



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

August 6, 2010

Mr. Robert Knight
President
Clark College
1800 East McLoughlin Blvd.
Vancouver, WA 98663

Dear President Knight:

On behalf of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to report that the accreditation of Clark College has been reaffirmed on the basis of the Spring 2010 Focused Interim Evaluation which addressed Recommendations 1, 2, 4, and 5 of the Fall 2008 Comprehensive Evaluation Report. This matter was the subject of Commission correspondence dated January 28, 2009. Congratulations on receiving this continued recognition.

In reaffirming accreditation, the Commission requests that the institution submit an addendum to the institution's Fall 2011 Year One Report to address Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2010 Focused Interim Evaluation Report. A copy of the Recommendation is enclosed for your reference.

In making this request, the Commission determined that Recommendation 2 of the Fall 2008 Comprehensive Evaluation Report remains out of compliance with the Commission's criteria for accreditation. Further, the Commission also determined that Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2010 Focused Interim Evaluation Report is an area where Clark College does not meet the Commission's criteria for accreditation. According to U.S. Department of Education Regulation 34 CFR 602.20 and Commission Policy A-18, *Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period* (copy enclosed), the Commission requires that Clark College take appropriate action to ensure that Recommendation 2 of the Fall 2008 Comprehensive Evaluation Report and Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2010 Focused Interim Evaluation Report are addressed and resolved within the prescribed two-year period. The timeline to come into compliance will be continued until January 2012.

In the unlikely event the Commission should conclude that an institution is in danger of being unable to fulfill its mission and goals or to continue to meet the Eligibility Requirements or Standards, the Commission reserves the right to request that the institution submit a report or host one or more evaluators for a special review.

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

President Robert Knight
Page Two
August 6, 2010

Best wishes for a rewarding academic year.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sandra E. Elman". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Sandra E. Elman
President

SEE:rb

Enclosures: Recommendation
Commission Policy A-18

cc: Ms. Shanda Diehl, Associate Vice President of Planning & Effectiveness ✓
Mr. Jack Burkman, Board Chair
Mr. Charles Earl, Executive Director, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

Focused Interim Evaluation Report
Spring 2010
Clark College
Recommendation

1. While a timeline is in place and work has begun, the Committee recommends that the College identify and publish the expected learning outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs. Furthermore, the Committee recommends that the College demonstrate, through regular and systematic assessment, that students who complete their programs, no matter where or how they are offered, have achieved these outcomes (Standard 2.B.2 and Policy 2.2).

Policy A-18 Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period

If the Commission determines that an institution it accredits is not in compliance with a Commission standard for accreditation, 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, 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 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. 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.

Adopted 1997/Revised 2002