SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

EST. 1916

ACCJC Midterm Report March 2019

Midterm Report: Sacramento City College

Date: Submitted to ACCJC: March 15, 2019
Report approved by the LRCCD Board of Trustees: Feb. 13, 2019

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Michael Gutierrez, President
Sacramento City College
3835 Freeport Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95822

We certify that there was a broad participation by the campus community and believe that this report accurately reflects that nature and substance of this institution.

_____

Dr. Brian King, Chancellor, Los Rios Community College District

_____

Ms. Pamela Haynes, President, LRCCD Board of Trustees

_____

Dr. Michael Gutierrez, President, Sacramento City College

_____

Dr. Art Pimentel, Chair, Senior Leadership Team, Sacramento City College

_____

Dr. Gayle Pitman, President, SCC Academic Senate

_____

Ms. Courtnee Mack, President, SCC Classified Senate

_____

Ms. Kimberly Ramos, President, SCC Student Associated Council

_____

Dr. Marybeth Buechner, SCC Accreditation Liaison Officer; Manager Tri-chair

_____

Ms. Patty Leonard, Faculty Tri-chair, SCC Midterm Report Steering Committee

_____

Ms. Kelly Irwin, Classified Tri-chair, SCC Midterm Report Steering Committee

_____

Mr. Kasey Gardner, Manager Tri-Chair, SCC Midterm Report Steering Committee

Table of Contents

Report Preparation

The last Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Accreditation site visit to Sacramento City College (SCC) occurred Oct. 5, 2015 through Oct. 8, 2015. Prior to that visit, a self-evaluation was written based on the ACCJC's accreditation standards ([RP.1](#)). SCC received its external evaluation report ([RP.2](#)) and reaffirmation of accreditation letter ([RP.3](#)) on February 5, 2016. The college was required to submit a Follow-up Report.

In March 2017, SCC submitted a Follow-up Report in response to the 2015 accreditation visit ([RP.4](#)). In June 2017, SCC received the ACCJC response indicating that SCC met all accreditation standards and reaffirming accreditation based on the follow-up report ([RP.5](#)). The next comprehensive evaluation of SCC will occur in Fall 2022.

Following the submission of the Follow-up Report, a Midterm Report Steering Committee was formed with the approval of the College Executive Council. The Steering Committee consisted of individuals from each of the employee constituencies appointed by the chairs of each constituency group.

- Patti Leonard (Professor, Communication Department)
- Kelly Irwin (Senior IT Technician)
- Kasey Gardner (Dean, Behavioral and Social Sciences) from Fall 2018 onward
- Don Palm (Dean, SCC Davis Center) through Summer 2018
- Marybeth Buechner (Accreditation Liaison Officer, PRIE Dean)

Timeline of Report Preparation:	
Spring 2018	
April	• Rough draft developed and discussed, constituency feedback gathered
May	• Second draft developed (based on constituency feedback)
Summer	• Editing and collections of evidence/documentation
Fall 2018	
September	• Additional constituent feedback gathered
October	• Full draft completed
November	• AS, CS, SLT and SAC approval the report. President's approval secured. Final document sent to DO by Nov 30.
December	• District Office reviews report
Spring 2019	
February	• Report approved by the LRCCD Board of Trustees

During Fall 2017, the Steering Committee members interviewed campus managers, faculty members, and classified staff and reviewed evidentiary documents in order to gather information about the work of the college relevant to the Midterm Report. The Steering Committee used that information to construct a draft of the report.

Sacramento City College's Midterm Report was developed through a collegial consultation process. Updates on the report were provided to the Academic Senate ([RP.6](#)), Classified Senate ([RP.7](#)), Student Senate ([RP.8](#)), Executive Council ([RP.9](#)), Department Chairs Council ([RP.10](#)), President's Cabinet ([RP.11](#)) and Senior Leadership Team ([RP.12](#)) throughout the process.

In Spring 2018, the first draft of the report was provided to each constituency group for discussion and feedback was requested. Additional information was gathered and a second draft of the document was developed. Editing, collection of evidence, and documentation continued over the summer. During Fall 2018, additional drafts of the report were produced and distributed for feedback.

In September, the Midterm Report was presented to the Senior Leadership Team ([RP.13](#)). In October, the final draft was approved by the Classified Senate ([RP.14](#)), Student Senate ([RP.15](#)), and Academic Senate ([RP.16](#)). In November, the final draft was approved by the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and reviewed by the Steering Committee, the College President, and the District Accreditation Coordinating Committee.

