised policies and procedure samples reflecting new laws and regulations. Examples of recent updates include a revision to policy concerning a district’s political activity, and the creation of new policies regarding intellectual property and the provision of voter registration materials. The question that remains, however, is what process will be established to formally reflect the updates in CCSF policy manuals, inform affected departments, and implement changes.

**Inclusion of All College Constituencies**

**Assessment of Student Satisfaction.** The College continually seeks the opinions of students and employees and researches issues concerning the quality of our programs, services, and facilities. Research is a priority at CCSF, and the College’s Office of Research, Planning and Grants handles the demands with a high level of professionalism. Its expertise in research design, sampling methods, data analysis, and reporting enables the College to: (1) conduct comprehensive evaluations on a huge scale, such as student success or student attitude studies with years of aggregated data or (2) conduct rather defined validity studies investigating, for example, the relationship between two specific variables, such as student success in a course, given a particular teaching method. The College has become information-rich not only because of the tremendous output of the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, but also because of the volume and variety of data that the College collects, generates, and maintains access to. The 1999 study, “What Students Think of CCSF,” was an analysis of the results of three years of student satisfaction surveys administered to 16,811 students by individual instructional departments as part of their Program Review processes. Students were asked to rate elements of an instructional department, such as quality of instruction, availability of instructors, respect for students, encouragement to express viewpoints, and classroom facilities. A broad analysis of all student responses showed that students were “generally quite positive about CCSF.” A further analysis of responses broken out by student background variables (e.g., age, ethnicity, sex, educational goal) and institutional variables, which included school affiliation (e.g., Behavioral Sciences) and student grade outcomes revealed more nuanced information regarding student attitudes. For example, greater differences in student satisfaction were found among programs within each school than among the seven schools themselves; rates of satisfaction differed by ethnicity; younger students were more critical in their appraisal of programs and of encouragement to express viewpoints; students who self-reported A/B grades gave high ratings regarding instructors’ encouragement to complete educational goals and to express viewpoints, while students who self-reported D/F grades were more likely to say that instructors did not keep them informed of their progress and complained of a general lack of communication with instructors. Such candid results have stimulated discussion among faculty about the important link between student participation and success, and efforts that might be made to reach out to low-achieving students. Equally informative have been other regular student surveys such as Students Who Petitioned for Graduation (2000 and 2001), Students Leaving Before Census (2000), and Student Opinion Survey (2004), which, in addition to eliciting satisfaction ratings of services and instruction, also attempted to assess students’ relationship to the College. For example, continuing students in the 2004 study were asked to rate their “sense of belonging at the campus,” the extent to which “students show respect for one another,” and the extent to which “faculty are supportive of students.” As in previous studies, students responded positively in general, with older students indicating higher levels of satisfaction than younger students, and Asian students indicating slightly lower levels of satisfaction than other ethnicities. The 2000-01 Survey of Students Who Petitioned for Graduation and the 2004 Student Opinion Survey cited employment and personal issues as the major problems that have “affected studies while at CCSF.” While the College may not be able to explore remedies to those problems, it can address other issues that students raised in the “open-ended” section of the latter survey, including issues such as limited course availability, parking, and access to student services.
Assessment of employee satisfaction. The Office of Research, Planning and Grants also produces employee opinion data. Examples of regular surveys include assessments of employee satisfaction with College services conducted in 2000 and 2004, and surveys evaluating employee use of technology, which have been conducted every other year since 1997. The 2004 Report on Employee Satisfaction provides participating employees’ mean ratings, high to low, of 75 College services—services provided by the Academic Affairs, Student Development, and Finance and Administration Divisions, and the Office of Facilities Planning and Construction, among others. This candid report highlights the top ten rated services and compares changes between 2000 ratings and 2004 ratings, both positive and negative. It further breaks out ratings by constituencies within the College, designations which essentially illustrate the complexity of CCSF employee “demographics”: full-time and part-time, classified and certificated employee designations, credit and noncredit, the main Ocean Avenue Campus and the other six campuses, years of employment, gender, and ethnicity. Results of employee (and student) satisfaction surveys are posted on the Office of Research, Planning and Grants website.

