Instructional Programs

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

Standard II.A

II.A.1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.

Descriptive Summary

The College’s Mission and Vision statements provide overall guidance that informs decision making about programs offered by the College. The Vision and Mission statements frame the Program Review process and are reflected in the College’s Strategic Plan, which in turn is one of the bases of the College’s Educational Master Plan. The credit and noncredit instructional programs are developed and reviewed by departmental/program faculty (with input from industry advisory committees and/or professional associations and/or programmatic accreditation agencies), the College Curriculum Committee, and in some cases the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, using the Mission’s seven-part focus on the following:

* Preparation for transfer to baccalaureate institutions
* Achievement of Associate Degrees in Arts and Sciences
* Acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace
* Active engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizen preparation, and English as a Second Language
* Completion of requirements for the Adult High School Diploma and GED
* Promotion of economic development and job growth
* Promotion of lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment

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

For the past few years, all departments have been engaged in an annual Program Review cycle. A key element of the Program Review cycle is a review of courses and programs, including a report on progress in assessing student learning outcomes. Each department has been tasked with developing a six-year timeline in which they will review every one of their courses and programs for currency.

One example of programmatic changes that have taken place over the last few years is the expansion of coursework related to “green” technology. The Engineering, Architecture, and Construction disciplines have all added coursework in this area, not just in response to workforce demands, but also in support of the College’s vision as contributors to innovation in post-secondary education [II A-1 p. 7, 9-10, II A-2, p.6].

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

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

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

The multifaceted reviews ensure program quality. Student achievement is noted by the successful completion of degrees and certificates, job placement, transfer to baccalaureate institutions, and progress through the mathematics, English, and ESL sequences. In 2010-11, the College awarded 1232 Associate Degrees, 1574 credit certificates, and 226 noncredit certificates [II A-4]. Job placement information from the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act Core Indicator report shows a placement match rate of 87.3 percent for CCSF career and technical students [II A-5 p. 2].

Student transfer to baccalaureate institutions in recent years is summarized below [II A-6]:

Table 1: CCSF Student Transfer Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **2007-08** | | **2008-09** | | **2009-10** | | **2010-11** |
| To CSU | 1,072 | | 1,067 | | 648 | | 1,349 | | |
| To UC | 344 | | 337 | | 324 | | 426 | | |
| Subtotal | 1,416 | | 1,404 | | 972 | | 1,775 | | |
| To CA Private Colleges | 273 | | 233 | | N/A | | N/A | | |
| To Out-of-State Colleges | 174 | | 176 | | N/A | | N/A | | |
| Grand Total | 1,863 | | 1,813 | | 972\* | | 1,775\* | | |

\*Does not include transfers to private or out-of-state colleges.

It should be noted that 2009-10 was an unusual year for transfer. Because of budget concerns, most CSU campuses did not accept spring semester transfer applicants, which resulted in a significant reduction in transfer numbers for CCSF and for community colleges statewide

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

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

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

More in-depth analysis of needs is also conducted through student focus groups, surveys, and feedback from students and staff. Program reviews also address developmental needs for more or fewer course offerings. Through CCSF’s Decision Support System, an online database that provides student enrollment, completion, and related data, staff can assess a wide range of factors that inform the planning process, including the demand for enrollment into courses, enrollment productivity, student characteristics, and student success. The data are reviewed with Academic Deans and the College Council, and are available to departments for their use in Program Review.

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

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

CCSF systematically incorporates a series of annual performance indicators tied to its strategic plan. Every other year, the College issues report briefs, which provide further analyses on topics such as movement of noncredit students to credit, basic skills, and transfer rates. According to data from the February 2010 Internal Scan, 20 percent of credit students originated from noncredit and approximately 30 percent of credit students have enrolled in a noncredit class [II A-7 p. 6]. Noncredit courses in English as a Second Language, adult education, and skills in business and the trades provide tuition-free, open-entry options for students seeking affordable and flexible educational opportunities.

As part of the Matriculation process preceding enrollment in credit and noncredit courses, students participate in mathematics, English, or ESL placement assessment. Determination of the appropriate levels of courses to take is a “multiple measures” process, which is based on a number of factors, including the placement testing, standardized test scores (e.g. SAT, AP), other college coursework completed, and counselor assessment of relevant indicators during individual interviews. Student course placement data are also useful to basic skills departments in their planning of course offerings to meet student needs.

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

All College units participate in the Program Review process, which requires assessment of student learning needs, progress in reviewing all courses, programs, projects, and services, and plans for program improvement. The data for student outcomes regarding success rates, persistence and retention rates are available through the Program Review process and vary by program.

In the Program Review documents, departments and programs were asked to describe the assessment of their student learning outcomes for courses and programs. It was found that different programs assess student learning using different instruments and using more than one assessment. In particular, locally developed exams and standardized content exams are used extensively. Health related programs such as Nursing, Radiology Technician, Emergency Medical Technician, and others utilize results from licensure exams, while the Aeronautics Program utilizes Federal Aviation Administration certification results. Employer surveys and/or advisory board feedback provide assessment information to career and technical education programs. Capstone courses or portfolio assessment are frequent in liberal arts programs such as Art, Multimedia, Photography, and Graphics. Culminating projects, demonstrations, or performances are the assessment of choice for programs such as Speech, Theatre, Music, Physical Education & Dance, Architecture, and AutoCad.

In 2009, the Board of Trustees directed the College to prepare an educational equity report, detailing the outcomes for specific groups, so as to eliminate disparities [II A-10]. As a result, the Mathematics and English departments have initiated pilot projects that accelerate the completion of course sequences by scheduling short-term classes and/or by consolidating sequential courses. Students beginning in the first level of basic skills English are now able to complete the English sequence in four courses rather than six [II A-11 p. 4].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Underlying CCSF’s broad based efforts to improve student learning are data findings that inform policy and practices on student equity and narrowing the achievement gap. Departments armed with evidence on differential impact have restructured their services. For example, the Office of Financial Aid has reorganized its unit into three dedicated units with separate offices to serve CCSF students more effectively. Both the English and Mathematics departments have initiated course consolidations to enhance the likelihood of student success.

Degree audit information is available to counselors and evaluators; however, the College would like to be more proactive in providing students with this and other information to enable them to monitor their own progress towards achieving goals and learning outcomes.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

CCSF offers an extensive array of diverse and flexible learning experiences for credit and noncredit students. Instructional options include in-class lecture format, laboratory, collaborative group work, computer-assisted instruction, online courses, telecourses, independent study, internships, study abroad programs, cohort programs, community-based courses, short-term courses, and on-site courses at various locations in the City of San Francisco.

The College offers courses at nine campuses and numerous other locations throughout the City of San Francisco, making CCSF easily accessible to students with diverse needs and goals. In addition to various modes of instruction, CCSF offers a variety of time scheduling options including short-term classes, weekend classes, classes that meet one to five times a week, and classes that meet early in the morning and in the evening. The College continues to adapt its delivery modes to best address learning style differences and meet the changing needs of the various communities it serves. The following are examples of the variety of modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of students.

**Distance Learning:** Distance education courses are offered by 27 academic departments, in all six schools within Academic Affairs and by Library and Learning Resources. Over 12,000 students enrolled in 338 distance education credit courses for the academic year 2010-11 [II A-12 p. 3]. A student can complete 100 percent of the requirements for an AA/AS degree (but not necessarily all their prerequisites) by taking distance learning courses. Students can complete approximately 95 percent of the courses required to transfer to the CSU through distance learning [II A-12 p. 9].

The College employs several strategies to support the learning of students in distance education. One such strategy was to develop LERN 55 Successful Online Learning, a one-unit course that has been offered since 2008. The California Community Colleges Data Mart report for Fall 2010 showed that CCSF students enrolled in distance education achieved a success rate of 70 percent, slightly higher than the statewide average of 68 percent [II A-13].

Faculty members at CCSF develop online courses following various steps compliant with the standards set by the Curriculum Committee and the Distance Learning Advisory Committee [II A-14 p. 59-66]. The Office of Technology Mediated Instruction, housed within the Educational Technology Department (ETD), works closely with faculty to prepare traditional lecture mode courses for online delivery. Faculty participate in extensive training and the newly developed online course is evaluated at various phases of development to ensure that the delivery is meeting the objectives and content of the state-approved course outline, the College’s standards for distance education, and federal ADA regulations. The ETD provides ongoing support to distance learning faculty via online modules, face-to-face workshops, and one-to-one meetings.

Faculty members teaching credit courses are given an option to enhance their face-to-face courses by delivering the objectives and content of the course using CCSF’s learning management system*.* These faculty are required to complete seven hours of training by the ETD. Additionally, ETD offers special topic workshops to support faculty in understanding the technology behind the management systemand guides faculty in ways they can improve their online classes, thus increasing student success and decreasing attrition. CCSF supported almost 100 technology-enhanced course sections in Fall 2009; this number increased to over 350 technology-enhanced face-to-face sections by the end of 2010-11 [II A-12, p. 3].

**Study Abroad:** Since 1985, CCSF has been a leader in Study Abroad education. Thousands of CCSF students, faculty, and staff, students from other colleges and universities, and citizens of the greater Bay Area community have participated in CCSF Study Abroad programs in such diverse locations as Australia, Cambodia, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, England, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Laos, Mexico, Mongolia, Russia, Spain, and Vietnam. While studying abroad, participants are enrolled in regularly approved courses which grant college credit toward graduation at CCSF or for transfer credit to a variety of four-year universities, particularly those in the California State University or University of California systems. This program addresses the global competence goal which many colleges and universities are now stressing.

**Internships and Work Experience Courses:** Internships and work experience courses are offered in both occupational and transfer-oriented disciplines. Work experience courses provide students with on-the-job learning experiences that give them the skills, knowledge, and attitudes to prepare them to succeed in a variety of jobs.

**Short-Term Courses:** These are designed to help students progress toward their educational goals more quickly. Short-term courses use an accelerated format to allow students to focus upon a particular class or set of classes more intensively and over a shorter period of time than usual. These have been traditionally offered during the summer session and now the College is offering this option more frequently during the regular academic year.

**Cohort Pathways:** These are designed to allow students to progress as a single group through a certificate program. Examples of cohort programs include the Metro Child Development, Metro Health Academy, and Youth Worker certificate programs. Students receive cohort instruction, tutoring, content-focused student mentoring, designated counseling, and linked class scheduling.

**Honors Program:** This program is designed to offer students an enhanced educational experience along with potential transfer and scholarship benefits. Honors courses provide students with an enriched curriculum either in specific sections of core transfer courses or through honors contracts where students agree to complete honors work in addition to the regular coursework. Students also have the opportunity to compete in the Annual Honors Student Research Symposium, which in recent years has been sponsored by UC Berkeley and Stanford University. CCSF Honors students were successful in transfer to the University of California, particularly to UCLA through its Transfer Alliance Program (TAP) which gives priority consideration for admissions to Honors students. According to a UCLA California Community College Admissions report between 2006 and 2009, 81 percent of CCSF TAP Students who applied to UCLA were admitted. In comparison, during that same period, 48 percent of CCSF students applying to UCLA overall were admitted [II A-15].