Evidence: RP

RP.1   [SCC's 2015 Accreditation Webpage](#)
RP.2   [External Evaluation Report (e.g. Accompanying External Evaluation Report)](#)
RP.3   [Reaffirmation of Accreditation Letter (e.g. February 5, 2016 Letter)](#)
RP.4   [Follow-up Report (e.g. SCC Accreditation Follow-up Report of 03/10/17)](#)
RP.5   [ACCJC Response (e.g. June 2017 Letter)](#)
RP.6   [Academic Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/03/18)](#)
RP.7   [Classified Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/12/18)](#)
RP.8   [Student Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/18/18)](#)
RP.9   [Executive Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/02/18)](#)
RP.10   [Department Chairs Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/05/18)](#)
RP.11   [President's Cabinet Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/03/18)](#)
RP.12   [Senior Leadership Team Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/11/18)](#)
RP.13   [Senior Leadership Team Minutes (e.g. minutes of 09/12/18)](#)
RP.14   [Classified Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/11/18)](#)
RP.15   [Student Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/10/18)](#)
RP.16   [Academic Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/09/18)](#)

Plans Arising Out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Actionable Improvement Plan 1 (I.B.3, I.B.4):

The College Leadership will develop "best practices" for engagement of departments and units in the planning process to:

- *Include strategies for effective communication, timely completion, and deeper understanding of the planning process and models that would be effective for groups of various sizes and responsibilities.*
- *Support ongoing continuous process improvement with respect to the engagement of departments with the planning process.*

Status: Completed.

For more information see the Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement (p. 9).

Beginning in Spring 2016, information was gathered from across the college on practices that are effective in increasing the engagement of departments in the planning process. This was discussed with the college leadership and used to develop a statement of best practices for planning at the division and department levels (AIP.1.1 see "Evidence: AIP.1.1" below). The best practices were included in the Fall 2017 revision of the SCC Planning Handbook (AIP.1.2).

During the 2016-17 academic year SCC conducted a strategic planning review and revised the SCC Strategic Plan. This resulted in several changes to the planning process that support best practices for planning and continuous process improvement (AIP.1.3). In 2017-18 additional changes were made to improve timely completion of planning activities (AIP.1.4).

In Fall 2018 the college acted to restructure the former "College Strategic Planning Council" as the "College Council" with an expanded charge, modified membership, and more frequent meetings. This will support effective communication and lead to further improvement in the planning process (AIP.1.5).

Responsible Parties:

- SCC President
- SCC Vice Presidents
- PRIE Dean
- Executive Council
- College Strategic Planning Committee
- President's Cabinet

Evidence: AIP 1

AIP.1.1   Executive Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/17/16) and College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes of 09/28/17)

AIP.1.2   Sacramento City College Planning Handbook (e.g. Planning Handbook)

AIP.1.3   College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/19/17)

AIP.1.4   College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes of 03/05/18 and 04/24/18)

AIP.1.5   College Council Webpage

Actionable Improvement Plan 2 (II.A.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, and II.A.3.c):

Through the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC), the College will institutionalize its updated and enhanced processes and accountability tools to ensure that all student learning outcomes, at all levels, are assessed on a systematic and cyclical basis and ensure that the results are used for continuous improvement.

Status: Ongoing.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) are systematically assessed at all levels. Future work includes developing the use of Canvas for SLO reporting.

During the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic years the SCC SLO "Toolkit" was expanded and the online SLO reporting tool was improved (AIP.2.1). The online SLO reporting tool was modified to capture student services SLO reporting (AIP.2.2). In addition, multi-year SLO reporting plans are now automatically updated.

In Fall 2017 Canvas was implemented as the new SCC Learning Management System and further modifications of the college online SLO reporting tool were paused in order to explore the possibility of using Canvas for this purpose (AIP.2.3). The college also considered moving to a different SLO reporting tool, possibly eLumen, which could combine effectively with Canvas. During Spring and Fall 2018 work continued on integrating Canvas with SLO reporting (AIP.2.4, AIP.2.5).

A review of SLO work indicates that SLO reporting is occurring across the college. Active courses, instructional programs, and student service programs have ongoing SLO assessment (AIP.2.6).

Responsible Parties:

- SLO Coordinator
- SLO Assessment Committee
- Student Services SLO committee
- Distance Education subcommittee of the Academic Senate

Evidence: AIP 2

AIP.2.1   Sacramento City College Student Learning Outcomes Toolkit
AIP.2.2   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes 10/22/15)
AIP.2.3   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes 10/05/17 and 10/19/17)
AIP.2.4   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes of 02/15/18)
AIP.2.5   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes of 09/20/18)
AIP.2.6   Student Learning Outcomes (e.g. Fall 2018 Institutional Effectiveness Reports)

Actionable Improvement Plan 3 (IV.A.1, IV.A.2.a):

As part of the ongoing cycle of continuous improvement, the College President, President's Cabinet, and all constituency leadership will facilitate and further develop dialogue, activities, and initiatives designed to improve College engagement in, understanding of, and respect for participatory decision-making. The Blue Book Task Force was convened in April 2015, an important first step to address these issues.

Status: Completed.

For more information see the Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement (p. 9).

The work of the "Blue Book Task Force" was completed in the 2016-17 academic year. A new Governance Guide was produced and is in use at the college (AIP.3.1).

The Effectiveness of Governance and Communication Survey was conducted in Fall 2017 and in Spring 2018, the constituency leaders engaged with the results of the survey (AIP.3.2). The College President called together a task force to make recommendations on how to improve communication and participatory decision-making (AIP.3.3). The Communication and Governance Task Force began meeting in Spring 2018 (AIP.3.4) and continued to meet through Fall 2018 (AIP.3.5).

