

CORE INQUIRIES

Sacramento City College
3835 Freeport Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95822

The Core Inquiries are based upon the findings of the peer review team that conducted Team ISER Review on February 24, 2022.

Dr. John Weispfenning
Team Chair

Contents

Peer Review Team Roster.....	3
Summary of Team ISER Review.....	4
Core Inquiries.....	5

Sacramento City College

Peer Review Team Roster

Team ISER Review

February 24, 2022

Dr. John Weispfenning, Team Chair* Coast Community College District Chancellor	Dr. Rudolph Besikof, Vice Chair* Laney College President
ACADEMIC MEMBERS	
Ms. Stephanie Curry Reedley College Academic Senate President/ Faculty Grant Coordinator/ Librarian	Dr. Sarah Harris College of the Sequoias Curriculum & Outcomes Assessment Coordinator
Dr. Anne Kingsley Diablo Valley College Professor of English	Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto Saddleback College Vice President for Instruction
Dr. Henry Young Victor Valley College Department Chair Business Administration	
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS	
Dr. David El Fattal Ventura County Community College District Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services	Dr. Ashanti Hands San Diego Mesa College Vice President, Student Services
Dr. Andreea Serban* Coast Community College District Vice Chancellor Educational Services & Technology	Mr. Bryan Ventura Cypress College Director, Institutional Research and Planning
ACCJC STAFF LIAISON	
Dr. Gohar Momjian Vice President	

*These individuals served on the district team.

Summary of Team ISER Review

INSTITUTION: Sacramento City College

DATE OF TEAM ISER REVIEW: February 24, 2022

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. John Weispfenning

An eleven-member accreditation peer review team conducted Team ISER Review of Sacramento City College on February 24, 2022. The Team ISER Review is a one-day, off-site analysis of an institution's self-evaluation report. The peer review team received the college's institutional self-evaluation report (ISER) and related evidence several weeks prior to the Team ISER Review. Team members found the ISER to be a comprehensive, well written, document detailing the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards, and Commission Policies. The team confirmed that the ISER was developed through broad participation by the entire College community including faculty, staff, students, and administration. The team found that the College provided a thoughtful ISER containing several self-identified action plans for institutional improvement. The College also prepared a Quality Focus Essay.

In preparation for the Team ISER Review, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop on December 1, 2021, and held a pre-review meeting with the college CEO on January 24, 2022. The entire peer review team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on February 3, 2022. Prior to the Team ISER Review, team members completed their team assignments, identified areas for further clarification, and provided a list of requests for additional evidence to be considered during Team ISER Review.

During the Team ISER Review, team members spent the morning discussing their initial observations and their preliminary review of the written materials and evidence provided by the College for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and US ED regulations. In the afternoon, the team further synthesized their findings to validate the excellent work of the college and identified standards the college meets, as well as developed Core Inquiries to be pursued during the Focused Site Visit, which will occur in the week of October 10, 2022.

Core Inquiries are a means for communicating potential areas of institutional noncompliance, improvement, or exemplary practice that arise during the Team ISER Review. They describe the areas of emphasis for the Focused Site Visit that the team will explore to further their analysis to determining whether standards are met and accordingly identify potential commendations or recommendations. The college should use the Core Inquiries and time leading up to the focused site visit as an opportunity to gather more evidence, collate information, and to strengthen or develop processes in the continuous improvement cycle. In the course of the Focused Site Visit, the ACCJC staff liaison will review new or emerging issues which might arise out of the discussions on Core Inquiries.

Core Inquiries

Based on the team’s analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

Core Inquiry 1: The team would like further clarification concerning the following: a. Frequency and method of evaluating and improving institutional handbooks, policies, and processes. b. Status of the improvement plan for communication and governance. c. Frequency of review and updates to decision-making structures and processes.
Standards or Policies: I.B.7, IV.A.6, IV.A.7
Description: a. In the ISER it is noted that there is an annual review, but some of the documents, such as the guide to participatory decision making, curriculum handbook, and the faculty handbook, were last revised in 2016.
Topics of discussion during interviews: a. Locus of responsibility for ensuring that documents outlining the college’s decision-making structures and processes are reviewed and revised in accordance with the college’s established timelines. b. Status of the improvement plan for communication and governance. c. Methods for updating processes/handbooks, frequency and cycles of their review or what determines when review and updating are necessary, if a cycle is not identified. d. Methods for vetting and communicating updates to the college community.
Request for Additional Information/Evidence: a. Documentation of regular cycle of evaluation for governance, especially documentation of processes/activities listed in the body of IV.A.7.
Request for Observations/Interviews: a. Members of the College Council and PRIE b. Chairs of other governance committees

