# Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services

*The institution offers instructional programs, library and learning support services, and student support services aligned with its mission. The institution's programs are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate for higher education. The institution assesses its educational quality through methods accepted in higher education, makes the results of its assessments available to the public, and uses the results to improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness. The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional programs and student and learning support services offered in the name of the institution.*

## Standard II.A. Instructional Programs

**II.A.1.** *All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution's mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs. (ER 9 and ER 11)*

### II.A.1. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**Fields of Study Consistent with College Mission.** All instructional programs that the College offers, regardless of location or means of delivery, are in fields of study consistent with CCSF's mission to offer high-quality programs that enable students to successfully transfer to four-year colleges or universities; receive an Associate Degree in the Arts or the Sciences; develop skills and acquire certificates to be successful in the workplace; develop Basic Skills; and pursue lifelong learning.[1]

As of Fall 2016, the College offers 87 two-year Associate Degrees (including 19 Associate Degrees for Transfer) and 68 primarily Career and Technical Education (CTE)-focused Certificates of Achievement approved by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. The College also offers 104 locally approved credit Certificates of Accomplishment, 56 noncredit certificates, and a High School Diploma.[2][3][4][5][6][7] The approved degrees and

---

[1] Vision and Mission Statement
[2] Career & Technical Education Program Guide, 2015
[3] Degree Programs Fall 2016
[4] Locally Approved Credit Certificate Programs Fall 2016
[5] Noncredit Certificate Programs Fall 2016
[6] State Approved Credit Certificate Programs Fall 2016
[7] 2016-17 Catalog

certificates provide evidence that program development and approval processes function to support the College's mission for transfer, Associate Degrees, CTE, and Basic Skills and lifelong learning.

CCSF's principal degree programs and certificates are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education field(s) of study, are of requisite content and length, are conducted at levels of appropriate quality and rigor, and culminate in identified student outcomes. (Eligibility Requirement 9)[8]

**Appropriate to Higher Education.** All programs offered, regardless of location or method of delivery, undergo a rigorous, faculty-led curriculum review and approval process that involves the College's Curriculum Committee, administrative review, Board approval, and, when appropriate, review and approval by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. Discipline faculty follow the standards outlined in the Curriculum Handbook, a regularly reviewed and updated set of guidelines that follows state curricular standards, for developing and revising programs.[9] [10] When creating new academic majors, department faculty identify the majors at four-year institutions to which the program will transfer. With new CTE programs, department faculty identify the labor market, review job projections, and survey prospective employers.[11] Because these degrees and certificates are developed through a rigorous faculty-led curricular process, are approved by the California State Chancellor's Office, and meet all state regulatory requires, they provide evidence that all programs are appropriate to higher education and are of high quality.

**Programs Culminating in Attainment of SLOs.** All programs culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes (SLOs; see Standard II.A.3.). Faculty continually assess learning outcomes at course, program, and college level, following a timetable outlined in the Institutional Assessment Plan.[12] [13] [14] Faculty are committed to continuous quality improvement (CQI) and engage in SLO assessment and reporting practices. This commitment is evidenced by 80 percent of courses identified at CQI and 70 percent of programs in Fall 2014. Spring 2015 marked the start of collecting disaggregated SLO data on all courses, all sections, with a 95 percent completion rate in the first semester (with similar results for Fall 2015).[15] [16] The SLO Dashboard provides the College community with results from assessments for institution-level learning outcomes.[17]

---

[8] Screenshot of Eligibility Requirements 9 - Educational Programs, Compliant, p.3 (Source: ER9, Educational Programs, Compliant, June 2014, p. 3)
[9] Chapter 4: Majors (Source: Curriculum Handbook)
[10] Chapter 5: Certificates (Source: Curriculum Handbook)
[11] Screenshot - Goals of the Major (Source: Chapter 4.2: Creating a New Major, *Curriculum Handbook v.4.0*)
[12] Screenshot - SLO Assessment Timetable (Source: Institutional Assessment Plan, p.6)
[13] Screenshot - PSLO Assessment Timetable (Source: Institutional Assessment Plan, p.6-7)
[14] Screenshot - GELO & ILO Assessment Timetable (Source: Institutional Assessment Plan, p.16-17)
[15] Screenshot - 95% Completion rate SLO reporting (Source: CCSF Assessment Reporting Process Evaluation, Spring & Summer 2015)
[16] 95% Completion rate SLO reporting Fall 2015
[17] SLO Dashboard

**Programs Culminating in the Achievement of Degrees, Certificates, Employment, or Transfer.** The College is meeting its annual benchmarks in institution-set standards for student achievement, illustrating that instructional programs culminate in the achievement of degrees, certificates, employments and transfer:

- Institution-set standard for transfer is 2,750; student total for 2014-15 was 3,057.

- Institution-set standard for Associate Degrees is 1,218; student total for 2014-15 was 1,318; total degrees awarded was highest in 2013-14 at 1,632.

- Institution-set standard for completion of CTE certificates is 737; students receiving CTE certificates went from a high of 982 in 2013-14 to 864 in 2014-15.

The College also has institution-set standards for job placement (80.72 percent) and licensure examination passage rates.[18] Moreover, the most recent CTE Employment Outcomes Survey concluded that "completing CTE studies and training—whether or not a credential is earned, whether or not a student transfers—is related to positive employment outcomes" and that the majority of respondents are employed full-time working in their field. High-quality education is further evidenced in the Student Success Scorecard and benchmark scores on the national Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE).[19] [20]

CCSF defines standards for student achievement and assesses its performance against those standards. The institution publishes expected learning and achievement for each program and for the college as a whole. The college systematically assesses its progress and publishes the results. (Eligibility Requirement 11)

### II.A.1. Analysis and Evaluation

Through integrated planning, a systematic and rigorous faculty-led curricular process (that encompasses both online and face-to-face classes), continuous outcomes assessment, Program Review, and articulation agreements, the College demonstrates that all instructional courses and programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, are aligned with the College Mission, appropriate to higher education, and culminate in achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs. As with all iterative processes, the College will continue to review and improve its processes and engage in sustainable continuous quality improvement.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.1.

---

[18] Screenshot of Annual Report for 2016, page 3 (Source: Annual Report for 2016, page 3)
[19] Student Success Scorecard
[20] CCSSE

**II.A.2.** *Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty and others responsible act to continuously improve instructional courses, programs and directly related services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success.*

### II.A.2. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**Meeting Academic and Professional Standards through the Course and Program Development and Curricular Approval Processes.** City College of San Francisco ensures that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations through rigorous faculty-led processes that include course and program development processes, curricular approval processes, student learning outcome (SLO) assessments, CTE Committee review, and the Program Review and Annual Planning process. All courses and programs, regardless of type, location where offered, or modality in which they are offered, go through meticulous steps to ensure that they are of high quality and continuously meet the mission of the College and student needs. The College offers credit, noncredit, developmental, collegiate, study abroad, and contract education courses and programs.

Authorized by the Academic Senate, the College's faculty-led Curriculum Committee ensures the quality of courses offered at the College by evaluating and verifying prerequisites, student learning outcomes, content, methods of instruction, evaluation methods, and number of credits and units awarded.[21]

The Curriculum Committee ensures that credit and noncredit courses and programs meet the standards of Title 5, California Code of Regulations.[22] [23] Curriculum Committee reviews of proposed Course Outlines of Record include careful consideration of student learning outcomes, the number and type of hours (lecture or lab), and the instructional methodologies specified, among other aspects.[24] [25] [26]

In addition, distance education courses require separate review and approval by the Curriculum Committee, which considers factors such as course suitability for distance education, regular and effective student-instructor contact, and distance evaluation integrity.[27][28] Any pre- or corequisite or distance education addenda are reviewed and approved separately from the rest of the course outline. To ensure overall quality of distance

---

[21] BP 6.03
[22] Screenshot - Curriculum Committee Membership (Source: Membership)
[23] Chapter 2.2.2 Title 5 Course Classifications
[24] Chapter 2.3.5 Student Learning Outcomes
[25] Hours (Source: Chapter 2.3. Course Specifics - Curriculum Handbook 4.0)
[26] Chapter 2.3.7 Instructional Methodologies
[27] 3.2 Distance Education Addenda
[28] ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education, pages 45-50 (Source: Guide_to_Evaluating_DE_and_CE_2013)

education courses, faculty who wish to teach a course online participate in a District-mandated training. [29] [30]

Once approved, the Curriculum Committee submits recommendations for acceptance of its actions to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Board of Trustees, and, in most cases, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

Discipline faculty have the primary responsibility for determining competency levels and SLOs for courses and programs. In the process of reviewing new courses and programs, the College's Curriculum Committee reviews the associated SLOs, assignments, and evaluation methods, among other things. To provide even greater oversight and continuity, in August 2014, the Curriculum Committee elected to include one of the faculty SLO Coordinators as a permanent resource member. This individual reviews SLOs and Program-level SLOs (PSLOs) in the curriculum approval process.[31] In the Curriculum Committee process for submitting certificates and majors for approval, departments map the learning outcomes of the program to the courses contained within that program. Students have a clear path of achieving the SLOs required of courses and programs. PSLOs map up to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and down to course-level SLOs. Courses that satisfy General Education Degree Areas, map to the relevant General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) as well.

The College extensively uses faculty expertise to guide and identify competency levels with regard to student learning outcomes. First, the SLO Committee is composed of faculty, administrative, and student members open to all disciplines.[32] This Committee is one of the starting points for institutional discussions about learning across the College. The SLO Committee produces regular summary assessment reports, charting assessment progress and highlighting instructional and student service improvements. Each fall, the SLO Committee conducts an assessment on one of the four ILOs crafted by the College community. The Committee both reviews mapping data to identify alignment gaps and extensively discusses outcome refinement. Moreover, the Committee guides the College community through a direct assessment of programs, disciplines, degrees, certificates, aligning with the ILO.[33] Recent efforts took full advantage of the recently implemented CurricUNET assessment module which can aggregate ILO-mapped section-level assessment data provided by faculty for all sections of all their courses. Every fall, the SLO Committee recruits additional faculty members to join GE assessment workgroups for work in spring.[34] These workgroups follow the same processes as ILO assessment. ILO assessment procedures include data from credit and noncredit courses aligning to degree or certificate programs and certificates including CTE programs.

