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# Appendix A: Responses to Recommendations

## Recommendation 1

*The Evaluation Committee found evidence that several difficult years of financial retrenchment and restructuring, coupled with new entrepreneurial initiatives, have resulted in incomplete integration and alignment among the mission, core themes and current institutional initiatives and financial emphases of the college. The Evaluation Committee recommends that the college review the integration of the mission, core themes and current institutional initiatives and financial emphases of the college to ensure that they are fully aligned. (Standards 3.A.1 and 4.A.1)*

## Shoreline Response

To ensure that resource allocation is aligned with the strategic plan and Core Themes, Shoreline developed a process in 2013 by which departments submit abbreviated Strategic Action Plans (aSAPs) to request funding for new, strategic work. The application requires the following content: (1) the project objective/summary; (2) a rationale describing how the project contributes to the strategic plan and Core Themes; (3) action steps to be taken if funded; (4) the Core Theme(s) being supported; (5) the strategic initiative/goal being supported; and (6) a method for evaluating success. The proposals are reviewed by the Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committee (SPBC) and the Dean Team for the extent to which they align with the strategic plan and Core Themes. These reviews are used by the Executive Team (ET) to make recommendations to the President who then submits a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees as part of the annual budgeting process.

Since 2013, this process has evolved, with refinements introduced each year based on feedback from the campus community. For example, the process for the budget year 2013-2014 was critiqued for (1) being difficult to submit and track; (2) not providing requesters a forum to provide clarification or refinement during the review process; and (3) requiring all requests for new funds, even those related to ongoing operations, to go through the full aSAP process. The first concern was addressed in 2014-2015 by implementing aSAP applications online and providing additional training on how to complete them. The second critique was addressed by having the SPBC conduct a double-review process with questions submitted to requesters between the first and second reviews, and responses to those questions considered in subsequent reviews. The Dean Team review format also changed, with division leads presenting a summary and background for all of the aSAPs within their area, with time allotted for questions and answers. In response to the third critique, requests were divided into strategic and operational categories. Strategic requests went through the aSAP process while operational requests were made via annual budgeting processes within individual departments and divisions.

To ensure transparency in resource allocation, the results of the aSAP process, including review comments and recommendations, are posted on the SBPC [website](http://intranet.shoreline.edu/strategic-planning-committee/2015-2016-budget-process.aspx). In some cases, requesters were contacted directly to explain the reasoning behind the final decision.

## Recommendation 2

*While SCC has developed new planning and assessment processes for academic programs and for non-academic programs and services, the Evaluation Committee could not find evidence that these have been fully implemented. The Evaluation Committee recommends the college fully implement the assessment process by using student performance on key measures of learning to revise courses, programs, and the general education outcomes and non-academic programs and services. These processes should be integrated meaningfully into college’s decision making processes, including resource allocation. (Standard 4.A.2).*

## Shoreline Response

The MCE responds to this recommendation.

## Recommendation 3

*The Evaluation Committee determined that many operational policies have not been approved by the Board of Trustees; some have not been reviewed or revised since originally written; and most have not been reviewed or revised in the past decade. The evaluation committee recommends that policies and procedures be created or revised and, where appropriate, reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees, to be in line with current practices and to correspond with the college’s core themes. (Standards 2.A.13,2.A.15, 2.A.16, 2.A.17, 2.A.18, 2.D.3)*

## Shoreline Response

In 2014, Shoreline’s College Council convened a subcommittee to systematically review all college policies. Each review begins with a systematic reading of a current Shoreline policy by the College Council and results in a recommendation to either eliminate, amend, or retain the policy. Those recommendations are next reviewed by the Executive Team, moved forward for affirmation and approval by the College President, then presented to the Board of Trustees as a point of information.

At the conclusion of the 2014-15 academic year, the College has reviewed one of six chapters of the College’s policy manual, covering 23 separate policies. The policy review process will continue on an ongoing basis, repeating on a recurring schedule after all policies have been reviewed. New policies identified by the review process, in addition to those required by changes in law, will be timely developed and approved consistent with this process.

