

Standard I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

I.B.1.

I.B.1. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

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

Dialogue about Student Learning. The Institutional Assessment Plan provides a systematic and evolving framework for ongoing outcomes assessment work.¹ The plan delineates institutional assessment goals such as supporting improvement, providing training, furthering program planning, disseminating data, and creating a system of resources and references. The plan specifies the cooperative nature of institutional effectiveness, showing how administrative and support services, as well as academic programs, contribute to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and achievement outcomes. To maintain currency and regularly prompt collegial dialogue about the College's assessment of learning, implementation of the assessment plan addresses the

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 They have been replaced by the research and reports completed by General Education and Institutional Learning Outcome workgroups who gather and share results across one group of GELOs or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

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

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

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

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

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

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

11

As one example of how Equity Forum input is supporting action, many students reported not

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

With regard to student learning, SLO Coordinators lead the dialogue and regularly contribute to the work of several committees.²³

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

The College focuses its internal professional development on building and reinforcing a culture of continuous improvement. For many years, each Flex Day has maintained a particular theme

I.B.1. Analysis and Evaluation

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

Self-reflective and collegial dialogue about continuously improving student learning and institutional processes occurs within and across all departments and at the institutional level in an ongoing cycle. The College's Institutional Assessment Plan provides a systematic framework for ongoing assessment work. CQI and SLO assessment are a regular part of professional development, of departmental Program Review and planning, and of institutional-level planning and evaluation. Broad-based participation is encouraged and supported through the use of online documentation as well as through semester reporting and Program Review activities. SLO assessments encompass the entire College, including not only courses and programs but also general education outcomes, institutional learning outcomes, student services outcomes, and administrative unit outcomes. The College engages in explicit, self-

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

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

The Institutional Assessment Plan articulates the faculty role in assessment:

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

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

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

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

SSO assessment is described in detail in Standard II.C.2. The SLO Coordination Team created a Detailed Status Report to track each SSO.⁴⁴ The report includes the assessment method, brief

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

An area of increased focus over the last few years is the Centers, particularly with regard to student support services and learning support services. The College's Equal Access to Success Emergency (EASE) Task Force has worked to promote equitable services across locations informed by data (see Standard II.C.3.).⁵⁰ CCSSE and Center Survey results have figured prominently in the analysis of student needs to inform the EASE Plan. Surveys solicit information on perceived availability, use, and helpfulness of services, with changes made in response, implemented beginning Spring 2016. Initial evaluation of these changes is occurring in Summer 2016, with continued follow up through subsequent surveys and other assessments to help determine whether changes have led to the desired impacts and provided more equitable access to success. As the College gathers student IDs for respondents to n8]TJ29s2(p6)-7 (ot)-2 (D)- (he)4 T*Tai

I.B.3.**I.B.3. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College has institution-set standards for student achievement at the institutional level and program levels.⁵¹

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

- " Course Completion Rate: 71 percent goal for 2016-17 and 73 percent goal long-term (6 year) 2016 ~~2016~~

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

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

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

I.B.3. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

I.B.4.

I.B.4. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

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

62

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

Summarize overall departmental/program improvements implemented, in progress, or

The College also uses summary outcomes assessment results to inform College-wide planning and overall College directive. The SLO dashboard further summarizes assessment results for all

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

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

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

I.B.5.

I.B.5. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

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

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

⁷⁷

⁷⁸

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

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

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

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

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

I.B.6.

I.B.6. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

and prerequisites and will

I.B.7.

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

Evaluation of Integrated Planning Practices. Beyond policies and procedures, the College evaluates how the planning practices that guide resource management contribute to institutional effectiveness and quality. SLO assessments and Program Review are the College's principal evaluation mechanisms for improving programs and services. Notably, these practices encompass instructional programs, student support services, and learning support services. To provide an institutional overview and determine the extent to which assessment and Program Review practices and mechanisms foster improvement, the College asseu(ct)-6 (i)rgeand mstha sove tTc 0 oveA

and important, ongoing roles in informing as well as assessing evaluation mechanisms.¹⁰⁵

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

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

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

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

121

122

123

124

125

order to set priorities. For 2016, the Facilities Master Plan will be a significant focus and venue

range and short-range planning. Planning is integrated across all areas of the College with a unifying focus on the College's mission. Broad-

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

Integrated Institutional and Programmatic Planning. The College explicates the relationship between and integration among its long-range plans through the Education Master Plan implementation matrix. As indicated in the flowchart, the EMP provides an overarching framework for support plans (e.g., Student Equity Plan) as well as resources plans (e.g., Technology).¹³⁴ The implementation matrix shows more specifically how action items from various College-wide plans connect to the overarching goals and strategic directions of the EMP.¹³⁵ ¹³⁶ The College has a defined process for assessing progress toward achieving goals of -eddfa Tw [(a)6

A substantial change is occurring in Fall 2016. In brief, the College is shifting its annual Program Review cycle to a three-year, comprehensive Program Review with annual components to support ongoing institutional and programmatic planning.¹⁴² While this change is less

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

I.B.9. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

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

The Restoration Evaluation Report also included the following statement:

¹⁵⁰

¹⁵¹

