

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (Year 7)

Peer-Evaluation Report

Bellevue College

Bellevue, Washington

April 22 - 24, 2026

NWCCU Liaison to the Peer Evaluation Team:

Dr. Ed Harri

Executive Vice President, NWCCU

A confidential report of findings prepared for the
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	4
II.	Assessment of Self-Evaluation and Support Materials	4
III.	Visit Summary	4
IV.	Topics Addressed as an Addendum to the Self-Evaluation Report	5
	a. Recommendation 1: Spring 2019 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability	5
	b. Recommendation 2: Spring 2019 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability	6
	c. Recommendation 4: Spring 2019 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability	6
	d. Recommendation 5: Spring 2019 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability	7
	e. Distance Education	8
V.	Standard 1: Student Success and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness	9
	a. Standard 1.A: Institutional Mission	9
	i. 1.A.1	9
	b. Standard 1.B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness.....	10
	i. 1.B.1	10
	ii. 1.B.2	12
	iii. 1.B.3	13
	iv. 1.B.4	14
	c. Standard 1.C: Student Learning	15
	i. 1.C.1	15
	ii. 1.C.2	16
	iii. 1.C.3	16
	iv. 1.C.4	17
	v. 1.C.5	18
	vi. 1.C.6	19
	vii. 1.C.7	21
	viii. 1.C.8	22
	d. Standard 1.D: Student Achievement	23
	i. 1.D.1	23
	ii. 1.D.2	24
	iii. 1.D.3	25
	iv. 1.D.4	25
VI.	Standard 2: Governance, Resources, and Capacity	26

a.	Standard 2.A: Governance	26
i.	2.A.4.....	26
VII.	Summary	27
VIII.	Commendations and Recommendations	27
a.	Commendations.....	27
i.	Commendation 1:	27
ii.	Commendation 2:	27
iii.	Commendation 3:	27
iv.	Commendation 4:	28
b.	Recommendations	28
i.	Recommendation 1:	28
ii.	Recommendation 2:	28
iii.	Recommendation 3:	28
iv.	Recommendation 4:	28
v.	Recommendation 5:	28

I. Introduction

A five-person peer evaluation team conducted a Year Seven Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (EIE) visit to Bellevue College] from April 22-24, 2026, in response to the *Year Seven Self-Evaluation Report* submitted by Bellevue College to NWCCU on January 20, 2026. The comprehensive visit covered Standard One, Standard Two, and four outstanding recommendations.

II. Assessment of Self-Evaluation and Support Materials

Bellevue College provided a thorough and thoughtfully prepared self-study addressing Standard One along with a response regarding the NWCCU Distance Education Policy. The self-study effectively incorporated relevant, working hyperlinks to supporting evidence throughout the document. The evaluation team also observed that the report was well-organized, with a clear and consistent structure that made it easy to navigate across sections. In several areas, Bellevue College demonstrated strong practice in presenting its historical context, current status, and identified opportunities and next steps for continued improvement. Overall, the Standard One self-evaluation, in combination with the institution's responses to the outstanding recommendations, offered valuable insight into the college's progress and ongoing development since the previous review.

III. Visit Summary

The evaluation team conducted twenty-six (26) meetings with members of the Bellevue College community over the course of a two-and-a-half-day site visit. These individual meetings included the President; two members of the Board of Trustees; Cabinet members; the Acting Provost; the Vice President of Administrative Services; the Vice President of Student Services; the Vice President of Institutional Advancement; the Vice President of Human Resources; the Vice President of Information Technology and Services; the Vice President of Community Care and Institutional Transformation; the Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness; multiple directors; union leadership; faculty and staff committees; student leaders; front-line staff; and additional stakeholder groups.

The evaluation team also facilitated open forums for faculty, staff, and students. Discussions during these sessions focused on institutional strengths, areas for improvement, college-wide planning processes, program review, assessment of institutional learning outcomes and the use of results, professional development opportunities, perceptions of budget allocation, employee evaluations, current initiatives, strategic priorities, shared governance, and student experiences with instruction and support services.

Participation in the open forums was fairly strong. The faculty forum included 25 participants, the staff forum included 32 participants, and the student forum included 8 participants. In addition, the evaluation team met separately with student government

leadership, incorporating the perspectives of three additional students. Across all sessions, participants were candid, thoughtful, and highly engaged.

Feedback from faculty and staff reflected a deep commitment to student success, including a strong focus on closing opportunity and achievement gaps. At the same time, several faculty and staff indicated uncertainty about how their individual roles, departments, or programs align with the college's strategic plan. Similarly, many participants expressed a lack of clarity regarding how resource allocation is connected to institutional planning processes. Shared governance was also a recurring topic, with multiple participants noting concerns about the effectiveness of the current governance model. Finally, institutional learning outcome assessment and student learning outcome assessment at the program level came up during the faculty forum and many other meetings. Most faculty in attendance noted that student learning outcome assessment at the program level was not as robust as they would like and that institutional learning outcome assessment was just getting started at the college.

Students consistently shared that faculty demonstrate genuine care for their well-being and academic success. Several students emphasized that their ability to persist in their studies has been significantly supported by services such as tutoring, advising, and library resources.

During the site visit, the evaluation team requested additional materials and evidence to support its review. All requests were addressed promptly and thoroughly by the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO).

IV. Topics Addressed as an Addendum to the Self-Evaluation Report

a. Recommendation 1: Spring 2019 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability

Focus on increasing the breadth and depth of library and information resources to support the baccalaureate programs and ensuring that a process is in place during curriculum adoption to identify and address required resources (2020 Standard 2.H.1)

The PRFR review team (spring 2025) confirmed that the college has made significant progress on standard 2.H.1 through its revamped integrated planning structure that weaves into all levels so that resource allocation follows the overall strategic plan driven structure of the institution. The peer evaluation team confirmed that the recommendation on the library has been satisfied.

Assessment of needs for upper division resources happens in collaboration between staff and faculty to determine needs and reallocate existing funding to better meet the needs of the baccalaureate programs. The library also has a dedicated position specifically supporting baccalaureate programs. A modest budget increase (\$25,000) was added for the book collection, and targeted infusions of one-time funds (a total of \$120,000) provided a boost to

databases resources. Databases, however, are subscription-based and sustainability of these resources remains a concern.

