

Standard I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

I.B.1. *The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.*

I.B.1. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Collegial and substantive dialogue about continuously improving student learning and achievement occurs within and across all departments and at the institutional level in a sustained, ongoing cycle that emphasizes equity, quality, and effectiveness. The main structures for dialogue are the College’s outcomes assessment processes at the course, program, service, and institutional levels; Program Review; Collegial and Participatory Governance venues; planning processes; and focused professional development activities (both internal to the College and external).

Dialogue about Student Learning. The Institutional Assessment Plan provides a systematic and evolving framework for ongoing outcomes assessment work.¹ The plan delineates institutional assessment goals such as supporting improvement, providing training, furthering program planning, disseminating data, and creating a system of resources and references. The plan specifies the cooperative nature of institutional effectiveness, showing how administrative and support services, as well as academic programs, contribute to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and achievement outcomes. To maintain currency and regularly prompt collegial dialogue about the College’s assessment of learning, implementation of the assessment plan addresses the competencies, skills, and knowledge gained by students who attend CCSF, expressed for segments of study or activity through measurable learning outcomes at the institutional, program, degree, and course levels.² Assessments use multiple methods of evaluation, and findings form the foundation of evidence that pollinates Program Review data analysis, reflection, and planning (see Standards II.A.3. – 6.; Standard II.C.2.). The SLO Coordination Team regularly reviews the plan (typically in the fall semester) and updates as appropriate with input from Participatory and Collegial Governance.

Regular “SLO Updates” sent to the entire College share outcomes assessment activities and results.³ For several years, while standardizing College-wide reporting processes and improving cross-departmental communication, the College also spotlighted exemplars from across the College in monthly highlights reports describing program improvements resulting from ongoing

¹ [Institutional Assessment Plan](#)

² [Screenshot of Definition of Learning, ACCJC Standards, Crosswalked and Glossary, July 2015, page 2](#) (Source: Definition of Learning, ACCJC Standards, Crosswalked and Glossary, June 2014, page 2)

³ [SLO Updates](#)

assessment.⁴ These highlights were used to demonstrate and share effective practices. They have been replaced by the research and reports completed by General Education and Institutional Learning Outcome workgroups who gather and share results across one group of GELOs or ILOs each semester.⁵ A content analysis of assessment reports show a College community that has embraced a culture of intentionality, finding assessment meaningful.⁶ Themes emerging from the content analysis include dialogue and collegial collaboration, professionalism, clear student improvement, and inspiration and satisfaction.

Departments and disciplines have different approaches for how their internal dialogue is structured. As one example, microbiology instructors meet to determine which SLOs to assess each semester and share assessment options. Evidence of ongoing dialogue regarding what assessments to use is captured online for reference. These types of conversations help norm semester-based outcomes assessment and support consistency in determining proficiency.⁷

The Role of Program Review. Semester-based outcomes assessment is incorporated into Program Review which serves as a venue for dialogue about learning, achievement, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness. Program Review offers an opportunity for intra-departmental discussion on progress and needs among department chairs and faculty; it also provides formal lines of communication between departments and immediate supervisors. The incorporation of outcomes assessment into Program Review has recently been enhanced and facilitated through integrated CurricUNET modules. Administrative units complete Program Reviews alongside instructional departments and student services. Centralized web pages house each semester's assessments and Program Reviews.^{8 9} To facilitate information exchange across all locations and services, assessment results and Program Reviews for all courses, programs, and services are available online. As a result, departments have ready access to assessment data for courses and services that affect their students' success, even when those courses and services are not housed in their own department.

Student Achievement. In addition to the examination of and discussion about learning, faculty and other program leads evaluate student success and achievement.¹⁰ This examination occurs at the course and program level as well as at the institutional level. Student achievement includes measured points of success in the form of educational milestones at defined points of completion, including successful course completion, certificates and degrees, licensure examination passage, post-program employment, and other similar elements.

⁴ [Screenshot of Monthly Assessment Highlights](#)

⁵ [GELO and ILO Assessment Reporting Dashboard](#)

⁶ [Thematic Analysis of Assessment Highlights](#)

⁷ [MB12 assessment webpage](#)

⁸ [Student Learning Outcomes](#)

⁹ [Program Review](#)

¹⁰ [Screenshot of Definition of Student Achievement, ACCJC Standards, Crosswalked and Glossary, June 2014, page 2](#) (Source: Definition of Student Achievement, [ACCJC Standards, Crosswalked and Glossary, June 2014](#), page 2)

CCSF takes great pride in its efforts to establish institution-set standards at the institutional level in the measures expected by the Commission and Federal Regulations. Further, the College extends this work into its review of measures specifically tied to the mission, localized to the College's unique purposes and functions, with an increasing focus on program-level standards (see Standard I.B.3.).

Equitable Outcomes for All. Equity features prominently in College dialogue about effectiveness and improvement. As displayed in the data section of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the College is very diverse, and a large percentage of students who attend the institution are first-generation college students, impacted by poverty, and from traditionally underserved groups. Disaggregated student achievement and learning outcomes data inform College processes. Equity figures prominently in both outcomes assessment and Program Review, as well as in College-wide plans. The College has disaggregated achievement data for Program Review by various student demographics for decades. Availability of disaggregated data since the 1990s has long provided an opportunity to address equity. Two recent improvements in 2015 have bolstered the focus on equity: disaggregation of learning outcomes (to accompany achievement outcomes) and pointed prompts in Program Review directing all units to analyze and address equity gaps in achievement.^{11 12} Equity analysis is facilitated through data workshops and coaching sessions for the new Argos system which provides details down to the course level (and sometimes section level) as well as public and highly graphical Tableau reports.^{13 14} The development of Argos reports increases the users' abilities to probe the data by disaggregating variables in their programs, allowing for more meaningful dialogue and discussion.

In addition to unit-level planning, equity figures prominently in discussions that inform College-level planning and goal-setting. The equity focus in the Education Master Plan (EMP) was established through broad discussions within the College, with input from the communities the College serves, and further developed through connections to student support plans and resource plans.¹⁵ For example, the College's Student Equity Plan (SEP) deepened dialogue through equity forums held to inform the development of the plan.¹⁶ In 2014, the College held 11 community forums and an all-day Equity Institute. The College's Vision and Mission statements similarly emphasize equity as a result of College-wide input. The annual review of the Vision and Mission Statements further highlights the College's equity emphasis.¹⁷

¹¹ [SLO disaggregation image from mission statement review PPT](#)

¹² [Screenshot of data analysis questions emphasizing equity](#) (Source: [Program Review Question on Data Trends](#))

¹³ [Emails announcing workshops to Dept. Chairs and School Deans](#), and to [Student Services](#)

¹⁴ [Tableau report for course success by demographics](#)

¹⁵ Screenshot of "Student Success" and "Goal 1" sections of the [Education Master Plan 2014-2020](#) (pages 51-55, 58-59) (Source: [Education Master Plan 2014-2020](#) (pages 51-55, 58-59); Screenshot of the Student Equity Plan, Basic Skills Report, and SSSP sections of the [2016 EMP Implementation Matrix](#) (Source: [2016 EMP Implementation Matrix](#)); [Screenshot of College-Wide Technology Goals](#), page 6 (Source: College-Wide Technology Goals of the [DRAFT Technology Plan 2015-2017](#), page 6)

¹⁶ [Screenshot of page\(s\) in Equity Plan describing forums](#) (Source: [CCSF Equity Plan 2015-16](#), pages 9, 23, 33, 41, 114, and 120)

¹⁷ [Vision and Mission Statements](#)

As one example of how Equity Forum input is supporting action, many students reported not knowing about College resources even after several semesters of enrollment and spoke of informal mentoring that helped them navigate. Equity-funded Peer Mentorship is designed to address these barriers including one-on-one pairing and ongoing support, leading study groups, helping students in dedicated computer labs, and connecting students with additional resources. As another example, students identified embedded tutoring in specific classes as a priority in Fall 2014 and Fall 2015 Equity Forums and Feedback. In response, the College has implemented equity-oriented tutoring during in Fall 2015 or Spring 2016 as follows:

- Professional tutoring for English Acceleration, History, and Multicultural Retention Services Department (MSRD);
- Peer tutoring/mentoring programs for Automotive, Behavioral Sciences, Computer Networking and Information Technology (CNIT), Economics, Fashion, MRSB, and Visual Media Design (VMD);
- Supplemental Instruction Programs for Chemistry and English as a Second Language (ESL);
- Peer Mentoring for African American Scholastic Programs (AASP), Asian Pacific American Student Success Program (APASS), Fire Science, Latino Services Network (LSN), Project Survive, Puente, Tulay, Voices of Immigrants Demonstrating Achievement (VIDA), and WayPass.

Initial data results indicate slight positive effects in Fall 2015 data, and more data will be available this summer.¹⁸

Institutional Effectiveness and Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI). Collegial and Participatory Governance serve as important venues for dialogue about student achievement and learning outcomes. As a result, the College as a whole is able to focus on how well it is meeting the needs of its students and to identify areas for improvement at the instructional level and at the institutional level. For example, the annual review of the Vision and Mission Statements occurs through the Academic Senate and the Participatory Governance Council (PGC)—and their committees—before the Board ultimately discusses them.¹⁹ Indices such as longitudinal achievement data and ILOs inform review and discussion of the Vision and Mission Statements.²⁰

Standing committees of the PGC provide an ongoing structure for CQI. Perhaps most prominently, the Planning Committee has as its stated purpose “Improving the institutional effectiveness at the unit-level and in the College overall.”²¹ Planning Committee meetings

¹⁸ [Screenshot of Equity-Related Tutoring Activities](#) (Source: [EMP Implementation Matrix - Year 2 \(2016\)](#), page 2)

¹⁹ [Administrative Procedures 1.00](#)

²⁰ [College Indices](#)

²¹ [Planning Committee Description and Purpose](#)

typically include reviewing SLO reports produced by the Academic Senate SLO Committee and discussing relevant recommendations.²² As part of Participatory Governance, membership consists of all constituent groups. Regular meetings, open to all, provide a forum/venue for an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue. Reports from the Planning Committee to the PGC highlight a collaborative approach to institutional effectiveness (discussed at length in Standards I.B.5. – I.B.9.).

