

## **Focused Interim Evaluation**

**Shoreline Community College 16101 Greenwood Ave. N. Shoreline, WA 98133**

**March 19, 2004**

**A Confidential Report for the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities**

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>		
Recommendation #1.....	1	Recommendation	
#2.....	5	Recommendation #3.....	7
Recommendation #4.....	9	Recommendation	
#5.....	9	Recommendation #6.....	10
Recommendation #7.....	11	Recommendation	
#8.....	12	Recommendation #9.....	13
Report Summary.....	15		

## **INTRODUCTION**

In October, 2002, Shoreline Community College hosted a visiting team for a Full-Scale Evaluation. The Self-Study process leading up to this visit was complete, thorough, and well integrated with college structures and procedures, and has been highlighted by the Commission on Colleges in its annual training sessions for institutions engaged in Self-Study. As documented in the 2002 Self-Study report, Shoreline's internal review process identified many of the same areas for improvement reflected in the visiting team's report. The college received fourteen Commendations and nine Recommendations, and has followed up on the Full-Scale Evaluation Recommendations in preparation for a Focused Interim Visit scheduled for April 8, 2004. Shoreline Community College remains committed to participation in the regional accreditation process; we very much appreciate this opportunity to improve our institution and measure our performance against the standards established by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

## **RECOMMENDATION #1:**

That the college use the results of its evaluation activities and ongoing planning processes to influence resource allocation and to improve instructional programs, institutional services and activities; further, the committee recommends that the college administration convey to the campus community the impact of planning on budgeting and the uses of the results of assessment on program and service improvement. (1.B.4)

This substantial and complex recommendation will be addressed in two main segments. The first will cover linkages established among planning, resource allocation and improvement. The second will address communication methods established to convey these linkages to the college community.

## **Planning, Resource Allocation and Improvement**

Shoreline Community College engages in systematic planning and evaluation of its activities, consistent with institutional mission and goals. Its assessment activities are extensive and relate directly to the college's Strategic Plan, Core Values and Strategic Directions. Through the Program Planning and Analysis (PPA) component of the strategic planning process, the college evaluates in what ways and how well it accomplishes its mission and goals. The college uses the results of its institutional effectiveness and assessment efforts for continuous planning and evaluation. Through its planning processes and its inclusive, cross-institutional committees, the institution analyzes itself and revises its goals, policies, procedures and resource allocations.

Shoreline is committed to allocating resources based on its planning processes and assessment data. Primary in these endeavors are strategic planning, the Program Planning and Assessment process, and resource allocation. Each of these processes is systematic, integral to our mission and strategic plan, and based on an ongoing cycle of planning and assessment to allocate resources for improvement.

## **Strategic Planning**

Resources are allocated through planning and assessment processes predicated by the college's Strategic Plan, its primary planning document. Much of the college's planning endeavors revolve around the Strategic Plan, which is widely available throughout the institution and is tangible in our thinking and planning. The Strategic Plan includes all of the college's many roles and activities, as is appropriate to its nature as an open-door, community-based institution serving a broad span of educational and economic needs. Such a large, inclusive plan can make it difficult to focus effectively on specific areas for improvement, so the college practice is to maintain a smaller set of current "Focus Areas." These Focus Areas, proposed by the Strategic Planning Committee and subject to Board of Trustees approval, become part of the college's ongoing resource allocation processes and decisions. Most activities requesting resources must speak to a Focus Area of the Strategic Plan. This includes staffing, hiring decisions, equipment and technology requests, and changes and improvements to programs and services.

Institutional Effectiveness Merges with Strategic Planning To better connect assessment data and strategic planning, this year the college folded the Institutional Effectiveness Committee into the Strategic Planning Committee, and the members meet as one group. A key aspect of this merger is that the institutional researcher now is able to communicate directly with those setting Focus Areas, and to provide data more effectively for our planning processes.

Strategic Planning Committee Receives Resources In addition to its annual review of the Strategic Plan and Focus Areas with the college community, starting this year the Strategic Planning Committee has been allocated budgetary resources to implement various college improvements identified by campus data collection efforts. Annually the Strategic Planning Committee, comprised of all constituencies—administrators, staff, faculty and students—reviews the plan’s Focus Areas and identifies them for the year based on input from the entire campus. This year through several focus groups and Intranet postings, the Strategic Planning Committee solicited input campus wide during Opening Week activities, developed a database of responses and compiled a report of major areas for improvement. The committee recently established deadlines and an RFP process to gather specific project recommendations. The college has allocated \$25,000 per year toward this effort. In spring quarter the committee will review these recommendations based on established criteria and identify projects for implementation. This is planning, assessment and resource allocation in process, and has highlighted for the campus community the direct impact of planning on budgeting. (See Exhibits for materials related to this activity.)

### **Program Planning and Assessment**

The Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) process every two years provides one of the college’s greatest opportunities for data collection, review and assessment, and resource allocation for our programs. Program Planning and Assessment biannual reviews are assessment activities involving faculty, staff and administration which result in a variety of program and service improvements that directly impact student learning outcomes. These reviews are based on institutional research data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and on input from program faculty and deans. In addition to staffing decisions, the PPA process provides a systematic way to identify college wide issues and serves as the basis for curricular and program development, equipment and technology upgrades, and program improvement. Analysis of the data is done at various levels, including faculty and administration.

