



# City College of San Francisco to Lose Accreditation

## Accreditation Newsletter

ISSUE 02 | July 2013

At its June 2013 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) acted to terminate the accreditation of City College of San Francisco (CCSF) effective July 31, 2014. This was the latest development in a process that was set into motion on July 2, 2012, when the ACCJC ordered Show Cause for CCSF.

### What is Show Cause?

Show Cause is one of three sanctions that the ACCJC issues when it determines that a member institution is out of compliance with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and/or Commission Policies. Possible sanctions include:

- **Issue Warning:** institution has deviated from Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and/or Commission Policies
- **Impose Probation:** institution has deviated significantly from Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and/or Commission Policies
- **Order Show Cause:** institution is in substantial non-compliance with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and/or Commission Policies

Sanctions are not progressive; an institution may receive Warning, Probation, or Show Cause with no previous sanction in its history. Show Cause is the most severe sanction an institution may receive; Termination of Accreditation is the single more severe action at ACCJC's disposal. In the July 2, 2012 letter to the Interim Chancellor of City College, the ACCJC directed CCSF to complete three reports:

- **Special Report:** a plan to correct evaluation team recommendations due by October 15, 2012
- **Show Cause Report:** an institutional self-evaluation report that documents status on recommendations due by March 15, 2013
- **Closure Report:** a detailed plan to close the institution in case of Termination of Accreditation due by March 15, 2013

### Why did CCSF receive Show Cause?

The ACCJC outlined three reasons why City College received Show Cause: failure to meet some Eligibility Requirements, failure to meet some Accreditation Standards, and failure to address the recommendations from the 2006 Evaluation Team.

Summary of CCSF 2012 Eligibility Requirement deficiencies:

- **#5 Administrative Capacity:**  
not enough administrative staff for an institution of CCSF's size
- **#17 Financial Resources:**  
not enough financial resources to support student learning programs and services and assure financial stability
- **#18 Financial Accountability:**  
failure to conduct timely audits and failure to address negative audit findings
- **#21 Relations with the Accrediting Commission:**  
out of compliance with Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and failure to address 2006 Evaluation Team recommendations

Summary of CCSF 2012 Accreditation Standards deficiencies (recommendations in bold are full or partial repeats from the 2006 Evaluation Team Recommendations):

- **Recommendation #1 Mission Statement:**  
process and timeline to review Mission Statement
- **Recommendation #2 Effective Planning Process:**  
fully implement planning process at all sites
- **Recommendation #3 Assessing Institutional Effectiveness:**  
fully implement Program Review and SLO assessment
- **Recommendation #4 Student Learning Outcomes:**  
fully implement SLO assessment at the course, program, general education, certificate, and degree level
- **Recommendation #5 Student Support Services:**  
fully implement outcomes assessment in Student Support Services
- **Recommendation #6 Human Resources Components of Evaluation:**  
include SLO assessment in faculty evaluations
- **Recommendation #7 Human Resources:**  
assess need for classified and administrative staff and build human resource planning into the institutional planning process

- **Recommendation #8 Physical Resources:** include cost of maintaining facilities into its planning and budgeting processes
- **Recommendation #9 Technology Resources:** develop a comprehensive plan for equipment upgrade and maintenance that is integrated with budgeting and planning processes
- **Recommendation #10 Financial Planning & Stability:** match annual, ongoing expenditures with financial resources
- **Recommendation #11 Financial Integrity and Reporting:** provide accurate and timely financial information to constituents
- **Recommendation #12 Leadership, Governance and Decision-making:** engage an external organization to train all constituents on their role in institutional governance and decision-making
- **Recommendation #13 Governance Structures:** evaluate and improve the college's decision-making structure
- **Recommendation #14 Effective Board Organization:** Board is to follow its policies, develop operating procedures, engage in board development, and evaluate its effectiveness

Of the fourteen recommendations above, ACCJC determined last month that City College of San Francisco has fully resolved two, nearly resolved one, and has not adequately resolved the remaining eleven.

## What's next for CCSF?

Loss of accreditation virtually guarantees the closure of an institution as accredited status is required to receive federal financial aid and to maintain transferability of course credits. City College has the right to request a review of the Termination of Accreditation decision. If this is unsuccessful, the final option is to appeal the decision. CCSF would retain accredited status during the review and appeal processes. If City College loses accreditation, it has the option to affiliate with an accredited college. Compton Community College was absorbed by El Camino College in 2006 after its 2005 loss of accreditation and is still fighting to regain accredited status. This possibility is fraught with difficulties for an institution of City College's size.

