

City College of San Francisco

Special Report

Submitted by:

City College of San Francisco

50 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112

To:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 15, 2012

Special Report – Certification Page

Date: October 15, 2012

This Special Report is submitted to the ACCJC for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's accreditation status.

We certify that we reviewed this Special Report and that we were involved in its development process.

Signed

Pamila Fisher, Interim Chancellor

John Rizzo, President, Board of Trustees

(Name, Title, Academic Senate)

(Name, Title, Classified Senate)

(Name, Title, Student Trustee)

Table of Contents

1. Report Preparation	XX
2. Response to the Commission Letter	XX
A. Eligibility Requirements	XX
Eligibility Requirement 5, Administrative Capacity	XX
Eligibility Requirement 17, Financial Resources	XX
Eligibility Requirement 18, Financial Accountability	XX
Eligibility Requirement 21, Relations with the Accrediting Commission	XX
B. Recommendations.....	XX
Recommendation 1: Mission Statement	XX
Recommendation 2: Effective Planning Process	XX
Recommendation 3: Assessing Institutional Effectiveness	XX
Recommendation 4: Student Learning Outcomes	XX
Recommendation 5: Student Support Services.....	XX
Recommendation 6: Human Resources Components of Evaluation	XX
Recommendation 7: Human Resources	XX
Recommendation 8: Physical Resources	XX
Recommendation 9: Technology Resources.....	XX
Recommendation 10: Financial Planning and Stability.....	XX
Recommendation 11: Financial Integrity and Reporting.....	XX
Recommendation 12: Leadership, Governance and Decision-making.....	XX
Recommendation 13: Governance Structures.....	XX
Recommendation 14: Effective Board Organization.....	XX
Special Focus: Centers and Sites	XX
C. Actions Addressing the Material Weaknesses and Significant Deficiencies Identified in the 2011 Auditors Report	XX
D. Response to the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team Report.....	XX
3. Appendices.....	XX
Index of Evidence	XX
Substantiating Evidence.....	XX

1. Report Preparation

The following section describes the organization for developing action plans and making progress in response to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Recommendations, the process of report preparation, the individuals who were involved in its preparation, and the chronological timeline of activities and events.

A significant number of City College of San Francisco (CCSF) faculty, staff, administrators, and trustees have engaged in a tremendous amount of work in a very short timeframe to develop and begin implementing plans to address the ACCJC's show cause letter of July 3, 2012. Much of the work began during July when a number of faculty and others were not present. Given the short turnaround and the need to begin work when not everyone was back on campus, adjustments may be necessary, but this report captures where the College is at this moment with respect to the concerns voiced by ACCJC.

Context

Upon hearing the accreditation visiting team's exit report, the College did not expect a positive accreditation outcome. The accreditation site visit was followed, just over two months later, by the sudden retirement of then-Chancellor Dr. Don Griffin due to illness. The CCSF Board of Trustees quickly appointed Interim Chancellor Dr. Pamela Fisher, who began to actively communicate that she expected a sanction based on her review of the draft evaluation report received soon after she arrived at CCSF, although the severity of the sanction was unknown. Along with messages related to the precarious financial situation the College was facing at that time, the Interim Chancellor simultaneously conveyed serious concerns regarding CCSF's accreditation findings that confirmed her own observations. The Interim Chancellor was in communication with ACCJC staff to remain apprised of the timeline for the release of the Commission's decision letter and evaluation report and to be prepared to respond to the findings. At that time, the media began to place attention on City College regarding its accreditation status based on a draft report that had been leaked to the press.

On July 3, 2012, the College received the Accrediting Commission decision letter and evaluation report. The College placed both documents immediately on its website,¹ as well as a response to the decision, indicating the gravity with which the College views the Accrediting Commission's findings and outlining next steps to address the Recommendations. The following few days were filled with inquiries from both print and broadcast media representing local, national, and educational organizations and press. In an effort to educate the community at large, as well as the internal community, about the College's accreditation status, the Interim Chancellor held forums attended by over 200 people, distributed a series of talking points, and coordinated a media response protocol to streamline the sources of communication.²

On July 6, 2012, the Interim Chancellor called a special meeting to provide information on the College's accreditation status, and she continued to communicate with the CCSF community on every occasion possible to keep everyone apprised of progress.³

¹ Staff later developed an expanded accreditation website to provide easy access to accreditation information.

² See CCSF response letter to ACCJC and accreditation talking points.

³ See CCSF community email updates 7/3/12 and 7/23/12, leadership team meetings (check dates), and 8/14/12 Flex Day Remarks

Process of Organization

On July 10, 2012, the CCSF Board of Trustees held a Special Meeting to discuss City College's accreditation status. Interim Chancellor Dr. Pamela Fisher presented an overview of the decision and recommendations from ACCJC. She also described the preliminary plans and next steps to address the recommendations. After the discussion, ACCJC President, Dr. Barbara Beno, with Trustee William "Bill" McGinnis of Butte-Glenn Community College District, presented a three-hour workshop on the topic of accreditation's purposes, processes and standards; the roles and responsibilities of Trustees in accreditation; and advice for board excellence. All Trustees were in attendance and participated in the workshop.⁴

On July 11, 2011, CCSF's Interim Chancellor appointed and directed a large Accreditation Response Team to discuss a strategy to address the Commission's specific recommendations. The Accreditation Response Team included trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives. The Accreditation Response Team suggested names to the Chancellor who planned to appoint smaller accreditation workgroups responsible for developing plans to address the 14 Recommendations.⁵ The Chancellor later appointed a Steering Committee to monitor accreditation progress. The Steering Committee was composed of each workgroup leader addressing the specific Recommendations and the president of each college constituency group.

On July 16, 2011, the Chancellor appointed smaller workgroups focused on each of the 14 Recommendations and charged them with developing timely action plans. The 14 Recommendations relate to the following areas of college operations:

1. Mission Statement, Review Process, Benchmark for Decision Making
2. Planning Process/Roles and Authority
3. Institutional Effectiveness/Program Review
4. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)/Instruction
5. SLO/Student Services
6. SLO/Evaluations in HR
7. Adequacy of Staff and Administrators/Planning
8. Physical Resources/Operation/Maintenance
9. Technology Resources
10. Financial Planning and Stability
11. Financial Integrity and Reporting
12. Leadership/Governance/Decision-Making
13. Governance Structures/Barriers to Decision-Making
14. Effective Board of Trustees Organization

Each workgroup (except for Workgroup 14, Board Organization) is led by a workgroup leader, typically the administrator responsible for the unit most closely associated with the related Recommendation. In some instances, where the administrator would naturally be responsible for more than one recommendation, another administrator or classified staff member was assigned.

⁴ See Board meeting agenda and notes; ACCJC Presentation.

⁵ See Accreditation Response Team meeting agenda and notes.

Workgroups include trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives. The entire Board of Trustees constitutes Workgroup 14 (Effective Board Organization). The Chancellor plays a facilitation role to compose the workgroups and identify and implement action plans that address the specific recommendation; she has also led Workgroups 1, 12, 13, and 14.⁶

The Chancellor established and led a special focus workgroup, Workgroup 15, to assess and analyze the issues related to the College's sites and centers. This topic appears in several of the recommendations, primarily in Workgroup 1 (Mission), Workgroup 2 (Effective Planning Process), Workgroup 5 (Student Services), Workgroup 8 (Physical Resources), and Workgroup 10 (Financial Planning). Workgroup 15 members include the workgroup leaders noted above in addition to trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives.

The College also hired two retired community college presidents to assist in addressing the recommendations. Dr. Betty Inclan, retired President of Berkeley City College, has been providing her expertise and knowledge to the workgroups focused on Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, Program Review, and Student Learning Outcomes. Dr. Robert Agrella, retired Superintendent/President of Sonoma County Junior College District, has been contributing to the workgroups focused on staffing and financial resources and the review of board policies, a component of Workgroup 14. Both consultants have been instrumental in sharing their knowledge, expertise, and, most important, outside perspectives in the workgroups.

On July 18, 2012, ACCJC Vice Presidents Mr. Jack Pond and Dr. Susan Clifford came to City College and presented a workshop to the Accreditation Response Team and workgroup members. The presentation was titled "Accreditation and College Responsibilities." Topics included: the purposes and processes of accreditation; elements of evaluation and improvement; the standards of accreditation; ACCJC policies; federal regulations; resources for institutions; model for effective program review and integrated planning; and Commission expectations. Approximately 70 individuals attended. In addition, with encouragement from ACCJC and the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), <INSERT NUMBER> CCSF personnel completed ACCJC's online accreditation basics course.⁷

On July 18, 2012, the Board of Trustees held a Special Meeting to review the work of the Accreditation Response Team and draft action plan. The Chancellor and Accreditation Liaison Officer provided an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the Board, Chancellor, ALO, constituent groups, workgroups, and consultants. They reviewed the summary of recommendations, workgroup membership, and overall timelines to meet the ACCJC deadlines for the Special Report and Show Cause Report. The ALO presented the workgroup matrices which were the tools used initially by the ALO and Chancellor to monitor and track each workgroup's progress. The matrices identified the Recommendation, workgroup membership, specific activities, timelines for the activities, related Recommendations and Standards, and resources needed to accomplish their task.⁸ The Board of Trustees asked questions, provided direction, and approved the work plans.

⁶ See workgroups list; the Chancellor's Office distributed the initial workgroups membership list on July 16, 2012. It continued to modify this list to ensure appropriate expertise and balance of perspectives.

⁷ See ACCJC presentation and attendees list (check if have it ?).

⁸ See 7/18/12 Board of Trustees agenda and handouts; workgroup timelines.

Process of Report Preparation

In addition to completing the matrices by August 3, 2012, written narrative progress reports were due to the Accreditation Liaison Officer by August 16, 2012. Follow-up progress reports were due September 7. The narrative progress reports, workgroup notes, handouts, and described outcomes formed the basis for writing the Special Report.⁹

On August 8, 2012, the Chancellor convened the Steering Committee for the first time. This Committee is responsible for reviewing the plans and outcomes of the workgroups and for ensuring that the workgroups are coordinating with each other when activities overlap and/or are dependent upon each other. The Steering Committee consists of the workgroup leaders; constituent leaders of the College including Academic Senate, Classified Senate, AFT2121, SEIU 1021, and Department Chair Council (DCC); the Student Trustee; and the Board President/Vice President. In addition, the Steering Committee includes the ALO, Accreditation Assistant, and Dean of Grants and Resource Development, who is responsible for the final writing and editing of the Special and Show Cause Reports. Given its constituency representation, the Steering Committee plays a role in helping to provide transparency and promote communication around accreditation work.¹⁰ The Committee met on August 8, August 22, and September 6. On September 19, 2012, they reviewed and edited the draft Special Report.

On August 23, 2012, the Interim Chancellor and ALO provided a comprehensive report to the Board of Trustees on the structure, activities, timeline and progress of the workgroups addressing the 14 Recommendations and unmet Eligibility Requirements cited by the Accrediting Commission. The Board reviewed the report and approved the working plans.