---

[29] ACCJC Policy on Distance Education Compliant, pages 8-15 and/or pages 45-46 (Source: Guide to Evaluating DE and CE 2013)
[30] Training for online instruction
[31] New Resource Member: SLO Coordinator (Source: Curriculum Committee Resolutions)
[32] Academic Senate SLO Committee Membership 2015-16 (Source: SLO Committee)
[33] Workgroup Processes and Guidelines
[34] GE Area A Workgroup

**Faculty Roles in the Systematic Evaluation of Programs through Integrated Planning and Program Review.** All College departments, student services, and administrative areas participate in a Program Review (every three years) and/or Annual Planning in the fall, for planning for the following years. Program Reviews and Annual Plans contain these elements:

1. Description of programs, services, and their locations

2. Analysis of specific and general data trends

3. Summary of progress to date on major planning objectives identified in the last Program Review

4. Major planning objectives for the coming year

5. Review of curriculum currency and plans for the next year to ensure offerings remain current (no older than six years) and meet student needs.

6. Review of assessment currency at section, course, and program level and plans for the next year to ensure meeting of the three-year benchmark.

7. Resource allocation requests

The College's Planning Committee, a standing committee of Participatory Governance, oversees more routine and annual processes associated with integrated planning, relying primarily on the Academic Senate in 10+1 matters as appropriate. The Assessment Planning Team, a subcommittee of the Planning Committee, works with members of all College divisions to review ongoing assessment practices, create an assessment plan for the College, and set and evaluate achievement benchmarks designed to document and improve institutional effectiveness.[35] [36] The Planning Committee works closely with the SLO Committee, and the SLO Coordinators serve as liaisons between both committees and the Academic Senate.

Part of the College's integrated annual cycle of evaluation and planning includes unit-level Program Review and Annual Plans. The unit-level Program Review and Planning process asks faculty and staff within units to reflect on overall department progress, improvement plans, and resource needs that connect to data obtained from the assessment of learning outcomes. Program Review asks departments to holistically review assessment data across a multitude of variables, identify achievement gaps, and ensure delivery methods and strategies are best serving student success. Program improvements and resource requests are tied to outcomes and, where available, backed up by assessment data and College plans. In addition to assessment analysis, department chairs and program coordinators utilize myriad data provided by the Office of Research and Planning, including demographic information, student success, retention, persistence data, and data comparisons across the College and state and with local four-year institutions. The College's recent efforts to focus the conversation around

---

[35] CCSF Institutional Assessment Plan
[36] Planning Committee Description

data asks faculty, staff, and administrators to review preset data trends and also allows for more localized unit-created data.[37] [38]

Comprehensive resources for completing Program Review exist on the College website and are easily accessible.[39] Resources provided at this site include guidelines and examples for each of the above elements, calendars and timelines, links to data sources, links to College plans and priorities, and information on how Program Reviews and Annual Plans are incorporated into the College's overall planning process. Program Review documents from previous years are also located on this page. In Fall 2015, the College began using CurricUNET to complete its Program Reviews, and now web resources are linked to the question within the software for easy access.

**Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review.** Faculty evaluate teaching methodology through the tenure review and faculty evaluation process every three years to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success.[40]

## II.A.2. Analysis and Evaluation

Faculty have the primary role in establishing and evaluating the content and methods of instruction through rigorous processes of curriculum, outcomes assessment, and Program Review and faculty evaluation. City College of San Francisco ensures that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations through a faculty-led processes that includes course and program development processes, curricular approval processes, SLO assessments, CTE Committee review, and the departmental Program Review and Annual Plan process. All courses and programs, regardless of type, location where offered, or modality in which they are offered, go through meticulous steps to ensure that they are of high quality and continuously meet the mission of the College and student needs. The College offers credit, noncredit, developmental, collegiate, and contract education courses and programs. In addition, the College offers a variety of linked classes and learning communities.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.2.

**II.A.3.** *The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and current course outlines that include student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outline.*

## II.A.3. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

---

[37] Data Trends - Selected
[38] Data Trends - Other
[39] Program Review Website
[40] CCSF Faculty Evaluation

Every course (credit and noncredit), certificate, and degree has identified student learning outcomes, and, in accordance with the Institutional Assessment Plan, assesses one SLO in every course section every semester for every student and aggregates those results for a more holistic review of every course, certificate, or degree at least once every three years.[41]

Student learning outcomes are an element of every course outline of record and Program Description, and Chairs and Deans ensure that students receive syllabi with accurate outcomes.

**Regular Assessment Using Established Procedures.** Regular assessment occurs with the support of a team of SLO Coordinators with specialization in the Sciences, Liberal Arts, and noncredit instruction.[42] Additionally, faculty experts employ a wide variety of rigorous assessment methods. For example, in noncredit ESL, faculty use direct assessments of student writing and speaking during a capstone promotion examination. This capstone supports the classroom assessment techniques used by ESL instructors daily. In Fall 2015, 3,585 students were directly assessed for promotion between ESL levels 2 through 6. Based on years of assessment, ESL instructors identified needed changes to level 4 curriculum, an important exit level to other programs, and then retested.[43] As the Fall assessment report notes, the Department was pleased that changes did not result in a bottleneck and students are progressing nicely to the mastery level once a clear skill set is demonstrated.[44]

While department-centered SLO Assessment has been taking place for many years, in Spring 2016, faculty completed the eighth cycle of institutional-level collection of assessment reporting. In these reports, faculty describe assessment processes, criteria for assessment, results, and plans for improvement. An archive of all assessment reports completed using the centralized system is publicly available with summary reports and process evaluations.[45]

Furthermore, in Spring 2015, in accordance with the new ACCJC Standard I.B.6, faculty began collecting SLO assessment results tied to student identification number so that the College could disaggregate data and identify corresponding achievement gaps in particular subpopulations.[46] [47] To jumpstart the process and populate the new CurricUNET reporting module with unitary data, campus leadership, using Collegial Governance structures, agreed that all faculty would assess at least one SLO for each section offered and report results.[48] In Spring 2015, 1,186 instructors submitted reports for 3,619 sections, resulting in a 95 percent response rate.[49] During the October 20 SLO FLEX Day, each department discussed the initial disaggregated SLO data linked to demographic data by the Office of Research and Planning

---

[41] Institutional Assessment Plan
[42] SLO Coordinators Bio and Contact page
[43] ESLN 3405 Beginning High Level 4 Assessment Report, Fall 2014
[44] Non-Credit ESL Promotion Testing Summary Report, Fall 2015
[45] Assessment Reporting Archive page
[46] Gap Calculator Handout
[47] CurricUNET User Guide CRN Level Assessment Report instructions
[48] SLO Update, Feb 4, 2015
[49] Screenshot of CCSF Assessment Report Process Evaluation, page 2 (Source: CCSF Assessment Report Process Evaluation, page 2)

and identified and discussed "areas of concern."[50] Course coordinators aggregate assessment data from multiple sections, across multiple semesters to submit Course Level reports on students' ability to meet each outcome. These reports, as directed by the Institutional Assessment Plan, are due at least once every three years. Like course student learning outcomes, program outcomes for degrees and certificates are also to be assessed at least once every three years.

More importantly, the Student Learning Outcomes Committee of the Academic Senate guides the process of sustaining and improving upon institutional procedures for continuous quality improvement. The Committee designed general rubrics for assessment reports and shared more specific examples with the campus community.[51] For example, the Fall 2015 validation of assessment demonstrated that:

> … more than 50% of the sampled assessment reports described the assessment tools clearly enough so that colleagues had a clear understanding of how assessments were conducted. Another 30% of assessment reports described the assessment, but lacked the kinds of details that are useful in using assessment data to guide course improvements and provide a useful assessment history for other colleagues.[52]

The Committee provided examples of robust answers to guide future submitters as well as recommendations for the continued growth, expansion, and meaningfulness of formal assessment techniques.

**Students Receive Syllabi with SLOs.** The Faculty Handbook requires that faculty provide each student pertinent written information about each course, including the SLOs, as they appear in the course outline of record.[53] Deans and department chairs collect and review all syllabi to ensure that the SLOs in the syllabi matched those found in each course outline of record; faculty make changes as needed as a result of that review.[54] [55]

The College streamlined methods for providing accurate course SLO information and access to the course outline of record to faculty and students through a link found on the online schedule and in the teaching schedules accessed through the CCSF faculty directory.[56]

Data indicate that faculty across the College review and share stated learning outcomes for the course with students. The 2014 CCSSE surveys shows that 74 percent of students surveyed note they reviewed and/or discussed student learning outcomes in all or most of their courses.[57]

---

[50] October 20th School Summary for English, Foreign Language and Fine, Applied, and Communication Arts
[51] CRN-Level SLO Reporting Rubric
[52] Screenshot of Student Learning Outcomes Committee Validation Summary Brief, page 4 (Source: Student Learning Outcomes Committee Validation Summary Brief, page 4)
[53] Section 4.7 - Instructors' Responsibilities in Classrooms & Labs (Source: Addendum to Faculty Handbook)
[54] Correspondence - Collection/Validation of Course SLOs in Syllabi
[55] Process for comparing COR SLOs with Syllabi
[56] Making a Great Syllabus Webpage
[57] Community College Survey of Student Engagement - City College of San Francisco, Q. 6

## II.A.3. Analysis and Evaluation

Faculty-led committees, with support from an SLO Coordination Team and Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, have created systems of assessment that ensure each course, degree, and certificate meet the Institutional Assessment Plan's three-year benchmark for assessment. Courses and programs are improved based on those results. Together, these systems of continuous quality improvement ensure that student learning outcomes are current, available, regularly assessed, and driving improvements. As per the Institutional Assessment Plan, the SLO Committee reviews and validates a representative sample of assessment reports to monitor that assessment practices follow institutional procedures and to help share quality assessment practices, thereby providing a continuous feedback on assessment quality and the institutional procedures for assessment. The College has put systems in place to identify learning gaps for subpopulations and will continue to strengthen culturally responsive teaching. Improvements based on these data is a component of the College's Quality Focus Essay.

**Response to Finding from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.**
The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

> *CCSF will also need to ensure that **all** course syllabi include SLOs that meet the requirements of the handbook to achieve compliance. (2002 Standard II.A.6.)*

As noted above, to ensure that students receive learning outcomes in syllabi, City College continues to strengthen its procedures. In Fall 2015, deans and department chairs began working with the Office of Instruction to create an electronic inventory of course syllabi. This collaborative effort was fully supported by the Academic Senate.[58] Faculty are required to include in their syllabi SLOs that are identical to those on the official course outline of record. Faculty provide their syllabi to their students and department chair during the first week of instruction. Chairs validate that SLOs are accurate and then forward to their deans, who upload them to a shared online inventory. The College continues to improve upon this process by developing more streamlined methods for providing accurate course SLO information and links to the course outline of record to faculty and students through a link in the online schedule and in the teaching schedules that students can access through the CCSF faculty directory.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.3.