Core Inquiry 2: The team would like further clarification of how the College evaluates its delivery methods for distance education. Specifically, the team would like additional information about how regular and substantive interaction between students and the instructor is ensured.
Standards or Policies: I.B.5, II.A.7, Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education
Description: a. The team reviewed a random selection of distance education courses provided by the college and saw inconsistent evidence of regular and substantive interactions for 10 of the 50 courses. b. The team’s review of the ISER found that data disaggregation by program type and mode of delivery are not directly addressed within the program review process. Moreover, the data dashboard screenshot provided did not include delivery mode.
Topics of discussion during interviews: a. College assessment of effective use of distance education as a mode of delivery. b. Program review data disaggregation by method of instruction and student demographics. c. Professional development opportunities to ensure regular and substantive interactions, including needs assessment and evaluation of them.
Request for Additional Information/Evidence: a. Documentation of the definition of regular and substantive interaction b. Training materials for Distance Education faculty members c. Dashboards or other evidence of review of success by modality d. Review another sample of distance education courses from a subsequent term (Spring 2022)
Request for Observations/Interviews: a. Distance Education Coordinator/Committee b. Professional Development Coordinators c. Instructional Designer d. Deans/chairs

Core Inquiry 3: The team would like to better understand how the College conducts the following:

- a. Regular Program/Administrative Review and Outcomes Assessment
- b. All outcomes assessment, including reporting of data and findings
- c. Steps taken as part of the College's and units' continuous improvement cycles or practices
- d. Ensuring that all class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes

Standards or Policies: I.B.2, II.A.3, II.A.16, II.B.3, II.C.1, II.C.2

Description:

- a. Although student services general learning outcomes are referenced in the narrative, the team needs more evidence to see how these outcomes are established and regularly assessed.
- b. More evidence is also needed to show that student learning assessment is incorporated in systematic and regular review of the college's instructional and student support services, as the college acknowledges that "regular SLO reporting has been uneven," which was consistent with the evidence provided.
- c. The College provided evidence that there is a cycle and process in place, however the team did not locate evidence of the level of college wide progress.
- d. The team did not locate a definition of AUOs that delineated them from program goals and would like to better understand this.

Topics of discussion during interviews:

- a. Cycles of assessment, including responsibilities for coordination of cycles, and review of assessment reports.
- b. Applications of AUOs and/or SLOs in non-instructional programs and curricular classes for the library and tutorial programs.
- c. Status or percentage of the SLO/AUO assessment completed.
- d. Status of the Student Services Program Review improvement plan (workgroup, timeline, cycle and process, etc.).

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:

- a. Access to the SLO repository
(<https://planning.scc.losrios.edu/SLO/Logon.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2fSLO%2f>)
- b. Update on Quality Focus Essay Action Project 2: Strategy #1 and #2 activities
- c. Summary reports of SLO and AUO assessment cycles and percentage completed.
- d. AUO training resources and related materials.
- e. Completed AUOs.

- f. Evidence of prior and current outcome assessment for library services and courses.
- g. A sample of syllabi with corresponding course outlines of record

Request for Observations/Interviews:

- a. SLO committee
- b. DE Committee/Coordinator
- c. PRIE Committee
- d. Student Services Program Review Workgroup
- e. Program Review Coordinator

Core Inquiry 4: The team would like further clarification on the following:

- a. Evaluation activities that assess the effectiveness of professional development and training activities offered by the College.
- b. Tracking of employee evaluations to ensure timely completion in accordance with collective bargaining contracts and district board policies.

Standards or Policies: III.A.5, III.A.14

Description:

- a. The ISER makes reference to activities related to professional development. Examples of activities within Human Resources include the New Hire Orientation, New Faculty Academy, Faculty Diversity Internship Program, as well as other professional development sessions and training. The team would like to know about the assessment of effectiveness of these efforts.
- b. The team would like to know how employee evaluations are tracked for timely completion.

