EVALUATION REPORT

City College of San Francisco

50 Phelan Avenue
San Francisco, California 94112

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
City College of San Francisco from March 11 through March 15, 2012

Sandra V. Serrano, Chair

City College of San Francisco
Comprehensive Evaluation Team Roster
March 11-15, 2012

Ms. Sandra Serrano (Chair)
Chancellor
Kern Community College District

Ms. Michele Bresso (Assistant)
Associate Vice Chancellor, Governmental and External Relations
Kern Community College District

Dr. Barbara Blanchard
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Grossmont College

Dr. Marybeth Buechner
Dean, Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness
Sacramento City College

Ms. Lynne Brower
Director, Continuing Education
Los Angeles Valley College

Ms. Meghan Chen
Dean, Library and Learning Resources
Mt. San Antonio College

Mr. J. Brian Haley
Dean, Learning Resources
Sierra College

Dr. Melissa Raby
Dean, Student Services
Columbia College

Mr. Peter Crabtree
Division Dean of Instruction,
Career and Technical Education
Laney College

Ms. Judith Chen Haggerty, JD, Esq.
Trustee
Mt. San Antonio College

Mr. Sean James
Vice Chancellor, Operations Management
Kern Community College District

Ms. Jeannette Redding
Professor, English and ESL
Oxnard College

Dr. Linda Lacy
Superintendent/President
Cerritos College

Dr. Wendy Stewart
Dean, Counseling and Student Development
MiraCosta College

Ms. Becky Elam
Vice President, Business Services
Mt San Jacinto College

Ms. Pat Flood
Department Chair, Business and Law
LA Mission College

Ms. Alicia Munoz
Department Chair, ESL
Cuyamaca College

SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: City College of San Francisco

DATE OF VISIT: March 11 – 15, 2012

TEAM CHAIR: Sandra V. Serrano, J.D.
Chancellor, Kern Community College District

A 17-member team visited City College of San Francisco from March 11 through 15, 2012, for the purpose of evaluating the institution's request for reaffirmation of accreditation. Through the review of documented evidence and through many interviews, two open forums, and attending standing meetings, the team conducted its evaluation and determined how well the institution was meeting the standards of accreditation and achieving its stated purposes, as outlined in the Accrediting Commission's 21 eligibility requirements and four standards of accreditation.

The college's self evaluation was well prepared and thorough. The college certified its self evaluation report in December 2011, following its comprehensive review by the college accreditation steering committee. City College of San Francisco also provided to the visiting team a 2012 Self Study Update that described events or changes that had occurred between November 1, 2011 and January 31, 2012. Additionally, the college was responsive in meeting the requests of team members for documentation not readily available, and in some cases, creating the documentation from scratch to fulfill specific requests of the team.

The team made extensive efforts to prepare for the visit. The team chair attended a team chair orientation on December 2, 2012, and most team members attended a team orientation provided by the Commission on February 7, 2012. Several members were added to the visiting team following the Commission Team Training and were trained in other venues. The team chair and team assistant conducted an advance visit to City College of San Francisco on January 16-17, 2012. Prior to the team visit, team members carefully read the college's self evaluation and related documents, including the recommendations of the previous accreditation evaluation team that visited the college in 2006. The team also completed preliminary assignments designed to provide initial impressions of the institution's self assessment.

Because of the size and complexity of City College of San Francisco, the visiting team conducted its review by adding one day to the visit. The team arrived on Sunday, March 11, for its team orientation and first meeting. The team spent Monday, March 12, in a thorough review of evidence, tours of many of the nine primary campuses, and initial meetings with campus leaders. Due to the extensive number of primary campuses, visits also took place on Tuesday, March 13. This additional time and effort ensured that the work for the remainder of the visit was able to be accomplished in an efficient and productive manner over the subsequent days.

During the visit, the team met with a large number of individuals at numerous campuses of the institution, including members of the Board of Trustees, the chancellor, administrators, faculty members, classified staff, and students. In addition, the team members conducted two, well-publicized open sessions for members of the college community and public who wished to convey their perspectives about the college's purpose and effectiveness directly to the team. The public open sessions were held on the Ocean (main) Campus and the Mission Campus.

The college is commended for the strong commitment demonstrated by the faculty, classified staff, administration and the Board of Trustees to the mission of the college that connects to the diverse communities served by the college and its partners to foster academic success among all students. A genuine engagement exists with the students served by the college and with the communities from which those students come.

The comprehensive institutional self evaluation and the visiting team evaluation collectively revealed overarching challenges that City College of San Francisco will need to address to improve institutional quality and effectiveness as noted in the following bulleted list.

Overarching Institutional Challenges

- City College of San Francisco has begun but not completed several promising planning and evaluative processes in recent years. The institution has developed a process for program review, planning and assessment, and the team was impressed by the potential of the CCSF model for program review. However, based on the team's interviews and review of college planning initiatives, as well as annual program reviews and independent assessments by external agencies, the team did not find evidence of a systematic and fully implemented model to measure and improve institutional effectiveness to improve student learning outcomes. City College of San Francisco needs to fully integrate the major components of a comprehensive planning process that is directly linked to an annual budget that reflects accurate assumptions for revenue, whether in years of growth or reduction.

- Student learning outcomes, student achievement, and assessment are recurrent topics of discussion that are described in the college's self study and captured in committee meeting minutes. Nonetheless, discussion has not evolved into institution-wide practice. In the team's judgment, City College of San Francisco did not demonstrate proficiency in assessing student learning outcomes or sustainable continuous improvement in its program review and planning processes. The college must stabilize its executive leadership, invest in professional development and allocate other resources that are necessary to advance and implement ongoing processes to improve student learning and achievement and align institution-wide practices.

- All segments of the college staff expressed and demonstrated a genuine commitment to being a student-centered college. Despite the unified commitment to the college mission, there exists a veil of distrust among the governance groups that manifests itself as an

indirect resistance to board and administrative decision-making authority. The chancellor, Academic Senate leaders, vice chancellors, deans, faculty, department chairs, Board of Trustees, classified staff, and student leaders have designed and implemented an elaborate shared governance model. However, the team did not find evidence of clearly delineated roles and authority for decision making, thereby hindering timely communication, decisions and results. Based on this behavior, and coupled with the large number of classified and administrative staff vacancies and expenditures that do not match existing revenue, the team is concerned that the roles, responsibilities and decision-making authority of leadership and the governance structures are not clearly defined. The team recommends that leadership, governance and processes be examined and refined to improve educational effectiveness and student achievement.

- The team was impressed by the documentation provided in the self study and in the voluminous, yet organized evidence provided in the team room. However, during the course of the team visit additional information was required to reconcile differences between evidence provided in the CCSF Self Evaluation Report and statements made in response to team inquiries. Furthermore, gaining access to some evidence related to technology, finances and human resources was not easy. Additionally, after the visit, the team chair received correspondence, which raised suspicion about the integrity of the institution. Furthermore, the college has not made progress to address a long-standing pattern of late financial audits and deficit spending, which harm the financial integrity of the institution. The college must take steps to restore trust and institutional integrity.

Recommendations of the March 12-15, 2012 Visiting Team

The accreditation evaluation team makes the following 14 recommendations to fully meet each ACCJC Accreditation Standard and Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendation 1: Mission Statement

To improve effectiveness of Standard I.A Mission, the team recommends that the college establish a prescribed process and timeline to regularly review the mission statement and revise it as necessary. The college should use the mission statement as the benchmark to determine institutional priorities and goals that support and improve academic programs, student support services and student learning effectively linked to a realistic assessment of resources (I.A.3).

Recommendation 2: Effective Planning Processes

To fully meet Standard I.B Institutional Effectiveness, the team recommends the college to develop a strategy for fully implementing is existing planning process to look at each campus and site, examine revenues and expenses, and systematically address instructional program planning, staffing requirements, provision of student and library services, including facilities needs and competing priorities. The planning process should include clearly prescribed roles and scope of authority for all governance stakeholders

involved in each component of the planning process (I.A.3, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.B.3.a, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a-b, III.C.1.a-c, III.C.2, III.D.1.a-c, III.D.2.a-c, III.D.2.g, III.D.3, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, and IV.2.a).

Recommendation 3: Assessing Institutional Effectiveness

To improve the efficacy of evaluation and planning to enhance institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college complete its work to fully implement its model for Program Review for all courses, programs and support services and advance its framework for defining and assessing Student Learning Outcomes for all courses, programs, support services and certificates and degrees, in order to develop and report performance metrics to measure institutional effectiveness, including information on noncredit students and specified indicators for the Annual Plan and the End-of-Year Assessment Report to the Board of Trustees (I.B.5 and ACCJC Rubric for Evaluation Institutional Effectiveness) (I.B.5).

Recommendation 4: Student Learning Outcomes

To fully meet Standard II Student Learning Programs and Services, the team recommends that the college identify the intended student learning outcomes at the course, program, general education, certificate and degree levels, develop and implement assessments of student learning, and analyze the results of assessment to improve student learning. The results of ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes should foster robust dialogue and yield continuous improvement of courses, programs and services and the alignment of college practices for continuous improvement (I.B; II.A.1.a, c, II.A.2.a-c, f, g-i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2; III.A.1.c; IV.A.2.b, IV.B.2.b).

Recommendation 5: Student Support Services

To fully meet Standard II.B Student Support Services, the team recommends that the institution systematically assess student support services using student learning outcomes and other appropriate measures to improve the effectiveness of its support services and develop as well as communicate its plans for the expansion of delivery and prioritization of student services that support student learning and achievement regardless of location or means of delivery (II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f and II.B.4).

Recommendation 6: Human Resources Components of Evaluation

To fully meet Standard III.A Human Resources, the team recommends that the evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include a component that assesses the effectiveness in bringing about those learning outcomes (III.A.1.c).

Recommendation 7: Human Resources

To fully meet Standard III.A Human Resources, the team recommends that the college assess the adequacy of its current number of qualified classified staff and administrators and their appropriate preparation and experience necessary to support the institution's mission and purpose. The college must ensure that human resource planning is fully integrated with the institutional program review, planning and budgeting processes and linked to the annual allocations of funding to maintain and improve institutional effectiveness (III.A.2, III.A.6, and I.B.4).

Recommendation 8: Physical Resources

To fully meet Standard III.B Physical Resources, the team recommends that the college incorporate all costs required to appropriately operate and maintain existing facilities, whether owned or leased, into its annual and long-term planning and budgeting processes and annually allocate the required human and fiscal resources to effectively and equitably operate and maintain physical resources at locations where courses, programs and services are offered (III.B.1).

Recommendation 9: Technology Resources

To fully meet Standard III.C Technology Resources, the team recommends the college develop a comprehensive plan for equipment maintenance, upgrade and replacement that is integrated with the institution's budget allocation processes; and that the college continues to monitor its information technology systems and implement measures to more fully secure the technology infrastructure (III.C.1.a, c-d, III.C.2).

Recommendation 10: Financial Planning and Stability

To meet the Standard III.D Financial Resources, the team recommends that the college use its mission statement to inform its allocation of resources decisions to match annual, ongoing expenditures with ongoing financial resources. This action is needed to increase its reserves to a prudent level that will allow it to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences, to meet its operating expenses without excessive short-term borrowing, and to effectively manage the financial impact of its unfunded, long-term liabilities (III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c).

Recommendation 11: Financial Integrity and Reporting

To meet Standard III.D Financial Resources, the team recommends the college use the resources necessary to provide accurate and timely reporting of financial information; and to report this information to internal users so they may effectively participate in the annual and long-term planning and budgeting processes (III.D.1.d, III.D.2.g).

Recommendation 12: Leadership, Governance and Decision-making

To fully meet Standard IV Leadership and Governance, the team recommends that the district engage the services of an external organization to provide a series of workshops for all college constituencies, including the members of the governing board, the chancellor, faculty, staff, students and every administrator, in order to clarify and understand their defined roles of responsibility and delineated authority in institutional governance and decision making (IV.A, IV.B).

Recommendation 13: Governance Structures

To fully meet Standard IV.A Decision-making Roles and Processes, the team recommends that college leaders from all constituencies evaluate and improve the college's governance structure and consequent processes used to inform decision making for the improvement of programs, practices and services. The college must ensure that the process does not create undue barriers to the implementation of institutional decisions, plans and initiatives (IV.A.1, IV.A.3).

Recommendation 14: Effective Board Organization

To fully meet Standard IV.B Board and Administrative Organization, the team recommends that the board act in a manner consistent with its policies and by-laws, assess and develop operating procedures, develop and implement a plan for board development, and regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its policies and practices (IV.B.1.a, e-h).

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT
FOR
CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

Comprehensive Evaluation Visit
March 11-15, 2012

Introduction

City College of San Francisco is a comprehensive community college in California serving the City and County of San Francisco. The college was founded in 1935 as an academic and vocational component of the San Francisco Unified School District. The college became a separate, independent entity in 1970 under the title San Francisco Community College District, which included both the existing college and the school district's Adult and Occupational Education Division. Thus, the San Francisco Community College District became the provider of both credit and noncredit education for its service region. This organization has grown dramatically over the years, from approximately 1,100 students in 1935 to a highly diverse student population of approximately 90,000 credit and noncredit students at nine primary campuses and nearly 200 neighborhood sites.

San Francisco is California's fourth largest city, with a current population over 805,000. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the city's population grew 3.7% between the years 2000 and 2010. Continued, albeit moderate, population growth in San Francisco will create a rising demand for community college education in an era of state funding reduction.

In 1990, the San Francisco Community College District underwent a major change in its organization. For many reasons, the institution and its governing board decided to restructure the institution as one, comprehensive institution instead of the bifurcated model it had historically employed. Under the previous model, the district operated as a multi-college district with discretely administered credit and non-credit programs. Under the new model, the district became a multi-campus college, operating under the title City College of San Francisco, and incorporated both credit and noncredit programs under a single administrative and governance structure.

Today, the physical facilities of the institution continue to reflect the growth in population and programming. In celebration of CCSF's 75th anniversary, the college opened its new Multi-Use Building in fall 2010. Other new and newly renovated buildings included the Health and Wellness Center, Child Care Center, Mission Campus and the John Adams Campus. The Veterans Educational Transition Services Center and Veterans Resources Center were recently added services to meet the needs of the growing population of over 500 veterans. Students of CCSF's Chinatown/North Beach Campus are anticipating the 2012 opening of a permanent home in the northeast part of San Francisco.

City College of San Francisco now offers some 125 credit and 84 noncredit certificates of achievement, certificates of accomplishment and awards, as well as 66 associate degree programs to area residents. The college employs 810 full-time faculty and more than 1,000 part-time faculty. Ninety-five percent of faculty and administrators hold master's degrees and approximately 200 hold doctorates. Slightly more than 800 classified and 40 administrative personnel also strive to meet the needs of the myriad communities of students who attend City College of San Francisco.

The present chancellor was appointed to that role at City College of San Francisco on December 18, 2008, following an interim chancellor appointment from March 1, 2008. Dr. Griffin has 43 years of service at CCSF, both as a faculty member and an administrator. He was hired to provide decisive and stabilizing leadership based on his commendable service of 39 years to the college and the City and County of San Francisco. The chancellor has notified the governing board that he intends to retire in 2012.

The college is governed by a seven-member, elected Board of Trustees. In April 2010, the Board of Trustees strengthened the college's relationship with its foundation by ratifying a master agreement. The agreement proved timely in that the 2010-11 CCSF budget included a $1.75 million assumption for fundraising, with an overall goal of raising as much as $3 million. Grant development continues to play a key role in the college's operations. In partnership with the City and County of San Francisco and the San Francisco Unified School District, CCSF received a $3 million, three-year grant in fall 2010 from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to fund the Bridge to Success program and devise new ways to help students complete an education beyond high school.

Details of the college's evolving programs, plans and processes were collected in readiness for its 2012 comprehensive evaluation. The result was a view of an institution with a rich history and a deep commitment to the communities and peoples it serves.