**II.A.4.** *If the institution offers pre-collegiate level curriculum, it distinguishes that curriculum from college level curriculum and directly supports students in learning the knowledge and skills necessary to advance to and succeed in college level curriculum.*

---

[58] Screenshot of 9/16/15 Academic Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes, pages 5-6 (Source: 9/16/15 Academic Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes, pages 5-6)

## II.A.4. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**Distinguishing the Curriculum.** The institution has a clear structure for distinguishing collegiate from pre-collegiate courses and a variety of supportive environments designed to help students transition into a college-level curriculum that satisfies general education, degree/certificate, and transfer requirements. For student registration and curricular consistency, the College distinctly codes credit/degree-applicable, credit/non-degree applicable, and noncredit courses.[59] Noncredit courses are signified by four digits and are clearly marked as noncredit in the course outline of record and Catalog, as are degree-applicable and nondegree-applicable credit courses.[60] [61] The course Catalog distinguishes between the types of classes (e.g., ESL credit and noncredit), and the College enforces those distinctions in course outline of record footers and CurricUNET Proposal Types.[62] [63] Credit and noncredit distinctions are also clear on the class schedule page,[64] providing further clarification of departments' course sequences from pre-collegiate through transfer level.[65] [66]

**Enforcing Prerequisites.** As a result of closely examining its internal prerequisite enforcement process while preparing the 2014 Institutional Self Evaluation Report, City College of San Francisco realized the need for a more consistent mechanism for prerequisite justification and enforcement. The College initiated conversations and recommendations to address these issues. Joint efforts among the Office of Instruction, Office of Matriculation, the Curriculum Committee, School deans and department chairs resulted in a process to review and affirm course prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories. The vast majority of these new requisites were put into place in Fall 2015 and the remaining ones were enforced in Spring of 2016. Collegewide discussions and panel presentations took place among students, instructors, and counselors about the relationship between courses and their prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories in the March 8, 2016, Flex Day.[67] The Office of Research and Planning has developed an Argos data report based on Math, English, and ESL level that will help to further the discussion on student success across the curriculum.[68]

**Supporting Students in Pre-Collegiate Courses to Help Them Advance to College Level.**
Students trying to advance to college-level curriculum receive support in various spaces, including the College's writing centers, libraries, and learning assistance programs. Moreover, the Basic Skills Committee (BSC) helps faculty better understand the uniqueness of pre-collegiate classroom methodology and students' needs, providing support in curricular change,

---

[59] Chapter 7: Course Applicability
[60] Curriculum Handbook -- Course Types
[61] College Catalog 2015-16, Transfer Information, page 56
[62] Course Catalog Listing ESL
[63] CurricUNET User Manual -- Course Types
[64] CCSF online class schedule
[65] Example: Mathematics Courses & Sequencing (Source: *Spring 2016 Schedule*, p.85)
[66] Mathematics Courses Offered (Source: *Spring 2016 Course Schedule*)
[67] Screenshot of March 8th Panel Discussion Summary, pages 5-23 (Source: March 8th Panel Discussion Summary, pages 5-23)
[68] ARGOS Level Eligibility Report; SLO Committee Meeting Notes - April 4, 2016

outcomes assessment, budgeting decisions, and professional development. Their work is designed to make pre-collegiate and college-level distinctions that are much more meaningful for faculty and students.[69] In the past year, the BSC has become a much stronger interdepartmental force at CCSF, now including collaborative leadership from ESL, English, Math, Transitional Studies, Counseling, and Business that has resulted in shared strategies for student success, including Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training (I-BEST). English and Math are working in tandem with the College's researchers to devise new outcomes assessment practices that can be replicated across the curriculum to better assist departments relying on BSC support. One effect of the BSC's improved interdepartmental integration devoted to supporting students was the creation of a much-needed Student Development brochure.[70]

Accelerated learning pathways continue to grow at CCSF as an important way to help considerably more pre-collegiate students embrace the intensity of deep college inquiry and move quickly and smartly into college-level courses. CCSF's own studies are consistent with national research in that the more pre-collegiate courses a student needs to take in order to reach college-level classes, the greater the odds that student will not reach college level. CCSF acceleration attempts to remove those potential exit points between classes. As shown in a Spring 2016 presentation to English by the Office of Research and Planning, when students begin in English five levels below transfer 1A, only 8 percent make it to 1A. Contrast that with the 41 percent (placing three levels below) and 57 percent (placing two levels below) who would then arrive in 1A within three years.[71]

Recent ESL and English collaborations, including paper norming sessions, have been driven by the need to work more effectively with shared students and those who have moved through the ESL sequence and into the pre-collegiate/credit English track.[72] The hope is that such collaborations will give more understanding to not only credit/noncredit/pre-collegiate distinctions but how to best support non-native speakers' success in English 1A and beyond.[73] [74]

Similarly, Math has reshaped and accelerated its pre-collegiate curriculum to help students reach transfer-level in smarter, faster ways. MATH 45: Preparation for Statistics, for example, brings more students to transfer-level MATH 80: Probability and Statistics than MATH 60 one semester sooner and with a much higher success rate. The combined MATH 40/60 (back-to-back short-term developmental courses) is designed to help students move more effectively to college-level math, and Accelerated Math Gateway (AMG) program, which integrates dedicated support, encourages pre-collegiate math students, especially women and minorities toward a STEM major.

[69] Basic Skills Comm Description
[70] Student Development Brochure
[71] Spring 2016 Slideshow on Basic Skills to 1A (Screenshot 2-3 key slides: CCSF Reality-What is...)
[72] Papers for norming
[73] ESL-ENGL Planning Model
[74] ESL-ENGL interview summary

The College's commitment to college-level student success and support is also evident in its professional development events and continuous analysis of student learning learning outcomes at the course, general education, and institutional level. For example, during the College's October 2015 professional development day devoted to the institutional learning outcome on cultural, social, and environmental awareness, hundreds of CCSF employees gathered in panel sessions and school and department meetings to analyze our generally high learning outcomes in relation to achievement and assessment data and what can be enacted at all levels to increase college-level success. The Area D (Social and Behavioral Sciences) General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO) Assessment Report draws specific attention to the Mission Center's achievement rates—particularly among Latinos and African Americans—exceeding other CCSF sites and calls for more emulation of the Mission Center's design, including, centralized support, learning communities, language support, and overall navigability.[75] GELO assessments at CCSF provide vital ways in which to view student success at the college level and on the verge of transfer.

## II.A.4. Analysis and Evaluation

College-level courses are distinguished clearly from the pre-collegiate level curriculum. All credit and noncredit courses, including Transitional Studies, undergo the same Curriculum Committee review and expectations, which has enhanced the committee's understanding of pre-collegiate and college-level distinctions. Moreover, the curricular distinctions that shape the rigor and validity of the College's offerings and assurance that they meet Title 5 standards, be it a credit Biotechnology course or a noncredit Business class, are a vital part of the review of courses by *ex officio* members of the Curriculum Committee involved directly in this area: the Articulation Officer, the Requisite Coordinator, the CurricUNET Administrator, Distance Education Coordinator, the SLO Coordinator, the CTE Coordinator, and the Associate Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management and Instructional Support Services.[76]

Pre-collegiate courses are designed and reviewed for the ways in which they support student learning and prepare students for college-level expectations. The College's outcomes assessments and course success data play an increasingly important role in looking at the demographics of success, trends in pre-collegiate-to-transfer course sequences, and the ethics of designating advisories and prerequisites in course outlines.

Through the review of data, the College has recognized a number of areas in which to improve the support it provides to students in advancing from pre-collegiate level courses to college level in the realms of Math, English, and ESL. To ensure focused attention on these projects, the College has included them as components of the Quality Focus Essay (Action Project 2).

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.4.

---

[75] Screenshot of Area D GELO Report, p. 13 (Source: AREA D GELO Report, p. 13)
[76] Screenshot of ACCJC Policy on Distance Education Compliant (Source: Guide_to_Evaluating_DE_and_CE_2013)

**II.A.5.** *The institution's degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The institution ensures that minimum degree requirements are 60 semester credits or equivalent at the associate level, and 120 credits or equivalent at the baccalaureate level. (ER 12)*

### II.A.5. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**Following Common Practices.** CCSF's degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, as stated in Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 6.03.[77] [78] For that reason, CCSF's policies and regulations establish standards for a proposed degree or program, including alignment with the College mission, as well as appropriate rigor, sequence of courses, frequency of course offering, units, and stated outcome—career technical education or transfer. These standards are also included in the CCSF Curriculum Handbook.[79] In compliance with CCR Title 5 section 55060, et seq, CCSF upholds the 60 semester-unit minimum requirement for Associate Degrees.[80]

CCSF Board policies affirm the Curriculum Committee's role in the review and approval of new and modified degrees and programs.[81] The Curriculum Committee proposes curriculum policies and procedures to the Academic Senate, which then forwards the recommendations to the governing Board for approval. As outlined in its Handbook, the Curriculum Committee's review and approval process determine compliance with state standards, as well as the feasibility and need at the local level.[82] If there is formal evidence that a program may no longer be viable, it could be discontinued, revitalized, or suspended according to the processes spelled out in Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 6.17.[83] The College reviews program viability regularly and assesses every PSLO at least once every three years.[84]

CCSF awards academic credit based on generally accepted principles for community colleges in accordance with the State of California higher education system. Information about degree requirements are regularly shared with students and the public.[85] (Eligibility Requirement 12)

### II.A.5. Analysis and Evaluation

CCSF shapes and sustains its degrees and programs through practices common to American higher education. Certificate and degree programs—and the course outlines that serve them—undergo careful review and documentation and are reviewed regularly for length, depth, and

---

[77] CCSF Policy Manual

[78] Draft AP 6.03 (recommended by Academic Senate in May 2016 along with revised BP 6.03; moving through formal adoption process)

[79] Curriculum Handbook (Chapter Two)

[80] Screenshot - Graduation Requirements (Source: *College Catalog 2015-16*, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements, p. 46)

[81] BP 6.03

[82] 1.2 Authority (Source: Chapter 1: Introduction, Curriculum Handbook v.4.1)

[83] BP 6.17

[84] ILO-Program/GELO-Course Mapping Image

[85] Screenshot of Eligibility Requirements 10, Award of Credit, Compliant, p. 3 (Source: ACCJC Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation, June 2014, page 3)

rigor. The curriculum procedure, including very clear and useful CurricUNET mapping for structure and assessment, is both dynamic and pragmatic on multiple levels. These practices have also generated important student-centered dialogue among colleagues and departments, as well as meaningful professional development interaction. The College has also taken great care to infuse general education into its Associate Degrees, fostering a culture of knowledge and inquiry on a programmatic level, communities of learning geared toward student success.

**Response to Findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.** The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

> *The College needs to establish a regular process for determining and publishing course sequencing within programs and ensuring processes are in place for appropriate time to completion. (2002 Standard II.A.2.c.)*

The District took action to document and review course sequencing and time to completion for all degrees and certificates. This work was done in collaboration among administration, department chairs, and discipline faculty. As a result, a form was developed to document the minimum courses required for students to complete all degrees and certificates. Once the forms were completed by department chairpersons and discipline faculty, they were reviewed by area deans for implementation.[86] Processes have been resolved and approved by the Curriculum Committee to establish sequencing and time to completion.[87] Minimum time to completion is listed for each program in the Catalog descriptions. Examples of course sequencing are found in the College Schedule.[88]

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.5.


