Executive Summary

Results of the Review of Access, Programs and Services for Students with Disabilities at Sacramento City College

Review date: April 8-10, 2003

Report Content
This report details program review commendations, compliance issues and recommendations in each of three areas: Administration/Leadership, Programs/Services, and Facilities/Physical Plant. The report also lists technical assistance provided to Sacramento City College. The accompanying CD-ROM provides an electronic copy of this document and the relevant reference materials.

Results in Brief

Leadership/Administration Commendations
- President is knowledgeable and very aware of disability issues and activities.
- Vice President for Student Services involved in disability-related activities.
- Knowledgeable and supportive Dean of Student Services.
- Director of Operations who is very aware of access issues and problems.
- Very capable and highly regarded DSP&S Coordinator.
- Administrative commitment to hiring qualified faculty with disabilities.
- Commitment to academic excellence, including in involvement of students with disabilities in programs like Phi Theta Kappa.
- Support for student governance activities that involve students with disabilities.
- Creative problem solving (e.g., current budget crisis) in ways that do not impact negatively on key programs, including disability-related programs and services.

Program/Services Commendations
- DSP&S budget consolidation has occurred, improving planning and oversight.
- Progress toward program integration is being made to address problems related to service fragmentation and confusion regarding program operations.
- Excellent coordination of staff effort by Supervisor of Counseling Services.
- Student comments regarding DRC and other services were highly favorable.
- College-wide alternate media policy in place.
- Excellent collaboration between DRC and Workability Program.
- Strong and effective working relationships with area DR personnel.
- Test proctoring services are very well organized and delivered.
- Generally capable and committed DSP&S staff who work very well together.
- Materials distributed through the Matriculation and Student Activities Program contain contact information regarding disability-related services.
• Excellent Flex/in-service training provided on disability issues and services.
• Commitment by Physical Education (PE) Department to mainstreaming students with disabilities into PE classes and activities.
• Accessible informational/instructional technology dispersed throughout campus.
• The High Tech Center provides effective technology training.
• College Website provides good access (see attached report).
• There is an excellent and integrated tutoring program in place.
• Good progress toward fully accessible distance education offerings.
• Growing body of Internet resources developed with attention to full access.
• There is attention to program and service access at satellite learning sites.

Facilities/Physical Plant Commendations
• Ramping of buildings was generally very well done, providing good access.
• Most buildings had working automatic doors.
• Plan in place for routine checking of door operations and maintenance.
• Major satellite campus facilities (i.e., Davis) were very accessible.
• Excellent access to bookstore and other sales areas.
• Major renovation underway to improve access to campus facilities.

Leadership/Administration Compliance Issues
• It is not clear if revenue generated through DSP&S special classes was being returned to the program as required under Title 5. Determination needs to be made regarding proper reallocation of funding to DSP&S activities and/or clear tracking of funds that are being returned to DSP&S needs to be a priority.
• There is confusion regarding program structure and lines of authority for all program components, including the Disability Resources Center and the Learning Disabilities Program. DSP&S program structure and reporting lines should be clarified in a manner consistent with Title 5 requirements.

Program/Services Compliance Issues
• Student files do not comply with requirements for documentation of disability, authorization of services, and recording of service delivery. There are also multiple records kept on students, and records are not organized in a logical fashion. Student record system should be reorganized and staff training and monitoring on records maintenance should be done regularly. In addition, files on students should be consolidated with one file for each student. Consideration of an electronic file system is encouraged. Attention to these issues will require time and effort of the DSP&S Coordinator, who currently has limited administrative time because of counseling demands. Plans to release the current DRC Counselor will create additional problems in attaining compliance in this area, and these plans should be reconsidered in light of compliance issues cited here.
Accommodations are not provided in a timely manner, with delays in completion of learning disability (LD) assessments and evidence of non-compliance with the approved assessment model. In addition, students who had been determined eligible for LD services at other colleges were being re-assessed; contrary to stated purposes for having a statewide model. LD assessments should be completed in a timely fashion in accordance with the statewide model, and conformance with state policy on transference of eligibility should be observed.

Facilities/Physical Plant Compliance Issues

- A number of access problems were noted on Sacramento City College Campus, including high counters in service areas, non-ADA compliant restrooms in some areas, and lack of ADA compliant signage. Continue efforts toward full ADA compliance, including timeframes for task completion.

Leadership/Administration Recommendations

There were no additional recommendations regarding leadership and administration.

Program/Services Recommendations

- Clarify roles and responsibilities of all DSP&S faculty and staff, and cross-train staff to provide support where needed to ensure efficient and effective services.
- Provision of sign language interpreters is problematic. Explore strategies (e.g., “blocking” classes) for better use of interpreters. Consider development of a District pool of interpreters, reducing within-district competition for the same limited pool of available interpreters. Examine ways (e.g., providing an interpreter “prep room”) in which to make holding interpreting job at Sacramento City more attractive.
- Initiate regular, full DSP&S staff meetings that provide opportunities for full and open discussions of operational issues and creative problem solving.
- Consider “Student Staffings,” engaging faculty and staff in periodic planning, review, and problem solving for students receiving more than one service.
- Establish regular meetings of HTC and Computer Services staff to review technology access issues and to problem-solve in a collaborative manner.
- Consider expanding accessible computer workstations in student labs and learning facilities so that more computers are equipped with access features.
- Re-constitute the DSP&S Advisory Committee to include more student and community representation with SCC employees serving only in ex-officio roles.

