Pre-Accreditation Task Group Responsibility
Review the current accreditation status of Sacramento City College in regards to the four new standards, corresponding themes, conceptual models, evidence, and training activities. Recommend appropriate follow-up actions to the President for his perusal, referrals, and actions.

Membership
Cathy Chenu-Campbell (Faculty)  Frank Malaret (Mgmt)
Celina Ing (Faculty)  Michael Poindexter (Mgmt)
Alan Keys (Faculty)  Shirley Short (Mgmt)
Linda Stroh (Faculty)  Julia Brootkowski (Classified)
Stefan Lee (Student)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review of Accreditation Components</th>
<th>Task Group Anticipated Completion Date</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Models</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement Model (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes Model (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Plan Timelines (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Framework (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Steering Committee Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Standard Committee Chairpersons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of District Coordinating Committee Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2009 Planning Accreditation Training and Activities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Accreditation Team Recommendation #1</td>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Accreditation Team Recommendation #2</td>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Accreditation Team Recommendation #3</td>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 SCC Mid-Term Report Follow-up</td>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Accreditation Eligibility Requirements</td>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Accreditation Standard 1 (Mission/Effectiveness)</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Accreditation Standard 2 (Student Learning Programs/Services)</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Accreditation Standard 3 (Resources)</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Accreditation Standard 4 (Leadership and Governance)</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Accreditation Themes</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitments, Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement, Student Learning Outcomes, Organization, Dialogue, Institutional Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Accreditation Policies</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence/Storage/Website</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief Summary – Task Group Review

Conceptual Models

SCC Continuous Improvement Model

[Diagram showing the SCC Continuous Improvement Model]

SCC Unit Plan -- Resource Allocation Timelines

[Diagram showing the SCC Unit Plan with resource allocation timelines]

Accreditation Presentation, Executive Council
May 16, 2007
Selection of Committee Members

SCC Accreditation Steering Committee members
- Cathy Chenu-Campbell (Faculty)
- Nelle Moffett (Accreditation Liaison Officer)
- Debbie Travis (Management)
- Julia Brootkowski (Classified)
- A student representative

LRCCD Self-Study Workshop Attendees (September 2007)
- Cathy Chenu-Campbell (Faculty)
- Linda Stroh (Faculty)
- Celina Ing (Faculty)
- Alan Keys (Faculty)
- Nelle Moffett (Accreditation Liaison Officer)
- Debbie Travis (Management)
- Julia Brootkowski (Classified)
- A student representative

SCC Representatives to District Coordinating Group
- Cathy Chenu-Campbell (Faculty)
- Nelle Moffett (Accreditation Liaison Officer)
- Julia Brootkowski (Classified)

2003 Accreditation Team Recommendations, Self-Identified Action Items, Midterm Report

The Task Group reviewed the main items in the 2006 SCC Midterm Report which was submitted to the Accrediting Commission in October 2006, and approved by the Accreditation Commission at its January 2007 meeting. Key points that must be considered in the 2009 SCC Self-Study are the 3 recommendations made by the last visiting team in 2003. These 3 recommendations focused on: institutional mission, planning and research, and student learning outcomes; strategic planning for educational centers district wide; and, a comprehensive plan for delivery of student services and staff development programs. Follow-up on these recommendations have already been assigned to various lead persons/groups.

The lengthy list of Self-Identified Action Items will be referred to the individual 2008-2009 Self-Study Standard Committees for possible inclusion in their reports and evaluations. Meanwhile, the lead persons or groups need to continue outlining their progress on each item, and systematically collecting supporting evidence. Nelle Moffett will continue to coordinate progress on these items.

2009 Accreditation Eligibility Requirements

The 2002 Accreditation Eligibility Requirements were also reviewed. With the new standards, these eligibility requirements become an integral element of the Self-Study Report. Responsibility for reviewing the documentation and collecting the evidence should be assumed by the Accreditation Liaison Officer in conjunction with the 2008-2009 Self-Study Steering Committee with the completion date in time for submission of the Self-Study in Fall 2009.

Accreditation Standard Review

Standard 1A (Mission)

The current mission statement (2001-2002) does reflect the educational purposes of SCC and is appropriate to institutions of higher education. Beginning in 2005, the PRIE Committee and other participatory governance groups have been working to update the mission statement and link it with institutional goals/objectives as well as student learning outcomes.
Evidence of intended student population is stipulated in Board policy and needs to be updated through the District Environmental Scans. Direct linkages between these scans and SCC goals and objectives need to be ascertained.

Additional evidence is still needed on how the mission statement is developed, periodically reviewed by all constituent groups, approved, and communicated to the general population. Evidence that the mission statement is directly linked to the College’s goals/objectives still needs to be achieved, as well as evidential analysis of planning, implementation, and re-evaluation as an integral part of institutional improvement.