This year the PPA process has resulted in 18 full-time faculty searches, allocation of resources for building and laboratory improvements, new curricular offerings, and increased availability in distance learning opportunities for students. In addition, the PPA process has clarified the collaborative efforts among programs such as the CEO program and English as a Second Language, the Visual Communication Program and Drama/Cinema (Digital Filmmaking) program and merging World Languages with American Sign Language into the Intra-American Studies/Social Sciences (IAS/SS) division. Such collaborations improve students’ ability to have coordinated course offerings and institutional support for their success. Specifically, the data collected on program growth, student demand, and each area’s relationship to the Strategic Plan informed decisions about these program developments.

### **Resource Allocation**

Strategic planning and the PPA process link directly to many forms of resource allocation at the college. A few recent examples are listed here to give a sense of how recent allocation decisions have connected with the planning and assessment cycle.

Distance Learning resources have been allocated based on Instructional Services Council assessment and recommendations. Comprised of academic deans, student services administrators, and representatives from the office for Workforce and Economic Development (WED) including International Programs, the Instructional Services Council (ISC) meets twice monthly to review various instructional issues with particular emphasis on enrollment patterns for the college. Various analyses done by ISC have resulted in addressing the increased demand for hybrid and Distance learning courses.

Enrollment reviews

—————> modified scheduling patterns and increased distance learning

Based on regular assessment of enrollments, student registration requests, and automated wait lists, the college has developed a variety of Distance Learning opportunities for students and faculty. Enrollment patterns have indicated that our hybrid and online classes are filled as early as three days after the opening of registration. Divisions are now developing and offering more distance learning courses to meet this demand. Since last year, we have added five additional fully online classes, at least 15 hybrid courses, and more than 27 web-enhanced classes. The college has hired a distance learning program assistant, and grant efforts have been successful in allocating \$10,000 toward faculty development, to improve online teaching skills and to add a web-enhanced component to existing curriculum. We are now in the process of refining faculty evaluation and course assessment tools for Distance Learning to provide improved measures of online instructional quality.

Technology resources are allocated through a variety of planning, data collection and assessment practices. Annual office computer assessments for divisions by our Technology Support Services have resulted in a systematic plan for upgrade of staff and faculty office technologies. This plan is continuously monitored and adjusted as the college's technology needs grow and change over time, and despite limited financial resources has been very responsive to student and program needs. For example, based on high student demand in the Healthcare Information program (HCI), and the program's self-assessment, the college provided a portable electronic classroom for this program, based on a wireless network environment.

Annual detailed equipment reviews by programs and divisions provide a wealth of assessment data to allocate resources for instructional equipment, furniture and supplies. Criteria used in prioritizing equipment requests include relevance to the strategic plan and evidence of need provided through the Program Planning and Assessment reports.

Physical Plant improvements, described in more detail under Recommendation #5, were driven by data such as the Noel Levitz survey conducted in 2001, which indicated strong concerns about campus safety, available study space and Library/Media services. Substantial resources were allocated to improvement in these areas, and the 2003 re-administration of this survey clearly showed increased satisfaction in safety, study space and information services, successfully demonstrating a complete cycle of assessment. (Noel-Levitz survey results are included as Exhibits.)

### **Communication Methods**

The college uses a number of communications vehicles to keep the campus apprised of planning, budgeting and improvement efforts. Communications take the form of in-meeting announcements, written memos, listserv postings, Day At A Glance postings (posted daily to the College's Intranet site and to individual college email accounts), Net News (published monthly on the Intranet), and a number of departmental, divisional, and committee websites hosted on the Intranet. Examples of these communication vehicles are included in the Exhibits for this Recommendation.

A regular, ongoing communications process supports the college's work in strategic planning and resource allocation. During the regular academic year, the Strategic Planning Committee meets each month to review current issues, work on refining the Focus Areas of the current plan, and to set goals and parameters for additional planning. The campus is apprised of their meeting dates, and anyone who has an interest in participating in the meetings may do so. Meeting announcements are posted on the college's Master Calendar.

To keep the campus informed of the work done in Strategic Planning meetings, minutes of each meeting are posted to the Strategic Planning Committee website along with any key announcements. Copies of the committee's minutes are provided among the Exhibits. In addition, every two months, the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee makes a presentation to the Board of Trustees in their regular public meetings. This keeps the Board up to date on Strategic Planning activities, and allows others present at Board meetings to easily track ongoing work on the strategic plan.

During Opening Week, the week prior to the start of each academic year, the faculty and staff engage in a number of activities to prepare for the coming college year. These activities typically include all-college activities related to governance and strategic planning. For Opening Week 2003, the entire college community (faculty, staff and students) engaged in small group discussions of the Focus Areas, which had been revised by the Strategic Planning Committee and approved by the Board of Trustees. A compilation of the results from these discussions was made available college-wide within a month of the small group meetings. Since then the Strategic Planning Committee has worked to distill massive numbers of suggested goals and activities down to a workable number of recommendations. The current draft of this document is available as an Exhibit.

