

Year One Peer-Evaluation Report

Olympic College

Bremerton, WA

October 2011

A confidential report of findings prepared for the
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Table of Contents

I. Roster of Evaluators	5
II. Introduction.....	6
III. Assessment of Self-Evaluation Report and Supporting Materials	7
IV. Topics Addressed as an Addendum to the Self-Evaluation Report	7
V. Eligibility Requirements.....	12
Eligibility Requirement 2 - Authority.....	12
Eligibility Requirement 3 - Mission and Core Themes	13
VI. Standard One: Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations	13
Standard 1.A - Mission	13
Standard 1.B - Core Themes	14
VII. Summary.....	16
VIII. Commendations and Recommendations	17

I. Roster of Evaluators

Dr. Edit Szanto (Chair)

Vice President of Student Services, Planning and Grant Development
College of Southern Idaho
Twin Falls, ID

Mr. Steffen A. Moller

Dean, Curriculum, Planning and Research
Clackamas Community College
Oregon City, OR

Ms. Christie Plinski

Vice President of Instruction
Mt. Hood Community College
Gresham, OR

II. Introduction

This peer panel evaluation is Olympic College's first evaluation under the new Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) accreditation standards and septennial process. The College submitted its Year One Self-Evaluation Report that addresses Eligibility Requirement 2 (Authority), Eligibility Requirement 3 (Mission and Core Themes), Standard One (Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations), as well as Addenda addressing Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Fall 2009 Comprehensive Evaluation. Olympic College's accreditation was reaffirmed at the associate degree level on the basis of the Fall 2009 Comprehensive Evaluation. The Commission also granted accreditation at the baccalaureate level to include the Bachelor of Science in Nursing.

The Year One Self-Evaluation Report addressed applicable eligibility requirements, articulated the College's purpose and mission, identified Core Themes that comprise essential elements of the mission, listed the objectives for each Core Theme and indicators of success for each objective, provided rationale for the selection of indicators, and identified an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.

The peer evaluation panel members carefully read the College's Year One Self-Evaluation Report and identified the institution's significant strengths and weaknesses in terms of its own expectations for itself as well as the Commission's standards and eligibility requirements. This Peer-Evaluation Report documents the evaluators' findings.

Olympic College is one of thirty-four community and technical colleges in Washington State. It was established in 1946 and serves the needs of Kitsap and Mason Counties. The main campus is located in Bremerton, but the College also has satellite locations in Poulsbo and Shelton, a distance learning program, and offers some specific programs and courses at other locations. Olympic College is authorized by the State of Washington and its Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) to deliver higher education programs within the State of Washington. Fall Quarter 2010 headcount was 8,916 students, an increase of 18% over fall 2006. Over the same time period, full-time equivalent (FTE) students increased by 33.8%.

The mission statement of the College reads:

We serve and enrich all our communities by providing quality education and training for all who seek to improve their lives through learning.

Since its last full-scale evaluation visit in 2009, the College has experienced increased enrollment while grappling with decreased state funding. Other changes include the opening of the new 80,000 square foot Humanities and Student Services building, the Sophia Bremer Child Development Center, the Veteran and Military Support Center, and the addition of more parking at the Bremerton campus. The College continued to expand baccalaureate opportunities for students in its service area: a BSN program at Olympic College, and a new partnership with Washington State University (WSU) to offer WSU's Bachelor of Science degree in mechanical engineering at the Bremerton campus.

III. Assessment of Self-Evaluation Report and Supporting Materials

The Evaluation Team acknowledges the efforts of the administration, faculty, staff, Board of Trustees, and students in addressing Standard One: Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations. Specifically, the work of the Mission Fulfillment Team is commended. In developing the Core Themes, Olympic College sought and considered input from a wide range of constituents.

The Year One Self-Evaluation Report addresses the applicable Eligibility Requirements and Standard One. It also articulates the process through which the institution developed, refined, and adopted its Core Themes. However, it lacks detail on the process used to define indicators and the acceptable threshold, extent, and degree of mission fulfillment.

The Report is nicely formatted and easy to read. Headings, subheadings, and tables make the Report easy to follow. The College submitted its catalog as supporting materials and Addenda to address recommendations from its Fall 2009 full-scale evaluation. The Addenda was somewhat less easy to read.

Olympic College derived its Core Themes from its Mission, Vision, and Values. It also identified objectives, achievement indicators, as well as acceptable level of achievement.

