



8060 165th Avenue N.E., Suite 100
Redmond, WA 98052-3981
425 558 4224
Fax: 425 376 0596
www.nwccu.org

January 27, 2015

Dr. Lonnie Howard
President
Clover Park Technical College
4500 Steilacoom Blvd. SW
Lakewood, WA 98499

Dear President Howard: *Lonnie*

On behalf of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to report that the accreditation of Clover Park Technical College has been reaffirmed on the basis of the Fall 2014 Year Seven *Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability* Evaluation which was expanded to include the onsite evaluation of Standards Two, Three, Four and Five. In addition, the College was requested to address Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 of the Fall 2011 Year One *Mission and Core Themes* Peer-Evaluation Report. The Commission's expectations regarding Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 of the Fall 2011 Year One Peer-Evaluation Report have been met.

In reaffirming accreditation, the Commission requests that the College submit an addendum to its Fall 2015 Year One *Mission and Core Themes* Report to address Recommendations 2 and 4 of the Fall 2014 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report. Moreover, the Commission requests that the College expand its Fall 2016 Ad Hoc Report without a visit to address Recommendations 1 and 3 of the Fall 2014 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report in addition to the previously requested update on the implementation of the Bachelor of Science degree program in Manufacturing Operations. A copy of the Recommendations is enclosed for your reference.

In making these requests, the Commission finds that Recommendations 1, 3, and 4 of the Fall 2014 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report are areas where Clover Park Technical College is substantially in compliance with Commission criteria for accreditation, but in need of improvement. However, the Commission determined that Recommendation 2 of the Fall 2014 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report does not meet the Commission's criteria for accreditation. According to U.S. Department of Education Regulation 34 CFR 602.20 and Commission Policy, *Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period* (enclosed), the Commission requires that Clover Park Technical College take appropriate action to ensure that Recommendation 2 of the Fall 2014 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report is addressed and resolved in the prescribed two-year period.

The Commission commends Clover Park Technical College for the beauty of its campuses, including the well maintained grounds and buildings. In addition, the Commission applauds the faculty, administration, staff, and students for creating a culture of respect where students feel encouraged and student success is obviously supported. Moreover, the Commission applauds the College for its strong connection and support of the local and state business and industry community. Further, the Commission finds

President Lonnie Howard
January 27, 2015
Page Two

noteworthy the College's Library faculty and staff for creating collaborative, welcoming, and program-supportive services. The Commission also commends the College for its exceptional technology, support, equipment, and facilities that enhance student learning and workforce preparedness. Lastly, the Commission finds laudable the institution's faculty for providing quality instruction that enhances student commitment to learning and prepares students for successful workplace transition.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes for a peaceful and fulfilling New Year.

Sincerely,



Sandra E. Elman
President

SEE:rb

Enclosures: Recommendations
Commission Policy, *Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within
Specified Period*

cc: ✓ Dr. Joyce Loveday, Vice President for Instruction
Ms. Mary Moss, Board Chair
Mr. Marty Brown, Executive Director, Washington State Board for Community and Technical
Colleges

Year Seven *Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability* Evaluation
Fall 2014
Clover Park Technical College
Recommendations

1. The evaluation committee recommends that Clover Park Technical College continue to develop and update policies and procedures (Standard 2.A and 2.F).
2. While acknowledging the complexities of revising financial processes motivated by changes in generally accepted auditing standards, it is recommended that the College complete financials as planned and undergo an external financial audit, in a reasonable timeframe, by professionally qualified personnel in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards (Eligibility Requirement 19, Standard 2.F.7).
3. The evaluation committee recommends that the College engage in ongoing systematic collection and analysis of meaningful, assessable, and verifiable data at the course, program and institutional levels, and that the College regularly review assessment processes to ensure authentic results that lead to improvement (Standard 4.A and 4.B).
4. The evaluation committee recommends that the College clearly define authority, roles, and responsibilities. Its decision-making structures have significantly changed during the past year. The current communication and restructuring is intended to foster the consideration of views of faculty, staff, administrators and students on matters in which they have direct and reasonable interest, but the formalization of the process is not complete (Standard 2.A.1).

Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period Policy

If the Commission determines that an institution it accredits is not in compliance with a Commission standard for accreditation or an eligibility requirement, the Commission will immediately initiate adverse action against the institution or require the institution to take appropriate action to bring itself into compliance within a time period that shall not exceed: (1) twelve months, if the longest program offered by the institution is less than one year in length; (2) eighteen months, if the longest program offered by the institution is at least one year, but less than two years, in length; or (3) two years, if the longest program offered by the institution is at least two years in length.

The Commission may extend the period for compliance noted above should it reasonably expect that, based upon the institution's progress toward meeting the Commission's standard for accreditation or eligibility requirement, the institution will come into full compliance within a reasonable timeframe. Should an institution deem that as a result of mitigating circumstances it is not able to comply with the standard for accreditation or eligibility requirement within the specified period of time, the institution may submit a written request to the Commission for additional time to come into compliance with the standard for accreditation or eligibility requirement. The request is to be submitted prior to the time limit for corrective action set forth by the Commission, provide a detailed explanation of the reasons why the institution cannot comply with the standard for accreditation within the designated time period, and demonstrate that the institution is making good progress in meeting the standard for accreditation. Following a review of the request, the Commission will make a determination as to whether the institution has based its request on valid reasons. If the Commission determines that the institution has substantiated good cause for not complying within the specified time period and is making good progress to come into compliance, the Commission will extend the period for achieving compliance and stipulate requirements for continuing oversight of the institution's accreditation during the extension.

1997
2002