Library staff and leadership have been added to two committees that demonstrate a clear effort to support programs in an intentional planning structure. A library staff member now serves as a regular member on the curriculum committee, which ensures that resource support considerations are integrated into the ongoing discussion of course and program development, including at the baccalaureate level. Also, the associate dean for Library and Media Services now sits on the Academic and Student Affairs Leadership Team, further strengthening the role of the library in relation to ongoing student support and academic planning. Staff expressed concern, however, that the leadership structure of the college leaves the library unit several layers away from the provost, reducing the library's voice in key leadership meetings and risking misalignment between library capacity and institutional direction.

b. Recommendation 2: Spring 2019 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability

Review the formative measures it uses to assess student learning outcomes and develop a summative assessment framework that can be effectively used as evidence to assess mission fulfillment. (2020 Standards 1.B.1, 1.B.2, 1.C.5).

The college acknowledges in its self-study report that this recommendation remains unresolved. Since 2019, the institution has revised its general education outcomes, reducing the original 18 outcomes to six more clearly articulated institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) that define the core knowledge, skills, and capacities expected of graduates. Faculty workgroups played a central role in this redesign, and six faculty-led teams are currently assigned to each ILO to support implementation. However, the college has not yet clarified how the ILOs will be fully operationalized or how they will be used as evidence to assess mission fulfillment. At the time of the site visit, the framework for assessing the ILOs was still under development, and the college had not produced any summative assessment data. In addition, there was no evidence of the assessment of program-level learning outcomes through formal assessment plans or other mechanisms. As a result, learning outcomes data are not yet available to inform institutional planning or evaluation processes. Challenges related to addressing this recommendation are discussed further in the institution's responses to Standards 1.B.1, 1.B.2, and 1.C.5.

c. Recommendation 4: Spring 2019 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability

Review the objectives for its core themes and develop meaningful, assessable, and verifiable indicators of achievement, metrics, and benchmarks that form the basis for

achievement of core theme objectives and that support improvement by informing planning and decision-making. (2020 Standards 1.B.2; 1.B.4).

In response to feedback from the 2019 Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (EIE) and the 2022 Mid-Cycle Review, the college revised its institutional objectives and indicators, reducing them from 11 objectives and 23 indicators to 10 objectives and 12 indicators. This work was intended to clarify institutional intent, reduce input-focused measures, and strengthen alignment with student success and institutional effectiveness outcomes. Additionally, updates to NWCCU Standards in 2020 made core themes optional, allowing the college more flexibility in the selection of indicators of achievement.

While the evaluation team found evidence that some of the revised indicators were more fully developed, particularly those associated with Achieving the Dream (ATD)–related work, others were not operationalized, as discussed further in the response to Standard 1.B.2. As a result, there was limited evidence demonstrating how these indicators were embedded in institutional processes to assess effectiveness or inform planning and decision-making.

At the time of the site visit, work to establish metrics and benchmarks associated with these indicators had been discontinued as the institution shifted its focus to new measures associated with the 2026 *Be Bold* strategic plan. The plan establishes a new set of meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators intended to evaluate mission fulfillment and institutional effectiveness, as discussed further in the response to Standard 1.B.4. However, implementation of the plan is still in its early stages, and data for these new measures of achievement are not yet available to support broad institutional planning and decision-making processes.

d. Recommendation 5: Spring 2019 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability

Develop a process that utilizes comprehensive planning to guide and document resource allocation. The process needs to integrate the use of assessment and evaluation to illustrate the review of institutional capacity, and that resource allocation aligns to outcomes of assessment and evaluation and guiding continuous improvement. (2020 Standards 1.B.1; 1.B.3; 1.B.4; 1.C.7).

The institution has experienced a number of challenges since the 2019 EIE visit, including responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and navigating several leadership transitions. During this period, efforts to strengthen planning processes intended to guide resource allocation stalled. As a result, while the evaluation team found evidence of data being used to inform planning, particularly data associated with Achieving the Dream (ATD)–related efforts, these examples were isolated and not part of a comprehensive planning process designed to guide resource allocation. The college also demonstrated the availability and use of multiple

sources of assessment and evaluation data. However, student learning data associated with program- and institutional-level outcomes were not available, as discussed further in the response to Standard 1.C.7.

More recently, the college has renewed efforts to improve institutional planning and effectiveness processes through the development of the *Be Bold* strategic plan. The self-study report outlines a planning cycle in which divisional plans articulate operational strategies, tactics, and metrics intended to support the strategic plan collectively driving continuous improvement. The evaluation team reviewed drafts of several divisional plans in various stages of completion. While this work represents an important step forward, these efforts are not yet complete or organized into a comprehensive process that clearly guides and documents how resources are allocated. In addition, uncertainty remains among faculty and staff regarding the roles and responsibilities of governance bodies involved in budgeting and resource allocation in support of the new plan, particularly the Budget Review Advisory Committee (BRAC) and the Resource and Planning Council (RPC).

As a result, while the institution is engaged in planning and is developing processes intended to support future assessment and evaluation activities, these elements do not yet function together as a coherent, documented framework demonstrating how resource allocation decisions are informed by assessment results or used to support continuous improvement.

e. Distance Education

Distance education at Bellevue College provides access and opportunity for BC students, which supports the mission of the college. It offers about 50% of its courses online, offering students flexibility for meeting their goals. Three programs are offered fully online (Healthcare Management and Leadership, Healthcare Informatics, and Radiation and Imaging Services) to serve specific workforce needs of the region. The college is a member of and follows NC-SARA guidelines. This includes providing online access to student support services (library, tutoring, advising, and career services) which are available via links that are included in all Canvas course shells. Courses are developed by faculty who have completed online instruction training, and they have access to instructional designers in eLearning who can assist with course design.

The college has developed a rigorous system for verifying identification of all students with practices to reduce incidences of fraud. The system is consistent across all students, regardless of course-taking modality. IT integrates student registration with Canvas using student identification numbers, and various touchpoints at can result in instructors, advisors, registration or IT staff flagging suspicious behaviors that spark an in-person identification check. The system includes mandatory orientation, advisor reviews, and instructor-initiated drops for non-participation. During the term, some faculty require in-person exams or use lockdown browsers and test proctoring to ensure that the student who participates is the one who earns credit. No additional costs are incurred by students for these procedures, but

requirements for in-person attendance must be announced in the class schedule before a student enrolls. Student privacy is assured through strict adherence to Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) as well as institutional policies governing data security and disclosure.

Courses offered via distance education (which includes online and hybrid classes) use the same curriculum and course outcomes as in-person classes. Practices for instructional consistency vary by department with some sharing course shells wholesale and other sharing specific teaching materials. A work group specifically convened to examine success rates across in-person analyzed data in Tableau dashboards and found no significant differences between in person and distance education modalities across all courses the college. The group did, conclude, however, that each department should analyze its own sets of courses and look at success, retention, completion rates for their disciplines.

