

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

A REGULAR INTERIM REPORT

Shoreline Community College
Shoreline, Washington

October 25-26, 2007

Prepared by

Dr. Sonya Christian, Chair
Vice President, Instruction and Student Services
Lane Community College

Dr. Galyn B. Carlile
Executive Dean, Riverside Campus
Rogue Community College

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities that Represents the Views of the Evaluator

Introduction

Shoreline Community College (Shoreline) is a public two year community college that was founded in 1964 in Shoreline, Washington, and was granted initial accreditation in 1966. This 83-acre campus, located 10 miles north of downtown Seattle, is the tenth largest community college in the state of Washington, and served 13,247 students in 2006-2007. The Board of Trustees is a five-member board that is appointed by the Governor of the State of Washington and confirmed by the Washington State Senate.

Recent Accreditation History

Shoreline's accreditation status was reaffirmed in October 2002 by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), and was followed by a focused interim visit in April 2004.

In reaffirming the accreditation status in October 2002, NWCCU had fourteen commendations and nine recommendations in the Full-Scale Evaluation report. The nine recommendations are listed below:

Recommendation #1: The visiting committee recommends 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)

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)

Recommendation #3: We recommend 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)

Recommendation #4: That the "Student Rights and Responsibilities" be included in publications readily available to students. (3.B.3)

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)

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, 6B.5)

Recommendation #7: That the Board of Trustees approves all major academic, vocational, and technical programs of study. (6.B.5)

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)

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)

The Focused Interim Evaluation report in April 2004 addressed the progress made by Shoreline in responding to the nine recommendations. This focused report had two commendations and two recommendations. The two recommendations are listed below:

Recommendation #1: The evaluator recommends that the college continue to link the results of evaluation activities to the ongoing planning process. (1.B.4)

Recommendation #2: That the college continue to integrate assessment of its educational programs (2.B.1) and provide evidence that assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning. (2.B.3, 2.2)

Regular Interim Report and Evaluation Visit

In response to the recommendations made in the Focused Interim Evaluation report in April 2004, Shoreline submitted a report to NWCCU on how the college has comprehensively addressed the recommendations. The evaluators for the current Regular Interim visit found the report and support documentation to be well organized and comprehensive in depth and breadth of analysis, which led to ease in conducting the on-site evaluative process.

The evaluation visit on October 25-26, 2007, lasted a day and a half, during which the evaluators had a campus tour; conducted interviews; and reviewed evidence organized by the college. The college had the evidence documents easily accessible in the resource room that was made available to the evaluators. The evaluators had meetings with the president of the college; the vice president for academic affairs who also serves as the accreditation liaison officer; the interim vice president for student services and the student services directors; instructional deans; interim vice president for administrative services and administrative services directors; the institutional director of research; members of the board of trustees and the foundation board; chairs of faculty senate, curriculum committee, and faculty federation president; chairs of college council,

strategic planning committee, and budget committee; faculty representing different disciplines; students; and classified staff representing different departments.

The interviews helped the evaluators verify the regular interim report as well as confirm whether the perception of faculty, staff, and administrators were in alignment with the written report. In addition, the documents provided by the interviewees and those in the evidence folders were extremely useful in validating the report.

Based on the documentation and interviews, the current evaluators endorse the findings of the focused interim evaluation that "...evidence that the college had made significant progress in all areas in which major recommendations were made by the October 2002 evaluation team." The major recommendations from the full-scale evaluation visit have been, and continue to be, adequately addressed and integrated into the ongoing operations of the institution. As a result, only two additional recommendations were noted in the April 2004 focused interim visit. These two recommendations have been addressed by Shoreline in their report, and the college has also provided an in-depth review of the many and varied changes within the organization since the 2002 visit.

Part A is a review of all the actions taken in regard to the nine recommendations from the full-scale evaluation visit in October 2002 and an in-depth analysis of the steps taken to meet the two recommendations from the focused interim visit of April 2004. Part B addresses the changes that have taken place within the organization's functional and logistical operations related to the Commission's standards one through nine.

