

# **Sacramento City College**

## **Midterm Report**

Submitted by:

**Sacramento City College  
3835 Freeport Boulevard  
Sacramento, Ca. 95822**

To:

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges**

**Due to ACCJC March 15, 2019**

## Midterm Report: Sacramento City College

**To:** Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From:

Michael Gutierrez, President  
Sacramento City College  
3835 Freeport Boulevard  
Sacramento, CA 95822

I certify that there was a broad participation by the campus community and believe that this report accurately reflects that nature and substance of this institution.

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

Ruth Scribner, President, LRCCD Board of Trustees

Dr. Michael Gutierrez, President, Sacramento City College

Dr. Gayle Pitman, President, SCC Academic Senate

Robert Kelly, President, SCC Classified Senate

\_\_\_\_\_, President, SCC Student Associated Council

Dr. Marybeth Buechner, SCC Accreditation Liaison Officer; Manager Tri-chair

Patty Leonard, Faculty Tri-chair, SCC Midterm Report Steering Committee

Kelly Irwin, Classified Tri-chair, SCC Midterm Report Steering Committee

Don Palm, Manager Tri-Chair, SCC Midterm Report Steering Committee

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	4
Report Preparation.....	4
Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process.....	6
Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement.....	9
Annual Report Data.....	11
STUDENT COURSE COMPLETION .....	11
DEGREE COMPLETION .....	11
CERTIFICATE COMPLETION .....	11
TRANSFER.....	12
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT .....	12
LICENSURE PASS RATE.....	13
JOB PLACEMENT RATE .....	14
Annual Fiscal Report Data .....	15
Notes for Data Section .....	16
Appendices (Evidence).....	16

DRAFT

## Introduction

The last ACCJC Accreditation site visit to Sacramento City College occurred October 5-8, 2015. SCC's 2015 Accreditation webpage provides information related to this visit and is accessible by the public.

Prior to that visit, a self-evaluation was written based on the ACCJC's accreditation standards. SCC received its external evaluation report and reaffirmation of accreditation letter on February 5, 2016. The college was required to submit a follow up report.

In March 2017, Sacramento City College submitted a Follow-up Report in response to the 2015 accreditation visit. In June 2017 SCC received the ACCJC response indicating that SCC met all accreditation standards and reaffirming accreditation based on the follow-up report.

The next comprehensive evaluation of SCC will occur in Fall 2022.

Sacramento City College has been working on the recommendations and planning agenda items arising from the 2015 accreditation since the College received the report of the visiting team from ACCJC.

## Report Preparation

A Midterm Report Steering Committee was formed with the approval of the College Executive Council. The Steering Committee consisted of individuals from each of the employee constituencies appointed by the chairs of each constituency group.

### Accreditation Midterm Report Tri-chairs:

- Patti Leonard (Professor, Communication Department)
- Kelly Irwin (Senior IT Technician)
- Don Palm (Dean, SCC Davis Center)
- Marybeth Buechner (Accreditation Liaison Officer, PRIE Dean)

During Fall 2017, the Steering Committee members interviewed campus managers, faculty members, and classified staff and reviewed evidentiary documents in order to gather information for the report. The Steering Committee used that information, in combination with additional information compiled by the PRIE Dean, to construct drafts of the report. In April 2018, the first rough draft was provided to the leaders of each constituency group for discussion at the constituency representative groups. In \_\_\_\_\_ 2018 an email was sent to the entire college with information on how to find the draft report and how to provide feedback through the constituency leaders. Updates on the progress of the report were provided to the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Student Associated Council, and Senior Leadership Team and additional drafts of the report were produced and distributed. In \_\_\_\_\_ a final draft of the report was completed and reviewed by the Steering Committee, the College President, and the Co-Chairs of the District Accreditation Coordinating Committee. During \_\_\_\_\_ 2018 the final draft was approved by the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Senior Leadership team. (Academic Senate minutes from xxxxx) Senior Leadership Team minutes. From xxxxx; Classified Senate minutes from xxxxx)

Spring 2018:

April: Rough draft developed and discussed, constituency feedback gathered

May – Second draft developed (based on constituency feedback)

Summer – Editing and collections of evidence/documentations

Fall 2018:

September – Nearly final draft completed

October – Additional constituent group feedback

November – AS, CS, SLT final approval (final draft to DO by Nov 30)