Practices to assure regular and substantive interactions (RSI) are instilled primarily through instructor preparation. Before teaching online, a faculty member must complete the Online Excellence Teaching Academy (OETA), which covers policies, interaction strategies, and high-impact practices. RSI is addressed in the policies and regulations module of OETA as well as in the high impact practices module. Compliance with RSI requirements, however, is not actively monitored during instructional periods. Instead, the college relies on faculty evaluation by peers and deans as well as student evaluations or complaints to know whether faculty are interacting regularly and substantively with their students. Students interviewed by the peer evaluation team (a very small sampling) indicated varied levels of interaction across their courses, with some faculty interacting frequently and some very little.

Concern: The college has established a thorough training program for online instructors that includes guidance on providing regular and substantive interaction and may verify RSI via periodic evaluations of instruction. However, the peer review team found no evidence that compliance with this federal requirement is monitored during the term of instruction. The college should develop a system for monitoring compliance for regular and substantive interactions.

V. Standard 1: Student Success and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

a. Standard 1.A: Institutional Mission

i. 1.A.1

1.A.1 The institution's mission statement defines its broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement.

The evaluation team found that Bellevue College has a clearly articulated and recently updated mission statement that defines its broad educational purposes and affirms its commitment to student learning and achievement. Approved by the Board of Trustees in April 2025 as part of BC Policy 1200, the mission positions the College as “a catalyst for lifelong transformation” that advances social and economic progress by equipping students with the skills, knowledge, and resilience needed to thrive in a changing world.

The evaluation team noted that the updated mission is supported by a revised vision statement and a newly established set of core values that collectively reinforce the institution's focus on student and employee well-being, collaboration and accountability, agility, curiosity, as well as integrity and authenticity. These foundational elements demonstrate an institutional commitment to removing barriers, fostering learning, and promoting student achievement across diverse populations.

Additionally, the College has established a clear plan for operationalizing its mission through division-level planning processes that are currently underway and aligned to BC Policy 1200. A plan for engaging unit-level planning processes will soon be engaged as well.

Overall, the evaluation team finds that Bellevue College's mission is current, well-defined, and meaningfully integrated into institutional planning and practice, demonstrating alignment with the expectations of Standard 1.A.1.

b. Standard 1.B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

i. 1.B.1

1.B.1 The institution demonstrates a continuous process to assess institutional effectiveness, including student learning and achievement and support services. The institution uses an ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning process to inform and refine its effectiveness, assign resources, and improve student learning and achievement.

In 2024, Bellevue College initiated a planning process to develop a new strategic plan. The resulting *Be Bold: Built for Students, Connected to Community* strategic plan is intended to guide institutional planning and evaluation processes. The previous plan, launched in 2017, was past its intended sunset date and presented challenges due to the lack of meaningful metrics to guide progress. In 2024, the college published a close-out report for the Board of Trustees that discussed initiatives that moved forward as well as those that did not.

To bridge the gap between old and new plans, the college relied on the Achieving the Dream (ATD) framework, which has been a significant institutional priority. The institution completed the ATD Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool (ICAT) in 2017 and again in 2026. This tool is a mechanism for assessing capacities related to cultivating a student-focused culture. Through conversations with staff, the evaluation team heard examples of how this assessment tool informed focused planning activities during this time. However, there was no evidence that its use was ongoing or systematic. While the ICAT may be used periodically in the future, it is not part of an annual institutional effectiveness process. Instead, significant elements of the ATD framework and corresponding metrics are now integrated into the *Be Bold* plan, as evidenced by a crosswalk provided to the evaluation team during the site visit.

At the time of the visit, widespread work had begun to develop divisional plans aligned with the new *Be Bold* plan. Divisions such as Academic Affairs and Student Affairs used ICAT data and a variety of mechanisms, including meetings and surveys, to engage teams

and solicit input. The evaluation team reviewed a selection of draft operational plans, at various stages of completion, which included clear goals, tactics, and measures aligned with strategic plan priorities and relevant outcomes.

However, the *Be Bold* plan is still in its infancy, and there is a lack of clarity regarding how resources will be assigned to support its success. While the college maintains an annual budget development process intended to integrate information from academic and student support program evaluations, there was insufficient evidence of an ongoing or systematic process for assigning resources or how this process would be operationalized to support the new strategic plan. Although conversations with leadership acknowledged the need to ensure the plan is adequately resourced, the team found limited evidence demonstrating how resource allocation decisions would function in practice.

Additionally, there is a lack of clarity regarding how elements of the college's governance structure, particularly the Budget Review Advisory Committee (BRAC) and the Resource and Planning Council (RPC), are currently involved in the budget and allocation process. The college describes BRAC as a recommending body that reviews and advises on the proposed expenditure requests submitted by the president's cabinet and engages evaluation before voting either to recommend or request additional information. BRAC recommendations are then returned to the Cabinet and the president for final decision-making. However, through conversations with faculty, staff, and leadership, the team found a lack of clarity regarding BRAC and RPC's role and responsibilities.

Beyond institutional-level planning, the college has assessment processes in place related to student achievement and student support services. Academic Affairs oversees the evaluation of academic programs and student achievement. Academic programs are evaluated through the Program Review process every five years, which is discussed in more detail in Standard 1.C.5. These reviews focus on student achievement measures and do not include an analysis of student learning outcomes at the program or institutional level. The college maintains a robust repository of dashboards for tracking and analyzing disaggregated student achievement data, which is discussed in more detail in Standards 1.D.2 through 1.D.4.

Academic Affairs historically documented progress toward annual divisional objectives through close-out reports, most recently for the 2023–2024 academic year. The division historically maintained a Program Viability Process focused on the economic feasibility of academic programs. Launched in 2019, the process was paused following leadership transitions. With the appointment of a new provost and vice president for academic affairs in 2024, the process remained on hold to reevaluate its structure and effectiveness. The redesigned process is scheduled for implementation in Spring 2026. The evaluation team reviewed some early supporting documentation for the new process. However, the revised viability process has not yet been operationalized.