**II.A.6.** *The institution schedules courses in a manner that allows students to complete certificate and degree programs within a period of time consistent with established expectations in higher education. (ER 9)*

**II.A.6. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

**Scheduling Courses to Allow for Program Completion in a Period of Time Consistent with Higher Education Expectations.** In order to meet student needs, the College offers courses during fall, spring, and summer terms in day, evening, and weekend formats. To enhance access for its diverse student body, the College provides full-term, late-start, and short-term classes in face-to-face, online, hybrid and tech-enhanced formats.[89] [90]

---

[86] Form Example: Communication Studies - Certificate/Degree Sequencing for Completion
[87] Resolution Regarding Advertising Minimum Time to Completion for Programs in Catalog
[88] Credit ESL Levels, p. 65; English Credit Course Levels/Paths to Transfer, p.61; Choosing a Basic Math Course, p.81; Mathematics Courses & Sequencing, p. 82 (Source: Spring 2016 Schedule)
[89] Definitions and Terminology for Distance Learning Courses
[90] Technology Mediated Instruction

The College's scheduling process begins at the department level with schedules developed to respond to student need and demand. CCSF 's scheduling of degree course sequences align with the student educational objectives. (Eligibility Requirement 9)[91]

**Newly Created Sequencing Form.** As a result of recent accreditation findings, the District took action to document and review course sequencing and time to completion for all degrees and certificates. This work was done in collaboration among administrator, department chairs, and discipline faculty. Specifically, the College developed a form to document the minimum courses required for students to complete all degrees and certificates. Once the department chairs and discipline faculty complete the forms, area deans reviewed them for implementation.[92] These forms are available to administrators and department chairs during schedule development processes and act as a tool to audit and to ensure that pathways to program completion are available.

The District took action to document and review course sequencing and time to completion for all degrees and certificates. Processes have been resolved and approved by the Academic Senate to establish sequencing and time to completion.[93] Schedules reflect program sequences and promote student completion of certificate and degree programs in a timely fashion.[94]

**Processes for Publishing Course Sequencing and Time to Completion.** The College includes in its Catalog guidance for students regarding course sequencing. Each program listed in the Catalog indicates to students when courses can be taken in any order, or when core and lower-level courses must be completed prior to taking addition. Every program lists minimum time to completion. Sample language for English includes, *"Completion of English IB is strongly recommended prior to enrolling in literature electives."*[95] Other programs provide sample semester schedules. For example, the Fire Science Program includes core and elective courses by semester.[96]

In addition to identifying the overall sequencing of courses, the College updated its Catalog program descriptions to include the expected minimum time to completion. When courses are offered less frequently than every fall and spring semester, the course description in the Catalog indicates their frequency. Courses are now coded so that students can anticipate whether they are offered each semester, annually, or infrequently.[97]

---

[91] Screenshot of Eligibility Requirements 9- Educational Programs, Complaint, p. 3 (Source: ACCJC Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation, June 2014, page 3)
[92] Form Example: Communication Studies - Certificate/Degree Sequencing for Completion
[93] Resolution Regarding Advertising Minimum Time to Completion for Programs in Catalog
[94] Credit ESL Levels, p. 65; English Credit Course Levels/Paths to Transfer, p.61; Choosing a Basic Math Course, p.81; Mathematics Courses & Sequencing, p. 82 (Source: Spring 2016 Schedule)
[95] Screenshot of Catalog for English degree, pages.228 -230 (Source: 2016 College Catalog for English degree, pages 228-230)
[96] Screenshot of Catalog for Fire Science course sequencing example, pages 72-73 (Source: 2016 College Catalog for Fire Science course sequencing, pages 72-73)
[97] Sample time to completion and course frequency language from the Catalog: Screenshot of Administrative of Justice Major (AS-T), p.70; Screenshot of Arts Major (AA-T), p.91 (Source: College Catalog, page 70 and 91)

## II.A.6. Analysis and Evaluation

The College offers educational programs in a variety of times and locations. Processes are in place to regularly review course offerings and evaluate the effectiveness of scheduling. The College has demonstrated a focus on facilitating student progress to completion.

**Response to Finding from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.**
The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

> *The College needs to establish a regular process for determining and publishing course sequencing within programs and ensuring processes are in place for appropriate time to completion. (2002 Standard II.A.2.c.)*

As described in Standard II.A.5. and in the Evidence section for this Standard, the College has instituted a new sequencing form that documents the minimum courses required for students to complete all degrees and certificates. These forms serve as a tool to audit and ensure pathways to program completion are available. In addition, the College Catalog includes information about the expected time to completion for each program in addition to documenting the frequency of course offerings.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.6.

**II.A.7.** *The institution effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies and learning support services that reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students, in support of equity in success for all students.*

## II.A.7. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies and learning support services to meet the needs of San Francisco's diverse student population, in line with its strong commitment to student equity.[98] The College supports learning with the goal that every student receives the same outstanding, challenging, and encouraging engagement. Evidence of the College's effectiveness is illustrated in the Scorecard which shows that statewide 39.6 percent of students who arrive unprepared for college ultimately complete a degree, certificate, or transfer-related outcome, compared to 52.6 percent of underprepared students at CCSF. Similarly, about two thirds (67.6 percent) of community college students statewide successfully complete at least 30 units, compared to nearly three quarters (74.0 percent) of CCSF students.[99]

**Delivery Modes that Reflect the Diverse and Changing Needs of Students.** To meet the diverse and changing needs of the CCSF community, course are scheduled during fall, spring

---

[98] CCSF Mission and Vision Statement
[99] California Community College Student Success Scorecard

and summer terms in day, evening, and weekend formats. Full-term, late-start, and short-term classes in face-to-face, online, hybrid and tech-enhanced formats are available to serve a variety of student needs and schedules.[100] [101] The College's scheduling process begins at the department level with faculty input on schedules based on student need and demand and that reflect program sequences that help students complete programs in a timely fashion. Delivery modes (lecture, lab, and work experience) are documented in the course outline of record, approved by the College's Curriculum Committee.[102] According to CCSSE results, 68.4 percent (n=1064) of students rated the convenience of class scheduling as either good (45.7 percent) or excellent (22.7 percent).[103]

A current example of an effective faculty-driven process to meet the changing needs of faculty and students can be seen in the adoption of Canvas as the College's new learning management system (LMS).[104] The Education Technology department (Ed Tech) periodically reviews and selects technology solutions in order to provide the most benefits to students and faculty. Faculty and students had been struggling with the College's current LMS, Moodle, which requires a disproportionate amount of attention on technology. In Fall 2015, Ed Tech recruited a review team made up of students, faculty, staff and administrators to evaluate Canvas and Moodle. The comprehensive review process included Participatory Governance via the Academic Senate, a pilot of five courses, an education campaign, a vote, student evaluation and a transition plan comprised of Canvas training and transitional support.[105] [106] The review team selected Canvas; a few of its strengths include a more intuitive interface for both faculty and students, downloadable apps for student who use tablets and smartphones and a much more robust functionality in tracking student learning outcome data at the student and course level.

**Teaching Methodologies that Reflect the Diverse and Changing Needs of Students.**
Faculty members provide instruction through a variety of methods including lecture, discussion, small group activities, field trips, flipped classrooms, and the use of technology. Discipline faculty determine the methodologies appropriate for the discipline and the content of the courses they are teaching and document their teaching methodologies in the course outline of record. Curriculum Committee review of course outlines ensures that the courses' student learning outcomes, content, and instructional methodology support each other. The Curriculum Handbook prompts faculty to consider instructional methodologies to meet learning outcomes, the Curriculum Committee Technical Review process also reviews the

---

[100] Definitions and Terminology for Distance Learning Courses
[101] Technology Mediated Instruction
[102] Chapter 2: Course Outlines (Source: *Curriculum Handbook 4.0*)
[103] 2014 CCSSE Survey
[104] Screenshot of Academic Senate 3/16/16 Minutes - Canvas as the College's new learning management system (LMS), pages 6-7 (Source: 3/16/16 Academic Senate Minutes)
[105] Recommendation Report, Learning Management System Review, 2016
[106] Student Canvas Evaluation, 2016

proposed instructional methodologies and, when necessary, prompts a discussion at the Curriculum Committee.[107] [108]

The majority of instructional programs and departments regularly discuss the effectiveness of current delivery modes and instructional methodologies. Evidence of this appears in the numerous proposals for revisions to the Instructional Methodology section of course outlines approved at every College Curriculum Committee meeting.[109] Revisions to instructional methodology involve discussion and consensus among the department chair, faculty who teach the course, and the school dean. Additionally, professional development activities often focus on teaching methodologies to improve students' learning experience.[110]

**Learning Support Services that Reflect the Diverse and Changing Needs of Students.** The College recently assessed students' support service needs at all locations through the Equal Access to Success Emergency Taskforce (EASE). Core services included library and learning resources. As a result of the EASE assessment, the College recently expanded library and learning assistance services to the three remaining locations previously without library services and provided increased online services and outreach; several examples include: 24/7 reference support through QuestionPoint and learning assistance online (see also Standard II.B.).[111] Additionally, the library has added two new library databases that provide video content to address the needs of distance learners as well as students' who prefer visual learning. The College also hosts department-specific labs such as English, Mathematics, and ESL labs. Moreover, the Disabled Student Programs and Services Department provides vital support to thousands of students through counseling, accommodations, accessible computer labs, alternate media, classes and more.[112] For more details on library and learning support services, see the response to Standard II.B.; for more details on EASE, see the response to Standard II.C.3.