Peer and student evaluation of faculty. The faculty evaluation process is an important assessment of our educational integrity and one that also provides an opportunity for students to express their satisfaction with their classroom experience. A process that full-time and part-time faculty undergo every three years, the evaluation is conducted by peer faculty (and the department chair, if requested) who observe the faculty member in his/her instructional, non-instructional, counseling, or library activities. Observations are documented in the form of checklist ratings and brief comments relating to strengths and areas in need of improvement. Full-time faculty may opt for a self-evaluation, which requires that the evaluatee provide narrative descriptions of strengths, weaknesses, and needs for improvement. Part-time faculty may select the self-evaluation option provided the previous two evaluations were satisfactory and there has not been a break in service. Student evaluations of teacher or counselor performance are a particularly important part of the self- or peer-evaluation processes. Students are able to anonymously evaluate teacher or counselor professional conduct (e.g., punctuality, respect for students’ opinions), teaching/counseling methods, and command of subject matter, among other qualities. All peer (or peer/management) responses and student data are summarized on the consensus evaluation form which includes a composite rating of “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory.”

The tenure review process is similarly structured, although tenure-track faculty are evaluated at least once during each of their first four years of service. These faculty are also required to submit a portfolio of their professional activities and accomplishments, which may include samples of teaching syllabi, assignments, lesson plans, or documents related to counseling or library activities. The inclusion of student evaluations and portfolio review upholds the integrity and credibility of the evaluation process.

Employee Evaluation of Administrators and the Chancellor

Another example of inclusiveness is the recently modified process for evaluation of administrators. Previously a process that occurred every three years and was conducted by an evaluation committee, the new process, initiated by the Chancellor in 2003, occurs yearly and invites the participation of all faculty. The Classified Senate is discussing its open participation in the process as well. The Chancellor is also evaluated annually by classified staff, faculty, and administrators.
Evaluation of the Shared Governance System. The evaluation of the Shared Governance System, designed by the College Advisory Council in collaboration with the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, is an exemplary assessment of the degree of trust, collegiality, and inclusiveness among the participants of the Shared Governance committees, who represent all of the major constituencies of the College. The Shared Governance System has been evaluated three times since its inception in 1993. Each evaluation indicated a stronger climate of trust and collaboration, while identifying needs for improvement, such as improving the “efficiency in moving new or updated policies and procedures through the Shared Governance System for approval,” as well as “real and meaningful participation from committees.” The most recent Shared Governance evaluation, conducted in 2004, was the most comprehensive to date, utilizing a multiple-measures approach, including: (1) an online survey of all participants on Shared Governance committees over the past three years (including questions that directly addressed issues of inclusiveness, such as whether committee members “speak regularly at meetings” and “are uncomfortable with expressing opposing views”); (2) three listening sessions held at two campuses, attended by faculty, administrators, staff, and students; and (3) a structured self-study framework of issues for discussion of four basic areas of inquiry: inclusion of College constituencies, effectiveness of the governance system, efficiency of the governance system, and alignment of the governance system with College goals and objectives. Responses to all of the forms of inquiry were used to inform discussion in four representative College organizations: the Academic Senate, Classified (Staff) Senate, Administrators’ Association, and Associated Students. Student participation in Shared Governance committees has not been consistent, however, largely due to changing class and work schedules which conflict with committee meeting dates. Therefore, student participation in the Shared Governance evaluation processes has been limited. In fact, the Associated Students organization chose not to participate in the online surveys or self-study discussions, citing inadequate exposure to and knowledge of the Shared Governance System and the roles of its committees. One of the recommendations that emerged from the evaluation process that attempts to remedy this issue is for stronger mentoring of new Shared Governance committee members, students in particular. Recommendations for improvement of ongoing operations reflected the need for improved clarity of the Shared Governance System itself—committee functions, tracking of issues through the system, and standardization of committee meeting protocols. Recommendations for new initiatives focused on the needs of Shared Governance participants—the need for mentoring new members, reassigned time for faculty committee chairs, notification of supervisors of an employee's appointment to a Shared Governance committee, and an annual letter from the Chancellor to all College employees and students inviting their participation in and reaffirming the critical importance of the Shared Governance System at CCSF and the roles they play in that process.

Public Input

The College's 2003-04 Facilities Master Planning process was exemplary in its outreach to the community and inclusion of public input. The College placed ads in the major dailies, neighborhood papers, and ethnic press; mailed postcards to over 40,000 neighborhood residents; and mailed letters to neighborhood organizations, inviting them to participate in listening sessions and public hearings that took place throughout the Master Planning and Environmental Impact Reporting (EIR) processes. Copies of the Master Plan and EIR were provided through the main public library and the CCSF website. Community residents and members of neighborhood associations were encouraged to voice concerns, questions, and recommendations about the Master Plan proposals and EIR. Residents of the Sunnyside neighborhood, which borders CCSF, voiced their appreciation of the opportunity to be heard, as they have been generally most affected by increases in student traffic. Public opinion was also sought regarding support for Bond Measure A in 2001. Polling conducted by a professional research organization of 600 likely San Francisco voters found that the voters agreed overall that CCSF's mission of education was extremely important to San Francisco. Throughout the course of the telephone survey, attitudes in support of the bond measure ranged from 69 percent to 73 percent. The bond measure passed in November 2001, with the support of 72 percent of the voters.
Operating in the “Sunshine”

