Spokane Community College underwent a successful full scale Accreditation Review in October 2003. As part of the confidential report prepared for the Commission on Colleges representing the views of the evaluation committee, five recommendations were enumerated. The college was scheduled for a focused interim visit in spring 2005 to address four of the five recommendations. This report details the actions taken to address Recommendations 1, 3, 4 and 5. As noted in the January 27, 2004 letter from the Commission on Colleges (Exhibit A), Recommendation 2 will be addressed in a progress report that the college will submit in spring 2006.
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Actions Taken Regarding Recommendations

Recommendation 1

While the committee found evidence of prior strategic planning and evaluation processes, current processes tend to be ad hoc, fragmented (i.e. at the department level) and not institutionalized. To assure institutional effectiveness, the committee recommends that the college continue to develop and implement a systematic institutional planning and evaluation system. Essential conditions, elements, and uses of this system are:

- Clearly define the planning and evaluation processes.
- The planning and evaluation processes should be documented and widely disseminated.
- The planning and evaluation processes are ongoing.
- The planning process is participatory involving appropriate constituencies, such as faculty, administrators, staff, students, and other interested parties.
- Results of the planning and evaluation processes influence resource allocation decisions and are used to improve programs and services.
- Necessary resources are provided for an effective planning and evaluation system to function.
- Institutional research is integrated with and supportive of institutional evaluation and planning.
- The college uses information from its planning and evaluation processes to communicate evidence of institutional effectiveness to the public.

In winter 2004, the Strategic Planning Committee was charged by President Hanson to redefine its role toward becoming the hub of campus governance. The committee was re-named the College Council and given the following charge:

1. to serve as the major college planning body;
2. to facilitate and coordinate the administration of strategic planning;
3. to facilitate and coordinate the administration of college effectiveness, and;
4. to act as the communication link for the governance systems.

One member of the Council served as a campus representative on the Community Colleges of Spokane (CCS) District Strategic Planning Committee and reported back to the Council on the district process. The College Council began developing clear lines of communication with the college governance councils and began ongoing work with planning and assessment activities. Beginning in winter 2004, chairs of the other governance councils met quarterly with the College Council, providing input to governance issues and planning. In addition, each council prepared a report of activities which was presented through the College Council to the President and the college community. Council membership was also expanded to include the Budget Analyst and Institutional Researcher.

In fall 2004, the CCS District Strategic Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees. The College Council reviewed college goals in light of the District Plan, finalized the 2004-2007 SCC Goals and presented them to the college community. The Council also prepared bylaws and evaluation templates for each governance council and developed a timeline for the ongoing planning process (Exhibit B). Information about college goals and the timeline for the process
was distributed to all campus employees and to the Associated Student Government in October 2004. Throughout the fall, divisions created operational plans connected to the college goals. Division Operational Strategic Plans were returned to the Council in December for review. The divisions then began work on departmental action plans which were completed and sent to the Council in March 2005. All college divisions and departments were involved in the development of the plans.

In April 2005, the plan was presented to the Board of Trustees for approval. A “Strategic Directions 2004 and Beyond” brochure, which included the college’s mission, values, goals and strategic process, was distributed to all college staff/faculty and to local community leaders and community partners. Implementation of the action plans were to have begun prior to the completion of Spring Quarter 2005. All requests for new funding or for adjustments to funding in the budget process for 2005-06 require direct connection to the division’s strategic operations plan. An annual evaluation has been set for September of each year. College governance councils are also required to complete their annual evaluation for review by the College Council in September each year.

As part of the ongoing evaluation process, the college surveyed students using the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and initiated a survey of non-continuing students. As the data is received, it will be presented to the campus and used as part of the annual review and assessment process.

In preparation for development of 2005-06 priorities, all major groups in the college were requested to offer a college-wide objective based on the college goals for submission to the College Council. By evaluating the qualitative data and determining patterns, the College Council will develop a list of college priorities for review by the Executive Committee. These priorities will be presented to the campus for review in fall 2005.

The college strategic planning process is based upon a three year rolling cycle, with an annual operational planning cycle. A timeline of the strategic planning process is provided as Exhibit B.

The Strategic Planning Process:

1. Analyze internal/external environment
2. Review and revise mission and values
3. Develop strategic directions and college goals
4. Develop evaluation plan and key indicators
5. Review and assess outcomes.

The Operational Planning Process:

1. Develop annual plan
2. Put plan into operation
3. Evaluate results and communicate findings

Throughout both the strategic planning and the operational planning processes, the delivery of programs and services to the community continues. A more complete chart of the cycle is provided as Exhibit C.
In keeping with the three-year cycle, the college will begin the re-evaluation of its mission and values in 2005-06.

