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Statement of Report Preparation:
(The statement, signed by the Chief Executive Officer of the institution, describes the process of report preparation and identifies those who were involved in its preparation, review, and approval.)
Response to Team Recommendations
(The report should describe the progress made on all recommendations, analyze the results achieved to date, provide evidence of the results, and indicate what additional plans the institution has developed.)

Recommendation 1 Student Learning Outcomes:
(Standards I.B.5; II.A.1.c)

(note: comments/suggestions shown in red)

Accreditation Recommendation 1: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the college build on the strong foundation it has established in identifying Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s) at the course, program, general education, and degree level to begin widely assessing the learning outcomes. The college should ensure that courses are assessed consistently across different sections of the same course and that the resulting findings are used by the departments to improve student learning (I.B.5; II.A.1.c).

Description
In working toward consistent assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program, general education, and degree level, Sacramento City College incorporated the analysis of SLO data into the Unit Plan process and the Program Review process beginning in spring 2010. Perhaps we should partially separate the notes about the two parts of this recommendation (1) work to ensure that courses are assess consistently across sections and (2) the resulting findings are used by the departments to improve student learning. For example, I think that the incorporation of SLOs in the Unit Planning process is part of the use of the resulting findings by the department, but not really part of ensuring consistency across sections. The new SLO annual reporting forms do fit both parts of the recommendation. In summer of 2010, templates for SLO plans and reports were revised to facilitate this analysis. A faculty SLO analyst was appointed for the 2010-2011 academic year, at .2 release time, to lead the SLO implementation activities planned for fall 2010. The College Strategic Planning Committee prepared the SLO Report, based on CCSSE data, assessing General Education Learning Outcomes.

In fall, 2010, a convocation activity for the entire college kicked off the SLO implementation activities. One of the major, initial components of this effort that was completed by each department was a 6-year multi-year plan indicating when SLO reports would be generated for each course offered by the department. *** INCLUDE LINKS TO THE PLANS AND REPORTS HERE*** The other major SLO reporting component presented at this time to enhance the consistency of and streamline the reporting process was the implementation of a revised SLO assessment reporting form for course-level assessments. The SLO coordinator and SLO analyst worked in tandem with department chairs on the implementation of the newly revised reporting forms, including types of assessments, assessment results, and changes planned based on those results. By the end of the semester, course SLO assessments had been implemented for instructional departments throughout the college.

In spring 2011, SLO reports using the new forms were filed college-wide. Course SLO’s were widely assessed across instructional areas and the resulting findings used at the department level to improve
student learning. Departments completed a mapping of General Education courses to GE learning outcomes. By the end of fall 2011, approximately 170 course SLO assessments reports had been completed and posted on InsideSCC.

At SCC our Institutional Student Learning Outcomes are defined as the combination of General Education SLOs (GELO’s) and Student Services SLOs. Substantial progress has been made in those areas. Initially, in 2010-11 items from the CCSSE survey were used to assess some GE SLOs. This method, however, proved to provide only incomplete information. Thus, in Fall 2011, the SLO subcommittee evaluated a sample of course assessment reports that aligned with SCC’s GELOs to include in a GELO pilot and a preliminary report was produced. The subcommittee also presented a variety of models for Program Learning Outcome assessments to instructional department chairs for their review. A college-wide survey on ProLO models was conducted to determine next steps for the college’s ProLO assessment effort in spring, 2012.

The College is actively assessing Student Services SLOs. Michael Poindexter, Vice President of Student Services, holds monthly meetings with all 19 Student Services Area Representatives. During most meetings throughout this three year period, at least one Student Services Area Representative reported about their SLO, assessment method used, assessment results, and improvements made in the teaching/learning process. These reporting out sessions proved to be an excellent forum for broadly sharing SLO progress within Student Services.

Given this foundational knowledge that each Area Representative has now for conducting SLO assessment, future plans for 2012 – 15 include unit partnering with at least one other Student Service Unit in assessing a common ProLO. In this way, Student Services can share common learning outcome data gathered across several student service units over time.

Student Services Division is currently engaged in the Program Review process for 2012 – 2015. The Program Review will cover all 19 Student Services Units and their full assessment cycle process on at least one SLO, measured during 2009 – 2011. 100% of Student Services Units have completed this one full assessment cycle and will be reporting their specific SLO(s), assessment measure(s), assessment results, and changes made to improve the learning process.

**Analysis**

Sacramento City College faculty, staff, and administrators have participated actively in the systematic development and implementation of SLO assessments at the course, program, general education, and degree level. Substantial progress has been made on the analysis and reporting of SLO assessment results at the course and institutional levels (see below). The next stage of SLO implementation will expand this effort to broaden the use of assessment results at the program level. A variety of forums and cross-constituency work groups have been employed to share information, obtain input from departments, and guide the college-wide effort to ensure consistency of assessment while valuing the perspectives of individual departments. The college’s SLO coordinator and SLO analyst regularly present progress and plans regarding SLO assessment across the college, most regularly to the Academic Senate and department chairs council. A representative from the SLO subcommittee of the Academic Senate also presents SLO updates to the Student Services area representatives (**check with Richard Erlich to confirm this.**)

An analysis of the course SLO assessment reports as of Fall, 2011(**check with MB on what date to put here) indicated a wide range of methods were used to assess SLOs across the college. The most commonly used assessment methods used were: exams and quizzes occurring throughout the course; final exams and projects; and homework, essays, papers, reports and other assignments (reference compilation
of this for CSPC?). As a result of the assessment of SLOs faculty reported a variety of planned changes to their courses. Plans to modify teaching methods and changes in exams or assignments were commonly reported. Changes in teaching methods were reported for over 50 courses in response to the assessment of SLOs.

The results of the course-embedded, GELO assessment pilot project that was conducted by the SLO subcommittee during spring and fall, 2011 have recently been compiled, analyzed, and presented to various groups across the college for discussion. This project utilized data from a sample of existing course reports completed in either Spring or Fall, 2011. The sample included results from 40 distinct course-level SLO assessments derived from 12 courses from several disciplines.

The results from the existing SLO assessments were first aligned with the college’s GELO categories based on the congruency of the course SLO with the GELOs. Several course SLOs aligned with multiple GELOs. Next, the SLO subcommittee developed and utilized a rubric to evaluate the level of success achieved on each of the aligned course SLOs. This evaluation was averaged across multiple raters to calculate an overall determination of either low, moderate, or high success for each outcome. Due to the limited sample size of aligned course SLOS for most of the GELOs, only two GELOs were included in the pilot results; Depth and Breadth of Understanding and Critical Thinking. **Do we want to include a link here or somewhere above to the official GELO document for context? For both of these GELOs, the results indicated that an overwhelming majority of students (~80%) achieved at least a “moderate” level of success.(see appendix for graphs of results).

Although the sample size was limited, further inspection indicated that SLOs encompassing both “Critical Thinking” and “Depth and Breadth of Understanding” had a somewhat unique influence of the pattern of results. Limiting the analysis to these SLOs only, resulted in more of a bimodal distribution as compared to the analysis that included SLOs unique to each GELO. In other words, the “moderate” data disappeared and was almost evenly split between the high and low success levels. (See graph ??? In appendix for more detail) These results may provide very preliminary support for the importance of knowledge fluency and context when providing analytical learning opportunities for students.