**Dual/Concurrent Enrollment Programs:** These programs are designed to provide high school students with learning opportunities that better prepare them for successful completion of CCSF certificate and degree programs leading to employment and courses leading to transfer. CCSF has over 30 K-12 partnership programs, many of which include a component of dual enrollment. One such program offers numerous courses to San Francisco Unified high school students in career and technical fields of study, such as business, computers, health, and engineering technology. Another example is the School to Career High School Teachers Pathway program, offered in partnership with San Francisco Unified School District. In 2009-10, 982 students participated in concurrent enrollment. Over 80 percent of these students successfully completed their coursework and achieved a mean grade point average of 2.95 in Fall 2009 and 3.07 in Spring 2010 [II A-16].

One way the College evaluates delivery methods is through student feedback solicited in the faculty evaluation and tenure review process conducted by the Office of Faculty Evaluation, Tenure Review and Curriculum. Evaluations from several areas show an approval rating with an average overall indicator score of 4.7 out of 5.0 [II A-17]. The College has also conducted student equity forums at various campuses as a means to solicit student feedback and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs and services [II A-18].

The College has open lines of communication internally (i.e. Curriculum Committee, Distance Learning Advisory Subcommittee, Office of Technology Mediated Instruction, Department Chairpersons Council, School and Campus Deans) and has recognized community input (Equity Hearings, Community Listening Sessions) when assessing what needs to be incorporated into its course offerings. Overall, CCSF has a delivery system that is open to and capable of exploring new delivery modes to better meet the needs of its students

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF has developed an instructional delivery system that provides easy accessibility to students. Departments use various methods to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in meeting student needs and incorporate changes as appropriate.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

The development of curricula is a faculty-initiated and controlled process, which includes the development of new courses, majors, programs, certificates, degrees, and the revision of existing ones. This can be an individual or collective activity. Course-level learning outcomes and strategies for attaining them are stated in the course outline; outcomes are in the Major Learning Outcomes section and strategies are in the Content and Instructional Methodology sections [II A-14 p. 40-54].

Course outlines are written by faculty and in some cases reviewed by a department-specific curriculum group. Further review occurs by the respective department chairs and school deans prior to submission to the Curriculum Committee. Majors, programs, certificates, and degrees also have learning outcomes identified on their respective documentation that is submitted to the Curriculum Committee. Accredited programs in the career and technical education area are mandated to hold industry advisory meetings. Programs that receive Perkins funding are also required to hold meetings with their advisory group to assure that curriculum reflects current industry needs.

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

A Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Workgroup was convened in Spring 2009 to begin to address topics of importance to advancing the SLO assessment process. This included discussion on the preferred model for the College, and the development of professional development workshops for preliminary discussion of general education SLOs. The Workgroup consists of nine members; three each from the Department Chairpersons Council, the Academic Senate, and administration. The group meets once a month during the fall and spring semesters.

An effective method for verifying SLOs at the college level is Program Review, a vehicle for department chairs and faculty to report on their progress in assessing student learning outcomes. All departments are required to review and update course outlines at least every six years and to include measurable SLOs. Through the Program Review process, departments assess their SLO progress from year to year and share examples that reflect their departmental dialog and action on SLOs. In Spring 2010, Program Review asked departments to state their assessment and course outline revision timetable through 2016 and to provide two examples of ongoing SLO assessments; one at the course level and the other at the program level. Departments were also asked to state how they would close the assessment loop, revising instruction or other aspects of the curriculum.

Departments also complete a survey in which they identify the percent of courses with SLOs and completed assessments as requested in the Accreditation Annual Report. As noted in the 2011 Annual Report, survey results indicate that 100 percent of courses and 85 percent of programs had identified SLOs with 75 percent of the courses and 73 percent of the programs engaged in an ongoing assessment process [II A-19 p. 2].

In the last two years, the SLO assessment process has been strengthened at CCSF. The SLO Workgroup has established an SLO website to offer guidance and instruction to faculty. Assessment has become a major component of faculty development days (FLEX days). At FLEX workshops, departments share their most successful assessment methodologies with their peers. These workshops have involved hundreds of faculty and inspired meaningful dialog about how to effectively use SLOs at an institution the size of the College. Many departments’ use of SLOs is truly exemplary and these FLEX workshops have allowed other departments to review successful techniques. There were presentations from such diverse departments as Business, Earth Sciences, Learning Assistance, and Radiologic Sciences. As an example, in the Earth Sciences Department, all instructors regularly review their course outlines and in-class methodology and make changes based on a variety of assessment tools, such as common exams, student feedback questionnaires, concept quizzes, and in-class participation and activities. Changes included course content additions, refocusing of content (addressing areas of weakness as determined by previous SLO assessments), different instructional techniques, and diagnostic testing. Instructors evaluated these changes and reported better student retention and more student engagement in and satisfaction with the courses [II A-20].

The 2010-11 Program Review gave the College community an opportunity to review other examples from Architecture [II A-21], Art [II A-22], English [II A-23], Health Education [II A-24], and Mathematics [II A-25]. For example, for several years the English Department has been analyzing data on student retention and success. Workgroups dealing with assessment, multicultural and multilingual concerns, affective issues and pedagogy, student surveys and focus groups, and site visits concluded the bulk of their work at the end of 2010, and all of their recommendations were integrated into the design of two intensive courses, English 95X and English 961A. English faculty also revised their entire sequence of reading/composition courses to reflect updated requirements for Instructional Methodologies and Student Learning Outcomes. The English Department has also accelerated and intensified its assessment process for courses. Preliminary results of Spring 2011 data indicate that initial and end of term retention was substantially higher for the accelerated courses than for the traditional ones. Also, student writing was assessed to be stronger using various measures. Finally, the number of students receiving ratings of “Accomplished” or “Satisfactory” was higher in the accelerated class than in the traditional transfer-level class for every domain being assessed: critical thinking; audience awareness and rhetorical strategies; organization and development; incorporating sources of research materials; and grammar, syntax, etc. [II A-23].

For the past year, CCSF has focused on addressing achievement gaps and their relationship to student equity. This process has been carried out in the spirit of continuous quality improvement. Reports of current practices throughout the institution, from English and mathematics course sequencing to financial aid, student employment, registration (including priority registration), counseling, international student programs, and placement testing were evaluated by the College community [II A-26]. Students offered testimony about their experiences and the discussions that ensued involved everyone from administrators and faculty to trustees and elected student officials [II A-18]. The results were often an array of institutional modifications with the often-stated intention of reassessing those changes after a pilot semester or year.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

Through ongoing dialog, CCSF has embraced and begun adopting SLOs and the assessment agenda at an ever increasing pace. SLOs have been identified for all courses and the majority of programs, and there is extensive ongoing work towards completing the assessment cycle for all of them.

Planning Agenda

The College will move towards the proficiency level for Student Learning Outcomes assessment of courses, certificates, programs, and general education breadth requirements by Fall 2012.

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

Descriptive Summary

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

The continued high quality of instructional courses and programs rests on the foundation of academic freedom and faculty professionalism. Academic freedom creates an environment of free inquiry, discussion, and critical analysis. Academic freedom allows faculty to offer dynamic instruction with the ability to improve offerings to meet student needs and maintain the College’s existing standard of instructional excellence. This excellence in teaching and learning remains the core of the College’s Mission and Vision statements. (See also II.A.7)

The College ensures its courses and programs are of high quality through its Program Review System, which applies to all instructional departments and programs including continuing and contract education, study abroad, and programs for international students. All units respond to questions that give the opportunity for reflection and planning. Immediate supervisors as well as subcommittees of the Program Review Committee review the Program Review documents.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CCSF has been making a concerted effort to expand the general education course options available at campuses other than Ocean. For example, the rebuilding of the Mission Campus included the creation of laboratory space to support science lab classes, and general education courses in biological sciences, chemistry, and physics are now offered. In addition, this lab space has allowed the Mission Campus to become a center of some of the Biotechnology programs. Similar plans are in place for the construction of the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus. Expanding the campuses other than Ocean to become more full-service campuses has been the product of the College’s Vision and Mission statements and the College’s Strategic Plan.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has well-established means for ensuring the quality of all courses, regardless of course type, delivery mode, or location.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

The role of the faculty is paramount in the review and improvement of the quality of CCSF courses and programs. Faculty are involved at every level of the assessment process from development of learning outcomes to their applications and evaluation. Faculty in each department are responsible for creating, reviewing, and assessing course and program outcomes within its offerings. Delivery and assessment are the responsibilities of classroom faculty, who are supervised by their department chair. Student learning outcomes are spelled out in the course outlines and program learning outcomes are published in the College Catalog (e.g., the Diagnostic Medical Imaging SLOs are on p. 366 of the 2011-12 Catalog).

Detailed guidelines in the Curriculum Committee Handbook relevant to the development process include recommendations for mapping courses to program outcomes [II A-14 p. 75-76, 82-83]. There is a refined set of protocols for assessment and evaluation of learning outcomes in the Program Review process. Also, due to the efforts of the SLO Workgroup and faculty departmental leadership, there is now a wide and shared understanding of how the assessment of SLOs can provide a framework for course and program creation and improvement.

The concept of a course and/or program starts with faculty in their respective departments and is based on factors such as labor market information, student demand, transfer trends, and/or advisory committee recommendations. Courses are developed in consultation with colleagues and always with the department chair. Implementation requires Curriculum Committee approval and often consultation with the Curriculum Committee Chair, who is always a faculty member, and the Dean of Instruction. The Curriculum Committee Chair acts as a resource to assist the faculty member and department chair in course and program development.

The Curriculum Committee conducts a rigorous peer-review process of every course and program proposed [II A-28]. The Committee consists of 18 faculty, 6 administrators, 1 classified staff, and 2 students. After a course and/or program has Curriculum Committee approval, it is referred to the Board of Trustees for its approval, and in certain cases, (programs with 18 or more units, noncredit courses, noncredit programs, etc.) the State Chancellor’s Office as well.

At CCSF, the process of peer and peer-management evaluation [II A-29] and student reviews [II A-17] of faculty includes an appraisal of the quality, academic rigor, and appropriateness of that professor’s instruction. A component of the evaluation of an individual faculty member is whether the courses are being taught in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline and department. This mechanism allows departments to ensure that departmental and discipline expectations for courses are common across the department and discipline. Since the faculty evaluation process is based on peer review, the process allows faculty within a discipline to have an ongoing dialog about the expectations of their courses.

Additionally, each department submits a program review in which all offerings can be evaluated and goals for improvement discussed. In 2008-09, CCSF piloted a revised Program Review process in which the units were required to identify the means of assessment, measurement criteria, analysis, and plans for improvement of one course and one program SLO. After the first year, the template was modified and this procedure is now integral to the Program Review process, with departments expected to discuss the assessment process in depth. The decentralized nature of implementation of the SLO process at CCSF ensures that discipline-specific faculty are responsible for the quality of their courses and programs.

In 2010-11, the review of student success data through the Program Review process generated the development of 76 new courses, revisions to 314 courses and the deletion of 64 outdated courses. In addition, departments created 7 new majors for the associate degree and 19 new certificate programs, updated 22 majors and 76 certificates, and deleted 5 certificates [II A-30, II A-31].