IV. Topics Addressed as an Addendum to the Self-Evaluation Report

Recommendation 1 – *The Committee recommends the College develop a system that assures all courses are assessed for learning outcomes and establish a tracking system that documents these assessments. (Standard 2.B.1)*

Olympic College addressed Recommendation 1 in the Addenda to the Year One Self-Evaluation Report.

Faculty at Olympic College developed learning outcomes and corresponding assessments for each course. The learning outcomes are tracked with the help of a centralized tracking system. Learning outcomes are vetted through the College's Course Approval Process through which the faculty submit course outlines to the appropriate dean for review. New courses and courses undergoing significant changes are referred to Division Instructional Policy Council (IPC) subcommittees. Committee members provide feedback on the course's learning objectives, outcomes, and assessments. After review by the subcommittee, the course is forwarded to the entire IPC. Both the subcommittee and the full IPC review the course and, if not satisfied, can send the course back to the faculty for changes. IPC recommends the course to the Vice President of Instruction for approval. Members of the full IPC include faculty, staff, administration, and students. Once approved, the course outline is made available electronically to all College employees. Courses are also entered into a centralized tracking system that schedules the course for regular review and possible updating every five years. Olympic College has over 2,100 courses in its inventory, and approximately one fifth is up for review in any one year. Reviews scheduled for 2010-2011 are on-track with 100% of new courses and 99% of existing courses scheduled for review having been completed.

Concern: The approval and review process, along with the tracking system, ensure that courses have learning objectives established with appropriate assessment techniques to assess learning outcomes. However, the Addendum did not provide details about the assessment process itself – how the assessment of the outcomes themselves occurs. It focused mostly on the initial approval and review of course learning objectives, and did not go into detail on how the College ensures that the assessment of learning outcomes is indeed carried out by faculty as approved/required by IPC.

Recommendation 2 – *The Committee recommends the College develop a system to assure the general education requirements of the AA and AS degrees are assessed for student learning outcomes and establish a tracking system that documents these assessments. (Standard 2.B.2)*

In order to address this recommendation, Olympic College continued its work on student learning outcomes and Core Abilities. Addendum 1 incorporated a timeline of this work, including the work that has been done since the 2009 full-scale evaluation visit. The timeline shows that since 1993 the College has been adding learning outcomes and assessment methods to all new courses submitted for approval. Workshops were provided to faculty and staff to learn how to write student learning outcomes. The College also established the Student Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SOAC) to help faculty write student learning outcomes.

As part of this process, the five Core Abilities (Communication, Thinking, Lifelong Learning, Information Literacy & Technology, and Global Perspectives) were included on course outlines, and faculty began mapping Core Abilities to their courses. The Core Abilities were established in order to assess the general education requirement for the AA and AS degrees. In 2007 the Core Abilities Task Force led faculty in the development of rubrics for each Core Ability. The purpose of the rubrics was to help faculty determine whether the course addresses Core Ability outcomes, and if it does, how it addresses those outcomes. In 2008 the College created a Core Abilities database. To date, mapping of all commonly offered general education courses has been completed. The Core Abilities rubrics were reviewed and revised in 2010. IPC approved the Core Abilities rubrics in October 2010 and February 2011. The approved rubrics were made available in electronic format to faculty and staff. In June 2011 IPC also approved Core Abilities as a graduation requirement beginning summer 2012 for the AA and AS degrees.

The College established a Core Abilities Course Mapping Database to identify where Core Abilities are addressed throughout the curriculum. IPC has begun work on including the Core Abilities information on the course outline form, as well. These course outlines are stored in the database maintained by Instructional Support Services (ISS). To document general education learning outcomes and assessments, Olympic College utilizes the Core Abilities Course Mapping Database and the database maintained by ISS.

Addendum 1 described the collaborative process used to develop Core Abilities and learning outcomes, rubrics to help determine which course learning outcomes address Core Abilities, mapping of learning outcomes to Core Abilities, and the Core Abilities content assessment in general education courses. The Student Outcomes Assessment Committee, Core Abilities Faculty Institutes, and the Faculty Curriculum Team (FCT) have had important roles and responsibilities in this process.

Core Abilities Faculty Institutes provide professional development to faculty on Core Abilities, and an opportunity to review and continually improve the assessment of Core Abilities learning outcomes. The process involves peer review of course assessments and corresponding student work. The results of the review provide the necessary feedback to help faculty improve the assessment of Core Ability learning outcomes. Faculty Institutes were held in June 2010, December 2010, and June 2011.