The use of SLO assessment results from all levels are now incorporated into the planning process. The Unit Plan Outcome Achievement Reports for 2010-11 included information on whether SLO assessment data had been used in the development or the measurement of the objectives for each unit. For approximately 13% of all unit plan objectives SLO assessment data was used to develop or evaluate the objective. All College Goals included objectives related to SLO assessment. Program Review includes analysis of SLO implementation. The annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports that are part of the College strategic planning process include an SLO report. Add a link here to those reports**

The implementation of program SLO (ProLO) assessment is currently underway. ProLOs have been defined for all degrees and certificates((See Socrates “SLO Reports”)) Additionally, since 2007(**check with Marilyn to confirm date) all new degrees and certificates and those that come through the curriculum review process as part of regular program review must submit a ProLO matrix that indicates the degree to which courses of the degree or certificate relate to each ProLO (See Public Folders, InsideSCC**not sure what to say here since Public Folders is not a complete database of these)

Although some programs, particularly those in the career/vocational areas have regularly assessed their program outcomes, the college is currently implementing a more systematic process for conducting and reporting ProLO assessments. Starting in Spring, 2011, the SLO subcommittee facilitated dialogue on ProLO assessment with the Academic Senate, Department Chairs Council and other groups. From this dialogue a number of different approaches to ProLO assessment were proposed and presented back to these groups for their feedback. In addition, a survey was conducted to determine which approaches or set of approaches would be preferable for the college to adopt. In general, the survey results indicate
strong support for both a “course-embedded” approach and the flexibility for departments to select the approach that was most appropriate for their needs. Based on the results of survey and college dialogue, the SLO coordinator and SLO analyst are formally working with departments currently undergoing program review to implement college-wide ProLO assessment. The ProLO assessment planning and implementation component will now be a consistent component to the program review process (**Does this accurately represent where we are going with this?)

Plan
The college will continue to incorporate SLO assessment into our planning and curricular documents and timelines so that the academic community remains fully engaged in the assessment process, using the results to restructure curricula for optimal student learning. Having established the use of SLO assessment data at the course and institutional level the next area of emphasis in our SLO work will be to broaden the use of Program SLO assessment data. (Does this section need to be expanded?)
Recommendation 2. Evaluation of facilities planning process
(Standard I.A.4; I.B.1; I.B.3; I.B.4; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.1.a; III.D.1.d; and IV.B.3.g)

Accreditation Recommendation 2: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop a more interactive process to keep the campus community engaged and informed of capital construction projects and the college planning process. (I.A.4; I.B.1; I.B.3; I.B.4; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.1.a; III.D.1.d; and IV.B.3.g)

Description:
The self study and the results of the staff survey (?) indicate that the campus community is not kept informed or involved in the physical resource planning and that dissemination of information pertaining to facilities needs improvement.

Facilities planning at both the main and outreach campuses reflects a coordinated approach between the district and the college based on an integrated set of planning processes. Planning begins with the development of the District’s Long Range Capital Needs Plan, which reflects a collaboratively developed long-term vision for facilities growth, modernization and renovation throughout the District based on enrollment forecasts and facility assessments. The LRCNP is dependent on quantitative evaluation of existing space, the ability to serve students and carefully documented projections of future needs.

SCC follows the Five-Year Construction Plan, which is developed as a shared responsibility between the College and the District. This plan represents the prioritization of new construction, modernizations, renovation, and maintenance projects at SCC, as reflected in the Facilities Master Plan.

To ensure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in support of its programs and services, the College has developed a number of decision support tools associated with long range capital planning. These tools include facilities master planning, annual updates of the Five-Year Construction Plan, review of the facilities deficiency database, Facility Resource Association Plan and the development of design standards.

The Vice President of Administration supervises the Director of Operations and oversees all aspects of the physical facilities. The Director of Operations, with Facilities Management, conducts numerous meetings with the end-users of proposed new facilities. The Director of Operations coordinates and ensures all parties invested in a project have the opportunity to participate in plan development. These meetings normally include the Facilities Management project manager, the Division Dean/manager, Department Chairs, appropriate faculty members, classified staff and other administrative personnel. The Campus Development Committee is given monthly updates on construction projects to keep the campus community apprised of the College’s construction program. The SCC Executive Council is updated at least annually on planned construction projects.

The Director of Operations and the Vice President of Administration have been collaborating on the response since the spring and summer of 2010. The revised Facilities Master Plan and revised Facilities Resource Plan will hold additional information on future projects’ designs, the flow of
the project, bids and awards and construction. Facilities updates were made through the Senior Leadership Team, Executive Council and during Convocation in order to formalize the information. Updates included documents that provide evidence for future project work, taking into account accreditation. An evaluation conducted by the Director of Operation and the Campus Development Committee covered the planning process from the start of a project to its conclusion, with special focus on communication between all parties, including end-users. The results of the evaluation were used to inform facilities project work.

In the fall of 2010, the Facilities Master Plan was updated to include projects associated with Measure M, which was passed in 2008. Measure A projects, passed in 2002, were documented in the original Facilities Master Plan in 2004. Both Plans were completed with extensive campus involvement through the Campus Development Committee, and information about planned projects was disseminated throughout the college community. The Facility Master Plans are posted to the web page Inside SCC for college community review and reference.

During the spring and fall of 2011, the SCC Facilities Resource Plan was modified to include more information about capital projects. The focus of this resource plan was campus level facility projects and how they were integrated into the unit planning system. Capital projects are covered by a host of district regulations and processes, covered in the Resource and Capital Outlay Institutional Plan (?). Some of the information about capital projects will be included in the Facilities Resource plan.

A Long Range Capital Needs Plan (?) metric chart is included in the quarterly metric briefing. This chart details the planned schedule for capital projects. Managers are briefed on this schedule and kept informed of changes that occur over time. The metric briefs are routinely posted on the college web page Inside SCC.

With each capital project, faculty, staff and management that are impacted by the building project are involved from the beginning of the project, including the selection of the architect doing the design work and an exhaustive set of design/planning meetings with the architectural team and district staff who will be managing the project. The design meetings take place at the beginning of the construction project and set the stage for the construction phase that follows. Using budget and scope of projects, all campus issues are addressed and resolved during design. Occasionally, during the bid process in difficult bid environments, the college community is involved if there is a need to modify the scope of the project with proposed changes to adjust the dollar amount of the project.

The facilities Master Plan is online at Inside SCC; the Facilities Resource Plan should be completed by the end of 2011. The metrics are embedded in the quarterly metric brief and are online in the Inside SCC archives. Architectural meeting minutes/notes are retained by Facilities Management and Campus Operations.

Analysis:
The Director of Operations and the Vice President of Administration have been collaborating on the response since the spring of summer 2010. The College has developed a number of decision support tools associated with long range capital planning, including the facilities master
planning, annual updates of the five-year Construction Plan, review of the facilities deficiency database, Facility Resource Association plan and the development of design standards. The Vice President of Administration supervises the Director of Operations and oversees all aspects of physical facilities. The Director of Operation and Facilities Management conducts numerous meeting with the end-users of proposed new facilities. All parties invested in a project have the opportunity to participate in plan development. The Campus Development Committee is given monthly updates on construction projects to keep the campus community apprised of the College’s construction program.

With each capital project, faculty staff and management impacted by the building project are involved from the beginning of the project. Using budget and scope of projects, all campus issues are addressed and resolved during design. The facilities Master Plan is online at Inside SCC, and the Facilities Resource Plan should be completed by the end of 2011.

**Plan:**
Faculty, staff and management impacted by building projects will continue to be involved from inception with the selection of the architect doing the design work. Campus issues are addressed and resolved during design. If there is a need to modify the scope of the project the campus is involved with proposed changes to adjust to the cost of the project. The facilities Master Plan is online at Inside SCC. The Facilities Resource Plan should be completed by year’s end; the metrics are embedded in the quarterly metric brief and are online in the Inside SCC archives.
Recommendation 3. Website
(Standard II.A.6.c, III.C)

Accreditation Recommendation 3. In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop an approach to redesigning its website to ensure that it is non duplicative, effectively opens documents and informational materials with one click, and provides accuracy and effectiveness for students and public audiences. (II.A.6.c, III.C)

Description
Sacramento City College’s website is often the “first face” encountered by the community. The accuracy of information and effectiveness of navigation to find that information is of high priority to the institution. Maintaining and updating the website is under the leadership of the Information Technology Dean. Improvement to the website is a continuous process.
By means of a campus-wide evaluation of the website, Spring 2010 saw the opening of the InsideSCC website, which allowed access a broad spectrum of information, is available to the community (and world). For staff, this website addition facilitated access to campus-only information without having to re-authenticate when moving from area to area.
Discussions are currently underway about additional improvements to the InsideSCC website. The President’s Cabinet is exploring ways to improve the design and functionality of the site. Of particular interest at these discussions are improving ease of navigation within this complex website and reviewing how areas of the website are maintained.