In Fall 2018, the College Strategic Planning Council was restructured as the "College Council" with an expanded charge, modified membership, and more frequent meetings. The expanded change includes more connection with participatory decision-making at the college. This action will be key to improving dialogue about participatory decision-making. It will also promote more effective communication about the overall planning process (AIP.3.6). At this same time, the SCC Executive Council began meeting as a smaller group of just the leaders of each College constituency group plus the College President. The Executive Council had previously included numerous nonvoting members at its meetings. This will allow for more effective communication among the constituency leaders.

Responsible parties:

- SCC President
- SCC Vice Presidents
- PRIE Dean
- Executive Council
- Governance and Communication Taskforce

Evidence: AIP 3

AIP.3.1 The Governance Guide: A Guide to Participatory Decision-Making at Sacramento City College (e.g. Governance Guide)
AIP.3.2 Executive Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 03/05/18)
AIP.3.3 College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes of 03/05/18)
AIP.3.4 Communication and Governance Task Force Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/25/18 and 05/07/18)
AIP.3.5 Communication and Governance Task Force Webpage
AIP.3.6 College Council Webpage

Actionable Improvement Plan 4 (IV.A.3, IV.A.5):

To improve effective and satisfactory cross-constituency participation in the governance of the College, the College Leadership will:

- *Develop a more robust Campus Issues process to facilitate a timely response and thorough explanation for how and why decisions are made.*
- *Create a clear and transparent process for utilizing survey data to make process improvements in communication and participatory decision-making.*
- *Provide both formal and informal venues for College-wide information sharing.*

Status: Completed.

For more information see the Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement (p. 9).

Campus Issue process: The SCC Executive Council worked to improve the Campus Issues process (AIP.4.1). This work was continued under the new College President in the 2017-18 academic year. In Fall 2018, the SCC Executive Council began meeting as a smaller group of just the leaders of each College constituency group plus the College President, which will allow for more efficient discussions of Campus Issues.

Use of survey data for process improvements: The 2017 Effectiveness of Governance and Communication Survey resulted in a robust response to using survey data to make process improvement related to college governance. The 2017 survey indicated several areas for improvement (AIP.4.2). In Spring 2018, the College President called together a Communication and Governance Task Force to address these issues (AIP.4.3). The taskforce continued to meet throughout Fall 2018 (AIP 4.4). The recommendations of the taskforce will inform the work of the newly restructured College Council (AIP.4.5).

Communication venues: New venues for College-wide information sharing were established during the 2017-18 academic year. The College President provides regular updates to the college and hosts information exchanges that are open to all (AIP.4.6). The Public Information Office (PIO) publishes a bi-monthly newsletter that informs the college community and provides direction on where to look for additional information (AIP.4.7).

Responsible parties:

- SCC President
- Executive Council
- PIO Office

Evidence: AIP 4

AIP.4.1   Executive Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/16/17)
AIP.4.2   Effectiveness of Governance and Communication Survey (e.g. 2017)
AIP.4.3   Executive Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 03/05/18)
AIP.4.4   Communication and Governance Task Force Webpage
AIP.4.5   College Council Webpage
AIP.4.6   President's Information Exchange (e.g. President's Information Exchange)
AIP.4.7   Public Information Office Newsletter (e.g. Public Information Office Staff and Faculty Newsletter and Public Information Office Student Newsletter)

Response to Team Recommendation for Improvement

<u>**College Recommendation #3**</u>

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the College needs to move forward on the action plan it identified by utilizing the Blue Book Task Force for making recommendations to help improve participatory decision-making processes and enhance college-wide communication. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3)

The External Evaluation Report confirmed that SCC meets all aspects of the relevant Standards. The report also recommended that, although no deficiency was present, the college could improve in the area of participatory decision-making and that SCC had begun work in this area (AIP 3 and 4). As noted in the report: "The Blue Book Task Force convenes to review, evaluate, and make improvements to the participatory governance processes. This Task Force helps all constituency groups improve processes that allow for transparent decision making. The College implements an Actionable Improvement Plan as part of continuous improvement and has the full support of all constituencies and the President through a review of participatory decision-making as codified in the "Blue Book" (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b)."

This recommendation was addressed first by the work of the Blue Book Task Force. Following the results of the 2017 Effectiveness of Governance and Communication Survey, additional improvements were undertaken.

Work of the Blue Book Task Force:

During the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic years, the task force reviewed the Governance Guide and made changes to bring it up-to-date with respect to current practice, as well as improve clarity. Feedback was gathered from SCC groups including the Academic Senate (RT.1) and (RT.2), the Department Chairs Council (DCC) (RT.3), the Classified Senate (RT.4), and the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) (RT.5).

A charrette was held in March 2016, at which all the constituency leaders came together to address the feedback received in order to determine where breakdowns in communication happen and to create recommendations for improvement (RT.6). This resulted in a "Best Practices" document being added to the Governance Guide (RT.7).

The revised Governance Guide was updated in several ways:

- The term "Blue Book" has been deleted from the name of the document since many readers do not recall the history of this name (original printing on blue paper) and are confused by the designation.
- The document has received edits for both style and correctness. For example, the names and charges of standing committees have been updated where appropriate to reflect recent changes.
- As an outcome of a college-wide charrette on participatory governance and decision-making, a new section on "best practices" has been added to give readers a clearer sense of how the concepts in this document should be implemented. This is now "Section IV: Best Practices for Communication and Decision-Making" (RT.8).