The team found evidence of evaluation activities related to the effectiveness of student support services. Historically, the Student Affairs division produced annual end-of-year reports summarizing progress toward goals, though this practice was discontinued in 2022. These assessments relied largely on satisfaction metrics that were not deemed

useful for evaluation purposes. The division intends to reinstate a reporting cycle in the upcoming year on a four-year cycle that will include separate evaluation and metrics for each department. New metrics focus on a co-curricular learning framework, an intentionally designed intake form for new students, and data related to student use of services, which will be analyzed alongside student demographics and performance metrics. While there is ample evidence Student Affairs appears has been engaged in data-driven decision-making during the last few years, there was limited evidence of a more formal, systematic evaluation process.

Concern: Although Bellevue College has taken steps to redefine its institutional effectiveness process through the newly launched *Be Bold* strategic plan, it has not yet implemented a consistent, systematic evaluation and planning cycle. While the college provided evidence of multiple data sources used to inform improvement, these data are not anchored in an ongoing, systematic evaluation process that informs planning or resource allocation. In addition, the academic data is centered on student achievement as measured by enrollment and retention indicators, and the institution was unable to provide evidence of the availability or use of student learning outcomes data to inform planning and improvement efforts.

ii. 1.B.2

1.B.2 The institution sets and articulates meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators of its goals to define mission fulfillment and to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions.

As part of the college's mid-cycle report development process, the institution focused and reduced the number of objectives and indicators based on feedback from the 2019 Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness report. Organized around four core themes, many of the remaining indicators reflected the college's engagement with the Achieving the Dream (ATD) framework, focusing on completion, retention, first-year credit accumulation, and progress in first-year English and math. The college provided evidence that, since the mid-cycle report, these ATD-related measures have been benchmarked against regional and national peers through dashboards that allow for disaggregation by multiple demographic groups and academic programs of study. Through conversations with staff and leadership, the evaluation team found evidence that these dashboards are used to inform program planning and decision-making, including some early indications of progress. However, the evaluation team found limited evidence that non-ATD-related measures were fully operationalized or used consistently to improve institutional effectiveness. The lack of progress was attributed to disruptions related to organizational changes and staffing challenges as well as competing institutional priorities.

As discussed in Standard 1.B.1, the college recently launched the *Be Bold* strategic plan. The plan establishes a new set of meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators intended to evaluate mission fulfillment and institutional effectiveness. It is organized around four priorities, each with measures of progress that include both long- and short-term indicators. Some measures are derived from existing data sources and therefore have

established targets, while others are new and will require the collection of additional data to establish baselines and support future goal setting.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Analytics has articulated plans to develop dashboards to monitor annual progress on strategic plan indicators and to collaborate with institutional leadership to finalize benchmarks and targets. Division-level operational plans aligned with the strategic plan are currently under development, with the intention of integrating goals and indicators into day-to-day operations. The college intends to use these operational plans as a consistent framework for monitoring progress, with results reviewed by the President's Cabinet to inform resource allocation and institutional priorities. However, at the time of the site visit, these structures and tools had not yet been developed or implemented.

Concern: The institution's most recent efforts to collect and analyze meaningful data associated with its established goals and objectives were not fully operationalized. While the *Be Bold* strategic plan establishes new goals and measures to define mission fulfillment and improve institutional effectiveness, there is not yet evidence of a consistent framework for monitoring progress or how results are used to support continuous improvement.

iii. 1.B.3

1.B.3 The institution provides evidence that its planning process is inclusive and offers opportunities for comment by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

The Bellevue College self-study report describes a broad-based and inclusive planning process associated with development of the new *Be Bold* strategic plan. This process was guided by a steering committee that included representatives from academic and administrative leadership, staff, faculty, student government, and other campus constituencies. Over an 18-month period, the committee conducted listening sessions, surveys, open house events, and focus groups. Participants included students, staff, faculty, advisory committee members, industry partners, K-12 and transfer institutions, tribal leaders, elected officials, alumni, donors, and community organizations, helping to ensure that institutional priorities reflected a wide range of perspectives. However, conversations with faculty indicated that many feedback opportunities occurred during the summer term, limiting opportunities for full-time faculty to participate and fully engage in the process.

With the establishment of this new planning cycle, the college outlines a framework in which the mission, vision, and values are grounded in the strategic plan. The plan is intended to be operationalized through divisional plans used to allocate resources, monitor progress through established indicators, and support continuous improvement. However, as discussed in Standard 1.B.1, these divisional plans are not yet complete, and a clearly defined and documented framework for resource allocation has not yet been

established or evidence of how these process leads to an improvement in institutional effectiveness.

Bellevue College governance includes four constituent councils, four functional councils, a coordinating College Assembly, and committees such as the Budget Review Advisory Committee (BRAC) and the Capital Projects Recommendation Committee. Membership across these bodies is diverse, and each council includes nonvoting resource liaisons from the President's Cabinet who help connect governance groups with institutional leadership and institutional information. Council members are expected to share updates with their constituencies, and publicly posted agendas and minutes contribute to transparency; governance leaders also provide updates at Board of Trustees meetings. However, conversations with faculty and staff revealed a lack of clarity regarding the purpose, roles, and responsibilities of some councils and committees as they relate to planning and decision-making, an issue discussed in more detail in Standard 2.A.4. It is worth noting that in the *Next Steps* section of the self-study report addressing Standard 1.B.3 the college indicates plans to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of its participatory governance system as the structure approaches its 10th anniversary.

The evaluation team also found evidence of institutional communications and town halls held over the past several years focused on budget shortfalls and the college's plans to address these challenges. These sessions were offered both in person and via Zoom, with recordings made available for later viewing.

Concern: The evaluation team found limited evidence that the institution's planning process is sufficiently defined in terms of how necessary resources are allocated or how planning activities lead to demonstrable improvements in institutional effectiveness.

iv. 1.B.4

1.B.4 The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it considers such findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, planning, intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement of its goals.

Bellevue College monitors a range of internal and external environments to identify emerging patterns, trends, and expectations and to inform institutional planning. Internally, the college collects data through campus surveys, program reviews, enrollment and retention dashboards, and the Achieving the Dream Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool (ICAT). The ICAT, most recently administered in 2025 and 2026, includes structured questions that assess institutional practices across areas such as leadership and vision, teaching and learning, data and technology, equity, and student support. The institution

mapped these items to the newly launched Be Bold strategic plan to help inform institutional effectiveness efforts.

The college also gathers feedback through both formal and informal mechanisms, including listening sessions, governance discussions, and town halls. Additional data collection supported development of the new strategic plan, including participation in the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) survey, which provided information related to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The college demonstrated how HEDS results informed service improvements implemented through the CARE team, which provides proactive and coordinated approaches to identifying, preventing, and managing interpersonal or behavioral concerns, illustrating the use of internal monitoring data to support operational improvements.