City College of San Francisco is commended for several exemplary models of demonstrated educational quality based on their program reviews, student learning outcomes and assessment results used for continuous improvement. These exemplary program models include engineering, culinary arts, earth sciences, mathematics, English, nursing and other health career programs, computer networking, information technology, credit ESL, among others. Also noteworthy are the student support services that are demonstrating a strong connection to the campus communities through outreach and enrollment services, as well as student activities that demonstrate institutional progress towards improving student persistence and performance through retention efforts aimed at those students assessed as having the greatest needs.

City College of San Francisco made a concerted effort to address the recommendations of the accreditation evaluation team that visited the institution in 2006. New processes, programs, plans and infrastructure models are a result. The following section details the 2012 accreditation team's evaluation of CCSF's institutional responses to the 2006 recommendations.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to the 2006 Recommendations

The accreditation evaluation team that visited City College of San Francisco in 2006 issued a report with eight recommendations. City College of San Francisco provided responses to these recommendations in a series of progress, midterm, and follow-up reports submitted to the Commission between March 2007 and March 2010, and in the college's comprehensive self evaluation report that was submitted December 2011. Following is a list of City College of San Francisco reports to the Commission with consequent Commission actions:

1. Progress Report submitted March 2007 focused on Recommendation 4: Financial Planning and Stability. The Commission took action to accept the report with a requirement that the college complete a Focused Midterm Report in 2009.

2. Focused Midterm Report submitted March 2009 addressed all eight recommendations with emphasis on Recommendation 4: Financial Planning and Stability. The Commission took action to accept the Focused Midterm Report with the requirement that the college complete a Follow-Up Report focused on Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes (demonstrated progress) and Recommendation 4: Financial Planning and Stability (demonstrated resolution).

3. Follow-Up Report submitted March 2010 addressed Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes and Recommendation 4: Financial Planning and Stability. The Commission took action to accept the report and expressed Commission Concern Regarding Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) and required this concern be addressed in the college's comprehensive self evaluation due spring 2012.

The college's comprehensive self evaluation in support of reaffirmation of accreditation 2012 was submitted to the Commission in December 2011. This report addressed all eight recommendations and the Commission Concern Regarding Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB).

During its visit in March 2012, the 2012 accreditation evaluation team assessed the college's efforts to respond constructively to the 2006 recommendations. The City College of San Francisco has begun but has not fully addressed the 2006 recommendations. There remains much to be accomplished to fully comply with the Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements.

The 2012 team's evaluation of the college's responses is organized in the same manner as the previous team's recommendations were presented.

Recommendation 1: Mission Statement

The team recommends that the college regularly review and approve the mission statement in a discrete process to ensure that it is clearly addressed (I.A.3, I.A.4).

The team confirmed that City College of San Francisco has partially addressed this recommendation in that the mission statement was reviewed, revised and approved once in six years. The college has reviewed, revised and approved its mission statement in a discrete process. Surveys were conducted in 2008 and 2009 to collect feedback relevant to reviewing the mission statement. Modifications to the mission statement were discussed by college governance councils and with constituent groups. City College of San Francisco Board Policy 1200, Mission and Vision Statement, was revised, and final approval from the Board of Trustees occurred in April 2010. Although the college's strategic planning cycle implies such a process, CCSF must define a process for the regular future review of the mission statement in order to fully meet the ACCJC Standard for Accreditation.

Recommendation 2: Planning and Assessment

The team recommends that the college build upon its continuing planning and assessment efforts and develop an integrated process of institutional planning and assessment that combines strategic planning, educational planning, facilities planning, technology planning, and personnel planning in a manner that links these planning processes to annual budgets. Planning should be based upon the findings of instructional and non-instructional program review, which should include clear criteria for resource reallocation and/or program and service development, expansion, or termination (I.B, II.A.2.e, and II.A.2.f).

The team confirmed that the City College of San Francisco has partially addressed this recommendation. To improve effectiveness, the planning system needs to be fully implemented and strongly associated with program performance, accountability, and the allocation of resources based on ongoing revenues.

The college has developed a relational but not yet fully integrated and informed institutional planning process that is based on the findings of instructional and non-instructional program review. Additionally, the new program review template delineates criteria for resource allocation.

The college's planning process now includes the Strategic Plan, the Technology Plan, the Facilities Plan and the Education Master Plan as supporting documents for the college's Annual Plan. The Annual Plan includes institutional goals, strategic priorities and some measurable objectives. The planning process, as designed, has the potential to effectively integrate institutional planning and assessment by combining strategic planning, educational planning, facilities planning, technology planning, and personnel planning to inform the development of annual budgets that align with actual revenues. However, the planning system must be used more effectively and comprehensively to meet these ends.

Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes

The team recommends that the college ensure that student learning outcomes are fully institutionalized as a core element of college operations, with specific focus on curriculum and program development (I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.3, and II.A.6).

The team confirmed that City College of San Francisco has partially addressed this recommendation. The college has made progress to establish a framework to define student learning outcomes and assessment strategies. CCSF shows exemplary work in SLO assessment and continuous improvement in a few units or programs college wide. The college has not engaged all units and programs to the level of continuous quality improvement based on defining and assessing student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels.

In 2007, a Student Learning Outcomes Task Force was formed to address the 2006 recommendation. By 2009, SLO assessment was integrated with the pilot Program Review Process. Dialogue about SLOs occurred, including discussions at workshops and meetings. Documentation and reporting of SLO assessment results remain a challenge as reported in the college's self evaluation. Also, collegewide discussion of the results of SLO assessment appears to be limited.

Information on learning outcomes for degree and certificate programs is provided for faculty in the Curriculum Handbook. Departments proposing certificate and degree programs identify the learning outcomes as a part of the college catalog description. Guidance about mapping program-level learning outcomes to individual courses has also been included.

The new program review template asks for information about SLOs and the integration of SLO assessment into the program review process. Departments submit a wide range of responses to these items. Some program review reports include exemplary analyses of SLO assessment data and information on "closing the loop" by making changes in response to that assessment. Other program review reports respond to these items with incomplete information or provide cursory responses. While SLO assessments are in place for some courses and programs, as reflected in the online SLO Survey Report, many programs are still in the initial stages of assessment. While many student support services units and departments have engaged in SLO assessment, there was no evidence that all units have engaged in assessment. There was little evidence available for SLO assessment and use in continuous improvement at the program, general education or institutional level. Efforts to implement SLOs and assessments for program improvement appear to be more isolated in pockets than institutionally systematic and purposeful.

Recommendation 4: Financial Planning and Stability

The team recommends that the college develop a financial strategy that will: match ongoing expenditures with ongoing revenue; maintain the minimum prudent reserve level; reduce the percentage of its annual budget that is utilized for salaries and benefits; and address funding for retiree health benefits costs (III.D.1.b, III.D.2.c, III.D.2.d).

The team confirmed that City College of San Francisco has not addressed this recommendation. The current projections for the 2011-12 year indicate ongoing expenditures will exceed revenues by approximately 5.9 million dollars. Salaries and benefits remain above 92% of the unrestricted general fund expenditures. Furthermore, unfunded liabilities, such as Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) and Workmen's Compensation, continue to negatively impact cash flow, and no plan has been developed to address payment of these liabilities. While the reserve meets the minimum California community college requirement, it is well below a minimum prudent level, as demonstrated by an increase in short-term borrowing to meet cash flow needs.

Recommendation 5: Physical Facilities Contingency Planning

The team recommends that the college ensure the development of adequate contingency plans, which should be implemented in a timely manner in order to reduce potential exposure to losses (III.D.2.c).

The team confirmed that City College of San Francisco has not addressed this recommendation. The college's response to this recommendation as reported in the self study section, Responses to WASC Team Recommendations, 2006, focused on emergency preparedness and public safety. However, the 2006 recommendation focused on Standard III.D.2.c, which refers to cash flow and reserves to maintain financial stability and deal with unforeseen incidents. Regardless of this confusion, the college directly responded to Standard III.D.2.c. in this subsection of its comprehensive evaluation report. While the college asserted that it has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain fiscal stability, the team concluded otherwise. Based on a review of evidence, interviews and the recent auditor's report, the team concluded that the financial stability of the City College of San Francisco is tenuous, and the institution is vulnerable in today's strained fiscal environment.

Recommendation 6: Physical Facilities Maintenance Planning

The team recommends that the college include the future costs of operating and maintaining new and existing facilities in its planning models and allocate funds in a timely manner to ensure the effective operation of these facilities (II.B.2.a).

The team confirmed that City College of San Francisco has not addressed this recommendation. Although the CCSF self evaluation indicated the limited use of a planning model that includes the total cost of ownership for capital equipment or systems, the team was unable to verify if such a model was used for planning. Due to the unstable fiscal condition of the college, there is scarcely an adequate annual budget for operations or reserve funding set aside for scheduled maintenance of existing facilities. The opening of the new Chinatown/North Beach Campus, which was set for summer 2012, will be delayed to Fall 2012 primarily due to fiscal constraints.

Recommendation 7: Technology Planning

The team recommends that all unit technology plans be brought up to date and that a unified collegewide technology plan be developed. This plan should be integrated with facilities and budget plans. Funds for technology acquisition and maintenance, including regular replacement of outdated hardware, should be integrated into the institution's budget (I.B.4, I.B.6, III.C.1, III.C.2).

The team confirmed that City College of San Francisco has partially addressed this recommendation. The college has made significant progress to unify and update the collegewide Technology Plan. The plan was developed in 2007-08 by a broad-based college team, reviewed through the shared governance process, and adopted by the Board of Trustees in spring 2009. An updated draft plan is under review.

The college now requires that all academic and student services departments complete program reviews and that operational areas like Information Technology Services develop annual assessment plans. These plans provide the college the detailed and up-to-date departmental planning information that was previously missing. By channeling individual unit technology requests into a comprehensive evaluation and prioritization process overseen by the College Planning and Budget Council, CCSF has responded to the first part of the recommendation.

Based on review of the 2009-2011 Technology Plan, the updated plan and the current budget, the team concluded that the institution continues to rely almost exclusively on bond and grant funding for the acquisition and replacement of hardware. The self evaluation report confirmed this and also indicated bond funding for technology purchases had been discontinued. Based on this evidence, the college has not integrated plans for technology acquisition, maintenance and regular replacement into the institution's budget planning and annual budget development.

Recommendation 8: Board of Trustees Evaluation

The team recommends that the Board of Trustees establish a method of self evaluation, determine the schedule for this process, and complete self evaluations on a regular basis (IV.B.1.g).

The team confirmed that City College of San Francisco partially addressed this recommendation. The board adopted a self-evaluation policy in fall 2008 and implemented the policy in spring 2009. The board has conducted two self-evaluation surveys, which include responses from governing board members and constituent groups. The first evaluation started and concluded in spring 2009, and the second started in fall 2010 and concluded by January 2011. The Board of Trustees adhered to all of the elements of the previous recommendation with the exception of conducting the evaluation on a regular basis.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, as well as approved by the State of California and appropriate federal agencies for offering its programs and services. The college is fully authorized to operate as an educational institution to offer both credit and noncredit instruction at the undergraduate level.

2. Mission:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco operates in accordance with a mission statement that is comprehensive and clearly defined. The statement is included in the college catalog, the website and major publications, as well as posted in the Board of Trustees' public meeting area. The mission statement is appropriate to the college as a degree-granting institution of higher education with a commitment to its local community. The mission statement makes reference to student learning as the purpose of the institution's educational effort. While the mission statement has been reviewed recently, its review is not regularly scheduled.

3. Governing Board:

The visiting team confirmed that the San Francisco Community College District is governed by an elected, seven-member Board of Trustees. This governing board functions as the final authority for ensuring the institution's appropriate mission, educational quality, financial stability, and effective operation. The governing board is sufficient in size and has the necessary independence for fulfilling its functions and responsibilities.

4. Chief Executive Officer:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco has a chief executive officer, the chancellor, who is appointed by the governing board to administer the college and district functions, and whose primary responsibility is to the institution. The chancellor has announced his impending retirement.

5. Administrative Capacity:

The visiting team did not confirm that City College of San Francisco has a sufficient administrative staff with appropriate experience to support the necessary services for an institution of its size, mission, and purpose. The organizational structure and staffing is fluid, and administrative oversight is unsettled. Four of the five or 80% of the vice chancellors are interim appointments. Several management positions are vacant and

duties are reassigned to incumbent administrators. A hiring freeze was imposed two years ago for administrative and classified positions.

6. Operational Status:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco is fully operational and has students who are actively pursuing programs of study in its degree and certificate programs.

7. Degrees:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco offers the associate degree in arts or in sciences in 62 majors and in four areas of emphasis, as well as 125 credit certificate programs and 84 noncredit certificates. Three-quarters of the college's programs either lead to associate degrees or certificates or prepare students for transfer.

8. Educational Programs:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco offers degree programs that are appropriate to and congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education fields of study, and are of sufficient content and length to ensure quality. Noncredit classes and programs also are offered with appropriate rigor and in accordance with the college's mission.

9. Academic Credit:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco awards academic credit based on generally accepted practices followed by degree-granting institutions of higher education.

10. Student Learning Achievement:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco publishes in its catalog statements of educational purpose and objectives for its academic programs. Course outlines include a variety of learning outcomes and achievement methods; however, the development of student learning outcomes for programs and the institution has not been completed.

11. General Education:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry.

12. Academic Freedom:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general.

13. Faculty:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco employed 810 full-time faculty and 1,034 part-time faculty in spring term 2012. The faculty members are qualified to conduct the institution's programs and services and meet state-mandated minimum requirements.

14. Student Services:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco provides comprehensive and accessible student services to its students in accordance with its mission and purposes, although the array of services are not available at each of the nine primary campuses.

15. Admissions:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco has adopted and adheres to admissions policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs.

16. Information and Learning Resources:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco provides specific, long-term access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to support its mission and instructional programs through a variety of formats, including library collections, media centers, computer labs, and other means.

17. Financial Resources:

The visiting team did not confirm that City College of San Francisco maintains and documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development that are adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability. The pattern of late audits, deficit spending, and the documented inability to implement corrective action to audit findings over multiple years lead the team to conclude that this requirement has not been met.

18. Financial Accountability:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco undergoes and makes available an external financial audit conducted by an appropriately qualified agency. The

audits are reviewed by the governing board in a public meeting. The audits are provided to appropriate agencies once the audit is issued, albeit untimely in at least 5 of the last six years. The annual audit report for the year ending June 30, 2011, was received by the governing board at its regularly scheduled meeting on March 22, 2012. The audit was forwarded to the visiting team on March 23, one week after the accreditation visit. The team concludes that the college does not conduct audits and provide reports to the college or community in a timely manner.

19. Institutional Planning:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco systematically evaluates its programs and services. The college publishes information regarding how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes and goals, including goals related to student achievement and learning. Planning and assessment processes, however, need to be fully integrated to include planning for human resources, technology resources and physical resources that inform the process for budget development and do not rely on unrealistic revenue projections and one-time funds.

20. Public Information:

The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco publishes on its website and in its catalog, class schedule, and other publications information regarding the college's purposes and objectives, admission requirements and procedures, rules and regulations affecting students, degrees and programs offered, degree and program requirements, faculty qualifications, support services, and other pertinent information.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission:

The visiting team could not confirm that City College of San Francisco adheres to each of the Eligibility Requirements and Standards of the Accrediting Commission. Although the college does conform to the major policies of the Commission, City College of San Francisco does not comply with Eligibility Requirement 17, Financial Resources, or Standard III. D. 2. a-c, and g, Financial Resources. The visiting team confirmed that City College of San Francisco describes itself in identical terms to all of its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accreditation status in a timely manner, and agrees to disclose information required by the Accrediting Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. The team was challenged as to its authority to review confidential information associated with employee evaluations, but access was provided on the condition the team chair take responsibility for shredding said documents following inspection. Whether the institution provides information that is complete and accurate, although not always timely, is unclear based on allegations that were not proved or disproved during the course of the visit. For example, in the team's evaluation of ACCJC Standard II, the team determined that the CCSF Self Study Report did not accurately reflect the college's percent of courses, programs and services with defined student learning outcomes and implemented strategies for assessment and continuous improvement.