Analysis
To ensure ongoing improvement, the Staff Resource Center has facilitated the presentation of workshops where staff receive training on the use of Ingeniux, the college’s web design tool. This training is continuous and is provided at least four times per school year, at each flex program and during each semester.

The InsideSCC website has seen improved access to forms and other information which previously were available only as a hard copy. Staff would have had to go to the admissions’ window or an administrators’ office. This improvement is an example of those services appreciated by staff and

Plan
As the improvement of the website is continually ongoing, the Information Technology area will research new areas of possible development, seek input from staff regularly, and evaluate the effectiveness of the website. The level of design continuity between departments will be addressed in this process.
Recommendation 4 Assessment portability
(Standard IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3)

Accreditation Recommendation 4: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college move forward with implementation of reciprocity of student placement assessments district wide (IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3).

Description
The Los Rios Community College District is comprised of four colleges, American River College, Cosumnes River College, Folsom Lake College, and Sacramento City College. Over the years, each college developed its own curriculum for reading, writing, mathematics, and ESL, as well as its own assessment processes for placing students in the appropriate courses. Both assessment instruments and placement processes varied by college. As a result, students attending more than one college or attending a different college than where they were initially assessed often had to be reassessed before enrolling in reading, writing, mathematics or ESL courses. This was confusing to students and costly in terms of student time and college assessment resources.

Beginning in 2006, the District Academic Senate and its committees in collaboration with the District’s Office of Education and Technology agreed to address curriculum alignment and assessment portability issues to create a more effective and integrated placement process. As detailed in the August 2009 LRCCD Status Report on Assessment Portability, the District formed an Assessment Portability Task Force to oversee reading, writing, mathematics, and ESL curriculum alignment; review and select appropriate assessment instruments; and collaboratively develop a District placement portability process (Ref. 1). In 2008, the first step to align curriculum course outlines through alignment of student learning outcomes was completed. Then, in April 2010, discipline representatives from all four colleges signed memos of understanding (MOUs) for accepting placements made at other colleges (Ref. 2). The agreements stipulated honoring the placements during a two-year pilot period while research was conducted to assess the success of students who transferred their placements to another district college. Next, the District contributed resources in Spring 2011 to purchase new assessment instruments at two of the colleges to replace instruments considered unacceptable by the other colleges. Then, in Fall 2011 with the new instruments and placement processes in place, students were able for the first time to port their placements to any district college regardless of where they were assessed and what assessment instrument was used. During this same time, discipline faculty agreed to a district wide two-year recency limit for all placements. The recency limit will become effective in Summer 2012.

Analysis
Sacramento City College faculty, staff, and administrators have actively participated with their colleagues across the District in the implementation of reciprocity of student placement assessments across all four colleges. The faculty have aligned SCC’s reading, writing, mathematics, and ESL curriculum with curriculum from the other three district colleges. The college has adopted the COMPASS assessment instrument as agreed. Beginning in Fall 2011, the assessment office staff implemented procedures to accept placements ported from other district colleges and to provide appropriate documentation for students wishing to port SCC
placements to another college. As agreed to in the discipline MOUs (Ref. 2), the District has a research plan in place to track the number of placements ported across the colleges and then assess how ported students’ success rates compare to native students’ success rates.

The college is also aware the state is exploring recommendation and implementation of a common community college placement assessment instrument state wide and is carefully following the discussion.

**Plan**
The college will participate in the District’s assessment portability research plan and collaborate with the other District colleges to use the results to determine and implement any needed placement improvements. District Research Offices will assist in determining the effects of assessment portability on student success.

The college will collaborate with the other District colleges to explore adoption of a common state wide community college placement assessment instrument if such an instrument is proposed.
Response to Self-identified Issues:
(In the Planning Agenda section of the self study, the institution reported on areas needing improvement. The institution should provide a brief description of the progress made on these self-identified issues)

Planning Agenda Item 1 - Effective communication.
Standards I.A.3, I.B.6, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.D.2.b, IV.A.2, IV.B.3.f

Planning Agenda Item:
By spring of 2010, the College President and the Public Information Officer will convene a task force to evaluate and report on the effectiveness of the numerous paths of communication, training and dissemination of information used to promote broad-based understanding and engagement in such College processes as planning and governance. This report will be reviewed for feedback through the constituency process outlined in the Blue Book with implementation of approved methods by spring 2011.

Description/Analysis:
A task force was established and met during spring 2010. It was determined that both qualitative methods (focus groups), and quantitative methods (survey research), would be used to address this item. In the fall of 2010, the PIO and PRIE dean conducted focus groups for each constituency group. Results of the focus groups were used to understand the underlying issues and to develop survey items. Because of overlapping issues, the survey of the effectiveness of college communication was combined with the survey of the effectiveness of governance structures to be administered in spring 2011.

A survey of college communication and decision making was conducted in spring 2011. Results were analyzed and reported to the President’s Cabinet. This method can be used periodically to gather information about communication across the college.

Results of the survey indicated….add information here about the results of the survey with respect to effective communication.

Results of the survey were disseminated to each of the constituency leaders, the College Strategic Planning Committee, the standing committee tri-chairs and the President’s Cabinet in fall 2011.

The College President hosted a meeting of the standing committee tri-hairs in order to broaden communication between committees and increase the alignment and integration of their work. The College President also hosted a meeting of individuals from across the college who are involved in staff development activities in order broaden communication and increase the alignment and integration of those activities.

Plan:
Over next year, the PRIE Office with work with the standing committees and the leadership of college constituency groups to continue to promote understanding of and engagement in college processes. The survey will be conducted again in Spring 2013.

Planning Agenda Item #2 - Student Learning Outcomes.
Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, and II.A.2.f
Planning Agenda Item:
By fall 2010, the Offices of Instruction and Student Services in conjunction with the PRIE Dean and SLO Advisory Group will engage the campus in broad-based dialogue on student success measured through learning outcomes assessment data and the design and implementation of processes to integrate this data with the program review process and the planning framework of the College.

SEE RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 1

Planning Agenda Items 3 and 4 - Training on the use of data.
Standards 3 and 4, I.B.5 and II.A.1.b

Planning Agenda Items:
3. By fall 2010, the Planning Research and Institutional Effectiveness Office will work with the PRIE Committee to provide ongoing training to the College community in working with data to assess institutional quality and student success that will affect change.

4. Continuing through Spring 2012, the Instructional and Student Services Leadership and the PRIE Dean will conduct workshops through the spring of 2012 focusing on the use of data such as the Community College Survey of Student Engagement and Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey in program review, Student Learning Outcomes assessment and planning.

Description/Analysis:
During the spring of 2010, Flex workshops by the PRIE dean, the PRIE Committee and others were presented. These workshops covered student success data, SLO data, student demographics, pre-requisite validation and the use of Survey Monkey. The PRIE Committee reviewed institutional quality data and provided input to the PRIE Office on how to make the data more user friendly and more effective for strategic planning. The CCSSE was administered for the second time at the College and the PRIE Committee discussed CCSSE data and its use.

In the summer of 2010, CCSSE data was used to begin assessing GELO’s and the results became part of the SLO Report prepared for the College Strategic Planning Committee.

In fall 2010, a workshop on CCSSE data occurred in mid-September for faculty who participated in the survey. CCSSE data was also presented and discussed at the Department Chairs Council and the Senior Leadership Team meetings. The Student Service Program Review process included survey data. The PRIE office produced targeted data reports for CSPC and PRIE including several Institutional Effectiveness Reports. August Flex workshops related to the use of data, such as student success data, SLO data, student demography, use of Survey Monkey. The PRIE committee reviewed the Institutional Effectiveness Reports, discussed the data, chose specific data on freshmen success to focus on for college-wide discussions and selected liaisons from the committee to various college areas.