With regard to student learning, SLO Coordinators lead the dialogue and regularly contribute to the work of several committees.²³ For example, SLO Coordinators have traditionally led the Academic Senate’s SLO Committee, which meets twice a month during the Fall and Spring semesters, and has the following as its purpose statement:

Review and refine plans, models, timelines, and reporting methods for assessing course, instructional program, general education, and institutional SLOs, and facilitate workgroups to review annual assessment plans and methods for GE Areas and ILOs.²⁴

SLO Coordinators attend PGC and Academic Senate meetings whenever directly relevant agenda items are posted and also participate in the PGC’s standing committee on Accreditation. At least one SLO Coordinator is a member of the Curriculum Committee.²⁵

To supplement formal governance processes when needed, the College creates broad-based task forces to promote dialogue and address specific issues. See, for example, the discussion of the Equal Access to Success Emergency (EASE) Task Force description in Standard II.C.3. (see also the discussion of the “Fantastic Five” in Standard I.B.9. and IV.A.5.)²⁶ These semi-formal venues help seed discussions that inform planning efforts.

Ongoing Professional Development Supports CQI. To support CQI efforts, members of the College attend external conferences to bring back information from the field that enriches dialogue about student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. For example, 25 members from across constituent groups and divisions attended the October 2015 Strengthening Student Success Conference (SSSC) hosted by the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges. Participants infuse what they learn into the various activities and meetings. Other major conferences include the annual three-day Curriculum Institute which members of the College have attended for several years. College employees have also attended multiple accreditation-related workshops sponsored by the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA), ACCJC, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC), Community College League of California (CCLC), the Research and Planning Group

²² [Planning Committee Agendas](#)

²³ [Screenshot of Institutional Assessment Plan - Committee Structures Supporting Outcomes Assessment, page 16](#) (Source: [Institutional Assessment Plan - Committee Structures Supporting Outcomes Assessment](#), page 16)

²⁴ [Student Learning Outcomes Committee](#)

²⁵ [Screenshot of Institutional Assessment Plan - Primary SLO Coordinator](#) (Source: [Institutional Assessment Plan - Primary SLO Coordinator Responsibilities](#), pages 11-12)

²⁶ [EASE Task Force Website](#); [Fantastic Five Website](#)

for California Community Colleges (RP Group), and others over the last several years. These events provide faculty leaders and others at the institution with important information about how SLO-related activities are being used to promote improvement at peer institutions. The Learning Outcomes email list similarly provides information from the field at large which informs the College's assessment practices.

The College focuses its internal professional development on building and reinforcing a culture of continuous improvement. For many years, each Flex Day has maintained a particular theme ranging from innovation and achievement to engagement and equity.²⁷ SLO work has been an evolving focus and theme of set-aside "SLO Flex Days" with faculty SLO Coordinators playing a critical role in guiding these professional development activities and advocating for training resources. Most recently, in 2015-16, the College held two SLO Flex Days in October²⁸ and March.²⁹

Encouraging various levels of dialogue has been a key component of SLO Flex Days. While Flex Days have traditionally featured department meetings, SLO coordinators have championed the addition of School-level dialogue for several years. For example, all the departments in the School of Health, Physical Education, and Social Services will meet on a given Flex Day to participate in structured dialogue. Due to the overwhelmingly positive response from the College's seven Schools, SLO Flex Days have now formalized this practice of School meetings to broaden dialogue across departments. As described in Standard I.B.2, this structured approach was used during the October 2015 SLO Flex Day to focus discussions on disaggregated SLO results. Flex Days also feature more traditional trainings and discussion sessions. The most recent SLO Flex Day fostered discussion through several structured panels that included instructional faculty, counseling faculty, and students.

Importantly, these types of discussions and self-reflective review of student learning and achievement measures form the basis of Program Review plans which are a part of the College's integrated planning and resource allocation processes. The College creates explicit venues for these dialogues. Through Program Review and decision-making processes described in detail in Standards I.B.5. and I.B.7., the College prioritizes plans based on the mission, College goals, and evaluation of data. Emphasis on data is explicit, self-reflective, student-focused, and informed by collegial conversations which reinforce a collective understanding of evidence. For example, the October 2015 SLO Flex Day directly informed Program Review through department, school, and College-wide discussions of equity gap data for student learning and student achievement.³⁰

²⁷ [Flex Program Archives](#)

²⁸ [Flex Program - October 20, 2015](#)

²⁹ [Flex Program - March 8, 2016](#)

³⁰ [Flex Program - October 20, 2015, Screenshot of Disaggregated Data Analysis Workshop Description](#) (Source: [FLEX SLO F15 Program Booklet](#)), [How to Access Argos Cubes](#), [Interpreting Disaggregated Data](#). (Source: [2015-2016 Professional Development Workshops](#))

I.B.1. Analysis and Evaluation

Informed by Collegial and Participatory Governance, professional development, and other venues for sustained and substantive dialogue, the review of student learning and achievement measures forms the basis of Program Review plans which are a part of the College's integrated planning processes. Dialogue about learning and success thereby provides the basis for the program plans which improve decision making and inform the resource allocation for new funds and the repurposing of existing resources. The College prioritizes its activities and allocations based on the mission, College goals, and data.

Self-reflective and collegial dialogue about continuously improving student learning and institutional processes occurs within and across all departments and at the institutional level in an ongoing cycle. The College's Institutional Assessment Plan provides a systematic framework for ongoing assessment work. CQI and SLO assessment are a regular part of professional development, of departmental Program Review and planning, and of institutional-level planning and evaluation. Broad-based participation is encouraged and supported through the use of online documentation as well as through semester reporting and Program Review activities. SLO assessments encompass the entire College, including not only courses and programs but also general education outcomes, institutional learning outcomes, student services outcomes, and administrative unit outcomes. The College engages in explicit, self-reflective activities to evaluate the impact of CQI activities, to improve these processes, and to further develop its collective understanding of evidence. The College's faculty SLO Coordinators and the Planning Committee, among others, play key roles in facilitating strategic dialogue. The College builds on strong examples of effective practice and actively seeks to ensure the sustainability of its CQI practices. The College continues to explore ways to expand the opportunities and venues for focused dialogue, and the continued improvement of student learning outcomes processes are part of the College's Quality Focus Essay (see QFE, Action Project 1).

Conclusion. The College meets Standard I.B.1.

I.B.2. *The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11)*

I.B.2. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Faculty have established learning outcomes and assessments for each course, program, certificate, and degree for credit as well as noncredit, and they assess learning outcomes following a timetable outlined in the Institutional Assessment Plan. Curricular and program standards and review processes are consistent regardless of location or mode of delivery. All courses that the College offers through distance education are also available through face-to-face instruction; no differences exist in learning outcomes between distance education offerings and traditional offerings in any program.

Looking at Learning. For many years, the College has maintained an ongoing, systematic SLO cycle that is continually evaluated and improved. Faculty conduct assessments and report assessment activities and results to the central repository each Fall and Spring, which the SLO team aggregates into semester progress reports showing progress to date on achieving CQI.³¹ Faculty are engaged in SLO assessment and reporting practices and committed to CQI as they continue to expand the examination of competencies, knowledge, and skills, evidenced by 96 percent of the College's courses having ongoing assessments back in Spring 2013 with that number maintaining each semester through Fall 2014.³² In Fall 2014, 80 percent of courses and 70 percent of programs identified as being at a CQI level. Since migrating to new CurricUNET reporting software in Spring 2015, the College has maintained a 95 percent completion rate for section-level SLO assessments.³³

The College publishes program SLOs (PSLOs) in the Catalog and faculty use CurricUNET to map SLOs to broader Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs) that align to the College mission.³⁴ By combining CurricUNET mapping with assessment data entered each semester at the section level for each student beginning in Spring 2015, PSLO reporting is more consistent and easier and thus will reach 100 percent CQI faster than before because of aggregate reporting. The SLO team will encourage program assessments in Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 to take advantage of over one year's worth of disaggregated section-level data. The College evaluates this process of collecting disaggregated student data collection annually to ensure it continues to meet our assessment needs. At least once every three years, course coordinators aggregate section-level data across multiple instructors and semesters and SLOs and provide a more holistic course-level assessment. Program Coordinators do the same for all programs.^{35 36}

The College also assesses General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) on a regular cycle in alternating semesters. The College has articulated four ILOs, and each Fall semester the College assesses one ILO.³⁷ GELO assessments occur each Spring.³⁸ Mapping to courses and programs and discussion of assessment results follows a rigorous process to ensure meaningful information and dialogue about improvements (see Standards II.A.3 – 6.; Standard II.C.2.).³⁹

Disaggregating Learning Results. In Spring 2015, the College began collecting disaggregated SLO data for all active course sections. The Office of Research and Planning made

³¹ [Outcomes Assessment - Reporting Results](#)

³² [Screenshot of Definition of Learning, ACCJC Standards, Crosswalked and Glossary, June 2014, page 2](#) (Source: Definition of Learning, ACCJC Standards, Crosswalked and Glossary, June 2014, page 2)

³³ [CurricUNET: Spring 2015 Reporting Process Evaluation, Screenshot of Fall 2015 Reporting, Screenshot of Spring 2016 Reporting](#)

³⁴ [Screenshot Program Learning Outcomes](#) (Source: [College Catalog 2015-16, p. 85](#))

³⁵ [Assessment Reporting Cycles, Frequencies, and Processes](#)

³⁶ [Institutional Assessment Plan, page 6-8 and page 16](#) (Source: [Institutional Assessment Plan](#), pages 6-8 and page 16)

³⁷ [Institutional SLOs](#)

³⁸ [GE Learning Outcomes](#)

³⁹ [Screenshot of Institutional Assessment Plan, pages 6-8 and page 16](#) (Source: [Institutional Assessment Plan](#), pages 6-8 and page 16)

disaggregated data available in Argos for single variate analysis by age group, gender, ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, first generation, foster youth, and veteran status—or any multivariate combination of these. The College chose to first focus on ethnicity gaps during the SLO Flex on October 20, 2015, in order to inform Fall 2015 Program Reviews.^{40 41}

Faculty SLO Coordinators lead and support assessment work at the College. One of the faculty coordinators is a member of the Curriculum Committee. Coordinators inform departments and offices about others doing work that may be relevant to their area through assessment evaluation reports, ILO assessment reports, and GELO assessment reports, as well as during FLEX events and other training sessions. SLO Coordinators hold weekly drop-in labs for one-on-one assistance. The SLO Handbook, which the coordinators maintain, also serves as a concrete resource.⁴² SLO coordination has increased from a single individual to a shared duty with a team of coordinators. For the 2015-16 academic year, College-wide SLO coordination totaled 2.0 FTEF reassigned time, with an additional 0.8 FTEF for CurricUNET implementation, development, and support.