**Faculty Evaluation as a Means of Ensuring the College Meets the Diverse and Changing Needs of Students.** Faculty evaluations are a collegial method for instructors to self reflect, learn from their peers and make improvements in courses and programs. Course content, subject knowledge, course presentation and delivery are a few of the areas evaluated.[113] Students also have the opportunity to evaluate their instructor's teaching methodologies.[114] In Fall 2015, students (*n=5,505*) rated their instructors on average 4.75 out of 5.[115]

---

[107] Curriculum Handbook 2.37
[108] Technical Review Avoiding Common Errors (TRACE) Checklist
[109] Curriculum Committee Calendar Agendas
[110] Example: SLO Flex Day Program, Oct. 20, 2015
[111] Learning Assistance Online
[112] Disabled Student Program & Services homepage
[113] CCSF Faculty Evaluation Website
[114] Screenshot - Student Evaluation forms, pages 195-198 (Source: Collective Bargaining Agreement July 2013 – June 2015, pages 195-198)
[115] Fall 2015 student evaluation summary statistics: Credit | Noncredit | ESL Noncredit | Library

**Professional Development as a Means of Ensuring the College Meets the Diverse and Changing Needs of Students.** In order to allow for faculty to remain current and effective in innovative teaching and learning strategies, the College supports training opportunities to help faculty meet the diverse and changing needs of students. Ongoing training opportunities are provided at the College, such as:

- ESL Tech Camp[116]
- Lynda.com[117]
- Kognito[118]
- Outcomes & Assessment Professional Development[119]
- Technology Learning Center (TLC)[120]
- Trauma and Learning[121]
- Flexible Calendar Days[122]
- Department Level Trainings (example: Live Text: Tool for Better Assessment[123])
- Teaching and Learning Center Trainings[124]

Biannual District professional development FLEX days provide activities that target diversity and equity issues. Two such examples include All College Flex activities: "Student Equity: Closing the Achievement Gap" and "Institutional Learning Outcome of Cultural, Social and Environmental Awareness."[125] [126]

## II.A.7. Analysis and Evaluation

The institution effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies, and learning support services that reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students, in support of equity in success for all students. Teaching methodologies and delivery modes are vetted through the curriculum review process. The College has an effective process for distance learning curriculum development and faculty training in online teaching and learning. Learning support services such as libraries and learning assistance in addition to pathway cohorts and multicultural retention programs address specific needs and have significantly impacted student retention and success. Ongoing SLO assessments provide data that assists faculty in adjusting teaching methodologies and learning support services to address the diverse and changing needs of students. Professional development opportunities provide an additional venue for dialogue and training on equity.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.7.

---

[116] ESL Tech Camp
[117] Lynda.com Technology Training
[118] Kognito
[119] Outcomes & Assessment Professional Development
[120] Technology Learning Center (TLC)
[121] Professional Development on Trauma
[122] Office of Professional Development
[123] Culinary Arts & Hospitality Management Program - Live Text: Tool for Better Assessment video
[124] Teaching and Learning Center Trainings
[125] Spring Flex Day 01/09/2015 Program Booklet - "Student Equity:  Closing the Achievement Gap
[126] SLO Flex Day, 10/20/2015 Program Booklet - "Institutional Learning Outcome of Cultural, Social and Environmental Awareness"

**II.A.8.** *The institution validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and/or program examinations, where used, including direct assessment of prior learning. The institution ensures that processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability.*

### II.A.8. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College has adopted an approved set of second-party assessment instruments as part of a multi-measure placement for evaluating and placing incoming students into English, reading, math, chemistry, and English as a Second Language. [127] [128] [129] [130] The validation conducted by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office includes three specific validation processes: content-related validity to determine appropriateness of the test for placement into a course or course sequence, criterion-related and/or consequential validity to determine appropriate cut-scores, and disproportionate impact to determine test bias. The second-party assessment tests are validated by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office on a regular cycle. The requisite validation studies were submitted in compliance with the CCCCO requirements, which have resulted in CCCCO approval for use in CCSF placement processes.

Diagnostic Medical Imaging, Licensed Vocational Nursing, Registered Nursing, Cardiovascular Tech/Echocardiography, Emergency Medical Technician, Health Information Technology, Medical Assisting, Paramedic, and Phlebotomy are subject to licensure examinations after program completion. The entities that administer those examinations are the various external accrediting organizations who are responsible for the validation of effectiveness in measuring student learning and competency and for minimizing test bias.

### II.A.8. Analysis and Evaluation

The College has applied practices which minimize test bias and validate effectiveness in English, Math, English as a Second Language, and Chemistry using recognized tests validated through the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. In addition, these four areas also use multiple measures to assess student learning such as cumulative high school GPA in discipline and CST discipline results.

**Response to findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.**
The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

> *The college also needs to enforce its published prerequisites through a consistent practice. The lack of enforcement is a result of the system not flagging the students in this situation. Everything is handled at the department level and each department handles them differently. (2002 Standard II.A.2.)*

---

[127] English Placement Test Renewal Report
[128] Approved Math assessment instruments Fall 2013
[129] California Chemistry Diagnostic Test
[130] ESL Grammar reading test summary and ESL Writing Sample Report

As noted above, the Office of Instruction, Office of Matriculation, the Curriculum Committee, academic deans and department chairs collectively developed a process to review and affirm course prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories. The vast majority of these new requisites were put into place in Fall 2015, and the remaining ones were enforced in Spring 2016.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.8.

**II.A.9.** *The institution awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. If the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows Federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions. (ER 10)*

### II.A.9. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**Credit and Outcomes.** The College complies with all state and federal regulations when awarding course credit, degrees, and certificates. CCSF offers credit, degree-applicable and credit, non-degree-applicable courses based on course outlines of record (COR) that are shaped by meaningful, measurable student learning outcomes appropriate to the discipline and academic level of the course or program. Every SLO and PSLO is assessed in three-year windows, prompting critical discussions about outcomes—their phrasing and assessment trends—in relation to the credit awarded or not awarded.

To comply with Title 5 regulations and to provide a clear and consistently applied policy on award of credit, the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate updated its policy on the relationship between course hours to units of credit.[131] [132] Deans and department chairs received directions and timelines to ensure that faculty updated all course outlines in need of modification.[133] A November 18, 2015, Curriculum Committee resolution, recommended by the Academic Senate, stated that all courses with noncompliant hours-to units-ratios or hour definitions/uses that did not have modified and approved course outlines by February 17, 2016, would be updated to meet the new rules.[134] The College fully implemented this resolution with the publication of the 2016-17 College Catalog.[135]

The Office of Instruction guides the process and works with the deans, department chairs, and Academic Senate to ensure a more systematic approach to maintaining curriculum currency. Faculty receive Curriculum Committee deadlines as well as Schedule and Catalog production timelines earlier to inform them of the timeframe for making curricular revisions. A course deactivation policy prevents courses with course outlines of record older than six years from

---

[131] Hours (Source: Chapter 2.3.3 Course Specifics - Curriculum Handbook 4.0)
[132] ACCJC Policy of Award of Credit, Compliant, pages 32-33 (Source: Accreditation Reference Handbook - July 2015, pages 32-33)
[133] Memo: Aligning Courses to Standard Hours & Units Policy
[134] Ensure Consistency and Accuracy of the Use of Course Hours and their Relationship to Units in the 2016-2017 Catalog and Beyond (Source: Curriculum Committee Resolutions)
[135] ACCJC Policy of Award of Credit, Compliant, pages 32-33 (Source: Accreditation Reference Handbook - July 2015, pages 32-33)

being offered. Banner served as an enforcement mechanism to flag outdated CORs as temporarily inactive and prevented them from being included in the upcoming Schedule until reactivation occurred through the Curriculum Committee processes. During the 2014-15 academic year alone, the Curriculum Committee processed over 1,350 curriculum related actions, including 621 course revisions. The Annual Planning process through CurricUNET provides a curriculum currency report for each department each year to guide them in planning curriculum updates necessary to keep curriculum current.[136] Through this collaborative effort the College has developed a more sustainable curriculum update routine with a higher degree of accountability.

CCSF awards academic credit based on generally accepted principles for community colleges in accordance with the State of California higher education system. Information about degree requirements are regularly shared with students and the public.[137] (Eligibility Requirement 10)[138]

### II.A.9. Analysis and Evaluation

By awarding academic credit based on generally accepted practices in higher education and adhering to regulatory requirements, the College continues to improve the quality of its credit offerings. Over the last four years, especially, the College has improved the process of ensuring that all course offerings meet the six-year threshold for currency. Outcomes assessments at the course, program, and institutional levels have become an increasingly valuable and essential part of CCSF's culture, leading to more ways to analyze the relationships interlocking outcomes, credit, and hours. The use of standardized reporting through CurricUNET allows for the provision of disaggregated data on outcomes and course completion. This systematic approach toward data has provided additional clarity on how effectively courses are being taught, which in turn has led to new perspectives on the credits and degrees earned as a result of the work done in those courses.

**Response to findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.** The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

> *The college self-reports that while its curriculum review process now includes review of hours and units of credit, addressed in the Curriculum Committee Handbook, it lacks Board Policy on the award of credit and there is a lack of consistency of credit awarded. The college has established timelines for the development and approval of such policies. Moreover, having identified the anomalous unit irregularity, the college has already begun review and correction of unit variances through its regular curriculum processes. (2002 Standard II.A.2.h.)*

---

[136] CurricUNET Curriculum Currency Report -- Program Review/Annual Planning

[137] Screenshot of Eligibility Requirements 10, Award of Credit, Compliant, p. 3 (Source: ACCJC Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation, June 2014, p.3)

[138] Screenshot of ACCJC Policy on Transfer of Credit, Compliant, pages 128-130 (Source: Accreditation Reference Handbook - July 2015, pages 128-130)

The College has Board Policies and Administrative procedures which address the award of credit and ensure consistent application of standards by the College's Curriculum Committee. The draft Administrative Procedure 6.03 states:

> The Curriculum Committee establishes and recommends criteria for the award of course credit based on the number and type of hours for each credit course in accordance with Title 5 and other state and federal regulations and guidelines. Detailed criteria are published in the college's Curriculum Handbook.[139]

The Curriculum Committee developed standards, reviewed and recommended by the Academic Senate, and implemented by the Office of Instruction. All of the College's course outlines are current. Two new Curriculum Committee recommendations approved by the Academic Senate ensure consistency and accuracy of the use of course hours and their relationship to units.[140] [141] All courses represented in the Catalog have correct hours to units ratios and follow CCSF's stated hours types and definitions to comply with federal and state regulatory requirements and Accreditation Standards.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.9.

**II.A.10.** *The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission. (ER 10)*

**II.A.10. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College provides clear information to its students about transfer-of-credit policies.

**Transfer of Credit to CCSF from Other Institutions.** The policy on transfer of coursework to City College is published in the "Academic Policies and Procedures" section of the College Catalog.[142] In accordance with this policy, Admissions and Records evaluators review incoming transcripts for course equivalency and call upon department chairs to review learning outcomes and content of incoming coursework to determine if course equivalency/comparability should be granted to meet general education, major, or certificate requirements. Student learning outcomes are included as an important review consideration on the Course Equivalency/Comparability form.[143]

---

[139] Draft AP 6.03 (recommended by Academic Senate in May 2016 along with revised BP 6.03; moving through formal adoption process)
[140] Ensure Consistency and Accuracy of the Use of Course Hours and their Relationship to Units in the 2016-2017 Catalog and Beyond
[141] Laboratory Units and Hours Compliance Resolution
[142] Transfer of Coursework to City College (Source: College Catalog 2015-16, Academic Policies & Procedures, p. 466)
[143] Course Equivalency/Comparability form

**Articulation and Transfer of Credit from CCSF to Other Institutions.** The College Catalog, in print and online, and the College website provide students with information about articulation and transferring coursework to other institutions from CCSF.[144] [145] [146]

The College supports an Office of Articulation with a full-time Articulation Officer and a half-time clerical assistant. The Office is responsible for developing and maintaining articulation agreements with other institutions where the College identifies patterns of enrollment between those institutions and CCSF. In addition, the Articulation Office disseminates all information related to articulation.[147]

CCSF awards academic credit based on generally accepted principles for community colleges under the California Higher Education System. Information about degree requirements are regularly shared with students and the public.[148] (Eligibility Requirement 10)

### II.A.10. Analysis and Evaluation

The College has effective processes in place for transfer of coursework and articulation agreements which are reviewed and updated regularly. The Office of Instruction recently improved the Course Equivalency/Comparability form by adding student learning outcomes as an important review consideration.