STANDARD I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations:

City College of San Francisco embraces a mission that emphasizes a commitment to an expansive diversity of students within a very diverse community. The mission statement, which was approved by the governing board and is published, defines the college's educational purposes, the intended student population and a commitment to student learning. The mission statement accurately indicates the range of populations served by the college and the scope of programs provided for those populations. The mission statement has recently been reviewed and modified; however, there is no specific established process or schedule for future regular reviews of the mission statement. The learning programs of CCSF are aligned with its mission statement and with the character and goals of its student populations (I.A.1, I.A.2, I.A.3).

The size, scope, and complexity of the mission and programs of CCSF compel an effective planning and resource allocation process. The college has developed a new and potentially effective program review process that forms the basis of the new planning system. College performance indicators are under development and, as of the end of spring 2012, will be available. The new planning system is structured to allow for the development of an Annual Plan and Annual Budget informed by program reviews, strategic planning, and collegewide plans such as the Technology Plan and the Educational Master Plan. This system is well designed and, if fully implemented, would allow the college to appropriately plan for resource allocation while incorporating information from other strategic and operational planning documents. However, this goal has not been realized (I.A.3, I.B.4, I.B.7).

Lack of clarity about the roles of college groups and recent changes in management assignments appear to present barriers to the effective use of the planning system. For example, disagreements about the scope of responsibility of the Program Review Committee and the Planning and Budgeting Council have been a source of tension. The management structure that oversees planning and research functions has been modified several times and staffing for the Research and Planning Office has been reduced.

Financial constraints and issues related to financial planning have weakened the connection between the planning processes and fiscal resources. For example, fiscal resources are often one-time or restricted-use revenue supplied by grants, bond funds, Perkins IV funds, and donations, which are currently allocated outside of the regular college planning process. The ability of programs and individuals to find resources and develop programs from funding sources outside of the regular planning process results in circumventing rather than following appropriate processes. The College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) has identified the need to incorporate grant data into program

review and to clarify the fundraising line item in the budget (Draft CPBC Minutes of February 28, 2012).

As a result of unclear leadership roles and governance processes made worse by declining revenues, the full implementation of what could be an effective planning process has been thwarted. Components of the process have been delayed. For example, the recent annual plans were completed part of the way into the fall semester of the plan year, which has impacted program review reports. The 2011-12 Annual Budget final recommendations were approved on September 22, 2011, nearly four months into the fiscal year. The development of measures of institutional effectiveness has been delayed, and communication about planning efforts is sometimes ineffective (I.B.6, III.D.1.a-c, IV.A.2.a).

The problems noted above have inhibited the ability of the college to work collaboratively toward the achievement of college goals, assure the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource process, and assess the effectiveness of its evaluation mechanisms. It also affects the ability of the planning process to allocate necessary resources and improve institutional effectiveness. The barriers to effective planning need to be removed to connect the new planning processes fully with resource allocation, including both awarding new resources and implementing resource reductions (I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7).

City College of San Francisco demonstrates limited accomplishment, both in measuring student learning and evaluating and in fully implementing an assessment and planning process. The core of its planning system is the program review process, which includes the analysis of data provided by the CCSF Research and Planning Office, information on progress of prior-year planning objectives and major planning objectives for the next fiscal year, discussion of the status of learning assessment for courses and programs, and description of resources needed to meet planning objectives. Student learning outcomes are in place for courses and programs. However, the implementation of SLO assessment, and the use of that assessment information to make changes, varies across the college. Some departments have exemplary processes in place, while others do not. Some program review reports address SLO assessment in depth; others treat the subject only in a cursory fashion or have incomplete information (I.B.1).

The college identifies strategic priorities and major goals in each year's Annual Plan. Many, but not all, of these goals are associated with objectives that are stated in measurable terms. This allows the college to assess progress toward achieving its stated goals and make data-informed decisions as part of an ongoing integrated planning cycle. The new planning system, if fully implemented, could be very effective. However, the links from the work of the Program Review Committee (PRC) and CPBC to specific resource allocations, both awarding resources and planning for specific resource reductions, need to be strengthened. Funding reductions, difficulties in financial planning, and ongoing financial constraints have negatively impacted effective use of an integrated planning system (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.7).

The college is working toward a greater use of documented assessment and the communication of those results to appropriate constituencies. The college's Office of Research and Planning provides a wide range of data related to quality assurance and institutional effectiveness, much of which is available online. For example, the Decision Support System (DSS), an online data system, contains a wealth of information relevant to institutional effectiveness. There are plans to expand the information collected to include studies of noncredit students. The degree to which data is used for dialogue and planning varies across the college. Some areas have engaged data in substantial ways. For example, the School of Business conducted a Noncredit Business Technology Student Survey in spring 2011 and is using the results to improve support for student achievement.

The college is planning to provide additional presentations on college performance indicators to the Board of Trustees. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the shared governance system is currently underway (I.B.5, I.B.6).

Findings and Evidence:

The mission statement of CCSF succinctly describes the diverse set of populations served by the college as well as the broad scope of courses, programs, and services utilized by those populations. The college has established student learning programs and services that are aligned with its purposes, character and student population. The CCSF self-evaluation provides data that demonstrate the range of cultural groups in the City of San Francisco and emphasizes the diverse approaches used by the college to serve these groups. City College of San Francisco resources and programs are tailored to specific groups within the population served. Neighborhood campuses focus on subsets of the college mission (I.A.1).

City College of San Francisco provides preparation for transfer, job skills development, and the achievement of associate degrees. The programs and services offered by the college clearly support these aspects of the college's mission. The mission statement also includes the college's commitment to community education, citizenship preparation, the achievement of GED and adult high school diplomas, and life-long learning. These emphases are aligned with the large percentage of students who enroll in noncredit classes at the college. The college offers a wide array of noncredit certificate programs, many in departments that also offer credit-based degrees and certificates.

The CCSF Board of Trustees recently approved revised mission and vision statements for the college (April 29, 2010, resolution page 4, amending Board Policy 1200). The mission statement is published in the catalog, class schedule, and on the college website (I.A.2). The mission statement review occurred via the shared governance process. The review was based on dialogue provided in meetings, workshops and surveys. Minutes from the Planning and Budgeting Council, Academic Senate, and College Advisory Council, as well as documented survey results, provide evidence of this process. The college planning process includes a six-year strategic planning cycle that infers a coterminous cycle of review for the mission statement. However, the team did not find an

established process and timeline for future reviews of the mission statement within this cycle (I.A.3).

College planning is linked to the institution's mission directly through the Strategic Plan and indirectly through the Program Review process. The Annual Plan cites the college mission statement. The mission and vision statements were part of recent strategic planning work that included a participatory decision-making process. Also included in recent strategic planning process was a team of coordinators, listening sessions, shared governance meetings, surveys and presentations, all working toward consensus (I.A.4).

The individual mission statements of various departments within the college clearly align with the overall college mission. A look at the web pages for departments as diverse as Library and Learning Resources, Speech Communication, Disabled Students Programs and Services, and the Strength and Conditioning Program demonstrate this alignment. Discussions with college employees from many areas indicate a deep commitment to the needs of the many populations served by the college that is in alignment with the mission statement (I.A.4).

The team finds that the current, ongoing funding for San Francisco City College appears insufficient to fully fund the mission of the college as it is currently conceived. CCSF's commitment to distributed instructional sites, and community-specific educational programming for those sites, strains the college's ability to adequately fund and staff those sites and programs. To fully meet the college's overarching challenges and ACCJC's Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the team advises the college to assure the mission of the college is obtainable based on accurate short-term and long-term funding assumptions.

Conclusions:

The team concluded that the college meets Standard I.A. Institutional Mission.

City College of San Francisco has a mission statement that defines its purpose, intended student population and commitment to student learning. The mission is reflected in its programs and services to meet the needs of a diverse community and is embraced by the college community. The college is to be commended for embracing all aspects of its mission and for the dedication of its staff to understanding and responding to the needs of the communities served by the college.

The mission statement was reviewed and revised in the last six years. To improve effectiveness, a prescribed process and timeline are needed to regularly review the mission statement and revise it as necessary.

Recommendation:

Recommendation 1: Process to Review Mission Statement

To improve the effectiveness of meeting Standard I.A Mission, the team recommends that the college establish a prescribed process and timeline to regularly review the mission statement and revise it as necessary. The college should use the mission statement as the benchmark to determine institutional priorities and goals that support and improve academic programs, student support services and student learning to effectively link processes to a realistic assessment of resources (I.A.3).

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

City College of San Francisco has several venues in which dialogue related to improvement and institutional effectiveness is expected. The Board of Trustees has an Institutional Effectiveness Committee. There are more than 40 shared governance committees that engage in dialogue about the college and its processes. The Academic Senate Executive Council, College Advisory Council, and College Planning and Budgeting Council connect this dialogue to planning and resource allocation processes.

Findings and Evidence:

While it is clear that venues for dialogue exist, it is less clear how effective this dialogue has been. For example, while the Program Review Committee report to the College Planning and Budgeting Council shows that dialogue related to the improvement of student learning is an intended part of the institutional planning process, there has been disagreement about the role of the Program Review Committee in making specific resource recommendations to the College Planning and Budget Council. In addition, the self evaluation notes that "it is time for a districtwide, highly coordinated review of the shared governance system, complete with listening sessions" (I.B.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3).

SLOs are in place for most courses and programs, and the program review template provides for the reporting of dialogue related to the assessment of student learning. However, the dialogue is often confined to individual departments and disciplines. Some program review reports engage this dialogue in a meaningful way, while others take a more cursory approach or provide only incomplete information. General Education outcomes have been approved by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, but a plan for the assessment of these outcomes, and a response to those assessments, are apparently still works in progress.

The many locations at which the college operates, combined with the large number of noncredit courses, make the evaluation of institutional effectiveness and the assessment of student achievement relatively difficult to coordinate. For example, while substantial

information on student achievement is provided for credit courses, it is not clear that the assessment of student learning and achievement is as advanced for noncredit courses. According to the institutional self evaluation, noncredit courses are open-entry/open exit. Many do not culminate in a formally recorded grade, so the process of evaluation for certificate completion is difficult (CCSF Self Evaluation, page 208). Although an opinion survey of credit students was conducted in fall 2010, the college has not yet found the resources to conduct a more labor-intensive, broad, noncredit student survey, which must be conducted in several languages. The last comprehensive survey of noncredit students was conducted in 2005-06 (CCSF Self Evaluation, page 167) (I.B.1).

The 2011-2016 Strategic Plan indicates six strategic priorities with associated objectives. The College Planning and Budgeting Council sets goals and objectives for the college in the Annual Plan. The 2011-2012 Annual Plan includes strategic priorities, major goals under each strategy, and objectives associated with most of the goals. Many of the objectives in the Annual Plan are stated in measurable terms; however, the development of metrics related to the achievement of Annual Plan goals and objectives has been delayed. End-of-Year Assessments have not been available for recent years. Production of the End-of-Year Assessments was delayed while the new Strategic Plan and related Annual Plan were developed. An End-of-Year Assessment is being prepared for 2011-12 (I.B.2).

The program review template includes information on student achievement and asks programs to respond to that data. The program review also asks that programs delineate specific objectives for the next planning cycle and indicate the achievement of previous objectives. A review of recent program review reports indicates that measurable objectives are present for programs. The degree to which these objectives are achieved varies from program to program. There is also substantial variation in the extent to which data related to institutional or program effectiveness is addressed in the program reviews. The College Program Review Committee reviews all program reviews and prepares a report for the College Planning and Budgeting Council. The planning system calls for the CPBC to identify guidelines for meeting major resource needs collegewide based on the college's proposed strategic priorities and major objectives (I.B.3).

The centrality of program review in the planning process ensures that input is broadly based. The planning system calls for a process by which the program reviews are examined and the resulting information analyzed and summarized by the Program Review Committee based on input from college constituencies. Under the design of the planning system, the work of the PRC leads directly to resource allocation recommendations to the College Planning and Budgeting Council to conduct budget hearings and to forward budget recommendations to the chancellor and, ultimately, Board of Trustees (I.B.4).

However, the connection between roles of Program Review Committee and College Planning and Budget Committee regarding specific resource allocations, both awarding of specific resource allocations and planning for specific resource reductions, needs to be strengthened. The 2010-11 Program Review for Institutional Advancement notes that

although the program review process has been strengthened each year, there needs to be more done at the institutional level to integrate program review with developing the institutional strategic, annual and educational plans, as well as ongoing work with the role of the College Planning and Budgeting Council (1.B.4).

In fact, the institutional self evaluation indicates that planning efforts have not been used to delineate the impact of revenue reductions (CCSF Self Evaluation, page 163). This was confirmed in minutes for the Program Review Committee, February 2012, as well a report from the finance group cited in those minutes. The report indicated that there has been no progress to develop a strategy that matches ongoing expenditures with matching revenue, especially when revenue is less than the prior year, ostensibly due to budget meetings and changing financial data (I.B.4).

Financial constraints and issues related to financial planning result in a lack of connection between the planning processes and fiscal resources. For example, fiscal resources are often supplied by grants, bond funds, Perkins IV funds, etc., which are currently allocated outside of the regular college planning process. As a result, the College Planning and Budgeting Council has identified the need to incorporate grant data into the program review template and to clarify the fundraising line item in the budget (Draft CPBC Minutes of February 2012). The ability of programs and individuals to find resources and develop programs from funding outside of the regular planning process encourages departments and programs to work around the process rather than follow the defined collective process of the Program Review Committee and College Planning and Budgeting Council (I.B.4).

Analyses of student achievement and institutional effectiveness are provided by the college's Office of Research and Planning. Internal communications include the results of various surveys and college planning documents. Information about program review and SLO assessment is available online. Information and documentation are available to students, the public, and college employees on the college's websites, especially those of the Office of Research and Planning. For example, the Decision Support System (DSS), an online data bank maintained by the Office of Research and Planning, provides detailed data to college employees. The DSS website averaged more than 200 views per month from college users (excluding use by the Office of Research and Planning) (I.B.5).

Recently identified gaps in institutional assessment, particularly with respect to documented assessment results related to collegewide objectives and indicators, resulted in the development of a modified CCSF End-of-Year Report. An End-of-Year Assessment Report is currently being prepared for 2011-12. The Office of Research and Planning has reviewed its work in order to address previous gaps with input from the Program Review Committee, College Advisory Council, Academic Senate, and College Planning and Budgeting Council (I.B.4, I.B.5).

The degree to which data is used for dialogue and planning varies across the college. Some areas have engaged data in substantial ways. For example, the School of Business conducted a Noncredit Business Technology Student Survey in spring 2011 and is using

the results to improve support for student achievement. English, Math, ESL, and matriculation have worked extensively with the Office of Research and Planning related to student equity initiatives (Chancellor's Taskforce Report on Student Equity and the Achievement Gap, October 27, 2011). The college is working toward a greater use of documented assessment and the communication of those results to appropriate constituencies. The Office of Research and Planning provides a wide range of data related to quality assurance and institutional effectiveness, much of which is available online. There are plans to expand the information collected to include studies of noncredit students (I.B.5).

For the past several years the college has been involved in a major reshaping of its planning and resource allocation processes. The new process centers on program review and is designed in a way that supports broad-based input and data-informed decision making. At the end of each recent planning cycle, a survey was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the Program Review Process. As a result of the most recent survey, a change was made from an annual review to a biennial program review cycle (I.B.6).

While the review and modification of the program review process has been accomplished in recent years, the evaluation of other elements of college communication and dialogue related to planning and resource allocation is lagging. The effectiveness of collegial dialogue is evaluated primarily through shared governance review. The college is due for such a review, perhaps overdue. This is especially important since much of the collegial dialogue that occurs in the shared governance committees is not only relevant, but critical to the implementation of the new planning system (I.B.6).

While the integrated planning system is well designed, there are indications of barriers to governance and financial issues that prohibit the effective functioning of some elements of the system. The timing of some planning elements has been delayed. For example, Annual Plans have been completed part way into the planning year rather than prior to the beginning of the year to which the plan applies. The Education Master Plan has not been updated since 2006. The quality of program review reports varies widely by department. The development of measures of institutional effectiveness (e.g. End-of-Year Assessment Reports) has been delayed. The program review-based planning process has not yet been fully engaged for the purpose of implementing revenue reductions to college budgets.