Subsequent to the Opening Week session, an all-campus meeting was held to discuss the Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) process. The meeting date and time was announced well in advance through Day At A Glance, and division deans were asked to encourage faculty and staff from their areas to attend. In addition, all information related to the PPA process is posted to the Strategic Planning and Governance websites, which are continuously available through the Intranet.

The PPA reports were filed by all areas of the college, and are currently being reviewed by the vice presidents and the president. Specific response letters to each PPA are being drafted, and will be distributed to each area submitting a report. Copies of the PPA reports will be made available to the entire campus for review on Library reserve and in the Office of Instruction. They are not posted to the Intranet, since that is an open access website, and many of the PPA reports contain significant strategic information which is not appropriate for distribution outside the institution.

PPA reports and the administrative response letters will be available to the Budget Task Force, in addition to other data and analysis made available to this group. As part of the budgeting process, the Task Force will be able to review the priorities of the college and of each program area. Communication regarding Task Force membership and meetings, and of their recommendations, will be disseminated to the campus via email, through announcements at division, council and committee meetings, and on the Intranet. Budget notes, provided through these same media, will clearly delineate the key changes to the budget and the assessments used to inform these changes. In addition, the Vice President of Administrative Services will present this information at public meetings of the Board of Trustees.

In summary, the college has taken this recommendation seriously, and has used a combination of existing structures and new efforts to more closely connect planning and assessment with resource allocation, and also to ensure that communication related to these activities is open, widely available, and inclusive of all college constituencies.

## **RECOMMENDATION #2:**

That the college integrate assessment of its educational programs into an overall planning and evaluation plan (2.B.1), demonstrate that students who complete their programs have achieved their outcomes (2.B.2), and provide evidence that assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning. (2.B.3, 2.2)

Although much work remains to be done, the college has made significant progress toward fulfilling this recommendation. In this interim report, the three elements of this recommendation will be addressed separately: assessment integration, program outcome assessment, and linking assessment to improvement.

### **Assessment Integration**

The college's overall planning and evaluation plan consists of the PPA (Program Planning and Assessment) process, the method by which the college enacts its Strategic Plan and monitors attainment of both program and college-wide goals. During the most recent round of PPA writing in Fall 2003, the college conducted a campus-wide open workshop on integrating assessment of student learning outcomes into the PPA process. At that meeting, faculty in program groups were asked to identify student learning outcomes at the program level, to list ways that the outcomes are assessed, and to describe improvements in instruction that resulted from the assessments.

As a result of this October 17 session and other more detailed sessions held over the following weeks, many of the instructional PPAs filed in December 2004 were more systematic in their inclusion of information about student learning outcomes, assessment efforts, and "closing the loop" to link assessment activities to instructional improvements. We have achieved this goal in multiple program areas; our task now is to move toward full campus implementation in the next cycle of our strategic planning process. PPA reports for the next cycle will be due in December of 2005. In preparation for this round of program planning and analysis, the college's Assessment Response Team (a working group created to support and promote more effective instructional assessment) plans to recommend revisions to the PPA outline and instructions to help instructional programs more easily include student learning outcomes in their PPA reports. It is clear that student learning is being assessed in all areas of the curriculum; our challenge is to make this work more evident in the PPAs, and to better integrate it with the overall strategic planning process.

### **Program Outcome Assessment**

As noted by the visiting team in October 2002, many professional-technical programs have developed capstone courses and/or portfolio processes to assess how well their students meet program outcomes. Particularly strong examples of development in this area since the October 2002 visit include: Health Care Information, which has created a project-based capstone course for integrated assessment of overall program skills; Automotive, particularly the Honda program, which is entirely based on an integrated set of formally and continually assessed individual student outcomes; and Criminal Justice, which has recently developed new rubrics for the measurement of course and program outcomes, through faculty participation in a multidisciplinary Critical Thinking group. In many ways, the professional/technical program areas have a head start in this development process, because of the state and college requirements they have been meeting to retain their program status. Every professional/technical program publishes its program outcomes in the college catalog, and these areas of the college have a higher-than-average awareness of the necessity to measure student attainment on these outcomes.

For program outcomes in the predominantly transfer curriculum areas, assessment work is focused primarily on the General Education Outcomes (GEOs). Although these will be addressed more completely in the college's response to Recommendation #3, it is worth noting here that the college has been systematically gathering examples of assignments, rubrics or scoring guides, and examples of student work that illustrate achievement of the General Education Outcomes across the curriculum. Notebooks containing this evidence have been completed for the GEOs on Communication, Information Literacy, and Multicultural Understanding. Currently, a notebook of evidence on the Critical Thinking component of the General Intellectual Abilities GEO is being compiled. In addition, a faculty/administrative team has been working on an implementation plan for the Multicultural Understanding GEOs, with a draft due for

discussion by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate Council at the beginning of spring quarter. (See Exhibits for the college's formal statements of these General Education Outcomes, the draft implementation plan, and for the evidence notebooks.)