Information on transfer of coursework, resources to assist students in locating the most up-to-date articulation information and assistance from department chairs, faculty advisors, and counselors helps to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.10.

**II.A.11.** *The institution includes in all of its programs, student learning outcomes, appropriate to the program level, in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.*

### II.A.11. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**Common Outcomes Exist Across the Institution.** Student learning at the College is guided by Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), which direct curriculum to include components of critical thinking, applying a wide variety of analytical tools; information competency; communication competency; ethical reasoning honed through the cultural, social and environmental awareness, as well as outcomes related to personal and career development.[149]

---

[144] Transfer Information, *College Catalog 2015-16*, p.55-66
[145] Articulation website
[146] Transfer Center website
[147] Articulation website
[148] Screenshot of Eligibility Requirements 10, Award of Credit, Compliant, p. 3 (Source: ACCJC Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation, June 2014, page 3)
[149] CCSF's Institutional Learning Outcomes

Programs must map to an appropriate set of ILOs, ensuring that instructional outcomes are grounded in these broad competencies.[150]

**Programs Are Connected to Required Competencies**. General Education curriculum roots learning outcomes in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage diverse perspectives. Outcomes for both major transfer patterns, Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and California State University (CSU), aid conversations across the College about student learning in these areas. Additional General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) include composition, natural science, social sciences, humanities, and diversity studies.[151] The following table provides an easy orientation to the College's institutional outcomes and demonstrates that it meets each area included in this Accreditation Standard.

| Area of Inquiry | Applicable GELO | Applicable ILO |
|---|---|---|
| COMMUNICATION | **Area A**<br>● Use the principles and application of language toward logical thought<br>● Demonstrate clear and precise expression<br>● Critically evaluate communications in whatever symbol system the student uses | **II. Communication**<br>● Communicate effectively<br>● Demonstrate respectful interpersonal and intercultural communication<br>● Recognize and interpret creative expression |
| INFORMATION COMPETENCY | **Area B**<br>● Select and integrate reliable, credible, and scholarly sources to support essays, using a standardized citation format. | **Critical Thinking and Information Competency**<br>● Locate, evaluate, synthesize, and appropriately use multiple forms of information. |
| QUANTITATIVE COMPETENCY* | Apply mathematical concepts through numerical, symbolic, graphical, and verbal methods to interpret quantitative information, solve problems, and communicate results. | |

[150] CurricUNET User Manual -- Program Outcomes and ILO Mapping
[151] Full list of local GE Outcomes; CCSF GE Outcomes; CSU Outcomes; IGETC Outcomes

| Area of Inquiry | Applicable GELO | Applicable ILO |
|---|---|---|
| ANALYTIC INQUIRY | **Area A**<br>● Use the principles and application of language toward logical thought<br>● Critically evaluate communications in whatever symbol system the student uses<br>**Area B**<br>● Read critically to annotate, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate primarily non-fiction, college-level texts.<br>● Compose organized and coherent source-based essays that demonstrate critical thinking and rhetorical strategies. | **Critical Thinking and Information Competency**<br>● Apply critical and creative reasoning, including diverse perspectives, to address complex problems. |
| ETHICAL REASONING | **Area C**<br>● Apply scientific knowledge and reasoning to human interaction with the natural world and issues impacting society.<br>**Area H**<br>● Analyze relationships of power within or between different social groups<br>● Use ethical reasoning and/or cultural, political, or social awareness in order to be effective citizens participating in a diverse world<br>**Area F**<br>● Examine and understand the importance of participating in civic duties and responsibilities based on historical and political precedent | **III. Cultural, Social, and Environmental Awareness**<br>● Demonstrate civic, social, and environmental responsibility |
| DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES | **Area E**<br>● Exhibit an understanding of the ways in which people in diverse cultures and eras have produced culturally significant works.<br>**Area H**<br>● Analyze the historical and cultural/aesthetic experiences of women, different ethnic/racial groups, or lesbian, gay, bisexual, and/or transgender persons<br>● Compare and contrast the values, attitudes, modes of creative expression, and/or dynamics of interpersonal interactions of people from diverse ethnic/racial groups, women, or lesbian, gay, bisexual, and/or transgender persons | **Critical Thinking and Information Competency**<br>● Apply critical and creative reasoning, including diverse perspectives, to address complex problems.<br>**II. Communication**<br>● Communicate effectively<br>● Demonstrate respectful interpersonal and intercultural communication<br>**III. Cultural, Social, and Environmental Awareness**<br>● Demonstrate an understanding of the history and values of other people and cultures<br>● Collaborate effectively in diverse social, cultural, and global settings |

* Corresponds to second graduation requirement

In Spring 2015, the College developed GE outcomes for CSU and IGETC transfer programs—forming outcomes for requirements not specifically covered by local GE outcomes. Additionally, the College created an outcome for quantitative reasoning to correspond to the second graduation requirement listed in the Catalog.

## II.A.11. Analysis and Evaluation

All programs map outcomes to the College's ILOs and GELOs, which cover the areas of communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage diverse perspectives.

**Response to findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.** The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

> *There is no general education learning outcome in Area A or other GE Areas that addresses quantitative reasoning. To fully meet this standard, CCSF needs to develop a learning outcome that addresses quantitative reasoning. (2002 Standard II.A.3.b.)*

Starting in late 2014, members of the SLO team and SLO Committee met to discuss options for creating a clear and unequivocal outcome related to quantitative reasoning. It was decided that placing such an outcome in local GE Area A: Communication and Analytical Reasoning was untenable. Too many courses primarily related to teaching effective communication would not address quantitative reasoning. Moreover, it was also unclear to the committee how many communication-related outcomes were being met by mathematics courses.

The SLO Committee, after consultation with the Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction, proposed the creation of an outcome for the second graduation requirement and the removal of courses meeting the second grad requirement from Local GE Area A.[152] [153]

The SLO Coordinator sourced the Mathematics Department Chair to work with faculty and create the language of the outcome. He forwarded the favored language to the SLO Committee for review. The Academic Senate and Bipartite approved the new Quantitative Reasoning outcome on October 21, 2015. The Academic Senate and Bipartite approved the removal of math from GE Area A on February 24, 2016. The CSU and IGETC pathways also use the outcome language.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.11.

---

[152] SLO Committee Notes, see Dec 14, 2014
[153] SLO Committee Notes, Fall and Spring 2015 (see especially January 23, 2015; Feb 6, 2015; and March 6, 2015)

**II.A.12.** *The institution requires of all of its degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for both associate and baccalaureate degrees that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum, based upon student learning outcomes and competencies appropriate to the degree level. The learning outcomes include a student's preparation for and acceptance of responsible participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning and application of learning, and a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences. (ER 12)*

### II.A.12. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**The College Requires a Component of General Education in All of Its Degree Programs**. Students completing the Associate Degree have two different options for satisfying general education requirements:

- Those completing the AA or AS degrees follow the College's locally developed General Education pattern.

- Those completing the AA-T or AS-T follow either the CSU GE or IGETC patterns.

In addition, each of the general education areas has its own set of learning outcomes, which faculty also developed.[154] The general education patterns for the Associate Degrees for Transfer align with the legislative requirements of SB 1440, which mandates full completion of CSU GE or IGETC. Moreover, the College developed outcomes related to CSU and IGETC transfer patterns in Spring/Fall 2015 with faculty participation and in consultation with the Articulation Officer. In many areas, the outcomes overlap with local GE patterns; however, the College created additional outcomes where the local GE pattern diverged.[155] In addition, completion of either of these general education patterns is in keeping with the stated mission of the College, providing programs that lead to transfer to baccalaureate institutions.

**General Education Components Are Based on a Carefully Considered Philosophy.** The faculty-developed rationale for the local general education pattern is reflected in the Academic Senate's "Goals of the General Education Program."[156] The Academic Senate expanded, revised, and passed the GE Philosophy Statement in January 2015.[157] The Curriculum Committee

---

[154] General Education Learning Outcomes for Area A-H, pages 48-50 (Source: *College Catalog 2015-16,* Associate Degree Graduation Requirements, p. 48-50)
[155] CSU/IGETC outcomes
[156] Academic Senate Resolution 2015.01.28.03c on Goals of the General Education Program; Goals of the General Education Program; Screenshot of Goals of the General Education Program in College Catalog, page 46 (Source: College Catalog 2015-16, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements, page 46)
[157] Screenshot - GE Philosophy (Source: College Catalog 2015-16, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements, page 46)

reviews courses that satisfy general education areas and ensures that they continue to meet stated requirements for rigor, outcomes, and assignments.[158]

**Relying on Faculty Expertise, the College Determines the Appropriateness of Each Course for Inclusion in the General Education Curriculum Based on SLOs.** Faculty-driven processes determine the appropriateness of courses for inclusion in all of the general education patterns. The Curriculum Committee, as part of the course approval process, places appropriate courses into the General Education areas.[159] [160] [161] The assignment of general education area applicability for a course depends on the learning outcomes of the course, as stated in the approved course outline of record, mapping well and completely to the GELOs of the proposed general education area. Courses are included in the CSU GE and IGETC patterns after recommendation by the College's CSU/UC Breadth Committee and approval by the appropriate CSU and/or UC faculty. The recommendation and approval process is based on the stated learning outcomes of the course, as indicated in the course outline of record.

CCSF awards academic credit based on generally accepted principles for community colleges with a general education philosophy based on principles for the University of California, California State University, and local practice. (Eligibility Requirement 12)

**The General Education Learning Outcomes Align with those Listed in this Accreditation Standard.** The College has developed local general education requirements in accord with Title 5, Sections 55061 et seq., that require elements noted in this Accreditation Standard.[162]

### II.A.12. Analysis and Evaluation

Students applying for the Associate Degree must complete a pattern of general education. The College primarily relies on the expertise of faculty when considering courses for inclusion in the general education curriculum. Outcomes related to CSU and IGETC transfer patterns were developed in the SLO Committee and approved by the Academic Senate and College Bi-partite Committee after consultation with faculty and the Articulation Officer. The College has clear statements about the goals and learning outcomes of the locally approved general education pattern, and these statements are included in the College Catalog. The College, relying on faculty expertise, regularly and recently updated the stated philosophy for its general education program to ensure that it comprehensively includes all available general education patterns.