Facilities/Physical Plant Recommendations

There were no recommendations in the area of facilities and physical plant apart from those noted as compliance issues.
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California Community Colleges operate under the auspices of California’s legislative mandates, including Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. As noted in guidelines developed to facilitate regulatory compliance, “It is the responsibility of the colleges to establish programs, policies, and procedures which meet the requirements of . . . relevant statutes and regulations.”¹ As such, this report is directed to the administration, faculty, and staff of Sacramento City College who have responsibility for ensuring that Sacramento City College is meeting requirements specified in Section 56052 of Title 5 with regard to program effectiveness, access requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act, compliance with Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended, and compliance with the California Education Code.²

This report summarizes issues related to Sacramento City College’s efforts to ensure equal access to learning and related opportunities by students with disabilities. The report presents findings in three functional areas: A) Administration/Leadership; B) Programs/Services; and C) Facilities/Physical Plant. In each section, the report provides commendations, offers legal/regulatory compliance issues, suggests issue resolution strategies, and includes other recommendations designed to enhance DSP&S operations. The report concludes with a list of the technical assistance provided to Sacramento City College. The final page of the report provides guidance

to the College on the written response to this report required by the Chancellor’s office.

The Review Team members extend their thanks to President Robert Harris, DSP&S Coordinator Constance Wilbur, administrators, faculty, staff, students, and others who gave generously of their time and effort in preparing for and facilitating the review process. The hospitality extended to the Review Team was outstanding.

Purposes of CCC Reviews

There are four purposes for conducting reviews of Community Colleges’ compliance with laws and regulations regarding the rights of persons with disabilities and each College’s efforts to ensure access to educational opportunities comparable to those provided other students. These purposes are:

1. Provide formative information and technical assistance to the DSP&S Coordinator and staff for program improvement.
2. Provide descriptive information and data to the Chancellor’s Office for system-wide analysis of the DSP&S program.
3. Promote the exchange of ideas and experience among DSP&S programs from around the state.
4. Comply with Title 5 section 56052, which requires evaluations of DSP&S programs to determine their effectiveness.

Overview of the Review Process

Prior to the site visit on April 8-10, 2003, requested materials about the College were provided to The Galvin Group for distribution to Review Team members. These materials included all those listed in the training handbook that had been prepared and distributed to colleges scheduled for reviews in 2002-03.

The sequence of the review varied from what is typically done for a DSP&S review at most colleges because of the need to visit satellite campuses operated by AHC SCC. On Tuesday morning, April 8, Quentin Smith traveled with DSP&S Coordinator Connie Wilbur to the Davis Satellite Campus located about 15 miles from the main SCC campus. A series of interviews were conducted, and the Davis campus facilities and physical plant were examined prior to traveling back to meet
with the full team at the hotel prior to traveling to the main SCC campus to begin the formal part of the review.

Once on the main SCC campus, the Review Team met with DSP&S staff and senior administrators of the College for an orientation to the review process. Personnel attending the orientation session included:

   Dr. Robert Harris, SCC President
   Dr. Patricia Hsieh, Vice President, Student Services
   Larry Dun, Dean, Student Services
   Gregg Atkins, Dean, Learning Resource Center
   Constance Wilbur, DRC Coordinator/Counselor
   Dr. Ann Schafer, LD Coordinator
   Derek Wydick, Workability Coordinator
   Michelle Bond, DRC Counselor
   David Hagerty, LD Instructor
   Liz Locke, Assistive Technology Specialist
   Janelle Stearns, Alternate Media Specialist
   Elaine Stagner, ASL Interpreter
   Linda Hibbard, LD Instructional Assistant
   JoAn Porrine, LD Instructional Assistant
   Anita Sanders, DRC Student Personnel Assistant
   Teresa Baume, DRC Counseling Clerk
   Patricia Cousin, LD Counseling Clerk
   Virginia Gessford, Tutoring Services Coordinator
   Karen Kunimura, Curriculum Committee Chair

Following the orientation session, the review team was treated to a very thorough tour of the campus, led by Dr. Harris and Dr. Hsieh. The tour provided an opportunity to learn about the physical components of the College; moreover, it provided direct evidence of the knowledge and awareness of the President and Vice President of Student Services with regard to access issues, programmatic components, and faculty and staff of the College.

**Overview of DSP&S Operations**

Sacramento City College (SCC) is located in an urban setting in Sacramento on about 75 acres of land, with buildings dating from the 1920s, interspersed with newer
buildings that have been constructed at various points in the College’s history. Not surprisingly, with facilities of varying age, the buildings at SCC reflect varying degrees of access for people with disabilities. The most recently constructed building, the Learning Resource Center opened in 1998, is a model of accessibility in a beautifully appointed learning environment. As noted later in this report, older buildings around the campus have persistent access problems that require attention in order to attain full compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Apart from the physical plant, SCC is clearly a place of learning where all students are welcome, and where there is deliberate attention to providing a learning environment in which every student is provided encouragement and support to achieve academically. The accomplishments of students, including students with disabilities, were obvious all around the campus, and the President and senior administration were very well informed about and aware of issues that affect student participation in campus life. The involvement of students with disabilities in a wide range of activities, including the Phi Theta Kappa academic honors society, the student governance organization, and other student activities, provided concrete evidence of true commitment to full integration of students with disabilities into the fabric of college life.