CCSF is committed to the principle of openness in conducting the business of the public and to the right of the people to know about the operations of the College. The Board of Trustees has recognized that access to both public meetings and public information is vital to ensuring full participation of the public in the workings of the College. Therefore, when the College was approached by the City of San Francisco to explore adopting the City and County of San Francisco’s “Sunshine Ordinance,” the Board of Trustees directed the Chancellor to establish an Advisory Committee to study the feasibility of its application to CCSF. The Advisory Committee was also charged with reviewing existing College practices and procedures regarding public meetings and public records (e.g., current compliance with the Brown Act and Public Records Act). Throughout 2002 and 2003, the Advisory Committee and the Board made numerous recommendations regarding efforts to increase opportunities for public participation. Joint meetings occurred between the Advisory Committee and the San Francisco City and County Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in 2003 and 2004, during which pros and cons of the recommendations presented by both groups were analyzed by the College’s General Counsel and the Deputy City Attorney assigned by the Task Force. By May 2005, 25 recommendations had been adopted by the Board of Trustees.

CCSF Communications: Commitment to Clarity, Accessibility and Appropriateness

Mass communications. The priority placed on honesty, inclusiveness, and forthrightness with members of the College community and the external communities it serves drives the prolific production of mass and target communications at CCSF. The distribution of the Spring 2005 Class Schedule illustrates the scale of the College’s regular communications with the public: 335,000 schedules were mailed to residences, over 10,000 were delivered to public libraries and high schools, and 80,000 were available through the College bookstores. Ads promoting the start of classes or announcing the development of new programs (such as the Bridge to Biotech program or the Asian-Pacific American Student Services program) are posted in the numerous regional dailies, weeklies, and monthlies, including ethnic and neighborhood newspapers. The Chancellor’s Annual Report to the Community, sent to 340,000 residences in October, is an illustrated, three-part fold-out poster of information produced by the Office of Public Information and Marketing. It provides the community with a detailed progress report on the College’s fiscal management, partnerships with the community, and quality improvement initiatives in programs, services, and facilities. The 2004 Annual Report also provided a detailed update on the implementation of the Facilities Master Plan. The Chancellor’s E-Bulletin, sent to 2,000 residences three times per year, gives regular updates of CCSF operations and accomplishments. Clearly, the College places great value in maintaining communications and relationships with the surrounding communities.

The College Catalog is the primary source of information for students and the public regarding curriculum, programs and services, College policies and procedures, and student rights and responsibilities. This year, 6,000 copies of the 2005-2006 CCSF Catalog will be printed, though it is the online delivery of both the CCSF Catalog and Schedule of Classes that ensures local, national, and international access to information about the College. The Catalog is continually updated in its online version to reflect changes that impact students and is a truly collaborative effort of administration, school and campus deans, department chairs, and program and service directors and coordinators, under the meticulous coordination of the Catalog Workgroup and the Office of Instruction. In a 2004 online survey of 2,500 students regarding their satisfaction with College services, the CCSF Catalog was among the 12 top-rated services. The 2003-2004 Catalog earned two awards for its presentation and readability: the Silver Medallion of Achievement from the National Council for Marketing and Public Relations and third place from the Community College Public Relations Association.
The College's weekly newsletter, *City Currents*, produced and distributed by the Office of Information and Marketing, keeps the College community informed of departmental activities and opportunities, as well as employee accomplishments. Official announcements and essential District information are also disseminated through *City Currents*. Seventeen issues of the newsletter are produced per semester and disseminated to our nearly 3,000 College employees, and made available online. The award-winning student newspaper, *The Guardsman*, the primary means of student-to-student communication, is produced weekly by students in the Journalism Department.