The Institutional Assessment Plan articulates the faculty role in assessment:

The role of faculty in assessment at City College is central. Credit and noncredit as well as full and part-time faculty participate in coordinated assessments of the stated Student Learning Outcomes for the courses they instruct. Since spring 2015 that includes assessing at least one SLO every semester for every student in every course section (managed by the primary instructor of the course section)... [I]n addition to the semester section-level SLO reporting, faculty work collaboratively to review courses across multiple semesters and instructors and across programs (once every three years).⁴³

As further described in the Institutional Assessment Plan, all faculty engage in the process of collecting disaggregated data and providing reports each primary semester (summer is optional). In addition, faculty-elected department chairs oversee the quality of reporting and facilitate assessment-based Program Reviews. Faculty ensure that students are aware of the SLOs on the course syllabus (identical to SLOs in the Course Outline of Record).

Student and Learning Support Services. The Student Services SLO Assessment Work Group, convened by a member of the SLO Coordination team, meets regularly to discuss the coordination of SLOs and Student Services Outcomes (SSOs) across all student services units and programs. After reaching 100 percent CQI on one or more SSOs in each area, student services sought to improve on their overall approach by creating broad alignment across services and discussed several options. During Fall 2015 discussions, the work group concluded that

⁴⁰ [Flex Program - October 20, 2015](#)

⁴¹ [Screenshot of School Reports](#) (Source: [School Reports](#))

⁴² [SLO Handbook](#)

⁴³ [Screenshot of Institutional Assessment Plan, page 13](#) (Source: [Institutional Assessment Plan, page 13](#))

departments should map department PSLOs/SLOs/SSOs to College-wide ILOs to facilitate this alignment.

SSO assessment is described in detail in Standard II.C.2. The SLO Coordination Team created a Detailed Status Report to track each SSO.⁴⁴ The report includes the assessment method, brief evaluation summary, immediate improvements, future (longer-term) improvements, direct links to submitted assessments, and mapping to ILOs. Where applicable, student services units map their program outcomes to appropriate items from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), which includes only Credit students, and CCSF's Center Survey, which includes both credit and noncredit students. Survey results are disaggregated in various ways and serve one mechanism for measuring the extent to which students meet SSOs.

The College used 2014 CCSSE data to assess student services in general and counseling specifically.⁴⁵ Based on CCSSE results, Student Health has implemented an online Health newsletter. The book loan program received Equity funds so that more departments could start book loan programs. The College is using data from a Centers Survey administered in May 2015, plus additional questions asked in Spring 2016, to inform changes at the Centers.^{46 47} The College plans to administer both surveys again in Spring 2017.

Learning support services also define and regularly assess outcomes to improve services to students. The Library and Learning Assistance Centers both participate in outcomes assessment as described in Standard II.B.3.

Using Evidence to Improve. Results of outcomes assessments are available in semester reports and also in Program Review and coordinated annual ILO and GELO assessment reports. For several years, the SLO Impacts Report highlighted assessments and the results of improvement efforts.⁴⁸ In addition, for many years, the College community received monthly SLO Highlights by email.⁴⁹ These highlights and the identification of improvements now occur through ongoing, detailed GELO and ILO assessments.

To close the feedback loop, CCSF faculty, led by SLO Coordinators and department chairs, review and evaluate student learning findings as an independent academic endeavor and as the basis of Program Review plans incorporated into the College's integrated planning processes. Through established collegial and participatory processes, plans for improvement are reviewed, prioritized, and used to inform the resource allocation for new funds and the repurposing of existing resources as described in detail in Standard I.B.5. The College prioritizes Program Review resource requests using a number of criteria, including the extent to which requests

⁴⁴ [SSO Detailed Status Report](#)

⁴⁵ Impressions from discussions with [Student Development](#) and [Counseling Departments](#) (Source: [CCSSE Reports](#))

⁴⁶ [Center Survey Results](#)

⁴⁷ [Center Survey - 2016 Supplemental Questions](#)

⁴⁸ SLO Impacts reports for [2013-14](#), [2012-13](#)

⁴⁹ [Screenshot of Monthly Assessment Highlights](#)

demonstrate that they are geared toward improvements that fulfill College Priorities and College-wide plans in accordance with the mission.

An area of increased focus over the last few years is the Centers, particularly with regard to student support services and learning support services. The College's Equal Access to Success Emergency (EASE) Task Force has worked to promote equitable services across locations informed by data (see Standard II.C.3.).⁵⁰ CCSSE and Center Survey results have figured prominently in the analysis of student needs to inform the EASE Plan. Surveys solicit information on perceived availability, use, and helpfulness of services, with changes made in response, implemented beginning Spring 2016. Initial evaluation of these changes is occurring in Summer 2016, with continued follow up through subsequent surveys and other assessments to help determine whether changes have led to the desired impacts and provided more equitable access to success. As the College gathers student IDs for respondents to these surveys, research staff can make connections between these responses and student achievement and learning.

I.B.2. Analysis and Evaluation

All instructional courses, programs, certificates, and degrees follow a regular, three-year cycle of outcomes assessment on top of section-level assessments each semester for one SLO for each student. Through the efforts of every faculty member at the College, the College can access disaggregated course-level SLO assessment results by various demographics in Argos. Due to mapping, and given a sufficient number of semesters' data collection, the College can also disaggregate instructional outcomes at the program and institutional level. All student support services and learning support services similarly engage in outcomes assessment. Faculty, staff, and administrators use results to effectuate improvements, some of which lead to resource requests via Program Review. Student learning outcomes have, in many ways, been the flagship endeavor at the College, and CCSF professionals have received invitations to share their work with the field as part of the State of California's Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI), Strengthening Student Success Conference (SSSC), Society for College and University Planning (SCUP), and other venues.

The College continues to identify improvements associated with SLO and SSO assessment. Examples of improvements based upon assessment have been shared with the College through SLO Highlights, Program Review, GELO and ILO assessment reports, trainings, and FLEX Days.

Conclusion. The College meets Standard I.B.2.

⁵⁰ [EASE Task Force Website](#)

I.B.3. *The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER 11)*

I.B.3. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College has institution-set standards for student achievement at the institutional level and program levels.⁵¹ Collegial and participatory discussions for changes or additions to institution-set standards or additional standards begin with the Assessment Planning Team (APT).⁵² The College developed these standards using longitudinal trend data and considering environmental factors such as declining enrollment. The Academic Senate makes the recommendation on institution-set standards, accompanied by broad participatory dialogue. After APT's initial discussion and development, the following entities review and discuss the standards: the Academic Senate; the Planning Committee, to which APT reports; and the Participatory Governance Council.⁵³ ⁵⁴ ⁵⁵ The Board of Trustees then approves the College's institution-set standards.⁵⁶ The College reviews these standards on an annual basis and refines them as necessary.⁵⁷

College-Level Measures. CCSF has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution including expected measures from ACCJC and federal regulations, but also additional and locally identified measures. The College and the Board annually review performance on these standards during the review and validation of the Vision and Mission Statements. Institution-set standards inform the line-by-line analysis of the "primary mission":

- Institution-set standard for transfer is 2,750; student total for 2013-14 was 2,803.
- Institution-set standard for Associate Degrees is 1,218; student total for 2014-15 was 1,282; total degrees awarded was highest in 2013-14 at 1,540.
- Institution-set standard for completion of CTE certificates is 737; students receiving CTE certificates went from a high of 894 in 2013-14 to 823 in 2014-15.

Note: The institution-set standards presented above are identical to the standards cited in "Presentation of Institution-Set Standards" and Standard II.A.1. However, due to run dates, the totals achieved differ somewhat from the totals in the "Presentation of Institution-Set Standards" and Standard II.A.1. The totals above reflect the point in time at which the College reviewed its accomplishment of the institution-set standards vis-à-vis the Mission Statement in Fall 2015.