**Response to findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.** The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

---

[158] Curriculum Handbook section on Course Applicability
[159] Curriculum Committee Resolution for Assignment of General Education Area Applicability
[160] Academic Senate Resolution for Transferring General Education Applicability to Curriculum Committee
[161] Background and plans for Curriculum Committee to take on assignment of general education course applicability for Fall 2016
[162] CCSF GELO Web Site

*To achieve compliance with this Standard, CCSF must clarify how the existing General Education Outcomes that address what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen for its local GE pattern align with the CSU Breadth and IGETC General Education patterns or develop new learning outcomes for CSU Breadth and IGETC that address these areas. (2002 Standard II.A.3.c.)*

The SLO Coordinator, with guidance from the SLO Committee, worked with discipline experts to craft outcomes when existing local GE outcomes did not correspond with the Standards, Policies, and Procedures for Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum or the direction provided by the Guiding Notes for CSU General Education Course Reviewers.[163] [164] Using existing GE workgroups, or groups of discipline faculty, proposed language for outcomes was refined over the course of three semesters and approved by the Academic Senate and Bipartite Committee in October of 2015. A fuller description of the discipline area experts consulted was crafted and appear on the SLO web page.[165]

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.12.


**II.A.13.** *All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. The identification of specialized courses in an area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core is based upon student learning outcomes and competencies, and include mastery, at the appropriate degree level, of key theories and practices within the field of study.*

### II.A.13. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**All Degree Programs Include Focused Study in at Least One Area of Emphasis.** The College offers four Associate Degrees: AS, AA, AS-T, and AA-T. The College develops Associate Degrees in accordance with applicable portions of Title 5, including the requirement from Title 5, section 55063(a) that students complete a minimum of 18 semester units in a discipline or area of emphasis.

For the AS and AA degrees, students satisfy the Major requirement in one of two ways:

- Completion of 18 or more units in an area of emphasis of the Liberal Arts and Sciences program; or
- Completion of 18 or more units in a curriculum specified by the department and approved by the State Chancellor's Office.[166]

---

[163] Standards, Policies, and Procedures for Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum
[164] Guiding Notes for CSU General Education Course Reviewers
[165] General Education Outcomes Development Summary
[166] 2016-2017 College Catalog, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements, pages 46-54

For the AS-T and AA-T degrees, students must satisfy the Major requirements. Major requirements are developed by program faculty, evaluated by the Curriculum Committee, and approved by the Academic Senate, CCSF Board of Trustees, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. For CTE programs, another layer of evaluation occurs with advisory committees. These majors are developed in accordance with statewide Transfer Model Curricula. For the 2016-17 academic year, CCSF has 19 majors approved for the Associate Degree for Transfer.[167]

### II.A.13. Analysis and Evaluation

All of the College's AS and AA degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

The College develops AS-T and AA-T majors in accordance with statewide Transfer Model Curricula and have well defined internal processes for evaluation, the majors include both focused study in one area of inquiry and an established disciplinary core.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.13.

**II.A.14.** *Graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification.*

### II.A.14. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

For the 2016-17 academic year, the College offers 87 Associate Degrees (including 19 AA/AS-Ts) and 68 Certificates of Achievement that are approved by the State Chancellor's Office and have a Career Technical Education (CTE) designation. The College also offers 104 locally approved Certificates of Accomplishment and 56 noncredit CTE Certificates of Completion. Graduates of these programs demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and external agency certification and licensure requirements.

**Demonstrating Technical and Professional Competencies.** In addition to the College curriculum approval process, CTE programs must receive endorsement from the Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC) to ensure that the industry needs of the Bay Area are being met and that colleges are not engaging in unnecessary duplication or creating a supply of graduates that exceeds workforce demand. A number of CTE programs, Nursing, Diagnostic Medical Imaging, Dental Assisting, Drug and Alcohol Studies, Administration of Justice and Fire Science Technology (police and fire training), Culinary Arts, Medical Technician, Health Information Management, Medical Assistance, and Paramedic Training must meet additional industry-specific accreditation standards and licensing examinations.[168]

---

[167] Degrees & Certificates, Argos - Fall 2015
[168] Programmatic Accreditors

Program Review reporting ensures that each program's curricula meets Title 5 requirements on currency, relevance, content, and requisites within a two-year time period.

CTE programs are required to convene advisory committee meetings annually and are encouraged to meet with advisors each term. Advisory committee membership consists of industry representatives, adjunct faculty, students, and employers. During advisory committee meetings, members review and discuss program and course student learning outcomes, curriculum content, and course sequences. The focus of the program advisory committees is to ensure that programs deliver instruction that addresses employment competencies and, when applicable, prepare students for licensure and/or certification by external agencies.

The College has strengthened its process of documenting advisory committee meetings. In 2014, the Program Review included a CTE Addendum with specific questions regarding advisory committees. The following year, the College made adjustments and adopted a standardized procedure for conducting advisory committees, including forms for standardizing agendas and minutes.[169] Reporting processes have improved: the new CurricUNET Program Review module incorporates the CTE addendum questions, with detailed prompts and instructions based on input from constituents and the Academic Senate's Program Review Committee. The College website includes a page listing CTE advisory committees by program.[170]

## II.A.14. Analysis and Evaluation

All CCSF's CTE programs regularly consider and discuss the labor market for and employment outcomes of their students. These discussions take place during annual advisory committee meetings, and are documented in the minutes. Improvement plans based on advisory input and SLO assessments are part of Program Review, and are also part of the College's Perkins Title I.C. internal allocation process. CTE programs are required to describe the labor market for their students, and verify that they have held an advisory committee meeting within the last twelve months in order to be eligible for Perkins funding. The process for approving new programs through the regional consortium assures that there is no unnecessary duplication of programs or destructive competition between colleges, and no flooding of the market in one job category that would be to the detriment of students.

Career Technical Education departments with outside accreditation requirements have strong linkages that demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification. These CTE areas have regular meetings with industry advisory committees matching their learning outcomes to industry standards. In addition, student licensure exam rates are high and programs indicate ongoing and continuous improvement in both their Program Reviews and accreditation reports.

---

[169] Forms for Recording Career Technical Education Advisory Committee Membership and Minutes
[170] CTE Advisory Committee Website

The College's participation in the CTE Employment Outcomes Survey has helped CTE programs to understand the positive employment and wage gain outcomes for completers, skill builders, and leavers. The College has participated in this survey since its inception and is sharing this data with sister colleges in the region to develop a clearer picture of CTE outcomes within regional industry sectors.

**Response to findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.** The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

> *Institutionalize the practice of establishing, meeting with, and documenting meetings with advisory boards for all CTE programs. (2002 Standard II.A.2.b.)*

> *Continue to implement current plans to insure that all CTE programs will convene their advisory boards by the end of Spring 2015 to review learning outcomes and insure exit skills for degrees and certificates meet the technical and professional competencies to meet workforce needs. (2002 Standard II.A.5.)*

The faculty in all CCSF's CTE programs regularly consider and discuss the labor market for and employment outcomes of their students. These discussions take place during annual advisory committee meetings and are documented in the minutes. Prior to Fall 2014, CTE departments archived advisory committee minutes in a variety of formats and documentation was held in individual departmental offices. In order to create a central repository and uniform system of documentation of advisory committees, the College adopted a CTE addendum for Program Review with specific questions about advisory meetings in Fall 2014 that is now incorporated into the CurricUNET Program Review module. As noted in the Evidence section above, the College undertook a number of other activities to standardize the information it collects regarding advisory committees. To enforce the new requirements, CTE programs become ineligible for Perkins funding without evidence of current year's advisory board meetings' agendas and minutes.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.14.

**II.A.15.** *When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.*

## II.A.15. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College's Catalog Rights Policy allows enrolled students to maintain Catalog rights in the year that they began enrollment or any Catalog in effect during the time of continuous enrollment.[171]

---

[171] Screenshot of Catalog Rights policy (Source: *College Catalog 2016-17, Associate Degree Graduation Requirements, p. 46*)

In accordance with California Education Code Section 78016 and California Code of Regulations Title 5, sections 51022 and 55130, the College's Board Policy 6.17 provides criteria, considerations, and requirements for eliminating or significantly changing College programs.[172] Administrative Procedure 6.17 details the steps taken to initiate, complete, and formulate recommendations regarding program viability. If a program is recommended for closure, the College must create provisions for enrolled students to complete their course of study.[173] For example, when the Diagnostic Medical Imaging (DMI) program was unable to hire a highly specialized instructor, and while the search for an instructor continues, the DMI program was put on hold, in accordance with AP 6.17, and the department made arrangements for the existing students to complete the program.

**II.A.15. Analysis and Evaluation**

The College policy on Catalog Rights helps to ensure that students are able to complete work toward program completion in the face of program modification. The College has a Board policy and administrative procedures to address program revitalization, suspension and discontinuance.

**Response to findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.** The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

> *The institution has identified that a policy and procedures were needed to deal with program deactivation. As a result, the institutional developed a policy that was approved by the board. However, the institution has only recently begun developing specific procedures to implement the policy … The self-evaluation identifies that procedures to support the policy are needed. Complete compliance can be achieved once the related procedures are implemented. (2002 Standard II.A.6.b.)*

The College completed the development of administrative procedures to accompany Board Policy 6.17 in Spring 2013 prior to the Fall 2014 Restoration Evaluation Team site visit. The first implementation of AP 6.17 was in Spring 2015.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.15.

**II.A.16.** *The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.*

---

[172] Board Policy 6.17
[173] Administrative Procedures 6.17

**II.A.16. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

**Quality and Currency of All Instructional Programs.** The College regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs. Instructional programs, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, basic skills and community education, are evaluated annually through Program Review and Annual Planning.[174] Program Reviews and Annual Plans includes a review of data, curriculum currency, and assessment currency.[175] [176] [177] A recent example of program improvements related to currency is illustrated in the the 2015 Engineering and Technology (ET) department Program Review. ET is currently overhauling the CAD program to take into account current trends in manufacturing and prototyping built upon 3D printing. With advisory board oversight, the department is evaluating current program outcomes and courses are being modified or deleted. ET faculty are also working with the Architecture Department to transition to a Building Information Modeling curriculum that crosses disciplines to provide students a fuller understanding of new industry standard.[178]

All course outlines of record and program descriptions are updated and approved by the Curriculum Committee at least once every six years to remain active. Per the Curriculum Committee Resolution on Catalog Currency, course outlines that have not been updated in the six years prior to an academic year and majors and certificates that have not had their program descriptions updated in the six years prior are deactivated and removed from the Catalog until updates have been approved.[179]

**Improving Programs to Enhance Student Learning Outcomes and Achievement.** As outlined in the Institutional Assessment Plan, the College assesses all program and course SLOs a minimum of once every three years; continual SLO assessment has led to ongoing program improvements.[180] In Fall 2014, ongoing assessment at the program level was at 94 percent up from 71 percent in 2012; similarly, ongoing course-level assessment improved from 88 percent in 2012 to 97 percent in 2014.