Services for students with disabilities are provided through a service model that differs somewhat from the service model typically seen on community college campuses. Rather than having a single DSP&S unit, with various programmatic components within the unit, disability services are provided through a fragmented set of programs with their own coordinators, staff, and resources. As had been noted in the previous program review, completed in 1997, this fragmentation contributed to problems in service coordination, resulted in inefficiencies in service delivery, and was generally problematic. Although the College had been making progress toward integrating disability-related services—significant progress had been made, including merging of budgets for the various program components at the time of the visit—program components were still physically separated at the time of the review visit, and some problems associated with this separation were obvious. These problems included the need for duplication of student records in different locations, increasing risks for breaches in confidentiality, and inability to use staff effectively to cover work needs based on demand in a specific programmatic area. Additional information about the nature of the problems observed and recommended strategies for problem resolution are provided in subsequent sections of this report.
Notwithstanding the physical plant problems that are often observed in colleges that occupy older facilities and the programmatic problems primarily associated with a fragmented organizational structure, what the review team witnessed at SCC was a very knowledgeable cadre of administrators, faculty, and staff who, with few exceptions, were committed to providing the best quality education to every student. The evidence from the program review and from an associated survey of students generally indicated a very effective service program that is meeting the needs of students with disabilities. With continued progress toward a fully integrated service program and the economies of scale that can be realized through such integrative efforts, the quality of services at SCC will continue to improve in a manner consistent with the College President’s obvious commitment to academic excellence in all aspects of SCC’s operations.

**Students Served through the DSP&S Program**

The Chancellor’s Office provided data for Table 1 summarizing student counts in specific disability categories for the 2001-2002 academic year. Table 2 summarizes the current staffing arrangements for DSP&S at Sacramento City College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Categories</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired Brain Impairment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Impairment</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Disability</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Impairments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Disability</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmentally Delayed Learners</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Disability</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Disabilities</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,010</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Data are provided only on the primary disability reported for each student. At least 46 students served also reported other disabilities. Other students who may have had more than one disability were served, but no accommodations were requested based on a secondary disabling condition.
## TABLE 2: Current staffing patterns at Sacramento City College as of April 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hours Week</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>DRC* Coordinator/Counselor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>DSP&amp;S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LD Coordinator</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>WorkAbility Coord./Counselor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LD Instructor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>LD Instructor (Adjunct)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>DRC Counselor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LD Instructional Assistants</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Assistive Technology Spec.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>ASL Interpreter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>DRC Student Personnel Assist.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>WorkAbility Student. Pers. Asst.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>DRC Counseling Clerk</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LD Counseling Clerk</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *DRC refers to the Disability Resource Center, one service component of a fragmented disability service model that is undergoing consolidation at SCC.
#Funded through the instructional budget.
@Funded through the Workability III Contract.
^Funded through Matriculation.

The services offered students with disabilities at SCC include:
- Alternate Format Materials
- Assistive Computer Technology
- Counseling
- Equipment Loan
- Exam Accommodations
- Interpreters/Real-Time Captioners
- Learning Disability Eligibility Assessment
- Mobility Assistance
Notetakers
Priority Registration/Registration Assistance
Readers
Referral to campus and community resources
Tutoring Referral
Use of Educational Facilities (chair/table seating, lockers)

Introduction Summary

Sacramento City College is a good example of an urban community college that has done a remarkable job of moving an older, pre-disability rights organization and supporting structures into the 21st century. The improvements in progress around the campus provided concrete evidence of an organization that is not only committed to academic excellence for all of its students, but that also has taken positive steps to ensure full participation by students with disabilities in all aspects of college life. Although some problems related to aging facilities and to inefficient organizational models persist, there was a obvious commitment at all administrative levels to resolving the problems identified and to continuing progress toward the highest quality services possible for students with disabilities and others.
Administration/Leadership

General Observations

Sacramento City College is characterized by an administration that is committed to providing support for academic achievement for all of its students, including those who have disabilities. The President of the College is very familiar with disability issues and was actively engaged in disability rights activities well before the era of the Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the subsequent passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The President is supported in his efforts by a Vice President of Student services and a Dean of Student Services who are very well informed about disability issues and who are actively engaged in efforts toward program and service improvement. The Vice President for Student Services has convened an annual task force on access issues to identify persistent physical access problems in the aging buildings that still comprise much of the campus. There has been ongoing progress in resolving access problems and eliminating physical barriers even in the face of severe budget cuts that have affected colleges statewide. One problem that has hampered efforts to resolve access issues on campus relates to the absence of a permanent Section 504/ADA Coordinator. The interim Campus Equity Officer is aware of problems and is working to assemble materials that will be needed by a permanent 504/ADA Campus Equity Officer once that person is identified.

The Dean of Student Services is, likewise, supportive of and actively engaged in efforts to promote better quality services for students with disabilities. He has been instrumental in promoting efforts to consolidate dispersed programmatic components that have contributed to discontinuity in service planning and delivery and to inefficient use of staff and other resources. At the time of the review visit, budgeting for disability service components had been consolidated and work was moving forward to bring the service components together in the same physical location. These efforts are to be applauded, and the goal of program consolidation should be pursued aggressively.