Two functioning bodies coordinate these activities: the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the SLO Workgroup. The PRC reviews unit progress in course and program assessment. The SLO Workgroup, along with the Department Chairpersons Council, provides staff development opportunities and coaching. The PRC’s 2009-10 overview of Program Review recommended that each department establish and maintain an ongoing cycle of planning, assessment, review, and revision of curriculum [II A-32].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has well-established procedures for course and program design, delivery, and evaluation. Faculty have the central role in establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.

Descriptive Summary

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

General education student learning outcomes have been identified by the Bipartite Committee, which includes faculty and administrators. These outcomes were based on the College’s institutional criteria and the Title 5 requirements for general education. Departments are undertaking a continuous review of program learning outcomes. They are introduced at the Curriculum Committee and revised within the department through unit dialog. As noted in the College’s 2011 Accreditation Annual Report to WASC, 73 percent of programs have an ongoing process of assessing program learning outcomes; however, the institution continues to regularly assess student progress towards achieving these outcomes and expects to be at the proficiency level by Fall 2012 [II A-19 p. 2].

All career and technical education departments are required to collaborate with an advisory committee when identifying those competencies that graduates need to have in order to enter the labor market. Many also use these committees to help determine how student learning outcomes should be assessed. This partnership between the faculty and an advisory committee is also required for those programs accredited by an external agency.

For example, the Diagnostic Medical Imaging Program uses an advisory committee to measure success in areas such as on-the-job competency and the professionalism of its graduates [II A-33, p.2]. Industry advisory groups are also utilized by the Business Department to ensure relevancy of curriculum in preparing students for the workforce, and the Drug and Alcohol Studies program relies on its advisory group to develop certificate options that respond to the research in the field. In 2010-11 under the guidance of the American Culinary Federation, the Culinary Arts Program underwent a review of its curriculum [II A-34, p.6]. Moreover, some career and technical programs, such as Interior Design [II A-35], Health Information Technology [II A-36] and Fashion [II A-37] have undergone the DACUM process in order to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes in their curriculum and align them with current industry and workforce practices. Another example is Automotive Technology, which worked with industry advisors to develop course and program learning outcomes that are in line with national standards. As a result, this program recently received National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF) certification [II A-2 p. 6]. In addition, the Aeronautics program recently revised its Curriculum Manual to reflect specifications and certification requirements set by the Federal Aviation Administration [II A-38].

For years, CCSF CTE departments have worked to interpret Perkins core indicator reports in order to use these data for meaningful program improvement. Simultaneously, the College has increasingly pushed these same occupational departments to think differently about how to use Perkins funds for true program improvement, beyond equipment and technology, with a particular focus on grant requests that are based on evidence that clearly identifies specific student success challenges.

CCSF’s Perkins coordinators launched a new SLO initiative to support faculty who had an interest in collecting and analyzing data to make changes in course and program delivery, called the “CTE Student Success Initiative” [II A-39]. Through this initiative, Research and Planning staff and the Perkins coordinators worked together with the Architecture and Child Development and Family Studies departments to gather evidence and develop action plans based on data. During the process, CCSF developed and is currently implementing a set of assessment tools—including student surveys, student and faculty focus groups, and student data analysis—to assess student outcomes. This SLO model will be replicated across occupational disciplines to evaluate program success, strategize changes, and help direct dialog with industry partners. This approach helps programs both meet outcome mandates for Perkins as well as address institutional goals focused on continuous quality improvement. For example, the research results for Architecture indicated the need for better course alignment and more lab space with access to computers. Based on these findings, the Architecture Department immediately began making changes to the program through Perkins requests; new course outlines were developed and additional lab space is being researched [II A-21 p. 11-13].

A number of departments (as identified in Standard II.A.2.g) have developed common exams as a means to better assess student performance. These exams are not necessarily required to pass the class, but are used by faculty to serve as a reference point to judge student competency regarding course-level learning outcomes. Some departments, such as Mathematics, identify common questions that are used in final exams to assess particular skills.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

The College has identified multiple valid sources of data that assist in the regular assessment of student progress towards achieving student learning outcomes. It is at the developmental level in the assessment of courses, certificates, and programs and moving progressively to the proficiency level. General education SLOs have been established and they are assessed within the context of the general education discipline in which they are included. The College is researching the most effective and valid means to assess general education SLOs in a cross-disciplinary approach.

Planning Agenda

The College will move towards the proficiency level for Student Learning Outcomes assessment of courses, certificates, and programs by Fall 2012. The College will identify the method for assessing general education Student Learning Outcomes in a cross disciplinary approach and complete such assessment.

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

Descriptive Summary

All certificate and degree programs offered by the College undergo a rigorous approval process that ensures proper planning and high-quality instruction. Once approved, separate review processes are used to ensure continued program success. Faculty play a central role in these approval and review processes.

All certificate and degree programs are developed by faculty and presented by departments to the Curriculum Committee for approval using the Committee’s formal review process, as detailed in Standard II.A.2.a. Program proposals are prepared in accordance with the standards published in the Curriculum Handbook, which includes identification of the proposed program’s overall learning outcomes and an identification of whether the program is credit or noncredit [II A-14 p. 5-58]. The Curriculum Committee reviews program proposals against these standards, ensuring that all instructional programs meet the standards of high-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The Office of Matriculation works closely with department faculty to ensure that all course and program prerequisites and corequisites are in compliance with applicable Title 5 requirements. These prerequisites and corequisites are then reviewed and are approved by the Curriculum Committee. Relevant student success data are provided by the Office of Research and Planning to assist in the identification of appropriate communication and computation prerequisites. Approved programs are forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final local approval.

External approval by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office is required of all of the College’s degree programs, all of its noncredit certificate programs, and many of its credit certificate programs. The California Community College Program and Course Approval Handbook establishes the criteria for State Chancellor’s Office approval of programs. To gain approval, the College must demonstrate that the proposed program meets curriculum standards that show the integration of courses in the program, so that students fulfilling program requirements will meet program goals and objectives.

The College has several ways in which it can demonstrate the quality of instruction of its programs. It uses data generated by the Office of Research and Planning to determine the efficacy of instructional programs. For example, a yearly cycle of research tracks the performance of all students who enter CCSF from the San Francisco Unified School District [II A-7 p. 35]. The institution also tracks transfer, job placement, student enrollment, and persistence and success rates by consulting with UC and CSU campuses and using information from sources like UC Statfinder, the CSU Academic Performance website, and the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. Figures available on these sites demonstrate that students who transfer from CCSF graduate from UC and CSU campuses at rates as high as or higher than students from other public and private high schools and colleges around the state [II A-40]. The Office of Career and Technological Education receives data from the State Chancellor’s Office about student employment, and a number of CTE departments track job placement data of their graduates.

Other data generated by the Office of Research and Planning to determine the quality of instructional programs come from students themselves. In the 2010-11 Credit Student Opinion Survey, students rated both the quality of instruction in CCSF classes and the content of courses as indicated in the table below [II A-41 p. 2].

Table 2: 2010-11 Credit Student Opinion Survey Results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Quality of Instruction** | **Content of Courses** |
| Excellent | 40.1% | 37.2% |
| Good | 45.2% | 48.7% |
| Fair | 11.9% | 12.2% |
| Poor | 2.9% | 1.8% |

As noted in Section II.A.5, CTE programs are required to meet with Industry Advisory Boards to ensure continued relevance of their programs to industry needs. Several programs, most notably in allied health, have external accreditation processes that serve to ensure quality of instruction. The College also tracks pass rates for students on external licensing examinations. As noted in Section II.A.5, students completing College programs have a strong record in passing those licensing exams.

The College has made significant steps in using the assessment of learning outcomes as a mechanism to evaluate the quality of instruction in its programs. Not only is the assessment of learning outcomes a process that is applied to every one of the College’s programs, but the institutional dialog that has taken place in the last few years about constructing processes by which departments create and then assess learning outcomes has helped to ensure a shared understanding of program quality and level. This shared understanding has then led to the standards published in the Curriculum Handbook.

In addition to the processes used to ensure high quality instruction, the College has several services to support students’ progress through all of the College’s programs. The College has also made several curricular changes to assist students in their progression through the English and mathematics sequences, in support of the associate degree and transfer [II A-26 Section 8].

A number of services, programs, and courses are designed to help students complete higher quality work and reduce their time to graduation. These include a full range of tutoring (lab-based and in-class) services, learning communities, internships, and work experience courses, which are available to students in many departments. They also include collaborative courses formed by CTE and ESL (Bridge to Biotech, ESL for Health Professionals, ESL for Child Development); Metropolitan Health Academy (MHA); Mathematics, Engineering & Science Achievement (MESA) Program; and retention programs like TULAY: Filipino American Success Program, Asian Pacific American Student Success (APASS), African American Achievement Program (AAAP), Latino Services Network (LSN), Puente Program, The Math Bridge Program, Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), ESL Partnerships Project, VESL Pathways Project, and others. These programs represent CCSF’s commitment to high quality instruction both in and out of the classroom.

Recently, the Office of Research and Planning compiled data on student time to completion in CTE certificate programs. The data indicated that the majority of students completed 6 to 29.5 unit certificates within two years and 30-60 unit certificates within 2.5 years [II A-42 p. 2]. Given the large number of part-time students enrolled at CCSF, this completion rate meets expectations built into the program design.

Sequencing has been addressed by enlisting the help of students, faculty, counselors, the Board of Trustees, and the College administration. A series of Student Equity forums, co-hosted by the Academic Senate, Associated Students and Board of Trustees, explored the issue of sequencing in relation to student completion and transfer rates. Departments with longer sequences and required transferable courses, like Mathematics and English, have addressed concerns about sequencing by increasing the number of ways students can progress to graduation or university transfer [II A-26 Sections 1 and 2].

English faculty have created two new intensive six-unit courses, English 95X and English 961A, that provide an alternative pathway through the English course sequence. Institutional research studies indicated certain populations of students were obtaining lower grades and dropping out before completing the required degree or transfer sequence. This new option provides students an opportunity to complete the English sequence in up to two fewer semesters. Five sections of 95X and ten of 961A were offered in Spring 2011 [II A-23 p. 5-7, 10, II A-43]. Each semester, the offerings will increase by five sections, pending student demand and available funding.

Mathematics offered four sets of intensive short-term sections of Math 840 and Math 860 in Spring 2011 so that a qualified student could take both 840 and 860 in the same semester. In Fall 2011, the College is offering two sections of a new 5-unit course, Math 45X, which provides an alternative to Math 840 and 860 (4 units each) for preparing students to enter a transfer-level statistics course. In ESL, through the credit integrated skills sequence, reading and vocabulary are integrated with grammar and writing skills in ESL 110-170; the noncredit division offers pathways to vocational programs and to credit ESL courses.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

High quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning are elements used in program approval. The College has evidence of high quality instruction and processes in place to ensure continued quality. In addition, the College has established services to support student completion, and is addressing sequencing in English and mathematics in support of students pursuing the associate degree and/or transfer.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

The institution uses diverse delivery modes that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students. A number of these have already been detailed in Standard II.A.1.b.

Course outlines include references to the methodologies employed. Methodologies take multiple forms: lectures, laboratory activities, demonstrations, case studies, individual research, group discussion, group projects, presentations, research papers, and independent studies. Instructors are encouraged to incorporate multiple methodologies in all of their courses. Instructors in earth sciences, ESL, foreign languages, and mathematics who were interviewed confirmed they use varied approaches during their classes, such as using board or visual aids to appeal to visual learners or hands-on activities for kinesthetic learners. Instructors assess student learning through the use of written exams, portfolios, performances, research-based projects, and essays.