### **Linking Assessment to Improvement**

The link between assessment and improvement is established on a continuous, ongoing basis across all of the educational program areas. Evidence of this link is not necessarily collected for every single change and improvement made, but is readily accessible through several of the college's major activities, including Program Planning and Assessment, formal Program Reviews in professional/technical areas, the tenure review process, and the biennial administration of a Noel-Levitz survey on student satisfaction. Each of these will be summarized here, with additional detail available in related Exhibits.

The Program Planning and Assessment reports provide a major source of improvement evidence, with their regular ongoing documentation of program performance, establishment of program goals, and structured revisiting of those goals over time. As noted above, not every program meets the performance standard set by the very best PPA teams, and thus not every PPA includes the evidence necessary to meet the standard set by the accreditation process. However, taken as a whole, this body of reports and administrative responses clearly demonstrates the college's emphasis on using assessment information to improve teaching and learning.

Program Reviews at Shoreline Community College have been in a cycle of renewed emphasis and vitality over the last several years. A highly qualified consultant/facilitator has been brought in to assist the program faculty, the deans, and the advisory committees in revamping this process and making sure that these reviews are far more than merely perfunctory exercises to meet a state requirement. The Dean for Professional/Technical Studies has done an excellent job of supporting these reviews, ensuring that the information gathered is of high quality and substantial utility in program improvement.

The tenure review process at Shoreline focuses on both summative and formative evaluation. In addition to evaluating the tenure candidate's abilities and performance as a basis for the tenure recommendation to the Board of Trustees (summative evaluation), the tenure committee members also function as a resource for growth and improvement (formative evaluation). Since the October 2002 accreditation visit, the annual seminars held for all tenure committee members have supported and emphasized this dual role, and this assessment process results in at least some improvement of teaching practices and abilities for every tenure candidate. In many cases, substantial improvement in teaching, as measured by student evaluation ratings and by peer observation reports, is clearly documented during the tenure process. Since the tenure documentation files are considered confidential, they will not be made available as Exhibits, but will be provided for review upon request.

The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory has been administered twice in the same form, once in the fall quarter of 2001, and again in the fall of 2003. Over the last six years, the college has tried a number of different measurement tools for tracking student satisfaction, and the Noel-Levitz survey instrument has now been adopted for ongoing biennial administration. This allows the accumulation, not just of snapshot data, but also of longitudinal data that can be used to track trends and student satisfaction changes over time in response to institutional improvements. Fall 2001 data was widely shared across the institution as part of the Self-Study process, and many different improvement efforts were undertaken in response. Fall 2003 data provides clear evidence of "closing the loop" on assessment. Not only was the 2001 data used to plan and prioritize improvement efforts, but the 2003 data demonstrates significant changes in key segments of the data, reflecting the success of those improvements. These key segments include the survey items measuring "adequacy of library resources and services," "availability of sufficient study areas," and overall improvement in the "Safety and Security" ratings.

**RECOMMENDATION #3:**

That the college identify an implementation process for the General Education component of the curriculum and provide criteria by which the relevance of each course to the general education component is evaluated. (2.C.2, 2.1)

The college has made significant progress toward implementation of the General Education Outcomes (GEOs). The six new GEOs include: quantitative reasoning, communication, multicultural understanding, information literacy, general intellectual abilities, and global awareness. Specific measurable outcomes have been identified in each of these areas, and will be provided as an Exhibit.

Implementation for the GEOs includes four basic approaches:

- 1 matching new outcomes in quantitative reasoning, communication and multicultural understanding to existing degree requirements;
- 2 infusing all six new outcomes throughout the curriculum as appropriate, using the Master Course Outlines (MCOs) to track and document each course's contribution to GEO attainment;
- 3 identifying existing assessment methods and developing new ones for courses with MCOs related to the GEOs;
- 4 developing intensive courses for GEOs not covered through the other three alternatives.

As documented in the 2002 Self-Study, the original timetable for GEO implementation was:

- 2000-01 Finalize and adopt new General Education Outcomes
- 2001-02 Develop portfolios of assessment practices for each GEO
- 2002-03 Review and revise general education requirements for all degrees

This implementation timetable has been delayed to allow for completion of the portfolio project for each of the six areas (not all were completed during the 2001-02 academic year), and to allow for development of greater understanding of assessment concepts and practices across the instructional programs.

Initial discussions with the Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate Council made clear that substantial work remained to be done to increase awareness and understanding of general education assessment throughout the institution. To that end, Professor Pamela Dusenberry has been appointed as Assessment Coordinator, and assigned 33% release time to provide faculty leadership to assessment efforts on campus, focusing specifically on the General Education Outcomes. She conducted multiple discussion sessions with the instructional divisions and college committees, in addition to college-wide professional development sessions, during the 2002-03 academic year. These conversations served to gather the college's beliefs, attitudes and opinions about GEO assessment. They resulted in heightened awareness of the GEOs, the importance of assessing them more systematically, and the need for a core group of faculty to work on integrating outcomes assessment more completely into the functioning of the college.