During the spring of 2011, the SLO subcommittee discussed the use of CCSSE data as indicators of General Education Learning Outcomes at the college. The PRIE dean held individual conversations with all deans and supervisors about planning and the use of data in the planning process in the summer of 2011. The PRIE office provided on request training on data use for assessment validation, unit planning, survey development and program review as needed by individuals and groups. The PRIE Committee led college-wide discussion of data on the success of first time freshmen at SCC. Venues for discussion included the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Senior Leadership Team, Student Government, Basic Skills Committee, etc.
As of fall 2011, focus of training has shifted to the use of in-house surveys by departments for planning purposes. Groups developing survey with the help of the PRIE Office include the Photography, English and ESL Departments, the Summer Success Academy, the student government, the faculty involved in the West Sacramento Learning Community, etc. Individual training on survey development provided for various campus groups including Cosmetology, Outreach, Social Sciences, Advanced Technology, etc.

**Plan:**
The PRIE Office will continue to provide ongoing training in the use and interpretation of data, both through workshops and individual on-demand assistance. Each fall the PRIE Committee will review a wide range of data about the College and choose a focus for college-wide discussion in the spring. The VPSS and VPI will continue to work to facilitate discussions about data related to student enrollment and success and work with areas in the use of that information for continuous improvement.

**Planning Agenda Item 5 - Matriculation redesign**
Standards II.B.1 and II.B.3.c

**Planning Agenda Item:**
Beginning in fall 2009, Student Services Leadership in conjunction with the Matriculation Committee will reconfigure matriculation processes based on recent program reviews. This redesign will focus on (1) fostering high levels of student engagement and (2) ensuring that more first-time students are aware of and access matriculation services (i.e., orientation, assessment, and counseling/advising services) prior to registration. A matriculation tracking system will be developed in order to identify and monitor the various pathways new students take through front door matriculation activities.

**Description/Analysis:**
During the 2009-2010 school year, the matriculation system at SCC was revised under the direction of Vice-President of Student Services, Michael Poindexter. A priority of the revision was that students be engaged at every stage in the matriculation process. The revisions include the following:

- New students are contacted by phone once they submit an application for admission and are then scheduled for an appointment to attend orientation and assessment. They are also scheduled for a New Student Counseling Workshop, which provides them with necessary registration and other critical success strategies to get them started on the right path.
- The newly designed matriculation process is intentionally prescriptive, not self-initiated, to ensure all students participate and receive the high touch front door services that produce results that breed success.
- All front door services are tracked using an Access Database until resources for the matriculation tracking system can be redirected to this task.

Currently, Student Services has programs which address: persistence, the Save Our Students (SOS) program campaigns for student success several times per year; early alert to academic success in the SARS program; equity of access to courses in the Priority Registration process; ease in getting started with an online orientation option; and non duplication of requirements by district-wide portability of assessments for course placements.

During the Spring 2011 semester, an Orientation taskforce is formed to address a redesign of orientation activities and explore the implementation of mandatory orientation. The report of the Orientation task force is presently an item on the Matriculation Committee’s February 2012 agenda. The task force recommendations include: Rename matriculation process as “Introduction to College,” Mandatory
Orientation for first-time students, continuous and ongoing “411” site maintained as the source of information for new students, faculty involvement in orientation, professional development for staff through national professional organizations, mandatory Human Career Development classes in the first year for new students, and additional resources for implementation of mandatory orientation and other components.

Beginning the 2011-2012 school year, the campus Matriculation Committee is currently revising the Matriculation Plan. All components of the matriculation process are being reviewed and revised to reflect current practices. The work of the committee should be completed March 2012, and forwarded to Executive Council.

Plan:
The Matriculation Plan revisions will be completed and implemented. Data will be collected to assess the impacts of the changes.

Planning Agenda Item 6 - Evaluation of SS structures
Standard II.B.4

Planning Agenda Item:
During 2009-2010, Student Services Leadership will complete a comprehensive evaluation of the administrative and reporting structures within its service areas with the goal of identifying further administrative and departmental realignments that will lead to improved service to students and strengthen interpersonal and organizational relationships.

Description/analysis:
During Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 ad hoc planning teams were created to address the planning agenda item. The Associate Vice President of Student Services worked closely with staff – one-on-one and in small groups – to facilitate the changes.

During the next academic year (2011-12) realignments of Student Services administrative and departmental structure resulted in a changing organizational chart with…..need more detail here…

Plan:

Planning Agenda Item 7 – Library funding
Standard II.C.1.a

Planning Agenda Item:
By spring 2010, the Learning Resources Center (LRC) Dean and librarians will work with the District to analyze library funding to ensure a common, consistent and equitable base of ongoing funding for learning and research materials in libraries throughout the District.

Description/Analysis:
During Spring 2010 and Fall 2010 discussions related to this item were ongoing at the District Level. These discussions are included in the Library Materials Program Plan. The following an excerpt from the Program Plan documents for the Library Book and Media Collection for 2012-2013 year:

“a team of librarians and area managers across the district continues its work on a district-wide uniform materials funding plan that envisions sufficient and stable materials funding distributed
on an equitable basis to all colleges in the district, for the benefit of all students in the district. The uniform formula uses an FTES-based allocation formula that allows libraries to provide sufficient materials in appropriate formats at a steady pace to a growing and changing student population. Fulfillment of the district plan will give students at all campuses equitable access to adequate, accurate, and current library materials. It will also help to overcome historic budget fluctuations and allow for effective planning and consistent updating of collections. Adoption of a district formula will also address this SCC accreditation self-study recommendation:

*By Spring 2010, the LRC Dean and librarians will work with the District to analyze library funding to ensure a common, consistent and equitable base of ongoing funding for learning and research materials in libraries throughout the District.*

http://www.scc.losrios.edu/Documents/PRIE/ProgramPlans/2012-13PlnYr/Lib-Media.pdf

**Planning Agenda Item 8 - Evaluation of learning support areas**  
Standard II.C.2

**Planning Agenda Item:**  
Beginning in fall 2009, the PRIE Dean worked with learning support services areas staff and respective area deans to standardize the process of evaluating the services the labs provide and communicating the results of the evaluations.

**Description/Analysis:**  
In fall of 2009, a survey tool kit for evaluation of learning support areas was developed. Academic support labs can choose items from the tool kit and add their own in order to develop surveys that measure the effectiveness of their work. The Tutoring Center piloted the survey toolkit in spring of 2010, and the ESL lab piloted the survey toolkit in fall of 2010.

The ESL pilot results were available in the spring of 2011. Other implementation of the survey toolkit planned for fall of 2010 and spring of 2011 did not occur. It will be rescheduled for the 2011-12 academic year. New approaches may need to be developed.

In Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 the VPI and VPSS worked with individuals involved in offering tutoring at the college to define the tutoring programs available to students and improve the consolidated Tutoring Program Plan. As part of this work, information has been gathered on how the tutoring areas gather and use data in three areas: (1) usage of tutoring services (2) perceptions of the effectiveness of those services and (3) direct measures of the outcomes of tutoring.

**Plan:**  
The VPI and VPSS will continue to work to align tutoring services available across the College. The PRIE dean will assist with gathering data on the effectiveness of tutoring services.

**Planning Agenda Item 9 - Review hiring process:**  
Standard III.A.1.a

**Planning agenda item:**  
By fall 2010, the College Equity Officer will convene a task force with representation from the constituency groups to work with District Human Resources to explore options for increasing the breadth of information obtained during the interview process, while working within the framework of District hiring processes. The results of this analysis will be reported to the College.
Description/analysis:
The task force was convened in Spring 2010. It is a subcommittee of the Staff Equity & Diversity Committee, with all constituency groups represented. A proposal was developed for a pilot project that would allow faculty hiring committees to include a “live” teaching demo in front of students as part of the hiring process. The process was vetted by Human Resources at the district and by SCC President Jeffrey, who approved the pilot for Spring 2011. The proposal was presented to the Academic Senate on September 7, 2010. A draft of a revised process was designed. A survey instrument for assessing the effectiveness of the revised process has been designed.

