

## Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

### Commendations and Recommendations for Seattle Central Community College

---

#### 2012

##### **Commendations**

1. The Evaluation Committee commends Seattle Central Community College for its commitment to restructure its planning and evaluative systems to conform to the new NWCCU accreditation standards under an accelerated timeline.
2. The Evaluation Committee commends the College for response to difficult fiscal realities while fulfilling its commitment to serve its urban population.
3. The Evaluation Committee commends the College for its development of a culture of inclusion in its interdisciplinary programs, clubs and organizations student leadership and involvement.
4. The Evaluation Committee commends the College and the associated Seattle Vocational Institute for their successful identification of articulation programs and for their innovative approaches for meeting local industry needs.
5. The Evaluation Committee commends the College and its IT department for its “human focus” in implementing and distributing its services.
6. The Evaluation Committee commends the College and its Curriculum Coordinating Council for its persistent and progressive attention to effective instruction.

##### **Recommendations**

1. While SCCC has developed new planning and assessment approaches, they do not appear to be fully implemented nor did the Evaluation Committee find strong evidence that they are completely integrated into the decision-making and resource allocation processes. The Evaluation Committee recommends that the College fully implement the new planning and assessment systems and that those systems be meaningfully integrated into decision-making and resource allocation processes. (Standards 3.B.2; 4.A.1; 4 A.2; 4.A.3; 4.A.4; 4.B.1; 4.B.2)
2. SCCC has spent considerable effort in identifying appropriate, meaningful and sustainable objectives and indicators. However, in several areas, the indicators appear to reflect easily obtainable, rather than meaningful and sufficient measures of achievement for the Core Themes. The Evaluation Committee recommends that the College carefully reconsider, realign, and where necessary, re-identify indicators that provide more meaningful measures of the fulfillment of the Core Themes and Mission. (Standards 1.B.2)
3. Although SCCC has identified general education student learning outcomes, the

## Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

### Commendations and Recommendations for Seattle Central Community College

---

Evaluation Committee could not find a required mechanism that ensures that appropriate verifiable general education student learning outcomes are incorporated and assessed within each program. (Standards 2.C.2 and 2.C.4 and Eligibility Requirements 11 and 22)

4. The Evaluation Committee recommends that the college review their resource allocation to ensure adequate support for the Applied Baccalaureate in Behavioral Science. The college should also review policies and procedures to involve teaching faculty in all appropriate decisions associated with the degree. (2.C.5)

*Seattle Central Community College Evaluation Committee Report for Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Conducted April 16-18, 2012, pp. 39-40*

## **2013**

### **Commendations**

1. The Evaluation Committee commends the good progress SCCC has made responding to Recommendation 2 in the short time since the Spring 2012 Comprehensive Evaluation. While much work remains to be done to have clearly defined, assessable and useful Performance Indicators for all Core Themes, SCCC has made an admirable start in this process.

### **Recommendations:**

1. The Evaluation Committee recommends that SCCC continue its comprehensive work to create a clear quantitative statement of mission fulfillment related to benchmarked achievement levels of institutional effectiveness Indicators.
2. The Evaluation Committee recommends that SCCC continue the work it has undertaken to refine Core Theme Performance Indicators. Progress has been made but significant work remains to:
  - Look across the core themes to eliminate redundancy of Indicators and find a common voice for descriptions of Indicators, Objectives, and Outcomes;
  - Define terms clearly so that Performance Indicators are measurable and can be reliably assessed over time;
  - Refine Indicators that are designed to assess “quality” to clearly establish if they are measures of the quality of inputs or the quality of outcomes.

*Year One Peer-Evaluation Report, Seattle Central College Spring 2013, pp. 9*