Students’ learning styles are generally investigated in class under the form of a short survey or through discussion with the instructor. Placement tests also indicate to the instructors what kind of help the students specifically require. ESL, for example, utilizes placement tests to clearly pinpoint students’ strengths or weaknesses and their speaking or writing abilities.

Faculty professional development (Flex Day) sessions always include diversity topics, which improve faculty knowledge and skills (e.g., the following topic was discussed in 2010: Does a Learning Problem Always Mean a Learning Disability?). These sessions allow instructors to meet and discuss student learning challenges. In the Foreign Language Department, faculty devote part of their Flex Day to SLO assessment by meeting to discuss teaching strategies and the diversity of the student body. During the semester, faculty also meet to discuss and reflect on their teaching methods and textbooks, whether informally or during Curriculum Committee meetings.

The recent student equity forums spotlighted the concerns of various groups, such as students with basic skills requirements, international students, and students with limited English proficiency. Faculty participate in professional development conferences and workshops offered on or off campus to address the diverse needs of all students.

Every year the Multicultural Infusion Project helps selected instructors modify their teaching methods to increase their focus on culturally relevant pedagogy. They share these concepts within their departments to encourage other faculty to do the same. To date, 165 faculty have been trained and 24 faculty have received mini grants to implement project ideas [II A-44]. One project idea was to create a portfolio of activities, assignments, projects, readings, and teaching strategies that is relevant to the Speech and Communication curriculum and that is informed by multi-cultural pedagogy and includes the voices of diverse cultural groups.

CCSF provides an exceptionally wide range of programs and services, such as the Asian Pacific American Student Success Center (APASS), the African American Scholastic Program (AASP), the TULAY: Filipino American Success Program, and the Latino Services Network (LSN), and addresses student diversity as well as needs and learning styles. The foregoing programs are open to all students interested in learning within a cultural context. Most of the programs offer a variety of classes (some pertaining to learning strategies), group sessions, peer-support study groups, mentoring, computer stations, and further counseling. Students with special needs can turn to the Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) which provides similar learning assistance in addition to assistive technologies (hearing aids, note takers, scooters, etc.).

Some programs address the learning needs of specific populations, such as: Veterans Educational Transition Services (VETS); Second Chance, which supports formerly incarcerated students; Guardian Scholars, which assists foster and emancipated youth; Project SHINE, which benefits immigrant and refugee students; Puente, which helps prepare educationally disadvantaged students for college; and the Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement (MESA) Program, which assists educationally disadvantaged students pursuing a mathematics-based career. Students enrolled in these programs receive supplemental support that can include tutoring, community-based learning, mentoring, and counseling.

CCSF also has a large Learning Assistance Center, including the Tutorial Center, Reading Lab, Writing Lab, and Computer Lab, that, together with other designated learning centers, serves an average of 9,500 students for a total of 125,000 hours of tutoring per semester [II A-45, II A-46]. Tutor training includes topics such as how to determine a student’s learning style. Students who received tutoring responded to an SLO survey regarding their tutor’s ability to recognize and respond to their learning styles [II A-47]. The Learning Assistance Center incorporates feedback to continue developing its Introduction to Tutoring and Advanced Tutoring classes and to increase the effectiveness of tutoring staff.

In Spring 2010, to assist more students with diverse learning styles and to help them meet learning outcomes, the English Department extended its 16-hour/semester lab requirement to all composition courses through English 1A. This sustained support for students addresses a range of English skills and comes in a variety of formats: one-on-one tutoring; reading and writing groups; supervised campus computer use; and documented online program interaction.

Other designated departmental learning centers include the Math Lab, ESL Center for Language and Academic Development (CLAD), Biology Resource Center, Graphic Communication/Photography Lab, and Speech Lab. A number of departments also support instruction through student-to-student mentoring offered in conjunction with the Office of Mentoring and Service-Learning. Some of the departments with mentoring projects include Astronomy, Business, Child Development and Family Studies, and Transitional Studies.

The Library supports instructional delivery in a number of ways, such as through its exhibition program, which explores issues and themes across departmental curricula and gathers resources across disciplines. Each exhibition is cosponsored by at least one academic department in order to support that department’s information needs. During the course of a semester more than 500 students complete a library exhibition assignment developed in collaboration with faculty from the College Success program. Students use their powers of observation and skills in critical analysis to complete an assignment related to the exhibition. The assignment invites personal introspection and response, offering a way to connect their life experience to their academic life and to library resources. The Library Exhibitions Blog provides an online forum for students to share their reactions to the exhibitions with others in the college community [II A-48].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Faculty employ multiple pedagogical approaches to meet the diverse needs and learning styles of students. The pedagogical approaches used are determined by discipline faculty. The College has a strong commitment to student services, which support the learning needs of the College’s diverse student body.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

In the previous WASC Evaluation Report, the visiting team recommended, “… the College ensure the institutionalization of their program review process by requiring that all units complete their program reviews in a timely and thorough fashion” [II A-49 p. 10]. In response to this recommendation, the College inaugurated a new Program Review process in 2008-09. This system was designed to include all units in the College and is completely integrated into the annual planning and budgeting cycle. The Program Review Committee was convened and it included three of the College’s Vice Chancellors, four faculty, two classified staff, and two student representatives.

In 2008-09, a total of 105 out of 121 units completed program reviews using a revised Program Review template developed by the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the Office of Research and Planning. All 121 units completed Program Review in 2010-11. Each College unit received an electronic template that included five years of data on enrollment, personnel, budgetary responsibilities, student and/or employee satisfaction, and a productivity measure depending upon whether it was an instructional, student services, or administrative unit. The template also included text boxes designed to elicit the following information on reflections on data trends: progress on prior planning objectives; major planning objectives for next fiscal year; status of learning assessment for courses and programs; and resources needed to meet planning objectives.

During the pilot period in 2008-09, all Program Review templates were reviewed by the appropriate senior administrators and then forwarded to the PRC for discussion and action. Since then, the members of the PRC have taken on the responsibility of reviewing all program reviews with assistance from additional volunteers. The program reviews are organized into seven related clusters of manageable size and then reviewed by a subcommittee. Subcommittees present both written and verbal reports to the full PRC. The PRC prepares a final report summarizing the review process and presents it to the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (College’s PBC) [II A-50]. All reports are posted on the Division of Research and Policy website for College wide review.

The PRC is the heart of the College’s Program Review System. It is, in effect, the first filter for reviewing all annual planning objectives and budget requests. The new Program Review plan detailed that the PRC would:

* Review all Program Review reports and make recommendations directly to the College’s PBC for budget modifications.
* Review Program Review reports for alignment of District unit planning objectives with College planning objectives.
* Review the status of student learning outcomes.
* Be responsible for the periodic evaluation of the College Program Review System and submit a final report with recommendations for improvements to the Chancellor.
* Review special Program Review reports and evaluations where the Chancellor requests a special review [II A-51 p. 29-30].

In the 2008-09 pilot year, units were asked to provide documentation about the assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs). Required information included means of assessment, measurement criteria, analysis, and plans for improvement. The goal was to begin the systematic and explicit integration of SLOs into the annual Program Review System, and to prompt a shared College wide understanding of the SLO process. The Program Review template now asks units to identify a six-year plan for revising course curriculum and programs [II A-52 Item 3].

The pilot process was evaluated in Spring 2009 and Fall 2009 [II A-53 Appendix “2”]. Results from this evaluation were used to reshape the second round of the Program Review process which was completed in 2009-10. This round included student achievement data and also focused on providing more detailed data on program expenditures to strengthen connections to budgetary planning. The third round in 2010-11 expanded the data on revenue sources to provide a more accurate picture of unit budgets.

Program Review information, comments from School Deans, Program Review subcommittee comments, and discussions with department chairs informed the development of the Educational Master Plan components. These will, in turn, be incorporated into the overall College Annual Plan and future planning documents.

The Program Review process has increased activity in the development and revision of course outlines and SLOs, has promoted focused dialog at the departmental level, and has motivated increased planning to support institutional effectiveness. This is evident in the PRC’s annual report to the College’s PBC [II A-50].

The new Program Review process is a living process which will continue to evolve. Over a period of years, this process will map the evolution of each unit and the SLOs associated with courses and programs.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The College has made robust progress. It has developed a framework and model which can be adjusted but allows for administrative oversight and leadership. It is a model which is faculty driven, yet dependent on guidance from department chairs, College deans, and the PRC.

The College continues to gather revenue data for inclusion in the Program Review process. The PRC will conduct a summative evaluation of the process, which will include a review of timelines, frequency, content, and template format.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

In 2004, the College modified its planning and evaluation cycle to formally include these five major components: Strategic Planning; Annual Planning; Cost Center Plans; Budget Planning; and Assessment [II A-54 p. 4].

The Strategic Plan is the College’s longest-range plan. It is supported by the College Education Master Plan, the Technology Plan, and the Institutional Annual Plan. These plans are developed in a collaborative manner through the College’s Shared Governance System. The College’s mission, goals, and objectives as stated in the Strategic Plan are the basis for continuous planning, thereby facilitating consistency and continuity in educational and fiscal planning. This process also allows for the monitoring and review of program implementation and results. The Strategic Plan is the foundation on which the College’s PBC reviews costs and makes recommendations to the Chancellor. The College’s PBC represents all major constituencies at the College–faculty, administration, staff, and students.

The Annual Plan reflects annual institutional objectives, which are developed based on the Strategic Plan Implementation Schedule and reflect institutional priorities. The Annual Plan reflects the collective thinking from the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and the College’s PBC. The Annual Plan represents core educational and administrative activities, which focus on the improvement and expansion of the programmatic direction at the College.

Departments, schools, programs, and administrative offices are classified as District units for the purpose of aligning programmatic and budget planning. The District unit objectives are then aligned to institutional objectives through the completion of a Cost Plan and Budget Form. This District Unit Planning process ensures the linkage between individual objectives generated by the District units and the annual institutional objectives. The District unit budgets are then reviewed by the College’s PBC, which recommends budget allocation to the Chancellor, who in turn forwards his recommended budget to the Board of Trustees. The Board’s Planning and Budgeting Committee holds several public hearings on the budget and may make modifications to the proposed budget at these hearings or at a meeting of the full Board.

The End-of-Year Assessment addresses the progress of District unit and institutional objectives. This enables College constituencies to identify needs and areas of improvement. In 2009-10 the Program Review process somewhat replicated the End-of-Year Assessment process.

To monitor its strategic objectives, CCSF produces an annual report on its progress and achievements. This report, called “The College Performance Indicators Report,” is distributed to and discussed with faculty, classified staff, and administrators. This report has been included as part of the College’s Annual Progress Report to the people of San Francisco and is accessible through the College website. Statistical data within this report guides educational planning since it evaluates student outcomes in the areas of retention, persistence, and graduation rates. The findings of this report become the basis for the development of goals as articulated in the Strategic and Annual Plans for the College.