Topics of discussion during interviews:

- a. Overview of professional development activities and how they are assessed for effectiveness.
- b. Methods for tracking of employee evaluations and ensuring timely completion.

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:

- a. Evaluation documentation for professional development activities and programs
- b. Report showing due dates and completion dates for employee evaluations.

Request for Observations/Interviews:

- a. Human Resources manager/District HR
- b. Staff Resource Center personnel
- c. Coordinators or other staff charged with professional development
- d. Faculty professional development/FLEX coordinator

District Core Inquiries

Based on the team's analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following district core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

District Core Inquiry 1: The team would like to better understand how the Board ensures a regular cycle of review of its board policies to ensure their effectiveness in fulfilling the district's mission and revises the policies as necessary.

Standards or Policies: IV.C.7

Description:

- a. The team reviewed the college's ISER, which indicated that policies and regulations are created and amended to address changes in law, District operations, and the needs of students. The evidence supports the ISER's statement that "*On a quarterly basis, the general counsel informs the board of the need to update policies or regulation.*" The team also confirmed that the Board reaffirms all Board Policies and Administrative Regulations in batch form (1000-9000). The Board has Board Policy 3112, which addresses the process for adoption of policies.
- b. However, in a random sampling of the Board Policies and Administrative Regulations online, the team found Board Policies that had not been updated since the 1980s and 1990s. The team would like to better understand how the Board ensures a regular cycle of review of its Board Policies and Administrative Regulations to confirm their effectiveness in fulfilling the District's mission.

Topics of discussion during interviews:

- a. Cycle for the regular assessment and revision of Board Policies and Administrative Regulations.

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:**Request for Observations/Interviews:**

- a. Individuals responsible for ensuring the regular updating of Board Policies and Administrative Regulations (e.g., Board Office).

District Core Inquiry 2: The team would like to deepen its understanding of the specific delineation of college and district roles and responsibilities to better understand the following:

- The interface between district level governance and college level governance
- The autonomy of the colleges
- The functions carried out at the district office
- The impact of completed reorganizations on the colleges and the district office
- The analyses being done for planned reorganizations

Standards or Policies: IV.D.2, IV.D.3, IV.D.4, IV.D.7

Description:

- a. The Functional Map uses the accreditation standards to identify primary, secondary, and shared responsibilities between the District and the College. While this approach provides a high-level view of responsibilities relative to each accreditation standard, it does not identify the actual functions and operations performed by the District Office making it difficult to determine the delineation of responsibilities. There are references to District reorganizations and centralizations but it is not clear what the impact on the delineation of responsibilities is.
- b. The team read the references to the 80/20 resource allocation formulas; however, it is not completely clear what would happen in the event the district experiences a revenue reduction in terms of impact on personnel and the colleges.
- c. The team did not see a district-level decision making guide that would help clarify the roles of the various districtwide committees.
- d. District governance and structure are discussed at the Chancellor's Cabinet. However, it is not evident how improvements are made as a result of these discussions.

Topics of discussion during interviews:

- a. Delineation of responsibilities between the District and the colleges.
- b. Resource allocation mechanisms.
- c. The evaluation of district/college delineations, governance processes, and improvements.
- d. How the colleges place items of interest on the agenda of the Chancellor's Executive Staff meetings.

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:

- a. Brief description of the functions carried out at the district office.
- b. Minutes of Chancellor's Cabinet meetings when District governance and structure were discussed.
- c. Agendas of Executive Staff meetings where college-initiated items of interest were discussed.
- d. Evidence of examples of any changes made in District governance.
- e. Example of how the 80/20 allocation formula works in the event of a reduction in revenue.
- f. Reports or analyses done leading to completed reorganizations, such as the centralization of the Public Information Officers and the Philanthropy office.
- g. Analyses of proposed reorganizations such Admissions and Records and Financial Aid.

Request for Observations/Interviews:

- a. Members of the Chancellor's Executive Staff
- b. Members of the Chancellor's Cabinet
- c. Members of District Academic Senate and other district-level participatory governance committees/councils (e.g., Technology, Curriculum, Research)