Part A: Actions taken regarding recommendations

This section is a review of the work Shoreline staff, faculty and administration have accomplished to document the college's response to recommendations from the last full-scale evaluation visit and the subsequent follow-up focused interim visit. A total of eleven recommendations are addressed in this section: nine from the full-scale evaluation visit, and two from the focused interim visit.

Recommendation #1: From the Regular Full-Scale Evaluation

The visiting committee recommends that the college uses 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)

Recommendation #1: From the Focused Interim Evaluation

The evaluator recommends that the college continue to link the results of evaluation activities to the ongoing planning process. (1.B.4)

After reviewing the report submitted by the college, assessing the documents provided in the evidence binders, and then analyzing the interviews with students, faculty, staff, and administrators, the current evaluators find that the Shoreline has made noteworthy and substantial progress in addressing the fundamental concerns addressed in this recommendation by taking the following actions:

- Identifying college priorities for 2007-2008 from the Strategic Plan based on an inclusive institutional review conducted during the college's *Opening Week* activities.
- Assigning institutional planning and budgeting to the same college executive, Vice President for Administrative Services, in order to advance the practice of planning processes influencing budget resource allocation (1.B.4).
- Developing the Goals and Assessment Matrix that serves as the program planning and analysis component of the strategic planning process and as a tool to request additional resources.
- Developing multiple communication methods to support ongoing participation and awareness of ongoing planning and other relevant institutional issues.

The evaluators found that the college has laid the groundwork for institutional planning, evaluation and resource allocation in an inclusive and transparent manner. Individuals and groups interviewed by the evaluators were fully aware of the college priorities, the Strategic Plan, the Goals and Assessment Matrix, and the process for resource allocation. As all these systems were being developed, the college experienced substantial change in leadership and organizational structure while simultaneously going through budget reductions. The evaluators were impressed with the commitment of senior administrative leadership, faculty and staff to developing these systems during such a turbulent time.

There is considerable evidence that the assessment activity in this process has directly led to a number of positive procedural and policy changes. Technology resource upgrade and replacement activities have also been connected to the strategic plan as well as detailed annual equipment reviews. The evaluators also found evidence that the institution is now making resource allocations through a request and review process according to a Goal and Assessment Matrix. Each unit or program bases these reviews upon institutional research data and uses this annual process to inform decisions on resource allocations regarding staffing, equipment and technology. The assessment matrix also acts as a trigger to initiate necessary changes to programs and services to improve educational effectiveness. The development of the Visual Communication Technology (VCT) Program and the electronic classroom for the Healthcare Information program are examples of the college's response to the results from institutional evaluation and planning.

In order to maximize the effectiveness of the strategic planning processes, Shoreline has strengthened existing modes of communication and initiated a number of new avenues to ensure college-wide awareness and understanding of the process and outcomes of the activity. Regular ongoing communication is facilitated through various committee activity and additional informational postings on the college intranet.

The strategic planning committee and the budget committee are discussing methods to systematically operationalize the process by which planning will inform resource allocation. A team of individuals from each of the committees attended a conference to gather best practices to guide Shoreline's implementation of the operational details. The evaluators recommend that the institution continue to maintain this focus and move into systematic implementation of the framework that has already been developed for the strategic planning committee and the budget committee.

Recommendation #2: From the Regular Full-Scale Evaluation

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)

Recommendation #2: From the Focused Interim Evaluation

That the college continue to integrate assessment of its educational programs (2.B.1) and provide evidence that assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning.

The evaluators found that the institution is making significant progress toward integrating assessment findings into the design and change of curriculum as necessary to ensure timely course and program improvement. The colleges Goals and Assessment Matrix designed by the Strategic Planning Committee has become one of the primary building blocks linking assessment findings to program and service improvement. While the processes are new and not completely implemented throughout the institution, there is

evidence that the college is serious about meeting the letter and spirit of this recommendation. Faculty, deans, and vice presidents are all aware of, and engaged with, the departmental review and planning process through the use of the Assessment Matrix. A number of the educational programs have completed the process or are well on their way to achieving full compliance with the strategic planning committee's goal.