⁵¹ See, [Checklist for Continued Compliance with Commission Policies and Federal Regulations](#)

⁵² [Assessment Planning Team Meeting - March 25, 2014](#)

⁵³ [Screenshot of Academic Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes](#) (Source: [Academic Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes of 3/26/14](#))

⁵⁴ [Screenshot of Planning Meeting Notes](#) (Source: [Planning Meeting Notes of 10/13/14](#))

⁵⁵ [Screenshot of PGC Meeting Minutes for 3/17/16, page 5.](#) (Source: [PGC Meeting Minutes for 3/17/16](#)) (For 2/5/2015 discussion, listen to [Raw Recording](#))

⁵⁶ Board resolution for [Review and Approval of the 2015 Institution Set Standards](#)

⁵⁷ [Assessment Planning Team Meeting - Spring 2016](#)

In addition to institution-set standards, the College also sets aspirational institutional effectiveness goals as required by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI). During Year One (2015) and Year Two (2016), the College diligently shared and discussed the IEPI goals framework at various Participatory and Collegial Governance venues including meetings of the APT, Planning Committee, Academic Senate, and PGC.⁵⁸ The Board received the goals as informational. The setting of these goals drew upon active improvement efforts supported by the Education Master Plan. See aspirational goals delineated below:

- Course Completion Rate: 71 percent goal for 2016-17 and 73 percent goal long-term (6 year)
- English Sequence Completion: 55 percent goal for 2016-17 and 60 percent goal long-term (6 year)
- Accreditation status: Fully Accredited–No Action
- Fund Balance: 9 percent
- Audit Findings: Unmodified

Strategies for achieving aspirational goals are broadly understood to be reflected in the Education Master Plan, Student Equity Plan, SSSP Plan, and Basic Skills Plan. The Student Equity Plan delineates specific targets for reducing achievement gaps.

Program-Level Measures. CCSF has defined elements of student achievement and performance for disciplines that require such by programmatic accreditors for organizational approval. For programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers are compiled, reported, and discussed, with further action taken when needed. Per the most recent Annual Report, 11 Allied Health programs had licensure examination passage rates ranging from 66 percent to 100 percent.⁵⁹ These passage rates surpassed nearly all institution-set standards for licensure by a substantial margin.

Action is taken when programs fall short of the institution-set standard. As one example, Licensed Vocational Nursing (LVN) met its institution-set standard of 72 percent for licensure pass rates as shown in last year's Annual Report, but fell six points below the standard in the most recent Annual Report.⁶⁰ ⁶¹ To address this disparity, faculty in LVN are assessing student performance, particularly in the Adult Medical Surgical Nursing series of courses during Fall 2015 and Spring 2015. In addition, general program prerequisites are being reviewed towards a likely modification.

⁵⁸ [Institutional Effectiveness Goals - Year 1 and Year 2](#)

⁵⁹ [Screenshot of Annual Report for 2016, page 3](#) (Source: [Annual Report for 2016](#), see page 3)

⁶⁰ [Screenshot of Annual Report for 2015, page 3](#) (Source: [Annual Report for 2015](#), see page 3)

⁶¹ [Screenshot of Annual Report for 2016, page 3](#) (Source: [Annual Report for 2016](#), see page 3)

In addition to standards for licensure, the College has an institution-set standard of 80.7 percent for students completing certificate programs and CTE degrees. In the most recent Annual Report, job placement rates ranged from 60 percent for Business/Commerce to 100 percent for Radiation Therapy Tech. Rates for job placement and licensure are program specific. Strategies to improve these rates are also program specific.

The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are directly connected to the College mission and are appropriate within higher education. The College shares and reports on results regularly College wide, and the College uses results in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocate resources, and to make improvements. CCSF analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

The College publicly archives Annual Reports to ACCJC via the College's Accreditation website.⁶²

I.B.3. Analysis and Evaluation

The College has an established practice of using institution-set standards and has plans in place for continued expansion to more programs and disciplines. Some standards are already well established with accompanying aspirational goals and strategies for improving. These include course completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer. These standards are widely discussed and well understood. Moreover, while institution-set standards for noncredit have not yet been required, the College is proactively developing these as described in I.A.2.

The College also establishes and uses standards for licensure and job placement, but these have not received the same degree of College-wide attention. Licensure standards are nearly all met. However, job placement standards warrant attention. While Annual Reports to ACCJC are accessible and available online, the reports should be actively shared via Participatory and Collegial Governance to broaden awareness of licensure and job placement standards and results.

Conclusion. The College meets Standard I.B.3.

I.B.4. *The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.*

I.B.4. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Assessment data are embedded within the College's institutional processes to support student learning and achievement. At the unit level, the College incorporates assessment data throughout

⁶² [Accreditation Reports](#)

Program Review. In the former Word and Excel version of Program Review, assessment data was pointedly addressed in “Question 4”:

Summarize overall departmental/program improvements implemented, in progress, or under consideration as a result of the assessment of learning, service, and/or administrative unit outcomes. (Be sure to reference the data/reports that underlie these new directions.)⁶³

With the migration to CurricUNET, the College can now take advantage of features that allow even further integration including a question that prompts units to address assessment currency and plan ongoing assessments.⁶⁴ Moreover, the information previously solicited in Question 4 is now integrated throughout the Program Review. Multiple questions prompt units to address aspects of assessment including in “Data Trends - Selected” and in “Planning.”⁶⁵ ⁶⁶ Further, resource requests in Program Review can link to assessment in several ways, including through direct links to assessment reports from the Assessment Module where units provided assessment data, analysis, next steps, and resource needs associated with those next steps.⁶⁷ Unit managers score and rank resource requests using explicit criteria that include links to program outcomes and assessment data.⁶⁸

Using Findings for Action. Assessment data are also summarized at the college level. Each fall semester, the College assesses one ILO, followed by the assessment of one GE outcome in the spring semester. SLO Coordinators assemble the teams who conduct these assessments and the members of those teams compile a report through which they share assessment results and recommendations, which the College discusses at various forums, in Participatory Governance meetings, and at Academic Senate meetings.⁶⁹ The College vets recommendations and gains traction on those recommendations through identified pathways as shown in the Institutional Assessment Plan.⁷⁰ The College has strong departmental level processes for implementing change based on specific discipline expertise. In addition, several institutional changes, such as more robust consideration of course advisories and prerequisites in the Curriculum Committee and broader implementation of multiple measures when assessing students for placement, followed clear processes for implementation. However, the College is interested in strengthening its processes for institutional-level change based on recommendations derived from SLO assessments. The Quality Focus Essay provides the opportunity to engage in this effort.

⁶³ See question 4 in [Form for Questions 1-7](#)

⁶⁴ [Program Review - Assessment Currency Guidelines](#)

⁶⁵ [Program Review - Data Trends - Selected Guidelines](#)

⁶⁶ [Program Review - Planning](#)

⁶⁷ [Screenshot of Assessment Module interface](#)

⁶⁸ [Resource Request Guidelines Criteria](#)

⁶⁹ As an example, see [screenshot of March 7, 2016 Planning Committee meeting handouts](#) and [Planning Committee](#) handouts more generally

⁷⁰ [Screenshot of Institutional Assessment Plan, page 16](#) (Source: [Institutional Assessment Plan](#))

The College also uses summary outcomes assessment results to inform College-wide planning and overall College directive. The SLO dashboard further summarizes assessment results for all ILOs and GELOs across all semesters.⁷¹ The SLO dashboard is featured within the college-level annual review and validation of the Vision and Mission Statements. The dashboard is published on the SLO website and the Indices page. It is shared with the Board. The mission, in turn, drives all planning at the College.

Disaggregating the Results. The College disaggregates SLO assessments by various demographics. Argos reports allow data to be “sliced” by age group, gender, ethnicity (both specific ethnic group and underrepresented minority, or URM), economically disadvantaged, first-generation college-going, foster youth, and veteran status.⁷² Note that the College can use all of these demographics in combination, allowing for an increasingly complex, multivariate view of the data. The gap calculator for achievement data in Argos provides an easy and uniform way to identify achievement gaps.⁷³ Individuals throughout the College used the Argos tools in preparation for October 20, 2015, SLO Flex Day discussions and subsequently incorporated them into Program Review. Moreover, the College is reviewing learning outcomes and achievement outcomes in tandem to better understand the respective gaps and how they are related. Addressing achievement gaps is a College Priority delineated by the Board and a Strategic Direction articulated in the College’s Education Master Plan.^{74 75}

In addition to student demographics, the Argos data-cubes allow individuals to slice and group assessment data by schedule (time of day) and location (which Center). Other “slicers” allow for grouping of course assessment data according to General Education requirements met by the course.

Assessment data also includes Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) in addition to SLOs. To the extent possible, the College also disaggregates data for these areas. For example, the Centers disaggregate their AUO data by location, credit and noncredit, time of day, and when available, other student demographics such as age, gender, and ethnicity.⁷⁶ Like SLOs, the Centers utilize these data within Program Review to identify areas in need of improvement.

I.B.4. Analysis and Evaluation

The College maintains institutional processes that use assessment data to support learning and achievement. It disaggregates assessment results to identify and analyze differences among students. College personnel define and assess outcomes across all categories (instructional, student services, learning support services, and administrative) and College wide.

⁷¹ [SLO dashboard](#)

⁷² [Argos visual for SLO assessment data](#)

⁷³ [Argos visual for gap calculator focused on achievement data](#)

⁷⁴ [College Priorities](#), see page 3, priority number 5

⁷⁵ [Education Master Plan, screenshot of page 59](#)

⁷⁶ [Center Survey Data - Interactive Data Visuals \(Tableau\)](#)

Assessment results inform improvements at the unit level as indicated in program-level assessment reports and through Program Review. The College has incorporated assessment results into Program Review for many years. The new CurricUNET system provides a tool that allows for the College to both deepen that integration and make it more sustainable. In addition, the ability to flag funded items in the CurricUNET system will provide more clarity and transparency regarding the decisions that resulted from requests substantiated by assessment data.

At the College level, ILO and GE outcomes assessments are relatively new. The first GELO report was available in Fall 2013, and the first ILO report was available in Spring 2014. With each semester, the breadth of College-wide data has increased as the College has added assessments for ILOs and GELOs. Now that the College can begin looking across nearly all ILO and GELO areas (a full complement will be available in 2016-17), the SLO Dashboard provides an exciting tool which will help focus the College on GELO and ILO areas most in need of attention. Further, now that the SLO Dashboard is available, it can also inform the Board Goals and College Priorities which the Board sets every year. Evidence of the use of the data is present in the program plans and institutional initiatives.