Administration at the program level has been somewhat problematic. Because DSP&S at Sacramento City College has been operating in a piecemeal fashion, with some services offered through the Disability Resource Center, some through the Learning Disabilities Program, and some (e.g., adapted physical education, tutoring) through other departments or programs, there is a sense of fragmented and inefficient operations that came through strongly during the review. Not only was service
planning not done in a comprehensive fashion, but staff was not being used efficiently and duplication of effort (e.g., maintaining two or more sets of service files) was noted in the disability service program at SCC. As noted above, the College was continuing its efforts to resolve the problems related to service fragmentation, and it appeared that real progress was being made in this area.

In summary, the overall impression of administrative efforts at SCC relative to disability services was one of an aware and committed group of administrators who understood the issues that require attention and who were working to resolve such issues in a manner that would have a high likelihood for continued improvement in the scope and quality of services provided students with disabilities at SCC. Specific findings relative to administrative issues are summarized below.

**Administration/Leadership Commendations**

- The SCC President is knowledgeable and very aware of disability issues and activities, and his commitment to providing opportunities for students with disabilities was evident in his support of involvement of students with disabilities in Phi Theta Kappa, student governance, and other College programs and activities.
- The Vice President for Student Services is directly involved in disability-related activities through her convening of an annual task force on College access and through other efforts to support high quality service delivery.
- There is a very knowledgeable and supportive Dean of Student Services who has been a strong proponent of program consolidation and service improvement.
- The Director of Operations is very aware of access issues and problems and has developed strategies for ensuring quality control with regard to electric doors and other access technologies on campus.
- The DRC Coordinator is highly regarded by faculty, staff, and students, and has been working diligently to address problems related to service fragmentation.
- There is a clear administrative commitment to hiring qualified faculty and staff with disabilities and to providing support needed for these individuals to perform successfully in their jobs.
- There is a clear commitment to academic excellence, including the involvement of students with disabilities in programs like Phi Theta Kappa.
- There was substantive support for student governance activities that involve students with disabilities.
There was ample evidence of creative problem solving (e.g., dealing with current budget crisis) in ways that do not impact negatively on key programs, including disability-related programs and services and that recognize the contributions that faculty, staff and others have made to the College.

Administrative/Leadership Compliance Issues

1. **Observation Supporting Issue Identification**: It was not clear from documentation provided prior to and during the review if the College was returning revenue generated through special class offerings to the disability service program as required under Title 5. This issue was raised on at least two occasions during which budget matters were discussed, and clear documentation was not available to make a determination on this matter. One person involved in fiscal operations expressed the view that the funds were being returned to the program, although tracking processes might not provide a clear pathway of funding going back to program support. Section 56070 of Title 5 of the Education Code requires that “Revenue from special classes shall be used for the provision of support services or instruction pursuant to Section 56026 and 56028 and shall not be used for indirect administrative costs as defined in Section 56068.”

   **Issue Resolution Strategy(ies)**: The College Administration should conduct a fiscal review to determine if in fact the revenue generated through special classes offered to students with disabilities is being returned to support programmatic and service components that specifically serve DSP&S students. In the event that there are discrepancies identified with regard to revenue generated and funding support provided, then the District and College need to remedy that situation through an allocation process that ensures compliance with Title 5, and through implementation of a tracking mechanism that allows for timely verification of compliance with regard to revenue generation and allocation. In the event that the District and the College are indeed in compliance with Title 5 requirements, then only the latter part of the previous resolution strategy—implementation of a tracking mechanism that allows for timely verification of compliance with regard to revenue generation and allocation—requires the attention of the District and the College. This issue does require attention in order to avoid possible revenue loss that might result from a fiscal audit and any

---

corrective actions that might result from a finding of non-compliance.

2. **Observation Supporting Issue Identification:** In conducting the review, it was clear that there was confusion among faculty and staff around campus regarding the structure of the disability services program and the lines of authority within the program. Many people who were interviewed had the perception that there were separate programs serving students with disabilities; one serving students with learning disabilities and one serving students with other disabilities. This perception was fostered by the physical separation of program components and by the designation of two coordinators within the larger disability services program. Title 5, Section IIIA—56048, is quite clear in its requirement that “Each district receiving funds pursuant to this subchapter shall designate a DSPS Coordinator for each college in the district. For the purpose of this section, the Coordinator is defined as that individual who has responsibility for the day-to-day operation of DSPS.” The arrangements at SCC at present do not clearly specify a DSP&S Coordinator, and this situation contributes to confusion regarding reporting authority and administrative responsibility, as well as to discontinuity in services to students.

**Issue Resolution Strategy(ies):** Complete efforts currently underway to consolidate disability services in a single location and the designation of one person as the DSP&S Coordinator. Whether the acronym DSP&S is used or the College continues to operate with the designation of the Disability Resource Center (DRC), the lines of authority should be clearly spelled out so that it is clear that the College complies with the Title 5 requirements for staffing of DSP&S units operated with Title 5 support. Designation of multiple coordinators within a single service program, such as DSP&S, is likely to continue to result in confusion and possible conflict related to lack of clarity in reporting responsibilities and lines of authority. It also will continue to contribute to inefficiencies in service delivery that ultimately detract from the quality of services that are provided to students served through DSP&S.

---

Administrative/Leadership Recommendations

There were no additional recommendations regarding administration or leadership at Sacramento City College.
Programs/Services

General Observations

The general impression as regards programs and services at Sacramento City College was one of true commitment to quality among most of the administration, faculty, and staff of the College. In general, comments gleaned from student interviews, as well as data gathered from the surveys completed and submitted by students reflected high levels of satisfaction with the services that were provided through the Disability Resource Center (DRC), the WorkAbility Program, the tutoring program, and other programs of the College.