Dec – Presidential approval

Spring 2019:

Jan 2 – President’s signed draft to DO (copy) on Jan 2, 2019

The final draft of the report was approved by the LRCCD Board of Trustees on \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT

## Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Actionable Improvement Plan	Actions to date	Responsible parties
<p><b><u>Actionable Improvement Plan 1 (I.B.3, I.B.4):</u></b> <i>The College Leadership will develop “best practices” for engagement of departments and units in the planning process to:</i></p> <p><i>Include strategies for effective communication, timely completion, and deeper understanding of the planning process and models that would be effective for groups of various sizes and responsibilities.</i></p> <p><i>Support ongoing continuous process improvement with respect to the engagement of departments with the planning process.</i></p>	<p><u>Development of planning “best practices” for college units:</u> The PRIE Dean gathered information from across the college on current practices that are effective in increasing the engagement of departments and units in the planning process. This information was discussed with the college leadership (EC minutes) and used to develop a statement of best practices for planning at SCC. The College Executive Council (EC), which includes the constituency leadership, has developed strategies support for the deeper understanding of the planning process. (EC minutes – this is likely to be completed in Fall 2018).</p> <p>This work was integrated in college planning processes. The Fall 2017 revision of the SCC Planning Handbook includes the “best practices” for planning at the division and department levels. Link to Planning Handbook:  <a href="https://dms.scc.losrios.edu/alfresco/d/d/workspace/SpacesStore/2a12c216-8e32-46ad-a17b-f1d406c67340/Planning%20Handbook%20Summer%202017%20final.pdf">https://dms.scc.losrios.edu/alfresco/d/d/workspace/SpacesStore/2a12c216-8e32-46ad-a17b-f1d406c67340/Planning%20Handbook%20Summer%202017%20final.pdf</a></p> <p><u>Support for ongoing continuous improvement of planning:</u> During the 2016-17 academic year, under the leadership of the College Strategic Planning Committee (CSPC), SCC conducted a Strategic Planning review and revised the SCC Strategic Plan. This resulted in several changes to the planning process that will support best practices for planning and continuous process improvement. (Strategic Plan link; CSPC minutes).</p> <p>The CSPC continues to address the effective use of the planning process across the college. Information from the 2017 Governance and Communication Survey has been included in this work. (CSPC minutes).</p> <p><b>This AIP has been completed – check that this is true in Fall 2018.</b></p>	<p>SCC President</p> <p>SCC Vice Presidents</p> <p>PRIE Dean</p> <p>Executive Council</p> <p>College Strategic Planning Committee</p> <p>President’s Cabinet</p>
<p><b><u>Actionable Improvement Plan 2 (II.A.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, and II.A.3.c):</u></b> <i>Through the Student</i></p>	<p><u>SLO processes and tools:</u> During the 2016-17 academic year SLO reporters were identified for instructional departments (SLOAC minutes) and data entry for</p>	<p>SLO Coordinator</p> <p>SLO Assessment</p>

<p><i>Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC), the College will institutionalize its updated and enhanced processes and accountability tools to ensure that all student learning outcomes, at all levels, are assessed on a systematic and cyclical basis and ensure that the results are used for continuous improvement.</i></p>	<p>course SLO reporting expanded. The online SLO reporting tool was modified to also allow for student services SLO reporting (SLOAC minutes). Student Services areas identified Department liaisons to facilitate SLO reporting from their areas.</p> <p>Multi-year SLO reporting plans are automatically updated on the online SLO reporting tool, which makes it easier for departments to stay accountable.</p> <p>In Fall 2017 Canvas implemented as the SCC Learning Management System. Further modifications of the online SLO reporting tool were paused while the possibility of using Canvas for course SLO reporting was explored (SLOAC minutes). The college also began exploration of using a different reporting tool, e.g. eLumen, which could combine more effectively with Canvas.</p> <p>During Spring 2018 ... improvements were made to the reporting function of the online SLO assessment tool. Work continued on integrating Canvas with SLO reporting.</p> <p>During Fall 2018....</p> <p><b>This AIP has been completed – check that this is true in Fall 2018.</b></p>	<p>Committee</p> <p>Student Services SLO committee</p> <p>Distance Education subcommittee of the Academic Senate</p>
<p><b><u>Actionable Improvement Plan 3 (IV.A.1, IV.A.2.a):</u></b> <i>As part of the ongoing cycle of continuous improvement, the College President, President’s Cabinet, and all constituency leadership will facilitate and further develop dialogue, activities, and initiatives designed to improve College engagement in, understanding of, and respect for participatory decision-making. The Blue Book Task Force was convened in April 2015, an important first step to address these issues.</i></p>	<p><i>Note: For more information and links to evidence see page _____, “Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement”</i></p> <p><u>Engagement in participatory decision-making:</u> The work of the “Blue Book Task Force” has been completed. A new Governance Guide has been produced and is in use at the college.</p> <p>The Governance and Communication Survey was conducted in Fall 2017. In Spring 2018, the constituency leaders engaged with the results of the survey (EC minutes) and the College President called together a task force to help make improvements in communication and participatory decision-making. (PC minutes). In Fall 2018...</p> <p><b>This AIP has been completed – check that this is true in Fall 2018.</b></p>	<p>SCC President</p> <p>SCC Vice Presidents</p> <p>PRIE Dean</p> <p>Executive Council</p> <p>Governance and Communication Taskforce</p>