The SCC Academic Senate approved the Blue Book Task Force recommendations in September 2016 (RT.9). Executive Council approved the recommendations in October 2016 (RT.10).

Effectiveness of Governance and Communication Survey:

The Effectiveness of Governance and Communication Survey, done periodically at the college, was conducted most recently in Fall 2017. The results indicated additional areas for improvement in both governance and college communication. In Spring 2018, this information was shared with the college constituencies and the constituency leaders engaged with the results of the survey (RT.11—Please see "Evidence: RT" for links to minutes). The College President called together a Communication and Governance Task Force to address the results of the survey and recommend changes (RT.12). In addition, the College Strategic Planning Committee used the survey results to improve college planning processes.

In Fall 2018, the Communication and Governance Task Force continued its work, producing recommendations on how best to improve communication in support of participatory governance (RT.13).

The Effectiveness of Governance and Communication Survey will be periodically conducted in future academic years to ascertain the impact of these changes.

The College Strategic Planning Committee Becomes the College Council

In Spring 2018, a consensus was reached around the need to improve and expand the work of the College Strategic Planning Committee (CSPC). In Fall 2018 the college acted to restructure the former CSPC as the "College Council" with an expanded charge, modified membership, and more frequent meetings (RT.14). The new charge includes an expanded role with participatory decision-making at the college. On Sept. 17, 2018, the Executive Council officially approved the restructure, expansion, and renaming of the committee to the College Council.

In November 2018, the new College Council began meeting. The Council will address key issues in planning and participatory governance and make recommendations to the Executive Council and the President's Cabinet. It will be key to improving dialogue about participatory decision-making and supporting more effective communication about the overall planning process.

College Council Charge:
The membership and charge of the College Council will be reviewed annually and can be changed by a vote of the Executive Council.

Planning:
- Lead college strategic planning and conduct an annual review of the college's Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals.
- Review college data and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).
- Set college goals/targets as required by the Accrediting Commission of Community Colleges (ACCJC) and/or the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO).

Participatory decision-making:
- Review college decision-making processes and structures, and recommend actions to improve communication and governance.
- Discuss related items referred to the College Council by the President's Cabinet, Executive Council, or other decision-making body, and make recommendations to the referring group.

- Provide support for, and enhance communication about, the College's Guided Pathways and Equity work.

Conclusion

The Blue Book Task Force has updated and revised the "Guide to Participatory Decision-Making at SCC" (aka: Governance Guide; aka: The Blue Book). This process produced recommendations to help improve participatory decision-making and enhance college-wide communication. Those recommendations have been implemented.

The Effectiveness of Governance and Communication Survey indicated that additional improvements could be made in participatory decision-making and college-wide communication. The college has created a Communication and Governance Task Force to address these issues. The task force met throughout the 2018-19 academic year to develop recommendations to improve participatory decision-making and enhance college-wide communication (RT.15).

The new College Council is key to improving dialogue about participatory decision-making. It will also promote more effective communication about the overall planning process.

Evidence: RT

RT.1   Academic Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 02/23/16)
RT.2   Academic Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 09/13/16)
RT.3   Department Chairs Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/01/15 and 03/03/16)
RT.4   Classified Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/08/15)
RT.5   Senior Leadership Team Minutes (e.g. minutes of 12/14/15)
RT.6   Department Chairs Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 03/03/16)
RT.7   "Best Practices" Document in The Governance Guide: A Guide to Participatory Decision-Making at Sacramento City College (e.g. "Best Practices" Document in The Governance Guide: A Guide to Participatory Decision-Making at Sacramento City College (Section IV: Page 5 and 6))
RT.8   Ibid.
RT.9   Academic Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 09/20/16)
RT.10   Executive Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/17/16)
RT.11   Executive Council Minutes (e.g. minutes of 03/05/18), Academic Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 03/13/18), Classified Senate Minutes (e.g. minutes of 04/12/18), and Senior Leadership Team Minutes (e.g. minutes of 03/14/18)
RT.12   President's Call for a Communication and Governance Task Force (e.g. President's Call for a Communication and Governance Task Force)
RT.13   Communication and Governance Task Force Webpage
RT.14   College Council Webpage
RT.15   Communication and Governance Task Force Webpage

Annual Report Data Analysis:

Each year the College reviews the data on key college metrics, including successful course completion, degree and certificate and transfer metrics, and licensure pass rates and job placement rates for Career Education programs. Recommendations for any needed changes to the institutionally set standards (the baseline expectations for the college) and/or stretch goals as needed are made each year following college discussion of the data (AR.1).

Course success and college completion:
For the past three years SCC measures of student success and completion have remained above the institutionally set baseline standards, but below the College stretch goals. These results were discussed by the CSPC (AR.2). Work being conducted as part of major college efforts related to Student Equity and Guided Pathways is expected to lead to improvements in these metrics.

SLO assessment:
SLO assessment is conducted across the college at the course, program, and institutional levels. SCC engages in ongoing assessment and improvement for its SLO reporting processes (AR.3). Currently, the college is working to improve the tools used for SLO reporting (see Actionable Improvement Plan 2 on page 6).