**Special targeted communications.** The College is ever cognizant of its responsibility to keep the surrounding communities informed of important changes or opportunities that will have an impact on its current and future students. An example of such a communication effort was the mailing of 60,000 postcards to residents surrounding the Mission Campus informing them, in English and in Spanish, of the relocation of the campus to a temporary site. A successful large-scale communication campaign which exemplified the College's commitment to student access was a media blitz, “Shake the Financial Aid Tree,” promoting the availability of financial aid to offset recent tuition increases that had been imposed on the California community college system by the Governor's Office. Anticipating that the increase in tuition and fees to $26 per unit would deter enrollment of new and continuing students already reeling from another fairly recent tuition hike from $11 to $18 per unit, the Office of Public Information and Marketing collaborated with the Financial Aid Office to develop a media campaign of print, radio, and television ads. The TV spots featured CCSF student financial award recipients, against the backdrop of the Diego Rivera mural, delivering the message that “Financial aid is available to help you to achieve your education goals” in English, Spanish, Russian, Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, and Tagalog. The TV spots aired 1,200 times over a six-month period on cable and Asian and Hispanic television stations broadcasting to the entire Bay Area. In addition, postcards announcing financial aid availability and featuring celebrated graduates of CCSF were mailed to 380,000 households in San Francisco, South San Francisco, and Daly City. The advertising campaign appears to have been successful, as the Director of Financial Aid reports that the number of financial aid awards in the 2004-05 academic year has increased by 20.5 percent thus far.

**Web communications.** The CCSF website has become the primary gateway to communications among the constituencies within our College and with the public, local and world-wide. In addition to serving as an informational resource regarding educational programs, student services, course outlines, etc., the website provides the College community with access to specific reports generated by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, such as results of student and employee surveys, College Performance Indicators, and the Decision Support-System (DSS). The DSS provides regularly updated information regarding demand for courses (course section enrollment), productivity data such as weekly student contact hours, student FTES (on which state funding is based), characteristics of enrollees (age, educational goal, GPA), and success rates in sections.¹ Some departments and offices have come to rely on this data in their programmatic decision making. This evidence now allows all departments to evaluate the viability of their offerings realistically; in addition, and, perhaps inadvertently, the availability of such candid data has helped to foster an environment of trust in open sharing of information.

The CCSF website has sparked a creativity which had only been glimpsed previously through the proliferation of brochures, posters, and flyers overflowing racks and covering walls. This creativity shows itself in individual program and department websites. Some of the multi-program departments have skillfully designed their websites to guide current and potential students to program descriptions that are sometimes difficult to locate in the Catalog. The Business Department website, for example, presents its array of credit and noncredit programs, such as Accounting, Legal Assisting, Real Estate, Small Business, International

¹ Not all data are updated with the same frequency.
Marketing, and Microcomputer Applications in Business. The Learning Assistance Program website, which received a Learning Support Centers in Higher Education Website Excellence Award, not only guides viewers through their offerings, but offers a visual tour of their facilities. The current website for the Institute for International Students, designed by students in the program, is a stand-out for its inviting visual presentation and friendly navigation to continually updated pages of information. While the variety in the style of the sites may reflect the differences in the fields themselves, variations in the graphic complexity and depth of information probably have more to do with the amount of resources and guidance available to the website developers. Departments or schools with greater resources have hired web consultants for their writing, design, and technical expertise. However, many programs have developed user-friendly websites through the talents of their own staff or students and the assistance of the CCSF website technical specialist. Communications Committee discussions about the architectural problems of the CCSF website front-page and resulting navigational difficulties have led to plans for a major redesign of the website, to include the re-labeling of links to be more meaningful to students and the public. Also discussed has been the standardization of individual program website design. The establishment of standard website content guidelines and a process of review would certainly be helpful to program website developers, though not at the expense of program website individuality (see also concerns in the next section, “Communications Plan”).

Communications plan. The Communications Committee, a Shared Governance committee that reports to the College Advisory Council, reviews issues and recommends policies concerning the quality of and access to College communications, including print and online publications, the front-page of the CCSF website, educational access television (EAtv-Ch27), and KCSF radio. In response to one of three 2004–05 Board of Trustees priorities, the improvement of internal and external communications, the Communications Committee drafted a Communications Plan to evaluate and recommend strategies for improvement. Specific discussions regarding EAtv-Ch27 have centered around the effectiveness of its use. The Committee is establishing a study group that will evaluate current programming, staffing, and technology; and explore the acquisition and production of new, additional programming, such as features about CCSF events and an outstanding teachers’ lecture series. Also being considered is the webcasting of Channel 27 to expand its audience reach beyond San Francisco. Plans are also being made to mail the EAtv-Ch27 Program Guide within the CCSF Class Schedule to San Francisco residents. Intense discussion surrounds the quality of the CCSF website. Pointing to the website’s lack of central or cohesive identity, clear oversight or a plan for growth, the Committee is discussing remedies, which include the possible development of a staff position of “website content master.” At the very least, the Committee recommends the creation of a “modern, accessible, updated, and integrated College website for use by students, faculty, staff, and community.”