These difficulties appear to be the result of several factors, which were confirmed in a review of meeting minutes and based on interviews. The college is urged to address the following indentified barriers to effective planning and implement its model of program review in a way that is conforms to standards and is fully integrated with institutional planning and budgeting: 1) disagreements about the scope of responsibility and authority of college governance groups such as the Program Review Committee and the Planning and Budgeting Council; 2) relatively weak links between planning and the allocation of resources due to disagreement about the collective decision making of the Program Review Committee and the Planning and Budgeting Council; 3) reorganization of college offices and reassignment of leadership and support staff that may have made effective

planning more difficult due to lack of continuity; 4) staffing cuts in the Office Research and Planning, which have impeded the ability of the office to produce research data and the many college planning documents in a timely manner; and 5) perceived disregard for financial planning and budgeting as the result of processes allocating restricted funds from grants and bonds outside of the prescribed planning and budgeting processes.

The institutional self evaluation states that the primary method by which the college measures institutional effectiveness of its broad educational purpose, student learning programs and services, and student learning is through the program review process, which includes a review of all instructional programs, student support services and library and learning support services. The Program Review Committee, working through subcommittees, reviews and summarizes the program review documents from across the college. The effectiveness of the program review process was evaluated via a survey of college employees, and improvements to the process are being implemented (I.B.7).

Conclusions:

The team concluded that the college partially meets Standard I.B Institutional Effectiveness. Additionally, the team concluded that the college's level of practice is not at the expected Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level in Program Review and Planning as outlined in the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluation Institutional Effectiveness; nor is the institution expected to be at the Proficiency Level in Student Learning Outcomes by fall 2012.

The college has recently implemented an ambitious new planning process that centers on program review and focuses on data-informed and broad-based decision making. This integrated planning process has the potential to systematically serve the college in carrying out its remarkable mission within the limits of its resources, especially financial resources. However, because of a number of factors, including decreased fiscal and staffing resources, as well as the need to clearly define governance roles and structure, the potential effectiveness of the system has not been realized. The connections to resource allocation have been hindered. The quality of program review reports varies widely, and development of measures of institutional effectiveness has been delayed.

Student learning outcomes are in place for most courses and programs, and the program review template provides for the reporting of dialogue related to the assessment of student learning. However, the quality of self-reflective dialogue varies and collegewide dialogue needs to be strengthened. General Education outcomes have been approved by the Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements, but a plan for the assessment of these outcomes and a response to those assessments are apparently still works in progress.
In order to carry out the institutional priorities, it will be necessary for City College of San Francisco to conduct comprehensive and continuous evaluation and integrated planning processes that are effectively linked to a more realistic assessment of the supply of human, physical, technological and financial resources, in order to make informed resource allocation decisions in accordance with clearly delineated roles and scope of authority.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 2: Effective Planning Processes

To fully meet Standard I.B Institutional Effectiveness, the team recommends the college to develop a strategy for fully implementing is existing planning process to look at each campus and site, examine revenues and expenses, and systematically address instructional program planning, staffing requirements, provision of student and library services, including facilities needs and competing priorities. The planning process should include clearly prescribed roles and scope of authority for all governance stakeholders involved in each component of the planning process (I.A.3, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.B.3.a, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a-b, III.C.1.a-c, III.C.2, III.D.1.a-c, III.D.2.a-c, III.D.2.g, III.D.3, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, and IV.2.a).

Recommendation 3: Assessing Institutional Effectiveness

To improve the efficacy of evaluation and planning to enhance institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college complete its work to fully implement its model for Program Review for all courses, programs and support services and advance its framework for defining and assessing Student Learning Outcomes for all courses, programs, support services and certificates and degrees, in order to develop and report performance metrics to measure institutional effectiveness, including information on noncredit students and specified indicators for the Annual Plan and the End-of-Year Assessment Report to the Board of Trustees (I.B.5 and ACCJC Rubric for Evaluation Institutional Effectiveness).

STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Service

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

The college offers a wide variety of programs serving transfer, CTE, basic skills, lifelong learning, and civic engagement as stated in the mission statement. The program selection includes degree and certificates in both credit and non-credit areas. The non-credit certificates fall primarily within two areas: CTE and basic skills ESL. In CTE areas, a student can attain job skills for promotion, or gain skills for a new career field through short-term certificates designed for quick job entry. In the basic skills area, the college has a large, non-credit program in ESL to meet the needs of San Francisco's large population of non-native English speakers. Recently, declining enrollments in the basic skills transitional programs have resulted in heavier section reductions in the non-credit area. According to college administrators, San Francisco's changing demographic patterns are resulting from declining immigration from Central America and Asia with a corresponding decrease in demand for non-credit ESL at satellite campuses such as

Chinatown and Mission. Because of these demographic shifts, there is an expectation that satellite campuses will continue to reduce non-credit ESL courses and add more credit general education courses and, in some instances, credit CTE courses. For example, the Chinatown Campus historically focused most heavily on non-credit basic adult education and ESL. In planning the new high-rise campus structure, the college has included several science labs as well as a new culinary arts lab, demonstrating that the college plans to offer more general education and transfer courses at the Chinatown Campus.

The locations of nine primary campuses and numerous sites of the college located throughout the city places almost everyone in San Francisco within walking distance or within public transportation of a City College of San Francisco neighborhood site. The college has done a superb job of bringing the community college to the varying communities throughout the City and County of San Francisco service area. The satellite sites appear to be focused on programs that address the needs of the neighborhoods they serve (II.A.1.a-b). The satellite campuses serve as an outreach and recruitment function for the college where students can transition from credit or non-credit programs at the satellite campuses to credit programs at the Ocean (main) Campus.

Most general education programs and offerings are concentrated at the Ocean Campus, although many of the site locations also offer some general education courses leading toward fulfillment of degree requirements. Many CTE programs are also concentrated at the Ocean Campus with a number of notable exceptions including aircraft maintenance at the San Francisco International Airport site and skilled trades, automotive and motorcycle repair at the Evans Campus. Mission Campus also offers graphics arts and media, although students must complete certificate requirements at the Ocean Campus. The college is noted for a number of exceptional CTE programs including its highly regarded Culinary Arts Program, its excellent Computer Network and Information Technology Program, its Computer Science Program, its Engineering Program, the Graphic Communications Program, the Business Program, and multiple health career programs located primarily on the John Adams Campus.

As the college continues to confront declining resources, it may face increasing challenges in its efforts to preserve the full range of educational programs and services currently available at the various campuses. An example is the Aircraft Maintenance Technology Program co-located at the San Francisco International Airport. The program has only one full-time instructor and one part-time instructor. Because the curriculum is tightly driven by Federal Aviation Administration requirements and involves extensive lab content, it is evident that a single full-time instructor cannot adequately deliver the program, even with adjunct assistance. Aviation technology students currently cannot complete their program within two years. Another example is the challenge that comes with the expansion of the Culinary Arts Program at the Chinatown Campus. The college will be offering culinary courses at three different campuses. The culinary chair has expressed concerns about instructional capacity within the department, and a senior administrator also mentioned the operational difficulties of expanding CTE offerings at the satellite campuses. However, the college consistently demonstrates capacity to secure grants and engage in fundraising efforts to support its educational programs. Department

chairs in CTE programs especially cite grants as the primary source of funds for equipment purchases, program improvements, preserving course offerings, and even facilities improvements.

An additional example of the challenges facing CCSF related to declining resources surfaced within days of the accreditation team visit. The Commission received an inquiry from the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) local Region 9 office on March 8, 2012, regarding City College of San Francisco. The DOE had read newspaper articles that stated City College of San Francisco was cutting classes due to state funding reductions.

The DOE questioned whether students were properly notified of any class section cuts and whether students were given options to finish courses already in progress. If programs were actually cut, the DOE inquired whether students were provided an appropriate period of time to complete a program and whether these cuts would significantly damage the quality of educational programs and the institution.

The Commission informed the DOE that the accreditation team assigned to visit CCSF would examine the issue of class cuts. The chancellor of City College of San Francisco assured the visiting team and the Commission that the newspaper articles conflated two events: (1) cuts to low enrolled classes that occurred during the first week of the semester affecting about 80 out of 500 low-enrolled sections, mostly in non-credit classes; and (2) the news about the state reduction in funding for community colleges this year. Chancellor Griffin stated that no programs were eliminated and that some summer school sections were cut.

City College of San Francisco assesses student needs in a variety of forums, such as listening sessions, planning retreats, and student equity forums. The institution gathers data on its students' demographics, community, and labor market information and incorporates this data into its strategic planning and Educational Master Plans as well as its program review process. Data from student services units also feed into these processes and resulting plans. In addition, CCSF offers its community a variety of modalities for learning, including internships, work experience courses, study abroad, distance learning and honors programs (I.A.1, II.A.1.a). Based on interviews with employees, the college is clearly student centered. Employees consistently demonstrated their concern for students, and, ultimately, the focus on students' success. The college's strength is definitely seen in its service to its various communities' needs (e.g. breadth of offerings) and attention to its students' success. A successful example of the college's Student Success Initiative in support of faculty innovation was evidenced in two academic programs, Architecture and Child Development. Both departments used survey instruments along with intense dialogue between faculty members leading to program changes that radically increased student success rates (III.D.2.d, II.A.1).

The college has revised its program review process several times since the last accreditation visit in its effort to more closely align planning with resource allocation. The collegewide program review process has gone through two cycles and was evaluated after each cycle. The most recent evaluation concluded with a recommendation to change

from an annual to a biennial review process. Beginning in 2012-2013, departments will undergo full review once every two years instead of every year. This change was made to allow departments and units more time to address program recommendations and implement improvements. On the other hand, programs and units identified with significant challenges as a result of the program review will be recommended for a more specific review. At this time, no programs have been identified to submit to a more specific review. However, this may be due to the fact that the college emphasizes that the program review process will not be punitive. These two approaches seem to be counterproductive instead of helping to achieve the goal of program improvement. Regardless of the perceived incongruity of these approaches, the Program Review Committee created a program discontinuance policy that was being reviewed by constituency groups as the governance process commenced the week of the team visit.

The program review process has incorporated student learning outcomes to be used as a method to ensure the quality of instructional programs at CCSF. Efforts to implement SLOs and assessments for program improvement appear to be more isolated in pockets than institutionally systematic and purposeful. There does not seem to be a strong institutional commitment to implementing the SLO improvement cycle within the senior faculty leadership. Outside of pockets of excellence, there does not seem to be strong institutional commitment to attaining a proficiency level across the institution by fall 2012. The self study recognizes a lack of institutional mechanisms to document assessment and improvement cycles, and there appears to be very limited dialogue occurring on campus about SLOs and assessments and their value in program improvement efforts. The self study notes that the college must rely heavily on staff development activities to increase faculty competency in the SLO assessment and improvement cycle; yet, faculty staff development days have been reduced to one per semester. Moreover, there is no designated faculty member tasked with leading an SLO training effort to engage others in the dialog about implementation of improved SLO assessment efforts. The college's SLO assessment data are not easy to find on the college website, rather data are embedded in each department's program review documents. The college has not addressed its general education SLOs, although the college has worked to develop a process to ensure all instructional programs will have assessed SLOs and reviewed assessment results for program improvements by 2016.

The team heard a common concern from the campus community about the instability of leadership on campus which is demonstrated in an organizational chart showing many interims holding the leadership positions related to instruction programs, student services and library and learning services. Many college constituents expressed that this is the cause of the incomplete implementation and integration of SLOs into the college culture. The student success data for degree and certificate attainment, successful course completion rates, retention and persistence rates are in line with other similar colleges (II.A.2.d). The work CCSF has done with the San Francisco Unified School District is commendable. The work aligns college readiness in math and English with each feeder high school in the city. This has led to the development of successful accelerated math and English programs within the CCSF curriculum.

City College of San Francisco not only offers city-wide access through its campuses and sites, but also through distance education, internships, dual and concurrent enrollment programs for high school students, and study abroad programs. The distance education program has nearly quadrupled since 2006. It is now offering several degrees and certificates fully online, and most transfer requirements are available online (II.A.1.b). The quality and preparation for faculty teaching courses through distance modes of education are commendable. City College of San Francisco offers training for faculty who wish to transition traditional, in-person courses to distance education courses with course evaluation at various stages of new online course development. City College of San Francisco also ensures the quality of its web-enhanced courses by requiring faculty to participate in a seven-hour training course that also provides professional development opportunities for faculty who would like to enhance their courses. The college also provides a course to support student online learning through the one-unit LERN 55 successful online learning course. Regardless of the quality of the CCSF distance education program, recent budget decisions have nearly eliminated the support for faculty teaching through distance education modes, which could have detrimental effects on the program effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence

The college operates a main campus, nine primary campuses that offer non-credit, CTE, transfer, and basic skills instruction. Observations of instructional activities at the main campus and a number of satellite campuses suggest that the college offers quality instruction through ways that meet its broadly defined mission (II.A, II.A.1).

Focused interviews with department chairs and lead faculty members of CTE programs reveal active and regular use of industry advisory boards. These CTE advisory boards, which meet at time intervals varying from quarterly to semi-annually, actively engage faculty in developing strategies to improve programs and learning outcomes. Some programs must meet stringent regulatory standards such as those imposed by the Federal Aviation Administration on the college's Aircraft Maintenance Technology Program. The Culinary Arts Program benchmarks some of its curriculum to National Restaurant Association exit examination standards (II.A.2.b, II.A.5).

The CTE program with the strongest manifest industry connections is the Culinary Arts Program. Students are required to complete a one-semester industry internship as a culminating activity. This activity creates ample opportunity for industry to provide continuous feedback to college faculty on the quality of its program completers and the overall effectiveness of its instructional program. None of the CTE programs sampled, except Culinary Arts, could document and track job placements. CTE program personnel had very limited knowledge and awareness of student success in the career field of focus and could not use job success as a measure of program effectiveness. Moreover, none of the sampled CTE programs had done much with the implementation of the SLO assessment and improvement cycle. It also appeared that many of these programs had not developed program-level learning outcomes (II.A.1.c).

An overarching planning issue identified by most of the CTE faculty involves insufficient resources for their programs. These resource concerns range from the adequacy of staffing, equipment and supplies to satisfactory facilities and sufficient program oversight. There was not a clear understanding within the CTE programs of how their planning was tied to resource allocation at the program level. Despite the pervasive lack of understanding on how resources are allocated, site visits at satellite campuses as well as a sampling of instructional labs on campuses revealed that classroom labs were generally very well equipped with needed instructional equipment and supplies (II.A.1).

In response to the DOE inquiry related to class section cancellations, the team examined the classes that were cut to determine 1) whether classes were cut mid semester or in the first two weeks of the term; 2) whether students were properly informed and given options for other class sections where appropriate; 3) whether the class cuts occurred in non credit or credit classes; and 4) whether the impact on program quality for any programs particularly affected institutional effectiveness.

The team determined that City College of San Francisco has a defined process for canceling low-enrolled classes with fewer than 20 students for credit and noncredit courses. The policy states that classes are cancelled with less than 20 students enrolled. Exception must be approved by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Spring term 2012 had three rounds of cancellations, one prior to the start of school when about 1/3 of the cancellations were done. The second round occurred the first two weeks of the semester, which accounted for about another third of the course cancellations. The third round occurred within two weeks after the full-term census date for the final third of the cancellations. The total cancellations amounted to just under 100 sections.

The first round of cancellations was unique in that cancellations were not necessarily aimed at low-enrolled classes, but more specifically at the type of instructor assigned to the class. Department chairs reported being instructed to cancel classes assigned to retired full-time faculty and short-term adjunct faculty, neither of whom receives preference for classes in the AFT contract. Although this seemed an unusual approach because many full classes were cancelled, the department chairs worked diligently to find another spot for the displaced students. Many faculty agreed to enroll more students than their class maximums to accommodate these students. Administration has stated that this was not the instructions they gave out for the first round of class cancellations, so there is misunderstanding between the decision makers and those who carried out the decisions.

The second round of cancellations was based solely on course enrollments, following the CCSF policies for cancellation. The departments made changes that included combining sections. This action was in accordance with policies at other California community colleges.

The third and final round of class cancellations, which occurred after census date, was directed at low-enrolled late start class sections.. The college could have been more proactive by canceling these sections at an earlier date. Many of these classes were open-

entry/open-exit courses; the college had hoped these classes would fill if given additional time for adding enrollment.