Outcome

During the September 27, 2012, Board meeting, the Board reviewed and approved the draft Special Report and provided direction to the Chancellor regarding those areas where the workgroups' charge had been to identify a list of possible solutions rather than a single recommendation. This was true for Workgroup 7 (Administrative Staffing) and Workgroup 10 (Finances/Stability). With regard to Financial Stability, some actions were to be taken immediately and have occurred already, others are being implemented, others will be considered through the collective bargaining process, and some may not be selected at all. For the other workgroup recommendations, the Board directed the Chancellor to oversee the completion and implementation of the full work plan, and to provide monthly updates on progress toward that goal. It is anticipated that all goals will either be accomplished or a concrete process will be in place with measurable progress toward the achievement of these goals being made by March 15, 2013.

⁹ See workgroup calendar of meetings, matrices, progress reports, agendas, and notes.

¹⁰ Meetings have been held regularly since the group first convened (8/8/12; 8/22/12; 9/6/12; 9/19/12). See Steering Committee list, meeting agendas, and notes.

2. Response to the Commission Letter

A. Eligibility Requirements

While the Show Cause Report due to the Commission by March 15, 2013 will address all 21 ACCJC Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation, the focus here is on the four Eligibility Requirements called out in the Commission's July 2, 2012 letter.

All of the Commission's Recommendations relate to these four Eligibility Requirements in varying degrees, and the response to those Recommendations provides additional details beyond the information presented in this section.

Eligibility Requirement 5, Administrative Capacity

ACCJC Finding: The college does not have sufficient administrative staff with appropriate experience to support the necessary services for an institution of its size, mission, and purpose.

In responding to a number of the Commission's Recommendations, especially Recommendations 1, 2, 7, 8, and 11, the College has begun to examine and take action on issues relating to staffing in order to comply with this Eligibility Requirement. Thus, this response to Eligibility Requirement 5 draws on the actions of the workgroups addressing these Recommendations, as described below and again later in the Special Report

Related Actions of Recommendation 1, Mission Statement. The first step has been to redefine City College of San Francisco's mission.¹¹ After an examination of internal and external data, a survey of City College of San Francisco personnel (and, to a lesser extent, students), reviewing the California Education Code, receiving input from the public, and engaging the Board in dialogue about the mission during a Special Board meeting, the Board identified the following four priorities for the District's mission: preparation for transfer, achievement of associate degrees, acquisition of career skills, and development of basic skills (including English as a Second Language and Transitional Studies). As part of that revision, the institution also refocused the mission on student learning and achievement, and highlighted the role of assessment; has begun more explicitly linking the mission to planning and resource allocation; and amended Board Policy 1200 to incorporate a statement that the Board will review the District's vision and mission annually during its summer planning retreat. Ultimately, the mission will guide us toward appropriate staffing levels once all planning systems are fully operational, with decisions regarding human and other resource allocation stemming from the District's vision and mission. As the College moves forward in responding to the other Recommendations, the prioritization of facets of the mission may result in changes to administrative staffing as the College makes decisions that impact its educational programs, services, and sites.

Related Actions of Recommendation 2, Effective Planning Process. In addition to addressing the mission, the institution has spent considerable time revamping its planning system, which now utilizes the mission statement and a more robust Program Review process (restored to an annual cycle) to make planning more integrated and effective—and thereby better aligned with the Accreditation Standards.¹² The planning process will be heavily informed by data and

¹¹ See also our response to Recommendation 1.

¹² See also our response to Recommendations 2 and 3.

assessment to support decisions relating to resource allocation, inclusive of staffing expansions or reductions. The workgroup responsible for Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process) has also discussed mid- and long-range planning for staffing.

Moreover, given the recommended changes needed to fulfill Recommendation 2, the College has determined that the District's Research and Planning Office must be expanded immediately in order to address the need for increasingly data-informed, systematic, and fully coordinated planning processes. In light of this, on August 23, 2012, the Board approved a new structure for that office, to be implemented in the short term.¹³ In the near term, this structure includes the following four essential positions and increases this office from two persons to four. The new positions are currently being advertised and should be filled by early November.

Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. This is a new position and is consistent with the Research and Planning staffing at other colleges. The Dean will oversee and direct all Research and Planning activities and ensure coordination between the two areas. This position will also be responsible for overall quality control and adherence to accreditation requirements, working closely with the Directors of Research and of Planning, once the latter position is filled (see note below). For the time being, the Dean will be directly responsible for carrying out all Planning activities with the support of a Management Assistant.

Management Assistant. This position will focus primarily on planning-related responsibilities under the direction of the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (later to be supervised directly by a Planning Director at such time that we can fill that position). Given the retirement of the District's Associate Vice Chancellor of Governmental Affairs and the decision not to fill that position and thus suspend activities relating to that area, we will be transferring the remaining staff person, a Management Assistant, to the Research and Planning Office to support planning activities.

Director of Research. This position is currently filled; however, this individual had planned to retire by August 2012. Given the vital functions of this role, the individual currently in this position has agreed to stay on for several months to train the new person to be hired into this position. This temporary overlap in coverage will ensure a smooth and efficient transition, given the specialized nature of the duties of this position.

Administrative Analyst/Programmer. Under the supervision of the Director of Research, this position is responsible for conducting institutional research, including accessing and analyzing Banner data and other data as well creating, administering, and analyzing surveys. The individual in this position was temporarily reclassified in February 2009 to Special Assistant to the Chancellor and has been managing Research and Planning in this temporary classification.

Long term, a **Director of Planning** position will need to be filled, but, as noted above, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness will directly oversee planning activities until such time that the budget allows for filling the Director of Planning position.

Related Actions of Recommendation 11, Financial Integrity and Reporting. The District's Finance and Administration area is also in dire need of staffing to ensure compliance with Eligibility Requirements and the Accreditation Standards; we have been addressing this need as outlined in our response to Eligibility Requirement 18 (Financial Accountability) below.

¹³ See organizational chart for Research and Planning.

Related Actions of Recommendation 7, Human Resources. The workgroup responsible for Recommendation 7 (Human Resources) has been at the core of efforts to propose options for more effective and efficient reporting lines and structures, using models of best practice to inform discussions. This workgroup has also been investigating the policies, procedures, and practices associated with interim appointments, transfers, additional duty assignments, evaluation, and training and professional development for both administrators and classified staff.

Consistent with ideas discussed by the workgroup to date, on August 27, 2012, the Board approved a new administrative structure with only three Vice Chancellors (instead of the previous five): Finance and Administration, Academic Affairs, and Student Services.¹⁴ The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration has been in that position for 20 years <CHECK NUMBER>. The Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs will continue to be filled as an interim position until the District conducts a full search to fill that position in the Spring of 2013. The Trustees also approved the hiring of a retired President, Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman, to serve as interim Vice Chancellor of Student Services. Dr. Scott-Skillman is a retired community college leader with over 42 years of experience in the community college system, as well as founder of Folsom Lake College. The decision to bring this individual into the District is based on the need to build our administrative capacity while leveraging the long-standing and deep expertise of the individual chosen. We have also been utilizing two other retired community college leaders, Dr. Robert Agrella and Dr. Betty Inclan, as consultants in the areas of planning and budgeting, finances, Student Learning Outcomes, and human resources. All three of these individuals bring a much-needed outside perspective to the District along with tremendous expertise.

In making this organizational change, three interim Vice Chancellors reverted to their previous status, two as Deans and one as Associate Vice Chancellor. Having two Vice Chancellors (both of whom were interims) over Student Service areas created confusion and thus was neither effective nor efficient. Moreover, the administrators responsible for campuses resided within both Academic Affairs and Student Development, which further compounded reporting inefficiencies. The new structure will streamline reporting lines and create greater cost-efficiencies as we continue to work on the organizational structure for the layers beneath the Vice Chancellors.

The District's immediate focus with respect to staffing has been on core institutional needs. As noted earlier, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Government Affairs has retired. Rather than filling that position, the District has suspended the activities of that office and has transferred the management assistant previously employed in Governmental Affairs to Research and Planning. Similar reassignments are taking place in other areas of great need as well, such as the reassignment of the full-time Shared Governance coordinator to help manage the Downtown Center while the College redesigns its Shared Governance system. To assist with organizing the accreditation efforts, the Evans site assistant was reassigned to the Chancellor's Office.¹⁵

A full reorganization that better supports the institution's size, revised mission, and fiscal realities is under study with the intent of implementing those portions that are outside the collective bargaining arena during the Fall 2012 semester.

¹⁴ See organizational charts.

¹⁵ See response to Recommendations 12 and 13.

The Human Resources workgroup has also reviewed issues relating to the reassignment of personnel, particularly administrators and classified staff. The workgroup has concluded that the initial hiring of any administrator or classified staff member is a rigorous process that ensures that the individual hired has the requisite experience and expertise to carry out the job duties. Reassignments, however, often have not followed the District's policies and procedures. Reassignments include interim and acting appointments, transfers, and additional duty assignments. At the moment, much of this concern regarding administrators has been mitigated by the change in the organizational structure at the Vice Chancellor level (referenced above).

Another concern is that the District has not been able to support training and professional development at optimum levels. Workgroup 7 has recommended that the District restore orientations and training for deans, department chairs, program coordinators, and classified staff, and expand to others as applicable.

The Interim Chancellor has already instituted a series of Leadership Training activities for the management team (inclusive of administrators and classified managers). Topics to date have included accreditation, enrollment management, Banner usage, Student Learning Outcomes, Shared Governance, and leadership strengths. Workgroup 7 has recommended that these activities continue, with a formal schedule developed annually.

In addition, Workgroup 7 has identified the need to reinstate professional development funding as soon as possible while at the same time exploring low- or no-cost options for professional development, including participation on Accreditation site visit teams, establishing a mentoring program, and the possibility of providing professional development, in some cases through existing CCSF classes.

Workgroup 7 has also begun examining evaluation procedures for all staff and is developing recommendations for improvement that would link evaluation outcomes with professional development opportunities to address areas for improvement when necessary.

Please also refer to the activities of and response to Recommendation 7 as they are integrally linked with Eligibility Requirement 5.

Related Actions of Recommendation 8, Physical Resources. Members of the workgroup charged with Recommendation 8 (Physical Resources) have been developing a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model that will include costs associated with staffing (e.g., oversight, maintenance, custodial) to allow the District to better project its staffing needs for each site, existing or new, which is a critical aspect of planning for the appropriate level of staffing to operate our buildings and sites.