Conclusion. The College meets Standard I.B.4.

I.B.5. *The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.*

I.B.5. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College maintains an ongoing, systematic cycle of integrated planning to attain its mission. The cycle includes evaluation, delineation of goals and objectives for improvement, resource allocation, and re-evaluation as depicted in the integrated planning flowchart.⁷⁷ The flowchart depicts annual processes as well as longer-range planning processes to show how longer-range planning guides annual planning.

Mission and Data in Program Review. Participation in the Program Review process involves all units of the College and provides the basis for decisions about resource allocation through an integrated process including all aspects of resource needs and requests. Units connect their functions to the Mission Statement through the initial question in Program Review.⁷⁸ This is followed by questions that solicit data analysis, questions that require units to evaluate their progress to date on implementing major objectives, and questions eliciting future improvement

⁷⁷ [Integrated Planning Flowchart](#)

⁷⁸ [Screenshot of 2015-2016 Program Review question about "unit description" and mission alignment](#) (Source: [Program Review Website](#))

plans (i.e., new major objectives) for the coming year, and, when needed, request resources to implement those plans.

Learning outcomes and achievement data are both central to Program Review. Integrated modules in CurricUNET enable clearer connections between units' assessment results (quantitative and qualitative) and resource requests. In addition, a wide variety of learning outcomes and achievement data are available via Argos and Tableau. Links to and instructions for these data reports reside in the Program Review guidelines which link to specific questions in CurricUNET.⁷⁹ Data for all instructional programs include student enrollment by demographics, productivity trends, and disaggregated student achievement data. Appointment information for counseling units is also provided, along with Center Survey data and CCSSE results including customized questions developed by student services.⁸⁰

Program Review Drives Planning. Program Review requires that unit managers score and rank resource requests on explicit criteria including links to Board-identified College Priorities (formerly Board Priorities) and goals from College-wide plans.⁸¹ This ongoing, annual cycle has occurred since 2008-09, with re-evaluation occurring at the beginning of each cycle. Participation has included nearly all units of the College for all years of implementation.

While always focused on CQI, the College has strengthened Program Review considerably since its inception in 2008-09. A new question in Program Review explicitly pulls out funded projects for tracking and reporting purposes.⁸² Implementation of CurricUNET will further allow for better tracking of the results of funded activities and projects since funded requests can now be flagged in the system. Moreover, the College has developed several decision-making flowcharts to clarify processes for prioritization of various funding types including both unrestricted general funds and categorical funds.⁸³

In addition to disaggregation across various student demographics, Program Review data are available at the department, discipline, and course level. School level data are available for comparison; for example, Chemistry can compare its outcomes to those for the School of Science and Mathematics. Data are also available by time of day, and units can make comparisons by CCSF General Education requirement, Career and Technical Education (CTE), and basic skills. In addition, course completion and SLO data-cubes also have a location "slicer" that compares distance education to face-to-face courses, as well as comparisons between the Ocean Campus and the Centers. Data for mode of delivery have been provided each year to the Education Technology Department and are also available more broadly so that each department can analyze and compare outcomes for its online courses. The College also participates in the

⁷⁹ [Instructions for accessing data for program review](#)

⁸⁰ [Additional questions added to CCSSE Survey](#)

⁸¹ [Criteria for Scoring and Ranking Requests](#)

⁸² [Progress - Resource Linked](#)

⁸³ [RRP Handbook](#) including decision-making flowcharts

CTE Employment Outcomes Survey (CTEOS) and provides a variety of labor market information to CTE departments.⁸⁴

The College implements plans for which it receives categorical funding through Program Review, which serves as the vehicle for units to request, and, if warranted, receive, funding to carry out activities related to those categorical plans.⁸⁵ The College has explicated the relationship between and integration among plans through the Education Master Plan (EMP) implementation matrix. Specifically, the implementation matrix shows how various College-wide plans connect to the overarching goals and strategic directions of the EMP. The College has a defined process for assessing progress toward achieving goals of all College-wide plans through status updates on the EMP implementation matrix. The College completed the first annual status update for the five-year EMP in Spring 2015.⁸⁶ The second update was completed in Spring 2016.⁸⁷

I.B.5. Analysis and Evaluation

The College has a well-established Office of Research and Planning that has acquired software and technology that afford greater access to the data and democratizes the data for use closer to where decision making occurs. In this way, the Office of Research and Planning increasingly pushes data and decision making for regular, routine inquiry activities directly to the user. Researchers can then take on a greater facilitation role, using their time to spark discussions about the data. Moreover, the Office of Research and Planning can now expand its role at the correct level of analysis and effectively shed traditional data collection and reporting requirements, which are time-consuming and do not effectively use expert time. The College continues to hire very qualified research staff to divide the tasks and provide specialization and economies of scale which are already producing results for the institution.

The College's integrated planning processes emphasize data-informed evaluation and re-evaluation. Units receive both qualitative and quantitative data for use in Program Review along with the assessment data that units collect themselves. Improvement planning is a central feature of Program Review. Data for mode of delivery has been provided each year to the Education Technology Department and is also shared more broadly. Additional data and slicers are available for CTE, basic skills, and general education courses and programs.

Conclusion. The College meets Standard I.B.5.

⁸⁴ [Webpage with Core Indicators, CTEOS Results, and Labor Market Information](#)

⁸⁵ Program Review Resource Allocation: [2014-2015](#), [2013-2014](#), [2012-2013](#)

⁸⁶ [EMP Implementation Matrix - Year 1 \(2015\)](#)

⁸⁷ [EMP Implementation Matrix - Year 2 \(2016\)](#)

I.B.6. *The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.*

I.B.6. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Addressing achievement gaps is a principle strategic direction articulated in the College’s five-year Education Master Plan and a consistent priority articulated annually by the Board.^{88 89} The College’s Vision and Mission Statements also support equity and diversity. Disaggregated student achievement and learning outcomes data inform College processes, including planning and Program Review. The College has disaggregated achievement data used for Program Review by various student demographics for decades. The College has bolstered this longstanding opportunity to focus on equity in Program Review by the collection and disaggregation of assessment outcomes (to accompany achievement outcomes) and by pointed prompts in Program Review requesting all units to analyze and address equity gaps in achievement.^{90 91}

Technology for Improved Practice. Argos reports allow achievement and outcomes data to be “sliced” by age group, gender, ethnicity (both specific ethnic group and URM), economically disadvantaged, first-generation college-going, foster youth, and veteran status.⁹² Units can use these demographics in combination, allowing for an increasingly complex, multivariate view of the data. The gap calculator for achievement data in Argos provides an easy and uniform way to identify achievement gaps.⁹³ Units can apply this analysis at various levels, whether to broad categories of curriculum (CTE versus basic skills), to all courses in a department, or to a specific discipline or course. There are “slicers” for location (including distance education) as well as for time of day. Together, these variables provide a wider and deeper look at student learning and achievement which provide faculty and assessment professionals opportunities to let their natural curiosity drive current and future inquiry.

Faculty drive assessment efforts. The College has a history of examining course and sequence completion by placement level. To deepen this work, the SLO coordination team requested and reviewed newly developed tools to view data on course completion disaggregated by students’ level of preparation as measured by last English or mathematics course completed, or placement level. The tool is useful for English and Mathematics sequence evaluation. In addition, the tool can be used to examine course completion in disciplines such as Accounting by level of Math preparation or History by level of English. The tool supports discussions about course advisories

⁸⁸ [Education Master Plan](#)

⁸⁹ [College Priorities](#), see page 3, priority number 5

⁹⁰ [SLO disaggregation image from mission PPT](#)

⁹¹ [Screenshot of data analysis questions emphasizing equity](#)

⁹² [Argos visual for SLO assessment data](#)

⁹³ [Argos visual for gap calculator focused on achievement data](#)

and prerequisites and will assist in curriculum development and ongoing assessments. Previously such data were available and provided on request, but it is now available as a self-service tool.

Individuals throughout the College used Argos tools in preparation for October 20, 2015, SLO Flex Day discussions, and the College subsequently incorporated the resulting reports and findings into Program Review. Moreover, each of the six instructional Schools prepared a writeup of the school-wide discussion (informed by department discussions) with recommendations for actions and activities.⁹⁴

The College can disaggregate SLO data due to CurricUNET implementation which collects performance by individual student on specific SLOs, coupled with demographic, curriculum, and schedule data matching handled by the Office of Research and Planning that expand the faculty and assessment professional toolbelt for dialogue and action. The College can also disaggregate considerable student services outcomes data, particularly survey data such as CCSSE which collects demographics and/or student ID. Student Services surveys now allows the College to tie student services survey results to academic outcomes data and student demographic information available in the College's database systems.

The Connection Back to Equity. The Student Equity Plan contains a detailed analysis of achievement gaps and strategies for closing gaps. The plan also includes specific performance expectations for target populations.⁹⁵ Allocation of resources to address equity and achievement gaps occurs through Program Review, which integrates with EMP and Student Equity implementation. The College made substantial allocations (human, fiscal, and otherwise) in 2015 with more allocations in 2016. As Standard I.B.9. further describes, the College tracks and reports the results of those allocations through its integrated planning and Program Review processes.

I.B.6. Analysis and Evaluation

The College disaggregates SLO data along with achievement data. In many instances, the College can also disaggregate student services outcomes data. Mechanisms are in place to analyze gaps and identify improvements at the unit level and College wide. The College allocates resources to address achievement gaps and tracks the impact of that allocation through CurricUNET (for unit-level implementation), through annual EMP implementation matrix status reports, and through Student Equity Plan progress reports to the State Chancellor's Office.