## Recommendation 4

*The Evaluation Committee recommends the Board of Trustees adequately consider in a timely, appropriate, and comprehensive manner the results from college audits including findings and management letter recommendations. (Eligibility Requirement 19, Standard 2.F.7)*

## Shoreline Response

The College received this recommendation, revised from Recommendation 4 of its Fall 2012 Comprehensive Peer-Evaluation Report, in the letter reaffirming accreditation dated February 4, 2013. In that letter, the Commission directed the College to address the revised Recommendation 4 in an Ad Hoc Self-Evaluation Report without a visit in Fall 2013. The College submitted the Ad Hoc Self-Evaluation Report to the Commission on September 16, 2013, detailing its progress in addressing the recommendation. In January 2014, the Commission accepted the College’s Ad Hoc Self-Evaluation Report and further requested that the College submit a Special Report updating the Commission on progress in responding to the recommendation. The College submitted its Special Report on April 25, 2014, and further described its progress in addressing the recommendation. The College underwent an external audit of its financial statements by the Washington State Auditor’s Office (SAO) beginning in October 2014. On December 1, 2014, the College’s Board of Trustees held a special meeting during which it heard the results of the financial statement audit from SAO staff. There were no findings or management letter recommendations. The College remains in compliance with Eligibility Requirement 19 and Standard 2.F.7.

## Recommendation 5

*The Evaluation Committee found that severe budget cuts over the past seven years have resulted in cuts to student services staff, library and several student success strategies have been eliminated, reassigned or reduced significantly. This appears to be in marked contrast to the expressed commitment to be a world-class leader in student success and community engagement. The Evaluation Committee recommends that the institution document how institutional activities support the college mission and core themes and, where appropriate, develop or restore needed services, such as academic advising. (2.B.1, 2.D.1, 2.D.3, 2.D.10)*

## Shoreline Response

Since the 2012 accreditation visit, Shoreline has made significant investments in student success strategies, reversing the downward trend in student support services funding. In the last three budget cycles, over $1.7 million dollars has been allocated to these areas. Full-time faculty and staff (five advisors, two counselors, two success coaches, and two support staff) have been hired along with administrative hires and title upgrades (Associate Dean of Transitional Studies, Associate Dean of Advising, Associate Dean of Engagement and Counseling Services, Associate Dean of Student Support Programs, and Director of Library Services). Shoreline has increased funding for tutoring and moved towards centralizing those services. We have reorganized the Financial Aid Department, resulting in reduced time between application and award. The College has also begun to engage in a significant college-wide reform aimed at student retention and completion.

In Winter 2015, Shoreline decided to centralize its three key tutoring services (the Math Learning Center, The Writing and Learning Studio, and the Tutoring Center) in the Library. The first phase of that move began in January 2015 and the second will be completed for the opening of Fall Quarter 2015. The intended outcome of this move will be to increase access to these proven student success strategies. Since moving the Tutoring Center to the Library, student use of tutoring services has increased by 39%. Another result of moving the MLC and TWLS is the creation of four new classrooms, with the outcome of increased access to high-demand classes during preferred times-of-day. For 2015-2016, the moves have been confined to the main floor of the library. Moving forward, we will assess the use of all three floors of the library building and develop a more permanent location for these student support services along with a significant remodel of the building.

The Financial Aid department has undergone structural review and reform, resulting in staff changes. In addition, these employees have been taken part in significant professional learning opportunities (attendance at workshops and state and national conferences), allowing “front-line” staff to work more effectively and efficiently. As a result of these efforts, the average time of file completion to award decreased from twenty-two weeks to ten, with plans to reduce award times even further. The College is reviewing promising practices for streamlining financial aid based on a recent visit to Wake Technical Community College in North Carolina.

In fall of 2014, Shoreline created the Student Success Coordinating Committee (SSCC) to develop and coordinate strategies to increase enrollment, course success, progress, retention, and completion. The committee was formed to support Shoreline’s evolution from ongoing *ad hoc* initiatives for student success to a disciplined and sustained approach with clear metrics and goals. Structured as a communication and coordinating body, this large and inclusive committee (31 members) is intended to accomplish work via small work groups that report back to the entire committee at the SSCC’s monthly meetings. The SSCC currently has five work groups addressing the following topics: recruitment/enrollment, first-year college success course, orientation, advising, and a first-year cohort seminar. The Director of Institutional Assessment and Data Management regularly reports to the committee either about the impact of student success projects or about analyses indicating a potential barrier to student success. The committee makes decisions about how to address these barriers either through an existing work group or through the development of a new work group.

In Summer 2015, Shoreline sent a team of six faculty and seven administrators to the Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Summer Institute 2015 to explore AVID for Higher Education (AHE) as a framework for approaching student success and retention in systemic way. It is noteworthy that three members of ET (President, Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, and Executive Director, Business and Student Support Services), three Deans, and one Associate Dean attended the institute demonstrating leadership commitment to exploring this option. Faculty who attended came from Humanities, Math/Science, Social Sciences, and Automotive, including the chair of the Faculty Senate and President of the Shoreline Federation. The team will review and present their findings to SSCC in Fall 2015.