<p><b><u>Actionable Improvement Plan 4 (IV.A.3, IV.A.5):</u></b></p> <p><i>To improve effective and satisfactory cross-constituency participation in the governance of the College, the College Leadership will:</i></p> <p><i>Develop a more robust Campus Issues process to facilitate a timely response and thorough explanation for how and why decisions are made.</i></p> <p><i>Create a clear and transparent process for utilizing survey data to make process improvements in communication and participatory decision-making.</i></p> <p><i>Provide both formal and informal venues for College-wide information sharing.</i></p>	<p><i>Note: For more information and links to evidence see page [redacted], "Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement"</i></p> <p><u>Campus issues process:</u> The SCC executive Council (EC) worked to improve the timeliness of the Campus Issues process (EC minutes 10/16/17) While few new issues came in during the 2017-18 academic year, those that did were effectively completed in a timely manner (campus issues webpage)</p> <p><u>Use of survey data on governance and communication:</u> The Governance and Communication Survey was conducted in Fall 2017. In Spring 2018, the constituency leaders engaged with the results of the survey (EC minutes) and the College President called together a task force to help make improvements in communication and participatory decision-making. (PC minutes). In Fall 2018...</p> <p><u>Formal and informal information sharing:</u> Venues for College-wide information sharing have been established. The College President sends regular updates to the college and hosts information exchanges that are open to all (link to info on exchanges) Beginning in Spring 2018, the PIO published a newsletter that informs the college community and provided information about where to look for additional information (link to newsletter).</p> <p><b>This AIP has been completed – check that this is true in Fall 2018.</b></p>	<p>SCC President</p> <p>Executive Council</p> <p>PIO Office</p>
---	--	---



# Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement

## **College Recommendation #3**

*In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the College needs to move forward on the action plan it identified by utilizing the Blue Book Task Force for making recommendations to help improve participatory decision-making processes and enhance college-wide communication. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3)*

The External Evaluation Report confirmed that SCC meets all aspects of the relevant Standards. The report also recommended that, although no deficiency was present, the college could improve in the area of participatory decision making and that SCC had begun work in this area (AIP 3 and 4). As noted in the report: “The Blue Book Task Force convenes to review, evaluate, and make improvements to the participatory governance processes. This Task Force helps all constituency groups improve processes that allow for transparent decision making. The College implements an Actionable Improvement Plan as part of continuous improvement and has the full support of all constituencies and the President through a review of participatory decision-making as codified in the “Blue Book.” (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b)”

This recommendation was addressed first by the work of the “Blue Book” Task Force. Following the results of the 2017 Governance and Communication Survey, additional improvements were undertaken.

### **Work of the Blue Book Task Force:**

The task force reviewed the Governance Guide and made changes to bring it up-to-date with respect to current practice, as well as improve clarity. Feedback was gathered from SCC groups including the Academic Senate (e.g. minutes from February 23, 2016; September 13, 2016), the Department Chairs Council (e.g. minutes see from March 3, 2016; October 1, 2015), the Classified Senate (e.g. minutes from October 8, 2015) and the Senior Leadership Team (e.g. minutes from Dec 14, 2015).