The efforts to examine learning differences for students based on identifiers provide insight and opportunity to look at issues such as gender differences, collaborative and other learning methods for students of color, and other emerging areas such as first-generation status. Student learning outcomes and equity are key action projects within the College's Quality Focus Essay.

Conclusion. The College meets Standard I.B.6.

⁹⁴ [Screenshot of School Reports](#) (Source: [School Reports](#))

⁹⁵ [Screenshot of Student Equity Plan, summary of goals and activities](#) (Source: [Student Equity Plan](#), page 8)

I.B.7. *The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.*

I.B.7. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

City College of San Francisco regularly evaluates its policies and administrative procedures across all areas of the institution to ensure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality. The College maintains a schedule for review and has a process for updates. As Board Policy 1.15 (Board Policy and Administrative Procedure) stipulates, “All policies will be reviewed in a 5 year cycle.”⁹⁶ Board policies encompass all areas of the institution from student services (Chapter 5) to instruction and learning support services (Chapter 6). Other chapters address resource management including budget (Chapter 8), facilities (Chapter 7), and certificated and classified personnel (Chapters 3 and 4). Within Chapter 2, the College maintains specific policies on planning (BP 2.18) and governance (BP 2.07 and 2.08).⁹⁷

Evaluation of Policies and Procedures. The schedule and revision process for policies and procedures is coordinated by the College’s General Counsel with oversight from the Chancellor. Perhaps most notably, Board Policy 1.00 corresponds to the Vision and Mission Statements of the College. The College reviews this policy annually as described in Standard I.A. and in Administrative Procedures 1.00.⁹⁸ The College reviews other policies when new laws are enacted or when other internal or external changes prompt associated action. As one example, Board Policy 2.18 on Institutional Planning incorporates references to the relatively recent requirement of California Community Colleges to have Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Plans.⁹⁹ The College has developed a process so that it reviews all policies and procedures on a cyclical basis even when not prompted by other changes. To ensure the effectiveness and appropriateness of policies and procedures, collegial and participatory input is robust.

Appropriate governance structures are used to review and update Board policies and administrative procedures. In some cases policies are academic in nature and the review occurs via the Academic Senate, and is then provided to the Participatory Governance Council as “information only.” In other cases, PGC provides the main venue. When a policy has a particular focus, review may begin with that group. The aforementioned policy on planning was reviewed by the PGC’s Planning Committee before being taken through Collegial and Participatory

⁹⁶ [Board Policy 1.15 on Board Policy and Administrative Procedure](#)

⁹⁷ [Board Policies and Administrative Procedures - organized by chapter](#)

⁹⁸ [Administrative Procedures 1.00](#)

⁹⁹ [Board Policy 2.18 on Institutional Planning](#)

Governance. Ultimately, the Board of Trustees approve all Board policies and maintains the policies, along with their companion administrative procedures, on the Board's website.¹⁰⁰

Evaluation of Integrated Planning Practices. Beyond policies and procedures, the College evaluates how the planning practices that guide resource management contribute to institutional effectiveness and quality. SLO assessments and Program Review are the College's principal evaluation mechanisms for improving programs and services. Notably, these practices encompass instructional programs, student support services, and learning support services. To provide an institutional overview and determine the extent to which assessment and Program Review practices and mechanisms foster improvement, the College assembles ILO and GELO assessments as described in Standard I.B.2. Before ILO and GELO assessments were fully implemented, the College assembled Program Review Summaries and culled course- and program-level assessments for monthly highlights also described in Standard I.B.2. Other longitudinal assessment mechanisms include CCSSE results and various data provided during the review of the Vision and Mission Statements as described in Standard I.A.2. These reports form a basis for assessing how much improvement is occurring throughout the College—and thereby provide a basis for reflecting on the degree to which SLO and Program Review activities focus on and lead to improvements.

In addition to the broader, institutional evaluation mechanisms, conversations about effectively using processes to foster improvement also occur at the unit level. During each Program Review and planning process, immediate supervisors must not only score requests but also provide feedback to the units regarding the quality of the Program Review. Scores include information about the degree to which unit objectives and requests are informed by effectiveness data.¹⁰¹

Improving Institutional Effectiveness Systems. The College has built internal systems to implement and oversee institutional effectiveness. For example, SLO evaluation reports assess the degree to which the College is focused on improvement, analyze the nature of the improvements, and highlight successes as well as the need to continually improve in this area.¹⁰² ¹⁰³ Key administrative and faculty positions work collaboratively to guide implementation as well as evaluation of integrated planning, Program Review, and outcomes assessment. These individuals include the Associate Vice Chancellor of Institutional Development,¹⁰⁴ Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Director of Research, and faculty SLO Coordinators. These individuals meet multiple times throughout each month during the regular semester to share information and strategies with a focus on further developing effective CQI processes throughout the College. The Planning Committee and its SLO Assessment Team workgroup have explicit

¹⁰⁰ [Board Policies and Administrative Procedures](#)

¹⁰¹ [Program Review Worksheet for Scoring Criteria](#)

¹⁰² [REPORT: Spring 2015 Reporting Process Evaluation](#)

¹⁰³ [Summary of Fall 2014 Assessment Reporting--March 2015](#)

¹⁰⁴ [Division of Institutional Development](#)

and important, ongoing roles in informing as well as assessing evaluation mechanisms.^{105 106} The former meets at least once monthly, while the latter meets once or twice a semester. When summarizing outcomes assessment activities, SLO Coordinators, the faculty on the Academic Senate SLO Committee, and the GELO and ILO workgroups assemble aggregated reports which observe and reflect on the degree to which assessment activities can be shown to foster effective improvement. This information is recorded and provided to the Planning Committee, among others.

Evaluation of Governance Processes. The College also evaluates its governance processes. The PGC is evaluated by its members and the College at large.¹⁰⁷ Standing committees are also evaluated.¹⁰⁸ The results of these evaluations are made public during committee meetings and PGC meetings with specific improvement efforts identified.^{109 110 111 112 113} Similarly, the Academic Senate evaluates its Executive Council and committees and conducts a Program Review to help assess past work and direct its own future efforts.^{114 115} The Classified Senate has initiated similar processes to evaluate its work.¹¹⁶ PGC conducts follow-up assessment to determine whether identified improvements have been implemented and are effectively addressing concerns.^{117 118}

Responding to a need for clarification about governance processes, the College developed a “Roles, Responsibilities, and Processes Handbook” (RRP Handbook) that simultaneously codified and evaluated the existing decision-making and resource allocation processes at the College and defined the roles and responsibilities within those processes as well as the interface between Participatory and Collegial Governance. The RRP Handbook contains a series of flowcharts and accompanying narratives related to (1) Program Review; (2) planning and development of College-wide plans; (3) planning and development of College-wide initiatives, Board policies, and administrative procedures; (4) resource allocation of supplemental General funds; and (5) resource allocation of categorical funds.¹¹⁹

For more information about evaluation of governance and decision making, see Standard IV.A.7.

¹⁰⁵ [Planning Committee Description and Purpose](#), see VI.a

¹⁰⁶ [SLO Assessment Team](#)

¹⁰⁷ PGC [Internal Evaluation Survey Results](#) and [External Evaluation Survey Results](#) (plus [External Evaluation Comments](#))

¹⁰⁸ [Evaluation of College Committees Survey Results](#)

¹⁰⁹ Standing Committee Summary Write Up: [Accreditation](#)

¹¹⁰ Standing Committee Summary Write Up: [Diversity](#)

¹¹¹ Standing Committee Summary Write Up: [Enrollment](#)

¹¹² Standing Committee Summary Write Up: [Planning](#)

¹¹³ PCG [External and Internal Evaluation - Recommendations for Improvements](#) - October 9, 2015

¹¹⁴ [Academic Senate Committee Evaluation Summary Report - Spring 2016](#)

¹¹⁵ [Academic Senate Program Review - Fall 2015](#)

¹¹⁶ [Classified Senate President's Report to the Board of Trustees, June 23, 2016](#)

¹¹⁷ PGC [Summary of Changes Based on Evaluation](#) - May 5, 2016

¹¹⁸ PGC [Minutes](#) - May 5, 2016, [screenshot of page 7](#)

¹¹⁹ [RRP Handbook](#) including decision-making flowcharts

I.B.7. Analysis and Evaluation

The College has systems by which it regularly evaluates policies, procedures, practices, and processes, especially those associated with instructional programs, student learning and support services, integrated planning, resource management, and governance. Outcomes assessment and Program Review practices ensure inclusion of all areas of the College. As a result of evaluations, the College has updated policies and adjusted processes to increase the focus on improvement.

The College also evaluates its practices with regard to assessment, Program Review, and integrated planning which encompass all areas of the institution. For example, SLO evaluation reports assess the degree to which the College is focused on improvement, analyze the nature of the improvements, and highlight successes as well as the need to continually improve in this area. The annual review of the institution's Vision and Mission statements (Board Policy 1.00) provides an additional opportunity for the College community, its Participatory Governance structures, and its leadership to assess progress to date and the level of improvement over the previous year. Key individuals during the annual review include PGC and Academic Senate members, the Chancellor, and the Board (see Standard I.A.2. for more details).

Evaluation of governance structures occurs each year and results in improvement efforts. Evaluations focus on the effectiveness of councils and committees. The PGC, the Planning Committee and its Assessment Planning Team, the Academic Senate and its Committees, Institutional Development, and leaders from throughout the institution continue to monitor and discuss these reports and processes to determine how well the College's evaluation systems are working and identify ways to further strengthen the emphasis on improvement.

Conclusion. The College meets Standard I.B.7.

I.B.8. *The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.*

I.B.8. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College regularly publicizes data and evaluation results to communicate matters of quality.