Many course and program improvements focus on content and delivery; implementation of tech-enhancement; varied instructional materials, sequencing; and assignments.[181] Other notable improvements resulted from coordination among faculty teaching the same course, providing evidence that increased dialogue among faculty has led to course and program improvement. Summary and validation reports conducted by the Academic Senate Student Learning Outcomes committee verify the quality of assessment reports submitted for courses

---

[174] Program Reviews and Annual Plans
[175] Data trends - Selected; Data Trends - Other
[176] Curriculum Currency
[177] Assessment Currency
[178] Program review (fall 2015)
[179] Screenshot - CC Resolution  - 6 yr currency (Source: Resolution Regarding Ensuring the Currency and Accuracy of the College Catalog)
[180] CCSF Institutional Assessment Plan - March 16, 2016
[181] Screenshot of Fall 2014 Assessment Summary Report, pages 2-3 (Source: Fall 2014 Assessment Summary Report, pages 2-3)

and programs and summarize findings so that assessment work and reporting will continue to improve College wide. Continued improvements in the quality and currency of courses and programs occur as a result of reported assessments. Current improvements made in the quality of programs include:

1. collaborating in course sequencing so students more easily master program level outcomes;
2. redefining of CTE programs in response to industry advisory board input;
3. collaborating to create common exercises to measure PSLOs;
4. establishing transfer degrees or new certificates;
5. updating technology or materials used across courses in a program;
6. strengthening instruction in a course central to a particular PSLO;
7. scaffolding assignments across courses;
8. holding alumni focus groups, changing the sequencing of courses, dialog to discuss retention, addition of internships, refining program level assessment, and professional development workshops.[182]

College faculty continue to improve formal assessment practices. Moreover, in the 2014 assessment, 84.9 percent (*n=1062*) students rated the quality of instruction in their classes as either excellent (39.9 percent) or good (45.2 percent).[183]

**Distance Learning.** The Educational Technology Department works to continually improve distance education; quality improvement is focused on student retention, persistence and success rates. The Department regularly engages in dialogue regarding the development and assessment of outcomes related to distance education and communicates with other departments and services to meet the changing needs of online students. In 2013, the College recorded the highest FTES generated for online classes at FTES 721 for spring and 719 for fall. While there was a decrease in FTES generated by distance learning in 2014-15, Fall 2015 showed a recovery with an increase of 70 FTES from the previous fall.[184] The success rate between distance learners and face-to-face learners in credit-only classes has not experienced a significant change over the last three years. The average success rate for distance learners is 61 percent over the last three years and 71 percent College wide for credit only. In comparing CCSF's success rates in distance learning with the state average over the last three years, CCSF is in line with the State average of a 61 percent success rate in distance learning and a 71 percent in face-to-face. There is some slight fluctuation between basic skills, credit, degree-

[182] Fall 2014 Assessment Summary Report
[183] Screenshot of CCSSE - CCSF Question 9 (Source: Community College Survey of Student Engagement - City College of San Francisco, Question 9)
[184] Distance Learning Growth Charts

applicable, transferable, and vocational over the three-year period for both CCSF and the State, however the changes in percentage points is not significant.[185]

**II.A.16. Analysis and Evaluation**

The College's integrated curriculum, outcome assessment and Program Review processes work together to ensure that courses and programs are being evaluated and improved with regard to quality and currency. This quality extends across all the different programs regardless of mode or delivery. The College's course and program level student learning outcomes assessment is systematic and leads to course and program improvements that support student learning.

**Response to Finding from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.**
The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

> *The College has recently reviewed almost all of its courses and programs through its revised curriculum approval and review process and has a calendar for completing that review. The process of assessing learning outcomes is established and functional. However, it has only recently begun these processes ... The College must continue to follow its calendar for the review of courses and programs and the assessment of learning outcomes. (2002 Standard 2.A.2e)*

The curriculum committee has established procedures to ensure the regular review and updating of all course outlines and student learning outcomes. In addition, the College has utilized its curriculum management system to identify, track, and assess the effectiveness of assessment at the course and program levels.

The January 14, 2015 Action Letter from the ACCJC also modified the 2014 Visiting Team Report, by adding the following suggested action:

> *Ensure consistency across the institution in reviewing all courses and programs, and in using data and analysis from the review in institutional planning and resource allocation.*

Faculty continuously focus on curriculum development and revision and assessment practices, developing more robust systems of evaluation. The implementation of CurricUNET's three-module system (curriculum, assessment, and Program Review) supports faculty efforts by providing effective online integration and alignment of course, program and institutional level assessments with Program Review and planning. Faculty, staff, and administrators have access to more consistent data, providing for deeper analysis and use of data in planning and resource allocation.

CurricUNET's improved reporting processes facilitate a more uniform curriculum development process; allows for a more sustainable curriculum update routine; and ensures a

---

[185] Course Success Summary CCSF vs State

higher degree of accountability and an easier way to track course and program assessments and improvements.

With the introduction of CurricUNET's assessment module and the collection of disaggregated student data, the College has a tremendous opportunity to continue and expand upon this growth in ways that have meaningful impact on teaching and learning.

The systematic collection and review of this data allows for the inclusion of both aggregate and disaggregated SLO and achievement results in Program Review. All departments, programs, and services are able to evaluate outcomes results and use them to plan improvements.

Necessary resources to implement improvement plans are then linked to outcomes and achievement data, systematically collected and evaluated, in each Program Review. As Program Review funding allocations are prioritized, this data can be referenced to identify the areas of both highest need and highest potential to improve learning. A rubric used by administrators to prioritize funding requests include the evaluation of this data.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard II.A.16.

## Standard II.A. Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self Evaluation Process

| Standard II.A. Changes Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Goal** | **Associated Action(s)** | **Person(s) Responsible** | **Completion Date** | **Outcome** |
| Ensure all syllabi contain SLOs<br><br>(Standard II.A.3.) | Create centralized electronic inventory of syllabi | School Deans<br><br>Department Chairs | Fall 2015 and ongoing | Verification that all syllabi contain SLOs |
| Adopt a Board Policy and Administrative Procedures on the award of credit<br><br>(Standard II.A.4./II.A.9. and Commission Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits) | Work through established BP approval process | VC Academic Affairs<br><br>AVC Instruction<br><br>Curriculum Committee | Fall 2015 | Clear policy and practice related to the award of credit. Adopted BP 6.03 on the award of credit. |

| | | **Standard II.A. Changes Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Goal** | **Associated Action(s)** | **Person(s) Responsible** | **Completion Date** | **Outcome** |
| Develop process to collect and review course sequencing (Standard II.A.5./II.A.6.) | With input from affected areas, create forms for even and odd years that lay out minimal offerings for certificate and program completion<br><br>Distribute to Departments<br><br>Deans and Chairs work collaboratively to refine form and to fill out sequencing<br><br>Allow time for processing<br><br>File and track in AA and School Dean Offices | Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs<br><br>School Deans<br><br>Department Chairs<br><br>Faculty<br><br>CTE advisory boards (resource)<br><br>Program-specific external accreditors | Fall 2015 | Course sequencing meets student needs |
| Develop learning outcomes that address quantitative reasoning (Standard II.A.11.) | Discipline experts create outcome that addresses quantitative reasoning. Outcome approved by AS and Bipartite | SLO Coordinator<br><br>Dean Institutional Effectiveness<br><br>VC Academic Affairs | October 21, 2015 | CCSF GE Outcomes website.<br><br>Senate Agenda<br><br>BiPartite Agenda |
| Create CSU and IGETC learning outcomes (Standard II.A.12.) | Have CSU and IGETC learning outcomes approved by AS and Bipartite | SLO Coordinators<br><br>VC Academic Affairs<br><br>Dean Institutional Effectiveness | October 21, 2015 | Approved CSU learning outcomes<br><br>Approved IGETC learning outcomes |

| Standard II.A. Changes Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Goal** | **Associated Action(s)** | **Person(s) Responsible** | **Completion Date** | **Outcome** |
| All CTE programs will establish an advisory board, meet at least once a year with the advisory board, and document their discussions with the advisory board<br><br>(Standard II.A.14.) | Develop forms and yearly processes to engage CTE advisory committees<br><br>This Spring, in preparation for next Fall, get forms (with information about advisory committees and other relevant information) through to Chairs and Deans.<br><br>Fall implement for next year<br><br>Solicit and review feedback on Outcomes (in advisory committees and on form)<br><br>Gather and evaluate industry feedback on outcomes for CTE programs in Program Review and Perkins applications<br><br>Hire AVC Workforce Development (See also II.A.5.)" | Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs<br><br>SLO Coordination Team<br><br>CTE/ Perkins Coordinator,<br><br>Department Chairs<br><br>School Deans | Fall 2015 for establishing advisory Board and<br><br>Spring 2016 for all meetings | All CTE programs will have an advisory board.<br><br>All CTE programs will meet with their advisory boards at least once a year.<br><br>All advisory board meetings will be documented. |
| Ensure consistency across the institution in reviewing all courses and programs, and in using data and analysis from the review in institutional planning and resource allocation.<br><br>(Standard II.A.16.) | Continue to link lottery money, faculty positions, staffing position, and budgetary requests with Program Review<br><br>Continue to follow established timelines for prioritization discussions<br><br>Continue to make results of prioritization public | VC Academic Affairs<br><br>AVC Institutional Development<br><br>Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Department Chairpersons, and School Deans | Initiated and ongoing | Planning and resource allocation ensures improved outcomes |

| Standard II.A. Plans Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Goal** | **Associated Action(s)** | **Person(s) Responsible** | **Expected Completion Date** | **Expected Outcome** |
| Sustain efforts related to syllabi and SLOs.<br><br>(Standard II.A.3.) | Continue existing collection of syllabi and validation of SLOs, and evaluate impacts of new process for providing accurate SLOs and instructions to faculty | VCAA Academic Affairs, Academic Senate | Ongoing | Syllabi will continue to include accurate SLO information |
| New ILO for quantitative reasoning<br><br>(Standard II.A.11.) | Develop a quantitative reasoning ILO and get approval from Academic Senate and Participatory Governance | SLO Coordinator<br><br>Academic Senate | End of Fall 2016 | New ILO for quantitative reasoning |