



ACCREDITING COMMISSION for COMMUNITY and JUNIOR COLLEGES
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Barbara A. Beno, President
Steven M. Kinsella, Chair

February 5, 2016

Mr. Michael Poindexter
Interim President
Sacramento City College
3835 Freeport Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95822

Dear President Poindexter:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on January 6-8, 2016, reviewed the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) submitted by Sacramento City College, evidentiary materials also submitted, and the report prepared by the evaluation team that visited on October 5-8, 2015. College leadership, including the president of the governing board and the college president certified the ISER Report which was submitted in application for reaffirmation of accreditation. The purpose of the Commission's review is to determine whether the College continues to meet Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies (hereafter called standards).

After considering all of the written material noted above, the Commission acted to **reaffirm accreditation for eighteen months** and to require a Follow-Up Report.¹ Reaffirmation of accreditation for eighteen months indicates that the institution is in substantial compliance with the Commission's standards. Sacramento City is required to submit its Follow-Up Report by **March 15, 2017**. The report should demonstrate that the College has resolved all deficiencies and meets standards. The Commission finds the College out of compliance with the following: Standard II.A.6 (College Recommendation 1); II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.C.1, II.C.1.c, and ER 16 (College Recommendation 2); Standards III.C.2 (District Recommendation 1); IV.B.1.j (District Recommendation 2); IV.B.2, and IV.B.3.e (District Recommendation 3).

Need to Resolve Deficiencies:

Accreditation Standards represent practices that lead to academic quality and institutional effectiveness and sustainability. Deficiencies in institutional policies, practices, procedures and outcomes which lead to non-compliance with any standard will impact institutional quality and ultimately, the educational environment and experience of students. The evaluation team has provided recommendations that provide guidance for how the institution may come into compliance with standards.

Mr. Michael Poindexter
Sacramento City College
February 5, 2016

College Recommendation #1

In order to meet the Standard, the Visiting Team recommends the College develop a system to ensure that students receive course syllabi that contain learning outcomes that are consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outlines of record. (II.A.6)

College Recommendation #2

In order to meet the Standards, the College should move from a pilot online tutoring program to a fully implemented online tutoring program to provide the same services to all students regardless of location or means of delivery. (ER 16 and Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.C.1, I.C.1.c)

District Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standard, the Evaluation Team recommends that the LRCCD develop a comprehensive Technology Plan for the district. The plan should be integrated with the program review process and with the on-going and routine technology assessments done by District Information Technology. The Technology Plan should align with and directly support the District Strategic Plan and the colleges' strategic plans. (Standard III.C.2)

District Recommendation 2: In order to meet the Standard, the Evaluation Team recommends that the LRCCD develop a clearly-defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges. (Standard IV.B.1.j.)

District Recommendation 3: In order to meet the Standards as well as to improve institutional effectiveness and align policy with practice, the Evaluation Team recommends that the District modify the existing Board Policy 4111 to more clearly define that the chancellor delegates full responsibility, authority, and accountability to the presidents for the operations of the colleges. The Evaluation Team further recommends that Section 1.2 of Board 2411, which establishes the role of the president as the chief college administrator, be added to the policy section 4000 – Administration. (Standards IV.B.2, and IV.B.3.e)

The External Evaluation Report provides details of the team's findings with regard to the College's work to meet the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. I advise you to read the Report carefully to understand the team's findings and recommendations. While your institution may concur or disagree with any part of the External Evaluation Report, the accreditation process intends that an institution will use the Report and its own Institutional Self Evaluation Report to assess its practices, assure compliance with standards, and to improve its institutional effectiveness and to excel.

Mr. Michael Poindexter
Sacramento City College
February 5, 2016

Increasing Institutional Effectiveness:

The team report noted College Recommendation 3 for increasing institutional effectiveness (improvement recommendations). This recommendation does not identify current areas of deficiency in institutional practice, but highlights areas of practice for which college attention is needed. Consistent with its policy to foster continuous improvement through the peer accreditation process, the Commission expects that institutions will consider the advice for improvement offered during the peer evaluation process and report on actions taken in response to the team's recommendations, if any. Failure of an institution to act on these recommendations will not itself constitute a deficiency in meeting standards or requirements of the Commission. However, in the Commission's experience, failure to take note of areas of practice pointed out in improvement recommendations may lead to future conditions which limit the college's ability to meet standards. As such, we highly recommend the team's improvement recommendations for your attention.

Additional Information:

Under U.S. Department of Education enforcement regulations, the Commission is required to take immediate action to terminate the accreditation of an institution which is out of compliance with any standards, or, alternatively, may provide an institution with additional notice and a deadline for coming into compliance that is no later than two years from when the institution was first informed of the non-compliance. With this letter, Sacramento City College is being provided with notice of the standards for which it is out of compliance and is being provided time to meet the standards.

In its self evaluation process, Sacramento City College also identified improvement plans it intends to undertake. These improvement plans should be linked to the College's ongoing evaluation and improvement work.

The guidance and recommendations contained in the External Evaluation Report represent the best advice of the peer evaluation team at the time of the visit but may not describe all that is necessary for the college to come into compliance (or to improve). While an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the Report, Sacramento City College is expected to use the Report to improve educational programs and services. In addition, the College has the responsibility to accept the Commission's action, and to uphold the integrity of the accreditation process by accurately portraying it and helping institutional constituencies to understand the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies pertinent to this Commission action.

A **final** copy of the External Evaluation Team Report is attached. Commission changes to the Report are noted on a separate page for inclusion with the Report. The College may now

Mr. Michael Poindexter
Sacramento City College
February 5, 2016

duplicate and post copies of the Report, with this added page. The Commission requires that you give the ISER, the External Evaluation Team Report, and this letter appropriate dissemination to those who were signatories of the ISER, and to make these documents available to all campus constituencies and the public by placing copies on the college website.

Please note that in response to public interest in accreditation, the Commission requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no more than one click from the institution's home page.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express appreciation for the work that Sacramento City College undertook to prepare for institutional self evaluation, and to support the work of the external evaluation team. The Commission encourages the College's continued work to ensure educational quality and to support student success. Accreditation and peer review are most effective when the college and the ACCJC work together to encourage continuous quality improvement in higher education. Thank you for sharing the values and the work of accreditation.

If you should have any questions concerning this letter or the Commission action, please don't hesitate to contact me or one of the ACCJC Vice Presidents. We'd be glad to help you.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/tl

Attachment

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

¹ Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review *Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission* found on the ACCJC website at: (<http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc>).