Sharing Institutional Results. Annually, the Office of Research and Planning analyzes the Scorecard data using the detailed, underlying files provided by the State Chancellor's Office.¹²⁰ Research staff share analyses through discussions with relevant departments (e.g., Mathematics, English, and ESL) and at various committee meetings (e.g., Student Equity Strategies). The College's homepage prominently displays the link to the Scorecard.

¹²⁰ [Student Success Scorecard](#)

The annual review of the Mission and Vision Statements also provides a regular mechanism for communicating progress to date on achieving College goals. An Institutional Effectiveness Dashboard incorporates trends and analyses assembled by research staff.¹²¹ The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness ensures that annual indices are discussed in Participatory and Collegial Governance, posted online, announced College wide, and presented to the Board. This annual review includes evaluation based upon institution-set standards.

The Office of Research and Planning maintains a website containing a variety of reports, such as the annually produced High School data and periodic reports such as the nationally benchmarked Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) surveys.¹²² Key findings from both surveys have been shared with faculty and other CCSF professionals to examine the role student engagement plays in student success and the impact of transition variables and factors on first-year students. The College has most recently administered noncredit surveys through the Center surveys. In addition to reports and survey analyses, detailed data are available in Argos for all College employees. Several reports are also made fully public through Tableau.¹²³ The Office of Research and Planning visits various departments and other groups to introduce new reports and help administrators, faculty, and staff use the interactive functions of the reports produced.

Transparency at the Course and Program Level. In addition to institution-level reporting, the College posts extensive information online from semester reporting of outcomes assessment and to Program Review. The SLO assessment reports web page and Program Review website provide evaluation information for all courses, programs, services, as well as for all major administrative functions.¹²⁴ The College encourages all employees to contribute to or at the very least be familiar with the Program Review(s) and annual plans associated with their area(s).

Understanding Strengths and Weaknesses. The College's planning processes are broad-based and data-informed, focusing on the institution's strengths and weaknesses. The 2015-16 College-wide planning processes included the EASE Task Force and the development of the Student Equity Plan. In 2014, the Education Master Planning process featured 36 strategy sessions that provided opportunities for members of the public to actively review and discuss data, including student achievement data and other institutional effectiveness indicators. The College also held four public forums in conjunction with the Education Master Planning development process.¹²⁵ These types of activities reflect a long history of using "listening sessions" or similar forums to engage with internal and external communities about the College's strengths and weaknesses in

¹²¹ [Institutional Effectiveness Dashboard](#)

¹²² [Research Reports, CCSSE](#)

¹²³ [Tableau Reports](#)

¹²⁴ [CurricUNET modules](#)

¹²⁵ [EMP Executive Summary, EMP Forums and Strategy Sessions](#)

order to set priorities. For 2016, the Facilities Master Plan will be a significant focus and venue for creating shared understanding and setting priorities.¹²⁶

The College is increasingly using its Flex Days to communicate results, discuss strengths and weaknesses, and identify areas for improvement. In particular, SLO Flex Days are data and evaluation focused. The most recent SLO Flex day highlighted the SLO dashboard summarizing ILO and GELO assessments within the context of discussing improvements.^{127 128}

I.B.8. Analysis and Evaluation

Considerable evaluative data and reports are publicly available online relevant to program quality and institutional quality more generally. Longitudinal analyses of student satisfaction and engagement provide insights into College quality from the student perspective. Recent CCSSE results and Center Surveys focused on student services provide a basis for in-depth discussions about both.

Effective communication is an ongoing challenge, particularly at such a large and dispersed institution. The College seeks to be as proactive as possible. Occasions such as the annual review of the Mission and Vision Statements provide an opportunity for the College community and for the community at large to analyze and reflect upon student achievement data, along with other data.

College-wide planning activities provide a robust forum for communication about strengths and weaknesses—resulting in clear priorities such as those set forth in the Education Master Plan, Student Equity Plan, and EASE. Other venues for communicating evaluation results include participatory governance, collegial governance, Board meetings, and College-wide Flex events.

Conclusion. The College meets Standard I.B.8.

I.B.9. *The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (ER 19)*

I.B.9. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College's integrated planning system supports and focuses improvements through a comprehensive process that relies on outcomes assessment, student achievement data, and systematic evaluations of institutional effectiveness and academic quality to inform both long-

¹²⁶ [Facilities Master Plan Website](#)

¹²⁷ [SLO dashboard](#)

¹²⁸ [Flex Program - March 8, 2016](#)

range and short-range planning. Planning is integrated across all areas of the College with a unifying focus on the College’s mission. Broad-based planning and Program Review activities result in resource allocation directed toward improving institutional effectiveness, academic quality, and outcomes for students. The College tracks resource allocation to determine its contribution to the effectiveness and quality of programs and services. To strengthen and sustain continuous improvement efforts, the College continually adjusts its ongoing cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.

Broad Based Planning with Assessment and Evaluation at the Forefront. Data on institutional effectiveness and academic quality inform planning. The College’s Assessment, Planning and Budgeting system flow chart clearly depicts the central role of data and assessment.¹²⁹ At an institutional level, outcomes and achievement metrics ground the annual review of the College’s Vision and Mission Statements, which in turn guide the development of College-wide plans (see Standard I.A.2.). Data used to determine how well the College is achieving its mission are public, readily accessible, and contribute to dialogue at all levels (see Standards I.B.1. – I.B.4.). Outcomes and achievement metrics are similarly fundamental to Program Review and annual planning (see Standard I.B.5.).

The Planning Committee, which includes all College constituencies, has an ongoing, active role in designing and monitoring planning processes to improve institutional effectiveness. For example, the Planning Committee oversees efforts to increase awareness of and broad-based participation in Program Review and other planning efforts.¹³⁰ Program Reviews for all College units are posted on the CCSF website along with data trends and scores. Program Review transparency was further increased with the implementation of CurricUNET which makes drafts publicly visible as they are being written.¹³¹

Opportunities to participate in College-wide planning are designed to engage relevant constituencies appropriate to the type of plan. Some planning processes such as Education Master Planning warrant especially concerted outreach even beyond the immediate College community. The EMP workgroup, a subcommittee of the Planning Committee, guided the EMP development. This rather large workgroup pointedly included members from key areas of the College along with appointed members from all constituent groups.¹³² To further broaden participation, the workgroup used College-wide emails, press releases, and a regularly updated website to encourage participation in public forums and strategy sessions.¹³³ Other long-range plans and college initiatives—from technology to facilities master planning to the EASE Task Force to address equitable access to student services—employ similar approaches to ensure broad input. In addition, completed Program Review documents inform College-wide plans,

¹²⁹ [Integrated Planning Flowchart](#)

¹³⁰ [Planning Committee Description and Purpose](#), see VI.a.

¹³¹ [Instructions for Viewing Reports in Program Review Module of CurricUNET](#)

¹³² [EMP Workgroup Membership](#)

¹³³ [EMP Website](#)

providing input from across the College and maintaining a data-informed approach to large-scale planning.

Integrated Institutional and Programmatic Planning. The College explicates the relationship between and integration among its long-range plans through the Education Master Plan implementation matrix. As indicated in the flowchart, the EMP provides an overarching framework for support plans (e.g., Student Equity Plan) as well as resources plans (e.g., Technology).¹³⁴ The implementation matrix shows more specifically how action items from various College-wide plans connect to the overarching goals and strategic directions of the EMP.¹³⁵ ¹³⁶ The College has a defined process for assessing progress toward achieving goals of all College-wide plans through status updates in the EMP implementation matrix. The College completed the first annual status update for the five-year EMP in Spring 2015. A second annual status update was completed in Spring 2016.¹³⁷ Both updates included presentations at various collegial and participatory governance venues and a presentation to the Board of Trustees.

As indicated in the flowchart, annual planning and Program Review are integrated with College-wide planning. Completed Program Review documents serve as data and evidence to inform dialogue and select strategies. Resource prioritization follows Program Review. Scoring criteria assess the request's connections to College Priorities and student success and provide a basis for decision-making. Results of specific resource allocation (including re-allocation) are chronicled within Program Review and (to date) summarized through output from CurricUNET.

Resource Allocation. The allocation cycle is completed according to the decision-making flowcharts.¹³⁸ Resource allocation decisions flow up from different committees and groups with requisite expertise, e.g., School Deans for Academic Affairs requests, Capital Projects Planning Committee for facilities requests, Faculty Position Allocation Committee (FPAC) for full-time faculty hires. In some cases, such as FPAC, both unrestricted (U-Fund) and categorical prioritizations are discussed. Categorical requests are also reviewed by the appropriate committee (e.g., Basic Skills, Equity, SSSP) which proposes prioritizations. The “Fantastic Five” (Fan5) meets throughout the year to ensure that the Program Review and annual planning processes address reporting and decision-making criteria for their specific area and to coordinate amongst College-identified priorities to best maximize and leverage funding. Fan5 includes the faculty coordinator and administrative liaison for each categorical area.¹³⁹ When appropriate, the College seeks grants and solicits donations to fund high-priority projects. Some examples

¹³⁴ [Integrated Planning Flowchart](#)

¹³⁵ [EMP Goals and Strategic Directions](#), one page summary sheet of EMP Goals and Strategic Directions

¹³⁶ [EMP Implementation Matrix - Year 1 \(2015\)](#), note Action Items from resource and support plans situated under shaded header rows that specify EMP Goals and Strategic Directions

¹³⁷ [EMP Implementation Matrix - Year 2 \(2016\)](#)

¹³⁸ [RRP Handbook](#) including decision-making flowcharts

¹³⁹ [Fantastic 5](#)

include CalRecycle (which addresses College Priority #4), Nursing Enrollment Retention (which addresses College Priority #5), and California Career Pathways Trust, or CCPT (which addresses College Priority #7).