There are a number of examples where the Shoreline administration and faculty have continued to emphasize integrating data, gained from various course and program assessment, into the improvement of teaching and learning throughout the institution. The Goals and Assessment Matrices for every program are reviewed by senior management, and information gained from these processes is included in the development and implementation, and program maintenance and improvement plans.

A noteworthy example of the progress made to address this recommendation is in the area of "early grade alert" notification procedures implemented as a result of student satisfaction inventory responses. Faculty, staff and counselors devised and initiated a course of action for early notification of students' progress within a course and established feedback processes that met the needs of students for earliest possible notification when progress within a course was insufficient to maintain satisfactory course competition.

The evaluators encourage the deans, faculty, and staff to continue to focus on assessment of student learning and to ensure that improvements in teaching and learning practices are a result of program review and assessment.

Recommendation #3: From the Regular Full-Scale Evaluation

*We recommend 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 evaluator from the Focused Interim Visit of April 2004 determined that the institution had made significant progress toward addressing this recommendation. The current evaluators found that additional progress has been made since the last visit, and a number of steps have been taken by the institution to further the assessment of General Education Outcomes systematically.

A noteworthy example of progress made in this area is the assessment of the general education outcome of information literacy. The library faculty and staff have partnered with faculty and staff in instructional areas to:

- develop a global rubric to assess information literacy
- assess the value added for students in conducting research by administering a pre-test and post-test for the classes that have a research component that requires the use of library resources.
- understand students' knowledge of information literacy by administering an Information Literacy Assessment Survey.

The evaluators noted that the information gathered from the assessment activities listed above (on the information literacy general education outcome) is generating conversations among faculty, which could lead to changes in practices to improve educational effectiveness.

Considerable progress has been made by a number of the faculty throughout the institution in defining general education outcomes and core objectives. However, the evaluators noted that while significant progress has been made toward meeting this recommendation, additional work needs to be accomplished in order for students to better understand the role of general education curriculum within their courses of study and to complete the process for all programs.

Recommendation #4: From the Regular Full-Scale Evaluation

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

The focused interim report noted that the college published the student rights and conduct information in the class schedule, college catalog, and on the website. The current evaluators for the regular interim evaluation confirmed that the college continues with the practice of publishing the information in the above mentioned venues. All student policies on rights and responsibilities and codes of conduct are currently published in detail in the college catalog, both online and in hard copy, and in the Student Guide, which is distributed to all Shoreline students.

Recommendation #5: From the Regular Full-Scale Evaluation

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)

The focused interim report noted that “the college has made significant progress in addressing this recommendation.” The current evaluators found that the college is committed to upgrading facilities in order to ensure the safety of students and employees.

Following are some examples of actions taken by the college to address this recommendation:

- Several damaged stairwells were replaced (for instance: south Greenwood Lot pathway, Building 2600)
- ADA accessibility improved (for instance: access ramps added to FOSS building, uneven walkway surfaces ground to even level).
- Improvements in lighting (for instance: event lot, visitor lot, staff lot).

Safety officers patrol the campus during the evening hours and weekends and are available to escort employees and students on request.

Recommendation #6: From the Regular Full-Scale Evaluation

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, 6B.5)

The focused interim report noted that “the college has successfully addressed this recommendation”

Since then there have been some critical events that caused serious turbulence on campus:

- A faculty vote of no confidence in the president leading to a senior administrative overhaul.
- Significant budget reductions from the state of Washington.

During this period, the Board of Trustees stepped in and provided leadership by appointing an interim president, and then followed up by leading a nation-wide search for a permanent president. The interim president, who later was appointed permanently to the position, focused on providing stability for the organization by proceeding with the work that had already begun on streamlining the governance system, prioritizing the strategic plan, and connecting planning to budget allocation. There was a complete turnover in three senior administrative positions—Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Student Services, and Vice President for Administrative Services. Some of the vice president positions have been filled, or continue to be filled, with interim appointments. We commend the president and senior leadership for their commitment to governance, planning and budgeting during an extraordinarily rough patch for the institution. For more details, see Part B, Standard One.

The college has formed a work group to study the purpose and function of each college committee with the intention of streamlining the structure.