During Spring 2011, hiring committees piloted the new process. The survey indicated that the information provided by the pilot process was valuable. A presentation was made to the Staff Equity & Diversity Committee by a group of Academic Senators on October 7, 2011.

Plan:
The Academic Senate has approved the continuation of the pilot to include a “live” teaching demonstration in the faculty hiring interview process for Spring 2012.

Planning Agenda Item 10 – Facilities planning
Standard III.B.2.b

Planning Agenda Item:
By spring 2010, the Director of Operations, in conjunction with the Campus Development Committee, will conduct an evaluation of the facilities planning process from the start of a project to its conclusion with special focus on the on-going communication between all parties in the process, including end-users. The result of this evaluation will inform future major facilities projects.

SEE ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION 2

Planning Agenda Item 11.-Staff participation in governance.
Standard IV.A.1

Note: It may be possible that Item 12 be included with the response for item 11 – as these actions are duplications for item 11

Planning Agenda Item:
Beginning in fall 2009, the College President will work with the Classified Senate to gather information on institutional practices related to staff participation in College governance processes and will report their findings to the Executive Council no later than May 2010. Executive Council will recommend appropriate action.

Description/Analysis:
Initial discussion during Fall 2009 led to Executive Council discussion of staff participation in governance during a Spring 2010 update on planning agenda progress. Some aspects of this item were combined with the college survey of communication and decision-making for which the results of that survey will be analyzed by constituency group and information on the responses of classified staff provided to the Classified Senate President (see planning agenda items 1 for further information and similarly for planning agenda 12).
The combined survey was administered in Spring 2011. The survey asked about engagement with college decision making and about the effectiveness of (1) college communication, (2) administrative structure and processes, and (3) participatory decision making processes. Over 160 SCC employees responded to the survey including 105 faculty, 42 classified staff and 10 administrators.

Results of the survey indicated that …. Need more information here on survey results with respect to staff engagement in governance.

The results of the survey were shared with the College President, the Senior Leadership Team, the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Associated Student Government and the SCC Standing Committees and the Department Chairs Council. The results of that survey were analyzed by constituency group and information on the responses of classified staff provided to the Classified Senate.

As of Fall 2011, the data from the survey of college decision-making and communication have become part of the Institutional Effectiveness Reports used by the College Strategic Planning Committee and the PRIE Committee.

Plan:
The Matriculation Committee has included the results of the report in meetings throughout 2011-2012. The Matriculation Committee will consider ways to make the mission and activities of the committee known to all campus staff during Spring 2012.

In Spring 2012, the Academic Senate has requested monthly reports from standing committee faculty chairs. The reports will be included in the AS agendas.

Need to develop this section?

Planning Agenda Item 12. – Effectiveness of governance structures
Standard IV.A.5

Planning Agenda Item:
Beginning in 2009-2010, the PRIE Dean will standardize the process for obtaining feedback on the effectiveness of the College governance structures and broaden the dissemination of results to the campus community.

Note: It may be possible to combine this with the response for item 11 – as these actions are duplications for item 11

In fall 2009 a draft of a pilot survey on the effectiveness of governance at SCC developed and presented at Executive Council, President’s Cabinet, Academic Senate and Classified Senate. During Spring 2010 the survey was piloted with participation by constituency leaders and councils and the results of the pilot survey were provided to the College President and Executive Council.

In Fall 2010 survey results were discussed with the CSPC and standing committee tri-chairs, the College President, the College Strategic Planning Committee and the Executive Council. This item was combined with the college survey of communication effectiveness; the results of that survey were analyzed by
constituency group and information on the responses of classified staff provided to the President’s Cabinet (For further information see item 1).

Due to related planning agenda items, focus groups were conducted to help develop survey questions that focus on effective college communication as well as the effectiveness of decision-making. The combined survey was administered in Spring 2011. The survey asked about engagement with college decision making and about the effectiveness of (1) college communication, (2) administrative structure and processes, and (3) participatory decision making processes. Over 160 SCC employees responded to the survey including 105 faculty, 42 classified staff and 10 administrators.

The results of the survey showed that…need to add information here on results with respect to the effectiveness of governance structures…

The results of the survey were shared with the College President, the Senior Leadership Team, the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Associated Student Government and the SCC Standing Committees and the Department Chairs Council. In Fall 2011 the data from the survey of college decision-making and communication have become part of the Institutional Effectiveness Reports used by the College Strategic Planning Committee and the PRIE Committee.

Plan: Need to develop this section.

Planning agenda item 13 - Process for President’s evaluation
Standard IV.B.1.j

Planning Agenda Item:
Beginning in 2009-2010, the Senior Leadership Team Chair and Classified Senate President will explore interest in developing a formal district-wide process in which classified and administrative staff members participate in an evaluation of a College President. The results of their exploration should be reported to the campus and district by fall 2010.

Description/Analysis:
In Fall 2010 District Policy 9000, Management and Confidential Personnel, Section 2.3 was revised to address this issue (12/15/10). The policy now states that “The Chancellor shall accept input on the College President’s performance from any College or District Constituency.” The Chancellor let it be known that he will accept input related to the evaluation of College Presidents at any time from all employees.

In Spring 2010 additional conversations regarding implementation of the process for gathering input on the President’s evaluation occurred at the District. At that time it did not appear that it would move forward quickly at the district level. However, in Fall 2011 the District Accreditation Coordinating Committee began discussions on how implementation could move forward more rapidly across the district. Faculty currently have input on the College President’s evaluation via a survey and, as a result of District Accreditation Coordinating Committee discussions and work by the District Academic Senate, a similar survey for gathering classified staff and managers input has been designed.

Plan:
Implement the use of common surveys across the District to gather input for the President’s evaluation from all College employee constituency groups.
Planning agenda item 14 - Evaluation of district committees

Planning Agenda Item:
During 2009-2010, College constituency leaders will work through the district governance processes to create a formal process by which the District governance committees are regularly evaluated and the results are communicated to the College community.

Description/Analysis:
During Spring 2010 preliminary conversations began at District Academic Senate. In Summer 2011 additional discussions occurred at the District Academic Senate (DAS) retreat in the context of the need for increased communication between district committees and the DAS. During Summer and Fall 2011 the District formed a leadership taskforce to address this issue. The taskforce is to report back in March 2012. The group has identified some areas where faculty could benefit from senate training or handbooks.

Plan: Need to develop this section
Update on Substantive Change in Progress, Pending, or Planned

This section will be updated just before the Midterm Report draft is submitted to the LRCCD BoT.
## Planning Agenda Items from the 2009 Accreditation Self Study Summary of Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard and planning agenda item</th>
<th>OPR</th>
<th>Coordinating groups</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
  - A task force was established and met during Spring 2010. It was determined that both qualitative methods (focus groups) and quantitative methods (survey research) would be used to address this item.  
  Fall 2010  
  - The PIO and PRIE dean conducted focus groups for each constituency group. Results of the focus groups were used to understand the underlying issues and to develop survey items. Because of overlapping issues, the survey of the effectiveness of college communication was combined with the survey of the effectiveness of governance structures to be administered in Spring 2011. For further information see item 12.  
  Spring 2011  
  Implementation methods are in place.  
  - A survey of college communication and decision making was conducted. Results were analyzed and reported to the President’s Cabinet. This method can be used periodically to gather information about communication across the college.  
  Fall 2011  
  - Results of the survey of college communication and decision making were disseminated to each of the constituency leaders, the College Strategic Planning Committee, the standing committee tri-chairs, and the President’s Cabinet.  
  - The College President hosted a meeting of the standing committee tri-chairs in order to broaden communication between committees and increase the alignment and integration of their work.  
  - The College President hosted a meeting of individuals from across the college who are involved in staff development activities in order to broaden communication and increase the alignment and integration of those activities. |
### 2. Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, and II.A.2.f