There was evidence of service problems related to the fragmented program structure discussed previously. These problems involved a number of issues, including: Lack of clarity among College faculty and staff regarding reporting relationships within the disability service program and some confusion about responsibilities within the program. Overspecialization of staff roles, resulting in lack of opportunity to use staff effectively where they were needed. Unbalanced staffing arrangements, with some service components staffed at a ratio that appeared to be disproportionate to the service load borne by a component. Duplication of student records in multiple locations, increasing risks for inadvertent breach of students confidentiality.

Notwithstanding problems related to fragmented service components, there was ample evidence that students with disabilities at Sacramento City College were generally receiving high quality services. Details of the findings are provided below.

Programs/Services Commendations

- Disability service component budgets have been consolidated, improving program planning and oversight.
- Progress toward program integration is being made to address problems related to service fragmentation and confusion regarding program operations, and plans for bringing the Disability Resource Center and the Learning Disabilities service components together in common space are moving forward.
- Coordination of disability services staff is handled very effectively by the Supervisor of Counseling Services.
Student comments regarding the DRC and other services were highly favorable.
There is a College-wide alternate media policy in place.
There is excellent collaboration between the DRC and Workability Program.
There is a strong and effective working relationship between the DRC, the Workability Program staff and area Department of Rehabilitation personnel.
Test proctoring services are very well organized and delivered, and were described by some faculty as being “nearly seamless.”
In general, there is a capable and committed staff within the disability services components who work very well together.
Materials distributed through the Matriculation and Student Activities Program contain contact information regarding disability-related services.
Excellent flex/in-service training is provided on disability issues and services.
There is a commitment by the Physical Education (PE) Department to mainstream students with disabilities into PE classes and activities, providing an experience similar to that provided students without disabilities.
Accessible informational/instructional technology is dispersed throughout the campus.
The High Tech Center provides effective technology training, with the goal of preparing students to use technologies available in laboratory and library settings effectively.
The College Website provides good access (see attached report).
There is an excellent and integrated tutoring program in place.
Good progress is being made toward fully accessible distance education offerings.
There is a growing body of Internet resources developed with attention to full access by persons with disabilities.
There is attention to program and service access at satellite learning sites operated by SCC.

Program/Services Compliances issues

1. **Observation Supporting Issue Identification:** A review of students file revealed that many were not in compliance with requirements specified under Title 5 regulations. This was true for files maintained in the Disability Resource Center, as well as for files maintained in the Learning Disability (LD) service component. Among the problems noted in the review of files was: 1) lack of documentation of disability; 2) missing student signatures authorizing services;

---

3) missing Student Educational Contracts; and 4) records of service delivery clearly indicating what had been provided to the student so that assessment might be made of the congruency of services with documented needs. Also, as noted previously, some students had more than one record, with one set of records in the DRC and one set of records in the LD service area. Furthermore, records were not maintained in any standardized format, making it difficult to locate specific documents within a given record. The files reviewed at SCC were clearly not in compliance with Title 5 Section 56062, which requires that “The college should maintain a file for each student reported to the state for funding through the DSPS program. The file should contain a college transcript of general as well as special classes and/or independent study in which the student is enrolled, amount and type of special services received, and verification of disability information.”

**Issue Resolution Strategy(ies):** SCC should adopt a standardized student record format and adhere to it in maintaining current and complete student files. Each student being served should have only one file providing information on all services that he or she is receiving with Title 5 support. A number of good models for student files are available in community colleges around the state, including the format and documentation in use at Riverside College. In addition, including a checklist of items contained within each student file might make it easier to confirm that required items are indeed in place. Checklists are available from Riverside College and from other colleges throughout California. Consideration should also be given to securing and implementing an electronic student record system at the time that the current system is upgraded. Excellent electronic systems have been developed and implemented in different Colleges (e.g., Diablo Valley College) around the State, and since a major overhaul of the current system is needed, it might be the opportune time to consider an electronic record. DRC personnel are encouraged to use the DSP&S Coordinators’ listserv to query other Colleges about systems in use and to explore options that might work for SCC. Once a standardized file format—whether electronic or paper—has been adopted, training of all staff on proper file maintenance procedures should be done periodically to reinforce the need for good record keeping.

Regarding upgrading and maintenance of students’ records, an important point should be made. At present, the DRC Coordinator/Counselor devotes at least

---

50% time and effort to direct student services. This commitment of time and effort to counseling and other direct services leaves little time available for administrative responsibilities, including record maintenance, staff training and oversight, and regular monitoring. At the time of the program review, plans were in the works to relocate the only other DRC counselor to another campus, further reducing the amount of time available to the DRC Coordinator for administrative tasks, including upgrading of record-keeping procedures, staff training, and monitoring. If these plans are acted on, the direct service load for the DRC Coordinator/Counselor would increase significantly, and it is very doubtful that the attention to student records, staff training, and ongoing monitoring stated as a need in this report would be provided. The loss of a DRC Counselor at SCC would most likely result in continued non-compliance with regard to student records, placing the College at significant risk for revenue loss resulting from determinations of service ineligibility for some students on whom required documentation was lacking.