During these conversations, it became clear that a faculty leadership team would be needed to lead and integrate college-wide efforts. The Assessment Response Team (ART) was formed in June 2003. The group has developed a mission statement and a set of guiding principles which have been publicized to the campus, and has started work on the promotion of GEO teaching, learning and assessment. During the 2003-04 academic year, the ART has developed a common understanding of student learning outcomes assessment philosophy, based on reading and discussion of background materials which have been made widely available on campus.

One barrier to implementation identified by the ART was a lack of institution-wide knowledge and awareness of the General Education Outcomes. The ART worked with faculty and students in the Visual Communications Technology program to create posters intended to generate student and faculty interest in the GEOs. The resulting posters will be distributed to faculty and staff and posted in classrooms during Spring quarter 2004, and should be available as an Exhibit by the time of the April 8 interim visit. For Spring 2004, the ART plans to review the 2003 Program Planning and Analysis reports to determine how well they integrate student learning assessment, and to make recommendations for changes to the PPA process for the Fall 2005 report cycle to better incorporate assessment of student learning outcomes into this key institutional activity.

The Curriculum Committee, as documented in its minutes for 2002-03 and 2003-04, has continued to work on understanding and implementing the General Education Outcomes. One change that has already been completed (in Spring quarter, 2003) is the revision of English 101, a required course for the Associate in Arts and Sciences degree, to ensure that the course conforms to the requirements of our new Communication outcome. Another major GEO project for the Curriculum Committee has been development of a new Master Course Outline form, designed to document not just intended course outcomes, but how they will be assessed and how they relate to the General Education Outcomes. In the meantime, the Committee has been using a temporarily modified Master Course Outline format, requiring every new or modified course to identify which, if any, of the GEOs are met by that particular course.

Since the 2002-03 academic year, the MCO has required faculty to write course outcomes that fall within the framework of the six GEOs. Faculty have experienced this requirement as onerous and restrictive, since it appeared to put the General Education Outcomes ahead of individual course outcomes. This version of the MCO form has contributed to confusion about whether every class is required to teach to all GEOs, and whether the college values courses more highly when they include more of the General Education Outcomes. The new MCO form re-orders course content so that faculty can begin with specific course outcomes. The form then asks for faculty to name the GEOs addressed by the course, and to identify the types of assignments and assessments by which student learning of course outcomes will be measured. In addition, the new form will be web-based and menu-driven, with links to procedures and information that will make creating or changing a course easier and will also ensure more complete and accurate documentation of each course.

Important groundwork in GEO implementation has been laid through the development of assessment portfolios for each of the six General Education Outcomes, along with greater institutional understanding of GEO assessment provided by the Assessment Coordinator and the Assessment Response Team. The college has now begun to work on the third stage of GEO implementation, developing criteria and processes for adding classes to lists of those meeting the college's General Education Core Requirements in Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, and Multicultural Understanding. Note that these are different from the six GEOs, in that they are the general requirements of a Shoreline Associate in Arts and Sciences transfer degree. (See College Catalog, page 42.)

Criteria by which new classes can be added to these lists are starting to be developed. A joint working group, made up of members from the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate Council, is meeting to create a process for writing the criteria, beginning with the Multicultural Understanding requirement, by far the most challenging and problematic of the three areas to be reviewed. The result of their work will be a clear process by which faculty can apply to have their classes designated as meeting one of the three Core Requirements. This will allow the college to move ahead with the revision and expansion of the "Approved List of General Education Core Requirements," available in its current form as an Exhibit for the interim visit. Also available as an Exhibit is the joint working group's draft plan for implementation of the Multicultural Education core requirement.

The Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate Council will also be called upon to determine whether additional “intensive” courses are needed to ensure the all six GEOs are adequately addressed within the college’s transfer degree structure. Similar to the “writing intensive” courses developed to teach writing across the curriculum, these courses would focus intensively on the skills and knowledge associated with one or more of the General Education Outcomes. If needed, these courses would be added to the degree structure.

Although the college has not met its initial timeline for implementation, significant progress toward meeting Recommendation #3 has been accomplished.

**RECOMMENDATION #4:**

That the “Student Rights and Responsibilities” be included in publications readily available to students. (3.B.3)

The 2002 Full-Scale Evaluation Committee Report noted that “policies on student rights and conduct are clearly defined but are not published in detail.” In response, the college has increased the student rights and conduct information available in its class schedules, college catalog and web pages. In addition, the full text of policies pertaining to student rights and responsibilities is published in the 2003-2004 Student Guide. These policies include:

Policy 5030 Student Conduct and Discipline

Policy 5033 Dishonesty in Academics

Policy 5035 Student Grievance Procedures Academic Evaluation.

The Student Guide is provided at no charge to every Shoreline Community College student, making this information readily available. Additional full-text copies of Policy 5035 are available at Division offices, in the Office of Instruction, and in the office of the Vice President for Student Services, and are provided to students whenever questions or complaints about academic evaluation are received in these locations. (See Exhibits for copies of the Student Guide, Class Schedule and College Catalog.)