Eligibility Requirement 5 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Board Policy 1200 regarding mission statement approved and adopted by Board (includes annual review of mission)	August 23, 2012 (1 st reading) September 11, 2012 (2 nd reading)
Mission statement explicitly linked to planning and budgeting system	September 18, 2012 (Board approval and acceptance)

	of Planning Process) ¹⁶
Research and Planning staffing structure approved by Board	August 23, 2012
New Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions posted	September 10, 2012
Candidates for new Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions selected and approved	October 25, 2012 (?)
Hiring policies, procedures, and practices reviewed	<DATE>
Training and professional development recommendations developed	<DATE>
Leadership training implemented	As of XXX and ongoing (?)
Annual schedule for training developed	<DATE>
Evaluation procedures for all personnel assessed, using models of best practice for comparison	<DATE>
Total Cost of Ownership Model completed	August 16, 2012 (?)
Total Cost of Ownership Model applied to Chinatown North Beach Campus to assess utility	August 23, 2012 (?)
Total Cost of Ownership Model accepted by the Board of Trustees <DO WE NEED THIS??>	<DATE>
One-time, temporary measures taken to increase human resource capacity within accounting	August 2012 (?)
Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll developed	August 29, 2012 (?)
Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll executed	January 31, 2013

Eligibility Requirement 17, Financial Resources

ACCJC Finding: The institution cannot document a funding base, financial resources or plans for financial development that are adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

The trustees, administration, faculty, and staff are working toward achieving the College's revised mission in a more cost-effective and efficient way. The redefined mission does not automatically prescribe how to achieve cost savings but it was a significant step forward. Only with a fully integrated planning and budgeting system will the College be able to realize the necessary cost savings to achieve financial stability.

On September 11, 2012, the CCSF Trustees adopted a balanced budget for 2012-13 reflecting some adjustments to the tentative budget approved on June 28, 2012. This budget has taken important first steps: all union partners have agreed to and implemented changes in compensation agreements that achieve immediate savings for the fiscal year, as they have now

¹⁶ See also our response to Recommendations 2 and 3.

done each year for several budget years. Other savings have already been and are being further achieved through attrition and by reducing the costs of reassigned time. Other short-term savings continue by delaying or reducing purchases of supplies and equipment.

Reorganization, as outlined in our response to Eligibility Requirement 5 (Administrative Capacity), will yield additional savings in 2013-2014.

There is significant analysis, planning, and work left to do both with respect to implementing permanent cost-saving measures and finding resources to raise financial reserves to a minimum 5% of overall budget, contribute to retiree health plans, fund a technology replacement plan, and fill key vacancies in classified and administrative positions.

To identify more sustainable measures for cost savings in both the near and long term, prior to receiving the ACCJC determination letter dated July 2, 2012, CCSF Trustees approved a request to the State Chancellor of California Community Colleges for the assistance of the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) on May 31, 2012, FCMAT is assisting CCSF in the development of a multi-year financial plan, with specific recommendations on revenues, expenditures, and overall strategies for achieving financial stability. These findings are contained within the September 18, 2012 FCMAT report, which includes 45 recommendations.¹⁷

<ADD A PARAGRAPH HERE THAT SUMMARIZES FCMAT FINDINGS OR IS IT ENOUGH TO POINT TO 45 RECOMMENDATIONS?>

In addition to FCMAT, the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 10 (Financial Planning and Stability), which began meeting in July, has developed a broad list of more than 50 possible options for reducing costs on an ongoing basis for presentation to the Board of Trustees. This list was released on September 7, 2012, and Board members began discussing the list on <INSERT DATE/UPDATE>.¹⁸ Workgroup 10 also developed calculations to determine that the options presented would yield actual savings.¹⁹

The District will need to implement dramatic systemic changes. CCSF has been spending as much as 92 percent of its budget on personnel costs, placing it at the very highest end of the state's community colleges. Reducing this number, to allow funding of the other critical needs identified in the Accreditation Report and achieving fiscal stability, is central to a meaningful resolution of the College's fiscal crisis.

Even if Proposition 30 passes in November, CCSF will face a projected deficit of more than \$14 million in FY 2013-14 if no action is taken to reduce costs. If it fails, automatic trigger cuts would once again be levied against community colleges. For CCSF, that would mean additional cuts this year of over \$10 million. Therefore, the College knows that it must make plans, as many other Community Colleges have already done or are doing, for this possible outcome.

A potential revenue source is the local parcel tax, Proposition A, which is also in the November ballot. It would provide the College with an additional \$14 million annually for the next eight years. If approved by San Francisco voters, this would mitigate many of the College's most immediate fiscal needs. However, it is not sufficient to address the College's full financial issues for the long term. The College is not counting on its successful passage in its fiscal planning.

¹⁷ See FCMAT Report.

¹⁸ See list entitled, "Options for Reducing Expenditures"

¹⁹ See calculation methodology spreadsheets. <DO WE HAVE THESE?>

The College recognizes that clear, difficult choices must be made immediately, and at a number of levels to fully address this Eligibility Requirement and its related Recommendation (10, Financial Planning and Stability) and the underlying Standards. The FCMAT report and the list of cost-saving measures identified by the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 10 will be instrumental in making these decisions. Going forward, greater integration between planning and budgeting that utilizes annual Program Review as a driver for both budget increases and reductions will be critical for sound decision-making.

Note that the response to this Eligibility Requirement maps directly to the response to Recommendation 10, Financial Planning and Stability.

Eligibility Requirement 17 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Compensation concessions agreed to by bargaining units/constituencies	June 28, 2012 (?)
Vice Chancellor reorganization implemented	August 27, 2012
List of cost-saving ideas developed	September 7, 2012
Calculation methodology for quantifying cost savings developed	September 7, 2012
FCMAT report issued	September 18, 2012
Cost saving measures selected by Trustees utilizing FCMAT findings and list of cost-saving ideas prepared by Workgroup 10	<DATE>
Cost saving measures implemented	<DATE>

Eligibility Requirement 18, Financial Accountability

ACCJC Finding: The institution fails to conduct audits and provide reports to the college or community in a timely manner. The institution has also failed to implement corrective action to audit findings over multiple years.

To remedy this issue in the coming year, the District has already taken one-time measures to increase staffing levels within the accounting department to meet deadlines for critical reports (Annual Financial Audit and Annual 311 report). These measures have included the return of one retiree who has historical and in-depth knowledge of District operations as well as contracting with a private firm for part-time consulting services. The District also has sought to reassign, on a short-term basis, current classified staff from other departments whose expertise will be particularly useful during audit preparation. To date, this last strategy has had very limited success.

These measures are only intended to address the 2012 Annual Financial Audit and the 2012 Annual 311 report. An ongoing solution is essential, and Workgroup 11 (Financial Integrity and Reporting) is discussing options to address these issues in the mid- to longer-term. In line with

the staffing plan, funding to fill three vacant positions in the accounting/budget department and two in the payroll department are included in the fiscal year 2012-13 budget.²⁰

Note that the response to this Eligibility Requirement maps directly to the response to Recommendation 11, Financial Integrity and Reporting.

Eligibility Requirement 18 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
One-time, temporary measures taken to increase human resource capacity within accounting	August 2012 (?)
2012 Annual Financial Audit report completed	<DATE>
2012 Annual Financial Audit report distributed	<DATE>
2012 Annual 311 report completed	<DATE>
2012 Annual 311 report distributed	<DATE>
Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll developed	August 29, 2012 (?)
Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll executed	January 31, 2013

Eligibility Requirement 21, Relations with the Accrediting Commission

ACCJC Finding: The institution does not adhere to each of the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and has failed to follow Commission directives to address the deficiencies noted by the 2006 evaluation team.

The College fully understands the gravity of the Commission's show cause determination, and it believes that the changes it is implementing as outlined above and in the sections that follow will go a long way toward addressing Eligibility Requirement 21. The College is not only addressing the deficiencies noted by the 2006 evaluation team, but also those now noted by the 2012 evaluation team.

In addition, the College has noted another deficiency which is related to substantive change. In December 2011, the College prepared a substantive change proposal for submission to ACCJC concerning a shift in the percentage of online instruction offered. The College never submitted the proposal due to administrative transitions, and it is aware that this is an additional deficiency it needs to address. The College will continue to report any additional deficiencies it finds that relate to the Standards and Eligibility Requirements and develop plans for acknowledging and attending to those findings.

In a number of cases, this Special Report refers to the need to "comply" with the Eligibility Requirements (or Standards), but the College wants to do more than merely comply. The College recognizes that what drives these Requirements and Standards is simply best practice, and this recognition underlies the responses contained within this report. The College is committed to adapting its practices to reflect those that are proven to be state of the art and/or to

²⁰ See Workgroup 11 Staffing Plan.

adopting new practices in cases where it does not have a similar practice in place or where a complete overhaul of College practices is necessary.

DRAFT

B. Recommendations

Recommendation 1, Mission Statement

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

The critical first step to addressing the Commission's Recommendations was to respond to Recommendation 1, given that the resulting statement serves as a driver behind many, if not all, of the other 13 Recommendations. Thus, the workgroup responsible for addressing the issues relating to the College's mission began meeting as soon as possible once the workgroups were established. Their first meeting was at the end of July, followed by three additional meetings in August.

The first task of the workgroup was to examine City College of San Francisco's current mission statement. Identifying the appropriate focus of the mission required a number of steps, including examining internal and external data, surveying CCSF personnel and students, reviewing the California Education Code language regarding the mission of community colleges, considering desirable components of a mission statement as described in ACCJC materials and trainings, and engaging the Board of Trustees in dialogue about the mission.

Internal data included credit and noncredit trends in:

- headcount
- age distribution
- ethnic group distribution
- educational goals
- awards and certificates
- basic skills English, Math, and ESL enrollment
- FTES

External (San Francisco) data included trends in:

- population
- ethnicity/race
- age
- foreign born populations
- legal immigration
- educational attainment by age group

An electronic survey was distributed to all College employees that asked them to prioritize the nine areas explicitly bulleted in the current mission statement.²¹ Over 1,200 employees

²¹ See employee and student surveys and results ("CCSF Mission Statement Priorities").

responded (out of approximately 2,500). Respondents included faculty, department chairs, administrators, and classified staff. In addition, the workgroup made an effort to contact students enrolled in Spring, Summer, and Fall 2012 by email. Unfortunately, technical difficulties did not allow for a complete survey of the students; however the 1,254 Credit students who were able to respond indicated priorities similar to those indicated by employees.

The workgroup helped facilitate a process for the Board to identify the following four priorities for the District’s mission: preparation for transfer, achievement of associate degrees, acquisition of career skills, and basic skills (including English as a Second Language). The Board of Trustees met on August 14, 2012, during one of several retreat sessions to review the Mission and policy regarding annual review. The statement refocused the mission on student learning, achievement, and assessment. After discussion and requests from speakers, the Board approved adding the words “Transitional Studies” as part of Basic Skills.²² As recommended by the workgroup, the Board also amended Board Policy 1200 to incorporate a statement that the Board will review the District’s vision and mission annually during its summer planning retreat.

<CHECK NEW NAME/NUMBER OF POLICY>

The first reading of the Board policy on the mission statement (as amended during the Board retreat) took place on August 23, 2012, at which time no additional changes were made.²³ The Board subsequently reviewed the new Board policy on the mission statement and adopted it on September 11, 2012.