What made these cancellations newsworthy in the San Francisco area was the fact that CCSF had not been diligent in enforcing its course cancellation policy until this semester. This appeared to be the first time that CCSF had utilized course cancellations as a money-saving measure and had a late round of cancellations to offset the February deficits revealed to all community colleges in the state. Attempts were made to place students in other sections whenever possible, as is regular practice at CCSF; however, long-range enrollment planning strategies need to be put in place to ensure late cancellations will not become a regular practice at CCSF.

Improvement in college procedures is also needed in the area of documentation of collegewide SLO assessment efforts. This documentation has been ineffective. Currently SLO assessment data is not easy to find on the college website but can be found embedded in each department's program review documents. The college has not yet addressed its general education SLOs, although the college has worked to develop a process to ensure all instructional programs will have assessed SLOs and reviewed assessment results for program improvements by 2016 (II.A.1.a).

The evidence suggests that the college has made some progress in establishing SLOs. It should also be noted that in a student survey given in 2010-2011, there was a positive response stating that faculty provided a syllabus containing clear and specific learning outcomes for the class, although evidence suggests that SLOs were not clearly stated in all course syllabi (II.A.2.h, II.A.6).

The SLO Workgroup was reportedly discontinued because its purpose, to assist departments in creating both course-level and program-level student learning outcomes, was perceived as being accomplished. Another reason this workgroup's efforts ceased was because the vice chancellor who chaired the group was moved to another area, highlighting another impediment to progress on student learning outcomes, namely, instability in leadership (III.D.2.b).

The Academic Senate is in the process of establishing the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Task Force on Student Learning Outcomes. The composition of this task force had not been finalized as of our team visit, and as recently as the March 7, 2012, City Currents Newsletter, the Academic Senate President placed a request for volunteers to join this task force. The purpose of this task force is to promote collegewide dialogue about student learning and coordinate student learning outcomes, which are crucial to accreditation. Once in operation, this group could assist the college in processing, managing and monitoring its progress on student learning outcomes.

The College Curriculum Committee has been assisting with quality control and processing of SLO creation and assisting in development of appropriate assessment methodology (II.A.1, II.A.1.b, II.A.2.a, b. e). The visiting team discovered that various departments have created a voluntary SLO coordinator position within their respective

departments and that substantive dialogue on student learning outcomes, assessments, and pedagogical response to results occurs at their monthly department curriculum committee meetings. Nevertheless, the disparate responses by departments to the student learning outcomes effort is a concern as departments appear to be either completely or barely engaged (II.A.2.f).

A review of the program review documents from 2011 shows that 57.7% of the instructional programs responded to the requests to provide an update on the progress of identifying and assessing student learning outcomes. The college's planning documents show when departments plan to assess and examine the results of SLO assessments for continuous quality improvement. Of the 63 departments that have submitted such plans, only 25% will be completed by 2013. Another 27% will have half of their courses assessed and examined for continuous quality improvement by 2013. The remaining 48% of instructional departments will have less than half of their courses assessed and examined for continuous quality improvement by 2013. Further analysis of the planning documents revealed that, as it pertains to course-level assessments, only 55% of programs will be 90% to 100% compliant by 2016. Clearly, institutional planning was not intended to support the fall 2012 SLO proficiency compliance deadline. The evidence examined during the visit does not substantiate the information reported to the ACCJC as of June 10, 2011, which indicates that 75% of all college courses have an ongoing assessment of learning outcomes and that 73% of college programs also have ongoing assessments of student learning outcomes (ACCJC Eligibility Requirement 21).

Another inhibiting factor to faculty investment in the student learning outcome initiative relates to the disconnection between SLO efforts and faculty evaluation (III.A.1.c). The SLO work has relied entirely upon volunteerism, and structures have been put in place to be as neutral as possible to effect optimal participation (II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, and II.A.2.i). Nonetheless, the college has recognized its need to draw attention to a few model programs that have closed the loop on the SLO assessment cycle. The college wants all to know of the few model programs' inherent ability to fully integrate the SLO process into the college's operations and culture (II.A.2, II.A.2.f).

Some programs have indeed taken assessment results and altered delivery to improve student learning, as exemplified by the mathematics and English departments when they initiated short-term classes and/or consolidated sequential courses. The college has expressed an urgent need to focus on student learning outcomes assessment data accuracy, collection, consistency, and analysis, and has made efforts to address this. In the Accreditation Update the college states that "establishing meaningful and authentic regular assessment of these learning outcomes has proven to be a daunting task." Recent CCSF Academic Senate minutes state that "because ACCJC/WASC expects the college to document being at the proficiency level in SLOs by fall 2012, considerable progress should be made during the spring semester."

Conclusions:

The team concluded that the college partially meets Standard II.A Instructional Programs.

The college has diligently pursued its broad educational mission through its network of campuses, all of which appear to maintain the same level of quality standards for instructional programs (II.A.1). The team concluded that the instructional programs in credit and non-credit programs provide high-quality instruction to meet the needs of the community while also demonstrating the college effort to meet the broad mission of the institution (II.A.1, II.A.2.c).

Although the college developed a comprehensive program review process, the results of program review are not linked to the resource allocation process, in particular not when revenues are declining. Consequently, the college has not achieved the proficiency level of implementation of program review (II.A.2.a, e, f and ACCJC Rubric for Evaluation Institutional Effectiveness for Program Review). Even though there is evidence that program budgets are often inadequate to fully support equipment and supply needs of instructional labs, the college has exercised great effectiveness in generating and allocating grant funds to properly equip laboratories (II.A.1).

Few departments are demonstrating levels of development, let alone proficiency, of implementation of student learning assessment and analysis accompanied by modifications of educational delivery that has led to greater student learning and success (II.A.3 and ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Student Learning Outcomes). Some basic skills, CTE and transfer programs have identified and assessed program-level SLOs, but many programs are not significantly engaged in using program- and course-level SLO assessments to improve instruction (II.A.2.i). Evidence did show, however, that CTE programs use advisory boards effectively for program improvement efforts (II.A.2.b, II.A.5).

In general, institutional student learning assessment and using the assessment results for continuous improvements are not embraced or implemented by many departments and programs. It is evident that the college would have to work with incredible intensity to meet the student learning outcomes implementation level of proficiency by fall 2012.

Recommendation:

Recommendation 4: Student Learning Outcomes

To fully meet Standard II Student Learning Programs and Services, the team recommends that the college identify the intended student learning outcomes at the course, program, general education, certificate and degree levels, develop and implement assessments of student learning, and analyze the results of assessment to improve student learning. The results of ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes should foster robust dialogue and yield continuous improvement of courses, programs and services and the alignment of college practices for continuous improvement (I.B; II.A.1.a, c, II.A.2.a-c, f, g-i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2; III.A.1.c; IV.A.2.b, IV.B.2.b).

B. Student Support Services

General Observations:

City College of San Francisco has a wide variety of student support services that are offered to its diverse student body of nearly 90,000 credit and non-credit students dispersed widely among nine primary campuses and hundreds of outreach sites. The support services provided are comprehensive and traditional for a public community college in California. Based on survey results, the Student Services Department has engaged in robust dialogue that has informed the institutional plan to expand the delivery of a range of student services at each of the college's primary campuses. However, with declining budgets and diminishing resources, several staff members expressed concern as to the college's ability to provide similar quality services at each primary college location (II.B.1, II.B.3.a).

The college provides an annual published catalog with accurate and current information. The catalog is also available on the college website. The catalog on the website is updated with information that has changes since the printing of the published catalog. The catalog is comprehensive and includes general information, requirements for admission, financial aid, student fees, and academic information and major policies (II.B.2).

The college assesses student support services through surveys and meetings to facilitate faculty and staff dialogue related to student needs; however, few programs utilized the results of surveys in the program review process. Although some support services have defined programmatic student learning outcomes, the team did not find evidence that all units have completed the full cycle of assessment, analysis and program improvement (I.B., II.B.3.a).

City College of San Francisco demonstrates a strong commitment to supporting the diverse educational interests, needs and goals of students. Each primary campus and site demonstrates a strong connection to the surrounding neighborhood with a focus on meeting community needs and providing student access and success. The college's commitment to its mission is evident in both the curricular and co-curricular programs and services, such as Associated Student Councils on each campus, a robust Inter-collegiate Council and resource centers for specific populations (II.B.3.b).

Findings and Evidence:

The college recruits and admits a diverse group of students consistent with its mission. The Office of Outreach and Recruitment provides early readiness to high schools, middle schools and surrounding communities. The college has recently developed a partnership grant through the Gates Foundation that focuses on recruiting and transitioning high school underrepresented students (II.B).

The team confirmed that college publishes a catalog for its constituencies with the appropriate and accurate information. The catalog is available through publication and on the college's website. The information in the catalog includes: General Information, the Calendar of Instruction, Admission Information, Student Financial Resources, Learning Resources and Student Services, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements, Transfer Information, Programs and Courses, College Rules and Regulations, Academic Policies and a listing of the college's faculty and administration. The catalog is published annually and updates made during the year are available on the college's website. The team determined that the catalog is current, comprehensive and clearly organized (II.B.2.a-d).

Based on interviews, campus visits and a review of written evidence, the team substantiated that the institution engages in several initiatives that foster personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development. Examples of these initiatives include mentoring and service learning, student ambassadors and the Puente Program (II.B.3.b).

The team verified that student data are collected and analyzed to inform equity efforts in several student support services areas. Through student equity hearings and specific population data, CCSF has developed multicultural retention programs that focus on closing the achievement gap (II.B.3 c and d).

The college offers a wide variety of support services, many provided in the languages that reflect the primary languages spoken by the student population and community at large. The college website is accessible in various languages, which is important for effectively serving immigrant populations in their primary language (II.B.3.a and d).

According to the college's self study report, all student support services units and departments have developed student learning outcomes, and 80% of the units and departments have engaged in assessment of those outcomes (CCSF Self Study Report, page 242). However, the team determined that while several support services units have initiated the process of student learning outcomes and assessment, all units have not developed student learning outcomes. According to the Vice Chancellor of Student Development, evidence of student learning outcomes and assessment among some student services units could not be supported by evidence because many of the records have been lost due to the departure of the SLO coordinator (II.B.4).

The college gathers data to review and improve programs and services including its unit strategic plans. Student data are collected using many methods including a 2007 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), listening sessions, student opinion surveys, the annual College Performance Indicators Report (CPI), Scheduling and Reporting System (SARS) reports, student equity hearings, pilot programs, and special faculty committees. While the tools for evaluation are expansive, the team could not find evidence that data from these tools were utilized by student services programs and services in their respective program review process. The program review template is focused on instructional units and is not an effective template for the comprehensive

evaluation of student services and support units. Program review of student support services is not tied to college goals and budget allocation processes. The team found that the student support services are not engaged is a systematic assessment and planning process that includes effective program review (II.B.1, II.B.4).

The institution's pride in the expansion of student support services to several of the primary campuses was evident. Student services personnel reported that the college determined which services would be offered at which of its nine primary campuses based on feedback received from students by various methods that included equity hearings, listening sessions, and meetings with students enrolled in basic skills as well as from faculty teaching basic skills at the different campuses. Although the college offers a variety of services at the different locations, the array of services are different by location (II.B.3.a).

The team concluded that not all services give the impression of being equitably or adequately offered to students regardless of service location or delivery method (II.B.3.a). This impression was underscored by the differing reporting lines for the same and like services. For example, counseling services at each of the primary campuses are assigned to different divisions with different reporting lines. This structure created challenges to effective communication and collaboration (II.B.1). In general, the decentralization of some support services increased student access for some to some services, but not all, along each student's academic journeys at the campuses of the City College of San Francisco (II.B.3.a, II.B.4).

Over the last six years, there has been a significant increase in enrollments in distance education courses. Online student support services are minimal, and there is no evidence of movement towards addressing the student support service needs for distance learning students in an online modality (II.B.1, II.B.3, and II.B.3.a).

Regardless of the diverse reporting lines among counseling programs, all counselors are offered a multitude of professional development activities including an "All Counselors Meeting" where counselors from all departments can obtain updated information regarding changes and new initiatives. A Bridge to Success Partnership Grant provides professional development opportunities to counselors from CCSF and San Francisco Unified School District. The team learned that this grant is a community-wide partnership to improve college readiness. The grant's student outcome evaluation findings include: 1) SFUSD course performance in math did not predict CCSF math placement; 2) Nearly one-half of students who entered CCSF with one risk factor passed all of their core courses. Extrapolating from the grant-reported student outcomes, the team determined that CCSF counselors are supporting student development and success (II.B.3.c).

Located in a richly diverse community, CCSF offers and supports a number of programs and events that enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. Examples include activities offered by the Latino Services Network, special events during Black History Month, and the Multicultural Infusion Project. Also included in the curriculum is a diversity requirement in general education for the associate degree under area H: Ethnic

Studies, Women's Studies and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies (II.B.3.d).

CCCApply is used as the college admission application and a Spanish version is available (II.B.3.a). The college uses a locally developed assessment instrument for placement in English and ESL. Accuplacer is used for placement in mathematics. Validation of the assessment instruments have not been completed in six years, and the locally developed assessment instruments are no longer meeting the requirements of the state agency that authorizes community college operations (II.B.3.e).

Based on interviews and site visits, the team concluded that previous findings regarding securing and storing of student files have not been fully addressed due to budget constraints. Current records are scanned and stored electronically; however, a considerable number of records are not yet converted. The college is urged to continue to make progress to complete this project (II.B.3.f).

Conclusions:

The team concluded that the college partially meets Standard II.B Student Support Services.

Overall, City College of San Francisco represents itself as a college that addresses the identified needs of students. The college provides innovative programs geared toward students with the greatest need for an enhanced supportive learning environment. City College of San Francisco has demonstrated a genuine commitment to creating student learning environments at diverse locations throughout the district through thought and action, albeit not through systemic evaluation and planning that is formalized in documented plans (II.B.3).

The quality of student services is assessed and improved through faculty, staff and student input provided by survey instruments. The student services planning and assessment, however, does not adhere to a process that was developed by the college's defined models for measuring institutional effectiveness. Neither is it recorded in program plans. Surveys and robust dialogue about how to best serve the various needs of its ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse students do not meet the ACCJC Standards of Accreditation as measures of institutional effectiveness (II.B.1, 3 and 4). To fully meet this standard, the institution should adhere to college-developed models for systematic planning, assessment and review.

The recently designated Interim Vice Chancellor of Campuses and Enrollment Services is enthusiastic about the prospects for providing comprehensive student services at the primary campuses. This leadership and enthusiasm should be aimed at creating and implementing a comprehensive student support services plan to meet the varied needs of its students regardless of location and through distance education. The plan should document the evaluation that is occurring and the program review and SLO assessment yet to be completed to close the loop to improve student support services. Additionally,

the student support services plan should address the need deliver student services to the distance education environment (II.B.4).

Recommendation:

Recommendation 5: Student Support Services

To fully meet Standard II.B Student Support Services, the team recommends that the institution systematically assess student support services using student learning outcomes and other appropriate measures to improve the effectiveness of its support services and develop as well as communicate its plans for the expansion of delivery and prioritization of student services that support student learning and achievement regardless of location or means of delivery (II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f and II.B.4).

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

The general quality of the institutional self evaluation report on Standard II.C Library and Learning Support Services is good, with evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of the programs and services based on its implementation of program review, defined student learning outcomes and assessment that are used to close the loop with improvements. The library demonstrates strong collegial commitment to systematic planning and outcomes assessment. Program reviews indicate effective use of assessment data to make improvements. There is rich evidence that library faculty and staff demonstrate that their courses and services meet students' learning needs by taking into account student-use demographics and the contribution of the library's activities to student learning and student satisfaction (II.C.2).

