

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services

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

Standard II.A. Instructional Programs

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

II.A.1. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Fields of Study Consistent with College Mission. All instructional programs that the College offers, regardless of location or means of delivery, are in fields of study consistent with CCSF's mission to offer high-quality programs that enable students to successfully transfer to four-year

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

- Institution-set standard for transfer is 2,750; student total for 2014-15 was 3,057.
- Institution-set standard for Associate Degrees is 1,218; student total for 2014-15 was 1,318; total degrees awarded was highest in 2013-14 at 1,632.
- Institution-set standard for completion of CTE certificates is 737; students receiving CTE certificates went from a high of 982 in 2013-14 to 864 in 2014-15.

The College also has institution-set standards for job placement ()-(2014)TJ(-)3 (or)3institution total for 2014-15 was 1,318.

II.A.2. *Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and*

Faculty Roles in the Systematic Evaluation of Programs through Integrated Planning and Program Review. All College departments, student services, and administrative areas participate in a Program Review (every three years) and/or Annual Planning in the fall, for

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

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

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

II.A.2. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Furthermore, in Spring 2015, in accordance with the new ACCJC Standard I.B.6, faculty began collecting SLO assessment results tied to student identification number so that the College could disaggregate data and identify corresponding achievement gaps in particular subpopulations.

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

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

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

II.A.3. Analysis and Evaluation

Faculty-led committees, with support from an SLO Coordination Team and Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, have created systems of assessment that ensure each course, degree, and certificate meet the Institutional Assessment Plan's three-year benchmark for assessment. Courses and programs are improved based on those results. Together, these systems of continuous quality improvement ensure that student learning outcomes are current, available, regularly assessed, and driving improvements. As per the Institutional Assessment Plan, the SLO Committee reviews and validates a representative sample of assessment reports to monitor that assessment practices follow institutional procedures.

II.A.4. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

outcomes assessment, budgeting decisions, and professional development. Their work is designed to make pre-collegiate and college-level distinctions that are much more meaningful for faculty and students.⁶⁹ In the past year, the BSC has become a much stronger interdepartmental force at CCSF, now including collaborative leadership from ESL, English, Math, Transitional Studies, Counseling, and Business that has resulted in shared strategies for student success, including Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training (I-BEST). English and Math are working in tandem with the College's

The College's commitment to college-level student success and support is also evident in its professional development events and continuous analysis of student learning learning outcomes

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

II.A.5. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

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

CCSF Board policies affirm the Curriculum Committee's role in the review and approval of new and modified degrees and programs.⁸¹ The Curriculum Committee proposes curriculum policies and procedures to the Academic Senate, which then forwards the recommendations to the governing Board for approval. As outlined in its Handbook, the Curriculum Committee's review and approval process determine compliance with state standards, as well as the feasibility and need at the local level.⁸² If there is formal evidence that a program may no longer be viable, it could be discontinued, revitalized, or suspended according to the processes spelled out in Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 6.17.⁸³ The College reviews program viability regularly and assesses every PSLO at least once every three years.⁸⁴

CCSF awards academic credit based on generally accepted principles for communit4 (di)-21.82 Tdndetnd prog4

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

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

Letter. The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

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

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

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

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

II.A.6. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Scheduling Courses to Allow for Program Completion in a Period of Time Consistent with Higher Education Expectations. In order to meet student needs, the College offers courses

s during fall, spring, and summer term.31(o)42ng tfring ag and time to do Mico 1/MCID 7 d time to co (i)2 (o)4 (n E

II.A.6. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

II.A.7. *The institution effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies and*

cT 0 -1.315 ud, th

and summer terms in day, evening, and weekend formats. Full-term, late-start, and short-term classes in face-to-

proposed instructional methodologies and, when necessary, prompts a discussion at the Curriculum Committee.^{107 108}

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

Learning Support Services that Reflect the Diverse and Changing Needs of Students.

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

Faculty Evaluation as a Means of Ensuring the College Meets the Diverse and Changing Needs of Students. Faculty evaluations are a collegial method for instructors to self reflect, learn from their peers and make improvements in courses and programs. Course content, subject knowledge, course presentation and delivery are a few of the areas evaluated.¹¹³ Students also have the o

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

ESL Tech Camp¹¹⁶

Lynda.com¹¹⁷

Kognito¹¹⁸

Outcomes & Assessment Professional Development¹¹⁹

Technology Learning Center (TLC)¹²⁰

Trauma and Learning¹²¹

Flexible Calendar Days¹²²

Department Level Trainings (example: Live Text: Tool for Better Assessment¹²³)

Teaching and Learning Center Trainings¹²⁴

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

II.A.7. Analysis and Evaluation

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

II.A.8. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College has adopted an approved set of second-party assessment instruments as part of a multi-measure placement for evaluating and placing incoming students into English, reading, math, chemistry, and English as a Second Language.^{127 128 129 130} The validation conducted by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office includes three specific validation processes: content-related validity to determine appropriateness of the test for placement into a course or course sequence, criterion-related and/or consequential validity to determine appropriate cut-scores, and disproportionate impact to determine (c)4 (t)-2 (t)-2 (o de)4rqueodw 12 -0 0 12.004

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

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

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

II.A.9. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Credit a-4 (tr)1 6)y4 (of5)1 -1 -M .t5-1 6)6 6)mcl-4 (r.)3.9 17.55 0 Td(He7 (c) T4 6) 3)2 7(v)3.910 (t)6 6 3

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

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

II.A.9. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

T

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

Programs Are Connected to Required Competencies. General Education curriculum roots learning outcomes in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage diverse perspectives. Outcomes for both major transfer patterns, Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and California State University (CSU), aid conversations across the College about student learning in these areas. Additional General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) include composition, natural science, social sciences, humanities, and diversity studies.¹⁵¹

Area of Inquiry	Applicable GELO	Applicable ILO
ANALYTIC INQUIRY	Area A • Use the principles and application of language toward logical thought • Critically evaluate communications in whatever symbols are used	

* Corresponds to second graduation requirement

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

II.A.11. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

There is no general education learning outcome in Area A or other GE Areas that

aligns with the following description of the standard: (l)-12 (es)- 4(d)-e

II.A.12.

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

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

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

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

II.A.12. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

II.A.13. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

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

II.A.14. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

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

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

The College's participation in the CTE Employment Outcomes Survey has helped CTE programs to understand the posit

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

II.A.15. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

The institution has identified that a policy and procedures were needed to deal with proioh (a)b dact (nua)4nc)4o c

II.A.16. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

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

II.A.16. Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CurricUNET's improved reporting processes⁷² 248(m)-2N-1 (o (tin(o (tin(o uta)510.8 (m)-2 a)510.8 mi)-u)6

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Standard II.A. Changes Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process

Goal	Associated Action(s)	Person(s) Responsible	Comments	Start Date	End Date	Status	Notes

Standard II.A. Changes Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process		
Goal	Associated Action(s)	Person(s)

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