CCSF’s Commitment to Diversity

CCSF serves a city and county of tremendous multicultural diversity, which is reflected in the ethnic demographics of the over 100,000 students enrolled in the credit and noncredit programs at CCSF: 36 percent of students are Asian/Pacific Islander, 21 percent White Non-Hispanic, 20 percent Hispanic/Latino(a), 7 percent African American, 5 percent Filippino, less than 1 percent Native American, and approximately 10 percent are of non-identified ethnicities. Of course, the cultural diversity of San Francisco and CCSF is multi-faceted, comprising not only ethnicity and race, but also socio-economic level, sexual orientation, educational background, and ability. More than lifestyles, these are cultures in their own right, some achieving representation in the governing bodies of the city of San Francisco, as well as in the governing body of CCSF. “Multicultural diversity” best describes the richness of the teaching and learning environment at CCSF.
The College has a clear commitment to fostering equity and multicultural diversity in its curricula, teaching methodologies, student services and programs, student outreach, and hiring and employment practices. This commitment to promoting “an inclusive community ... where all people are enriched by diversity and multi-cultural understanding” and to providing “educational programs and services to meet the ... needs of our diverse community” is affirmed in the CCSF Vision and Mission Statements. To “continue to develop initiatives that promote social and racial trust among all College constituencies” is one of the priorities of the Strategic Plan 2003-2008. The College’s commitment to diversity of the workforce is most clearly stated in Strategic Priority 8.1:

“Ensure that the College’s workforce reflects the diverse communities we serve.

a. Continue and expand efforts to recruit and hire a diverse faculty.

b. Pursue development strategies to cultivate and support a future corps of faculty for CCSF.

c. Evaluate the progress and success of the College’s recruitment and hiring efforts and processes.”

Diversity in hiring and employment practices is not only a Strategic Plan priority, but a historic priority that pre-dates the beginnings of (now defunct) affirmative action hiring practices more than 30 years ago. The College has long recognized the importance of a diverse workforce that is reflective of the community and students it serves and sensitive to the range of issues that its students face in obtaining higher education, preparing for a career, and dealing with the world at large. Table 1 shows the racial/ethnic demographics of students, teaching and counseling faculty, classified staff, and administrators as reported in the Fall 2004 CCSF Employee and Hiring Data Report. For additional measures of diversity (veteran status, disabilities, and sexual preference), please see the section of this Self Study entitled, “City and College Data.”

### TABLE 1

**Racial/Ethnic Demographic Data of Students, Faculty, Staff, & Administrators Fall 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Classified</th>
<th>Classified</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100% to due to rounding.

---

2 Employee count is based on raw data submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office by CCSF.
The data in Table 2, provided by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, presents the ethnic demographics of adults, ages 18 and older, who reside in the city and county of San Francisco. According to the DSS data, between 2000 and 2004, the percentage of CCSF students who resided in the city and county of San Francisco ranged from 84 percent to 87 percent.

### TABLE 2
**San Francisco City and County Adult Population**
Ages 18 and older (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>44,010</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>207,499</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>314,737</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>88,106</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>12,223</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>671,738</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Total does not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

While the ethnic diversity among our classified staff generally matches or exceeds the College’s strategic priority to “ensure that the College’s workforce reflect(s) the diverse communities we serve,” the ethnic diversity of our faculty and administration has been growing more slowly. As the passage of Proposition 209 suspended affirmative action practices in hiring, the College has made other efforts to attract teaching faculty applicants with ethnically diverse backgrounds, of importance especially for departments which serve large numbers of basic skills level students. The Grow Your Own initiative, supported by discussions within the College Diversity Committee, is an innovative recruitment program designed to inspire current or former CCSF students to pursue a teaching or counseling position at CCSF. These students receive mentoring and scholarships to pursue graduate degrees and serve as teaching or counseling interns at the College. The Grow Your Own project would benefit from increased promotion and publicity, since, to date, few students have participated. The project might also expand its outreach to current CCSF classified employees, many of whom are currently working towards graduate degrees in order to advance their professional careers.

Other efforts to recruit underrepresented candidates include the Human Resources Department’s participation in the CCC Affirmative Action Job Fairs, and placement of job announcements in a variety of appropriate publications, newspapers, trade journals, and websites.