The systematic review of instructional programs primarily occurs through the Program Review process which was detailed in Section II.A.2.e, and is supplemented by the College Curriculum Committee. Program Review is designed to provide faculty the opportunity to engage in a self study that encompasses several aspects of their program including a review of student learning outcomes and program improvement. Once reviews are evaluated by the PRC and a report is submitted to and accepted by the College’s PBC, all Program Review documentation is posted online for review by the College community at large. Departments may also share SLO assessment results at departmental and interdepartmental meetings, on their websites, and at Flex workshops.

Another vehicle to support program improvement is tied to the allocation process for Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA) of 2006. Proposals for funding must fulfill CTE departmental needs and meet the criteria established under federal legislation. Applicants must demonstrate how departmental needs were evaluated (e.g., use of focus groups, advisory committee recommendations, or institutional data) and how they will support program quality and improvement. Proposals must meet the permissible uses of funds, as authorized by Perkins, and also demonstrate the use of Core Performance Indicators data in the proposal planning process and in the assessment of performance outcomes.

Sometimes systematic evaluation of instructional programs has led faculty to seek grants to develop new programmatic models. Faculty from the Health Education and Child Development and Family Studies (CDEV) departments obtained grant funding to develop, implement, evaluate, and disseminate a new course of academic study that prepares students to transfer to California State University campuses for further study in health, early childhood education, and other human services. This funding supports implementation of the Metro Academy, a model which restructures how educational programs are delivered (as a school within a school) and intends to help first-generation, low-income, and underrepresented students persist in their studies and complete their educational program in a timely manner. It is a long-duration learning community of linked classes, with students working together as a cohort over four semesters. All Metro core courses satisfy graduation requirements for the associate and bachelor’s degrees. Faculty in Health and CDEV learn in professional development seminars together with faculty from other departments (like English) how to integrate writing across the curriculum and how to include health and CDEV content in English courses. This joint project with San Francisco State University is a transfer model targeted at students whose goal is transfer who would benefit from additional supportive services and blended content. Initial studies of student success in the CCSF Metro Academy of Health show the pilot cohort had a retention rate of 80 percent after four semesters, and after the first year in Metro, the next cohort had a retention rate of 78 percent [II A-55].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College is committed to ongoing planning and utilizes a cyclical approach to review the planning and evaluation process, monitor progress, and align funding resources. Currently, the College’s PBC is reevaluating the continuation of the End-of-Year Assessment in its present form, as much of the information has been replicated in Program Review. It will review alternative formats for the End-of-Year Assessment, such as scorecards, dashboards, or key performance indicator reports, which are used by other colleges.

Institutional data are available to the College community on the website and efforts are continuously made to summarize and synthesize information in a readily understood format. As an example, the Chancellor has instituted a series of ongoing presentations made by various programs and departments to address achievement gaps. The Board of Trustees has also conducted hearings for the same purpose. It should be noted that the College has been severely impacted by the reduction in state funding. Nonetheless, CCSF continues to show constant progress and growth in measuring achievement through systematic, cyclical, and data driven methods.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.A.2.g. If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.

Descriptive Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

The English Department uses a variety of common assessments in its courses. English 90 and 91 require a common portfolio for promotion into subsequent courses. These portfolios, based on essays, annotated readings, and a cover letter, make use of one essay and one reading common to all sections. The English faculty use a common rubric for grading and grade portfolios as a group, using two raters to minimize differences between instructors and a third reader in the event of discrepancies. English 92, 93, 96, 1A, 1B, and 1C go through cycles of evaluation for assessment purposes and to guide the three-year course revision process. These may be common summaries, common essays, specific targeted strategies, reading, testing, et cetera. The new accelerated/intensive courses, English 95X and English 961A, will be going through a 3-year assessment process from Spring 2011 to Spring 2013, using many of the above-mentioned practices [II A-23 p. 6, 13-14].

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

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

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

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

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

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

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

Planning Agenda

None.

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

CCSF follows Title 5 standards for awarding credit for student work [II A-14 p. 31-37]. Each course has student learning outcomes, called major learning outcomes in the official course outline, and all courses use these SLOs as the basis for awarding credit. In Spring 2011, the Academic Policies Committee approved a policy statement confirming compliance with federal guidelines established in Fall 2010.

The ratio of hours of student work to units is verified by the Curriculum Committee during its review. The Curriculum Committee also reviews the Course Outlines of Record to ensure that the content of the course supports the learning outcomes of the course, and that the content justifies the units awarded [II A-14 p. 31-32].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College is in compliance with both Title 5 and federal guidelines.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

As listed in the 2011-12 College Catalog, the College offers 62 majors for the associate degree, 3 awards of achievement, 73 credit certificates of achievement, 88 credit certificates of accomplishment, 79 noncredit CDCP (Career Development College Preparation) certificates, and 5 noncredit certificates [II A-58 p.4-8]. In 2010-11, the college awarded 1232 associate degrees, 1574 credit certificates, and 226 noncredit certificates [II A-4]. In response to California Senate Bill 1440, the College created transfer degrees in psychology, speech communication, and physics. These degrees were developed in line with the statewide approved Transfer Model Curricula, intended to better prepare students for transfer to California State University. As more statewide Transfer Model Curricula are approved, the College will be reviewing them and developing more degrees.

The College Catalog contains detailed descriptions for all degree and certificate programs. The College awards degrees and certificates based upon completion of coursework from a program’s required core and elective courses. These program requirements are based on major learning outcomes established by faculty.

Successful completion of courses is based on student demonstration of proficiency of the stated major learning outcomes. All course outlines include multiple measures of assessment to ensure that students have indeed achieved the learning outcomes. These formats include essays, quizzes, exams, presentations, oral reports, demonstrations, and performances. Some programs in the arts and in career and technical education areas require the completion of capstone courses, portfolios, internships, or clinical practice. In some programs students demonstrate proficiency of the stated major learning outcomes through passing state licensure exams.

All degree programs and many certificate programs require a minimum grade point average of 2.0. These programs and certificates are consistent with Title 5 requirements and are approved by the Curriculum Committee, the Board of Trustees and, as necessary, the State Chancellor’s Office. They are scheduled for review and update at the department level every five years, although some are updated more often in response to labor market changes.

The College is currently formalizing and aligning the development of SLOs for all programs through the Curriculum Committee. Currently, the Career and Technical Education departments are identifying and assessing program SLOs, as are a number of transfer-oriented programs. The College’s Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, composed of administrators and members of the Academic Senate Executive Council, approved SLOs for the general education program.

The SLOs are regularly reviewed and evaluated at the department level which in turn can generate changes in portions of the Course Outline of Record and/or the creation of new courses to address student learning. The Mathematics and English departments recently completed assessments of their curriculum based on faculty dialog and feedback from Board- and College-sponsored equity hearings. Based on assessment results, a new intensive English course was designed and English and mathematics courses were also scheduled in an intensive 9-week format [II A-26 Sections 1 & 2]. Departments have also been asked to assess their progress in using SLOs to enhance student learning via the Program Review process.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the standard.

The College curriculum includes about 3000 courses and 300 programs. SLOs have been identified for all courses offered. While a concerted effort has been made to identify SLOs for all programs and complete the assessment cycle for all courses and programs, it is still a work in progress. Through a process of dialog throughout the District, the College has focused on general education and program SLOs to address student capacity to pursue continued higher education; basic skills curriculum to ensure student progress from noncredit to credit and basic skills to college level in the areas of mathematics, English, and ESL; and CTE SLOs to ensure students’ competency to enter the workforce as identified by the field experts. The College needs to further its work to continue to identify and assess SLOs for all programs.

The College awards a significant number of credit certificates and degrees and noncredit Business and TRST certificates. The College is working on improving the ability to award noncredit ESL certificates. Noncredit courses are open-entry/open-exit, and many do not culminate in a formally recorded grade, so the process of evaluation for certificate completion is difficult. In addition, the numbers reported do not include students who qualify for a certificate but who fail to file the appropriate paperwork. It is suspected that this represents a significant number of students.

Planning Agenda

1. The College will assess its general education Student Learning Outcomes, identify Student Learning Outcomes for certificates and programs that do not have any, and complete a corresponding assessment. The College will ensure that all active courses are continually assessed. The College will create a plan to formalize this assessment cycle to ensure it is at the proficiency level by Fall 2012.
2. The College will continue working to update practices to streamline the process of petitioning for certificates and degrees, and to encourage students to file for certificates for which they qualify. The College will continue to engage in discussions with Shared Governance bodies and the faculty union about developing procedures to facilitate awarding noncredit ESL certificates.

II.A.3 The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalogue. The institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.

Descriptive Summary

Students pursuing degree programs are required to pursue one of two different general education patterns. Nearly all of the College’s degree programs require completion of the College’s local general education requirements, which includes coursework in the following areas [II A-58 p. 47-61]:

* Communication and Analytical Thinking (Area A)
* Written Composition (Area B)
* Natural Sciences (Area C)
* Social and Behavioral Sciences (Area D)
* Humanities (Area E)
* United States History and Government (Area F)
* Health Knowledge and Physical Skills (Area G)
* Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies (Area H)

The College has a small number of degree programs designed to support transfer, as required by the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act (SB 1440). As required by this legislation, students pursuing these degree programs must complete either the California State University General Education (CSU GE) or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) pattern, and not the College’s local general education pattern [II A-59, II A-60, II A-61].

The College Catalog is the primary venue for communicating the general education goals, rationale, and philosophy to all stakeholders. The general education requirements section of the Catalog begins with a summary of the goals of the requirement areas. Each of the general education areas has a more detailed discussion, including learning outcomes, preceding the list of courses that satisfy that area [II A-58 p. 47-61]. These requirements and their descriptions are revised periodically and as needed in a process that usually begins with faculty and is always reviewed by the Academic Senate Executive Council before final approval by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.

As stated in the Catalog, the primary reason for the general education program is to foster in students a lifelong interest in their own learning and affirm the College’s commitment to graduating students who are prepared to participate in a diverse and democratic society.

Each course included in the list of courses for any of the general education requirements has been approved by the Curriculum Committee and then undergoes a rigorous review, comparing its course outline to the criteria for inclusion in the area that is proposed, to ensure that the learning outcomes for each course within the area mirror the learning outcomes for the requested general education area and the mission of the general education program as a whole. Successful proposals detail how the course meets those criteria, with specific reference to the course’s stated learning outcomes and their integration into the content and instructional methodology of the course. Faculty on the Academic Senate Executive Council (a 29-member body elected by the entire faculty), examine each proposal closely, looking for evidence in both the major learning outcomes and the course content that the course meets the criteria. To receive final approval for inclusion in a general education area, a course must be unanimously approved by all 34 members of the Bipartite Committee or by at least a two-thirds majority of the faculty and, separately, two-thirds of the administrators on the Committee. The process to add a new course to the general education requirements is a thoughtful, rigorous one that has resulted in a wide range of choices for students that ensure them a diverse, enriching education.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The general education program goals and philosophy are explicit, well-articulated, and carefully used to ensure that students receive the best education possible and to prepare them for full civic and workforce participation. Faculty and administrators take the decision about inclusion of a course in a general education area very seriously.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.A.3.a. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including the following: An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

Descriptive Summary

Title 5 Section 55063 establishes minimum requirements of the associate degree, including some basic parameters about the College’s general education program. Specifically, this section requires courses in natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, English composition, and communication and analytical thinking. The following areas in the College’s general education program have been established to meet those requirements [II A-58 p. 48-50]:

* Communication and Analytical Thinking (Area A)
* Written Composition (Area B)
* Natural Sciences (Area C)
* Social and Behavioral Sciences (Area D)
* Humanities (Area E)

Title 5 Section 55063 also allows the College to establish local general education requirements. The following areas have been established as local requirements of the College’s general education program [II A-58 p. 50-51]:

* United States History and Government (Area F)
* Health Knowledge and Physical Skills (Area G)
* Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies (Area H)

The Academic Senate established a philosophy and broad goals of the general education program in 1982, and established criteria that courses must meet in order to be included in the various general education areas. The most recent change to the College’s general education program came in Spring 1989, with the addition of Area H.