The Fall 2015 Convocation and Opening Week focused on student engagement, beginning with an all-college Day of Learning. The day included sessions on our five-year strategic plan, the new advising plan, the new early warning plan, the results of several data scans, and a communication training intended to provide faculty and staff with the tools to engage students in meaningful dialogue. The Day of Learning was followed by several days of concurrent sessions focused on student learning outcomes assessment, enrollment and financial aid, changes in Canvas, Windows 10, the library search tool Primo, study abroad, understanding F1 visas, and accessibility issues for online classes.

The Executive Team, Administrative Team, and Board of Trustees are currently engaged in a collective reading of *Good to Great and the Social Sectors* by Jim Collins with the goal of understanding how a learning organization can become world class by adopting a disciplined set of principles and practices.

## Recommendation 6

*The Evaluation Committee recommends revision of indicators to ensure they are meaningful and are connected with aspirational thresholds. Institutional assessment via effective indicators can verify that objectives are met or not met, and such data can inform and improve upon institutional planning, initiatives, and operations that consistently occur in a framework that supports core themes. (Standards 3.A.1, 4.A.1)*

**Shoreline Response**

Shoreline has continually subjected our Core Themes, Core Theme Objectives and Core Theme Indicators to an iterative process (design, deploy, review, reflect, redesign). In preparing for its Fall 2013 Year One Self-Evaluation, the number of Core Theme Indicators was reduced from 56 to 37 and all 52 sub indicators were eliminated. Recently, some of the new indicators were modified to reflect data availability. We expect to see further changes as we strive to establish meaningful and aspirational metrics. We are also asking more fundamental questions regarding our Core Themes; for example, the Executive Team recently reflected and discussed the following question: “Are the current Core Themes tied to mission fulfillment or are they values?” Once the five-year strategic plan is complete, we expect to launch a more inclusive discussion aimed at mission, vision, Core Themes, and Core Theme Indicators.

# Appendix B: Draft Strategic Planning Goals

**As we implement our plan, we will integrate the principles of the Triple Bottom Line, to ensure that all decisions incorporate social equity, economic viability, and ecological integrity.**

**1) All aspects of our students’ learning environment will support their success.**

Objectives:

1. Improve physical spaces and technology to be more conducive to student learning.
2. Engage in Strategic Enrollment Management, encompassing the entire student experience, from the moment students aspire to attend to the moment they attain their educational goals.

**2) All of our programs and services will engage in continuous improvement processes to ensure they support students’ success.**

Objectives:

1. Develop a robust mechanism for ongoing student learning outcomes assessment at the course, program, and institutional level.
2. Engage in an ongoing, data-informed cycle of academic program review that allows for agile changes in program offerings, creativity and an entrepreneurial mindset.
3. Invest in professional learning for faculty and staff to support continuous improvement.

**3) We will thrive as a college community and become a vital partner to all the constituencies we serve.**

Objectives:

1. Develop and support innovative programs to engage the constituencies we serve.
2. Strengthen the Shoreline Community College identity and brand to both its internal and external constituencies.
3. Develop, implement, and review an annual internal and external communications & marketing plan.
4. Increase enrollment to ensure responsive program offerings and financial stability.
5. Engender community involvement and philanthropic support.

**4) We will engage in ongoing conversation and discovery about our shared purpose and differences, which will inform our practices and decisions.**

Objectives:

1. Engage in ongoing learning so that all members of the college community support open, safe communication that is sustained through turnover of students, staff, and faculty.
2. Create a methodology to periodically evaluate the impact of this learning.

# Appendix C: Example logic model for institutional assessment based on current strategic plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inputs** |  | **Outputs** |  | Outcomes -- Impact |
|  | ***Activities*** | ***Participation*** |  | ***Immediate outcomes*** | ***Strategic Goal & Indicator*** | ***Core Theme Indicator*** |
| Facilities staff timeMaterialsFaculty timeContracted fundingAdministrator time |  | Convert Math Learning Center into classroomsMove Math Learning Center to central location in library | # of additional sections offered# of students served by Math Learning Center |  | Decrease in waitlists for target classesIncreased passing rates in math | 1.1b. Increase student access through class offerings and improved schedulingIndicator: Increased overall enrollment1.3 Increase enrollment, retention and completionIncreased retention due to higher math success rates | Student Success/ Educational AttainmentIndicator 1.1.1Increased graduation rateIndicator 1.2.2Increases in % of transfer students reaching their quantitative point |