**Recommendation 3**

*Although the college has formed budget, program review, campus planning and strategic planning committees, it is not clear that a linkage exists among these processes, nor that these processes are understood or inclusive of appropriate constituencies. The committee recommends that the college demonstrate the linkages between the institution’s goals and objectives and its resource allocation, to achieve these goals and objectives. This linkage and the processes should be clearly defined, documented and participatory with appropriate constituencies.*

President Hanson’s charge to the College Council (noted above) included the responsibility for developing clear communication and accountability linkages among governance councils. As part of this process, the college’s distribution of resources has now been linked to college and divisional strategic/operational plans. The college’s strategic plan articulates the needs and priorities of the college. Deans, working with department chairs, faculty, and staff, identify divisional needs which are prioritized to be consistent with the strategic plan and priorities. Deans then meet with the vice presidents to formalize a single prioritized list that becomes the planning document for distribution of college resources (state resources, Perkins, WorkFirst, excess enrollment, student technology funds, etc.) Information and updates on the budget and resource allocation process has been presented at the quarterly all-college meetings beginning with winter 2004, at division meetings across campus, and at regular council and committee meetings.

One component of the resource allocation process has been the SCC Technology Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC). Co-chaired by the college vice presidents on an alternating basis and the ASG president, TPAC works with students, faculty and administrators to develop and implement a campus-wide technology acquisition plan and process to identify and prioritize technology and equipment requirements that are funded through the student self-tax technology fee, Perkins, worker retraining, and college allocations. Currently students are charged $3 per credit hour to fund these requirements. A total of $600,000 was appropriated as the annual budgeted amount for technology and equipment for school year 2004-2005, from which $95,000 was allocated to fund contingency requests. Based on enrollment projections, $530,000 will be budgeted for school year 2005-2006. The Technology Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC) charge, CCS rules and procedures and SCC procedural guidelines are described in Exhibit D.

Another component of the process has been the development of resource allocation models for college funds. The Executive Dean of Workforce, working with the Budget Analyst, Institutional Researcher and constituent groups, has articulated a process which addresses the following tasks:

1. identifying the various budgetary categories that are allocated;
2. defining or developing the formula for how each category is allocated;
3. modifying the model to accommodate the needs of the institution, and;
4. testing the model against the accreditation recommendations.
The following six major budgetary categories have been examined thus far: 1) Part-time Faculty Costs, 2) Equipment Expenses, 3) Worker Retraining, 4) Perkins, 5) Tech Fee allocations, and 6) Local Funds. Worksheets have been developed for the last two budget years to illustrate historical allocations.

At this point, allocation models for two budgetary categories have been codified, Worker Retraining and Perkins. The Worker Retraining and Perkins distributions follow the distribution of FTE's in various instructional units. Two proposed models for distribution of Tech Fee dollars have been discussed. The analysis regarding the Part-time Faculty Costs, Equipment Expenses, and Local Funds are forthcoming. While preliminary, some of the discussion has resulted in proposals that could lead to the development of effective models and tools for resource allocation.

**Recommendation 4**

*Though evidence was found that part-time faculty are evaluated within a 5-year period, evidence was not found that multiple indices are used to evaluate all part-time faculty. Therefore it is recommended that a process for all part-time instructor evaluation using multiple indices be implemented.*

The following are the agreed upon procedures for the evaluation of adjunct faculty. These procedures are consistent with the faculty contract:

- For new adjunct faculty, student evaluations are conducted in each of the first two quarters of employment.
- An in-class observation is completed in the first quarter. Observations may be completed by a peer or supervisor. Completed evaluations are forwarded to the appropriate dean for certification of demonstrated teaching proficiency.
- Student evaluations are conducted once a year beginning with the second year of employment.
- An in-class observation is conducted along with the annual student evaluation once every three years starting with the third year of employment.
- Multiple indices of evaluation include but are not limited to the following:
  1. in-class observations by peers, department chairs, deans, the vice president for learning, and the president;
  2. students evaluations, and;
  3. evaluation of course outlines, syllabi or other teaching materials.

Due to the marked turnover amongst instructional deans in recent years, it is possible that the procedures for the evaluation of part-time faculty were not handled in a uniform and consistent manner. The Vice President for Learning and the Instructional Deans have reviewed the evaluation procedures to ensure their uniform and consistent application.

**Recommendation 5**

*It is recommended that the College clarify its campus system of governance to facilitate the successful accomplishments of its mission and goals. While the individual departments have been functioning at a high level of success during a period of administrative transition, there is less evidence of this occurring at the institutional level. Important elements to be addressed are:*
A. Administrators, faculty, staff, and students understand and fulfill their respective roles in the campus governance system.

B. The system and processes are documented and widely disseminated;

C. The system of campus governance ensures that the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among and between the administrators, faculty, staff, and students are clearly described in a constitution, charter, bylaws or policy documents.

D. The system of campus governance makes provision for the consideration of faculty, student, and staff views and judgments in those matters in which these constituencies have a direct and reasonable interest.