Externally, the institution draws on workforce, community, and regional data to inform planning and program development. State labor market information identified a critical shortage of medical assistants, prompting the college to develop responsive workforce programming. Community and employer input further supports alignment of academic offerings with regional needs. To inform longer-range planning, the college engaged EAB, a nationally recognized higher education consulting firm, to conduct environmental scans that synthesized regional and national trends and served as a foundational component of the strategic planning process.

As described in Standard 1.B.3, findings from environmental scans, surveys, and listening sessions informed the recent strategic planning process and were communicated to the campus community through all-campus email updates. Collectively, these practices demonstrate that the institution actively monitors both its internal and external environments and uses these findings to assess its strategic position, inform future direction, and support programs, services, and recently developed planning processes and indicators of achievement.

c. Standard 1.C: Student Learning

i. 1.C.1

1.C.1 The institution offers programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission, culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes that lead to collegiate-level degrees, certificates, or credentials and include designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

A review of the catalog, governance structure, and processes reveals that the institution offers academic programs with appropriate content and rigor consistent with its mission. The development, approval, and ongoing review of academic programs are governed by

the college's faculty-led Curriculum Advisory Committee (CAC) which ensures curricular quality and academic integrity. The CAC forwards recommended proposals to the senior academic officer for institutional approval, after which they are submitted to the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) for final approval. External advisory groups inform curricular decisions, supporting alignment of degrees, certificates, and other credentials with industry standards and recognized fields of study.

Program requirements and learning outcomes are clearly identified in the college catalog. As the college continues its transition from General Education Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes, and advances its curricular and course mapping project, continued attention to clear and consistent language will support student understanding of learning expectations and outcomes.

ii. 1.C.2

1.C.2 The institution awards credit, degrees, certificates, or credentials for programs that are based upon student learning and learning outcomes that offer an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning.

The peer evaluation team verified that all academic credit, degrees, certificates, and credentials awarded by the institution are based on student learning and clearly defined learning outcomes. Current academic offerings reflect appropriate breadth, depth, and sequencing of coursework. The Curriculum Advisory Committee (CAC), in collaboration with the senior academic officer, is responsible for ensuring that curricular breadth, depth, and sequencing align with SBCTC standards and support student learning.

The college's established CAC process emphasizes programmatic collaboration and faculty review to ensure that curricular proposals are appropriate and support the intentional design of curricular breadth, depth, and sequencing that promotes students' synthesized learning.

The college is developing a program viability framework intended to inform decisions related to ongoing, new, and revised programs. Once implemented, this framework is anticipated to intersect with the CAC, Program Review, and budget and resource allocation processes, strengthening alignment, documentation, and integration of academic quality and institutional decision-making.

Compliment: The peer evaluation team compliments the college on their Curriculum Advisory Committee, for their well-established, effective, collaborative, and trusted approach to curriculum development and revisions in support of academic quality and student learning.

iii. 1.C.3

1.C.3 The institution identifies and publishes expected program and degree learning outcomes for all degrees, certificates, and credentials. Information on expected student learning outcomes for all courses is provided to enrolled students.

Expected program and course learning outcomes for each degree program are published in the college catalog, which is updated annually and publicly available online. The Faculty Onboarding Handbook requires course syllabi to include course outcomes and learning objectives, course expectations, and required activities that are essential to the awarding of credit.

For curricular modifications, the Curriculum Advisory Committee (CAC) requires course learning outcomes to be included in all proposals submitted for review. The CAC may consult with external advisory groups, as appropriate, prior to forwarding proposals to the senior academic office for approval. The college catalog designates General Education learning outcome by course.

As the college continues its transition from General Education Learning outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO), continued attention is needed to ensure that ILO language across curriculum mapping, course learning outcomes, and in published program materials.

iv. 1.C.4

1.C.4 The institution's admission and completion or graduation requirements are clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible to students and the public.

The college's admission requirements are clearly defined and widely published, ensuring easy access for students and the public through the college catalog and institutional website. Admission information is organized by student type, including new students, students under the age of 18, international students, and transfer students, and is accessible through targeted webpages that address the needs of each population.

The college follows a Guided Pathways model through BC Pathways, which identifies eight areas of study to support student exploration and program selection. Additionally, the online and physical Welcome Center provides information on academic pathways, campus resources, application checklists, and related student support.

Graduation requirements are publicly available in the college catalog. The Degree Requirements webpage lists general graduation requirements applicable to all degrees and provides links to degree-specific requirements. The Degree and Certificate Completion Worksheet offer students an additional tool to track progress toward

completion. Students are able to view their academic progress through the ctclink portal, supporting transparency and timely degree progression towards completion.

v. 1.C.5

1.C.5 The institution engages in an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs. The institution recognizes the central role of faculty to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs.

Bellevue has engaged faculty in meaningful review of student achievement data through its Program Review process, reflecting a clear commitment to examining student success. Program Review documents show that faculty are highly invested in the process and thoughtfully analyzing measures such as grades, course enrollments, and pass rates, and in many cases are disaggregating these data to better understand student performance across programs. This work demonstrates important effort in building a culture of inquiry and evidence.

At the same time, faculty and staff shared that the current state of program review does not incorporate direct assessment of program-level student learning outcomes, and the team found no evidence of an effective system of outcomes assessment, such as program-level assessment planning documents or resulting continuous improvement initiatives. In the sample program reviews provided (including Economics, BAS Data Management, Philosophy, and Geography), student achievement data are used in place of learning outcomes assessment. While these measures provide good insight on course-level performance and retention/persistence rates, they do not fully address how well students across a program are achieving specific learning outcomes. There is no evidence of cohesive discussion of program learning outcomes or of how those outcomes are systematically mapped to course-level outcomes and assessed using direct measures of student learning.

In conversations with faculty and staff across the institution, it was clear that many faculty and staff at Bellevue College are aware of this gap. In the self-study report, the college rates themselves as 'emerging' in this area of work and understand the importance of focusing on the quality of student learning, rather than relying primarily on measures of student achievement. Strengthening this distinction will support more meaningful assessment practices that better reflect student learning and inform program improvement efforts.