With the expected high usage of the Chinatown Campus, which is due to open by the 2012 fall semester, the Library and Learning Support Services Division is planning to offer an increasingly robust collection and more librarian hours, information competency sessions, and in-person tutoring. That planning will be connected to courses offered at the Chinatown Campus, with the intent of providing a one-stop service point for students at that campus.
Although Standard II.C is well documented, the evaluation sections are somewhat brief. Because several CCSF campuses lack a library and other learning support services, attention has been given since the 2006 accreditation visit to increase the number and availability of electronic books, databases and teaching materials. Library hours have been reduced by up to 30% on several campuses, and delivery service to all campus sites is not yet a reality. For some of CCSF's 90,000 students, access to library and learning support resources and services remains problematic (II.C.1.c).

Findings and Evidence

The library has been a campus leader in publicizing and improving its student learning outcomes to enhance its services. Library workshops have had student learning outcomes since 2004. Since the 2006 accreditation self study, improvements in the delivery of library services based on SLO assessment data have been ongoing and substantial. To cite the 2012 accreditation self study, "The library wiki provides a central location for all LLR assessment information, including: a seven-year timeline of assessments to conduct each year, measurements by library service area, process documents to guide assessment work groups, survey instruments, an assessment analysis form, and a chart to identify assessments performed, with recommendations and results" (CCSF Self Study Evaluation, page.282) (II.C.1, II.C.2).

The Library and Learning Support Services Division (LLR) conducts dialogue about student learning as evidenced by the collaboration between the faculty of the library and discipline faculty. Library faculty consulted with discipline faculty to develop the library collection and to embed information competency instruction in distance education courses. The predominant disciplines that incorporate embedded electronic librarian services include English, speech, and health; students from those courses email their assignments to the librarians for reference assistance (II.C.1.a.b and c).

In addition, the LLR Division is doing a commendable job of surveying students and faculty to assess how collections and services meet their instructional needs. Methods used include statistical data analysis, student and faculty surveys, focus groups, faculty and student evaluation of workshops, pre- and post-testing within specific programs, and informal anecdotal feedback from the college community. Collegewide surveys periodically assess satisfaction with the library and learning support service areas, regardless of the location of the services. The college's 78 computer labs across the district also support students in their learning; however, general computer labs (i.e. non LLR labs) throughout the district seem to have a less defined evaluation process (II.C.2).

The Learning Assistance Department (LAD) includes discipline faculty to provide tutoring support in high-demand subjects. LAD began its work in student learning outcomes in 2007, and, like the library, the resulting work through collaboration and dialogue has been posted on its website for the college to see.

Conclusions

The team concluded that the college meets Standard II.C Library and Learning Support Services. The team confirmed that the college has made consistent improvement in addressing each element of Standard II.C since the 2006 self study, especially in terms of student learning outcomes in information competency courses and the use of technology to improve student learning. Infusion of information competency into general courses, regular workshops, and the creation of the graduation requirement for information competency are quite noteworthy accomplishments. The library and learning support units have incorporated systematic evaluation and planning within their ongoing work, and they document these aspects of their activities. Library resources are made

available throughout the institution and a collaborative effort among the campuses is impressive. To improve the adequacy of the library book collection, the college needs to address the age of the book collection as part of its institutional planning and budgeting activities. The institution has done an admirable and successful job in meeting ACCJC Accreditation Standards in this area.

STANDARD III
Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations:

City College of San Francisco employs over 2,600 faculty, classified staff and administrators to support over 90,000 students. These students are enrolled in more than 200 associate degree and certificate programs. The variety of the programs and diversity of the student population demand the college find qualified personnel that mirror this diversity. The college has demonstrated through its policies, procedures and practices an exceptional commitment to diversity while recruiting qualified staff in all areas of employment.

Due to recent budget reduction, City College of San Francisco has implemented a two-year hiring freeze. Only essential positions have been filled with 76 full-time faculty hires and 59 full-time classified hires from September 2011 to December 2012. During this timeframe administrative staff has been reduced significantly. This has resulted in reassignment of administrative staff to provide coverage of operational areas. In spite of the budget difficulties the human resources department effectively oversees the recruitment, screening, selection and hiring of personnel in accordance with laws, regulations, contracts and polices imposed by the numerous local, city, county and state governing bodies and agencies.

Findings and Evidence:

The selection process for faculty is comprehensive. Job descriptions provide delineation of the needed education, skills or experience necessary to meet the qualifications for the functional duties of each position. Job announcements are thoroughly reviewed by a number of committees or individuals as appropriate to the position being recruited. A screening process is in place to assure applicants meet the minimum qualifications as detailed in the job description. The screening process includes appropriate constituent membership. Faculty membership is required for the screening of faculty positions and the interview requires a teaching demonstration plus a portfolio of previous work. Degrees or certificates are verified for those positions requiring specific credentials. In this process, the institution granting the degree or certificate to the candidate is verified as an accredited institution. The screening process in place assures members of hiring panels

are properly trained and/or have the specific background or knowledge about the position being recruited (III.A.1, III.A.1.a).

Collective bargaining agreements for classified staff and faculty clearly outline evaluation procedures for classified staff and faculty. The evaluation process for administrators is clearly described in administrative procedures. The team reviewed a sample of performance evaluations and interviewed responsible administrators. As a result, the team has determined that the Department for Human Resources is appropriately monitoring the application of established procedures. The team also verified that the Department for Human Resources tracks performance evaluations for faculty and classified staff, and the chancellor's staff tracks performance evaluations for administrators. The performance evaluation assures the effectiveness of its human resources, identifies strengths and special qualities, and defines areas where improvement is needed. In cases where improvement is needed, the process includes the creation of an improvement plan (III.A.1.b).

The self study identified several components of the faculty evaluation process designed to ensure the effectiveness of producing student learning outcomes, including that the student evaluation provides measures of linkages between the faculty and SLOs. During the visit, the team was not able to substantiate these assertions. The actual instrument used for faculty evaluation does not include these component parts. A review of evaluations did not provide evidence that this sub-standard is being met (III.A.1.c).

The Board of Trustees for the City College of San Francisco has adopted policies that set forth standards of expected employee behavior to ensure a safe and respectful work and learning environment. Board Policy 3050: Institutional Code of Ethics is the written code of professional ethics for all personnel. BP3050 is published in employee handbooks and collective bargaining agreements. In addition, the Board of Trustees adopted a Workplace Violence Policy in 2004 and Board Policy 3052: Conflict of Interest was approved in 2010. District policies are easily accessible on the college's website. Some district policies were adopted years ago and may benefit from a review to ensure accuracy with current laws and regulations (III.A.1.d, III.A.4.c.).

Over the last several years, budget cuts have resulted in severe classified staff and administrative staff reductions and reassignments to fill the vacancies in critical areas. For example, of the five vice chancellor positions, four are interim reassignments. Natural attrition has been the basis for staff reduction and, therefore, is not always in alignment with institutional priorities and goals or recommendations for the allocation of human resources. The need for new or replacement positions is established during the program review process; however, a formal staffing plan is not part of the integrated planning process. Positions remain vacant and sorely needed (I.B.3, I.B.6, and III.A.2).

As classified staff and administrator positions are being reduced or reassigned, or as duties of vacant positions are absorbed by existing personnel, new facilities have been opened or will be opening soon. During the same time, the college has fulfilled its priority to hire and maintain an ample number of full-time faculty to meet the instructional mission of the college (III.A.2).

The institution has established written personnel policies and procedures that are reviewed regularly through the shared governance process and, if appropriate, by the unions. Personnel policies seem to be consistently and equitably administered, although employee needs and concerns are voiced and addressed via the Joint Labor Management Council, the College Diversity Committee, the Chancellor's Cabinet, the Academic Senate, and the bargaining unions. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) 2121 has a Grievance Committee that meets on a regular basis with the head of employee relations to work out any perceived problems between the district and faculty. Additionally, the Human Resources Committee meets every other week to address pertinent personnel issues, employee concerns, new and updated employment laws, and personnel policies. Recommendations for adoption of new and/or amended personnel policies are presented to the Board of Trustees for review and adoption. Board approved personnel policies and procedures are available on the department website. Some policies appear to be dated, which may suggest a need to establish a timeline for systematic review and update. New policy development and review occurs through the established shared governance process. All policy manual amendments and additions go through two readings prior to governing board approval. The number of bargaining unions and committees ensures compliance with this Standard (III.A.3.a).

During the site visit the team observed personnel records are kept in secure and locked areas in the Human Resources Department. These personnel records are confidential and are treated as such. Employees may view personnel files during regular business hours. For all employees, California Education Code and Labor Code provisions of security and confidentiality are assured. Personnel records maintained online are accessible only by authorized password (III.A.3.b).

Access to confidential data was an identified audit exception in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010 financial report. The auditors noted there was not a clearly documented procedure used when an employee resigns or is terminated to ensure that access to confidential electronic district records has been removed. The auditors noted CCSF did not have a checkout form from the Department for Human Resources that would provide evidence that the employee had been removed from access to all electronic or confidential data. Corrective action for this audit finding was implemented as noted in the financial report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011 (III.A.3.b).

City College of San Francisco serves a very diverse student body and, as a result, places emphasis on equity and diversity when planning, creating policies, developing programs, and selecting employees. This effort is led by an active College Diversity Committee that meets regularly to ensure diversity remains an important topic of the college's agenda for discussion. This focus has led to an annual review and analysis of data needed to implement effective change to increase student completion rates. City College of San Francisco is to be commended for its commitment to diversity and equity. The college's efforts to achieve equity and diversity are exemplary (III.A.4.a).

The human resources department prepares an annual Employee and Hiring Data Report. The data are used to regularly assess that CCSF's record in employment equity and

diversity is consistent with its mission. The data provided in the self study and the evidence reviewed by the team reflect ethnic diversity in personnel (III.A.4.b).

The college has an Affirmative Action Officer to monitor and ensure compliance with governing board policy on equal employment and educational opportunities. This position, along with the associate dean of affirmative action and the director of student advocacy, rights and responsibilities create a team that assures institutional integrity and fair and equitable treatment of administration, faculty, staff and students (III.A.4.c).

Professional development is provided to faculty, staff and administrators, limited ostensibly due to the budget cuts. City College of San Francisco has worked to provide professional development although the numbers of faculty development days and training opportunities have been directly affected by budget cuts. A review of evidence shows a good effort to provide professional development to all employee groups of the college; however, interviews with staff reveal a sentiment that budget reduction in this area has gone too deep and that essential skills training has not been readily available. Surveys given to staff also substantiate the opinion that professional development opportunities are not adequate. The dramatic reduction in professional development opportunities and deep reduction in the number of faculty development days pose a challenge to the college to prioritize its allocation of resources to meet this need (III.A.5.a).

The college does not currently systematically evaluate professional development programs and use the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement (III.A.5.b).

It is ambiguous whether human resources planning is integrated with institutional planning. Based on a review of planning documents and interviews, at a minimum the program review process includes an opportunity to assess staffing needs and request added staff. Regardless of need based on institutional priorities and goals due to declining revenue, the recommendations for the allocation of human resources are not followed or budgeted. Moreover, not enough data exists to systematically assess the effective use of human resources and to use the results of assessment for improvement. For example, the recently approved Strategic Plan lists specific goals for human resources and staffing, and the assessment will take place the future. The second example cited in the self study is the 2010-11 Annual Plan, Section 8.1. Since this planning effort is recently developed, there has not been sufficient time to evaluate progress or assess effectiveness of the planning effort. Interviews revealed the administrative units will complete an annual report this spring to document progress made toward goals. This documented annual report process was not completed in spring 2011. As a result, it is unclear whether or not the goals have been achieved or assessed.

Conclusions:

The team concluded that the college partially meets Standard III.A Human Resources.

The self study and documented evidence reveal staffing needs are identified through program reviews for academic programs and student support services and other college

operations. However, the team concluded that the allocation of new and replacement positions is not informing the annual budgeting process (III.A.1, I.B.1). Hiring policies, processes and practices appear to comply with state laws and governing board policies to ensure equity and diversity and a qualified workforce (III.A.1, III.A.3). Evaluation procedures are clearly identified for faculty, administrators and classified staff; and evaluation processes are effectively monitored by the Department for Human Resources III.A.1.b). However, the institution has not incorporated the results of learning assessment into the evaluation procedures for faculty, administrators and other faculty and staff responsible for student learning (III.A.1.c). A strong commitment to diversity is demonstrated by a wide range of services and programs for all segments of the college and community as demonstrated by employment data and reports (III.A.4). Limited professional development opportunities are being provided during these difficult economic times. Regardless of declining revenue, employees expressed a need for appropriate professional development opportunities. To fully meet this standard, the college must integrate professional development opportunities into its planning process and ensure that priorities are linked to an appropriate allocation within its limited annual revenues (III.A.5, III.A.6).

The self study notes the classified and administrative staff levels have been decreasing during the economic decline. Staffing realignment prompted by the economic downturn is determined by the chancellor for administrative positions. Classified vacancies are reviewed by the Vacancy Review Classified Group (VRG). It does not appear that position review processes are in alignment with planning or the shared governance process as indicated in documents provided during the visit (III.A.2, I.B.6).

The team is concerned there is not sufficient classified staff or administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the leadership, management or services necessary to support the institution's mission and operations. The absence of a formal staffing plan and assessment data make it difficult to determine whether human resources planning efforts are integrated with the college's planning processes or conducted on an ad hoc basis due to declining resources. The self study indicates human resources planning is integrated with institutional planning. Requests for positions are included in program reviews and seen by the Program Review Committee. In theory, these requests are linked to annual budget allocations. In practice, this doesn't seem to occur, at least, not when revenues are reduced (I.B.6, III.A.2).

During the site visit, the team saw instances where personnel were overtaxed with additional duties or carrying out new roles. For example, four of the five vice chancellor positions were filled by interim administrators. Other administrators were assigned new administrative duties in addition to their existing loads. At the time of the team visit, two key management positions in the facilities area were vacant without current plans to refill the positions. It is not certain what the cumulative impact will be on facilities operations. Also, classified staff vacancies are filled through reassignment to address critically needed vacant positions. It is uncertain whether or not the minimum qualifications as defined in the job description are evaluated for the reassignments. Most disconcerting is that the planned and nearly completed new Chinatown campus may be delayed due, in

part, to inadequate human resources to operate the much larger facility (I.B.6, III.A.2, III.A.6 and III.D.1a-d).

Recommendations:

Recommendation 6: Human Resources Components of Evaluation

To fully meet Standard III.A Human Resources, the team recommends that the evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include a component that assesses the effectiveness in bringing about those learning outcomes (III.A.1.c).

Recommendation 7: Human Resources Staffing and Planning

To fully meet Standard III.A Human Resources, the team recommends that the college assess the adequacy of its current number of qualified classified staff and administrators and their appropriate preparation and experience necessary to support the institution's mission and purpose. The college must ensure that human resource planning is fully integrated with the institutional program review, planning and budgeting processes and linked to the annual allocations of funding to maintain and improve institutional effectiveness (III.A.2, III.A.6, and I.B.4).

B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

City College of San Francisco serves a number of diverse communities with campuses and sites throughout the City and County of San Francisco. Some of the campuses are located in leased facilities. The district-owned facilities are Civic Center, Downtown, Evans, John Adams, and Ocean campuses as well as the district offices at Gough Street. Since the last accreditation, facility improvement has been undertaken at all sites owned by the district. It is clear the college is committed to adding and improving facilities and to ensuring safety, security and accessibility at all locations (III.B.1).

The team toured many campuses including Evans, Southeast, Downtown, John Adams, Ocean, Chinatown/North Beach, Civic Center, Castro, Airport and the Mission Campus. The tours verified the college's assertion of safe, secure and well maintained facilities. The college is commended for the maintenance, cleanliness, safety, security and accessibility of the various campus sites (III.B.1, III.B.2). Simultaneously, the college is warned to project the total cost of ownership of new facilities, whether leased or owned, to include all assets such as furniture, equipment and fixtures (III.B.1 and III.B.2).

A Facility Master Plan, approved in 2004, has guided the capital improvements since the last accreditation visit. The City and County of San Francisco requires a City College of San Francisco Facility Master Plan be developed every ten years. The current Facility

Master Plan will inform project development through 2015. City College of San Francisco has had three successful bond initiatives totaling $491 million in local support. Funds from the three bonds have been allocated to projects with a small amount reserved as a contingency. A fourth general obligation bond will be required to complete the projects listed in the Facility Master Plan. In addition to the local bond funds, CCSF has received $185 million in state matching funds (III.B.1).

