

FEB 07 2014

8060 165th Avenue N.E., Suite 100 Redmond, WA 98052-3981 425 558 4224

Fax: 425 376 0596

Olympic College President's Office

February 3, 2014

Dr. David C. Mitchell President Olympic College 1600 Chester Avenue Bremerton, WA 98337-1699

Dear President Mitehell:

On behalf of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to report that at its January 8-9, 2014, meeting, the Board of Commissioners reaffirmed the accreditation of Olympic College on the basis of the Fall 2013 Year Three *Resources and Capacity* Evaluation which was expanded to address Recommendations 1 and 2 of the Fall 2011 Year One Peer-Evaluation Report.

In reaffirming accreditation, the Commission determined that its expectations with regard to Recommendations 1 and 2 of the Fall 2011 Year One Peer-Evaluation Report have been met. In addition, the Commission requests that the College submit an Ad Hoc Self-Evaluation Report in Fall 2015 to address Recommendation 1 of the Fall 2013 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report. In making this request, the Commission finds that Recommendation 1 of the Fall 2013 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report is an area where Olympic College is substantially in compliance with Commission criteria for accreditation, but in need of improvement.

Moreover, the Commission also added a second Recommendation which addresses external financial audits. Recommendation 2 states:

2. The evaluation committee recommends that for each year of operation, Olympic College undergo an external financial audit and that the results from such audits, including findings and management letter recommendations, be considered in a timely, appropriate, and comprehensive manner by the Board of Trustees (Eligibility Requirement 19 and Standard 2.F.7).

The Commission requests an Ad Hoc Report in Fall 2014 to address Recommendation 2 of the Fall 2013 Year Three Peer-Evaluation Report. A copy of the Recommendations is enclosed for your reference.

The Commission determined that Recommendation 2 of the Fall 2013 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report is an area where Olympic College does not meet the Commission's criteria for accreditation. According to U.S. Department of Education Regulation 34 CFR 602.20 and Commission Policy, Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period (copy enclosed), the Commission requires that the College take appropriate action to ensure that Recommendation 2 of the Fall 2013 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report is addressed and resolved within the prescribed two-year period.

President David C. Mitchell February 3, 2014 Page Two

Lastly, the Commission commends the College for its exemplary report.

If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes for a peaceful and fulfilling New Year.

Sincerely,

Sandra E. Elman

President

SEE:rb

Enclosures:

Recommendations

Commission Policy, Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance

Within Specified Period

cc: Ms. Ruth Ross Saucier, Dean of Library Media

Year Three Resources and Capacity Evaluation Fall 2013 Olympic College Recommendations

- 1. The evaluation committee recommends that the College regularly evaluate administrators and classified staff in accordance with its annual evaluation procedures (Standard 2.B.2).
- 2. The evaluation committee recommends that for each year of operation, the College undergo an external financial audit and that the results from such audits, including findings and management letter recommendations, be considered in a timely, appropriate, and comprehensive manner by the Board of Trustees (Eligibility Requirement 19 and Standard 2.F.7).

Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period Policy

If the Commission determines that an institution it accredits is not in compliance with a Commission standard for accreditation or an eligibility requirement, the Commission will immediately initiate adverse action against the institution or require the institution to take appropriate action to bring itself into compliance within a time period that shall not exceed: (1) twelve months, if the longest program offered by the institution is less than one year in length; (2) eighteen months, if the longest program offered by the institution is at least one year, but less than two years, in length; or (3) two years, if the longest program offered by the institution is at least two years in length.

The Commission may extend the period for compliance noted above should it reasonably expect that, based upon the institution's progress toward meeting the Commission's standard for accreditation or eligibility requirement, the institution will come into full compliance within a reasonable timeframe. Should an institution deem that as a result of mitigating circumstances it is not able to comply with the standard for accreditation or eligibility requirement within the specified period of time, the institution may submit a written request to the Commission for additional time to come into compliance with the standard for accreditation or eligibility requirement. The request is to be submitted prior to the time limit for corrective action set forth by the Commission, provide a detailed explanation of the reasons why the institution cannot comply with the standard for accreditation within the designated time period, and demonstrate that the institution is making good progress in meeting the standard for accreditation. Following a review of the request, the Commission will make a determination as to whether the institution has based its request on valid reasons. If the Commission determines that the institution has substantiated good cause for not complying within the specified time period and is making good progress to come into compliance, the Commission will extend the period for achieving compliance and stipulate requirements for continuing oversight of the institution's accreditation during the extension.