Recommendation #7: From the Regular Full-Scale Evaluation

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

The focused interim report noted that “the college has made significant process toward this recommendation.”

The evaluators found that the Board of Trustees formally approved all the new degree programs since 2002. In addition, the Board of Trustees have adopted a new policy, Policy 6251, which requires that in addition to new degrees, all new certificates for programs over 45 credits be approved as well. This policy will be applied to those certificates and degrees that were approved by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges but not the Shoreline Board of Trustees. These will be brought to the Shoreline Board during the October through December board meetings for approval.

The evaluators for the regular interim report note that this recommendation has been successfully met.

Recommendation #8: From the Regular Full-Scale Evaluation

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)

The focused interim report noted that “the college addressed this recommendation.” The evaluators for the regular interim visit found that the college has addressed this recommendation. In addition, the college continues to strengthen the budget process and make it more transparent.

The interim Vice President for Administrative Services is responsible for both the Strategic Planning Committee and the Budget Committee. This key strategy adopted by the college has made the processes for planning and budgeting more integrated, and transparent to the different constituent groups who have representatives on these key governance committees. In addition, the Assessment Matrix is a key planning tool that has budget implications, and helps facilitate the communication between the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the instructional deans and the faculty.

Recommendation #9: From the Regular Full-Scale Evaluation

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)

The focused interim report noted that “the college has made significant progress in addressing this recommendation.”

In the last two external audits, Shoreline received “no audit findings,” which demonstrate the college’s compliance with 7.C.12. The college hired a budget director reporting to the president to be responsible for internal controls. In addition, the vice president for Administrative Services has oversight for the Strategic Planning Committee and the Budget Committee. The college’s commitment to addressing this recommendation has certainly produced positive results.

Part B: Institutional changes since the regular evaluation and the focused visit.

Standard One – Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness

The last two years (2005-2006 and 2006-2007) have been turbulent for the college. The following events contributed to the turmoil:

- The faculty passed a *no confidence* vote in the president.
- The Board of Trustees appointed the Vice President of Human Resources as the Acting/Interim president in September 2005 as they conducted a national search. In July 2006, they appointed the Acting/Interim president as the new president of Shoreline Community College.
- Reorganized senior level administration by eliminating the Vice President for Workforce and Economic Development and appointing new personnel, initially as interims in the remaining vice president positions.
- The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), responsible for legislative appropriation, had to “pull back” funding due to the enrollment decline at Shoreline. This resulted in budget cuts at the college, which was then followed by an institutional reorganization.

The evaluators found that administration, faculty, and staff remained dedicated to the institutional mission and the students, particularly during the turbulent years since the focused interim visit in April 2004. The evaluators also found the Board of Trustees fully engaged with the college, and they provided the necessary leadership through the transition period of changes in upper administration. The evaluators were impressed with the president and the senior administration for their focus on institutional governance, planning, and budgeting, and their commitment to an inclusive and participatory planning process, given the climate of budget cuts and reorganization. The documents provided by the college, and interviews with managers, faculty, staff, and students provided more than the necessary evidence for these findings and conclusions.

The Board of Trustees recently adopted the Strategic Plan, which was developed through the participation and representation of faculty, staff and administration. The current evaluators found that the college’s planning activity was fairly and adequately documented in the written report and in the evidence binders. The planning activities and resulting actions have also been widely, and appropriately, communicated to all units of the organization.

Committee structures have been redesigned in order streamline work and to ensure participation in the planning process, and the dissemination of information. An example of success here is the evidence of widespread support for the work of the Strategic Planning Committee. The college is commended for its commitment to participatory processes in developing its strategic plan and priorities.

Standard Two: Educational Program and its Effectiveness

The Shoreline instructional staff has initiated numerous curricular additions through the development and implementation of new program and course offerings as well as changes within existing offerings since the full-scale visit. This has been accomplished in an era of budget reductions and organizational redesign. These changes have been made on both the main campus and the Lake Forest Park satellite campus.