In order to address this recommendation, the College established the Faculty Curriculum Team in fall 2009 to help complete the mapping of general education Core Abilities. The College provided a Course Mapping Workshop to help faculty map general education courses. To date, 100% of general education courses have documented learning outcomes and 80% of the most frequently offered general education courses are mapped.

Concern: This section of Addendum 1 also focuses mostly on how learning outcomes are established and mapped, and provides little information on how exactly the College assesses general education outcomes, and how it knows whether students meet those required outcomes. The figure on Page 7 shows that the College uses the results of surveys such as CCSSE, ACT - indirect feedback from students to gauge whether the course meets Core Abilities outcomes. While self-reported information and satisfaction levels do serve an important purpose, more information would have been helpful on how students will directly demonstrate that they have met these learning outcomes, how general education requirements of the AA and AS degrees are assessed for student learning outcomes, and how the College will determine whether students have or have not met Core Abilities graduation requirements. The Evaluation Team urges Olympic College to continue its work on the assessment of general education requirements of the AA and AS degrees for student learning outcomes and to clarify the threshold used by the College to decide whether students meet the Core Abilities graduation requirement.

Recommendation 3 – *The Committee recommends that the College further its work in creating a systematic, comprehensive and “seamless” academic, career and other educational programs advising model that helps students to make appropriate decisions regarding their academic choices and career paths. (Standard 3.D.10)*

Olympic College has made significant improvements in its advising model and its implementation. The Advising Coordinating Taskforce oversaw the process. The Taskforce is a standing committee with representation from faculty, counselors, educational advisors, administration, and staff. An Advising Referral System was implemented to help students negotiate the advising process.

New students at the College are directed to attend a new student advising session and they are not allowed to register for classes until an educational advisor meets with them and approves their registration form. The College also offers a one hour 0-credit face-to-face or online Orientation To Advising course (GEN-S 095). After attending the course, students meet with their educational advisors to discuss their educational goals, begin to develop an educational plan, identify a faculty advisor, and register for classes. The College has three full-time educational advisors and seven to eight part-time advisors. There are also four full-time

program-specific advisors. Undecided students are referred to faculty counselors for career guidance and assistance with selecting majors. After students identify their educational goals and declare the degree or certificate they wish to seek, they are referred to faculty advisors who approve their educational plans. Students continue to work closely with their faculty advisors who monitor the students' progress. Approximately 75% of full-time faculty advise students. Responsibilities of faculty advisors are well defined. Faculty advisors also participate in training provided by the Advising Center.

The College implemented an advising relationship management program that facilitates the assignment of advisees to faculty advisors, supports communication between them, and helps track educational plan development and approval.

Olympic College also implemented a mandatory 45-Credit Educational Plan Checkpoint that prevents students from registering for their 45th credits unless their educational plans have been reviewed and approved by an advisor. In the fall of 2010 the College launched an online Degree Audit to help with the advising process. The tool provides access to degree and certificate requirements, transcripts, courses needed to complete the declared degree or certificate, educational plans, and advising notes. The College also implemented an online Schedule Planner that allows students to search for courses and see which courses have open seats left. Olympic College plans to release an Advising Relations system in the fall of 2011 to help track the referral of students to faculty advisors and to facilitate communication between students and their advisors.

In addition to new services, processes, and systems, advising at Olympic College is also enjoying new facilities. With the completion of the new Humanities and Student Services building, educational advisors and faculty counselors are now in the same area, making it more convenient for students.

Compliment: The Evaluation Team compliments the College's work in creating a systematic and comprehensive academic, career and other educational programs advising model that supports students from entry point through graduation. (Standard 2.D.10)

Recommendation 4 – *Develop clear protocols for assigning related responsibilities to teaching academic employees in order that faculty workloads reflect the mission and goals of the institution. (Standard 4.A.3)*

Olympic College's Collective Bargaining Agreement specifies Essential Responsibilities as well as Related Responsibilities for faculty. Faculty are expected to perform all Essential Responsibilities and select from Related Responsibilities. All full-time teaching faculty are required to submit the list of Related Responsibilities they select to their Deans. In reviewing these, the Deans consider the needs of the Division and the College as well as the relative workload. Faculty who indicate less of a commitment are required by the Dean to add additional Related Responsibilities in order to achieve equity. Faculty who indicate too many Related Responsibilities are either asked to do less or receive compensation for the extra work. The College also has a process to address situations where the faculty and the Dean cannot agree on the type or quantity of Related Responsibilities. These procedures are also specified in the

Collective Bargaining Agreement. The procedures call for an appeal to a review committee consisting of three faculty members and two administrators appointed by the Association President and the Vice President of Instruction or Student Services. In case of further disagreement or lack of implementation, the matter is referred to the appropriate Vice President.