While there have been no major structural changes to the College’s general education program since 1989, there have been some changes to the standards and criteria for several of the areas. Specifically, the Written Composition requirement was updated beginning with the 2006-07 College Catalog to include information competency [II A-62 p. 54], and was further adjusted in the 2009-10 College Catalog to reflect a more stringent requirement [II A-63 p. 49]. While not a general education area, the mathematics graduation requirement was also updated effective with the 2009-10 College Catalog to reflect a more stringent requirement [II A-63 p. 52].

In the 2008-09 academic year, members of the Academic Senate met to establish learning outcomes for each of the general education areas. The learning outcomes that were established are closely tied to the inclusion criteria for the various areas, to ensure that any course included in an area include the learning outcomes that have been identified for that area. These were adopted by the Academic Senate and the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements in the Spring 2009 semester, and were first published in the 2009-10 College Catalog [II A-63 p. 48-51].

As noted in II.A.3, the College has a rigorous process for evaluating inclusion of courses into the various general education areas. Courses are reviewed to ensure that the learning outcomes of the course are aligned with the learning outcomes of the proposed general education area, thus assuring that the learning outcomes of the general education areas are reflected in the course outlines of applicable courses.

The College’s work to date in assessing the achievement of learning outcomes in the College’s general education areas has been at the department/discipline level. This is in keeping with the overall decentralized implementation strategy the College has taken in the assessment of learning outcomes. The sheer number of the College’s general education course options for students makes cross-disciplinary work on the assessment of learning outcomes challenging. For example, students can satisfy the College’s Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement (Area D) by taking one of over 175 courses across 27 disciplines. It has been a challenging process in which faculty in those disciplines collaborate on the assessment of learning outcomes.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

The College has a well-defined philosophy for its general education program, which includes the basic content of the major areas of knowledge. This general education philosophy, developed by the Academic Senate through the 1980s, has proven robust and has served the College well for over 20 years. There is a rigorous process that ensures that the learning outcomes that have been established for the various general education areas are reflected in the course outlines of courses required for those areas. Additionally, each course listed under the general education areas is reviewed by faculty who teach that course and SLOs are created and assessed for each individual course on a continuing basis.

Work remains on having a cross-disciplinary approach to the assessment of learning outcomes, but it is complicated by the breadth of offerings in most of these areas. The College has not yet established mechanisms by which it systematically assesses how well students use the knowledge gained in its general education program when they are enrolled in subsequent courses, employed, or involved in other endeavors. However, the College has established a series of workshops in which faculty teaching courses under each General Education area meet and discuss the SLO process and assessment for their courses. While these outcomes are specific and unique for each individual course, this workshop allows for a collegial discourse across disciplines.

Planning Agenda

Despite the challenges faced, the College will pursue the assessment of learning outcomes across the disciplines represented in the College’s general education areas.

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

Descriptive Summary

Several of the College’s graduation requirements directly apply to students’ abilities to be a productive individual and lifelong learner:

* Written Composition (Area B) encompasses both written communication and information competency. Students must take English 1A to meet this requirement, and will complete five hours of workshops offered by the Library in information competency as part of that course.
* Scientific and quantitative reasoning are assessed in both the College’s Natural Sciences (Area C) general education area and in the College’s separate mathematics graduation requirement.
* Critical analysis and logical thinking are covered in detail in courses used to meet the Communication and Analytical Thinking (Area A) general education requirement.
* Courses selected for inclusion in Written Composition (Area B) must show that students will be able to communicate clearly both in writing and orally.

More broadly, courses offered by the College that are deemed to be applicable to the associate degree have been evaluated by the College’s Curriculum Committee against the requirements of Title 5 Section 55002(a) [II A-14 p. 16-17]. This ensures that students have a number of experiences in courses that require critical thinking and the understanding and application of concepts at the college level. Further, these courses have required students to study independently outside of class time. The College’s Curriculum Committee reviews all proposed degree-applicable courses, and uses the proposed course outline of record as the basis of its approval. Finally, many of the courses that a student takes while pursuing an associate degree require written and/or oral expression, so students will get practice with these skills in contextualized settings.

In noncredit, the Older Adults Department trains life-long learners to maintain their independence and age successfully.

As noted in the College’s response to II.A.3.a, the College’s work to date in assessing the achievement of these learning outcomes has been at the department/discipline level. Again, this is in keeping with the overall decentralized implementation strategy the College has taken in the assessment of learning outcomes. The College has yet to implement broad cross-disciplinary strategies to the assessment of learning outcomes.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

The College has a well-constructed approach to lifelong learning in the College’s general education program. The College has a rigorous process of review of all courses deemed appropriate to the associate degree, ensuring that students have a variety of experiences in courses requiring collegiate-level critical thinking. The College has a decentralized approach to the assessment of learning outcomes related to lifelong learning. Work remains on having a cross-disciplinary approach to this assessment, but is complicated by the breadth of offerings in most of these areas.

Planning Agenda

The College will pursue the assessment of learning outcomes across the disciplines and general education areas related to lifelong learning.

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

Descriptive Summary

The general education program has several requirements related to ethics and effective citizenship, specifically Areas E, F and H [II A-58 p. 49-50]:

* Students develop an appreciation and understanding of the ways in which people throughout the ages and in different cultures have responded to themselves and to the world around them through artistic and cultural creation, and have developed aesthetic sensitivity and skills as well as an ability to make informed value judgments in courses related to the College’s Humanities (Area E) requirement.
* Students examine and understand the importance of participating in civic duties and responsibilities based on historical and political precedent in courses related to the College’s United States History and Government (Area F) requirement.
* Students develop an appreciation and understanding of the history, culture, and perspective of diverse ethnic groups, women, and people of diverse sexual orientations and identities through courses satisfying the College’s Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies (Area H) requirement.

As noted in the College’s response to II.A.3, broad goals related to ethics and effective citizenship were established by the Academic Senate, and learning outcomes for each of these areas were established in Spring 2008 [II A-63 p. 51]. In noncredit, students may take courses in citizenship and workplace skills. ESL offers “El Civics”, a sequence of civics modules.

In addition, the College offers a variety of opportunities for students to further their experiences related to ethics and citizenship. Citizenship within the College is fostered through the Office of Outreach and Recruitment’s Ambassadors’ program. A cadre of current students helps to orient incoming freshman to the campus and college culture. During the year, the Ambassadors visit high schools and community-based agencies to recruit prospective students. In 10-11, Student Ambassadors served a total of 13,535 prospective students and 913 parents through campus tours, high school presentations and tabling events [II A-64 p. 1].

The Associated Students collaborates with CCSF student development services to facilitate students’ engagement with the College and wider community. Through the Office of Student Activities, students may get more involved in CCSF through the student clubs, student government, or any one of the ten Associated Students supported Resource Centers: Bookloan Program, Family Resource Center, Guardian Scholars, Homeless At-Risk Transitional Students (HARTS) program, Multicultural Resource Center, Students Supporting Students, Queer Resource Center, Veterans Educational Transition Services, and Immigrant Resource Center.

Student government on the Ocean Campus is composed of a student body president and sixteen students elected to the student senate [II A-65]. Members of student government are required to enroll in Student Leadership 12. Other options for student engagement on the Ocean Campus include 80 student clubs [II A-66], each of which sends a representative to form the membership for the Interclub Council. Additionally, students at other campuses have an opportunity to engage in student leadership, with seven campuses plus the Adult Learning and Tutorial Center at Gough Street having active Associated Student Councils. The seven campuses are: Chinatown/North Beach, Civic Center, Downtown, Evans, John Adams, Mission, and Southeast.

The Office of Mentoring and Service-Learning oversees the collaborative efforts of instructors and community partners to instill a sense of civic engagement. For example, in Project SHINE, students enrolled in various credit courses volunteer in CCSF’s noncredit citizenship and ESL classes to coach elders in learning content to pass the citizenship exam or improve their English skills [II A-66].

In addition, there are approximately 15 projects designed for students to provide service both to communities outside of the College and within the College, enabling students to develop leadership skills. Many of the projects are not tied to a specific course, but are associated with the following departments: Music; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Studies; Health Education; Child Development and Family Studies; Astronomy; and Student Health Services. Courses which have sections linked to the projects include: WOMN 25; ENGL 93 and 96; BIO 26; LALS 15; SOC 1, 2, and 30; LBCS 93D; CNIT 197; and FASH 45A. In Fall 2010, credit courses that offered Project SHINE as a service learning option included: ASAM 20, 30, and 35; IDST 50; SPAN 3A; ESL 79, 150, and 160; POLS 1, 2, and 3; LALS 10; HLTH 10; and ENGL 93.

Faculty members at CCSF have access to the Multicultural Infusion Project, which supports selected faculty in transforming curriculum to infuse multicultural content and practice. Monthly meetings are held to develop an appreciation of cultural diversity through pedagogy and content. Annual meetings enable participants to reflect on ways in which the institution can better serve underrepresented students.

The Art Department promotes cultural engagement through the art club and student art exhibitions. Through the faculty-sponsored art club, enrolled art students meet to create, view, and critique their art and that of others. The club can also help to organize and publicize group shows that are exhibited in the community. The Art Department also maintains two galleries and several viewing areas at the Fort Mason site and the Ocean campus and at the Gough Street site. At these venues, students have the opportunity to exhibit their work in select and juried exhibitions, learning how to exhibit and promote their work and address criticism outside of a classroom setting. These learning platforms provide students with a non-classroom experience in which emotive response, critical thought, and civility are developed as students offer their unique perspectives of the world and its cultural connections.

The College is privileged to be the steward of Mexican muralist Diego Rivera’s 1940 work depicting Pan American unity. It exemplifies the use of art to create a cultural awareness of a historical movement addressing relevant social and political issues. The mural, staffed with trained student docents, is accessible to the public and included by student ambassadors in their campus tours presentations. To incorporate a cultural perspective into their courses, faculty members in many departments (ESL, Social Sciences, Art, Foreign Languages, English, etc.) integrate all or parts of Rivera’s mural into their courses. In Latin American & Latino Studies 14 (LALS 14), students participate in a unique, full semester credit course with ongoing research about Diego Rivera, his life, his work, and the mural, and contribute their work to the Rivera Collection, a special library collection housed in the Rosenberg Library/LRC.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

All students pursuing the associate degree take courses related to ethics and effective citizenship. The College has a rigorous process to evaluate courses for inclusion in the related general education areas, ensuring that the course outlines reflect the learning outcomes for courses in these areas. Additionally, existing extracurricular programs provide excellent vehicles for students to engage in activities and practices to grow as ethical human beings and effective citizens.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

CCSF offers associate degrees in compliance with Title 5 Section 55063. The Associate in Science (AS), Associate in Arts (AA), Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T), and Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T) degrees are awarded by CCSF based on the satisfaction of several different requirements, as noted in the Associate Degree Graduation Requirements section of the Catalog [II A-58 p. 45-53]. Among the listed requirements is the major requirement, which students can satisfy in one of several ways:

* Students can follow a specific major that has been developed by an instructional department at CCSF and approved by the State Chancellor's Office;
* Students can follow one of four Areas of Emphasis in the Liberal Arts and Sciences program: Arts and Humanities, Communication, Science and Mathematics, and Social and Behavioral Sciences (AA and AS only);
* Students can complete 18 units in a particular field of study if a major curriculum has not been specified by the department (AA and AS only).