As described in the College’s response to Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process), the mission is now more explicitly linked to planning and resource allocation. That is, the revised planning system now utilizes the mission and a more robust Program Review process (restored to an annual cycle) to make planning more integrated and effective—and thereby better aligned with the Accreditation Standards.²⁴

Recommendation 1 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Revised mission statement developed by workgroup	August 3, 2012
Mission Statement reviewed and discussed by Board	August 14, 2012
Board Policy 1200 regarding mission statement approved and adopted by Board (includes annual review of mission)	August 23, 2012 (1 st reading) September 11, 2012 (2 nd reading)
Mission statement explicitly linked to planning and budgeting system	September 18, 2012 (Board approval and acceptance of Planning Process) ²⁵

²² See attached Board agenda for August 14, 2012.

²³ See attached Board agenda for August 23, 2012.

²⁴ See also our response to Recommendations 2 and 3.

²⁵ See also our response to Recommendations 2 and 3.

Recommendation 2, Effective Planning Process

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

As noted in the response to Recommendation 1 (Mission Statement), the institution has spent considerable time revamping its planning system. The workgroup responsible for addressing Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process) has met on five different occasions, beginning in late July.

During the first meeting, the group discussed a proposed Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting timeline developed by Research and Planning staff which would reflect a number of characteristics of effective planning:

- directed by Board priorities and the College’s Mission Statement;
- informed by data and assessments;
- supported by unit-level planning that addresses Board priorities, references data trends, and is sufficiently timely so as to inform the following year’s annual plan and annual budget;
- transparent and efficient in prioritizing allocation and resource decisions, including resource reductions when necessary, for the upcoming year; and
- characterized by broad communication and dialogue at several critical junctures.

The planning process and timeline encompasses the following, with each action informed by and building on the previous actions:²⁶

Spring 2012 – Summer 2012	▪ Annual Performance Indicators and College-Wide Assessments for 2011-2012
Summer 2012	▪ Board’s Annual Priorities and Planning Assumptions for Resource Allocation for 2013-2014
Fall 2012	▪ Unit-level Program Reviews for 2013-2014
January 2013 – February 2013	▪ Administrative Recommendations for Increasing / Reducing Resource Allocations for 2013-2014
February 2013 – April 2013	▪ Governance Review for Increasing/Reducing Resource Allocations for 2013-2014 ▪ Budget Preparation for 2013-2014
May 2013 – June 2013	▪ Board Review and Approval of Tentative Budget and Annual Plan for 2013-2014
July 2013	▪ Resource Allocations Distributed for 2013-2014

²⁶ See attached Annual Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Timeline and Flowchart for details.

During the course of subsequent discussions, the workgroup acknowledged that Program Review had historically been viewed as a mechanism for new allocations but would now need to be used to identify areas for reduction as well.

The planning and budgeting process now incorporates an evaluation of the process, which the College will conduct each fall (beginning in Fall 2013) via Program Review. The results will inform the need for making changes to the system during the subsequent spring with implementation of the changes the following fall.

In addition, Research and Planning staff developed a planning and budgeting flowchart to accompany the timeline. Overlays to the flowchart make it easier to visualize the various components of planning (e.g., assessment, dialogue, etc.) and to understand their frequency and connection to the other components.²⁷ Both the timeline and flowchart will facilitate broader understanding of the annual planning and budgeting process.

The workgroup has also established a development schedule for the Education Master Plan. The Education Master Plan will strengthen the process of continually connecting annual planning with enrollment, staffing, technology, facilities, and other resource-related plans. The development of an effective Education Master Plan will be time-consuming; given the need to focus the College's attention on implementing the new planning and budgeting process now that it has been approved by the Board, the development of the Education Master Plan will begin in Spring 2013. The first step will be to conduct environmental scans and facilitate dialogue about data in Spring and Summer 2013 to support decision-making with respect to the Education Master Plan. The Fall 2013 Program Review will contain vital information for drafting the Education Master Plan, approval of which would follow in Spring 2014.

In order to support the new and increasingly data-informed, systematic, and fully coordinated planning process, the College has determined that the District's Research and Planning Office must be expanded immediately, as noted and elaborated on in the response to Eligibility Requirement 5 (Administrative Capacity). In light of this, on August 23, 2012, the Board approved a new structure for that office, to be implemented in the short term.²⁸ In the near term, this structure includes the following four essential positions:

- Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (new position to be filled immediately)

- Management Assistant (internal transfer from Government Relations)

- Director of Research (existing position filled by an individual who will retire during Spring 2013; new individual will be hired immediately)

- Administrative Analyst/Programmer (existing position)

Long term, a Director of Planning position will need to be filled, but the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness will directly oversee planning activities until such time that the budget allows for filling the Director of Planning position.

The new Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions were posted on September 10, 2012 with an application deadline of September 28, 2012.

²⁷ See Planning and Budgeting flowchart.

²⁸ See organizational chart for Research and Planning and response to Eligibility Requirement 5 (Administrative Capacity).

Recommendation 2 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Annual planning and budgeting process and timeline developed	August 31, 2012
Planning documents (process, timeline, flowchart) approved by Board	September 18, 2012
Initial implementation of new planning process: planning priorities for fiscal year 2013-14 identified based on College mission, internal and external trend data, and realistic budget scenarios for 2013-2014	September 18, 2012
Educational Master Plan development schedule drafted	September 10, 2012
Educational Master Plan development schedule approved by Board	<INSERT DATE>
Environmental scans for Education Master Plan conducted	Summer 2013
Education Master Plan drafted	End of Spring 2014
Research and Planning staffing structure approved by Board	August 23, 2012
New Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions posted	September 10, 2012
Candidates for new Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Research positions selected and approved	October 25, 2012 (?)

Recommendation 3, Assessing Institutional Effectiveness

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

The work on Recommendation 3 (Assessing Institutional Effectiveness) has necessarily overlapped with that of Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process), given that Program Review is one of the key mechanisms for effective planning. Workgroup 3 has focused on revising the Program Review template, establishing criteria for dean-level comments, developing Program Review guidelines, developing a Program Review website, and developing the Program Review timeline in coordination with Workgroup 2 (Effective Planning Process). These activities are described below.

Program Review Template. The Program Review template has been updated to ensure that its contents promote effective planning. The elements of the pre-existing Program Review document were relevant, but Workgroup 3 has tightened the language of the items to bring clarity to the questions being addressed. This was especially true on the SLO-related items. In an effort to provide a stronger link to planning and budgeting, the previous question soliciting future objectives has been separated into three distinct questions on maintenance of effort, growth, and reduction. Each dean will also rank unit needs/goals as it relates to the allocation of resources. Over time, additional changes will be made to include all pertinent financial and other data related to each department as part of the annual review and evaluation of the Program Review process to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Guidelines. To provide direction to those completing the Program Review reports for their units, Workgroup 3 has been developing a simple and easy-to-use set of guidelines. The goal is to obtain more uniform quality across all units by providing better guidance. Work on the guidelines has been continuous in order to make the examples fit with the changes to the improved template.

Rubric. Workgroup 3 has developed a rubric that will be used by the deans to rank/evaluate requests for additional resources. These rankings will be forwarded to the Vice Chancellors and then the Chancellor for consideration, then discussed by the College's primary Governance Council to directly inform the development of the subsequent year's budget and annual plan.

Program Review Website. The website for Program Review will serve as a resource that establishes Program Review as an ongoing process throughout the year. The website has been updated with the assistance of members of Workgroup 3. All information will be in one place for easy reference of the writer and reader to aid in more effective and efficient decision-making.

Key Dates for Fall 2012. The Program Review timeline must be synchronized with other annual planning and budgeting activities in the College. Workgroups 2 and 3 continue to communicate and jointly develop this timeline. The Research Office will roll out data for Program Review after September 18, 2012, and all Program Review reports will be due before the end of the fall semester. In addition to synchronizing with annual planning and budgeting, a chief goal of program review is to foster dialogue and collaboration among interrelated units and with supervisors. To facilitate these practices, a companion timeline with key target dates for Fall 2012 has been developed.

A continuing challenge has been that the data variance provided in the Program Review template compared to other sources of data generated questions as to accuracy of data. Meetings with other groups, such as the Enrollment Management Team, have resulted in agreed-upon data sources and a better understanding of variances in reporting. For data on enrollment, it is agreed that a set calendar for generation of reports would greatly reduce the variances. This understanding should contribute toward reducing the amount of variance.

Another area of concern with regard to data has been the unit-level accuracy of staffing and budget-related data. While overall expenditure data for the College is audited and verified, unit-level data has not, until recently, received similar scrutiny, resulting in some misidentifications such as an employee's salary being charged to the wrong unit. To correct these miscodes, all budget managers will participate in mandatory sessions in late Fall 2012 during which budgets will be reviewed and misidentifications will be corrected on-the-spot.

To date, discussion of performance metrics to measure institutional effectiveness has occurred primarily within Workgroups 2 and 4. In May 2012, the College assembled an End-of-Year Assessment report corresponding to the 2011-2012 Annual Plan. This report was shared with the Board and published on the College's website. In June 2012, the College's Research and Planning staff participated in a summit focused on identifying additional noncredit metrics. The summit was facilitated by the State Chancellor's Office, and the additional metrics will be included in future ARCC reports, beginning in Spring 2013. In September 2012, the Board reviewed ARCC achievement measures in a format that included several comparison institutions. Additional achievement measures are being identified by Workgroup 2. For example, the College participated in a survey conducted by the RP Group which collected information about job placement rates for CTE students at both a program level and college-wide; these data will be available shortly and will be widely shared and discussed.

Recommendation 3 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Program Review template updated and aligned with planning process	September 18, 2012
Criteria for dean-level comments on Program Review developed	September 18, 2012
Rubric for ranking requests developed	September 18, 2012
Guidelines for preparing Program Review reports written	September 18, 2012
Program Review website developed	September 24, 2012
Timeline for program review synchronized with planning process	September 18, 2012

Recommendation 4, Student Learning Outcomes

To fully meet Standard II Student Learning Programs and Services, the team recommends that the college identify the intended student learning outcomes at the course, program, general education, certificate and degree levels, develop and implement assessments of student learning, and analyze the results of assessment to improve student learning. The results of ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes should foster robust dialogue and yield continuous improvement of courses, programs and services and the alignment of college practices for continuous improvement.

Throughout the course of six meetings from mid July through the end of August, the workgroup responsible for addressing Recommendation 4 (Student Learning Outcomes) created plans based on the elements of the Proficiency Level of ACCJC's *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes*. The team reviewed the rubric elements, determining for each: (a) the College's current status, (b) goals for the College, and (c) means of achieving those goals.