SCC has a Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Advisory Group that has been working on student learning outcomes within courses, programs, and degrees. Currently, the Advisory Group is working on general education outcomes. Workshops have been sponsored by the Advisory Group and Staff Development Committee for all campus constituent groups. More work (with evidence) needs to be done to include student learning outcomes within the updated mission statement, and within the goals/objectives of the College. Evaluation of institutional assessment of its effectiveness still has not been addressed.

Evidence that the current mission statement has been approved by the Board of Trustees is available through the Board agenda and minutes.

SCC updated its mission statement during 2001-2002 and since 2005 has been reviewing and updating the mission statement to link it with institutional goals/objectives and student learning outcomes. The PRIE Committee and various campus constituent groups are involved in this update, with frequent updates communicated to various groups. Responses and feedback are then incorporated into the formative stages.

**Standard 1B (Improving Institutional Effectiveness)**

Extensive work needs to be done to link the institutional mission to the College’s goals/objectives, decision-making actions, and allocations. Importantly, direct linkages between the mission statement with planning/decision making still needs to be delineated and implemented.

The status of SCC in regards to the accreditation standard on institutional effectiveness, planning, and continuous review remains very problematic. Although there are some institutional efforts in the areas of planning, assessment, research, and dialogue, these efforts are largely isolated, fragmented, and not understood or followed by the majority of constituent groups.

Dialogue is occurring within each discipline during program review cycles of every 6 years, within the deliberations of the Curriculum Committee and various other campus committees, such as the Student Learning Outcomes Advisory Group. Some campus-wide forums, workshops, and flex day activities have been held. However, for the most part, broad-based focused institutional direction, actions, and dialogue on linking planning with student learning outcomes, and continuous evaluation within College goals and objectives is still lacking.

More importantly, although there are written District and College goals and objectives, there is limited evidence ascertaining that these goals are understood by all constituent groups in order to guide the campus in making decisions, or to allocate resources, or to develop curriculum or programs. The work of the Tri-Chair Committee in linking decision-making processes, unit plans, and resource allocations is in its infancy stages, and much still needs to be clarified, disseminated, and effectively implemented. Other campus groups are working on developing an overall Cycle of Continuous Improvement Model that will be utilized to guide planning, goal setting processes, and would include unit plans, program and services review data and information. At the same time, the PRIE Office and Committee continue its work on integrating the planning processes within institutional decision-making and actions.
Another major area of concern is the institutional planning and goal setting processes. Currently, the planning and goal setting processes are too complex, not easily understood by the most campus groups, not measurable, and not linked to effective implementation and re-evaluation.

Limited evidence exists to describe how the institution will achieve its goals, nor how the planning process is communicated to the entire campus for input and decision-making, nor how the college plans to use appropriate research data and feedback to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of its planning processes.

Continuous effective and evaluative planning and assessment for continuous improvement is not pervasive on campus. Only a very small percentage of the campus community understands, implements, or evaluates the effectiveness of their own planning processes or actions.

Although some assessment does occur at the course and program levels, this activity is not duplicated throughout all disciplines nor is it campus-wide. Importantly, continuous assessment for improvement is not yet seen as an integral part of the college’s institutional planning and goal setting processes.

Standard 2A (Student Learning Programs and Services/Instructional Programs)
Through the program review process which is conducted every 6 years, each department evaluates and reviews all its curricular offerings, enrollment data, achievement and persistence rates, suggestions and recommendations from advisory committees, and articulation agreements with 4-year institutions. Follow-up data from student/employer surveys and information from external licensure/certification exams are also included to measure student success rates.

Annual unit plans with linkages to resource allocations and the college mission are also included in the program reviews. These unit plans also include annual reviews of outcomes as related to requests for financial and human resources. Supplementary data and environmental scans are provided for by the college and district research offices.

Much of the curricular/certificate/degree data is presently documented in SOCRATES. This data include student learning outcomes, objectives, delivery systems, methods of assessment, general education patterns (if any), articulation requirements, and, correlation to Title V requirements or required industry standards.

Various standing committees (such the Curriculum Committee, the Distance Education Sub-Committee, or the General Education Sub-Committee) are specifically responsible for reviewing each curricular proposal for quality and appropriateness. Other ad hoc committees, for example, the Program Viability Sub-Committee is charged with reviewing and recommending program termination.

Special ad hoc committees are charged with specific target areas. For example, the Student Learning Outcomes Advisory Task Group supports the student learning outcomes efforts of faculty and staff. An important supportive role of this group is to facilitate communication and integrate efforts across academic departments.