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF continues to make it a priority that the education offered in its degree programs is not only consistently broad and current, but also comprehensive and elective—reflecting the interests of the student earning the degree. CCSF’s priorities as an institution are to provide broad perspective as well as specialization within all of its degree programs.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco offers 25 general areas of career and technical study, which include 178 credit and noncredit certificates, degrees or Awards of Achievement. Of these programs, at least 28 prepare students for passing external licensing or certifying exams. Any new certificate of 18 units or higher or degree program must complete a rigorous review process established by the Education Code. The process involves obtaining Labor Market Research, input from Advisory Boards, and approval from the College Curriculum Committee, as well as the endorsement of the Bay Area Community College Occupational Planning Committee. These activities, along with the program review conducted by each career and technical education program, contribute to the standards demanded by employers and external licensing agencies.

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

To promote the goal of meeting employment standards, occupational programs are required to meet with Industry Advisory Boards. Members include industry professionals who provide feedback that assists departments in the curricular changes to maintain programmatic currency. Examples include: The Business Advisory Board provided input into Green and Sustainable Business program development and the use of social media in business [II A-69]; the Real Estate Advisory Board gave curriculum development input for Real Estate Marketing and Commercial Real Estate courses, and updates on local commercial leasing and mortgage lending changes [II A-70]; the Trauma Prevention and Recovery Advisory Board reviewed student learning outcomes and provided input for certificate modifications [II A-71 p. 3-4]; the Drug and Alcohol Studies Board provided input on the collaboration between the Drug and Alcohol Studies program and the new CCSF Community Mental Health Certificate program and the development of an internship preparation workshop [II A-72 p. 3-5].

Many programs rely on their pool of part-time faculty who concurrently hold jobs in industry or are practicing artists. These individuals bring to the College their direct, relevant and current experience in the field, which results in ongoing dialog with full-time faculty and the revision of curriculum to reflect industry practices and standards. Additionally, many faculty are active members, or even board members, of industry or professional associations, such as the American Association for Paralegal Education, the California Association of Realtors, California Association of Drug and Alcohol Educators, and the Northwest Stone Sculptors Association, as well as several professional health associations. Faculty involvement in these groups also strengthens industry connections that lead to ongoing curricular updates and increased standards. Child Development and Family Studies faculty are members of a total of 15 local advisory and policy boards in San Francisco [II A-73].

CCSF’s Office of Workforce and Economic Development oversees the California Resource Center for Occupational Program Design and Evaluation. Its function is to provide service to business, education and industry by conducting DACUM job analyses. Trained CCSF faculty working for this Center help CCSF departments and other colleges create or update an ideal education or training program for specific industry needs. Several career and technical programs have completed DACUMs, most recently the Fashion and Design and Hybrid Technology in Automotive Technology programs.

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

Job placement data are also obtained through Career Connection, a grant-funded online job placement tool free to all CCSF students and alumni, which includes an employer follow-up tracking survey. In 2010-11, the College formed a working group to explore new technologies and processes that would increase the effectiveness of job placement tracking and assessment of student technical and professional competencies. The group completed its assessment and identified an online tool (also used by other colleges) that will better facilitate student internships and employment [II A-74].

1. During Fall 2011, CCSF joined 14 other colleges around the state to collaborate on the CTE Employment Outcomes Project. CCSF will be working with the Research and Planning Group as well as community colleges to collect data from CTE students who have completed a certificate or are no longer studying at the College. The CCSF student survey will ask about current employment status, including whether students are working in the field of study, how much they are making and whether the program prepared them for their job. The long-term goal of this pilot program is to set up the appropriate tools and process to track CCSF student employment success data moving forward.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Many career and technical programs are outstanding in preparing students for employment competencies. They stay abreast of current needs of industry, work closely with advisory boards, and regularly revise curriculum to maintain relevance to the workforce. They also have implemented tracking systems to measure student success rates and regularly produce the highly skilled graduates the local economy demands.

Program success is also exemplified through national and statewide recognition. In Fall 2010, the Diagnostic Medical Imaging program received the Minnies’ Award as one of the top two institutions in the nation for learning diagnostic radiology, second only to Johns Hopkins University Medical Center [II A-75 p. 1]. In Spring 2011, CCSF Journalism students won a combined 20 awards in the Journalism Association of Community Colleges competition. General excellence awards were also won by student publications, *The Guardsman* newspaper and *Etc. Magazine* [II A-76].

Overall, CCSF has done a satisfactory job in developing processes to acquire information about students’ ability to meet employer standards and pass external exams. Since the previous Self-Study report was completed, the College has been looking at this area more carefully. As a result, a working group has been developed which is taking serious steps to adopt a comprehensive job development and placement tracking tool. More advanced technological resources are now available that did not exist previously, making this a more feasible option.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

The Catalog is available in print and online, and includes clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. Courses and programs are reviewed for catalog inclusion by department chairs at least once a year and are further reviewed by the Dean of Instruction before inclusion in the Catalog.

New courses and programs are developed according to standards outlined in the Curriculum Committee Handbook, which includes student learning outcomes. Courses and programs are reviewed by Department Chairs, the Curriculum Committee and Dean of Instruction. In accordance with Program Review requirements, all courses are updated and reviewed within a six-year cycle. Student Learning Outcomes for programs are increasingly being developed and added to the Catalog and program brochures.

As stated in the CCSF Faculty Handbook, all credit instructors are mandated to distribute thorough syllabi, which include course expectations and student learning outcomes [II A-77, p 52]. In the 2010-11 Credit Student Opinion Survey, 93 percent of students responded favorably when asked if they had received a syllabus that specified what they would learn in the class [II A-78 p. 2]. Additionally, all faculty are subject to evaluation every three years, which includes reviewing course syllabi and their relation to the official course outline of record.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF is undergoing a systematic effort to ensure that all new courses and programs meet the requirements for clarity and stated learning outcomes. Instructors, Department Chairs, School Deans and the Dean of Instruction all review courses and/or program descriptions for clarity and stated outcomes and objectives. Course and program descriptions are based on the rubric as stated in the Curriculum Committee Handbook. The College verifies that individual courses adhere to the course objectives/learning outcomes through peer, student, and tenure review of faculty and through departmental review of courses and program requirements.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Students may use coursework completed at other institutions to fulfill program, general education, and/or elective unit requirements for the associate degree or certificate programs at City College of San Francisco. The 2011-12 College Catalog includes a clear policy for evaluating coursework transferred from other institutions [II A-58 p. 416]. Students may use lower and/or upper division transfer coursework to fulfill any or all of the following:

* specific program requirements for a certificate, major, or award of achievement;
* general education graduation requirements; or
* unit requirement for graduation (minimum of 60 semester units).

The unit requirement may be met with courses from regionally accredited (e.g., accredited by Western Association of Schools and Colleges) colleges or universities. Students are subject to the residence requirement for the associate degree, regardless of the number of units transferred into the College.

Program and general education requirements must be evaluated through the course equivalency process. Course equivalency is determined by the chair(s) of the department(s) offering comparable courses, and is communicated by them to the Office of Admissions and Records (A&R) via the “Evaluation of Course Equivalency” form [II A-79]. Counselors often assist students in identifying possible course equivalencies. Student inquiries with either a specific department or with A&R should occur prior to petitioning for graduation.

The policy and procedures for accepting incoming courses are reviewed periodically by the Academic Policies Committee. The College is currently working to streamline its course equivalency process to better serve students and faculty.

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

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

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

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

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Articulation information is extensive and frequently updated. Policies are clear and updated in response to student needs.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

According to California Education Code Section 70902 /Title 5, CCR, Sections 55230 et seq. and 53203, ultimate approval for program revision (major changes) rests with the Chancellor of the College. Guidance for program revision is covered in the Curriculum Committee Handbook [II A-14 p. 79-80]. Revisions typically originate and develop at the departmental level with final forms being submitted to the Curriculum Committee for further processing and approval.

For non-academic programs, California Education Code, Section 78016 provides for the review of and termination of vocational programs that do not meet established criteria and Board Policy 6.14 establishes that the institution will terminate vocational programs in accordance with applicable law. Interviews with department heads, school Deans, and program chairs have revealed that, in general, departments assess the needs for their programs according to internal and external criteria and revise accordingly.

There is no College wide policy for departmental evaluation of individual programs for termination or modification. Students are informed and supported by faculty, department heads, and counselors/advisers when programs are modified or terminated. The CCSF 2011-12 Catalog explains protection against changes in programs ("catalog rights"). The stated policy ensures that if programs are changed during the time a student has been continuously enrolled, the student has a right to follow the program as originally stated in the catalog which was in effect at the onset of his or her study. If a course is no longer offered, the department makes accommodations for students by accepting a replacement course, waiving a course requirement, etc. [II A-58 p. 46].

In practice, when a program is deemed terminable, the usual procedure (phasing out) is to close enrollment into the program and allow current students to complete remaining coursework. All efforts are made to ensure students achieve their educational goals. When revisions are finalized, the counseling departments are notified and appropriate campus counselors advised on how to assist affected students realize their educational goals.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Program eliminations and modifications are successfully handled at the departmental level with appropriate approvals received from Administration. Special care is taken to ensure students can continue their progression toward their educational goals. Students’ educational progress is protected via the College Catalog Rights policy.

Although the College has employed a successful process for program elimination, there is no College wide policy that establishes formalized procedures to follow regarding program modification and elimination, other than the information found in the Curriculum Committee Handbook. However, each department has successfully handled needed program adjustments to ensure its viability and supported affected students to ensure their educational success.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.A.6.c. The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.

Descriptive Summary

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

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

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

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

The College Class Schedule is printed three times a year and when budget allows, is mailed to all San Francisco residents and public libraries, and is available through the CCSF Bookstore and on all campuses. This schedule provides detailed information about each semester’s course offerings, campus maps, and information about programs and services the College offers. With each publication, the Schedule is reviewed for accuracy, currency, and completeness by the Office of Marketing and Public Information and the Chancellor.

The Office of Marketing and Public Information publishes the weekly in-house newspaper *City Currents*, which features faculty and staff accomplishments, Board news, student achievements, and current events at the College.

In order to save on printing costs, the Office of Marketing and Public Information recently shifted from a print to an electronic format for *City Currents*, which is now posted weekly on the College website and is distributed electronically to all personnel via the College’s email system. The Office also serves as a point of entry for all outside inquiries about the College’s policies and procedures, referring requests for public records to the College’s Legal Counsel, and directing all press inquiries to the appropriate vice-chancellor, dean or department chair. Finally, the Office communicates the College’s mission and programs to the community via outreach such as advertisements in all San Francisco neighborhood and ethnic newspapers.