**Student Learning Outcomes:**
By fall 2010, the Offices of Instruction and Student Services in conjunction with the PRIE Dean and SLO Advisory Group will engage the campus in broad-based dialogue on student success measured through learning outcomes assessment data and the design and implementation of processes to integrate this data with the program review process and the planning framework of the College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIE Dean</th>
<th>CSPC, AVP Program Review, AVP Student Services, SLO coordinator, SLO committee, Student Services representative</th>
<th>College engaged in dialogue and SLOs in planning &amp; program review by Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*See separate Accreditation recommendations table below (page 8).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training on institutional quality data</th>
<th>Prie Office</th>
<th>Prie Committee</th>
<th>Training on data use ongoing by Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| By fall 2010, the Planning Research and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE) Office will work with the PRIE Committee to provide ongoing training to the College community in working with data to assess institutional quality and student success that will affect change. | - Spring 2010  
- Flex workshops by PRIE dean, PRIE Committee members and others on data. Examples from the pre-semester flex days include workshops on student success data, SLO data, student demographics, pre-requisite validation, and the use of Survey Monkey.  
- The PRIE Committee reviewed institutional quality data and provided input to the PRIE Office on how to make the data more user friendly and more effective for strategic planning. |  |
| Fall 2010  
Training on the use of data is ongoing.  
- PRIE Office produced targeted data reports for CSPC and PRIE including several Institutional Effectiveness Reports.  
- August flex workshops related to the use of data. Examples include workshops on student success data, SLO data, student demography, use of Survey Monkey.  
- The PRIE committee reviewed the Institutional Effectiveness Reports, discussed the data, chose specific data on freshmen success to focus on for college-wide discussions and selected liaisons from the committee to various college areas. | - Spring 2011  
- The PRIE Office provided on request training on data use for assessment validation, unit planning, survey development, and program review as needed by individuals and groups.  
- The PRIE committee led college-wide discussion of data on the success, or lack thereof, for first time freshmen at SCC. Venues for discussion included the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Senior Leadership Team, Student Government, Basic Skills Committee, etc. |  |
| Summer 2011  
- The PRIE dean held individual conversations with all deans and supervisors about planning and the use of data in the planning process. | - Fall 2011  
- Individual training on survey development provided for various campus groups including Cosmetology, Outreach, Social Sciences, Advanced Technology, etc. |  |
4. **Standard II.A.1.b**  
**Training on survey data:**  
Continuing through spring 2012, the Instructional and Student Services Leadership and the PRIE Dean will conduct workshops focusing on the use of data such as the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey in program review, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment, and planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIBE Dean</th>
<th>Workshop Details</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Summer 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VPSS, AVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Instruction and Student Services, PRIE Committee | Workshops continuing through spring 2012 | - The CCSSE was administered for the second time at the College.  
- The PRIE Committee discussed CCSSE data and its use. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Standards II.B.1 and**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VPSS, AVP</th>
<th>Matriculation</th>
<th>Beginning Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009-Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The revised matriculation system at SCC is designed to engage students at
### II.B.3.c Matriculation redesign:
Beginning in fall 2009, Student Services Leadership in conjunction with the Matriculation Committee will reconfigure matriculation processes based on recent program reviews. This redesign will focus on (1) fostering high levels of student engagement and (2) ensuring that more first-time students are aware of and access matriculation services (i.e., orientation, assessment, and counseling/advising services) prior to registration. A matriculation tracking system will be developed in order to identify and monitor the various pathways new students take through front door matriculation activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Services</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| every stage in the matriculation process. New students are contacted by phone once they submit an application for admission and are then scheduled for an appointment to attend orientation and assessment. They are also scheduled for a New Student Counseling Workshop, which provides them with necessary registration and other critical success strategies to get them started on the right path. The newly designed matriculation process is intentionally prescriptive, not self-initiated, to ensure all students participate and receive the high touch front door services that produce results that breed success.
- All front door services are tracked using an Access Database until resources for the matriculation tracking system can be redirected to this task.

#### Fall 2010

- An Orientation Taskforce was formed to address a redesign of orientation activities and explore the implementation of mandatory orientation. The taskforce will report its recommendations to the Matriculation Committee.

#### Spring 2011

- Matriculation Committee is reviewing and assisting in the revision of the Matriculation Plan.

### 6. Standard II.B.4 Evaluation of SS structures:
During 2009-2010, Student Services Leadership will complete a comprehensive evaluation of the administrative and reporting structures within its service areas with the goal of identifying further administrative and departmental realignments that will lead to improved service to students and strengthen interpersonal and organizational relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPSS, AVP Student Services</th>
<th>Evaluation completed during 09-10 academic year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009-Spring 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Ad hoc planning teams were created to address the planning agenda item. The Associate Vice President of Student Services worked closely with staff – one-on-one and in small groups – to facilitate the changes.
- **Completed Spring 2010**

### 7. Standard II.C.1.a Library funding:
By spring 2010, the Learning Resources Committee will implement a plan for identifying, prioritizing, and requesting library funding needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRC Dean</th>
<th>Representative to District Committee;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work begun by Spring 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010- Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Discussions are ongoing at the District Level. These discussions are included in the Library Materials Program Plan.
Resources Center (LRC) Dean and librarians will work with the District to analyze library funding to ensure a common, consistent and equitable base of ongoing funding for learning and research materials in libraries throughout the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 8. Standard II.C.2

**Evaluation of learning support areas:**

Beginning fall 2009, the PRIE Dean will work with learning support service areas staff and respective area deans to standardize the process of evaluating the services the labs provide and communicate the results of the evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIE Dean</th>
<th>Academic Support Lab personnel, area deans</th>
<th>Beginning Fall 2009.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Fall 2009**

- Work began by Fall 2009
  - A survey ‘toolkit’ for evaluation of learning support areas developed. Academic support labs can choose items from the toolkit and add their own in order to develop surveys of the effectiveness of their work.

**Spring 2010**

- The Tutoring Center piloted the survey ‘toolkit’ pilot.

**Fall 2010**

- The ESL Lab piloted the use of the survey toolkit.

**Spring 2011**

- ESL pilot results available. Other implementation of the survey ‘toolkit’ planned for Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 did not occur. It will be rescheduled for the 2011-12 academic year. New approaches may need to be developed.

**Fall 2011**

- The VPI and VPSS are working with the tutoring coordinators to define a consolidated tutoring program for the college.
- We are developing ways in which information about all of the labs, including data on the services they provide, may become part of Unit Plans and/or Program Plans, which may become a way capture this information.

### 9. Standard III.A.1.a

**Review hiring process:**

By fall 2010, the College Equity Officer will convene a task force with representation from the constituency groups to work with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity Officer</th>
<th>Task force as appointed. (input from District HR rep., Academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Fall 2010**

- The task force was convened in Spring 10. It is a subcommittee of the Staff Equity & Diversity Committee, with all constituency groups represented. A proposal was developed for a pilot project that would allow faculty hiring committees to include a “live” teaching demo in front of students as part of the hiring process. The process was vetted by HR at the district and by President Jeffrey, who approved the pilot for Spring 11. The
District Human Resources to explore options for increasing the breadth of information obtained during the interview process, while working within the framework of District hiring processes. The results of this analysis will be reported to the College.

- Senate, Classified Senate, Equity committee)

Proposal was presented to the Academic Senate in early September (9/7/10). A draft of a revised process was designed. A survey instrument for assessing the effectiveness of the revised process has been designed.
- Hiring during Spring 2011 piloted the new process. The survey indicated that the information provided by the pilot process was valuable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Services Director</td>
<td>Evaluation conducted by spring 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By spring 2010, the Director of Operations in conjunction with the Campus Development Committee will conduct an evaluation of the facilities planning process from the start of a project to its conclusion with special focus on the ongoing communication between all parties in the process including end-users. The result of this evaluation will inform future major facilities projects.
• Discussion began.  

Spring 2010  
• Executive Council discussed the item during an update on planning agenda progress.  

