



**Northwest Commission on College and University (NWCCU)**  
**Annual Update for WSQA**  
**Academic Year 2008-2009**

College Name: Columbia Basin College

Contact Person: Joe Montgomery, Ph.D.; Dean, Institutional Effectiveness

Contact Phone: (509) 544-4935

Contact email: [jmontgomery@columbiabasin.edu](mailto:jmontgomery@columbiabasin.edu)

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
<p align="center"><b>Accreditation recommendations of March 19, 2009.</b></p> <p><i>Background:</i> As a member of the group of four colleges pilot-testing the new accreditation process, Columbia Basin College (CBC) submitted its Year 1 Report, entitled “Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations” to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) on March 1, 2009. The Commission reviewed the report and formally accepted the submission at its March 10, 2009 meeting.</p>	<p><b>CBC Response:</b>  <i>The Review Process</i>            A three-part review process was conducted. First, a brief literature review was performed to cross-check CBC’s measurement approach against current approaches to measuring organizational and educational performance. The literature review examined definitions of commonly-used terms, examples of indicators, measurement issues associated with the reliability and validity of indicators, and recommendations of experts on developing sound measurement</p>	<p><b>Improvement Results:</b>            A full description of the changes made to Themes, Goals and Indicators is provided in the report “Responses to the NWCCU Recommendations of March 19, 2009” available at <a href="http://www.columbiabasin.edu/accreditation">http://www.columbiabasin.edu/accreditation</a>            Summaries of the changes made in each Theme area are provided below.</p> <p><i>Theme 1: Open Access</i>            As a result of the review process for the first Theme, Open Access, Goal A (Enrollment) was revised to focus more specifically on</p>

<p><i>NWCCU Recommendations:</i>  In a subsequent letter to CBC (dated March 19, 2009) the Commission listed four Commendations regarding the quality of the report as well as two Recommendations for follow-up actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Commission recommends that the College review its core theme goals and achievement indicators to ensure they inform meaningful judgments of its achievements.</li> <li>2. The Commission recommends that the College review its core theme indicators to ensure they represent direct evidence of intended achievements.</li> </ol> <p>In addition to the two Recommendations, the Commission mentioned specific concerns with two proposed indicators: (a) faculty quality based on the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty members (Academic Theme, Goal D, Indicator 1); and (b) an indicator based on the percentage of disabled students receiving services compared to a statewide average (Access Theme, Goal C, Indicator 2). These two measures received particular attention in the review process.</p>	<p>systems. The review included Nichols' <i>A Practitioner's Handbook for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Outcomes Assessment and Implementation</i> (1995), <i>Monitoring School Quality: an Indicators Report</i> (NCES, 2000), <i>Assessing Organizational Performance in Higher Education</i> (Miller, 2006), <i>The Balanced Scorecard</i> (Kaplan and Norton, 1996), and two books by Robert Pritchard: <i>Organizational Productivity Measurement</i> (Pritchard, Jones, Roth, Stuebing &amp; Ekberg, 1987) and <i>Measuring and Improving Organizational Productivity</i> (Pritchard &amp; Weaver, 2007). The review did not surface any real or potentially problematic areas for CBC's approach, but did note inconsistencies across writers in terms of definitions (e.g., use of the terms "indicators" versus "measures"), little attention given to relating indicators with standards in order to interpret results, and relatively few examples of indicators that might be useful for CBC. However, Robert Pritchard's (2007) work on developing rigorous, ratio-scale measures based on performance standards related to standards promises to be very useful. Several potential indicators have been developed for CBC using his Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System (PROMES).</p> <p>Second, the Goals for each of the Core Themes were evaluated by the Dean for Institutional Effectiveness and by the</p>	<p>CBC enrollments in comparison to community demographics, thus reflecting open access by all community members. Goal B (Retention, progress and completion) was modified to address reasonable progress by students in their educational programs, rather than "high rate" of retention and completion. Goal C (Student Services effectiveness) was unchanged, while Goal D (Minority enrollment) was eliminated because it was covered under revised Goal A.</p> <p>Indicators under Goal A and Goal B were modified to reflect enrollment rates and educational progress for students of different demographic characteristics and locations within the service area, resulting in more meaningful measures of access. Other measures were eliminated either due to redundancy or inadequate level of meaningfulness.</p> <p><i>Theme 2: Academic</i>  As a result of the review for the Academic Theme, Goal A (Student Learning Outcomes) was eliminated because the proposed SLO indicators will appear under the analysis of General Education Outcomes in a separate report. Goal B (Student demonstrate learning) was removed from this section because the objective indicators will be provided under the heading of Program Review. Subjective student evaluations of their educational experience were moved to Goal E. The Goals and Indicators for</p>
---	--	--

	<p>Theme lead administrator. The focus of the review was the importance of each Goal to accomplishing the Theme and whether, taken together, the Goals reflected a broad coverage of the domain of the theme. As a result of the review, wording to a number of the Goals was modified (detailed in tables provided below).</p> <p>Third, each indicator was reviewed in terms of (a) the degree to which it contributed to a meaningful judgment of achievement of its associated Goal and (b) categorized as being either objective or subjective in nature. A number of indicators were subsequently modified to improve their specificity, improve their direct relationship to the associated Goal, and increase meaningfulness and degree of objectivity.</p>	<p>Transfer Success (now Goal A) and High Quality Faculty (now Goal B) basically remained the same. The new Goal C Indicators were expanded to include specific student ratings provided on the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Goal D (Highly qualified faculty) was modified to include specific indicators on use of technology to enhance learning.</p> <p><i>Theme 3: Workforce</i></p> <p>Few changes were made to the Goals and Indicators for this Theme. Under Goal A (Students learn and develop program skills), individual items from the CCSSE survey were specified as indicators, rather than a more general statement about student perceptions of career learning.</p> <p><i>Theme 4: Basic Skills</i></p> <p>Several changes were made to the Basic Skills Goals and Indicators. Goal A (Enrollment) was eliminated, with the intent of covering these results under the Access Theme. The indicator related to CASAS performance was eliminated as being redundant with measures from the Student Achievement Initiative (SAI). Indicators regarding the transition of ABE/GED/ESL students to higher educational levels (Goal C) were expanded to include transition to a level above the most immediate higher level. In addition, indicators were added to include student perceptions based on survey responses (currently, these students are not included in the campus-wide survey process)</p>
--	---	---

--	--	--

Name of College \_\_\_\_\_

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
		<p><i>Theme 5: Cultural Enrichment</i>            Only minor changes were proposed to the Cultural Enrichment Indicators (Goals were not revised). The changes involved a greater focus on number of students attending cultural or diversity-oriented events and their satisfaction with these programs.</p> <p><i>Theme 6: Physical and Emotional Well-Being</i>            Only a few changes were made to the Goals and Indicators for this Theme. Wording changes to several Goals were made mainly to simplify and shorten the statements. Several Indicators were re-worded to focus on student or staff participation in events or programs, rather than counting the number of programs offered. An indicator that originally involved a count of the number of counselors offering mental health services was revised to indicate a per capita number of counselors compared to other community colleges.</p>