The action plans that the workgroup developed are clustered within the elements of that rubric:

- **Element #1** – Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates, and degrees.
 - Action 1.1* Clearly define SLOs for all courses.
 - Action 1.2* Define SLOs for programs.
 - Action 1.3* Document course SLO efforts.
 - Action 1.4* Document program SLO efforts.
 - Action 1.5* Assess General Education SLOs.
- **Element #2** – There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.
 - Action 2.1* Foster dialogue through online resources.
 - Action 2.2* Embed discussion of the assessment of SLOs in meetings and hold special meetings.
 - Action 2.4* Integrate SLOs into Program Review (see also Actions 3.1 and 4.2).
- **Element #3** – Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.
 - Action 3.1* Integrate SLOs into Program Review (see also Actions 2.4 and 4.2).
 - Action 3.2* Develop and assess Institutional Learning Outcomes.
- **Element #4** – Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.
 - Action 4.1* Identify external assessment needs.
 - Action 4.2* Integrate SLOs into Program Review (see also Actions 2.4 and 3.1).
 - Action 4.3* Provide online resources and training.
- **Element #5** – Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.
 - Action 5.1* Complete Comprehensive Assessment Report.
 - Action 5.2* Complete ACCJC College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation.
- **Element #6** – Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.
 - Action 6.1* Document alignment of course and program SLOs.
 - Action 6.2* Document alignment of course SLOs to General Education SLOs.
 - Action 6.3* Update requirements for Curriculum Committee.
- **Element #7** – Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of course and programs in which they are enrolled.
 - Action 7.1* Publish program SLOs.
 - Action 7.2* Pilot means for students to demonstrate awareness.

The workgroup's progress form provides a detailed description of each activity.

Key outcomes are that (1) there is now a policy limiting the maximum age of course outlines to six years; (2) a timeline is in place to update course outlines that are older than six years; (3) a new process exists for submitting information about course SLO assessment efforts; (4) the College has a centralized web presence for SLO efforts; (5) SLOs are integrated into Program Review and will serve as one basis for making resource allocation decisions; (6) a drop-in Q&A SLO lab now exists, although it is not funded and is staffed by volunteer faculty; (7) a comprehensive assessment report will be developed each semester; (8) course SLOs will be mapped to program SLOs and to General Education SLOs; and (9) students will have better access to course and program SLOs in an effort to raise their awareness of SLOs.

Recommendation 4 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Draft policy and timeline for updating course outlines and limiting their age to six years developed and submitted to Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for approval and circulation (Action 1.1)	September 7, 2012
Plans for submitting SLOs to the Curriculum Committee completed by each department (Action 1.2)	August 31, 2012
Planning phase of documenting course SLO efforts completed with results available online (Action 1.3)	<DATE>
Execution phase of documenting course SLO efforts initiated (Action 1.3)	<DATE>
SLOs for all programs developed with results available online (Action 1.4)	By end of Fall 2012
Structured approach to documentation of program SLO efforts developed (Action 1.4)	By end of Spring 2013
Department websites with additional SLO information linked to central SLO website (Action 1.4)	<DATE>
Information regarding the alignment of course SLOs to General Education SLOs submitted by departments (Action 1.5)	October 1, 2012 and ongoing
Central SLO website developed (Actions 1.4, 2.1)	<DATE>
Dialogue about SLOs embedded in general meetings and meetings with a special focus on SLOs (Action 2.2)	August 13 and September 12, 2012, and ongoing
Comprehensive SLO Reports completed (Action 2.3)	By end of Fall 2012
SLOs integrated into Program Review (Actions 2.4, 3.1, 4.2)	<DATE>
Performance metrics determined for institutional achievement outcome data (Action 3.2)	<NEED TO DISCUSS WITH P. MERY>

Performance metrics determined for institutional learning outcome data (Action 3.2)	<NEED TO DISCUSS WITH P. MERY>
Performance metrics reported for institutional achievement outcome data (Action 3.2)	<NEED TO DISCUSS WITH P. MERY>
Performance metrics reported for institutional learning outcome data (Action 3.2)	<NEED TO DISCUSS WITH P. MERY>
External assessment needs identified (Action 4.1)	By end of Fall 2012
Online resources and training regarding SLOs made available (Action 4.3)	<DATE>
Comprehensive Assessment Report completed (Action 5.1)	<SAME AS ACTION 2.3?>
ACCJC College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes completed (Action 5.2)	March 15, 2013 (?)
Alignment of course and program SLOs documented (Action 6.1)	<DATE>
Alignment of course SLOs to General Education SLOs documented (Action 6.2)	<DATE>
SLO requirements for Curriculum Committee submissions updated (Action 6.3)	<DATE>
Program SLOs published in online catalog	Ongoing
Means for students to demonstrate awareness piloted	<DATE>
Evidence of alignment data available online	<DATE>
Faculty SLO Handbook developed and distributed	September 12, 2012

Recommendation 5, Student Support Services

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

As documented in the response to Eligibility Requirement 5 (Administrative Capacity), Student Support Services now fall under one Vice Chancellor. While the majority of the 23 areas responsible for documenting and assessing SLOs fall within the Student Support Services Division, several fall within Academic Affairs.

Those within Student Support Services include:

- Admissions and Records (Credit and Non-Credit)
- CalWORKS
- Continuing Student Counseling Department

- Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS)
- Financial Aid Office
- Guardian Scholars
- Homeless at Risk Transitional Students (HARTS)
- Learning Assistance Center
- Matriculation
- New Student Counseling
- Outreach and Recruitment
- Student Health Services: Medical and Psychological
- Puente Program
- Scholarship Office
- Single Stop
- Student Activities
- Student Affairs
- Student Support Services
- Students Advocacy, Rights & Responsibilities
- Veteran's Educational Benefits Program

There are four programs identified below that are integrated with Academic Affairs (referred to as Retention Programs). These programs are housed in the Multicultural Retention Services Department—MRSD):

- African American Scholastic Program
- Asian Pacific American Student Success Program
- Latino Services Network
- TULAY

Another program, the Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) is also integrated with Academic Affairs. DSPS provides both Student Services (Academic Accommodations Counseling) and Special DSPS Courses which are an integral part of the program. SLOs for the DSPS courses are located in the Academic Affairs/Instructional portion of this report.

These programs utilize SLOs in a variety of ways, ranging from assessing and measuring existing and in-progress programs to expanding upon current services and enhancing their quality. However, no centralized system for capturing SLOs or their use for program improvement existed. While not all Student Support Services areas have previous SLO assessment data, at this time all have developed at least one and up to three SLOs. SLOs are therefore at various stages of implementation based upon the Accrediting Commission's SLO rubric.

A particular challenge in this area has been the retirement or reassignment of a number of faculty and department chairs responsible for SLO management.

Through weekly meetings (scheduled to continue through the end of March 2013), the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 5 (Student Support Services) has engaged in a

number of activities to better document the progress of SLO assessment and improvements based upon the assessment. Three FLEX day workshops kicked off Student Services SLO activities with a focus on identifying and implementing SLOs through Student Services.

The following table reflects the current SLO work by student services area, the number of SLOs currently being assessed, and the level of implementation of each SLO:

Student Services SLO Cycle 2012-13			
	Area/Department	Number of SLOs	Levels of Implementation
1.	Admission and Records (Credit & Non-Credit)	3	1 at Proficiency 2 at Development
2.	Retention Programs: African-American Scholastic Program Asian Pacific American Student Success Program Latino Services Network TYLAY		4 at Development
3.	CalWORKs	2	2 at Development
4.	Continuing Student Counseling Department	20	3 at Proficiency 17 at Development
5.	Disabled Students Programs & Services (DSPS)	2	2 at Proficiency
6.	Extended Opportunity Programs & Services (EOPS)	4	1 at Development 3 at Proficiency
7.	Financial Aid	3	1 at Sustainable Quality Improvement 1 at Proficiency 1 at Development
8.	Guardian Scholars	1	1 at Development
9.	Homeless at Risk Transitional Students (HARTS)	1	1 at Development
10.	Learning Assistance Center (Learning Assistance course SLO's—see LAC-SLO website)	3	3 at Sustainable Quality Improvement
11.	Matriculation	3	3 at Development
12.	New Student Counseling	3	1 at Sustainable Quality Improvement 1 at Proficiency 1 at Development
13.	Outreach & Recruitment	3	3 at Sustainable Quality Improvement
14.	Single Stop	1	1 at Development
15.	Student Health Services: Medical and Psychological	11	3 at Awareness 3 at Development 3 at Sustainable Quality Improvement 2 at Proficiency

16.	Puente Program	1	1 at Development
17.	Scholarships	1	1 at Development
18.	Student Activities	6	6at Development
19.	Student Advocacy, Rights & Responsibilities	2	2 at Development
20.	Student Affairs	2	2 at Development
21.	Student Support Services	2	2 at Development
22.	Veteran's Educational Benefit Program	1	1 at Development

A standard template/matrix was developed to ensure that SLO documentation is consistent throughout the various service units and is aligned with the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness*. This SLO matrix consists of eleven columns, which include:

- **Area:** The program, service, department, or work unit.
- **WASC Rubric SLO Statement:** The knowledge we want students to acquire through workshops, units, class, program, or process. Outcome developed per WASC standards.
- **Success Measurement/Benchmark:** How success is defined (success indicator is qualitative and/or quantitative). Identification of any measuring tools used.
- **Assessment:** Review of data in each Student Service area to determine what the student has learned through analysis of pre- and post-data, and will then develop material, train presenters, and debrief on the process.
- **Changes:** Impact that the assessment result has on the current outcome.
- **Timeline:** Start and end dates of work to be completed.
- **Continuous Quality Improvement:** How each student service area will keep improving the SLO process by identifying how to make the process better for the next cycle.
- **Lead Person:** Responsible person ensuring completion of work associated with the outcome.
- **Evidence/Documentation:** Supporting information gathered and utilized.
- **Location of Evidence/Documentation:** Archive all supporting documentation that is easily accessible.
- **Alignment Reference/s:** Reference WASC Standards; Strategic Plan; Department goals, etc.
- **Program Review:** Alignment of SLO to program review – how the “outcome” fits with the department/unit’s Program Review process.

Workgroup 5 (Student Support Services) also worked collaboratively with Workgroup 4 (Student Learning Outcomes). Both groups coordinated the development of a central, online repository. That website provides up-to-date and consistent information on SLOs, including those for Student Services. Given that a number of these units have engaged in SLO development and assessment, the workgroup has selected several examples as best practices to be incorporated into a binder that will serve as a resource to others.

A new College SLO Handbook created by the academic senate now includes a section on non-instructional SLOs, which is appropriate for Student Services. This section will guide faculty in

developing and implementing Student Services SLOs. The entire handbook will be of particular use to those Student Services program that have both instructional and counseling components.

The workgroup established an SLO Assessment Cycle Calendar for Fall 2012 through Spring 2013 and will review this calendar on an ongoing basis, modifying it as necessary. Activities within this calendar include:

• Develop and regularly update SLOs to be assessed and develop action plans	August 31, 2012
• Develop multiple measures (pre/post survey, focus groups, etc.) for assessing SLOs	October 15, 2012
• Collect SLO data using the multiple measures tool	October 31, 2012
• Analyze data and summarize findings in Matrix	November 15, 2012
• Submit SLO progress to date to dean/chairs	November 15, 2012
• Dean/chairs give feedback to units	December 1, 2012

Underlying these activities is the belief that dialogue about student learning throughout this process must be ongoing, pervasive, and robust.