2. Observation Supporting Issue Identification: There was fairly compelling evidence that some students were not being provided timely accommodations for their disabilities due to delays in determinations of disability status. This was most evident with regard to students who were potentially eligible based on determinations of learning disability. Title 5 requires that every college receiving Title 5 funding have in place policy and procedures for “...responding, in a timely manner, to accommodation requests involving academic adjustments.” There were numerous examples at SCC of LD assessment processes extending over weeks and months. A number of students reported frustration with the process and not being able to complete the assessment. At least one student who had already been assessed and determined to be eligible for LD services at Cosumnes River College—a College within the same District as SCC—was informed that she would need to complete another LD assessment, involving taking a class and completing testing processes, before being deemed eligible to receive LD services at SCC. This requirement flies in the face of the intent of adopting a Statewide LD assessment model. The Statewide LD Eligibility Model was designed so that “...criteria should be uniform and should be implemented statewide. Otherwise, a referred student could be determined eligible for LD services at one community college and not at another. Hence,

---

students who transfer from one community college to another might be in jeopardy of losing LD services because of inconsistent practices among colleges. The California Community College LD Eligibility Model procedures are being implemented statewide to prevent this problem."

During the program review, it could not be determined that the prescribed Statewide model for determining eligibility for LD services was being applied in a consistent fashion congruent with the guidelines developed by the LD Task Force and approved for Statewide application by the Chancellor’s Office. No matter what other issues are present, a college cannot add a requirement of taking a course or going through additional assessment in order to receive accommodations if the student already has appropriate documentation of a disability that also allows identification of his or her educational limitations.

**Issue Resolution Strategy(ies):** Ensure that all personnel involved in determinations of service eligibility have received training on current State mandated assessment models, and that the assessment processes are being applied in a consistent fashion. Assistance in this regard is available from Marcia Krull, (909) 487-6752, ext. 1537, or Patricia Flores-Charter, (619) 421-6700 ext. 5300, the consultants contracted to provide the LD eligibility model training. A review of current rates and typical timeframes for completion of LD assessments at SCC and comparison with rates and timeframes at other colleges might also be of value in determining if additional training and/or staffing issues are impinging on SCC’s abilities to provide timely assessments and appropriate accommodations to students who are potentially eligible for LD services. The consultants identified above can provide information that might be of value in conducting an internal review of this type.

**Program/Service Recommendations**

1. **Observation Supporting Recommendations:** Disability service components at SCC operate with a fairly small number of faculty and staff. However, with the fragmented structure, there is a high level of specialization in staff assignments, reducing the abilities of supervisory personnel to use staff effectively where they might be needed. In these difficult economic times Colleges simply do not have the luxury of staff specialization that might have been supportable in less constrained budgetary times.

---

Recommendation: The DRC Coordinator/Counselor should take the lead in completing the Refined Summary of Roles and Responsibilities for Disability Services, with substantive involvement of the Dean of Student Services, other faculty and staff working within the consolidated program, and consultants and/or advisors. After redefining staff roles and responsibilities to make best use of the personnel available, efforts should be initiated on cross training staff to perform multiple job functions in supporting the academic and related needs of students with disabilities. New job descriptions should reflect a broader range of responsibilities in staff roles, allowing for greater latitude in assigning staff to specific functional responsibilities as demand from students may dictate. Consideration should be given to more generic job titles (e.g., disability services assistant) rather than more narrowly defined job titles (e.g., DRC assistant, LD assistant). Although assistants might be primarily assigned to one function, through the broadening of job titles and cross training of staff, personnel will be better prepared to provide support where needed to ensure timely and appropriate services. In addition to offering opportunities for better use of staff, this approach has the potential for creating enhanced employee support systems, with staff better able to provide illness coverage and other back-support when co-workers may require it.

2. Observation Supporting Recommendations: Securing the services of qualified sign language interpreters is a growing problem at SCC. There are too few qualified interpreters in the area, and SCC competes with other colleges and users in the area, most notably American River College (ARC), which has a very large population of hearing impaired students. Also, there are differences among colleges within the district regarding pay scales for interpreters, often putting SCC at a disadvantage when trying to attract interpreters who have other opportunities within the District.

Recommendation: A number of strategies for addressing this problem should be explored by SCC. These include: Entering into discussions with American River College and Cosumnes River College on the potential for establishing a District Interpreter Pool. With the agreement of the three Colleges, rates could be agreed upon, policies for recruiting interpreters from specific geographic areas could be established, and processes for resolving conflicts and disputes could be formulated. This approach might help to ameliorate the problem of intra-District competition for
interpreters. In addition, by establishing a district-wide interpreter service would provide more full-time and/or permanent positions, which would provide better job stability.

“Blocking” classes for which interpreters have been arranged and announcing these offerings early in the registration process. This is done at other colleges with high enrollments of students with hearing impairments, including Riverside College. Students are informed that by selecting a “blocked” class they will be assured of having an interpreter. Also, this approach provides a means of encouraging student support groups by bringing students with a common need together in the classroom. Obviously, students will have the option of choosing another class offering if they desire to, but for many, the opportunity to participate in a class with other students with whom they can communicate will be attractive and might reduce the number of classes for which interpreter coverage is needed.

Consider strategies for making interpreting at SCC more attractive. This might involve establishing an interpreter “Prep” room where interpreters can socialize, access resources, and otherwise feel welcome. It might also include special recognition events and other activities that reinforce the message that interpreter services are an important part of SCC offerings.