Career education:
The licensure pass rate for SCC students completing Career Education programs is currently high, often above the college stretch goals. In the coming year, the college will reconsider the stated stretch goals. It should be noted that the institutionally-set standards for employment have been based on Perkins data, which does not include self-employed individuals. Because of that, the baseline standards were set lower for fields in which substantial self-employment is expected. In the future, the college will consider moving to a different data source.

Job placement rates for most Career Education programs are higher than the institutionally set standards. The most recently available Perkins data show a few programs with job placement rates below the institutionally set baseline standard. Those are programs that typically result in substantial self-employment of graduates, which is not reflected in the available data. There have been improvements in this metric in recent years with many programs now above the stretch goals. In future years, the college will consider revising the stretch goals.

Evidence: AR

AR.1   College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/24/17, 11/15/17, and 04/12/18)
AR.2   College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes (e.g. minutes of 11/15/17)
AR.3   Student Learning Outcomes Report (e.g. Fall 2018 Institutional Effectiveness Reports)

ACCJC Midterm Report Data Reporting Form

ANNUAL REPORT DATA
INSTITUTION-SET STANDARDS

Sacramento City College

STUDENT COURSE COMPLETION
(Definition: The course completion rate is calculated based on the number of student completions with a grade of C or better divided by the number of student enrollments.)

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Review		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Institution Set Standard	63%	63%	63%
Stretch Goal	70%	70%	70%
Actual Performance	67%	67%	68%
Difference between Standard and Performance	4%	4%	5%
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-3%	-3%	-2%

Analysis of the data: The College is above the ISS for this metric, but below the stretch goal. SCC Student Equity efforts are expected to result in improvements in this measure.

DEGREE COMPLETION
(Students who received one or more degrees may only be counted once.)

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Review		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Institution Set Standard	1000	1000	1000
Stretch Goal	1880	1880	1880
Actual Performance	1634	1582	1692
Difference between Standard and Performance	634	582	692
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-246	-298	-188

Analysis of the data: The College is above the ISS for this metric, and moving toward the stretch goal. SCC Guided Pathways work is expected to result in improvements.

CERTIFICATE COMPLETION
(Students who received one or more certificate may only be counted once.)

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Review		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Institution Set Standard	350	350	350
Stretch Goal	637	637	637
Actual Performance	606	464	381
Difference between Standard and Performance	287	114	31
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-31	-173	-256

Analysis of the data: This metric is above the ISS, but declining. SCC Guided Pathways and Strong workforce efforts are expected to reverse this trend.

TRANSFER

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Review		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Institution Set Standard	700	700	700
Stretch Goal	1095	1095	1095
Actual Performance	935	931	1031
Difference between Standard and Performance	235	231	331
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-160	-164	-64

Analysis of the data: The College is above the ISS for this metric, and moving toward the stretch goal. SCC Guided Pathways work is expected to result in improvements.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Number of Courses	1311	1491	1493
Number of Courses Assessed	1243	1421	1491
Number of Programs	212	195	195
Number of Programs Assessed	183	195	195
Number of Institutional Outcomes	22	27	24
Number of Outcomes Assessed	22	20	24

Analysis of the data: SCC is conducting SLO assessment across the college. We are working on continuous improvement of SLO assessment reporting tools.

LICENSURE PASS RATE

(Definition: The rate is determined by the number of students who passed the licensure examination divided by the number of students who took the examination.)

Program Name	Institution Set Standard	Actual Performance			Difference			Stretch Goal	Difference		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3		Y1	Y2	Y3
Cosmetology (written)	80%	92%	87%	74%	12%	7%	-6%	85%	7%	2%	-11%
Cosmetology (practical)	80%	100%	95%	96%	20%	15%	16%	85%	15%	10%	11%
Nail Technology (written)	80%	100%	86%	88%	20%	6%	8%	85%	15%	1%	3%
Nail Technology (practical)	80%	100%	97%	86%	20%	7%	6%	85%	15%	2%	1%
Dental Hygiene (national)	80%	100%	100%	100%	20%	20%	20%	85%	15%	15%	15%
Dental Hygiene (state)	80%	100%	100%	100%	20%	20%	20%	85%	15%	15%	15%
Dental Assisting (written)	80%	92%	100%	91%	12%	20%	11%	85%	7%	15%	6%
Dental Assisting (practical)	80%	100%	96%	n/a	20%	16%	n/a	85%	15%	11%	n/a
Physical Therapist Assistant	85%	100%	100%	92%	15%	15%	7%	90%	10%	10%	2%
Registered Nursing	80%	94%	93%	97%	14%	13%	17%	85%	9%	8%	12%
Vocational Nursing	80%	86%	97%	100%	6%	17%	20%	85%	1%	12%	15%
Electronics Technology (element 1)	80%	100%	n<10	n<10	20%	n<10	n<10	85%	15%	n<10	n<10
Electronics Technology (element 2)	80%	95%	n<10	n/a	15%	n<10	n/a	85%	10%	n<10	n/a
Electronics Technology (element 3)	80%	95%	n<10	n<10	15%	n<10	n<10	85%	10%	n<10	n<10
Mechanical-Electrical Technology (type 1)	80%	93%	96%	86%	13%	16%	6%	85%	8%	11%	1%
Mechanical-Electrical Technology (type 2)	80%	91%	96%	89%	11%	16%	9%	85%	6%	11%	4%
Mechanical-Electrical Technology (type 3)	80%	76%	98%	84%	-4%	18%	4%	85%	-9%	13%	-1%
Mechanical-Electrical Technology (universal)	80%	73%	96%	82%	-7%	16%	2%	85%	-12%	11%	-3%
Railroad Operations	80%	100%	n/a	n/a	20%	n/a	n/a	85%	15%	n/a	n/a
Aeronautics-Airframe & Powerplant	80%	100%	100%	100%	20%	20%	20%	85%	15%	15%	15%
Air Dispatch (FAA Knowledge)	80%	100%	n<10	81%	20%	n<10	1%	85%	15%	n<10	-4%
Air Dispatch (FAA Practical)	80%	100%	100%	100%	20%	20%	20%	85%	15%	15%	15%