The evaluators observed that despite the impact of the many resource challenges, workforce reductions and budget cutbacks, the faculty and staff continued to offer high quality academic programs, which enable Shoreline students to be successful in attaining their educational goals. Support services in the library and media center have continued to stay abreast of the changes and have been a major factor in the success of the expansion of distributed education for students who cannot commute to the campus.

The college has been able to redesign many of the curriculum formats to include components supporting Career Pathways and Academic Options Pathways. These offerings have greatly improved the ability of Shoreline students to formulate their goals and achieve them in a timely and efficient manner. The evaluators found evidence that the program staff keep the program current.

The college has strengthened its international programs by developing guidelines to help inform formation of international partnerships, developing policies to help ensure the fiscal sustainability of international programs and courses of study.

The college-wide acceptance of the Goals and Assessment Matrix is a primary example of how programmatic changes are based on analysis of available data collected through assessment and evaluation. Procedures for enhancing and implementing change were supported by a Master Course Outline (MCO) process designed to insure a degree of consistency in the identification of student learning outcomes and assessment of those outcomes in each course. The evaluators found that the Assessment Matrix and the MCO are widely used in both career and technical education and academic transfer curricula.

To enhance the viability of Shoreline career and technical programs, faculty in these areas facilitate an employer driven external review process and develop a work-readiness report for each program. The institution also demonstrates its ability to make assessment data affect change through the Essential Skills Goals and Assessment Matrix. Information from this activity is used to measure students basic skills gain.

The regular interim report prepared by the college also points out changes through out the institutions grading systems, admissions procedures and non academic programs. The student support services, student union, student leadership program as well as a number of basic organizational components have all experienced changes that improve educational effectiveness noted in the report as well as through evaluator observation.

Standard Three: Students

There have been several changes to Student Services in the last several years in an attempt to streamline services and make them more effective. In addition, there are changes that came about due to the reorganization that occurred as a result of budget cuts.

Here is a sampling of some of the changes:

- Use of online processes for admissions in several Career Technical areas.
- Simplified procedures for students and faculty as they relate to grades. (For example, students can verify their unofficial transcripts directly on line).
- Testing and Assessment office moved to Enrollment Services as a result of reorganization.
- Development of an online tutoring system.

The evaluators found that the changes have improved the effectiveness of student services as demonstrated by the student surveys and other data collected from the systems. The evaluators were impressed with the student leadership program and the degree to which students were involved with institutional processes and institutional decision-making. There appears to be excitement on campus around the renovation of the PUB which is jointly funded by students through a fee and the state through certificates of participation. The two recommendations in the full-scale evaluation report were addressed satisfactorily in the focused interim evaluator's report. The current evaluators found that the college continues to address these recommendations satisfactorily (see Part A, recommendations 4 and 5).

The college has developed an Inquiry Management System (IMS) and is effectively using the system. This system automatically responds to student inquiries and connects them with appropriate personnel, including faculty, depending on the nature of the enquiry. From the evidence provided in the binders and from interviews, the evaluators found that not only is the system being used to respond to students, but aggregate data from the system is collected to inform institutional policies and practices.

Enrollments have declined over the last five years. Enrollment in 2006-2007 (5196 FTE) was 16.7% less than the enrollment in 2002-2003 (6236.9 FTE). The college is fully aware of how enrollment affects the state legislative allocation through the funding formula, and is using its strategic plan to stabilize enrollment.

Standard Four: Faculty

The college has instituted a few new policies and contractual agreements since the focused interim visit and several since the 2002 full-scale evaluation visit. An example is the intellectual freedom policy that was initiated by the Faculty Senate in Spring 2005 in an attempt to review and revise an old policy, *Policy #5270—Students' Freedom to Read*, which was last revised in 1969. The new policy broadened the scope by including support for the academy freedom of faculty to choose course materials, upholding students' rights to read by supporting the library's rights to include educationally relevant materials in their collections of books and other media, without fear of censorship. The

policies and contractual agreements attempt to improve and clarify roles and responsibilities and as such support the commission's standards.

There have been 47 full-time faculty hires since 2001-2002 from a total workforce of 146 full time faculty in 2006-2007. The number of total full time faculty has varied between 146 and 151 in the five years since the last full-scale evaluation visit on October 2002. Faculty salaries have increased in the last five years with full time faculty voting on the distribution of the legislated salary allocation as funding increments, cost of living adjustment, or disparity increases as done for part time faculty in 2002-2003.