In order to support transparency, the College compiles the finalized list of Related Responsibilities in a document that lists all full-time faculty member's Related Responsibilities. The list is reviewed and checked for equity by all academic deans, the Vice President for Instruction, and the President of the Association of Higher Education (AHE). Based on this review, the deans may request some faculty to add additional Related Responsibilities. The finalized list is posted on the website where all full-time faculty can access it.

Recommendation 5 – *The Committee Recommends the College continue its work to fully implement the process for part-time faculty evaluation. While progress has been made following the 2001 accreditation visit, there is an uneven practice across the campus. (Standard 4.A.5.; Policy 4.1.b and 4.1.c)*

Since the 2009 full-scale accreditation visit, Olympic College negotiated a new Collective Bargaining Agreement that added considerable language to Section 4 (Procedure for Assessment of Adjunct Faculty and Full-Time Temporary Faculty). The 2009-2013 faculty union contract includes a more thorough description of the types of assessments required, timeline and frequency of assessments, and a detailed description of what is required in quarters 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, and subsequent quarters.

The College also implemented a centralized tracking system to document and track adjunct faculty evaluations. The tracking system allows the College to create reports that show evaluation types and completion rates across disciplines and divisions. The tracking system allows administrators to check the progress and send reminders as necessary. The College ensures that faculty review the results of student evaluations by requiring faculty to complete self-reflections based on student evaluations.

Although the College established a uniform campus-wide practice for part-time faculty evaluations, completion rates are still not at an optimal level. While completion rates for student evaluations in Winter 2011 were 95%, the completion rates for self-reflection and faculty observation were at 70% and 68% respectively. The College recognizes that these numbers are not optimal and as part of Theme A, Objective 2 set the acceptable level of achievement at 95% on all forms of adjunct faculty assessments.

Recommendation 6 – *The Committee recommends the College continue its work to fully implement student assessment of both full and part-time faculty. (Standard 4.1.C)*

In 2010, Olympic College implemented a new software system, Class Climate, to help with improving the response rates on its online student assessments of faculty. The new system allows for both online and paper-based assessments. Overall response rates increased significantly since implementation. One hundred percent (100%) of full-time probationary faculty are being assessed and full-time tenured faculty assessment is also in compliance. The

Self-Evaluation Report did not specifically address the response rate for the part-time/adjunct faculty group.

The centralized tracking system also implemented in 2010 allows the College to track student assessments of full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty. Detailed reports can be generated that show the number of adjuncts teaching each quarter, the number of student assessments due, number of assessments completed, number of assessments overdue, number in compliance, and percentage of compliance. Student assessments of adjunct faculty for the Winter 2011 quarter were at 95% compliance.

Recommendation 7 – *The Committee recommends the College use a minimum three-year planning model for major categories of income and expenditures. (Standard 7.A.2)*

Since the 2009 full-scale evaluation visit, the College developed a three-year planning model. However, the model does not include all major categories of income and expenditures. For example, while salary considerations are addressed under assumptions, they are not included in the operating budget under expenditures. Personnel costs are a major expenditure category. The College chose to include smaller items such as \$1,000 per year in interest income, yet did not include more significant categories such as salaries and benefits.

Concern: The Evaluation Team is concerned that Olympic College did not include all major categories of income and expenditures in its three-year planning model. (Standard 2.F.2)

Recommendation 8 – *The Committee recommends the College develop a Board of Trustees approved policy for cash management and investments. (Standard 7.C.4)*

Olympic College developed a cash management and investments policy that has been adopted by its Board of Trustees in November 2009. While the College has met the requirement of adopting a Board-approved policy, the Self-Evaluation Report lacked details concerning investment strategy/guidelines, authorized/prohibited investments, limitations, short-term cash management and long-term investments, and asset allocation.

Although Olympic College addressed this recommendation, the Evaluation Team found that the information submitted in support of this recommendation lacked important detail. Whereas the policy may contain that detail by reference - it references the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 39.58 and Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) regulations - no supporting materials were submitted to show those details.

V. Eligibility Requirements

Eligibility Requirement 2 - Authority

The institution is authorized to operate and award degrees as a higher education institution by the appropriate governmental organization, agency, or governing board as required by the jurisdiction in which it operates.