3. **Observation Supporting Recommendations**: It did not appear that regular meetings of all staff involved in disability-related service components were convened on a regular basis. Instead, there appeared to be regular meetings of staff in various components of the service program (e.g., DRC, LD) on varying time schedules. This practice contributes to fragmentation and discontinuity in the service program.

**Recommendation**: Initiate regular, full DSP&S staff meetings that provide opportunities for full and open discussions of operational issues and creative problem solving. These meeting should be held at regularly scheduled times. All staff who work with students with disabilities—including those working in the Adapted Physical Education (APE) Program, those in the Tutoring Program, those in the Library, the Department of Rehabilitation, and others—should be encouraged to attend, and all DRC and LD faculty and staff should be required to attend. Meetings should be held at least bi-monthly if not monthly, an agenda should be prepared and followed, with adequate time for open discussion, and minutes should be kept to facilitate monitoring of progress made on issues raised in the meetings. Having full staff meetings on a regular basis can help to build
cohesion within the program.

4. **Observation Supporting Recommendations:** There appeared to be no structured process for examining the needs and supports systems in place for students who had disabilities that might require services from more than one component of the disability services program at SCC. It appeared that service planning and decision making for students requiring multiple services was done on an ad hoc basis, without exploring the possibilities for more efficient approaches to service delivery that might emerge from meetings of personnel from different service components. These meetings could provide opportunities to discuss with the student his or her needs and the ways in which they might best be met.

**Recommendation:** Consider “Student Staffings,” engaging faculty, staff, and the Department of Rehabilitation in periodic planning, review, and problem solving for students receiving more than one service. These could be planned with the student available to participate, and they should focus on strategies for addressing needs in ways that are preferred by the student. In addition to providing a means for more direct involvement of students in service planning and delivery, this approach offers opportunities for brainstorming and creative problem solving that are often overlooked in more isolated service planning approaches.

5. **Observation Supporting Recommendations:** Although the High Tech Center (HTC) is functioning effectively as a training ground for students who need to learn about technology that is dispersed throughout the College, there are not regular meetings between HTC staff and staff of the Computer Services Center. Nor are there regular meetings between the HTC staff and other staff involved in technology-based accommodation supports, including the Alternate Media Specialist. As such, it is not clear if good communication is ongoing regarding the needs of students in different technology-equipped settings or if available technology (e.g., Brailling equipment) is being deployed effectively to meet student needs. In a college like SCC, where students must rely on technologies dispersed throughout the campus, open and regular communication between those who are responsible for the technology and for those preparing students to use it is critically important.

**Recommendation:** Establish regular meetings of HTC staff, Computer Services staff, and others (e.g., the Alternate Media Specialist) to review technology access issues and to develop solutions in a collaborative manner. In addition to
identifying problem areas and strategies for resolving computer-related access issues, the group could explore the current deployment of existing technologies and suggest practices in which it might be used better to meet the needs of students. Initially meetings might be held on a bi-monthly basis, with quarterly meetings convened after participants were satisfied that key issues had been identified and sorted out.

6. **Observation Supporting Recommendations**: In most of the computer facilities (e.g., learning laboratories, library carrels) only one or two workstations is/are equipped for access by students with disabilities. While this provides a minimal level of access, it does limit the number of persons with disabilities who can access the technology at a given time. Also, if someone with a mobility impairment who needs the physical access provided by an adjustable table is using the workstation, then someone whose only need may involve access to a screen-reading program may not be able to have access at a convenient time. Furthermore, having only one or two accessible workstations in a lab might be construed as a segregating practice, requiring students to work on a designated computer rather than having access to a number of machines as other students do.

**Recommendation**: Consider expanding accessible computer workstations in student labs and learning facilities so that more computers are equipped with access features. While not all computers need to be equipped with all access features (e.g., large-screen monitors, adjustable tables), adding access software to computers in labs increases the options for students who may not need other access features beyond those that can be provided through software modifications. Options may include changing software licenses at a relatively modest cost or implementing network-based assistive computer technologies to targeted stations. SCC technology personnel are encouraged to consult with staff at the HTCTU and to use the DSP&S Coordinators’, High Tech, or Alternate Media Listservs to explore how this issue has been dealt with on other campuses.

7. **Observation Supporting Recommendations**: The DSP&S Advisory Committee at SCC is comprised almost completely of personnel from SCC, including many who are directly involved in disability service provision. There are only a few members (e.g., one or two students, Department of Rehabilitation staff) who are not SCC employees. While this approach to the Advisory Committee may result in good attendance at meetings, it is unlikely to produce much in the way of fresh thinking or new perspectives about disability issues or the way in which they are addressed at SCC.
Recommendation: Re-constitute the DSP&S Advisory Committee to include more student and community representation with SCC employees serving only in ex-officio roles. Particular attention to representation by students with varying types of disabilities, as well as by persons with disabilities from the community is important. Also, representation by persons from different community organizations serving persons with disabilities can be advantageous. If possible, representation by corporations or philanthropies involved in community giving should be considered as well. Once the new Advisory Committee is constituted, keep meetings to a minimum, use the Committee to address substantive issues (e.g., fund raising for a specific goal or project, outreach to a particular segment of the community), and keep the Committee members informed. Since an Advisory Committee is required under Title 5 regulations, the College may as well make use of it in a constructive fashion.
Facilities/Physical Plant

General Observations

The main campus at Sacramento City College is located in buildings that span eras—some dating back to the 1920s, with others constructed as recently as 1998. As such, there is great variation in the levels of access observed around the campus. In general, a very good job has been done of providing access even to old and very “disability unfriendly” structures. Ramping has been very well done around the campus, and almost every building has functioning automatic doors. The newer buildings offer models of access, with spacious restrooms, well designed hallways and public spaces and very well thought out paths of travel. However, access problems do persist around the campus and these are discussed below.