Fall 2010  
• Some aspects of this item were combined with the college survey of communication and decision-making; the results of that survey will be analyzed by constituency group and information on the responses of classified staff provided to the Classified Senate President. (*For further information see planning agenda items 12 and 1.*)  

Spring 2011  
• The combined survey was administered in Spring 11. The survey asked about engagement with college decision making and about the effectiveness of (1) college communication, (2) administrative structure and processes, and (3) participatory decision making processes. Over 160 SCC employees responded to the survey including 105 faculty, 42 classified staff and 10 administrators.  
• The results of the survey were shared with the College President, the Senior Leadership Team, the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Associated Student Government and the SCC Standing Committees and the Department Chairs Council. The results of that survey were analyzed by constituency group and information on the responses of classified staff provided to the Classified Senate.  

Fall 2011:  
• The data from the survey of college decision-making and communication have become part of the Institutional Effectiveness Reports used by the College Strategic Planning Committee and the PRIE Committee. |
12. **Standard IV.A.5 – Effectiveness of governance structures:**
Beginning in 2009-2010, the PRIE Dean will standardize the process for obtaining feedback on the effectiveness of the College governance structures and broaden the dissemination of results to the campus community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIE Dean</th>
<th>Executive Council</th>
<th>Beginning academic year</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A draft of a pilot survey on the effectiveness of governance at SCC developed and presented at Executive Council, President’s Cabinet, Academic Senate and Classified Senate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring 2010**
• The survey is piloted with participation by constituency leaders and councils. Results provided to the College President and Executive Council.

**Fall 2010**
• Survey results discussed with the CSPC and standing committee tri-chairs., the College President, the College Strategic Planning Committee and the Executive Council.
• This item was combined with the college survey of communication effectiveness; the results of that survey were analyzed by constituency group and information on the responses of classified staff provided to the President’s Cabinet (*For further information see item 1*).
• Due to related planning agenda items, focus groups were conducted to help develop survey questions that focus on effective college communication as well as the effectiveness of decision-making. The results of the survey will be analyzed by constituency group.

**Spring 2011**
• The combined survey was administered in Spring 11. The survey asked about engagement with college decision making and about the effectiveness of (1) college communication, (2) administrative structure and processes, and (3) participatory decision making processes. Over 160 SCC employees responded to the survey including 105 faculty, 42 classified staff and 10 administrators.
• The results of the survey were shared with the College President, the Senior Leadership Team, the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Associated Student Government and the SCC Standing Committees and the Department Chairs Council. The data will become part of the Institutional Effectiveness Reports for the College Strategic Planning Committee and the PRIE Committee.

**Fall 2011:**
• The data from the survey of college decision-making and communication have become part of the Institutional Effectiveness Reports used by the College Strategic Planning Committee and the PRIE Committee.

**Fall 2009**
• A draft of a pilot survey on the effectiveness of governance at SCC developed and presented at Executive Council, President’s Cabinet, Academic Senate and Classified Senate.

### 13. **Standard IV.B.1.j – Process for President’s evaluation:**
Beginning in 2009-2010, the Senior Leadership Team Chair and the Classified Senate President, Senior Leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classified Senate President, Senior Leaders</th>
<th>District Office</th>
<th>Beginning academic year</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• District Policy 9000, Management and Confidential Personnel, Section 2.3 was revised 12/15/10. It states that “The Chancellor shall accept input on the College President’s performance from any College or District Constituency.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results reported by**

---

32
Classified Senate President will explore interest in developing a formal district-wide process in which classified and administrative staff members participate in an evaluation of a College President. The results of their exploration should be reported to the campus and district by fall 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hip Team President</th>
<th>Fall 2010.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Spring 2010
- Preliminary conversations about how this will be implemented across the district have occurred. SCC faculty have input into the President’s evaluation, but the process is not consistent district-wide.

Fall 2011
- The District Accreditation Coordinating Committee is discussing how this can be implemented across the district. The Chancellor has let it be known that he will accept input related to the evaluation of College Presidents at any time from all employees. Faculty currently have input on the College President’s evaluation via a survey as well. The district is designing a similar survey for gathering classified staff and managers input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Standard IV.B.3.g – Evaluation of district committees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During 2009-2010, College constituency leaders will work through the district governance processes to create a formal process by which the District governance committees are regularly evaluated and the results are communicated to the College community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executives Council</th>
<th>District Office</th>
<th>Work done during 2009-10 academic year.</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Spring 2010
- Preliminary conversations begun. The issue has been explored, but it does not appear that the issue will move forward at the district level at this time.

Summer and Fall 2011
- The District has formed a leadership taskforce to address this issue and they have met a few times. The taskforce is to report back in March 2012. The group has identified some areas where faculty could benefit from senate training or handbooks.
## Recommendations from the 2009 Accreditation Report

| SLOs: Accreditation 
| Office of 
| Coordinating 
| Timeline | Progress |
| recommendation 1 | Primary 
| Responsibility | groups | | |
| Accreditation recommendation 1: | | | | |
| In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the college build on the strong foundation it has established in identifying **Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)** at the course, program, general education, and degree level, to begin widely assessing the learning outcomes. The college should ensure that courses are assessed consistently across different sections of the same course and that the resulting findings are used by the departments to improve student learning. (I.B.5; II.A.1.c) | Prie Dean | CSPC, AVP Program Review, AVP Student Services, SLO coordinator, SLO Advisory Group, Student Services representative | College engaged in dialogue and SLOs integrated into planning & program review by Fall 2010 | Spring 2010 |
| **Related planning Agenda Item:** Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, and II.A.2.f – **Student Learning Outcomes:** | | | | |
| By fall 2010, the Offices of Instruction and Student Services in conjunction with the PRIE Dean and SLO Advisory Group will engage the campus in broad-based dialogue on student success measured through learning outcomes assessment data and the design and implementation of processes to integrate this data with the program review process and the planning framework of the College. | | | | |
| **Some excerpts from the team report:** | | | | |
| • The extent to which these objectives are achieved is reported to the PRIE office and the board of trustees on an annual basis. To date, few of the objectives, including the objectives linked to student success goals, reference the student learning outcomes and assessment process. See team recommendation 1. (I.B.7) (p20) | | | | |
| • In the area of SLO assessment, the college should expand the number of courses, programs, and degrees and certificates for which student learning outcome assessments are conducted and reported between now and 2012. The assessment process should ensure consistency and accountability across all sections of a given | | | | |

### Summer 2010
- Analysis of the unit plan objective achievement reports indicates use of SLO data across the college as part of the planning process at the unit level.
- The program review template is revised to include additional information on SLO assessment.
- The unit plan outcomes reporting form is revised to capture information on how SLO assessment data is used in writing objectives or evaluating the accomplishment of outcomes.

### Fall 2010
- Forms for SLO plans & reports revised.
- Fall 10 convocation SLO ‘kick-off’ planned.
- Department dialogues occur in many areas.
- SLO analyst appointed (0.2 reassigned time).
- CCSSE data was used to begin assessing GELOs and the results became part of the SLO Report prepared for the College Strategic Planning Committee (part of the Institutional Effectiveness Reports).