Link to Academic Senate minutes (e.g. minutes of 2/23/16, 9/13/16)

<http://www.scc.losrios.edu/academic senate/agendas-minutes/>

Link to Department Chairs Council minutes: (e.g. minutes of 10/1/15, 3/3/16)

<http://www.scc.losrios.edu/dcc/2014-2015-minutes/>

Link to Classified Senate minutes: (e.g. minutes of 10/8/15)

<http://www.scc.losrios.edu/classifiedsenate/>

Link to SLT minutes: (e.g. minutes of 12/14/15) <http://www.scc.losrios.edu/president/slt/senior-leadership-2016-17/>

A charrette was held in March 2016, at which all the constituency leaders came together to address the feedback received in order to determine where breakdowns in communication happen and create recommendations for improvement (Department Chairs minutes of March 3, 2016). This resulted in a “Best-Practices” document being added to the Governance Guide. Link to Governance Guide:

<https://dms.scc.losrios.edu/alfresco/d/d/workspace/SpacesStore/cde8be36-dea0-4b10-ab83-904a08b23f95/SCC%20Guide%20to%20Participatory%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

The 2015-16 academic year revision updated the Governance Guide in several ways:

- The term “Blue Book” has been deleted from the name of the document since many readers do not recall the history of this name (original printing on blue paper) and are confused by the designation.
- The document has received edits for both style and correctness. For example, the names and charges of standing committees have been updated where appropriate to reflect recent changes.
- As an outcome of a college-wide charrette on participatory governance and decision-making, a new section on “best practices” has been added to give readers a clearer sense of how the concepts in this document should be implemented. This is now Section IV.

(Link - SCC Participatory Decision Making webpage <http://www.scc.losrios.edu/prie/institutional-effectiveness/governance/> ).

The SCC Academic Senate approved the Blue Book Task Force recommendations in September 2016 (Academic Senate minutes from September 20, 2016). Executive Council approved the recommendations in October 2016 (CR3.7 Link to Executive Council minutes <http://www.scc.losrios.edu/president/executive-council/executive-council-2016-17/> ).

### **Governance & Communication Survey**

The Governance & Communication Survey, done periodically at the college, was conducted in Fall 2017. The results indicated additional areas for improvement in both governance and college communication. This information was shared with the college constituencies and the constituency leaders engaged with the results of the survey (EC minutes, AS minutes, CS minutes, SLT minutes). In Spring 2018 the College President called together a task force to address the results of the survey and recommend changes. (PC minutes). The task force concluded that...In Fall 2018....

The “Communication and Governance Survey” will be periodically conducted in future academic years to ascertain the impact of these changes.

### **Conclusion:**

The Blue Book Task Force was convened to update and otherwise revise the “Guide to Participatory Decision-Making at SCC (aka: Governance Guide; aka: The Blue Book). It produced recommendations to help improve participatory decision-making and enhance college-wide communication. Those recommendations have been implemented.

The Governance and Communication Survey indicated that additional improvements could be made in participatory decision-making and college-wide communication. The college has created a task force to address these issues. The task force...In fall 2018...

# Annual Report Data

## INSTITUTION-SET STANDARDS

### STUDENT COURSE COMPLETION

(Definition: The course completion rate is calculated based on the number of student completions with a grade of C or better divided by the number of student enrollments.)

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Review		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Institution Set Standard	63%	63%	63%
Stretch Goal	70%	70%	70%
Actual Performance	67%	67%	68%
Difference between Standard and Performance	4%	4%	5%
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-3%	-3%	-2%
Analysis of the data:	<input type="text"/>		

### DEGREE COMPLETION

(Students who received one or more degrees may only be counted once.)

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Review		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Institution Set Standard	1000	1000	1000
Stretch Goal	1880	1880	1880
Actual Performance	1634	1582	1692
Difference between Standard and Performance	634	582	692
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-246	-298	-188
Analysis of the data:	<input type="text"/>		

### CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

(Students who received one or more certificate may only be counted once.)

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Review		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Institution Set Standard	350	350	350
Stretch Goal	637	637	637
Actual Performance	606	464	381
Difference between Standard and Performance	287	114	31
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-31	-173	-256
Analysis of the data:	<input type="text"/>		

---

**TRANSFER**

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Review		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Institution Set Standard	700	700	700
Stretch Goal	1095	1095	1095
Actual Performance	935	931	1031
Difference between Standard and Performance	235	231	331
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-160	-164	-64
Analysis of the data:	<input type="text"/>		

---

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Number of Courses	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Number of Courses Assessed	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Number of Programs	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Number of Programs Assessed	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Number of Institutional Outcomes	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Number of Outcomes Assessed	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Analysis of the data:	<input type="text"/>		

## LICENSURE PASS RATE

(Definition: The rate is determined by the number of students who passed the licensure examination divided by the number of students who took the examination.)