Facilities/Physical Plant Commendations

- Ramping of buildings was generally very well done on the main campus, providing good access.
- Almost all buildings on the main campus had working automatic doors.
- There was a plan in place for routine checking of door operations and maintenance.
- Major satellite campus facilities (i.e., Davis) were very accessible, with only minor access issues observed that were being addressed within days after the end of the review visit.
- There was excellent access to bookstore and other sales areas.
- Major renovation was underway to improve access to campus facilities, with new construction in process in a number of areas.

Facilities/Physical Plant Compliance Issues

1. **Observation Supporting Issue Identification**: As public entities covered under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, community colleges are required to comply with specific requirements. These are spelled out in brief in the Checklist for Existing Facilities: Version 2.1, available from the U.S. Department of Justice Website. More detailed discussions of Title II

---

9 Adaptive Environments Center, Inc/Barrier Free Environments, Inc. (1995). *Checklist for Existing Facilities: Version 2.1*. This document can be downloaded in either text or PDF formats from the U.S. Department of Justice website at [link]
requirements are provided in U.S. Department of Justice documents on the ADA. Specific access problems noted around the Sacramento City College campus included:
Non-ADA compliant signage on many buildings of the main campus;
High (inaccessible counters) in number of service areas (e.g., Admissions and Registration, Financial Aide);
Some restrooms in older buildings were not ADA compliant, with inadequate space and/or configuration of stalls, inaccessible hardware on doors, etc.;
Shower curtains on accessible stalls in some women’s restroom.
The Davis campus had minor access problems (e.g., non-ADA-compliant sink hardware in bathrooms, bathroom pipes not wrapped).

Issue Resolution Strategy(ies): Sacramento City College should continue working toward full access on all its campuses and for all facilities. In this regard, an updated ADA Transition Plan might be useful, highlighting areas where access problems persist and providing a strategy and timeline for addressing such problems. At the time of the review, SCC was operating with an interim Section 504/ADA Coordinator, and he acknowledged his lack of awareness of the transition plan. With the assignment of a permanent 504/ADA Coordinator for the College, the Transition Plan should be reviewed, updated in light of identified needs, and coordinated with an action schedule for addressing persistent barriers on the main campus and other access issues on recently established satellite campuses. Updating the Transition Plan can be done in a very cost effective way by using students with disabilities, persons with disabilities from community who have expertise relative to access issues, and other volunteers. SCC has made excellent progress in providing access to its facilities, with a little effort, full compliance can be realized.

Facilities/Physical Plant Recommendations

No other recommendations were made regarding facilities and physical plant.
Technical Assistance

Technical assistance was requested in the areas of:

Progress Monitoring and Follow-up. Patricia Flores-Charter providing on-site guidance on strategies for efficient progress monitoring and follow-up and had agreed to provide sample materials from her program to the SCC staff.

Instructor Involvement and Support. Recommendations were made during the review visit regarding strategies for instructor involvement and support. Additional research will be done in this area to identify other resources that may be useful based on information gathered during the review.

DSP&S Policies and Procedures. SCC staff were referred to the Galvin Group Website (www.galvin-group.com) for some materials, with other materials that were formerly available through the Access Resource Website to be provided in follow-up correspondence with the DRC Coordinator.

Program Management. Extensive on-site recommendations on program management actions were provided by members of the review team. Additional research is underway to determine if other resources are appropriate to the needs of the SCC disability service programs. As always, SCC personnel are encouraged to make effective use of the various DSP&S Listservs. A wealth of information can be gleaned from the Listservs.
Required Follow-up with Chancellor’s Office

The Chancellor’s Office has produced this report in accordance with laws and regulations of the United States of America and the State of California regarding equal access to and treatment of persons with disabilities in public programs and facilities. In order to satisfy its requirements for oversight of programs and services operated under the auspices of California’s tax-supported community college systems, the Chancellor’s Office of the California Community Colleges requires that Sacramento City College produce a written response to the Chancellor’s Office within 90 days of receipt of this report. The response should include the following three items:

1. A brief description of the College’s plan for resolving each compliance issue identified in the report.
2. An estimate of the date by which the issue will be resolved in a manner that ensures compliance with State and Federal laws and regulations.
3. An indication whether or not the College plans to act on the other recommendations included in the report by identifying specific recommendations and the nature of planned actions.

In the event that a compliance issue has been inappropriately or inaccurately identified through the review process, the College should notify the Chancellor’s Office in writing concerning the nature of the inappropriate or inaccurate portion of the report. This notification should indicate the actual status or nature of the program component or issue identified as non-compliant. The Chancellor’s Office reserves the right to schedule an on-site follow-up review of the College to determine if compliance issues have been or are being resolved in an appropriate and timely fashion.

Closing Remarks

The members of the Sacramento City College Program Review Team wish to express their appreciation for the hospitality that was extended to them during the visit. As this report indicates, the Review Team members were most impressed with the program that they saw at SCC. It is staffed by people who are truly committed to full inclusion of persons with disabilities in higher education.