---

The College Diversity Committee, chaired by the Chancellor, oversees the development of initiatives that realize the Strategic Plan 2003-2008 priorities related to diversity. These priorities include “diversifying the curriculum across the College” (Strategic Priority 2.2), “promoting diversity at all levels of the College” and “ensuring that the College’s workforce reflects the diverse communities we serve” (Strategic Priority 8.1).

The Diversity Committee recommended changes to the faculty and administrative hiring processes that updated and strengthened the standard for evaluating an applicant’s ability to work with a multicultural student population. The changes, implemented by the Human Resources Department, now require that applicants describe in their application cover letter how their teaching methods meet the needs of culturally and academically diverse learners. Hiring interviews, as in the past, must include a question that directly relates to the candidates’ experience working with diverse student populations. The Human Resources Department also promotes a diverse composition of faculty and administrative hiring committees and faculty tenure review committees.

The College and its Board of Trustees are committed to employing administrators, faculty, and staff members who are dedicated to student success. CCSF recognizes that diversity in the collegiate environment fosters cultural awareness, promotes mutual understanding and respect, and creates an improved environment for teaching and learning. CCSF is committed to hiring that supports the goal of equal employment opportunity and provides equal consideration for all qualified candidates—this means that all qualified individuals have a full and fair opportunity to compete for hiring and promotion and to enjoy the benefits of employment with the District. Equal employment opportunity should exist at all levels and in all job categories, and ensuring equal employment opportunity involves creating an environment that fosters cooperation, acceptance, democracy, and free expression of ideas and is welcoming to men and women, persons with disabilities, and individuals from all ethnic groups and other groups protected from discrimination.

Committed to the charge of embracing diversity and diversifying the curriculum across the College, the Diversity Committee supported the development of the Multicultural Infusion Project (MIP). The MIP, now in its second year, is a rigorous professional development program that has trained participating faculty to recognize and assess individual and cultural learning styles, infuse multicultural content and perspectives into their curriculum or counseling content, and employ teaching/counseling strategies that meet the needs of a culturally diverse student population. Participants in MIP are attempting to become more culturally competent, which, broadly applied to teaching and counseling, means developing the ability to interact with individuals from cultures other than one’s own without stereotyping or reinforcing society’s inequities. Further, MIP is a crucial opportunity for participants to form community, initiate sensitive dialogs, and support one another across departmental, cultural, ethnic, gender, and other lines that often inhibit trust and sharing.

Another initiative, the Basic Skills Improvement Initiative, which grew out of the Title III grant, was developed in response to the needs of the large percentage of students who place into pre-collegiate coursework in English and math and experience low pass rates, particularly students of color. Details about this initiative can be found in the Theme I essay.

The College has an extensive offering of student retention programs whose specific purposes are to reach out to students in need of learning assistance, particularly at the level of pre-collegiate basic skills coursework. These programs are designed to focus on those underrepresented populations that are at high risk for attrition and noncompletion. Such programs provide students with supplementary instruction and regular academic counseling; some of the programs work with students in collaboration with their instructors. Students who participate in these programs have demonstrated generally higher rates of course success, higher GPAs, and higher graduation and transfer rates than their non-participating peers both by discipline and by ethnicity.
CCSF is well regarded for integrating extensive noncredit programs into several departments. The College has also developed several modes of instruction directed toward serving student populations with unique needs. Examples include the Vocational ESL Immersion Program, the Welcome Back Program, Project Shine, and the Working Adults Degree Program. In recognition of this work, the institution received in 2004 the MetLife Community College Excellence Award specifically for reaching out to first-generation, immigrant, low-income and working adults through the ESL Department and community-based programs developed by the institution. Moreover, the College recently received two grants from the National Science Foundation, totaling $1.1 million, to develop the On-Ramp to Biotech and Bridge to Biotech programs, intended for underrepresented and limited-English residents of San Francisco County.

The College continues to prioritize its efforts to achieve a workforce that is reflective of the diversity of the communities it serves, to incorporate multicultural perspectives into the curricula and teaching strategies, and to offer programs and services that will provide needed assistance to at-risk students. The College is clearly committed to creating a diverse environment that will increase equity in student achievement and success. In fulfilling this commitment, the College recognizes that the law in the areas of hiring/employment practices as well as curriculum and student services is evolving, and it is committed to the foregoing programs and practices only to the extent permitted by applicable law.