Program Name	Institution Set Standard	Actual Performance			Difference			Stretch Goal	Difference		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3		Y1	Y2	Y3
Cosmetology (Written Exam)	80%	77%	92%	74%	-3%	12%	-6%	85%	-8%	7%	-11%
Cosmetology (Practical Exam)	80%	87%	100%	96%	7%	20%	16%	85%	2%	15%	11%
Nail Technology (Written Exam)	80%	95%	100%	88%	15%	20%	8%	85%	10%	15%	3%
Nail Technology (Practical Exam)	80%	65%	100%	86%	-15%	20%	6%	85%	-20%	15%	1%
Dental Hygiene (National Exam)	80%	86%	100%	100%	6%	20%	20%	85%	1%	15%	15%
Dental Hygiene (Practical Exam)	80%	90%	100%	100%	10%	20%	20%	85%	5%	15%	15%
Dental Assisting (Written Exam)	80%	100%	92%	91%	20%	12%	11%	85%	15%	7%	6%
Dental Assisting (Practical Exam)	80%	89%	100%	n/a	9%	20%	n/a	85%	4%	15%	n/a
Physical Therapist Assistant	85%	92%	100%	92%	7%	15%	7%	90%	2%	10%	2%
Registered Nursing	80%	80%	94%	97%	0%	14%	17%	85%	-5%	9%	12%
Vocational Nursing	80%	80%	86%	100%	0%	6%	20%	85%	-5%	1%	15%
Electronics Technology (Exam Element 1)	80%	100%	100%	100% (n<10)	20%	20%	20%	85%	15%	15%	15%
Electronics Technology (Exam Element 2)	80%	90%	95%	n/a	10%	15%	n/a	85%	5%	10%	n/a
Electronics Technology (Exam Element 3)	80%	85%	95%	100% (n<10)	5%	15%	20%	85%	0%	10%	15%
Mechanical-Electrical Technology (Type I)	80%	85%	93%	86%	5%	13%	6%	85%	0%	8%	1%
Mechanical-Electrical Technology (Type II)	80%	87%	91%	89%	7%	11%	9%	85%	2%	6%	4%
Mechanical-Electrical Technology (Type III)	80%	89%	76%	84%	9%	-4%	4%	85%	4%	-9%	-1%
Mechanical-Electrical Technology (Universal)	80%	84%	73%	82%	4%	-7%	2%	85%	1%	-12%	-3%
Aeronautics-Airframe & Powerplant	80%	95%	100%	100%	15%	20%	20%	85%	10%	15%	15%
Air Dispatch (FAA Knowledge Exam)	80%	100%	100%	81%	20%	20%	1%	85%	15%	15%	-4%

## JOB PLACEMENT RATE

(Definition: The placement rate is determined by the number of students employed in the year following graduation divided by the number of students who completed the program.)