## What does this mean for Pasadena City College?

This means that we, as a campus community, need to pay close attention to reports made by our accrediting agency. Examining previous ACCJC recommendations is a key step in successfully navigating the accreditation process. Reports from ACCJC during the last three accreditation cycles reveal several recommendation trends for PCC.

## Integrated Planning

Integrated planning is the institutional processes that relate program review to planning and resource allocation. The three stages of integrated planning are:

- Program Review: Programs examine data on past performance to determine improvement goals
- Planning: Programs document improvement goals in program plans
- Resource Allocation: the College allocates resources based on the results of Program Review and Planning so that programs can improve

Recommendations regarding Integrated Planning are noted in the 1996, 2003 and 2009 reports. ACCJC has recommended that the college strengthen the connections between program review, planning and resource allocation, with a specific recommendation to link planning to resource allocation in the 1996 and 2003 reports.

PCC has received multiple recommendations to use data, an integral component of program review, to drive decision-making. The topics of data and program review were seen again in 2009 as part of an ACCJC recommendation that contributed to PCC receiving Warning. This report also stated that "student learning outcomes assessment be incorporated into the program review; program planning, and resource allocation processes."

## Governance/Collegiality/Campus Climate

Recommendations regarding governance, collegiality and campus climate are also present in multiple reports. In 1996, the Commission reported that PCC needed to ensure that all policies and procedures were updated and consistent and that "campus constituents must look beyond self-interest to develop trust and work cooperatively to stem declining employee morale." The 1996 Evaluation Team also recommended that "to resolve shared governance wrangling between administration and faculty, steps should be taken to develop a delineation of functions agreement between the faculty college bargaining unit and the Faculty Senate." The recommendations to increase effective communication and "provide evidence that all campus constituents are working to restore collegiality and integrity in their relationships" are made in the 2003 report. In 2009, ACCJC recommended that PCC "develop codes of ethics for management and classified employees" and "develop and implement formal processes for the regular evaluation of each component of its governance and decision-making structures and use the results for improvement as needed."

## Distance Education & SLO Assessment

The 2009 report from the Commission included recommendations addressing Distance Education and SLO Assessment. It was recommended that PCC "establish and implement policies and procedures that define and ensure the quality and integrity of the distance education offerings" and that the college "expands its assessment of student learning outcomes to include all programs, degrees, and certificates, and, if applicable, learning and support service areas."

## Where do we go from here?

### *Integrated Planning*

Near the conclusion of the Spring 2013 semester, an Integrated Planning Study Session was convened to evaluate the links among program review, planning, and resource allocation. Representatives from the Academic Senate, the Planning and Priorities Committee (the Accreditation Steering Committee), the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (Program Review), and the Budget and Resource Allocation Committee were in attendance. Gaps in our processes were discussed and agreement was reached to reconvene in the Fall semester to formulate a detailed improvement plan.

### *Governance/ Collegiality/Campus Climate*

The Academic Senate leadership is currently working with the Administration to develop a strategy to positively affect campus climate and improve the Shared Governance process. These discussions have included the possibility of inviting a third party to campus to address governance and collegiality among all constituency groups on campus. Next steps will include engaging the Classified Senate and Associated Students in these discussions.

### *Distance Education*

Significant progress has been made in our Distance Education program on campus, including the development and approval of Distance Education Policies and Procedures. The Distance Education Department continues to work with faculty and Deans to ensure that our online and hybrid offerings meet Federal, State, and Accreditation Standards. The continued leadership of the Academic Deans is proving critical in ensuring all standards and regulations are met.

### *SLO Assessment*

The quality of the documentation of SLO Assessment will be a key component of our Accreditation Evaluation. Several changes in the process for documenting SLO assessment have been made over the last year:

- Annual Assessment Reports document course level assessment for every discipline/department at the college.
- Program SLO assessment is a component of all program reviews.
- General Education Outcome (GEO) assessment occurred for the first time last year and will continue and expand in the 2013-14 year with a college-wide assessment of GEO #2: Cognition.

It is essential that all faculty and staff responsible for the achievement of student outcomes assess these outcomes and document the improvements they make as a result of the assessment process.

## In Conclusion

The situation at City College of San Francisco is a tragedy for its 85,000 students, 2,600 faculty and staff, and the entire San Francisco community. The decision to Terminate Accreditation was completely unexpected within the Accreditation community and is a game-changer for two-year institutions in the Western Region. The circumstances at Pasadena City College are not comparable to CCSF, but there is a clear lesson we can draw from City College: now is a time to be vigilant and come together to do the necessary work to ensure the reaffirmation of our accreditation.

This newsletter was co-authored by Stephanie Fleming, Accreditation Self-Evaluation Coordinator (slhood@pasadena.edu) and Matthew Jordan, Accreditation Liaison Officer (mtjordan@pasadena.edu).