JOB PLACEMENT RATE

(Definition: The placement rate is determined by the number of students employed in the year following graduation divided by the number of students who completed the program.)

Program Name	Institution Set Standard	Actual Performance			Difference			Stretch Goal	Difference		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3		Y1	Y2	Y3
Business and Commerce, General	70%	60%	76%	87%	-10%	6%	17%	75%	-15%	1%	12%
Accounting	70%	68%	76%	81%	-2%	6%	11%	75%	-7%	1%	6%
Business Mangement	70%	64%	73%	71%	-6%	3%	1%	75%	-11%	-2%	-4%
Real Estate	60%	57%	N<10	N<10	-3%	N<10	N<10	65%	-8%	N<10	N<10
Digital Media	60%	80%	67%	62%	20%	7%	2%	65%	15%	2%	-3%
Computer Programming	70%	39%	55%	59%	-31%	-15%	-11%	75%	-36%	-20%	-16%
Computer Infrastructure and Support	70%	N<10	N<10	80%	N<10	N<10	10%	75%	N<10	N<10	5%
Computer Networking	70%	66%	77%	76%	-4%	7%	6%	75%	-9%	2%	1%
Electronics and Electric Technology	70%	87%	64%	63%	17%	-6%	-7%	75%	12%	-11%	-12%
Environmental Control Technology	70%	85%	87%	86%	15%	17%	16%	75%	10%	12%	11%
Railroad and Light Rail Operations	60%	50%	70%	72%	-10%	10%	12%	65%	-15%	5%	7%
Aeronautical and Aviation Technology	60%	79%	73%	71%	19%	13%	11%	65%	14%	8%	6%
Drafting Technology	70%	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	75%	N<10	N<10	N<10
Applied Photography	60%	57%	56%	56%	-3%	-4%	-4%	65%	-8%	-9%	-9%
Occupational Therapy Technology	75%	82%	90%	83%	7%	15%	8%	80%	2%	10%	3%
Physical Therapist Assistant	75%	69%	100%	91%	-6%	25%	16%	80%	-11%	20%	11%
Registered Nursing	75%	86%	96%	98%	11%	21%	23%	80%	6%	16%	18%
Licensed Vocational Nursing	75%	79%	85%	88%	4%	10%	13%	80%	-1%	5%	8%
Dental Assistant	75%	88%	85%	88%	13%	10%	13%	80%	8%	5%	8%
Dental Hygienist	75%	85%	89%	96%	10%	14%	21%	80%	5%	9%	16%
Child Development/Early Care and Education	60%	69%	87%	90%	9%	27%	30%	65%	4%	22%	25%
Library Technician	70%	N<10	92%	90%	N<10	22%	20%	75%	N<10	17%	15%
Administration of Justice	70%	77%	80%	83%	7%	10%	13%	75%	2%	5%	8%
Cosmetology and Barbering	60%	55%	64%	80%	-5%	4%	20%	65%	-10%	-1%	15%
Piloting	60%	N<10	77%	N<10	N<10	17%	N<10	65%	N<10	12%	N<10
Air Traffic Control	60%	N<10	60%	N<10	N<10	0%	N<10	65%	N<10	-5%	N<10

Note: Degrees and certificates are grouped by 6-digit TOP code.

ANNUAL FISCAL REPORT DATA

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Reviews		

General Fund Performance

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Revenue	$346,201,354	$331,965,562	$347,975,390
Expenditures	$329,622,399	$323,592,800	$353,999,378
Expenditures for Salaries and Benefits	$267,866,857	$276,448,045	$287,436,211
Surplus/Deficit	$16,578,955	$8,372,762	($6,023,988)
Surplus/Deficit as % Revenues (Net Operating Revenue Ratio)	4.8%	2.5%	-1.7%
Reserve (Primary Reserve Ratio)	15.6%	18.5%	15.2%

Analysis of the data:

2018 Unrestricted General Fund Revenues increased by $16M, offset by an increase in expenditures of $30.4M. This is mainly the result of increases in Salaries and Benefits from both mandatory and discretionary salary improvements, coupled with increasing employer pension contributions required by PERS and STRS. The surpluses generated in 2016 and 2017 were also due to an influx of one-time funding dollars that were recognized as revenues in those years but spent in the subsequent period, resulting in the observed 2018 general fund deficit. Our Primary Reserve Ratio remains robust and reflective of the District's focus on prudent fiscal management.