Olympic College meets Eligibility Requirement 2 (Authority). The College adequately addressed this requirement in its Self-Evaluation Report by citing the Community and Technical College Act in Washington Code and appropriate authorization by the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCT).

Eligibility Requirement 3 - Mission and Core Themes

The institution's mission and core themes are clearly defined and adopted by its governing board(s) consistent with its legal authorization, and are appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education. The institution's purpose is to serve the educational interests of its students and its principal programs lead to recognized degrees. The institution devotes all, or substantially all, of its resources to support its educational mission and core themes.

The College provided sufficient evidence in its Self-Evaluation Report that it meets Eligibility Requirement 3 (Mission and Core Themes).

VI. Standard One: Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations

The institution articulates its purpose in a mission statement, and identifies core themes that comprise essential elements of that mission. In an examination of its purpose, characteristics, and expectations, the institution defines the parameters for mission fulfillment. Guided by that definition, it identifies an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.

Standard 1.A - Mission

Olympic College's mission statement reads:

We serve and enrich all our communities by providing quality education and training for all who seek to improve their lives through learning.

The mission statement was first adopted in 1999, went through an inclusive review process starting 2006, and re-affirmed and adopted by the College's Board of Trustees in January 2008. The Self-Evaluation Report describes the inclusive review process that provided opportunity for input and participation from constituents, including: students, faculty, staff, and community members. The mission statement articulates the purpose of the institution and it is appropriate for an institution of higher learning. The Self-Evaluation Report provided evidence that the mission statement of the College guides the College's efforts and the allocation of resources. The mission statement is widely published: on the College website, printed in the catalog, class schedule, student handbook, trifold publication distributed to all employees, annual report to the community, *Facts & Figures* brochure, on all job announcements, classified staff yearly performance expectations document, and it is also posted in multiple locations on all three campuses.

Olympic College defined mission fulfillment in the context of its purpose, Vision, and Values. In articulating institutional outcomes that would represent an acceptable threshold of mission fulfillment, the College developed a rating scale from 1 to 3:

1. Below Expectations
2. Meets Expectations
3. Exceeds Expectations

The College will assign a rating for each indicator, then will average indicator scores for each objective. Objectives with an average score of 2 or higher will be deemed as meeting expectations. To determine fulfillment of Core Themes, scores of objectives within each Core Theme will be averaged. And finally, the average of Core Theme scores will determine the acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.

Concern: Since averaging entails adding up the scores and dividing the total by the number of indicators/objectives/Core Themes, the process assumes equal weights for each indicator/objective/Core Theme. However, if some indicators/objectives/Core Themes contribute more towards the fulfillment of the mission, basic averaging may not provide for the most accurate threshold of fulfillment.

Standard 1.B - Core Themes

Olympic College identified four Core Themes that manifest essential elements of its mission:

1. Student Learning and Quality Teaching
2. Student Access and Support
3. College Environment
4. Community Enrichment and Responsiveness

The four Core Themes collectively encompass the College's mission: *We serve and enrich all our communities by providing quality education and training for all who seek to improve their lives through learning.*

Olympic College also linked the Core Themes to its Vision and Values. The Self-Evaluation Report described the process used by the College to develop its Core Themes. The process was participatory and was led by the Mission Fulfillment Team. Two Board members serve on the team. Input was sought from the college community through a variety of means. The Board of Trustees adopted the Core Themes in February 2011.

The College established objectives for each of its Core Themes and identified indicators of achievement based on which it will evaluate the accomplishment of the objectives and Core Themes, and will ultimately use to determine mission fulfillment.

The Self-Evaluation Report makes it evident that a great deal of thought and work went into developing the Core Themes, objectives for each Core Theme, and related indicators of achievement. Each Core Theme has three objectives, and each objective has several indicators. The College identified a total of 12 objectives and 49 indicators. Some indicators overlap Core Themes and the College clearly summarized which indicators relate to more than one Core Theme and how they handled the duplication. The Self-Evaluation Report stated that the College tried to select assessments that used tools and systems already available to the College, but in some instances new tools and processes had to be created.

The first Core Theme is central to the mission of Olympic College. The Evaluation Team found that the three objectives developed for this Core Theme are relevant, tangible, and specific enough to illustrate how the College intends to realize the Core Theme. The Self-Evaluation Report states the rationale for the objectives and indicators.