IV. Conclusion & Future Directions

This essay is, in many respects, a litany of parallel and overlapping evaluations, surveys, review processes, initiatives, services, and professional development projects—which, in effect, is the intention. The activities described here only begin to scratch the surface of the volume of inquiry and innovation that takes place at the College in pursuit of excellence. The College has the honesty and confidence to raise issues of concern about the inclusiveness of governance, the respect for multicultural diversity, the equity of student achievement, and the maintenance of academic standards; and CCSF is fortunate to have the resources of data, research capacity, and institution-wide participation to investigate these issues and develop solutions. The following recommendations, incorporated within this essay and the standards reports, encompass issues that the College should address as priorities in its ongoing commitment to strengthening the integrity of our institution.

With respect to policies, practices, and procedures, this essay highlights the need to implement a structured process for reviewing and updating the District (Board) Policy Manual and for publishing and implementing policy changes. To ensure that the College continues to include all constituencies in problem solving and decision making, it should foster a higher level of engagement of students on Shared Governance committees and in the Shared Governance System evaluation process. In the area of communications, the College should undertake a variety of initiatives, including: creating a new CCSF website that is “modern, accessible, updated and integrated” (per the Communications Committee recommendation); providing better management and oversight of CCSF website content and architecture, perhaps through a new position (Web Content Master) and by establishing guidelines for content, design, and navigation; and expanding EAtv/Channel 27 programming and access. Finally, to promote diversity, the College should better publicize and implement faculty recruitment programs and strategies such as the “Grow Your Own” program and identify additional means to intensify its support of an increasingly diverse teaching faculty.
V. Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institutional Annual Plan, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Impact of Matriculation on Students at CCSF, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student Services Systems Review, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Board Resolution: Model District Policy on Prerequisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administrative Evaluation and Appointment Renewal Procedures, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shared Governance System Evaluation, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Facilities Master Plan, 2003–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>David Binder research poll on public support for Bond Measure A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Class Schedule, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>College Catalogs, 2003–04 and 2005–06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Annual Report to the Community and E-Bulletin, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>City Currents (weekly faculty newsletter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Guardsman (Associated Students newsletter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mid-Year Report of Annual Plan Objectives, 2004–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Individual CCSF program websites (Business Department, Learning Assistance Program, Institute for International Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Communications Plan of the Communications Committee on improving internal and external communications (Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Enhanced Self-Study Report, 2000–01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2000 Accreditation Team Recommendation on alignment of AA degree requirements in Math and Written Composition with Title 5 standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Title 5 Model District Policy on Prerequisites, Corequisites, Advisories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Survey Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What students think of CCSF, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students who petitioned for graduation, 2000–01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students leaving before census, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student opinion survey, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee satisfaction with College services, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee use of technology, 1997–2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Res. 22  Article 9, (faculty) Evaluation, Collective Bargaining Agreement between SFCCD and AFT 2121
Res. 23  Board Resolution 050526-S2: Recommendations regarding the Sunshine Ordinance
Res. 24  Ads promoting start of class (2005)
Res. 25  TV spot: Financial Aid is available to help you achieve your goals
Res. 26  Decision Support System
Res. 27  CCSF Vision Statement
Res. 28  CCSF Mission Statement
Res. 29  Strategic Plan, 2003–2008
Res. 30  College Performance Indicators Report, 2004
Res. 31  Grow Your Own Initiative
Res. 32  Chancellor’s Prospectus for Academy for Improved Student Success
Res. 33  Multicultural Infusion Project
Res. 34  Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills Accountability Report: Part 1
Res. 35  Policy and Procedure Service website, Community College League of California
Res. 36  Board Resolution 040610-S1: Certification of Final EIR for Master Plan
MAJOR FINDINGS
The City College of San Francisco self-study process covered ten months of intense examination of all facets of the College's programs and services, resulting in the identification of 82 recommendations for improvement. These recommendations can be found at the end of each of the Standards Reports and the Theme Essays. The Accreditation Work Group collected all 82 recommendations and conducted a comprehensive review to identify duplications and redundancies. Through this process, the Work Group was able to identify 18 major findings that integrate the issues and concerns contained in the original 82. The Accreditation Self Study Steering Committee has reviewed and adopted these findings.