Other Post-Employment Benefits

Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) for OPEB	$77,820,930	$100,810,484	$107,057,954
Funded Ration (Actuarial Value of Plan Assets/AAL)	135%	108%	109%
Annual Required Contribution (ARC)	0	0	0
Amount of Contribution to ARC	$3,200,000	$3,200,000	$3,200,000

Analysis of the data:

The District's OPEB plan remains in an overfunded status. The increase in the AAL and corresponding decrease in the funded ratio, beginning in 2017, is primarily due to a Board approved increase to the District's retiree medical premium benefit. Effective July 1, 2017 the monthly benefit was increased from $256 to $280. The District's OPEB plan remains in an overfunded status and any additional increases will be carefully considered to ensure that the plan remains fully funded.

Enrollment

Actual Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTES)	47,779	52,640	44,353

Analysis of the data:

Similar to other Districts within the California Community College System, we have been experiencing flat and declining enrollment over the last few years. The increase in FTES for 2017 was due to allocating more Summer FTES to that year in order to capture available growth funding. Although we will continue to focus on outreach efforts to stabilize and grow our enrollment, our analysis indicates that any decrease in our FTES derived funding will be fully offset by an increase in the Supplemental and Student Success Incentive Allocations under the new funding formula for California Community Colleges.

ANNUAL FISCAL REPORT DATA

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Reviews

Financial Aid:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
USED Official Cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD- 3 year rate)	20.3%	21.8%	20.4%

Analysis of the data:

The student loan default rate for Sacramento City College shows no upward nor downward trend in recent years. Work being done toward reducing the rate includes Direct Loan Exit Counseling notifications being sent to students who are no longer enrolled, drop below 6 units, or transfer from Sacramento City College. We have student loan borrower rights and responsibilities information available on the financial aid website. The financial aid office collaborates with business faculty to provide financial literacy and wellness workshops and classroom presentations. Work being done toward reducing the rate in the future includes expanding our financial literacy and wellness program and working with a Default Prevention Management Company.

Appendices

<u>Evidence:</u>

Please note that the Appendices includes the PDF versions of listed documents unless otherwise stated in the description of the evidence.

Report Preparation (RP):

RP.1   SCC's 2015 Accreditation Webpage
RP.2   External Evaluation Report
RP.3   Reaffirmation of Accreditation Letter
RP.4   Follow-up Report
RP.5   ACCJC Response
RP.6   Academic Senate Minutes 04/03/18
RP.7   Classified Senate Minutes 04/12/18
RP.8   Student Senate Minutes 04/18/18
RP.9   Executive Council Minutes 04/02/18
RP.10   Department Chairs Council Minutes 04/05/18
RP.11   President's Cabinet Minutes 04/03/18
RP.12   Senior Leadership Team Minutes 04/11/18
RP.13   Senior Leadership Team Minutes 09/12/18
RP.14   Classified Senate Minutes 10/11/18
RP.15   Student Senate Minutes 10/10/18
RP.16   Academic Senate Minutes 10/09/18

Plans Arising Out of the Self-Evaluation Process (AIP):

AIP.1.1   Executive Council Minutes 10/17/16
             College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes 09/28/17
AIP.1.2   Planning Handbook
AIP.1.3   College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes 04/19/17
AIP.1.4   College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes 03/05/18
             College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes 04/24/18
AIP.1.5   College Council Webpage

AIP.2.1   Sacramento City College Student Learning Outcomes Toolkit
AIP.2.2   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes 10/22/15
AIP.2.3   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes 10/05/17
             Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes 10/19/17
AIP.2.4   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes 02/15/18
AIP.2.5   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes 09/20/18
AIP.2.6   Student Learning Outcomes Institutional Effectiveness Report Fall 2018

AIP.3.1   The Governance Guide: A Guide to Participatory Decision-Making at Sacramento City
             College
AIP.3.2   Executive Council Minutes 03/05/18
AIP.3.3   College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes 03/05/18
AIP.3.4   Communication and Governance Task Force Minutes 04/25/18
             Communication and Governance Task Force Minutes 05/07/18
AIP.3.5   Communication and Governance Task Force Webpage

AIP.3.6   [College Council Webpage](#)

AIP.4.1   [Executive Council Minutes 10/16/17](#)
AIP.4.2   [Effectiveness of Governance and Communication Survey 2017](#)
AIP.4.3   [Executive Council Minutes 03/05/18](#)
AIP.4.4   [Communication and Governance Task Force Webpage](#)
AIP.4.5   [College Council Webpage](#)
AIP.4.6   [President's Information Exchange](#)
AIP.4.7   [Public Information Office Staff and Faculty Newsletter](#)
                [Public Information Office Student Newsletter](#)

Response to Team Recommendation for Improvement (RT):