The report also included acceptable levels of achievement (criteria for success) for each indicator. Some of the indicators are indirect assessments of Core Themes – they describe processes by which the College intends to ensure the fulfillment of the Core Theme. The efficacy of these indicators depends on the quality and rigor of the underlying process (e.g. whether the formal annual review of programs and courses ensures the currency, relevancy, and transferability of curriculum and programs depends on the rigor and effectiveness of the review process). While surveying faculty on self-reported use of innovative or contemporary curricular techniques can yield information on the perception of faculty, more direct measures would be beneficial. Perceptions could provide different results depending on the constituent group surveyed (e.g. faculty, students, administration, etc.). The same is true for student perception of teaching effectiveness. While course evaluations provide important information for faculty to help them continually improve their courses, the College may want to consider more direct indicators to measure the effectiveness of teaching. The rationale for how faculty involvement in research, creative endeavors, and community involvement supports the objective of “focus on student learning” is not immediately evident from the Self-Evaluation Report.

Indicators on the Students Learn objective rely heavily on student surveys and self-reported information and satisfaction levels. More direct indicators that measure whether students learn would be beneficial. How does Olympic College know whether students learn while enrolled at the College, reach their educational goals, and gain the necessarily knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes?

Olympic College used race, age, gender, and education level in the definition of under-represented groups. The College chose not to include income or social economic status in the list of characteristics. The indicator that calls for headcount percentages to mirror or exceed underserved population groups of service area may be challenging to achieve when it comes to age and education level. Some of the benchmarks call for meeting or exceeding the average score of all Washington State community colleges. The Evaluation Team assumes that the College community deliberated and concluded that meeting the average score would be considered adequate in accomplishing the College’s objective. Considering the indicator related to “causes of delay in goal achievement,” the Evaluation Team was not sure whether only causes over which the College has control would be included or also external causes over which the College has little or no control (e.g. health issues, loss of employment or change in work schedule, change in family situation, etc.). While under-served population definition included a variety of demographic characteristics under access, when it comes to completion the definition only included one factor (color).

From the Self-Evaluation Report it is not immediately evident how the number of page views per month on the community calendar of events indicates the fulfillment of the objective related to Olympic College’s role as a cultural resource for the community.

Compliments

1. The Evaluation Team compliments Olympic College on the development of its Core Themes. The process used to develop the Core Themes provided for opportunity for input from a range of constituents and the resulted in Core Themes that manifest the essential elements of the College's mission statement.
2. The Evaluation Team compliments the College on the extensive work that was put into the development of Core Theme objectives and corresponding indicators and criteria for success.

Concern:

1. The Evaluation Team is concerned that some of the indicators and benchmarks identified are indirect measures and the connection to the accomplishment of the respective objectives is not always clear. Olympic College should continue to review and refine its indicators and corresponding criteria for success in order to ensure that all indicators are meaningful, assessable, and verifiable, and collectively they will allow the institution to evaluate the accomplishment of the objectives and Core Themes.

VII. Summary

The Peer Evaluation Team reviewed Olympic College's Year One Self-Evaluation Report that addressed Eligibility Requirement 2 (Authority), Eligibility Requirement 3 (Mission and Core Themes), Standard One (Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations), as well as Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the 2009 Comprehensive Evaluation Report.

This is the first time Olympic College submitted a report under the new Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) standards and seven-year process. The Peer Evaluation Panel reviewed the College's articulation of its purpose and mission, Core Themes, objectives and indicators, rationale for the selection of indicators, and identification of an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment. The panel also reviewed the College's response to the recommendations from its last full-scale evaluation.

The Evaluation Team acknowledges Olympic College for the effort the College put forth in carrying out this self-evaluation, the participatory process utilized to develop its Core Themes, as well as the work done on improving its advising model.

While considerable work has gone into the identification of indicators of success and the acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment, further refinement will help the College in constructing a strong foundation upon which they can build throughout the septennial accreditation process.

VIII. Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations

1. The Evaluation Team commends Olympic College for the identification of Core Themes that manifest essential elements of its mission, and for the participatory process used to develop the Core Themes. (Standard 1.B.1)
2. The Evaluation Team commends the College's work in creating a systematic and comprehensive academic advising model that supports students from entry point through graduation. (Standard 2.D.10)

Recommendations

1. The Evaluation Team recommends that Olympic College continue to review and refine its indicators and corresponding criteria for success in order to ensure that all indicators are meaningful, assessable, and verifiable, and collectively they will allow the institution to evaluate the accomplishment of the objectives and Core Themes. (Standard 1.B.2)
2. The Evaluation Team recommends that Olympic College include all major categories of income and expenditures in its three-year planning model. (Standard 2.F.2)