Findings and Evidence:

The Master Plan, developed with the assistance of a facilities planning firm with experience in college master planning, presents a comprehensive strategy through 2015 for the development of grounds and facilities to meet the college's needs for enrollment growth, access and traffic concerns, and improving aging facilities. The plan evaluated existing campus conditions relative to institutional needs and recommended ways to organize and phase in short- to long-term campus development to meet those needs. The Facilities Master Plan has guided the institution in the planning, construction, maintenance, upgrades and replacement of district physical resources since it was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2004 (III.B.1.a).

A District Facility Condition Assessment was done in cooperation with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office in 2003 and 2010. The 2010 assessment clearly identified the current condition of facilities and the data are being used to determine the priority and scheduling of projects for repairs and upgrades (III.B.1.a). While measures have been taken to improve physical resources through modernization and new construction, there exists a need to update facilities to reasonable standards required for an environment conducive to learning and working where courses, programs and services are offered. During the visit, the team verified through interviews and a review of documentation that plans are in place for the safety, security and inspection of sites owned, leased or rented by the college. Considering the declining fiscal condition of the college, the adequate allocation of funding for maintenance and operations is uncertain (III.B.1.b and III.B.2.a).

The college has developed a master plan that supports institutional improvement goals. Long-range capital plans are completely dependent on bond and State of California capital funding. There is still no process to include the Total Cost of Ownership Model of facilities or equipment into short-term or long-term budget planning. Currently, equipment replacement is based on failure and safety, although the program review process includes a component to identify needed equipment (III.B.2.a).

The management oversight of the facilities operation and maintenance is shrinking. The positions of director of facilities, maintenance and operations and the director of real estate are vacant and have not been approved for hiring, presumably because of budget limitations. The duties of these two positions are being absorbed by the vice chancellor of administration and finance. The Facilities Master Plan is an important component of the comprehensive institutional integrated planning process. This plan includes identified upgrades, maintenance and replacement for facilities to support instructional programs

and services. The relatively new college planning model provides the necessary framework for the future integration of facility planning into the college's systematic assessment and plan for the effective use of all resources, including physical (III.B.2.b).

Conclusions:

The team concluded that the college partially meets Standard III.B Physical Resources.

City College of San Francisco provides safe and sufficient physical resources across its campuses. Each campus is secure, safe and adequately maintained, although some facilities are very dated and dreary. The district has built new facilities, such as the nearly completed Chinatown/North Beach Campus, and made improvements to existing facilities, such as the John Adams Campus in support of student learning and achievement. The Facilities Master Plan was developed to support the Education Master Plan. The self evaluation indicates participation in the facilities planning process from all areas of the college community through the shared governance process. User groups are involved in planning efforts for specific buildings (III.B.1).

Recent staff reductions have resulted in an administrative realignment of duties among positions with management oversight of facilities and their operations. The adequacy of administrative oversight for facilities maintenance and operations is dubious considering the size of the facility plant and the age of many buildings and could quickly jeopardize compliance with the standard (III.A.2, III.B.1, and III.B.2).

The team encourages the college to expand its understanding of the Total Cost of Ownership Model and to utilize this model when planning for new capital construction projects, including facilities, equipment, maintenance and replacement decisions. The team urges the college to continuously evaluate the effective use of physical resources to improve the college's ability to provide the physical resources to support the educational programs and services to the diverse communities it serves on nine primary campuses (III.B.2).

Recommendation:

Recommendation 8: Physical Resources

To fully meet Standard III.B Physical Resources, the team recommends that the college incorporate all costs required to appropriately operate and maintain existing facilities, whether owned or leased, into its annual and long-term planning and budgeting processes and annually allocate the required human and fiscal resources to effectively and equitably operate and maintain physical resources at locations where courses, programs and services are offered (III.B.1).

C. Technology Resources

General Observations:

Technology resources and services are provided by Information Technology Services, which includes four units: Technical Services, Technical Operations, Project Management and Consulting, and Administration. These units provide service and support such as the Service Desk, desktop services, networking and infrastructure, computer lab management, enterprise computing resources, programming, administrative support, and telephony services.

City College of San Francisco has an active and innovative Information Technology Services (ITS) Department. Training is available for faculty who want to develop online courses or use technology resources in on-ground classes. Several college departments (e.g. the library and the Learning Assistance Center) have programs and classes to train students in the effective use of technology.

A new chief technology officer was hired in the summer of 2010 and a current Technology Plan is now in place. During this difficult budget period, funds are lacking to implement an annual technology replacement program. Starting in the 2010-2011 academic year, the college began to transfer into Information Technology Services classified technology employees who previously reported to exclusive departments.

Findings and Evidence:

The college has used the components of the college planning process to develop the collegewide Technology Plan, which ensures that its various types of technology needs are identified. The CCSF vision and mission statements, Strategic Plan, and Annual Plan inform the Technology Plan. The 2009-11 Technology Plan is evidence based and addresses the technology needs as articulated by faculty, staff, and students. These constituents have provided input by means of the shared governance process (e.g., the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable), departmental committees (e.g., the Library Technology Committee), from requests or problems logged by the Service Desk and other technology staff, and from comments and suggestions provided in surveys of employees and students who use technology for a variety of purposes. Based on interviews and a review of documents, it appears that technology support is related to college needs, and technology services have been effectively provided (III.C.1, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d, and III.C.2).

As with many public and private institutions, City College of San Francisco's information technology infrastructure is constantly under attack by viruses and hackers. The purpose of the attacks is to damage the infrastructure or capture personal information of users in the systems. In November of 2011, the college had a risk assessment done to identify vulnerabilities in the infrastructure. During this assessment, several malicious viruses were discovered within the system. Immediately after this discovery, the college took steps to remove all malicious viruses from infected computers and servers. In

addition, the chief technology officer implemented an intruder detection system to monitor incoming and outgoing network traffic. This system also helps identify computers or servers that may become infected. There is no evidence that any of the college's databases were compromised. Even so, the college continues to discuss strategies that will keep the system secure while not interfering with academic freedom. The results of the assessment indicate the college has not met the standard for privacy and security (III.C.1.a).

Faculty and staff training and technical assistance are provided by several units, including the Technology Learning Center and the Technology Mediated Instruction Unit. Additionally, individual technical needs are served by the Service Desk and online documentation and tutorials. Notable is the training provided by library faculty to students in online research and information competency skills, and to faculty and students related to the use of online resources and technology applications. User surveys rate technology training as good.

As the college copes with a reduction in revenues, the elimination of the training facilities for the Educational Training Department has raised concerns. Although there are indications the budget shortfalls could affect the institution's ability meet the requirements of the standard in the future, this has not yet occurred as noted in the team's evaluation of educational programs and related use of technology. At the time of the visit, the requirement to provide quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel was met (III.C.1.b).

A review of the 2009-2011Technology Plan and the 2009-2011Technology Plan Update along with the 2011-2012 college budgets confirms the institution continues to rely almost exclusively on bond and grant funding for the acquisition and replacement of hardware. This does not achieve the stability that is equivalent to an ongoing source of college general funds. The college's self evaluation acknowledges that technology plans are supported with one-time soft money. The college self evaluation also indicates bond funding for technology purchases has been discontinued. Based on this evidence, the college has not integrated into the ongoing budget plans the total cost of technology acquisition and maintenance, including regular replacement of outdated hardware (III.C.1.c).

The institution's planning process for technology projects evolves from the Strategic Plan, the Technology Plan, the Annual Plan, and initially from program review reports. Capital equipment requests are made as part of the annual budgeting process and priorities are established by the College Planning and Budgeting Council. In addition to these processes, several shared governance committees are responsible for recommending policy and driving details of the discussion about utilization of technology resources. The Information Technology Policy Committee recommends policy regarding technology usage. The Teaching Learning Technology Roundtable provides a monthly forum for faculty to discuss technology needs, and the Communications Committee manages policies concerning website design and content. The Distance Learning Advisory Committee oversees the policies concerning distance education at CCSF, including online and telecourses.

While these numerous planning and governance groups are designed to ensure that distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of the programs and services at the college, the budget does not reflect the results of the planning process because the discretionary resources are too limited to finance established priorities and goals (III.C.1.d).

The college has a technology planning process that is linked with the institutional planning process and receives input from multiple venues. The institution's strategic, technology, and annual plans, as well as the vision and mission statements, emphasize that technological support should meet the needs of teaching, learning, collegewide communications, research, and operations systems. However, without a viable source of revenue, CCSF is severely limited in sustaining its information technology infrastructure and operations. The institution's ability to effectively use planning and assessment to maintain or improve technology resources to support learning and institutional effectiveness may be severely limited by a lack of technology funding (III.C.1 and 2).

Conclusions:

The team concludes that the college partially meets Standard III.C Technology Resources.

The college has developed a planning process designed to meet the Standard. Even though the institutional planning and assessment processes are designed to drive the budgeting process to assure technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness, the plan is not linked to the allocation of resources, presumably because the revenue is insufficient to address the needs identified in the planning process. Although CCSF has continued to make progress in many areas related to technology, the areas that remain to be addressed are funding of equipment upgrades and replacement, and improving infrastructure security.

Recommendation:

Recommendation 9: Technology Resources

To fully meet Standard III.C Technology Resources, the team recommends the college develop a comprehensive plan for equipment maintenance, upgrade and replacement that is integrated with the institution's budget allocation processes; and that the college continues to monitor its information technology systems and implement measures to more fully secure the technology infrastructure (III.C.1.a, c-d, III.C.2).

D. Financial Resources

General Observations:

City College of San Francisco has been ineffective in developing and implementing a comprehensive budget planning system that addresses its lack of resources and declining budget. There is a strong connection between the priorities contained in the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan (which reflects the college's vision and mission statements) and the Annual Plan. However, the planning system has not been effectively utilized to address the current lack of resources and declining budget picture.

As with many California community colleges, City College of San Francisco has had declining state revenue for a number of years. As one of California's largest providers of noncredit education, the college's fiscal health has been further challenged by the state's ongoing low level of funding for noncredit instruction.

While CCSF recognizes in its institutional self evaluation that "lack of adequate state support during recent years has led to annual budgets that do not provide adequate resources to meet the needs of the college's current enrollment," the college has not demonstrated the will to reexamine the scope of the college's mission and supporting operations to decide the scope or level of programs and services that can be provided within the limits of its actual financial resources. While the comprehensive budget planning system set priorities for educational improvements, there is no process to reduce the scope of programs and services provided across the service area based on a reduction in funding (III.D.1 a-c).

The lack of self examination and failure to react to ongoing reduced funding has caused the institution to reach a financial breaking point. The college's unrestricted net assets are in a deficit position for the third consecutive year and the deficit continues to grow. Without sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain financial stability and realistic plans for the future, CCSF will be challenged to maintain financial solvency (III.D.1 and 2.c and g). Unless the scope of the mission is adjusted or the college finds an additional stable funding source, it is unlikely the college can continue programs at its current level.

Findings and Evidence:

The comprehensive budget planning system that connects financial planning with institutional planning provides a strong link between the priorities contained in the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan (which reflects the college's vision and mission statements) and the Annual Plan. The Annual Plan consists of a set of institutional objectives that are to be achieved by the college through the efforts of the college's organizational units– departments, schools, and administrative operations. This process identifies goals and expectations for the next budget year. This plan relies primarily on institutional plans for content and timelines. This integrated comprehensive planning process is only effective if

institutional financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The team did not find this to be taking place (III.D.1a-c, III.D.3).

In the development of institutional plans, the college has not included long-term liabilities to provide realistic assessments of financial resources available to support and sustain all obligations and operations. However, as annual budgets are prepared, revenue estimates are included in detailed budget development documents and are updated to include the latest information available (III.D.1.b).

The short-range financial plans do not incorporate plans for payment of future liabilities. The long-range liabilities that have not been considered include post employment medical benefits (OPEB) and a substantial underfunding of the district's workers compensation self insurance fund. The June 30, 2011 underfunding of the OPEB liability is calculated at $35.7 million dollars, and the negative fund balance in the worker's compensation liability fund is $3.2 million dollars. These liabilities clearly are a threat to the financial stability of the college. The primary reason these issues cannot be resolved is because the unrestricted general fund salaries and benefits exceed 92% of the total expenditures excluding transfers (III.D.1.c). The remaining 8%, excluding transfers, simply is not adequate for all other operations and maintenance, hence the reliance on grants, bonds, and other one-time funding (III.D.3).

The college publishes and makes available to all cost center managers its guidelines and processes for budget development and financial planning and follows these guidelines and processes. The annual budget guide is made available to the public on the college website, as are other budget documents such as preliminary and final budgets. The institution has clearly defined and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets. While this is used for the annual budgeting process, recently in light of the unexpected budget cuts, delays in the fiscal closing process and completion of the Annual Audit, accurate information was not available to constituencies who are required to be included in making recommendations based on timely financial data (III.D.1.d).

Financial documents generally reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Of concern are findings in the last two years by the independent auditor that there are deficiencies in internal controls. Deficiencies in internal controls increase the possibility that there are or will be inappropriate use of financial resources. In the most recent audit findings, seven of the 13 findings directly related to the lack of appropriate internal controls. In a review of the prior two years of audit findings, only 18 of the 35 findings had been fully implemented prior to the next year's audit. The failure to fully correct the audit findings reveals a failure to fully comply with the standards (III.D.2.a).

A thorough review of the evidence including cash flow projections required State of California reports, and independent auditors' reports. Additionally, the current auditor, prior auditor, and CCSF management were interviewed. This examination revealed the

institution does not have sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, or realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. This is demonstrated by the unusual paragraph added to the auditor's opinion referring to Note 17 in the June 30, 2011 annual financial statements. This addition to the opinion and the related footnote to the financial statements demonstrate the external auditor's concern with the financial condition of the college (III.D.2.c).

Based on the examination of the current practices of the institution, the team concluded that effective oversight of finances and all contracts and financial resources from all sources are used in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e, III.D.2.f).

As disclosed in the self study, "three former college administrators acted several years ago in a manner that led to the San Francisco District Attorney filing complaints against them. Ultimately these complaints, which were related to the college's campaigns for bond measures, resulted in convictions for the misuse of public funds. To provide safeguards against such activity occurring again, the Board of Trustees has enacted many new policies designed to strengthen controls on finances and contracts (see IV.B.1). In addition, three years ago the college hired its first full-time internal auditor to provide another layer of oversight for financial resources." While the college has implemented these changes, the independent auditor's findings related to internal controls and the changes to the internal auditor's duties appear to lessen the independent oversight. The assigned work of the independent auditor's appears to have changed. This is an indicator that the institution does not use existing personnel and processes to evaluate financial management processes, nor does it use the results of the evaluation to improve financial management systems (III.D.2.g).

Conclusions:

The team concludes that the college partially meets Standard III.D Financial Resources.

The financial situation at City College of San Francisco continues to deteriorate. The budget does not realistically provide the financial resources necessary to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.

The short range budget plans do not include payment of future liabilities and obligations such as OPEB and the shortfall in the workman's compensation self insurance pool.

The general fund reserve is at a level that makes the college unable to meet financial emergencies or unforeseen occurrences. This low reserve has also created a reliance on short-term borrowing to meet the cash flow needs of the institution.

While the college has plans to reduce salary and benefit costs that currently exceed 92% of the unrestricted general fund budget, there has been no significant progress in reducing these costs since the last accreditation visit. The failure to address this structural problem continues to limit the college's ability to address other financial problems.

The institution has also failed to correct deficiencies identified by the external auditor. A number of audit findings have repeated for several years without any corrective action.

In reviewing financial information available throughout the institution, it is apparent that accurate, appropriate, and timely information is not provided to constituencies who are required to make decisions based on timely financial data. This creates a situation where the institution is unable systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and use the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement

The institution does not use existing personnel and processes to evaluate the financial management process and use the results of the evaluation to improve financial management systems.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 10: Financial Planning and Stability

To meet the Standard III.D Financial Resources, the team recommends that the college use its mission statement to inform its allocation of resources decisions to match annual, ongoing expenditures with ongoing financial resources. This action is needed to increase its reserves to a prudent level that will allow it to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences, to meet its operating expenses without excessive short-term borrowing, and to effectively manage the financial impact of its unfunded, long-term liabilities (III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c).