### Winter 2010
- Convocation kicks off renewed SLO implementation activities.
- Department planning for course SLO assessment reporting engaged. (forms due 9/15)
- SLO coordinator and SLO analyst set office hours to work with faculty on SLO implementation.
- Departments are beginning work on the revised SLO annual reporting forms including types of assessments, the assessment results, and planned changes.
- Math and CIS are providing exemplary course SLO assessment models that other departments may follow.
- Course SLO assessment planning forms are completed by instructional departments.
- Course SLO assessment is reporting is implemented for instructional departments college-wide.
course by identifying common outcomes and appropriate assessment methods and fostering dialogue about the results and the implications for teaching. (p21)

- It is not clear if the institutional standard for SLO assessment is written or widely known, nor is it clear that the academic units are held accountable to a standard. Course and program level learning outcomes assessment reports available on the planning and research website contain varied levels of information about the extent to which the results have been analyzed and used for instructional improvement. See team recommendation 1. (p23)

- The institution has met or exceeded most of the standard sub-sections. Concerns remain about the completion of SLOs for all courses and programs; the clear evidence of assessment of those SLOs, and how the results of that assessment are leading to improvement in all areas of the college. The communication on the collaborative process for developing and assessing courses as well as programs needs to improve. Aligning the student learning outcomes at all levels and with the same understanding among all faculty will help the college reach the ACCJC benchmark of Proficiency by 2012, but it will require considerable effort as a priority for all instructional employees. (p24)

Spring 2011
- Formal course SLO reports are collected based on the course SLO planning forms filed in Fall 2010. Course SLOs are widely assessed across the college; the resulting findings are used by the departments to improve student learning.
- SLO subcommittee begins work on how to evaluate and analyze the results of the SLO assessment report for dissemination, dialogue, and strategic planning.
- The SLO subcommittee discussed the use of CCSSE data as indicators of General Education Learning Outcomes at the college.
- SCC departments complete a mapping of GE courses to GE learning outcomes. The SLO subcommittee discusses models of using course-embedded assessment for GE learning outcomes.

Fall, 2011
- Approximately 170 course SLO assessment reports have been completed and posted on InsideSCC as of 11/10/11
- The SLO subcommittee evaluated additional course assessment reports to include in the GELO pilot and a preliminary report is currently being produced.
- The SLO subcommittee researched and proposed various models for Program Learning Outcome assessment and presented these models to Department Chairs Council for review.
- A survey on ProLO models was collected, and the results were utilized by the SLO subcommittee to determine direction of ProLO assessment efforts in Spring, 2012.

Capital construction projects - Planning agenda item and Accreditation recommendation 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Recommendation 2: 2. In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop a more interactive process to keep the campus</th>
<th>Office of Primary Responsibility</th>
<th>Coordinating groups</th>
<th>Timeline (as specified in self-study)</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Services Director</td>
<td>VPA, Campus Development Committee,</td>
<td>Evaluation conducted by spring 2010</td>
<td>Spring and Summer 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The VP of Administrative Services and head of Operations have discussed this report several times and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community engaged and informed of **capital construction projects** and the college planning process. (I.A.4; I.B.1; I.B.3; I.B.4; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.1.a; III.D.1.d; and IV.B.3.g)

**Related planning agenda item**

**Standard III.B.2.b – Evaluation of facilities planning process:** By spring 2010, the Director of Operations in conjunction with the Campus Development Committee will conduct an evaluation of the facilities planning process from the start of a project to its conclusion with special focus on the on-going communication between all parties in the process including end-users. The result of this evaluation will inform future major facilities projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some excerpts from the team report:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The self study and the results of the staff survey indicate that the campus community is not kept informed or involved in the institutional planning of physical resource planning and needs to improve its dissemination of information pertaining to its facilities planning processes. (p36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The college and district have made significant gains in the planning for long term physical resources, but the plans and integration of those plans are not clearly understood by the campus community. Sacramento City College did state this as a planning agenda item, but the issue was noted as a recommendation during the last team visit in 2003. (Recommendation 1.c) (p36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| have been collaborating on the response. A big part of it will be the revised Facilities Master Plan but the Facilities Resource Plan will also be revised with additional information about the flow of a project’s design, bid and award and construction. |

**Fall 2010**

- Facilities updates with SLT, Exec Council and Convocation were conducted to formalize this information and include documents that provide evidence for this work with respect to accreditation. The results of this evaluation were used to inform facilities project work.

- We updated the Facilities Master Plan (fall 2010) to include projects associated with Measure M which was passed in 2008. Measure A projects (passed in 2002) was documented in the original Facilities Master Plan (2004). Both plans were completed with extensive campus involvement though the Campus Development Committee and information about the planned projects was promulgated throughout the campus community. The Facility Master Plans are posted to Inside SCC for campus community review and reference.

**Spring 2011-Fall 2011**

- The SCC Facilities Resource Plan is being modified to include more information about capital projects. The focus of this resource plan was with campus level facility projects and how they were integrated into the unit planning system. Capital projects are covered by a host of district regulations and processes and this information was covered in the Resource and Capital Outlay Institutional plan. While redundant, we are moving some information about capital projects into the Facility Resource plan.

- We have included a Long Range Capital Needs Plan metric chart in the quarterly metric briefing. This chart details the planned schedule for capital projects and
when design is planned to begin for each project. The managers are briefed on this schedule and kept informed of changes that occur over time. The metric briefs are posted on Inside SCC as a routine matter as information to all.

- With every capital project, the faculty, staff and management that are impacted by the building project are involved from inception with the selection of the architect that will do the design work and an exhaustive set of design/planning meetings with the architectural team and the district staff that will be managing the project. These design meetings are at the beginning of the construction project and set the stage for the construction phase that follows. With the bounds of budget and project scope, all campus issues are addressed and resolved during design. On occasion, during the bid process in difficult bid environments, if there is a need to modify the scope of the project the campus is involved with proposed changes to adjust to the dollar amount of the project.

- The facilities Master Plan is on line at inside SCC; the Facilities Resource Plan should be completed by year’s end; the metrics are embedded in the quarterly metric brief and are on line at the Inside SCC repository. Architectural meeting minutes/notes are retained by FM and Campus Operations.

**Accreditation recommendation 3 - Website**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 3. In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop an approach to <strong>redesigning its website</strong> to ensure that it is non duplicative, effectively opens documents and informational materials with one click, and provides accuracy and effectiveness for students and public audiences. (II.A.6.c, III.C)</th>
<th>Office of Primary Responsibility</th>
<th>Coordinating groups</th>
<th>Timeline (as specified in self-study)</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Technologies</td>
<td>Evaluation conducted by spring 2010</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td><strong>•</strong> InsideSCC website opened to access without having to re-authenticate when moving from area to area. Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt from the team report:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is need for design continuity between departments. (p37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on the use of Ingeniux, the college’s web design tool, is provided in order to improve the design of the website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation recommendation 4 - Assessment Portability</td>
<td>Office of Primary Responsibility</td>
<td>Coordinating groups</td>
<td>Timeline (as specified in self-study)</td>
<td>Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Recommendation 4. In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college move forward with implementation of reciprocity of student placement assessments district wide. (IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3) | District Assessment Portability task Force | Assessment Center staff, discipline faculty and research offices at each college. | Evaluation conducted by spring 2010. | Spring 2010  
- Initial evaluation of the portability process completed.  
Fall 2010  
- Work done across the district has resulted in a MOU signed by all colleges and a pilot period during which placements will be portable across the district.  
- The official Assessment Portability start date is Fall 2011. This means that students who assess in Spring 2010 will be able to “transport” resulting placements starting Fall 2011.  
- Assessment Center Representatives and other faculty and managers continue to prepare for how best to communicate portability opportunities and limits to students and faculty.  
- The research component of this project has resulted in a research proposal, and related programming modifications.  
- ESL assessment will be common and portable district-wide and Spring 2011 will be the beta semester. The computerized versions will be piloted at all the sister colleges and will have the essay as well. The cut scores, along with multiple measures and all that stuff will be standardized district-wide and eventually, all scores will be consistent so that students do not shop around.  
Spring 2011  
- Work continues to implement the assessment portability plan. Assessments taken in Spring 2011 are portable across the district. The colleges further develop the plan to implement the research component of the process.  
Fall 2011  
- The four colleges agreed on Placement Recency Policies. This was an issue that potentially could have caused the portability progress to have taken a few steps back. Plans are in place to look at the data on exactly how many students in our district are taking advantage of the opportunity provided by portable placement. |

Excerpt from the team report:
- There is a concern that there is no portability of assessments throughout LRCCD. Inasmuch as the colleges have interdistrict agreements for courses, library usage, and other processes that enhance the student success and retention experience, this is an anomaly. There is a white paper entitled Assessment Portability to resolve this issue, but the progress is unknown. (IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3) (p44)