RT.1   [Academic Senate Minutes 02/23/16](#)
RT.2   [Academic Senate Minutes 09/13/16](#)
RT.3   [Department Chairs Council Minutes 10/01/15](#)
                [Department Chairs Council Minutes 03/03/16](#)
RT.4   [Classified Senate Minutes 10/08/15](#)
RT.5   [Senior Leadership Team Minutes 12/14/15](#)
RT.6   [Department Chairs Council Minutes 03/03/16](#)
RT.7   ["Best Practices" Document in The Governance Guide: A Guide to Participatory Decision-Making at Sacramento City College (Section IV: Page 5 and 6)](#)
RT.8   [Ibid.](#)
RT.9   [Academic Senate Minutes 09/20/16](#)
RT.10   [Executive Council Minutes 10/17/16](#)
RT.11   [Executive Council Minutes 03/05/18](#)
                [Academic Senate Minutes 03/13/18](#)
                [Classified Senate Minutes 04/12/18](#)
                [Senior Leadership Team Minutes 03/14/18](#)
RT.12   [President's Call for a Communication and Governance Task Force (e.g. President's Call for a Communication and Governance Task Force)](#)
RT.13   [Communication and Governance Task Force Webpage](#)
RT.14   [College Council Webpage](#)
RT.15   [Communication and Governance Task Force Webpage](#)

Annual Report Data Analysis (AR):

AR.1   [College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes 10/24/17](#)
                [College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes 11/15/17](#)
                [College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes 04/12/18](#)
AR.2   [College Strategic Planning Committee Minutes 11/15/17](#)
AR.3   [Student Learning Outcomes Institutional Effectiveness Report Fall 2018](#)

Notes for Data Section:

Please note that the additional information listed below pertains to individual sub-sections of the ACCJC Midterm Report Data Reporting Form. This information reflects the Institution-Set Standards reported in the 2018 Annual Report. However, Licensure Pass Rate numbers have been updated since the 2018 Annual Report.

Annual Report Data:

Please note:

- Year 1 is 2015
- Year 2 is 2016
- Year 3 is 2017

Licensure Pass Rate:

Licensure Pass Rate numbers have been updated since the 2018 Annual Report.

Please note:

- Year 1 is 2015
- Year 2 is 2016
- Year 3 is 2017

Additional notes for 2016 (Year 2) Pass Rates:

- Electronics Technology (Elements 1, 2, and 3) had less than 10 students taking the exam.
- Railroad Operations exam was not offered.
- Air Dispatch (Knowledge Exam) had less than 10 students taking the exam.

Additional notes for 2017 (Year 3) Pass Rates:

- Electronics Technology (Element 1 and 3) had less than 10 students taking the exam.
- Electronics Technology (Element 2) was not taken.
- Railroad Operations exam was not offered.
- Dental Assisting (Practical Exam) was not offered.

Job Placement Rate:

Job rates based on Perkins Employment Data, which does not include self-employment. Because of this the Perkins-based institutionally-set standards are set somewhat lower for areas in which substantial self-employment is typical. Degrees and certificates with institution set standards for job placement rates are grouped by 6-digit TOP code because the Perkins employment is based on program TOP code.

Please note:

- Year 1 is 2014
- Year 2 is 2015
- Year 3 is 2016

Additional notes for 2014 (Year 1) Pass Rates:

- Perkins Total was less than 10 for the following program(s) in this academic year: Computer Infrastructure and Support, Drafting Technology, Library Technician (Aide), Corrections, Piloting, and Air Traffic Control.

Additional notes for 2015 (Year 2) Pass Rates:

- Perkins Total was less than 10 for the following program(s) in this academic year: Real Estate, Computer Infrastructure and Support, and Drafting Technology.

Additional notes for 2016 (Year 3) Pass Rates:

- Perkins Total was less than 10 for the following program(s) in this academic year: Real Estate, Drafting Technology, Piloting, and Air Traffic Control.

Annual Fiscal Report Data:

Annual Fiscal Report Data, reporting years, and supporting explanations per District Fiscal.

Please note the Reporting Year for General Fund Performance, Other Post-Employment Benefits, and Enrollment:

- Year 1 is 2016 (2015-16)
- Year 2 is 2017 (2016-17)
- Year 3 is 2018 (2017-18)

Support for General Fund Performance category per Fiscal:

- Revenue support is from Year-End Object Code Report, Per ACCJC Includes Transfers-in (Fund 11, 13, 14 Only). FY16 and 17 agreed to annual reports submitted to ACCJC.
- Expenditures support is from Year-End Object Code Report, Per ACCJC Includes Transfers-out (Fund 11, 13, 14 Only). FY16 and 17 agreed to annual reports submitted to ACCJC.
- Expenditures support for Salaries and Benefits is from Year-End Object Code Report (Fund 11, 13, 14 Only). FY16 and 17 agreed to annual reports submitted to ACCJC.
- Surplus/(Deficit) support is Revenue-Expenditures.
- Surplus/(Deficit) as % Revenues (Net Operating Revenue Ratio) support is Surplus (Deficit)/Revenue
- Reserve (Primary Reserve Ratio) support from Ending Fund Balance (less Restricted Amount)/Expenditures. Ending Fund Balance from respective budget book pages for General and Instructionally Related Funds.

Please note the Reporting Year for Financial Aid:

- Year 1 is 2013
- Year 2 is 2014
- Year 3 is 2015