The results of resource allocation are publicized on the Program Review webpage.¹⁴⁰ The timing of decision-making has not always been reliable due to a variety of factors. However, it is anticipated that the aforementioned codification of decision making will improve timeliness and will also provide a concrete basis for discussions about further improvements if warranted. In addition, as described next, the College has designed and made changes to Program Review to simultaneously improve timeliness, deepen reflection at the program level including continually strengthening the focus on student learning and achievement, foster collaboration, and promote institution-level synthesis and discussion.

Continual Improvements. The College continually improves institutional structures and processes based on systematic evaluation to better effectuate academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and accomplishment of its mission. Several years ago, the College created an annual Program Review process to promote clear linkages between assessment, planning, and budgeting. These linkages have been achieved and continue to be refined. Also by virtue of being annual, the system could be constantly improved. The following paragraph presents a detailed description of how the College continually refined the way outcomes assessment is embedded into its processes Program Review process. The paragraph serves as one example of attentive, incremental changes over time.

Some improvements are incremental, as evidenced by the way the College incorporated SLOs into Program Review. In 2008-09, the inaugural year of annual Program Review, “assessment of student learning” was included but it did not have its own question; rather, it was subsumed within then-Question 7 which asked about major objectives for which departments could cite linkages to assessments.¹⁴¹ By 2009-10, Program Review more pointedly required information about SLOs through distinct questions and submission of a detailed attachment to elicit more specific responses about SLO assessment. Along with two questions about data trends and internal and external developments, reflective responses to “the SLO question” would provide a basis for developing programmatic objectives. Changes were not only made to the form, but also supporting materials and activities and results. The College has used Program Review scoring criteria for several years and improved the criteria in 2013 to reinforce the emphasis on improvement. Most recently, the implementation of CurricUNET further incorporated assessment data throughout the program review process through integrated Assessment and Program Review modules, and provides the ability to readily disaggregate learning outcomes data (see Standard I.B.6.).

¹⁴⁰ Program Review Resource Allocation: [2014-2015](#), [2013-2014](#), [2012-2013](#)

¹⁴¹ [2008-09 program review question 7](#)

A substantial change is occurring in Fall 2016. In brief, the College is shifting its annual Program Review cycle to a three-year, comprehensive Program Review with annual components to support ongoing institutional and programmatic planning.¹⁴² While this change is less incremental, it is designed to ensure that current systems are not disrupted. This change arose through much input, study, and discussion including both Collegial and Participatory Governance. The change will allow for deeper reflection at the unit level, for increased collaboration across departments and services, and for more institution-level synthesis and discussion. The College is designing the Fall 2016 mid-semester Flex Day to foster understanding of the changes and provide space for deeper conversations across programs and services.¹⁴³

Additional meta-evaluative efforts are underway as the College is continually refining and improving planning and Program Review processes.¹⁴⁴

Realizing Results. City College tracks progress toward achieving its goals and provides evidence of institutional effectiveness improvements linked to the mission. College-wide plans explicitly support the mission.¹⁴⁵ Moreover, as indicated in the flowchart, the EMP serves as an overarching framework for other long-range plans including support plans (e.g., Student Equity Plan) and resources plans (e.g., Technology), thereby reinforcing focus on the mission.¹⁴⁶ The three overarching goals of the EMP can be summarized as follows:¹⁴⁷

- Advance student achievement,
- Transform and sustain College infrastructure,
- Provide opportunities for organizational development and effective innovation.

Through the EMP implementation matrix, action items that support these goals are regularly tracked and assessed.¹⁴⁸ ¹⁴⁹ When possible and appropriate, progress toward particular targets is quantified such as with the Student Equity Plan. As part of the continuous evaluation loop in planning, many plans such as Basic Skills, Student Equity, and SSSP require embedded, annual progress reports. The College's Technology Plan uses a similar approach and is updated on a rolling basis.

¹⁴² [Homepage for comprehensive Program Review and annual planning](#)

¹⁴³ Draft outline for [Fall 2016 mid-semester Flex](#)

¹⁴⁴ Program Review Evaluations: [2015 \(including CurricUNET\)](#), [2014](#), [2013](#), [2011](#); Academic Senate's [Program Review Conversation](#)

¹⁴⁵ [Screenshot of Vision and Mission on EMP \(Source: 2014-2020 Education Master Plan, page 6\)](#); [Screenshot of Vision and Mission on Technology Plan \(Source: DRAFT 2015-2017 Technology Plan, page 2\)](#); [Screenshot of RFP for Facilities Master Plan \(Source: RFP for Facilities Master Plan, page 3\)](#)

¹⁴⁶ [Integrated Planning Flowchart](#)

¹⁴⁷ [EMP Goals and Strategic Directions](#), one page summary sheet of EMP Goals and Strategic Directions

¹⁴⁸ [EMP Implementation Matrix - Year 1 \(2015\)](#), note Action Items from resource and support plans situated under shaded header rows that specify EMP Goals and Strategic Directions

¹⁴⁹ [EMP Implementation Matrix - Year 2 \(2016\)](#)

The College tracks allocation requests and associated progress via Program Review. Those departments, programs, and services that received new allocations must summarize the results of the funding.¹⁵⁰ These allocations include items purchased with categorical funding (e.g., Basic Skills, Equity, Perkins, SSSP) and unrestricted funding (e.g., facilities and maintenance projects, technology projects, full-time faculty hires, classified staffing hires).¹⁵¹ Allocation requests are explicitly connected to College Priorities and plans using dropdown menus.¹⁵² The Office of Research and Planning exports and compiles allocation-related progress reports for review and dialogue. These types of summaries provide a concrete basis for thorough discussion of how well the College’s comprehensive planning system leads to accomplishment of its mission and improves institutional effectiveness and academic quality.¹⁵³

I.B.9. Analysis and Evaluation

City College of San Francisco employs broad-based planning processes that ensure opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies. The Planning Committee has an ongoing, active role in designing and monitoring planning processes to improve institutional effectiveness. Broad-based opportunities to participate include annual assessment and Program Review processes, as well as long-range planning projects and large-scale initiatives. Opportunities are well publicized and are designed to engage relevant constituencies which will vary depending on the type of plan. The College’s planning processes lead to resource allocation, including new allocations as well as re-allocation of existing resources. When appropriate, the College seeks grants and solicits donations to fund high-priority projects. The College tracks progress toward achieving its goals and provides evidence of institutional effectiveness improvements.

Response to Findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.

The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comment related to this Standard:

Implement college-wide plans, clarify the relationship and integration among these plans, and execute a well-defined assessment process that summarizes the outcomes and impact of the plans. (2002 Standard I.B.3.)

The College has explicated the relationship between and integration among plans through the Education Master Plan (EMP) implementation matrix which shows how various College-wide plans connect to the overarching goals and strategic directions of the EMP. The College has a defined process for assessing progress toward achieving goals of all College-wide plans and summarizing outcomes and impacts through status updates annually recorded in the EMP implementation matrix and discussed by the College as described in Standards I.B.5. and I.B.9.

The Restoration Evaluation Report also included the following statement:

¹⁵⁰ Program Review Guidelines: [Progress - Resource Linked](#)

¹⁵¹ Program Review Guidelines: [Resource Requests](#), [Screenshot of resource list drop down](#)

¹⁵² Program Review Guidelines: [Resource Requests](#), [Screenshot of resource request drop down for connection to Board Priorities](#); [Screenshot of resource request drop down for connection to College Plans](#)

¹⁵³ [Resource-Linked Progress and Improvements List](#)

*Continue the process of program review and evaluation as described in the self-evaluation.
Make necessary modifications to ensure compliance. (2002 Standard III.D.4.)*

The College continues to refine its ability to track resource-linked progress and improvements that result from Program Review allocation as described in Standard I.B.9.

In addition, the Restoration Evaluation Report included this over-arching statement:

Implement the comprehensive plan for assessment of the student support service needs of the Ocean campus and the Centers. (2002 Standard I.B.)

The response to Standard II.C.3. describes how the College implemented the comprehensive plan for assessment of the student support service needs of the Ocean Campus and Centers through the Equal Access to Success Emergency (EASE) Task Force. See also Standard I.B.2.

Conclusion. The College meets Standard I.B.9.

Standard I.B. Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self Evaluation Process

Standard I.B. Changes Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process				
Goal	Associated Action(s)	Person(s) Responsible	Completion Date	Expected Outcome
Codify decision making processes (Standard I.B.7; Standard IV.A.2)	Develop series of flowcharts and narratives that codify the roles, responsibilities, and processes related to decision making at the College	Chancellor Academic Senate AVC, Institutional Development With input from all constituents	April 2016	College as a whole will have a clearer sense of decision making related to the development of Program Preview, plans, initiatives, Board policies, and administrative procedures and related to resource allocation
Explicate the relationship between and integration among College-wide plans (Standard I.B.9.)	Create EMP implementation matrix that shows how various College-wide plans connect to the overarching goals and strategic directions of the EMP	Office of Research and Planning	Initiated December 2014; 1st progress report May 2015; ongoing	Integration of plans and related resource allocation

Track resource-linked progress and improvements that result from Program Review allocation (Standard I.B.9.)	Request information regarding progress and improvements in Program Review	Office of Research and Planning	Initiated in Fall 2015 and ongoing	An understanding of how allocation of resources is leading to improvement to inform ongoing resource allocation decision making
---	---	---------------------------------	------------------------------------	---

Standard I.B. Plans Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process				
Goal	Associated Action(s)	Person Responsible	Expected Completion Date	Expected Outcome
Ensure that licensure and job placement rates are addressed in Program Review (Standard I.B.3.)	Prepare for next program review cycle	AVC of Workforce	Fall 2016	Articulate activities to improve licensure and job placement rates (when needed) and/or adjust rates as warranted and appropriate
Address equity gaps using disaggregated SLO data (Standard I.B.6.)	Delineated in QFE	See QFE	See QFE	See QFE