Program Name	Institution Set Standard	Actual Performance			Difference			Stretch Goal	Difference		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3		Y1	Y2	Y3
Business and Commerce, General	70%	60%	76%	87%	-10%	6%	17%	75%	-15%	1%	12%
Accounting	70%	68%	76%	81%	-2%	6%	11%	75%	-7%	1%	6%
Business Management	70%	64%	73%	71%	-6%	3%	1%	75%	-11%	-2%	-4%
Real Estate	60%	57%	40% (n<10)	40% (n<10)	-3%	-20%	-20%	65%	-8%	-25%	-25%
Digital Media	60%	80%	67%	62%	20%	7%	2%	65%	15%	2%	-3%
Computer Programming	70%	39%	55%	59%	-31%	-15%	-11%	75%	-36%	-20%	-16%
Computer Infrastructure	70%	75% (n<10)	75% (n<10)	80%	5%	5%	10%	75%	0%	0%	5%
Computer Networking	70%	66%	77%	76%	-4%	7%	6%	75%	-9%	2%	1%
Electronics and Electric	70%	87%	64%	63%	17%	-6%	-7%	75%	12%	-11%	-12%
Environmental Control	70%	85%	87%	86%	15%	17%	16%	75%	10%	12%	11%
Railroad and Light Rail	60%	50%	70%	72%	-10%	10%	12%	65%	-15%	5%	7%
Aeronautical and Aviation Technology	60%	79%	73%	71%	19%	13%	11%	65%	14%	8%	6%
Drafting Technology	70%	100% (n<10)	80% (n<10)	100% (n<10)	30%	10%	30%	75%	25%	5%	25%
Applied Photography	60%	57%	56%	56%	-3%	-4%	-4%	65%	-8%	-9%	-9%
Occupational Therapy	75%	82%	90%	83%	7%	15%	8%	80%	2%	10%	3%
Physical Therapist Assistant	75%	69%	100%	91%	-6%	25%	16%	80%	-11%	20%	11%
Registered Nursing	75%	86%	96%	98%	11%	21%	23%	80%	6%	16%	18%
Licensed Vocational	75%	79%	85%	88%	4%	10%	13%	80%	-1%	5%	8%
Dental Assistant	75%	88%	85%	88%	13%	10%	13%	80%	8%	5%	8%
Dental Hygienist	75%	85%	89%	96%	10%	14%	21%	80%	5%	9%	16%
Child Development/Early Care and Education	60%	69%	87%	90%	9%	27%	30%	65%	4%	22%	25%
Library Technician	70%	89% (n<10)	92%	90%	19%	22%	20%	75%	14%	17%	15%
Administration of Justice	70%	77%	80%	83%	7%	10%	13%	75%	2%	5%	8%
Cosmetology and Barbering	60%	55%	64%	80%	-5%	4%	20%	65%	-10%	-1%	15%
Piloting	60%	83% (n<10)	77%	56% (n<10)	23%	17%	-4%	65%	18%	12%	-9%
Air Traffic Control	60%	67% (n<10)	60%	75% (n<10)	7%	0%	15%	65%	2%	-5%	10%

# Annual Fiscal Report Data

Category	Reporting Years since Comprehensive Reviews		
----------	---	--	--

General Fund Performance

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Revenue	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Expenditures	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Expenditures for Salaries and Benefits	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Surplus/Deficit	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Surplus/Deficit as % Revenues (Net Operating Revenue Ratio)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Reserve (Primary Reserve Ratio)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Analysis of the data:

Other Post-Employment Benefits

Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) for OPEB	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Funded Ratio (Actuarial Value of Plan Assets/AAL)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Annual Required Contribution (ARC)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Amount of Contribution to ARC	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Analysis of the data:

Enrollment

Actual Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTES)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Analysis of the data:

Financial Aid

USED Official Cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD - 3 year rate)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Analysis of the data:

## Notes for Data Section

Year 1 is 2014.

Year 2 is 2015.

Year 3 is 2016.

## Appendices (Evidence)

### Responses to plans arising from the self-evaluation process:

AIP 1

AIP 2:

AIP3:

See below, page **XX**

AIP4:

### AIP 3 / Recommendation 3:

#### Evidence Links:

Academic Senate minutes (e.g. minutes of 2/23/16, 9/13/16, 9/20/16)

<http://www.scc.losrios.edu/academicsenate/agendas-minutes/>

Department Chairs Council minutes: (e.g. minutes of 10/1/15, 3/3/16) <http://www.scc.losrios.edu/dcc/2014-2015-minutes/>

Classified Senate minutes: (e.g. minutes of 10/8/15) <http://www.scc.losrios.edu/classifiedsenate/>

SLT minutes: (e.g. minutes of 12/14/15) <http://www.scc.losrios.edu/president/slt/senior-leadership-2016-17/>

Executive Council minutes (e.g. minutes of 10/17/16) <http://www.scc.losrios.edu/president/executive-council/executive-council-2016-17/> ).

SCC Participatory Decision Making webpage <http://www.scc.losrios.edu/prie/institutional-effectiveness/governance/>



Guide to Participatory Decision-making at Sacramento City College (The Governance Guide):

<https://dms.scc.losrios.edu/alfresco/d/d/workspace/SpacesStore/cde8be36-dea0-4b10-ab83-904a08b23f95/SCC%20Guide%20to%20Participatory%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

Attachment: Best Practices for Participatory Decision Making (excerpted from the Governance Guide)

DRAFT