Student learning outcomes have been completed for the majority of courses and programs. Currently, the Student Learning Outcomes Advisory Task Group is finalizing criteria to be used in evaluating courses that would fulfill the general education requirements.

Assessment of these courses and programs is at the infancy stage. Only a handful of faculty members are systematically assessing these outcomes within courses. However, much more work needs to be done for assessment and analyses to be a campus-wide process.
Curricular and program data and information is communicated to the campus at large, to the community at large through the Public Information Office using brochures and handouts, faculty and student handbooks, catalogues, online information, tabloids, and articulation agreements. Individual student information sheets are given to each student in each class by the instructor.

More work needs to be done to publicize information on student outcomes and achievement or success rates to the public. Faculty involvement in assessment documentation needs to be included in this dissemination.

Institutional policies are presented to and approved by the Board of Trustees. Such policies include academic freedom and student grievance procedures, while information on objectivity in the classroom is part of the faculty contract.

What is still problematic is the systematic and consistent assessment of outcomes at all levels and evaluation of the resultant assessment to improve student learning outcomes. From the basic course level to the institutional level, assessment is sporadic in many areas or non-existent in other areas. What data that is available is anecdotal and not linked to evaluation of courses, certificates, programs, or to institutional goals and objectives.

Equally disturbing is the lack of linkages between student learning outcomes at the course and program levels with the institutional mission or with any of the institutional planning processes. There is currently no discernible process that links each of these components with the institutional or instructional evaluation and improvement.

As of April 2007, the institution is working on the annual report on student learning outcomes required by ACCJC, and will be used as a base document to document the process of assessing and institutionalizing student learning outcomes.

However, considerable effort still needs to be done to use assessment data for instructional and institutional improvement.

**Standard 2B (Student Learning Programs and Services/Student Support Services)**

Information on incoming and current students are currently obtained from various sources: Education Initiative, enrollment data, matriculation information, surveys (e.g., Noel Levitz), and district-wide data.

 Particularly important is the proposed localized Student Satisfaction Survey which would assist Student Services to evaluate admission, recruitment, and retention services; feedback on student reactions; current student needs; counseling needs; and, the value of student educational plans.

Student Services program reviews will begin in Fall 2007 within Matriculation, EOPS, and HCD areas. Other areas will be cycled into succeeding years.

An overall comprehensive Student Services Strategic Plan is currently being discussed and developed. Information and evaluative criteria from the program reviews, learning environments and outcomes, surveys, other area unit plans, and research data will be included in this Strategic Plan.

Plans are currently in the works for a new SCC web site that would include the entire College Catalogue set in different languages. There will be annual updates to the curricular sections, with periodic updates to information that must be current, such as dates for applying for financial aid.

On-line services are currently being updated and expanded. These services include: e-services, built-in services through web sites, and the availability of an online services coordinator. Other outreach services are being reviewed and expanded though the use of focus groups. Information on online tutoring, assessments, enrollment, and counseling availability will be included.
Efforts toward promoting student understanding of diversity are continuing with the Cultural Democracy events and with the work of the Multi-Cultural Center. Workshops and other functions are being held throughout the academic year. However, more work needs to happen to institutionalize the values proposed at these workshops.

New security policies are being proposed to the Board of Trustees, and will add assurances that all student records continue to be secured.

Assessment information is a continuing topic of discussion with focus on state-wide assessment. The California Community College Board of Governors are looking at statewide assessment, and while SCC does have assessment information in a few areas (such as English and Math placement), there is limited data information and placement within other disciplines.

The new version of PeopleSoft will be able to provide more informational data, and the Education Initiative has supplied specific information on first-time students. However, the Research Office still needs to be certain that current data on assessment, placement, and student learning outcomes are available to all constituent groups.

**Standard 2C (Student Learning Programs and Services/Library and Learning Support Services)**

To fully address this particular standard, SCC will need to identify those specific learning support services to include in Standard 2c or in Standard 3. Although the Library itself is clearly identified, individual services such as Tutorial Services or the learning skills laboratories must have a clear delineation.

Consequently, any evaluative process such as program review or unit plans is problematic. Although several areas do individual planning processes, there is no systematic or consistent process that includes all library and learning support services on campus, online, or at the outreach centers.

At the same time, with the exception of the library technology instructional program, student learning outcomes have not been developed. Limited assessments have been done utilizing pre- and post-surveys; however, no workshops or formal training sessions have been held in other areas.

The level of support services for online students and for the outreach centers continue to be improved. More interdisciplinary and campus-wide dialogue and evaluative analyses need to occur to address delivery of services, the link between student learning outcomes in the content areas, and the learning materials that are available or that would need to be available.