As the college continues to further develop its learning outcomes assessment processes, particular care should be given to establishing an assessment plan with a consistent framework for assessing program-level learning outcomes. This includes clearly

articulating program outcomes, mapping them to course-level outcomes, and incorporating direct evidence of student learning outcomes assessment (such as assessments of capstone projects, signature assignments, or other program-level artifacts) into program review. Building and strengthening this alignment will support the college's ability to demonstrate that curricular decisions and program improvements are informed by outcomes-based evidence of student learning in addition to student achievement data. Ongoing institutional support, including time, resources, and shared planning between faculty and administration, is essential to these faculty-led assessment efforts.

Concern. The peer evaluation team notes a concern that, in conversations with BC faculty and as demonstrated in the sample Program Reviews, it is evident that student achievement data (e.g., grades, course enrollments, and pass rates) is used as a proxy for student learning outcomes assessment. There is no evidence of systematic evaluation of program-level learning outcomes or clear alignment between program and course outcomes. This gap is especially concerning given the original summative assessment Recommendation 2 from Bellevue's 2019 EIE report and the commentary from evaluators in the mid-cycle report, which found little evidence of program outcomes assessment being developed beyond the work of the original FACT team. While faculty demonstrate commendable and thoughtful engagement with disaggregated student success data to inform program review, this work does not yet reflect the distinct purpose of learning outcomes assessment, which is to evaluate how well students across a program are achieving specific learning outcomes. This disconnect, evident in the Program Reviews provided for Standard 1.C.5 (e.g., Economics, BAS Data Management, Philosophy, and Geography), suggests a need for greater institutional clarity and shared understanding of the distinction between student achievement and learning outcomes assessment, as well as more intentional integration of outcomes-based assessment practices at the program level.

vi. 1.C.6

1.C.6 Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy.

Bellevue College is undergoing an ongoing transition from General Education Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes. As this transition continues, the peer evaluation team observed that there is a need for greater collaboration between faculty and administrative constituents to help create an engaged and informed culture of assessment at the college.

It is clear that faculty and administrators at the college fully understand the challenges associated with implementing a systematic, institution-wide approach to assessing Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). The peer evaluators observed strong evidence of thoughtful faculty engagement in developing the new ILO framework, including ongoing work to define learning outcomes, as well as the knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with them. There is meaningful work happening with rubric creation and mapping ILOs to course-level outcomes in classes across disciplines, particularly in the areas of Information Literacy and Critical Thinking. The faculty involved in this process are engaged and excited in this work and want the resources to move forward and scale it up. Conversations with ILO and outcomes assessment groups reflected an awareness of both the complexity and importance of how institutional learning outcomes assessment can be used to show larger trends in student learning across campus.

The current ILO framework remains in the pilot phase, and a full assessment cycle has not yet been completed. While definitions, rubrics, and supporting materials are in development, the institution has yet collected, analyzed, and used ILO assessment data across a complete cycle. As a result, ILO assessment is not yet being systematically implemented, nor are results yet being used to inform teaching, learning, and institutional decision-making. Though conversations revealed that there has been some confusion about how best to move forward in scaling this work, the college has recently hired staff to assist in moving that project along, including a new Assistant Director of Accreditation and Assessment position open at the time of this writing.

Completing and documenting a full ILO assessment cycle will mark an important milestone for the college, giving faculty and administration space and opportunity to reflect on how ILO assessment can function as a faculty-driven, sustained, systematic process that meaningfully informs student learning and institutional improvement. Faculty expressed a clear desire for a targeted assessment plan that is created and shared among constituents in this work, as well as support for faculty (including time, stipends, etc.) to engage more fully in this work. The evaluation team believes that the work done by ILO pilot faculty groups is a strong foundation, and that strengthening collaboration among faculty, staff, and administrators will be essential to building shared understanding and developing assessment approaches that more accurately reflect student learning and support continuous improvement.

Concern. The peer evaluation team notes a concern related to Standard 1.C.6 regarding the college's ongoing transition from General Education Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes. As this transition continues, there is a need for greater collaboration between faculty and administrative constituents to help create an engaged and informed culture of assessment at the college. Such conversations should help clarify the differences between student achievement data and student learning outcomes assessment data. There is also a need for building a scalable framework in which to systematically collect, analyze, and use student institutional learning outcomes data to

show how student learning outcomes assessment data can be used to inform decision-making. Strengthening the ILO assessment partnerships between faculty, staff, and administration will be important to ensure that the college builds a clear and sustainable framework for assessing Institutional Learning Outcomes. This collaborative effort will also help show that student learning is adequately represented and meaningfully informs academic planning and continuous improvement.

vii. 1.C.7

1.C.7 The institution uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes.

Bellevue College has a highly developed, thoughtful, and data-informed approach to academic and learning support, and there is ample evidence of meaningful engagement with student success data to inform curricular changes and planning for academic support services. The Academic Success Center, in particular, reflects a strong, integrated model of intentional care and student support, using multiple data sources (such as course pass rates, enrollment trends, and service utilization data) to inform student support service design and resource allocation. This work demonstrates a highly commendable commitment to improving student success and aligns with broader institutional efforts, including participation in Achieving the Dream initiatives.

However, an understanding of the distinction between student learning outcomes assessment data and student success data does not yet appear to be consistently reflected in practice. While the self-study indicates that the college recognizes this distinction, the sample Program Reviews do not clearly demonstrate it, as student achievement measures (e.g., grades, pass rates, and enrollment trends) are used in place of direct evidence of student learning outcomes assessment. In section 1.C.7, the self-study's description of assessment evidence again reflects a reliance on student success data.

Although these student success data provide valuable insight into student performance and progression, they are distinct from learning outcomes assessment data that measure how well students are achieving specific learning outcomes. Consequently, the evaluation team found no evidence of how student learning outcomes assessment data are being systematically used to inform academic and learning support planning, as described in the standard.

Moving forward, particular attention should be given to strengthening the integration of student learning outcomes assessment data into academic and learning support decision-making. This includes clearly differentiating between student success metrics and learning outcomes assessment, and ensuring that assessment results are used alongside other data sources to guide planning, resource allocation, and program improvement. Continued development in this area will support the college's ability to demonstrate that learning

support practices are informed not only by student success trends but also by evidence of student learning outcomes assessment.

Compliment. The peer evaluation team compliments the Bellevue College Academic Success Center for reflecting a strong, integrated model of intentional care and student support. Through the thoughtful use of multiple data sources (including course pass rates, enrollment trends, and service utilization data) to inform service design and resource allocation, the Center demonstrates a highly commendable commitment to advancing student success and aligns well with broader institutional improvement efforts, including participation in Achieving the Dream initiatives.