Spokane Community College has experienced considerable administrative turnover over the last ten years. The college has had four Presidents between 1995 and 2005, and five Vice Presidents of Learning during the same period of time. A comprehensive college governance model was adopted under the leadership of Dr. Jim Williams in 1998. By all accounts, there was extensive campus participation in the development of this model. Dr. Williams left SCC in 1999. As a result of the lack of continuity at the presidential level and the marked turnover of administrators, the model adopted in 1999 was never fully implemented.

After reviewing the elements of the governance model that were still in operation when he arrived in November 2003, President Hanson began working on a proposal for a revised college governance model that would build on the existing structure while clarifying the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among and between the administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The proposal for a new governance model was distributed to the campus at the beginning of fall quarter, 2004 (Exhibit E). At an all college meeting on October 14, 2004, the model was presented for review and discussion. Based on feedback from the campus community and groups such as the College Council, the Council of Chairs, the Executive Team, the Instructional Council, and the Student and Instructional Services Council, the following governance structure was presented for full implementation to the campus in January 2005.

The college governance structure consists of the following councils and committees:

- College Council (formerly the Strategic Planning Committee): This council serves as the major college planning body. Its work focuses on strategic planning, college effectiveness, and the governance system.
- Finance Council (formerly the Budget Advisory Committee): This council assists in the development of a long-range budget plan for the college, evaluates the results of the annual budget process, and recommends changes as necessary.
- Facilities Council: This council develops, reviews and evaluates plans for campus facilities, including review of the Master Plan and capital projects requests.
- Technology Planning Advisory Committee: This committee coordinates the development of the spending plan for the SCC student technology fee. It also participates in the ongoing assessment of the campus-wide technology plan and the ongoing implementation of the campus-wide technology replacement schedule.
- Diversity Council: This council develops the college’s diversity plan and provides coordination of the college’s diversity activities.

In addition to the groups listed above, there are standing committees and councils that perform important advisory functions, including the Council of Chairs, the Staff Council and the Curriculum Committee.
The administrative team is renamed as the college’s Executive Team and consists of the following members: the President (chair), the Vice Presidents, the Deans, the Financial Analyst, the Institutional Researcher, and the Assistant to the President. The members of the Executive Team have individual accountability and responsibility for their assigned areas. They are collectively accountable and responsible for viewing the college as a whole and making recommendations that align the best interests of their units and the college. The Executive Team is also accountable and responsible for collaborating with governance councils to assure that information is shared to inform decisions and recommendations.

Two management councils play important roles in the college’s planning and decision-making processes. The Instructional Council consists of the following members: The Vice President for Learning (chair) and the Instructional Deans. The Student and Instructional Services Council consists of the following members: The Vice President for Student and Instructional Services (chair) and the Student and Instructional Services Deans, Managers, and Department Chairs. The Instructional Council and the Student and Instructional Services Council hold joint meetings every month to facilitate communication and collaboration.

E. As a multi-unit governance system (district), the division of authority and responsibility between the central district office and the institution is clearly delineated, documented and disseminated.

In December 2003, the Board of Trustees of Community Colleges of Spokane (CCS) began a comprehensive review of the CCS mission, vision, and values for success through a process designed to support and guide strategic planning for the district.

Based on the trustees’ direction, District Administration developed its 2004-07 strategic plan, consisting of objective and action steps designed to support the colleges (Spokane Community College and Spokane Falls Community College) and the Institute for Extended Learning as they aim to achieve the Board’s goals. The District Administration plan is organized into four sections: Business and Financial Operations, Human Resources, Operations, and Marketing and Public Relations (Exhibit F). The plan for District Operations includes the following goal and objectives:

Goal: Clarify policy and operational roles to continually enhance the efficiency of instructional, students and administrative services, emphasizing collaborative and student-centered strategies, while avoiding unnecessary duplication.

Objective 1. Update, clarify, organize and communicate Board policies in accordance with RCWs and WACs.

Objective 2. Update, clarify, organize and communicate administrative procedures.

Objective 3. Improve district business processes and information for decision making.

Exhibit F provides timelines for the completion of these goal and objectives.
Conclusion

In its report to the Commission on Colleges, the evaluation committee found evidence of prior strategic planning but noted that current processes tended to be ad hoc, fragmented and not institutionalized. The evaluation committee noted that the college had formed a number of governance committees and had established planning processes. However, it was not clear that there were linkages among these processes nor that the processes were clearly understood and inclusive of appropriate constituencies. The evaluation committee observed that individual departments had been functioning at a high level of success during a period of administrative transition, but that there was less evidence of this occurring at the institutional level.

These findings are not surprising when one considers the marked administrative turnover that Spokane Community College experienced between its accreditation visits in 1993 and 2003. The unfortunate impact of these changes on the college’s ability to sustain coherent and comprehensive planning processes were well-documented in the self-study completed in 2003 (Exhibit G). Over the last two years, the college’s administration has stabilized. As a result, the faculty, staff, students, and administration of Spokane Community College have been able to come together in a collaborative effort to fully implement the governance systems and strategic planning processes that are essential for effective governance and institutional planning.
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