**RECOMMENDATION #5:**

That the college should make adequate provision for the safety of students and others by improving the lighting of walkways around the campus, particularly on paths leading to the parking lot and in the lots themselves. (3.B.4)

Under the direction of the new Director of Campus Safety/Security, Facilities and Capital Projects, the safety of students, staff and visitors has become a high priority. Funding that had been going unspent for those items was prioritized and expended. Improvements have been made across campus, focusing primarily on walkways and campus lighting.

Significant improvements in walkways, crosswalks, stairs and ramps include:

- 1 The walkway in front of the Library (4000 Building) was repaired, and the sinkhole filled and resurfaced.
- 2 An access ramp was added to the east side of the FOSS Building (5000), connecting the stairway to the sidewalk and making the building ADA accessible from that side.
- 3 Between the Pagoda Union Building (900) parking lot and the Music Building (800), at East Entrance Drive, wooden stairs were replaced with concrete steps and metal railings.
- 4 The entire north Greenwood Lot Pathway was replaced with concrete stairs, metal railings and asphalt walkways; the south Greenwood Lot Pathway had new handrails installed on the stairways.
- 5 Uneven walkway surfaces were ground to a more even level by a commercial concrete grinding company, including sidewalks near the 1700 and 1800 buildings.
- 6 The broken steel crosswalk plate at the FOSS (5000) crosswalk was replaced.

7 The damaged stairway to the 2600 Building was repaired.

8 A contractor has been retained to add a stairway and do sidewalk improvements between the VCT Building (2000) and the Automotive Center (2100).

Significant improvements in lighting include:

- 1 Additional lighting fixtures were provided for the event lot on the east side of campus.
- 2 Additional lighting fixtures were installed in the visitor lot on the south side of campus and in the adjacent staff lot.
- 3 More efficient, brighter light bulbs were installed in several areas of the campus, including the FOSS (5000) staff lot and the Greenwood Lot Pathways.
- 4 New lighting poles and fixtures were installed in the Greenwood Parking Lot (student lot), changing it from a very dark to a very well-lit area.

The reorganized Facilities Use Committee has been assigned the task of identifying areas which can be improved with future funding. As the Facilities Master Plan is implemented, attention will continue to be given to accessibility and to correcting problems that currently exist, but for which there is not a solution without funding. The college is committed to grounds and buildings that are safe and accessible as well as aesthetically pleasing.

**RECOMMENDATION #6:**

That Shoreline examine its governance committee structure, number of committees, and their charges so that the governance structure better facilitates the successful achievement of the college's mission and goals.  
(6.A)

Beginning prior to the October 2002 Full-Scale Evaluation visit, and continuing through the April 2004 interim visit, the college has been examining its governance structure, number of committees and the charge for those committees. The college is moving forward with the examination and restructure, although the governance system continues to be a "work in progress." Although governance restructuring will not be completed by the time of the interim visit, significant progress has been made.

One of the problems identified in the 2002 Self-Study was a proliferation of governance committees, each of which required a formal appointment process with representation from each major constituency group: students, faculty, classified staff and administrators. Within this structure, each constituency group had to provide many representatives, and some individuals served on multiple committees, resulting in heavy committee workloads and burnout for the most engaged individuals. In response to this concern, the number of "governance committees" has been reduced from thirteen to three. These include the Strategic Planning Committee and the newly formed Shoreline College Council. The third governance committee, the Governance Steering Committee, is tentatively scheduled to sunset at the end of this academic year, with its governance oversight duties to be reassigned to the College Council once the governance restructure is complete.

Other committees previously designated as "governance committees" have been renamed to be "College Wide Committees." Membership on College Wide Committees can include faculty, classified staff and administration, but is not subject to the same strict constituency representation requirements as the more formal governance committees. For example, students are encouraged to participate in College Wide Committees but are not required to provide designated members. The students have amended their constitution and bylaws to require that members of the Student Senate and their Executive Team participate on the Strategic Planning Committee and the College Council. This change is anticipated to improve the quality of student participation by supporting strong, consistent representation on the most important college committees.

Each College Wide Committee has been asked to review its structure and charge to determine if there is a continued need for its existence. At this time, the majority of committees have recommended that they continue to function in order to meet specific college needs. One exception is the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which has merged with the Strategic Planning Committee, in order to provide a closer link between assessment and planning. Other groups within the college's structure, such as the Faculty Senate, are reviewing and revising their mission and goals, resulting in a clearer understanding of how they function within the institution as a whole. (See Exhibits for additional detail.)

A governance assessment survey undertaken in the winter quarter of 2000, and a college-wide discussion held during Opening Week 2002, identified a number of concerns about the existing governance structure. Two major concerns identified were: 1) uncertainty as to how information that needed to be acted on by the Board of Trustees got to that body, and 2) gaps in the communication of important information to the campus at large. In response to these concerns, a new governance committee has been created: The Shoreline College Council. The Council, made up of equal representation of students, classified staff, faculty and administration, reports to the College President and reviews all items scheduled for Board of Trustees consideration. Key information items from all areas of the college are shared and discussed with the Council, and its members are asked to assist in the institution-wide dissemination of information. While the Council has experienced some "growing pains" following its creation in the fall of 2003, Council members are committed to the premise that led to its creation, and are working well together to fulfill their responsibilities.