The faculty evaluation process has been in a state of transition for several years. A new Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) was developed as a result of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) between the college administration and the Federation of Teachers. The work which began in 2003 has not yet been implemented due to a variety of reasons, including change in personnel. A pilot implementation is supposed to occur in 2007-2008. The evaluators point out that it is critical for the college to systematically implement this plan in 2007-2008.

Standard Five: Library

The library faculty and staff appear to be very much involved in instructional program development and expansions. It was clear to the evaluators that the library personnel, because of their close involvement with instructional areas, are aware of new program development and try to support this with educational resources within a limited budget. There are several examples to support this effort on the part of the library; for instance, the addition of a new database targeted towards the Automotive and Health Occupations program, and the addition of ARTstor, a database of images to support the Visual Communication Technology (VCT) program.

Since the 2002 full-scale evaluation visit, the library has increased its collections of full text periodicals from 4,500 in 2002 to more than 11,000 in 2007—almost a 145 percent increase.

The library has also played a central role in the general education core outcome of information literacy (see Recommendation #3 for more details). The evaluators commend the work of the faculty and staff of the library and the instructional departments in developing a global rubric to assess information literacy, for administering a pre-test and post-test to assess the *value-added* for students after their experience with the library, and for administering the information literacy survey to a variety of classes.

Standard Six: Governance

There have been significant changes to the senior leadership, which is clearly outlined in the report prepared by the college. This resulted in a turbulent two year period during which time the institution has maintained focus on its mission. The evaluators found that

the institution was in compliance with standard six even during the transition in leadership. The president and senior administration have provided leadership in setting intuitional goals and priorities in an inclusive and participatory manner. For more information see Part A, Recommendation #1 and Part B, Standard One.

Standard Seven: Finance

From the documents provided in the evidence binders and the interviews with the faculty and staff, particularly the chairs of the strategic planning committee, college council, and the budget committee, it is clear that the college has done a good job of strengthening its financial structures. Here are some actions taken by the college that contributed to the improvement in planning and communication as it relates to institutional finance and budgeting.

- Investing in human resources (hired a budget director who reports to the President for budget and internal controls).
- Developing a budget planning system that incorporates departmental budget planning.
- Integrating budget planning into the governance system. A budget committee was established that reports to the Vice President for Administrative Services, who also provides oversight to the Strategic Planning Committee to ensure that planning informs budgeting

Standard Eight: Facilities

The college has done substantial work in improving the campus infrastructure since 2002. Some examples:

- Replacing and upgrading the campus water main, the energy management system, boilers, and fire alarm system.
- Major remodeling of instructional spaces (Examples: Biotechnology, Physics, Geology, and Environmental Science).

Also see Part A, Recommendation # 5 for further facilities work completed.

Standard Nine: Institutional Integrity

The evaluators found that Shoreline has policies that are published and practiced that adhere to institutional integrity in its representation to the community and the public; in its teaching and services; and in its treatment of students, faculty, and staff.

General Commendations and Recommendations:

Commendations:

1. The faculty, staff, and administrators are commended for their dedication to serving students and the community, and providing an excellent learning environment in spite of organizational and budget restructuring.
2. The president and senior executives of the college are commended for their leadership in the development of plans and establishment of institutional priorities through a transparent inclusive process; further the board of trustees is commended for its commitment to Shoreline Community College through the turbulent transition of senior leadership.
3. The institution is commended for its extensive participatory process in involving appropriate constituencies in developing its strategic plan and priorities, including the criteria to influence resource allocations.

Recommendation:

1. While the evaluators found that the institution has made excellent progress in the realm of planning and budgeting, and has initiated processes for planning to influence budgeting, it still needs to demonstrate that systematic planning influences college-wide budget allocation. The evaluators recommend that the institution use the results of its systematic evaluation activities and ongoing planning processes to influence resource allocation and to improve its instructional programs, institutional services, and activities. (1.B.4)