The workgroup also developed a Master Calendar to guide ongoing development and analysis of SLOs for continuous improvement of student services. The calendar includes Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 SLO assessment cycle activities. Spring 2013 SLO activities include having discussions within the units on the findings from the data collected; revising SLOs based on findings; refining the assessment and developing SLOs for the next academic cycle; and submitting the final SLO Cycle Matrix to deans/chairs, who then submit to SLO Team Leader for data compilation, with deans/chairs giving units feedback on their SLO report. The Master Calendar also includes deadlines to ensure all units complete SLO activities by the established deadlines and includes the Student Support Services SLO Accreditation Response Team activities and dates of meetings.

Recommendation 5 Outcomes and Timeline for SLO Tasks:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Student Support Services binder containing best practices established	Established August 1, 2012 Ongoing
Three FLEX Day workshops on identifying and implementing SLOs throughout the Student Services Division	August 14, 2012
Previous SLO work identified, clarified, and consolidated	August 31, 2012 and ongoing
SLO Assessment Cycle Calendar established for Fiscal Year 2012-13	August 31, 2012

SLO Workshops for Student Services Administrators: Status report on SLOs for each area	September 5, 2012 and September 13, 2012
Standard template/matrix for recording SLOs developed	September 6, 2012
Second series of three FLEX Day workshops – Speaking with one Voice focused on SLO development and program review	September 12, 2012
SLO manual for Student Support Services developed	September 15, 2012
SLO Master Calendar developed	September 17, 2012
Central repository for all Student Services SLOs available online	September 30, 2012

Recommendation 6, Human Resources Components of Evaluation

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

Throughout the course of four meetings beginning in July 2012, the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 6 (Human Resources Components of Evaluation) has focused on the following: (1) drafting language for inclusion in job announcements, performance evaluations, and handbooks for all personnel responsible for student progress toward achieving stated SLOs and (2) initiating conversations and negotiations with employee bargaining units to reach agreement on the inclusion of SLO language in job announcements, performance evaluation instruments, and handbooks. To date, SLO language has been drafted for the following, **in consultation with the appropriate bargaining units**.²⁹

- faculty job announcements
- Faculty Handbook
- classified staff evaluation

Faculty negotiations should be complete by the end of September for the inclusion of SLO language in faculty evaluations.

<NOTE: what can we say about the status of administrator evaluations/documents?>

The workgroup has also begun re-engineering professional development to incorporate SLOs as a topic whenever possible. The first effort in this regard was the provision of a FLEX Day dedicated to SLOs on September 12, 2012.

²⁹ See draft faculty job announcements, draft Faculty Handbook, and draft classified staff evaluation.

Recommendation 6 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
AFT, SEIU, Department Chair Council, and Administrators Association approve inclusion of SLO evaluation components in performance evaluation instruments	By end of September 2012
All applicable performance evaluation instruments for faculty, department chairs, classified staff, and administrators with direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving the stated SLOs contain SLO components	Early Fall 2012
Performance evaluation instruments containing SLO components implemented	Spring 2013
Faculty and Administrator Handbooks contain language regarding the inclusion of SLOs in performance evaluation instruments	<DATE>
Relevant job announcements contain language regarding SLOs	Ongoing
Professional development activities, including new hire orientations and FLEX days, incorporate SLOs	Initial FLEX activity took place on September 12, 2012; professional development activities will be ongoing

Recommendation 7, Human Resources

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

The workgroup responsible for Recommendation 7 (Human Resources) has been at the core of efforts to propose options for more effective and efficient reporting lines and structures by using models of best practice to inform discussions. Discussions have included exploring the optimal number of direct reports to Vice Chancellors as well as how to maximize the number of hands-on administrators while not increasing the number of personnel. Most likely this will occur by decreasing the number of department chairs and increasing the number of deans resulting in greater effectiveness, efficiency, and cost-savings. The workgroup's analysis has taken into consideration the level of administrative and staff support for centers and sites beyond the Ocean campus. This workgroup has also been investigating the policies, procedures, and practices associated with reassignments (interim appointments, transfers, additional duty assignments), training and professional development, and evaluation for both administrators and classified staff.

With respect to the reassignment of personnel, particularly administrators and classified staff, the workgroup has concluded that the initial hiring of any administrator or classified staff member is a rigorous process that ensures that the individual hired has the requisite experience and expertise to carry out the job duties. However, reassignments, in practice, often have not followed the District's policies and procedures. Reassignments include interim and acting appointments, transfers, and additional duty assignments. Transparency in these transactions is vital. At the moment, much of this concern regarding administrators has been mitigated by the change in the organizational structure at the Vice Chancellor level (described in the response to Eligibility Requirement 5, Administrative Capacity).

The need for reassignments is largely driven by staffing shortages and the lack of a staffing plan overall for filling positions, whether through internal transfers (by indentifying individuals with both the appropriate skills sets and availability) or new hires. Staff allocation must be equitable and take into consideration the under- or over-utilization of staff throughout the District so that an optimal balance can be achieved. Thus, Workgroup 7 has requested that Workgroup 3 (Program Review) emphasize the use of data to inform requests for staffing expansions and reductions on the Program Review template.³⁰

Alongside the concerns identified regarding reassignments is the concern that the District has not been able to support training and professional development at optimum levels. Workgroup 7 has recommended that the District restore orientations and training for deans, department chairs, program coordinators, and classified staff and expand to others as applicable. In addition, the new Program Review guidelines prompt units to identify any unit-specific staff development needs.

The Interim Chancellor has already instituted a series of Leadership Training activities for the management team (inclusive of administrators and classified managers). Topics to date have included accreditation, enrollment management, Banner usage, Student Learning Outcomes, Shared Governance, and leadership strengths.³¹ Workgroup 7 has recommended that these activities continue, with a formal schedule developed annually.

In addition, Workgroup 7 has identified the need to reinstate professional development funding while at the same time exploring low- or no-cost options for professional development, including participation on Accreditation site visit teams, establishing a mentoring program, and the possibility of providing professional development in some cases through existing CCSF classes.³²

Workgroup 7 has also begun examining evaluation procedures for all staff and is developing recommendations for improvement that would link evaluation outcomes with professional development opportunities to address areas for improvement when necessary. Research to date on best practices for administrative evaluations has raised questions about the effectiveness of the Administrators Evaluation Oversight Committee.

³⁰ See Program Review template.

³¹ See leadership team training agendas and handouts.

³² See also Workgroup 7 "Recap" for further details.

Finally, Workgroup 7 has developed a list of observations regarding barriers to administrative authority that cut across a number of the Recommendations (particularly Recommendation 13) and often impede progress.³³

Recommendation 7 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Leadership training implemented	As of July 2012 and ongoing
Hiring policies, procedures, and practices reviewed	Completed September 2012
Training and professional development recommendations developed	Completed September 2012
Observations regarding barriers to administrative authority documented	Completed September 2012
Options for more effective and efficient reporting lines and structures identified	September 27, 2012
Evaluation procedures for all personnel assessed, using models of best practice for comparison	November 2012
New procedures for hiring interim positions developed	November 2012
Administrators Handbook reviewed and revised, including provisions for administrative hiring and evaluation	November 2012
Options for administrative contracts explored	November 2012

Recommendation 8, Physical Resources

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

The Recommendation 8 workgroup has been examining the costs of ownership associated with the District's physical resources. To understand how the annual budget items pertained to District facilities and maintenance, the workgroup reviewed the College's annual budget and major chart of accounts. This review revealed several challenges related to center-based budgeting, confirming that the College has not had a practice of allocating or expending money by campus/center.

In light of this challenge, Workgroup 8 looked to other college models for facilities/physical plant plans. Through consensus, the workgroup felt that the College would benefit from developing and implementing a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model for its campus and

³³ See also Workgroup 7 "Recap" for list of barriers to administrative authority.

centers. In reviewing documents from Santa Monica college, Workgroup 8 found a model that incorporated principles based on the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) staffing standards. It was decided that APPA staffing standards could be utilized by the College to determine appropriate levels of staffing in Buildings and Grounds, Facilities, Custodial services and the like.

A Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model that includes costs associated with the following would allow the College to better estimate and incorporate costs into annual and long-term planning and budgeting:

- 5450 Self-Insurance Claims
- 5510 Water/Sewage
- 5520 Gas/Electricity
- 5530 Telephone
- 5540 Other Utilities
- 5560 Housekeeping
- 5610 Other Property Leases
- 5620 Property Leases- SFUSD
- 5631 Vehicle Leases
- 5632 Copier Leases
- 5633 Other Leases
- 5640 Maintenance and Repair – Non Equipment
- 5650 Maintenance and Equipment
- 5655 Maintenance and Repair – Vehicles

<CAN WE SAY ANYTHING ABOUT THE APPLICATION OF THE MODEL TO CNB?>

<DOES THE TCO MODEL NEED TO BE ACCEPTED BY THE BOARD?>

In addition, neglected maintenance is evident at many of the College's buildings. With data provided by Buildings and Grounds, the workgroup has compiled a list of major building systems that are in disrepair or in need of replacement now or within the next five years. Among them are items such as elevator maintenance, replacement of HVAC systems, roofing maintenance and many others, all of which require significant budgetary resources that the College must identify.

The College has recently enlisted the Community College Foundation to conduct a facilities assessment which includes a space inventory and assessment of maintenance. This report is expected to be completed in October 2012. As information becomes available this may inform future workgroup discussions and recommendations.

From the work completed thus far, Workgroup 8 has begun to see emerging themes such as the following:

- The College presently does not have an in-house expertise in the area of facilities, planning, maintenance, or operations.
- Staffing to handle wide-ranging maintenance from plumbing to engineering to grounds keeping is woefully inadequate.

- The College must develop and sustain a budgeting practice of funding deferred maintenance for existing and new buildings.

Future steps are as follows:

- Workgroup 8 will continue to work with the staffing guidelines and develop the TCO model.
- Workgroup 8 will review the Facilities Assessment in October – November 2012
- Workgroup 8 will share workgroup findings with Workgroup 7 (Human Resources) and Workgroup 15 (Campuses/Sites).

Recommendation 8 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Total Cost of Ownership Model completed	August 16, 2012 (?)
Total Cost of Ownership Model applied to Chinatown North Beach Campus to assess utility	August 23, 2012 (?)
Total Cost of Ownership Model accepted by the Board of Trustees <WILL THIS NEED TO BE FORMALLY ACCEPTED?>	<DATE>

Recommendation 9, Technology Resources

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

Technology at City College of San Francisco falls into two distinct groups:

- **Instructional and Program Technology:** This category includes technology directly related to academic or program needs and includes student computer labs, projectors, learning management system, library systems, and software for instructional purposes.
- **Administrative and Institutional Technology:** This category includes the administrative systems necessary to run the college and include Banner (ERP), databases, email, telephones, network, firewalls, employee computers, student health systems, and library systems.

The Workgroup 9 (Technology Resources) progress report provides a comprehensive summary of all actions to date, along with plans going forward. The group has met seven times over the course of July, August, and September and has focused on the activities described below.³⁴

³⁴ See workgroup 9 (Technology Resources) Progress Report for details.