Concern. The peer evaluation team notes a concern regarding the institution's ability to demonstrate that results of learning outcomes assessment efforts are systematically used to inform academic and learning support planning for continuous improvement. While the self-study (p. 46) states that the college maintains a clear distinction between student learning outcomes assessment and student success data, this distinction is not consistently evident in the sample Program Reviews or in conversations across campus. Program Review materials rely on student achievement metrics such as grades, course performance, and retention data, with no evidence of use of learning outcomes assessment at the program or Institutional Learning Outcomes level to guide improvement efforts. Although these student achievement data appropriately inform decisions related to program structure and resource allocation, they do not fulfill the role of learning outcomes-based assessment for continuous improvement. This suggests a need for stronger alignment and shared understanding of how learning outcomes assessment results can be used to inform program-level and institutional-level improvements. Academic Affairs leadership, Program Review faculty and staff, and assessment constituents acknowledged this gap and identified opportunities to strengthen the integration of learning outcomes assessment results into ongoing academic and learning support planning.

viii. 1.C.8

1.C.8 Transfer credit and credit for prior learning is accepted according to clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible policies that provide adequate safeguards to ensure academic quality. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures that such credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic rigor, and quality.

Bellevue College meets this standard with clear care and intentionality through a highly collaborative, integrated approach between Admissions, Enrollment Management, Enrollment Services, Academic Advising, and the Registrar in the evaluation of transfer credit, transcript review, and credit for prior learning. This coordinated process reflects a deep commitment to equity and access for students, as staff work thoroughly and thoughtfully to ensure students receive appropriate credit while minimizing barriers. This is an especially important and commendable effort given the college's diverse student

population, including international students with credit transfer needs from international institutions. Transfer credit and prior learning are accepted in alignment with clearly defined, widely published, and accessible policies that safeguard academic quality, ensuring that all accepted credit is comparable in rigor, content, and connections to the institution's programs.

The college also demonstrates a proactive, multi-layered approach to protecting institutional integrity through careful student verification practices and multiple checkpoints designed to prevent fraudulent enrollment, balancing admissions processes with accountability in a deliberate, student-centered manner. Opportunities for continued growth and institutional support in this area, expressed by staff in conversation with the evaluation team, may include exploring ways to add resources to assist in the complex and evolving work of fraud detection in admissions and enrollment management; streamlining time-intensive manual processes through investment in enhanced document management systems for transcript handling; and considering approaches to strengthen or refine crosswalks for CLEP credit evaluation.

Compliment The peer evaluation team compliments Bellevue College for its highly collaborative and integrated approach to the evaluation of transfer credit, transcript review, and credit for prior learning. This coordinated and collegial effort demonstrates a strong institutional commitment to access and opportunity, supporting students from admission through transfer and graduation by ensuring appropriate credit is awarded while thoughtfully minimizing barriers.

d. Standard 1.D: Student Achievement

i. 1.D.1

1.D.1 Consistent with its mission, the institution recruits and admits students with the potential to benefit from its educational programs. It orients students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information and advice about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

The college has a wide range of recruitment efforts and an established structure of student onboarding. Bellevue College clearly recruits and serves a wide range of students with the potential to benefit from its educational programs, including certificate- and degree-seeking students, high school students through Running Start, participants in the Career Education Options (CEO) program, and ELL/ABS learners. Its outreach to international students is particularly impressive, including the forward-thinking practice of providing access to distance education while students are waiting in their home countries for visa-related interviews. This range of pathways and outreach suggests that Bellevue College's recruitment practices focus on a broad range of students who seek a variety of educational and career goals.

The peer evaluation team found the orientation process to be a notable strength. The required two-part orientation, which includes the online New Student Orientation (NSO) and a 90-minute in-person New Student Enrollment session (with a virtual option), is

structured and outcomes-driven. The college requires completion of both components prior to registration, which establishes accountability and ensures that students receive essential information before enrolling in coursework. Moving forward, the College is developing an intake system at the point of registration that will provide more detailed information about challenges students are facing and for which they may benefit from interventions such as basic needs support.

The college provides timely and accurate academic information through mandatory advising for new students, including onboarding steps (the NSO and NSE mentioned above) that appear to be regularly updated. Admissions policies and procedures are clearly codified in formal policy documents and are reinforced through robust, option-rich web materials.

At the same time, the volume and complexity of online materials present a potential challenge. While the abundance of information supports transparency and choice, the layered and dense structure of web pages may be overwhelming for students unfamiliar with higher education. Specific issues include the following: the virtual tour requires multiple clicks to access and is buried within the welcome page, there is an uneven availability of program maps (some have them posted and some do not), and catalog links do not consistently resolve to program-specific pages. These factors may reduce the usability of otherwise strong informational resources. Graduation and transfer policies, while present in institutional materials, are not as clearly or consistently foregrounded as other requirements, which slightly weakens alignment with the standard's emphasis on those topics.

ii. 1.D.2

1.D.2 Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

The college has established a meaningful and comprehensive set of student achievement indicators and making them widely available. Core metrics include persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation outcomes, and these are clearly identified and tracked. Tableau dashboards allow users to disaggregate these indicators across all required demographic categories, including additional groupings meaningful to the institution, enabling in-depth equity analyses.

The indicators are published and contextualized through comparisons with regional and national peer institutions. This comparative approach situates institutional performance within the broader higher education landscape, thereby strengthening the usefulness of the data. Regular reporting of these indicators to the board of directors demonstrates institutional commitment to transparency and accountability. Practices for disaggregation,

comparison, and sharing of achievement data is well established and appears to be consistently used at the institution, in particular within Student Affairs as further discussed in relation to standard 1.D.4.

iii. 1.D.3

1.D.3 The institution's disaggregated indicators of student achievement should be widely published and available on the institution's website. Such disaggregated indicators should be aligned with meaningful, institutionally identified indicators benchmarked against indicators for peer institutions at the regional and national levels and be used for continuous improvement to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources.

Bellevue College not only publishes disaggregated achievement data, but it also embeds its use across planning, review, and improvement processes. Robust dashboards enable analysis of progress toward internal goals as well as regional and national benchmarks. Campus-wide workshops and trainings at Community Days and guidance for using data within the academic program review process are two examples of effective means of encouraging and supporting data for decision making. In addition, the IERA sends out regular emails with data snapshots that reinforce the culture of data use that the college has established.

The institution has used various survey data (Campus Climate Survey, Washing Student Experience Survey) to understand student wellbeing and has taken concrete action in response, such as establishing a food pantry, expanding housing support, and enhancing case management approaches within Student Affairs. These examples demonstrate clear linkage between data analysis and strategic decision-making on behalf of students.