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

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

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

Most recently, the Outreach Office started a City College Facebook page offering information about upcoming scholarship applications, registration deadlines, job opportunities, and campus events, as well as links to in-house videos about the College counseling programs, student achievements, and international student assistance programs. As of May 2011, the Facebook page had 5,832 registered “fans.”

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

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

CCSF reviews and updates its published materials thoroughly and regularly, and communicates its mission, policies, and procedures in a clear, consistent manner to students, personnel, and the public. The College has taken steps to address the problems with its website mentioned in the 2006 WASC review, and continues to work on the currency and accessibility of information.

Planning Agenda

None.

II.A.7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or world views. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

Descriptive Summary

The College has clear policies that illustrate its commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. Accessible through the SFCCD Board Policy Manual in print   
and online, Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Freedom” clearly defines academic freedom with its rights and responsibilities and contains guidelines for textbook selection, library selections, and public forums [II A-85]. The

SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement 10/22/09-6/30/12 includes Article 8, “Academic Freedom, Duties, and Responsibilities,” and Article 30, “Intellectual Property”[II A-86]. Both the District P.M. 6.06 on Academic Freedom and the SFCCD/AFT 2121 Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 8. are cited in Section 4.1”Academic Freedom” in the Faculty Handbook [II A-77]

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

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has always been committed to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and has in place policies that support these commitments. The student academic policy is readily available to students and staff. The website has been expanded so all materials are readily available online.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

Board Policy 6.06 entitled “Intellectual Academic,” clearly defines academic freedom with its rights and responsibilities. It demonstrates institutional commitment to free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge [II A-85].

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mode** | **Question** |
| Credit | Does the instructor seem to be free of racial, sexual, religious and political prejudices? |
| Noncredit | Shows respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups. |
| ESL | The teacher respects the students. |

Students are asked to rate faculty on a 5-point scale, with 1 representing Never, and 5 representing Always. A review of the results over the last few semesters shows that, on average, faculty score very well on these questions, both in an absolute sense, and in comparison to the other questions on the survey. Generally, faculty scored between 4.8 and 4.9, which is higher than the average scores of the other questions, and indicative of the faculty’s ability to create a bias-free learning environment and to distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline [II A-17].

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

The SFCCD Policy Manual states, “The College requires certain standards of conduct of all its students. The College shall adopt rules and regulations governing student behavior along with appropriate penalties for student misconduct consistent with applicable law” [II A-88]. With reference to academic honesty, it has adopted and published policies to address this issue, so that faculty, students, and the public are kept informed.

Academic or intellectual dishonesty is outlined in Rules of Student Conduct under College Rules and Regulations in the 2011-12 CCSF Catalog as well as the “Types of Discipline” to be administered [II A-58 p. 401]. Also, academic or intellectual dishonesty, such as cheating or plagiarism, is the first item discussed in the section on Grounds for Disciplinary Action under the heading, Student Conduct in the CCSF Student Handbook [II A-87 p. 58].

The types of disciplinary action are also clearly identified in the Handbook. Furthermore, the English Department policy on plagiarism [II A-89] and that of the ESL Department [II A-90] have specific measures addressing academic dishonesty. These documents are given to students during the first week of class and are available at the departmental offices throughout the year. Noncredit Business at the John Adams Campus has specific documents on appropriate computer usage posted in the computer labs there.

The College has been very thorough in establishing and publishing clear expectations regarding student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty. The CCSF Catalog clearly states the disciplinary sanctions for academic or intellectual dishonesty and the process [II A-58 p. 401-402]. Moreover, the Catalog clearly specifies that students have a right to due process and it is the responsibility of the Office of Student Advocacy, Rights and Responsibilities to assure the implementation of this due process.

The Library & Learning Resources Spring 2008 Assessment of Research Skills Workshops confirmed the need to address responsible use of information and to support curricular opportunities to learn about plagiarism [II A-91]. Information about proper citation format was added to all the library skills workshops. Moreover, the Library’s Information Competency & Curriculum Committee developed a separate workshop to teach citation format and how to avoid plagiarism in Fall 2008. Content and activities in *Workshop P: Citing Sources Responsibly* address the following two SLOs: 1) Students prepare in-text citations and citations for the “Works Cited” list/bibliography using an appropriate style manual such as MLA or APA; and 2) Students demonstrate understanding of CCSF computer-use policies and legal-ethical practices regarding access and use of the Internet, plagiarism and copyright. Workshop P has been well received by all instructors who are aware of it, many of whom require students to complete it as part of their coursework.

In its Mission and Vision statements which are posted at every campus, in various publications, and on the CCSF website, the College emphasizes that “In our community, respect and trust are common virtues…” At an institutional level, these high ideals set a standard of conduct that fosters academic honesty. These ideals are reinforced in the classroom—many faculty members include explicit policy language about academic honesty in the course syllabi.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College makes its policies on academic honesty readily available to both students and faculty through the CCSF Catalog and the CCSF Student Handbook and Planner. The Catalog is available both in printed hard copy and online. The Student Handbook is published in hard copy (a small, spiral bound booklet) and available to students at the various CCSF campuses primarily through the new student orientation process.

In addition, the fact that various departments have also developed specific policy documents further serves to inform both students and faculty that policies on academic honesty do exist and that there are formal procedures and a process in place when breaches occur.

The College has made a conscious effort to make all public documents available on its website. With the CCSF Catalog readily accessible online, students and faculty can directly access the College’s policies on academic honesty, the consequences of academic dishonesty, and the disciplinary sanctions to be imposed for such misconduct.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Standard II.A Evidence

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Title** | **Web Address** |
| II A-1 | Engineering and Technology Program Review, 2010-11 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Engineering and Technology Program Review, 2010-11.doc](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Engineering%20and%20Technology%20Program%20Review,%202010-11.doc) |
| II A-2 | Evans Campus Program Review, 2010-11 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Evans Campus Program Review, 2010-11.doc](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Evans%20Campus%20Program%20Review,%202010-11.doc) |
| II A-3 | Chancellor’s Office Program and Course Approval Handbook, 3rd Edition | <http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/OfficeOfInstruction/StatePaperwork/ProgramApproval_501.pdf> |
| II A-4 | Chancellor’s Office Data Mart – Student Program Awards, 2009-10 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/CCCOStudentProgramAwards2009-10.pdf> |
| II A-5 | Perkins Career and Technical Education Act Core Indicator Report, 2011-12 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Perkins Career and Technical Education Act Core Indicator Report.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Perkins%20Career%20and%20Technical%20Education%20Act%20Core%20Indicator%20Report.pdf) |
| II A-6 | California Post-Secondary Education Commission. Transfer Pathway Charts | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/PathwayCharts.pdf> |
| II A-7 | Environmental Scan, Internal Trends, February 10, 2010 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/InternalEnvironmentalScan2010.pdf> |
| II A-8 | Environmental Scan, External Trends, February 10, 2010 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/ExternalEnvironmentalScan2010.pdf> |
| II A-9 | The High School Report XII: The Placement, Performance and Persistence of New Students from SFUSD High Schools, May 2011 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/hsr2011.pdf> |
| II A-10 | Student Equity and the Achievement Gap Report, October 2009 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Whatishot/EquityReport-October_2009.pdf> |
| II A-11 | Executive Summary Update: Student Success, Equity Initiatives & Departmental Reforms, October 2010 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/pdf/dsfet01.pdf> |
| II A-12 | Education Technology Program Review, 2010-11 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Education Technology Department Program Review, 2010-11.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Education%20Technology%20Department%20Program%20Review,%202010-11.pdf) |
| II A-13 | Chancellor’s Office Data Mart – Program/Retention Success Rates By Distance Education Status, Fall 2010 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/CCCOProgramRetentionSuccess2010.pdf> |
| II A-14 | Curriculum Handbook | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Curriculum_Committee/handbook.html> |
| II A-15 | UCLA California Community College Admissions, Fall 2006 – Fall 2009 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Appendix 6 Adm StatsF06-F09\_CCSF.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Appendix%206%20Adm%20StatsF06-F09_CCSF.pdf) |
| II A-16 | Concurrent Enrollment Banner  Report 2009-10 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Concurrent Enrollment Banner Report 2009-10.xls](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Concurrent%20Enrollment%20Banner%20Report%202009-10.xls) |
| II A-17 | Fall 2010 Student Evaluation Summary Statistics, Credit, Noncredit, ESL, Library | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/pdf/200910Faculty EvaluationSummary.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/200910Faculty%20EvaluationSummary.pdf) |
| II A-18 | Student Concerns raised at Equity Hearings, February 9-18, 2010 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/EquityConcerns.pdf> |
| II A-19 | WASC Annual Report, Final Submission, June 10, 2011 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/SLO_ReportToACCJC.pdf> |
| II A-20 | SLO Process by Course for Earth Sciences, Fall 2010 – Spring 2011 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Departments/Earth_Sciences/SLOs/SLOReviewJan2011.pdf> |
| II A-21 | Architecture Program Review, 2010-11 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Architecture Program Review 2010-11.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Architecture%20Program%20Review%202010-11.pdf) |
| II A-22 | Art Program Review, 2010-11 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Art Department Program Review, 2010-11.doc](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Art%20Department%20Program%20Review,%202010-11.doc) |
| II A-23 | English Program Review, 2010-11 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/English Department Program Review, 2010-11.doc](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/English%20Department%20Program%20Review,%202010-11.doc) |
| II A-24 | Health Education Program Review, 2010-11 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Health Education Program Review, 2010-11.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Health%20Education%20Program%20Review,%202010-11.pdf) |
| II A-25 | Mathematics Program Review, 2010-11 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/Mathematics Program Review, 2010-11.doc](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/Mathematics%20Program%20Review,%202010-11.doc) |
| II A-26 | Chancellor's Progress Report, Student Equity and the Achievement Gap, June 24, 2010 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/student-services/student-counseling/extended-opportunity-programs-and-services/News/\_jcr\_content/contentparsys/documentlink/file.res/Student Equity Report psetf0610.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/student-services/student-counseling/extended-opportunity-programs-and-services/News/_jcr_content/contentparsys/documentlink/file.res/Student%20Equity%20Report%20psetf0610.pdf) |
| II A-27 | Chancellor’s Taskforce Report on Student Equity and the Achievement Gap, April 28, 2011 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/pdf/psetf0411.pdf> |
| II A-28 | Curriculum Committee, Technical Review | <http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Curriculum_Committee/tech_review.html> |
| II A-29 | Peer or Peer Management Evaluation | <http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/OfficeOfInstruction/EvaluationForms/Exhibit_D_Peer.pdf> |
| II A-30 | Curriculum Committee Actions, Fall 2010 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/ACTIONS OF CURRCOMM FA2010.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/ACTIONS%20OF%20CURRCOMM%20FA2010.pdf) |
| II A-31 | Curriculum Committee Actions, Spring 2011 | [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research\_Planning/WASC/ACTIONS OF CURRCOMM SP2011.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/WASC/ACTIONS%20OF%20CURRCOMM%20SP2011.pdf) |
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| II A-82 | Academic Policy and Related Changes, 2011-12 | <http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/documents/OfficeOfInstruction/Catalog/PolicyUpdate_2011-12.pdf> |
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