Recommendation 11: Financial Integrity and Reporting

To meet Standard III.D Financial Resources, the team recommends the college use the resources necessary to provide accurate and timely reporting of financial information; and to report this information to internal users so they may effectively participate in the annual and long-term planning and budgeting processes (III.D.1.d, III.D.2.g).

STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations:

In addition to the traditional governance groups, the City College of San Francisco established the Office of Shared Governance and created a position of Shared Governance Coordinator to assist in the inclusive participation in college planning processes. There is wide participation from faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students in institutional governance appropriate to their expertise or their role as a representative of a constituent group (IV.A.1).

The college recognizes four foundation groups of the formal governance mechanisms: 1) the Academic Senate, representing faculty; 2) Service Employees International Union (SEIU) 1021, representing the classified staff; 3) the Associated Students, representing students; and 4) the Administrator's Association, representing administrators (IV. A.1).

City College of San Francisco has established clearly written policies that delineate the roles and responsibilities of all constituents in the decision-making process. There is an in-depth description of the three college shared governance systems: 1) the Collegial Governance System, 2) the College Advisory System, and 3) the Planning and Budgeting System. The Office of Shared Governance is responsible for regular updates to the Shared Governance Handbook which is posted on the college's website.

The college noted difficulty in maintaining a central repository of agendas, minutes and other records of the activities of the shared governance committees and made a commitment to improve the system (IV.A.2). To address this, the Committee on Information and Public Records Department discussed ways to improve the timeliness of receiving committee agendas and minutes. The Office of Shared Governance posts minutes and agenda when they are received.

The roles for faculty and administrators for curricular and other educational matters are clearly defined and allow for appropriate input. Student learning programs and services rely on faculty participation and administrative leadership in making recommendations for improvement through the program review and curriculum approval processes. Collaboration with academic administrators is built into the process. The Curriculum Committee includes administrators appointed by the chancellor. Additionally, the chancellor appoints appropriate administrators to each collegial governance committee. The review of existing courses and programs and the initiation of new courses and programs are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee before submission for review and approval by the board (IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b).

The college has developed formal structures for participation by staff, faculty, administrators, and students that facilitate cross-constituent communication. Community listening sessions were offered and a two-day planning session was held in spring 2010 to seek input on the development of the Strategic Plan. Issues or actions arising from college-level discussions were used to revise the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan. Reports from the constituent groups are listed on every Board of Trustees agenda. Difficulty was noted in full engagement by students in the governance processes, and budget cuts were blamed for diminishing participation on committees by classified staff and faculty. The college has implemented several avenues to provide information to the college community to achieve goals and improve learning For example, the Office of Shared Governance ensures that agendas are posted and minutes are made available to the CCSF constituencies by way of the college website and publications (IV.A.3).

The college affirms the institutional intention to maintain honest and direct dealings with the Commission standards, policies, and guidelines. Although the college has sought to

respond to the recommendations of previous accreditation teams, some of the recommendations have not yet been met. The college's relationship with the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) is sound. The primary interactions with the DOE are by the Financial Aid Office and the Office of Workforce and Economic Development. These staff members continually participate in training and development events related to accreditation and DOE regulations (IV.A.4).

The institution's Shared Governance Agreement specifies that an evaluation of the governance system will be conducted every two years, but the last evaluation was completed in 2007. A survey of employees was conducted in fall 2010 regarding satisfaction with the three shared governance councils (IV.A.5).

Findings and Evidence:

The college has an extensive and inclusive shared governance process, and there is general satisfaction indicated by the institutional leaders although criticism was expressed by others (IV.A.1). Generally, there is evidence of respect between and among the college constituencies, although the team encountered at least one instance of little or no confidence in the performance of an administrator (IV.A.4). Given that the college is a large institution with several service locations, it is not surprising that there are communication challenges (IV.A.1).

The college has 43 committees with defined roles and responsibilities. It was noted that student participation was of concern and that recording of meeting outcomes needs improvement (IV.A.2.a).

The Collegial Governance System supports and facilitates the participation of faculty in the Academic Senate and its representation on matters related to academic and professional matters. The College Advisory System seeks recommendations in key operational areas from four committees: 1) Information and Public Records; 2) College Diversity; 3) Communication; and 4) Information Technology Policy. These committees report to the College Advisory Council (CAC). The Planning and Budget System oversees the development of the college strategic plans, the annual plans, the End-of-Year Assessments, and the annual college budgets. These systems' processes are extensive and described in the Shared Governance Handbook (IV.A.2.a).

The college's planning process is designed to allow institutional stakeholders to participate at all levels of discussion, planning and implementation (IV.A.1). The membership of the College Academic Policies Committee, Curriculum Committee, and Bipartite Committee, and the Academic Senate reflect significant faculty participation, ensuring faculty involvement in the development of recommendations about student learning programs and services. In addition, City College of San Francisco's Board of Trustees is committed to working with the Academic Senate. In some areas of participatory governance, the board has agreed to the conditions of mutual agreement. In curriculum development, educational program development, and standards or policies

regarding student preparation and success, however, the board relies primarily on the recommendation of faculty (IV.A.2.a-b).

Interviews with the curriculum committee chair, discipline faculty, and the Academic Senate leadership revealed concerns with the board's manner in dealing with some academic matters, specifically student learning programs and services. Examples include the board's resolution to eliminate student placement exams and a trustee resolution to modify the curriculum for the Police Academy Program (IV.A.1, IV, A.2 a-b, IV.A.3, IV.A.5).

During interviews, criticism regarding the efficiency of the institutional governance process was revealed. The criticism centered on the length of time to reach a recommendation. It was also noted that there may be misunderstanding regarding the role of a recommending body verses a decision-making body (IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3).

Responses to previous recommendations, demonstrated organizational changes, documented planning processes and outcomes of alleged transgressions infer that the college demonstrates integrity and honesty with external agencies (IV.A.4). On the other hand, there were several instances where the team's findings were not consistent with assertions made by the college in its accreditation self study report in relation to ACCJC Accreditation Standard II. In addition, more than one allegation of retaliation was made during team interviews, although the team could not confirm or refute these allegations during the course of the visit. Furthermore, a document was received by the visiting team from the CCSF Academic Senate President, which claimed "significant issues omitted from the institutional self study report for City College of San Francisco and from the February 1, 2012 update in regards to Standard IV.B.1." This document, with included documented references, was addressed to the chair of the accreditation team, but delivered to a team member. This document was sent on behalf of the CCSF Academic Senate, yet it was not approved by the CCSF Academic Senate until after the accreditation team visit. These instances, plus the verified untimely financial audits and several audit findings that have not been corrected, are significant issues that if not separately, then collectively, challenge the college's honesty in its relations with the Commission as defined in ACCJC Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation (IV.A.4 and ACCJC Eligibility Requirement 21).
The evaluation process for the decision-making structures and processes has not been completed. An employee survey in fall 2010 revealed the range of satisfaction with the governance process was from 2.86 to 2.46 with 4 representing an excellent rating. The team identified concerns from several sources regarding the commitment from the board to the institutional governance structures. The evaluation process is proceeding through spring 2012 with plans to present the results to the board in May 2012 (IV.A.5).

Conclusions:

The team concluded that the college partially meets Standard IV.A Decision-making Roles and Processes.

The college supports wide involvement in decision making at formal and informal levels. The college at all levels relies primarily on faculty in the development and implementation of student learning programs and services (IV.A.2, IV.A.2.b, and IV.A.3). The college's integrity in dealing with external agencies is questionable, and allegations should be examined to clear up the veil of distrust and reestablish conclusive institutional integrity (IV.A.4).

Effective communication includes feedback that closes the loop and ensures that decision making results in continuous improvement. The college has structures in place locally to support college decision making; however, the effectiveness of these structures could not be verified and is questionable. There is an undercurrent of distrust among the governance constituents that manifest as indirect resistance, primarily by the faculty, but also among and within each constituent group. The delineation of roles and understanding of authority for input and decision making, greater awareness of the institutional processes and the use of evaluation and assessment tools are needed to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the planning and decision-making processes (IV.A.2, IV.A.3, and IV.A.5).

Recommendations:

Recommendation 12: Leadership, Governance and Decision Making

To fully meet Standard IV Leadership and Governance, the team recommends that the district engage the services of an external organization to provide a series of workshops for the governing board, chancellor, faculty, staff, students and administrators to clarify and understand their defined roles of responsibility and delineated authority in institutional governance and decision making (IV.A, IV.B).

Recommendation 13: Governance Structures

To fully meet Standard IV Leadership and Governance, the team recommends that college leaders from all constituencies evaluate and improve the college's governance structure and consequent processes used to inform decision making for the improvement of programs, practices and services and ensure that the process does not create undue barriers to the implementation of institutional decisions, plans and initiatives (IV.A.1, IV.A.3).

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations:

The college's Board of Trustees is an independent, policy-making board responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a).

The governing board, as a result of concerns that surfaced in the Churchwell Report on the special investigation regarding alleged misappropriation of public funds, has focused efforts on safeguards to protect public funds. Several new policies have been adopted or revised for fiscal probity (IV.B.1).

The curriculum approval process details the board's role in ensuring the quality of the college's academic offerings. Additionally, the central role of the district and college academic senates in academic and professional matters, including educational program and curriculum development and the establishment and maintenance of educational standards, is defined in board policy (IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.b). The board is the final authority for educational quality as well as oversight of legal and fiscal matters (IV.B.1.c).

The board has policies for its organizational structure, assessing its performance, a code of ethics, involvement in accreditation, and conducting the annual evaluations of the chancellor. The board does not have its own plan for orientation and development. The chancellor has assumed this role. The chancellor works cooperatively with college and district administrators to implement board polices (IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.f-h, and IV.B.1.j).

The chancellor of City College of San Francisco was appointed on December 18, 2008 and has served the college for 41 years as an instructor and an administrator. The chancellor has full-time responsibility and authority for guiding the college and implementing district policies. In this role he serves as the board's designated representative with respect to all employer-employee matters (IV.B.2, IV.B.3).

The college administrative structure has and is going through many changes due to the fiscal crisis and the large number of administrators who have retired. The chancellor has realigned the administrative structure. There are several interim positions and many lateral appointments with additional assigned duties (IV.B.2.a).

The chancellor is responsible for guiding institutional improvement, overseeing and evaluating the college's administrative structure, communicating institutional values, goals, and directions, and ensuring that institutional policies are consistent with the college and district mission and policies. The chancellor provides the leadership and direction to the college community so that the linkages between the college plans, program review, and the planning and budgeting process are understood (IV.B.2.b-e).

Findings and Evidence:

The board is responsible for establishing policies and understands its fiduciary responsibility. There have been and remain financial challenges which must be addressed to assure the financial stability of the college. The appearance of certain news stories in the local paper revealed that individual board members contacted the press regarding board and college issues prior to consulting with the chancellor. Other examples referred to individual board members pursuing personal agendas to advance personal interests. These behaviors raise questions about the governing board's bias and independence (IV.B.1.a).

The governing board was commended by college constituents for establishing the mission of the college and for its advocacy for meeting the needs of the students and the communities it serves (IV.B.1.b).

The board has embraced its responsibility for the educational quality, legal matters and the financial integrity of the institution. There remain hard feelings and regret since the institution suffered through a very difficult period as three top administrators were accused of misuse of public funds dating back to 2001, 2005 and 2006 capital bond campaigns. In fall 2011, convictions occurred for two of the three college employees who faced criminal charges (IV.B.1.c).

There have been many instances in which the board policies regarding meeting requirements were not followed. It was documented that 40 committee meetings were conducted in 2011 and, although the agendas for the meetings were available online, no minutes were created for the meetings. It was also noted that the board needed to evaluate and revise policies and practices for currency, relevance and compliance (IV.B.1.e).

The board does not have its own system for orientation and development. The chancellor has assumed this role, although new trustees have attended new trustee orientations provided by California Community College League. The board does adhere to a code of ethics that includes consequences for behavior that violates the code. As a result of interviews with constituent groups and board members it was concluded that the board could benefit from orientation and development sessions regarding programs, services and governance bodies within the institution and the delineation of the roles and responsibilities of board members and administrators, including the chancellor, and to include the role and authority of faculty, classified staff and students (IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.h).

The board adopted a self-evaluation process on January 29, 2009. The process includes a self-assessment instrument and includes public discussion of the results. The board has conducted two self-evaluation studies, one in spring 2009 and the second starting in fall 2010 but not completed until January 2011. In addition to the board self-assessment, an evaluation from constituent groups was included. It has been stated that the results of the evaluation have not been utilized to identify strengths and areas for improvement, nor have the results been effectively communicated.

The governing board evaluation revealed deficiencies which were identified as concerns through evaluation of the college's fulfillment of the specifications of Standard IV. The evaluation instrument used a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1=strongly disagree; 2=somewhat disagree; 3=neither agree nor disagree; 4=agree; and 5 strongly agree. Below are responses to a sample of statements within the evaluation survey, rated by the members of the board as a whole and the college's stakeholders. The responses are indicative of the evidence based on several interviews conducted during the accreditation team visit (IV.B.1.g).

- The board understands that the primary function of the board is to establish the policies by which the district is to be administered. The board response rating was 3.0. The response rating from the college groups was 2.41.
- The board focuses on policy in board discussions, not administrative matters. The board response rating was 2.67. The college group's response rating was 2.07.
- The board sets goals for the chancellor and conducts effective performance evaluations annually. The board response rating was 2.25. No response rating from college groups.
- The board is knowledgeable about the district's educational programs/services. The board response rating was 2.83. The college group's response rating was 2.78.
- The board establishes appropriate measurements to ensure institutional effectiveness and monitors these measurements. The board response rating was 2.17. The college group's response rating was 2.78.
- The board understands and adheres to its roles and responsibilities. The board response rating was 2.67. The college group's response rating was 2.23.
- Board members are engaged in a continuous process of training and development. The board response rating was 1.50. There was no response rating from college groups.

The board receives information and updates regarding the accreditation process. Several board members have volunteered to serve as a resource to the standard teams (IV.B.1.i).

The board has established policies for hiring and evaluation of the chancellor and has followed the policy on the chancellor's evaluation. The visiting team found that constituent groups viewed the chancellor's authority to enforce policy and direct the college diminished by board members' overactive involvement in the operations of the college. There were several examples provided to establish this conclusion. The chancellor did not affirm this assessment (IV.B.1.j).

The chancellor has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he leads. During very difficult times, the chancellor has developed strategies for reorganization and budget savings. The chancellor was praised for his leadership in developing budget strategies during the worst economic downturn in community college history. The chancellor was also characterized as a consensus builder during a time when all constituent groups must agree on common goals (IV.B.2.a-b).

Conclusions:

The team concluded that the college partially meets Standard IV.B Board and Administrative Organization.

The governing board and the chancellor of City College of San Francisco have navigated the institution through some very difficult times due to several factors such as the change in administration, the need to implement fiscal safeguards due to the misuse of public funds, and budget reductions due an ongoing, statewide financial crisis. As a result of

many difficult governing board decisions, the roles and delineated authority of the governing board and the chancellor have been called into question, which demonstrates a need for understanding governance authority for decision making (IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.1.j, and IV.B.2.a, d).

The role of the board should be clarified, and a program for board development should be implemented to promote effective leadership and decision making and to improve institutional effectiveness. The board and the college will benefit from a review and affirmation of the purpose of intuitional governance and clarification of the roles and delineated authority that guide the process for decision making. In addition, the institution will benefit from a review and update of board policies to ensure their relevance and understanding (IV.A.1-4; IV.B.1.d, e, j).

The college staff, faculty and administration voiced strong affection for the institution and thoroughly believe in the mission of the college. It was noted on several occasions that the board members, like other college constituents, have the desire to make the institution stronger for the communities they serve.

Recommendation:

Recommendation 14: Effective Board Organization and Operating Procedures

To fully meet Standard IV.B Board and Administrative Organization, the team recommends that the board act in a manner consistent with its policies and by-laws, assess and develop operating procedures, develop and implement a plan for board development, and regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its policies and practices (IV.B.1.a, e-h).