The college's ambitious retention goal of 70% by 2029 further illustrates purposeful use of indicators aligned with regional peers. Ongoing exploration of additional external data tools (such as PDP and CCSSE) suggests a forward-looking approach to strengthening evidence-based improvement. A remaining opportunity lies in continuing to expand and normalize faculty access to, and instructional use of, these data.

Compliment: The peer evaluation team found ample evidence of meaningful data collection and use in the service of increasing student achievement and improving student experiences. They have articulated clear plans to continue developing their practices to be increasingly proactive and holistic in their services.

iv. 1.D.4

1.D.4 The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.

The college has transparent data visualization systems (noted previously) and documented examples of data-informed actions. The college created an SQL data server to provide centralized data resources so that departments/units can access data to inform

their planning and decision making. The system integrates data from a variety of sources, centralizing the information so it is accessible by all.

The review team found evidence that these processes directly inform equity-focused interventions. For example, using intake, advising, and financial aid data to spot student needs early and coordinate timely interventions, the college has expanded advising access, redesigned new-student resources, and increased campus outreach. This represents a shift from an individual transactional approach toward proactive, holistic support for students. More specific to particular groups, when data analysis revealed challenges in timely completion of gateway courses, the college implemented changes in onboarding practices that led to improved outcomes for Black and Latinx students. Similarly, concerns identified through achievement data resulted in the implementation of an early alert system, with documented improvements in pass rates and retention among students who received interventions.

These examples suggest a culture of data-informed inquiry, action, and evaluation that aligns closely with the intent of the standard. While there is interest in improving documentation of decision-making based on data, the evidence provided shows that data transparency and use are already meaningfully embedded in institutional practice.

VI. **Standard 2: Governance, Resources, and Capacity**

The following Standard 2 element was specifically reviewed during the visit resulting from meetings during the visit.

a. Standard 2.A: Governance

i. 2.A.4

2.A.4 The institution's decision-making structures and processes, which are documented and publicly available, must include provisions for the consideration of the views of faculty, staff, administrators, and students on matters in which each has a direct and reasonable interest.

The college has a publicly available governance model, Bellevue College Governance (BCG), designed to include councils, constituent groups, and a general assembly. The current model was developed and implemented in 2017 and was described to the peer evaluation team as having been broadly welcomed by the college community.

However, in meetings with functional and constituent council leadership, the peer evaluation team observed inconsistencies between documented council charters and current practices related to communication, roles, responsibilities, and decision-making authority. Areas of confusion included responsibilities for resource allocation, budgeting, and recommendation-making. Additionally, concerns were raised regarding participation barriers, inclusion of constituent groups, limited progress on initiatives, and uncertainty regarding the purpose and effectiveness of some councils.

Concern: Since the development of the governance model (under a prior administration), a drift from the original intent of the documented charters to current practice has become

evident. To support the effectiveness of the governance model, the college would benefit from a systematic review of council charters and governance practices to clarify purpose, roles, responsibilities, communication processes, and expectations for inclusive and meaningful participation in decision-making.

VII. Summary

Bellevue College's Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (EIE) self-evaluation report was clearly written, thoughtfully organized, and supported by accessible hyperlinks to a wide range of relevant evidence. The Bellevue College Acting Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) was responsive and timely in providing additional materials and clarification requested by the evaluation team, both in advance of and during the site visit.

The evaluation team appreciated the openness, professionalism, and engagement of faculty, staff, and students who generously contributed their time and perspectives throughout the process. These interactions reflected a strong, shared commitment to student success across the institution.

The team also extends its sincere appreciation to the college's support staff, whose careful planning and attention to detail ensured a well-coordinated and welcoming visit. Their hospitality and dedication contributed significantly to a positive and productive evaluation experience.

VIII. Commendations and Recommendations

a. Commendations

i. Commendation 1:

The peer evaluation team commends Bellevue College for its deeply embedded, institution-wide commitment to student success, reflected across all areas of the college. Evidence demonstrates a sustained and collaborative effort to remove barriers, expand access, and create an inclusive, supportive environment that effectively meets students' needs throughout their educational experience with care and intentionality.

ii. Commendation 2:

The peer evaluation team commends Bellevue College for its significant investment in the systematic collection, disaggregation, analysis, and institution-wide use of student achievement data. Evidence demonstrated how these data are effectively used to inform decision-making processes and to identify and address opportunity and achievement gaps.

iii. Commendation 3:

The peer evaluation team commends Bellevue College for providing clear and coherent guided pathway information that supports students in navigating their educational journeys. Through BC Pathways, the First Year Seminar, and course mapping, the college centers the student experience from admission to graduation and strengthens academic engagement and goal attainment.

iv. Commendation 4:
The peer evaluation team commends Bellevue College for the highly collaborative, integrated approach in the evaluation of transfer credit, transcript review, and credit for prior learning. This coordinated, collegial effort reflects a strong commitment to opportunity and access, supporting students from admission to transfer and graduation, ensuring that they receive appropriate credit while minimizing barriers.

b. Recommendations

i. Recommendation 1:

The peer evaluation team recommends that Bellevue College develop and implement a formal, scalable, and inclusive process that integrates institutional, operational, and departmental planning with resource allocation. This process should ensure that resources are aligned with institutional priorities and tied to the strategic plan. The process should be regularly assessed for effectiveness and used to inform continuous improvement. (2020 Standards 1.B.1; 1.B.3)

ii. Recommendation 2:

The peer evaluation team recommends that Bellevue College evaluate its institutional effectiveness through mission-aligned goals, objectives, and indicators of achievement. (2020 Standard 1.B.2)

iii. Recommendation 3:

The peer evaluation team recommends that Bellevue College develop and formalize an approach to assessing program-level learning outcomes, ensuring that assessment practices across academic programs are consistent and sustainable. The college should demonstrate how program learning outcomes assessment results are used to improve student learning and guide continuous improvement. (2020 Standards 1.C.5; 1.C.7)

iv. Recommendation 4:

The peer evaluation team recommends that Bellevue College develop and formalize a collaborative approach to assess institutional learning outcomes, ensuring that assessment practices are consistent, sustainable, and applied across the institution. (2020 Standards 1.C.6; 1.C.7)

v. Recommendation 5:

The peer evaluation team recommends that Bellevue College systematically review and assess the effectiveness of its governance model as a means of continuous improvement. This work should result in an operationalized model with a clear delineation of purpose, roles, responsibilities, and communication processes. (2020 Standard 2.A.4)