Minutes of Governance Committee meetings are available on an ongoing basis for those interested in tracking the restructure work over time. In addition, formal college-wide communication regarding governance changes is due to be released to the campus by the start of spring quarter 2004, and should be available as an Exhibit for the interim visit.

The college anticipates that the revised governance structure will provide a clearer more readily understandable pathway for those items that require Board approval, more effective avenues for cross campus communication, and a less cumbersome, better coordinated structure for college governance.

**RECOMMENDATION #7:**

That the Board of Trustees approves all major academic, vocational, and technical programs of study. (6.B.5)

At the time of the Full-Scale evaluation in October 16-19, 2002, the college was found to be out of compliance with its own internal policy on Board approval of major new programs of study. Since then, the Board has reviewed one new program: Speech Language Pathology Assistant. SLPA is the only major new program which has been added since October 2002. All other additions to the college's approved program list during this time period have been relatively minor changes to existing programs. (See Exhibits for current list of approved programs.)

The college's next new program under development is Information Assurance, an offshoot of the Computer Information Systems program. Although the Board receives advance information about new and upcoming programs at their annual retreat, this new program will not be brought to them on their formal agenda until Information Assurance has gone through the rest of our approval process, in accordance with college policy. This program is currently at the stage of statewide review, meaning that a statewide Notice of Intent has been filed, inviting other community and technical colleges to raise any concerns they may have about impact on their programs. If the Notice of Intent process is successful, the new program should be brought to the Board for consideration, after review by the Dean of Professional/Technical Studies, the Curriculum Committee and the College Council. The lead faculty member is due to attend Purdue University's graduate certificate program in Information Assurance this summer, and will start work there on developing new courses to fill out the program. The Information Assurance program is currently scheduled to appear on the Board agenda early in the fall quarter of 2004.

**RECOMMENDATION #8:**

That the college publish an annual budget, both in detail and in summary, to appropriate constituencies. The funding of strategic focuses and budget policies, principles and guidelines, and the processes for developing the budget should be clearly defined and followed. (7.A.3)

As noted in the October 2002 Full-Scale Evaluation Committee Report, just prior to the most recent accreditation visit, Shoreline Community College had employed three different Vice Presidents for Administrative Services within the same number of years. This extraordinary level of turnover left the budget process fragmented and poorly communicated. Adding to the continuity and communication problems were extreme economic problems in the state and the college's resulting need to reduce budgets by nearly \$2,000,000 within a two year period. Under these circumstances, morale, trust and understanding were clearly lacking, and needed to be rebuilt.

In 2001, the college's Strategic Planning Committee had agreed that budgeting should be done on a biennial basis to coincide with the legislative allocation process, and to work on an alternate-year basis with the development of Program Planning and Assessment reports. The budget development plan was not well documented or tied to the Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) process at that time, and allocation of resources was only partially connected to needs identified through assessment processes.

The 2003-2004 budget was prepared in reaction to a significant statewide budget reduction. The principles, process and final product of this year's budget plan were broadly communicated to the Board, administration and campus constituencies. The process was followed as planned, and a similar process is being used for developing the 2004-2005 budget.

For preparation of the 2003-04 budget, the Vice President for Administrative Services held two open forums once the funding available from the state was determined. Following the agreed-upon procedure, a Budget Task Force was appointed because the anticipated reduction was more than \$100,000. The Task Force, made up of representatives from all campus constituencies and every major segment of the college, prepared recommendations for the budget reductions that were submitted to the Board of Trustees as part of the 2003-2004 Budget.

To encourage and support open communication on the budget reductions, regular Brown Bag Lunch meetings were held to allow members of all campus constituencies to ask questions and follow the status of the Task Force's work. Open meetings were also held early in the morning and once during evening hours to give everyone a chance to have their concerns and questions addressed, regardless of their work schedules or class times.

The Vice President of Administrative Services also attended division meetings to keep each area abreast of the process, and regularly reviewed the draft budget with the Operations Council and the President's Staff. The Operations group includes all administrative staff members employed by the college; all areas of the institution are represented by their respective Vice Presidents at the President's Staff. A Budget Workshop was held for the Board of Trustees to solicit their input. A final budget was given to the Board of Trustees for approval at their May 2003 meeting.

A detailed copy of the budget, including departmental budgets, salary information and summaries was given to each Vice President and each Dean, and two copies were placed in the Library for campus check out. Extra copies were made available in the Vice President of Administrative Services Office for anyone requesting them. The budget is updated quarterly and balanced to the revenue projections monthly. Updated budget information is made available in open meetings of the Board of Trustees on a regular basis, and is distributed widely on campus as part of the materials packet prepared for each Board meeting.

The 2004-05 budget development process has been documented in writing and has been shared with the SCC Council and published in Net News. (See Exhibits) The entire biennial process has not yet completed a full cycle with the current administration and governance structure. Currently the college is preparing its 2004-2005 budget, for the second year of the biennial budgeting cycle, with no new revenues and no significant reductions. Campus wide meetings and visits to departments are being scheduled to maintain communication. No Task Force will be appointed for development of the 2004-05 budget, as the projected increase/decrease in available resources is less than \$100,000. The Board will approve the budget at their May meeting, and copies of the detailed operating and grants and contracts budgets will be distributed to administrative staff and made available in the Library by the end of June.