These 18 findings are organized into three major categories: Teaching and Learning; Planning, Budgeting, Evaluation, and Improvement; and Organization and Institutional Resources.
Teaching & Learning

1. Develop an institutional plan through Shared Governance processes to further address the discussion, development, implementation, and assessment of student learning outcomes. (T.2, S.II.A)
   
a. Support and train instructional and student development faculty and staff on development and assessment of learning outcomes at the course and program levels, including training of some faculty to act as resources to others, expanding participation and promoting time for dialog. (S.II.A, T.2, T.3, T.5)
   
b. Develop human and financial resources to provide programs and services, expertise, and technology support necessary to implement student learning outcomes. (T.2)
   
c. Bring students into the student learning outcomes discussions. (S.II.A)
   
d. Explore the possible implications such an institutional plan could have for changes in institutional processes such as curriculum development and review, faculty and administrative evaluations, and institutional planning. (T.2, S.II.A)

2. Increase efforts to develop an integrated College curriculum:
   
a. Support the integration of multicultural perspectives into College courses. (S.II.B)
   
b. Promote cross-disciplinary and integrative learning communities. (T.3)

3. Expand the College's professional development program by establishing a teaching and learning center in support of faculty and staff to help meet the goals and objectives in the College's Strategic Plan, especially Priority #1 (Basic Skills); Priority #2 (Academic Programs); Priority #3 (Workforce Development); and Priority #5 (Student Development). (S.III.A, T.1, T.3)

4. Expand innovative methods of delivery of instruction and student services to meet the multiple needs of students. (S.II.B)
   
a. Improve the dissemination of information on instructional pedagogies and evaluation techniques related to students’ diverse learning styles. (S.II.A)
   
b. Expand the use of technologies for the delivery of student services. (S.II.B)

5. Use appropriate data to establish a level of funding for instructional materials that anticipates the need to acquire core collections and instructional equipment for existing and new campus libraries and learning resources. (S.II.C)

6. Develop a coordinated library/learning resources system to provide, maintain, and track the use of broadcast/audio/visual services so that a seamless and user-friendly system serves the instructional needs of faculty, staff, and students. (S.II.C)
Planning, Budgeting, Evaluation & Improvement

7. Continue to improve the College's planning, budgeting, and evaluation system.
   a. Expand the number of College venues throughout the District to conduct dialogs on planning objectives, budget allocations, and assessment reports using current and additional College information and data. (S.I, S.II, T.3)
   b. Ensure that the College's Program Review System is integrated into the College's Budget, Planning, and Evaluation System. (S.I, T.5)
   c. Establish a schedule for the review of all major College business processes to identify improvement objectives that will be integrated into the College Planning and Budgeting System. (S.III.D)

8. Establish a regular schedule of review of all curricula and link it with Program Review of all instructional and student services departments. (S.I, S.II.A)

9. Develop criteria for terminating programs through appropriate institutional processes. (S.I, S.II.A)

Organization & Institutional Resources

10. Continue to promote participation by the classified staff, faculty, administrators, and students within the College's Shared Governance System. (S.IV)

11. Continue to improve College communication and publicity efforts.
   a. Improve the College's website for clarity, currency, content, and functionality of design. (S.II.A, S.II.B, T.6)
   b. Expand EAtv/Channel 27 programming and improve access. (S.II.A, S.II.B, T.6)
   c. Improve marketing and information about the campuses. (S.II.A, S.II.B, T.6)
   d. Improve dissemination of College policies, especially those on academic freedom and student honesty. (S.II.A)
12. Expand efforts to improve communication and coordination of information among counseling, library/learning resources, and instructional programs. (S.II.C)

13. Continue to refine the College hiring procedures.
   a. Promote faculty recruitment programs and strategies to increase diversity of applicants and finalists. (S.III.A, T.6)
   b. Review hiring processes to find ways to streamline procedures. (S.III.A)

14. Expand College technology capacity.
   a. Update the College technology plan. (S.III.C)
   b. Expand training and expertise of technical support staff for the College’s technology infrastructure. (S.II.C, S.III.C)
   c. Increase electrical capacity to support College technology needs. (S.III.C)
   d. Establish standard replacement cycle for institutional computers and peripherals. (S.II.C)

15. Ensure the College’s long-term fiscal stability by developing and implementing a comprehensive plan to match ongoing spending with ongoing revenue. (S.III.D)

16. Conduct a review of the College’s current liabilities for retiree health benefits and develop a long-term plan to address this liability. (S.III.D)

17. Regularly review and develop, as needed, Board of Trustees policies, particularly policies on permanent maintenance of all student records; ethical behavior of employees; statement of economic interest; and Board self-evaluation. (T.6, S.IV, S.III.A, S.II.B)

18. Continue to improve the College facilities and College physical infrastructure.
   a. Implement long-range planning for total costs of ownership for all new facilities and major equipment initiatives. (S.III.B)
   b. Improve the College’s capacity to integrate long-term facilities planning with financial planning. (S.III.B)