Identify Guiding Principles. To inform the College's approach to addressing Recommendation 9, Workgroup 7 began by identifying guiding principles for supporting the overall mission of the College through technology. The guiding principles are contained within the ITS Mission Statement as follows (completed on August 7, 2012):

ITS Mission Statement. Information Technology Services (ITS) supports City College of San Francisco (CCSF) and all its departments by: creating services and maintaining technology being used by students and employees; providing technical expertise to improve productivity, effectiveness, and efficiencies; and providing customer support for technology. ITS is customer-centric, empowering the CCSF community by providing needed technology that in turn improves student success. The following Guiding Principles will be followed by ITS in order to support the overall mission of CCSF. These guidelines are part of a continuous improvement process to adapt to technological changes and allocate resources based on prioritized needs of technical excellence.

Guiding Principles:

Sustainability

Information technology equipment will be purchased, maintained, replaced, and recycled using a continuous sustainable model.

Coordination

Information technology resources will be allocated in accordance with the annual needs of CCSF through the ongoing Program Review process.

Standardization

All information technology systems will be configured to CCSF standards to ensure adequate support and reduce downtime.

Shared Resources

Efforts will be taken to make all appropriate information technology equipment accessible to the entire college community.

Staffing

Adequate staffing levels and training programs will be maintained to accommodate for technological changes and employee attrition.

Innovation

New technologies will be evaluated and implemented at CCSF in order to achieve cost savings and a high level of technical excellence.

Articulate Relationship with Planning Process. This activity is the key component of Recommendation 9 and overlaps with the activities of the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process). Workgroup 9 has developed a plan which emphasizes a strong relationship with the entire CCSF planning process and incorporates each of the types of technology resources noted above into the annual planning and budgeting process for equipment upgrades, replacement, and maintenance. In previous years, this has occurred on a best effort basis and has not been part of a well-defined process. Therefore, there is a need for an immediate, temporary "bridge plan" to bring equipment, primarily faculty and staff desktops, up to the appropriate levels of technical performance. The workgroup has also developed a permanent plan for ongoing implementation after the bridging phase, which will utilize Program

Review as the mechanism for decision-making.³⁵ As the institutional planning process continues to develop, more work is in progress to integrate the details of the replacement plan. ITS is developing documents and forms to aid departments in meeting technology standards and creating program review priorities. Workgroup 9 will also work with other planning groups to suggest IT-based criteria for prioritizing requests at the institutional level, which will be integrated with criteria from the other resources of Finance, Staffing, and Facilities. The College will need to revisit the coordination of technology planning with planning overall regularly to ensure that detailed coordination is sustained. In addition to this, the use of the Banner ERP system will be increased and enhanced in order to provide essential decision-making information to the CCSF management team.

Complete Academic Equipment Inventory. In order to determine technology replacement strategies and priorities, Workgroup 9 completed an inventory of existing technology, making note of the age and condition of equipment within computer classrooms and computer rooms and inclusive of classroom projectors. This inventory was completed on October 1, 2012. To ensure that planning activities related to technology are accurate, the College will need to update this inventory regularly.

Develop Models for Replacement. The College will upgrade or replace technology equipment according to a pre-defined schedule using a model that takes into account age, functionality, and other factors. Models for consolidation and sharing of resources across multiple units within the College are also required and will be included in this activity. The workgroup completed development of the replacement model on September 4, 2012.

Identify Sources of Equipment Usage Data. The College is currently tracking how frequently many of its computing assets are used but does not have sufficient information available to make data-driven decisions. This is especially important considering the goal of computer lab consolidation instead of a direct one-for-one replacement. Workgroup 9 has identified two systems at CCSF capable of performing the task of tracking usage: Accutrack and PC Cop.³⁶ Both of these systems are currently in use and are being expanded to include all academic computing assets.

Determine Cost Requirements for Technology Resources. These items will also be incorporated into the Program Review process described in Workgroup 9's Progress Report. A financial summary has been prepared which includes both ongoing annual technology-related expenses as well as the expenses required for cyclical replacement of technology equipment. All technology-related staffing requests will be submitted by ITS in the Program Review process to enhance technical services across all organizations.

Redefine Technology Plan Dates. The 2009-2011 Technology Plan has been extended for one year while the 2013-2016 Technology Plan is finalized. Technology-related requests will be incorporated into the Program Review process beginning in the Fall semester. Departmental submissions are due by mid-December for inclusion in the upcoming fiscal year.

³⁵ See also "Program Review Alignment" within Workgroup 9's Progress Report.

³⁶ See also section entitled "Technology Resources Utilization" in the Workgroup 9 Progress Report.

Identify Constraints of Funding Sources. The funding sources for technology equipment include General Fund, Bond measures, grants, and donations. Grants are typically limited to funding Academic equipment and the Bond is limited to funding technology infrastructure projects. When new technology is acquired, it is important to identify the differences between the funding sources to make sure that we utilize the appropriate funding source depending on the type of technology. Workgroup 9 completed this activity on September 4, 2012.

<THIS SHOULD ADDRESS SECURITY ISSUES SOMEWHERE>

Recommendation 9 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Relationship with College planning process articulated	September 7, 2012
Guiding principles identified	August 7, 2012
Academic equipment inventory completed	October 1, 2012
Replacement models developed	September 4, 2012
Technology Plan dates redefined	September 4, 2012
Cost and staff requirements for technology resources determined	September 4, 2012
Constraints of funding sources identified	September 4, 2012
Sources of equipment usage data identified	August 31, 2012

Recommendation 10, Financial Planning and Stability

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

Only with a fully integrated planning and budgeting system will the College be able to realize the necessary cost savings to achieve financial stability.

On September 11, 2012, the CCSF Trustees adopted a balanced budget for 2012-13 reflecting some adjustments to the tentative budget approved on June 28, 2012. This budget has taken important first steps: all union partners have agreed to and implemented changes in compensation agreements that achieve immediate savings for the fiscal year, as they have now done each year for several budget years. Other savings have already been and are being further achieved through attrition and by reducing the costs of reassigned time. Other short-term savings continue by delaying or reducing purchases of supplies and equipment.

Reorganization, as outlined in our response to Eligibility Requirement 5 (Administrative Capacity), will yield additional savings in 2013-2014.

There is significant analysis, planning, and work left to do both with respect to implementing permanent cost-saving measures and finding resources to raise financial reserves to a minimum 5% of overall budget, contribute to retiree health plans, fund a technology replacement plan, and fill key vacancies in classified and administrative positions.

To identify more sustainable measures for cost savings in both the near and long term, prior to receiving the ACCJC determination letter dated July 2, 2012, CCSF Trustees approved a request to the State Chancellor of California Community Colleges for the assistance of the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) on May 31, 2012, FCMAT is assisting CCSF in the development of a multi-year financial plan, with specific recommendations on revenues, expenditures, and overall strategies for achieving financial stability. These findings are contained within the September 18, 2012 FCMAT report, which includes 45 recommendations.³⁷

<ADD A PARAGRAPH HERE THAT SUMMARIZES FCMAT FINDINGS OR IS IT ENOUGH TO POINT TO 45 RECOMMENDATIONS?>

In addition to FCMAT, the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 10 (Financial Planning and Stability), which began meeting in July, has developed a broad list of more than 50 possible options for reducing costs on an ongoing basis for presentation to the Board of Trustees. This list was released on September 7, 2012, and Board members began discussing the list on <INSERT DATE/UPDATE>.³⁸ Workgroup 10 also developed calculations to determine that the options presented would yield actual savings.³⁹

The District will need to implement dramatic systemic changes. CCSF has been spending as much as 92 percent of its budget on personnel costs, placing it at the very highest end of the state's community colleges. Reducing this number, to allow funding of the other critical needs identified in the Accreditation Report and achieving fiscal stability, is central to a meaningful resolution of the College's fiscal crisis.

Even if Proposition 30 passes in November, CCSF will face a projected deficit of more than \$14 million in FY 2013-14 if no action is taken to reduce costs. If it fails, automatic trigger cuts would once again be levied against community colleges. For CCSF, that would mean additional cuts this year of over \$10 million. Therefore, the College knows that it must make plans, as many other Community Colleges have already done or are doing, for this possible outcome.

A potential revenue source is the local parcel tax, Proposition A, which is also in the November ballot. It would provide the College with an additional \$14 million annually for the next eight years. If approved by San Francisco voters, this would mitigate many of the College's most immediate fiscal needs. However, it is not sufficient to address the College's full financial issues for the long term. The College is not counting on its successful passage in its fiscal planning.

The bottom line is that the College recognizes that clear, difficult choices must be made, immediately, and at a number of levels, to fully address this Recommendation and its related Eligibility Requirement (17, Financial Resources) and the underlying Standards. The FCMAT report and the list of cost-saving measures identified by the workgroup responsible for Recommendation 10 will be instrumental in making these decisions. Going forward, greater integration between planning and budgeting that utilizes annual Program Review as a driver for

³⁷ See FCMAT Report.

³⁸ See list entitled, "Options for Reducing Expenditures"

³⁹ See calculation methodology spreadsheets. <DO WE HAVE THESE?>

both budget increases and reductions will also be critical for sound decision-making.

Recommendation 10 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Compensation concessions agreed to by bargaining units/constituencies	June 28, 2012 (?)
Vice Chancellor reorganization implemented	August 27, 2012
FCMAT report issued	September 18, 2012
List of cost-saving ideas developed	September 7, 2012
Calculation methodology for quantifying cost savings developed	September 7, 2012
Cost saving measures selected by Trustees utilizing FCMAT findings and list of cost-saving ideas prepared by Workgroup 10	<DATE>
Cost saving measures implemented	<DATE>

Recommendation 11, Financial Integrity and Reporting

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

To remedy this issue in the coming year, the District already has taken one-time measures to increase staffing levels within the accounting department to meet deadlines for critical reports (Annual Financial Audit and Annual 311 report). These measures have included the return of one retiree who has historical and in-depth knowledge of District operations and contracting with a private firm for part-time consulting services. The District also has sought to reassign current classified staff on a short-term basis from other departments whose expertise will be particularly useful during audit preparation. To date, this last strategy has had very limited success.

These measures are only intended to address the 2012 Annual Financial Audit and the 2012 Annual 311 report. An ongoing solution is essential, and Workgroup 11 (Financial Integrity and Reporting) is discussing options to address these issues in the mid- to longer-term. In line with the staffing plan, funding to fill three vacant positions in the accounting/budget department and two in the payroll department are included in the fiscal year 2012-13 budget.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ See Workgroup 11 Staffing Plan.

Recommendation 11 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
One-time, temporary measures taken to increase human resource capacity within accounting	August 2012 (?)
2012 Annual Financial Audit report completed	<DATE>
2012 Annual Financial Audit report distributed	<DATE>
2012 Annual 311 report completed	<DATE>
2012 Annual 311 report distributed	<DATE>
Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll developed	August 29, 2012 (?)
Long-term staffing plan for accounting and payroll executed	January 31, 2013

Recommendations 12 and 13, Leadership, Governance and Decision-making

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

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

The focus of Workgroups 12 and 13 began with analyzing the College's current Shared Governance system. Through their own observations and the results of the 2011-12 Shared Governance evaluation, workgroup participants acknowledged the merits of the College's Shared Governance system while also identifying a number of shortcomings and barriers inherent in the system that impede decision-making. The workgroup also discussed the value of using the term "Participatory Governance" versus "Shared Governance" in that it more accurately reflects the advisory nature of college councils and committees.