As the Program Planning and Assessment reports from all areas of the college are tied directly to the Strategic Planning Focus Areas and to the institutional mission, vision and goals, they will be used to prioritize funding decisions in the first year of each biennial budgeting cycle. This will increase the real and perceived value of the PPA process in the assessment of financial need and in the budgeting decisions of the college. Institution-wide communication regarding the budget and budget process will continue to happen openly and on a regular basis. The college will have completed a full cycle of its new biennial process by the end of the 2004-05 academic year, culminating in the publication of its official 2005-06 annual budget.

**RECOMMENDATION #9:**

That the college address and respond to the external auditors' recommendations, dated September 20, 2001, regarding the internal controls of the college. (7.C.12)

Immediately upon the exit interview with the external auditors, the college began implementing their suggestions and had completed implementation at the time of the accreditation visit in October 2002. (See Audit Report in Exhibits) Each item was handled on an individual basis.

**Self-Sustaining Funds**

Budgets were prepared for most self-sustaining funds on campus. The community college accounting system in the State of Washington does not require this and there are some funds for which this is not a possibility. The Vice President for Administrative Services and her staff monitor these funds on a regular basis. The funds that are budgeted are budgeted based on the previous year's actual revenues, carry over fund balances and any anticipated changes. Because these funds cannot spend beyond their allocated resources, the Budget and Finance Office has implemented a procedure in which all proposed expenditures are checked against available resources prior to expenditure approval. This is working extremely well, and helps budget managers become aware of potential over-expenditure problems before they actually occur.

As many funds in the state accounting system are defined as unbudgeted, and as it is not a state requirement to budget these funds, we will continue to operate those funds as unbudgeted. To do otherwise would require re-allocation of staff resources away from other more essential activities and processes.

**Overhead Allocation**

The College charges 15% overhead on all revenue generating budgets allowed to retain their fund balances. It has been this way for 5 years, although this practice is not widely known and understood in all areas of the college. With recent staff turnovers in both the Budget and Finance Office and the offices responsible for managing revenue generating budgets, the overhead procedure has not been communicated as well as it needed to be, and the budget coding is not organized in a manner that makes overhead information easy to interpret, particularly for new staff members.

At the Board's direction the College will be redoing its entire coding structure for implementation no later than July 1, 2005. This will provide greater clarity, and workshops will be held campus wide to communicate the changes in coding, including the reasoning and the rules attached to each program. The administrative staff should be stable by that time, and it will be a good time to remind the college of how overhead, accountability and limitations work.

**Accounts Receivable Duties**

Staffing levels at the college require that the Accounts Receivable Fiscal Specialist be able to access the receivables files. The cashiers receipt all payments and make deposits. The Controller monitors the receiving reports in the fiscal process and signs off on all write offs. At present, not all billings are done through the Budget and Finance Office, although this is recognized as a desirable practice to be implemented gradually as staffing resources allow. Currently the grants and contracts are billed by the Budget Office and in some areas of grant assignment, but all payments are receipted through the cashier and balanced by the Fiscal Specialist. Our procedure is similar to those of most other community colleges within the State of Washington. There is a definite segregation of duties, and the college has successfully passed all state audits on these processes.

Running Start is billed according to the Running Start Billing Procedure. This is the procedure approved by the State of Washington. (See Exhibit)

The college did not have an aging report for Accounts Receivable, but prior to year end, we hired a consultant from the system to help verify our receivables, catch-up write offs and implement an aging report. That report is monitored periodically by the college's Director of Finance and Budget and by the Vice President of Administrative Services. The college has a Collections and Write-Off Policy and Procedure that has been approved by the state auditor. (See Exhibit)

**Accounts Payable Follow-Up**

Accounts Payables are current and pending accounts are monitored daily. The College is extremely pleased with the work of the new staff person assigned to these duties. He is very thorough and communicates with the departments regularly, making sure all payments are made to the vendors within the timeline suggested by the Office of Financial Management. Improvement in this area has been significant. The College also implemented a procurement card system, which allows departments to secure items in less time. The procurement card system has reduced the number of transactions the college processes. Departments can prepare one document for payment to the credit card vendor instead of to multiple vendors.

Shoreline Community College has not had an audit finding since 2000. It is part of the State of Washington single audit and has been placed on a two year audit cycle, consistent with the new state procedures.

**REPORT SUMMARY:**

Overall, the college has made significant progress in all of the areas in which major Recommendations were received from the October 2002 evaluation team. The college's self-assessment in preparation for the April 2004 interim visit indicates that the requirements of Recommendations Four, Five, Seven and Nine have been met in their entirety. The college is continuing to work toward full implementation of Recommendations One, Two, Three, Six and Eight. Shoreline Community College welcomes the analysis and assessment of the interim visit evaluator, as a key checkpoint in the college's ongoing process of self-improvement and compliance with Commission on Colleges standards and guidelines.