Concurrent with the initial information-gathering stages, the Board of Trustees and other constituents (administrators, classified managers, and faculty) participated in training sessions to better understand roles and responsibilities within a Shared Governance environment. Trainings and discussion also helped all constituents to gain a better understanding of Shared Governance as a participatory governance process in which committees serve an advisory function rather than a decision-making function. Trainings included those provided by ACCJC regarding accreditation (which included a discussion on the roles and responsibilities of trustees facilitated by Dr. Barbara Beno and Trustee William McGinnis of Butte-Glenn Community College District), the Community College League of California (facilitated by CCLC President, Scott

Lay, and Academic Senate for California Community Colleges President, Michelle Pilati), and the Association of Community Colleges Trustees (facilitated by Dr. Narcisa Polonio).

Additionally the workgroup reviewed sample polices on Shared Governance from other districts (Yosemite, San Mateo, Contra Costa, and Santa Rosa).

Based on this review, workgroup members developed a list of the criteria that will serve as the basis for a new Participatory Governance system. Those criteria, or new principles, are summarized below.

Criteria for New Participatory Governance System

Criteria	Charge	Structure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grounded in solid processes and outcomes • Collegiality • Mutual trust and respect • Simplicity • Efficient • Action-oriented • Transparent • Encourages diversity of voices • Recruits experience/expertise • Data informed decisions (quantitative vs. qualitative) • Culture of evidence • Student centered (impact on students) • Respect for decisions • Stakeholder input 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding roles • Training • Promotes better college • Authority/responsibility /accountability (with default deciders) • Timeliness • Clarify charge of committees <p>Advisory Committee which ultimately may get formed should be charged with following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget • Planning • Policy • Institutional Effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of components and roles • No one component can dominate • Equity • Accessibility for participation / opportunities • Promote student voice • Term limits/appointment process • Pathways • Clear chair/responsibilities/agendas/minutes (need template) • Agenda building

Of particular concern is the fact that students have not been participating in Shared Governance at an optimal level. At one time, students received stipends for their participation from Associated Students, but that was stopped a few years ago. The workgroup believes that this is a major contributor to the lower participation rates and recommended reinstating this practice of providing students with stipends to boost participation. The Associated Students have reinstated the stipends as of Fall 2012 and will likewise discuss further ways to enhance student contributions to Shared Governance.

As a result of these activities, which occurred throughout July and August 2012, the workgroup is now developing a proposed new model of Participatory Governance and accompanying policy, scheduled for completion by the end of November 2012. Additionally, the workgroup is developing a set of principles and guidelines for the implementation and operation of college committees.

Recommendation 12 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Merits and shortcomings of current Participatory Governance system identified along with best practices from other institutions	August 1, 2012
Ideal criteria for Participatory Governance system developed	August 10, 2012
New Participatory Governance model drafted	September 27, 2012 (?)
Revised Participatory Governance policy drafted	September 27, 2012 (?)
New Participatory Governance model and policy implemented	November 2012 (?)
Committee structure and guidelines developed	November 2012 (?)

Recommendation 14, Effective Board Organization

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

Given the focus of this Recommendation on the Board of Trustees, the workgroup addressing this Recommendation is composed of all Board members. The first measures taken to address this Recommendation included several training and retreat sessions. Dr. Barbara Beno, ACCJC President, and William McGinnis, Butte-Glenn Community College District Trustee, facilitated a three-hour workshop on July 10, 2012 on the topic of accreditation, covering its purposes, processes and standards; the roles and responsibilities of trustees; advice for board excellence; and examples.

Subsequently, on August 6 and 7, 2012, Dr. Narcisa Polonio, President of the Association of Community Colleges Trustees, facilitated a two-part retreat designed to enhance board performance. The focus was on roles and responsibilities of the Board, a Board Self-Assessment, and the drafting of Board goals. The Board goals for 2012-13 are:

1. Ensure appropriate responses to the recommendations of the Accrediting Commission.
2. Adopt a short- and long-term plan for acquiring fiscal stability.
3. Support the acquisition of a stable, highly qualified senior leadership team.
4. Conduct a comprehensive review of board policies related to board organization and operation, administrative authority, and Shared Governance.
5. Implement a professional development plan for the Board of Trustees that leads to increased board effectiveness and a cohesive and collegial team.
6. Do whatever it takes to save City College and best serve our students and community!

The Board also has been reviewing its bylaws and policies related to Policy Manual (PM) Section 1, "The Governing Board, The Community, The Chancellor." The Chancellor and consultants have reviewed the remaining policies within Section 1 and have drafted some

proposed changes. The Board Policy Committee reviewed the proposed changes. The Board will conduct a first reading on September 27 of the updated policies.

Included in this section and requiring focused attention is PM Section 1.01, "Election and Membership" which includes Board compensation. The Board has revised this policy to prorate the compensation paid to Board members according to the number of meetings attended. The first reading of the policy was conducted on July 26, 2012. At its second reading on August 23, 2012, the Board adopted the revised policy.

The Board also has reviewed the following policies, the need for which arose through the work of other workgroups responsible for Recommendation 1 (Mission Statement), 12 (Leadership, Governance and Decision-making), and 13 (Governance Structures).

Board Policy 1200, Mission Statement. As noted in the response to Recommendation 1 (Mission Statement), the Board reviewed a proposed statement and provided additional direction for revisions at a special meeting (completed August 14, 2012). The first reading of the revised statement occurred on August 23, 2012, and the second reading and adoption of the revised mission statement took place on September 11, 2012.

Policy Manual 2.07, City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System. The response to Recommendations 12 and 13 describes the need for changing current policy regarding Shared Governance. The Board will conduct a first reading of the new policy in October. A new policy focusing on the role of the Academic Senate and its relationship to the Board of Trustees as a separate policy (10+1) is being developed.

To assist the Board in gaining a full and clear understanding of Shared Governance, particularly as it considers changes to this policy, Scott Lay, California Community College League President, and Michelle Pilati, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges President, presented a workshop on Participating Effectively in District and College Governance: the Law, Regulations, and Guidelines on August 23, 2012. The workshop was attended by three Trustees and further professional development on the topic will be considered as part of the Board's professional development plan.

To assist in its deliberations and to further enhance board effectiveness, on September 11, 2012, the Board approved a voluntary request for the appointment of a Special Trustee by the State Chancellor for California Community Colleges. This decision is consistent with recommendations made by ACCJC and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

Recommendation 14 Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed
ACCJC President, Dr. Barbara Beno, with Trustee William "Bill" McGinnis of Butte-Glenn Community College District, conducted Board training on accreditation's purposes, processes and standards, the roles and responsibilities of Trustees in accreditation	July 10, 2012
Dr. Narcisa Polonio, President of the Association of Community Colleges Trustees, facilitated a two-part retreat focused on roles and responsibilities of the Board, a Board	August 6 and 7, 2012

Self-Assessment, and the drafting of Board goals	
Board goals for 2012-13 drafted	August 7, 2012
Board goals for 2012-13 adopted	August 23, 2012
Scott Lay, California Community College League President, and Michelle Pilati, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges President, presented a workshop on Participating Effectively in District and College Governance: the Law, Regulations, and Guidelines	August 23, 2012
Board self-assessment completed	August 7, 2012
Board Policy Committee review of PM Section 1 revisions completed	September 2012
Board's first reading of revised PM Section 1 completed	October 25, 2012
PM Section 1 revisions approved by Board	September 27, 2012, 1 st Reading
Board Policy 1200, Mission Statement revisions approved by Board	September 11, 2012
Policy Manual 2.07, City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System revisions approved by Board	October 1 st Reading
Appointment of Special Trustee approved by Board	September 11, 2012
First annual professional development plan created	September 27, 2012

Special Focus: Centers and Sites (Workgroup 15)

Given the references to centers and sites throughout the ACCJC Recommendations, the Chancellor formed a "special focus" workgroup dedicated to this topic. The purpose of the workgroup is to analyze and assess the issues regarding centers and sites and identifying and collecting the data necessary to conduct a fiscal and programmatic analysis.

Centers and sites fall into the following categories:

Category A: College and centers that receive Foundation Grant from the State

Category B: leased sites that receive no Foundation Grant and pay significant rent

Category C: leased sites that receive no Foundation Grant and pay very little rent

Category D: owned sites

The workgroup is reviewing data and information necessary to conduct a fiscal and programmatic analysis of centers and sites, in order to more cost effectively and efficiently serve students.

Given that many factors within the other Recommendations will affect the analysis of this workgroup (e.g., administrative structure, staffing plans, financial decisions, and board direction), this analysis is to a certain extent dependent upon the outcomes of other decisions and will be completed fully after October 15. The ultimate outcome of this will be recommendations

for a comprehensive set of options for serving students as cost-effectively and efficiently as possible. The workgroup has discussed options that include the consolidation of non-Foundation Grant sites, as well as the possible consolidation of others. However, in the short term, two recommendations were forwarded to the Board for their approval on September 27, 2012. The first is to consolidate the course offerings currently offered at the Castro site (approximately 20-25 sections) to other centers throughout the city. The Castro site is located at a junior high school that operates as a College site in the evening. This move will allow the classes to be offered in a more appropriate facility for higher education and provide cost savings from cancelation of rent and reduction of staff time needed to oversee the facility.

Coincidentally, these classrooms contain adult furniture that is desperately needed at other sites in order to increase classroom capacity and thus increase productivity. The College ceased buying new desks/chairs several years ago and some faculty have indicated a willingness to accept additional students in their classes if more chairs were available.

A second recommendation to the Board of Trustees is to immediately begin the process of placing the property at 33 Gough Street on the market for a long-term lease. This property is in a prime location for development, located one block off of Market Street. The facility does not receive a Foundation grant and houses fiscal and administrative staff. The plan is to relocate those staff to other District-owned property.

Special Focus Outcomes and Timeline:

Outcome	Date Completed/ To Be Completed
Centers/Sites defined	Completed
Total Cost of Operation model completed	Being Completed by Workgroup 8
Foundation Grants reviewed	Completed
Data regarding program and course offerings / sections per center collected	Completed
Human Resources allocation examined	(TBA)
Proximity to alternative locations/transportation reviewed	Completed
Real estate value assessed	Completed
Data on site utilization and productivity collected	Completed
Data on site utilization and productivity analyzed	Completed
List of options for more cost-effectively and efficiently serving students generated (consolidation, elimination, property sales, property leases, etc.) and presented to Board of Trustees	December 2012

C. Actions Addressing the Material Weaknesses and Significant Deficiencies Identified in the 2011 Auditors Report

<P. GOLDSTEIN AND J. BILMONT ARE PREPARING THIS>

D. Response to the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team Report

<K. CHARLES WILL DRAFT INITIAL RESPONSE>

DRAFT