

EVALUATION REPORT

Guam Community College
PO Box 23069 GMF
Barrigada, Guam 96921

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Guam Community College March 19, 2012 through March 22, 2012

Dr. Roland “Chip” Chapdelaine, Chair

LIST OF TEAM MEMBERS

Dr. Roland “Chip” Chapdelaine (Chair)
President
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

Mr. Milton Higa
Vice-Chancellor
Kapiolani Community College

Dr. Adam Karp
Dean, Fine & Applied Arts
American River College

Dr. Jannett Jackson
President
College of Alameda

Ms. Rhea Riegel
Institutional Research Coordinator
Fresno City College

Ms. Victoria Rosario
Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Services
Los Rios Community College District

Dr. Mary Gallagher (Assistant)
Vice President, Administrative Services
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

Ms. Martha Tilmann
Professor Computer Science
College of San Mateo

Dr. Ian Walton
Instructor of Mathematics Emeritus
Mission College

Dr. Roger Welt
Interim Vice President of Student Services
Grossmont Community College

Dr. Anthony Zambelli
Instructor, Economics
Cuyamaca College

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

INSTITUTION: Guam Community College

DATE OF VISIT: March 19 - March 22, 2012

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Roland “Chip” Chapdelaine
President, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

A team of 11 professional educators visited Guam Community College (GCC) March 19 through March 22, 2012, for the purpose of evaluating the institution for reaffirmation of accreditation. The team members prepared for the visit in advance by reading the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) and preparing a draft report of their conclusions regarding the College response to the recommendations from the most recent educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, their impressions of their assigned standard, and their opinion of the overall Self Evaluation Report. The team arrived for the visit fully prepared to validate the information contained in the Self Evaluation Report and to evaluate the college against Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College (ACCJC) Standards, Eligibility Requirements and Policies. The chair had occasion to request additional information for the team in advance of the visit and the information was always provided promptly by the College. The College was very responsive to the chair’s inquiries and requests.

The team found that the College was fully prepared for the site visit. The team also confirmed that there was widespread understanding by the College of the accreditation process. The accommodations for the team worked very well, with a large conference room at the hotel adjacent to the chair’s room for team meetings, and a secure team meeting room on campus, fully equipped with laptops for each team member and other accessories needed to complete work efficiently. The College provided round trip transportation daily.

The Institutional Self Evaluation Report for Guam Community College was a well written, comprehensive report that detailed the processes used by the institution to fully meet the eligibility requirements and the Commission Standards. The report told the story of Guam Community College from its inception to the present day. The report included internet links to evidence, making it easy for the team to identify whether the standard had indeed been met. The presentation of the data and information in the ISER created an image of the College that was almost hard to imagine because the portrayal was so positive. On the site visit, the team confirmed that what was written was indeed the College culture – one of caring and nurturing so that students achieve success. A familial feeling penetrates the campus and creates a great team atmosphere. This campus behaves as a small community, but with many formalized processes in place to ensure that student learning remains the center of the campus dialog and those resources are utilized efficiently.

This is a College with solid programs in workforce training and transfer and committed faculty, administrators, and staff.

Commendations

The team commends the College for a genuine sense of family spirit on campus, which is evident in its commitment to student access and student success.

The team commends the College for establishing and clearly communicating to students and the community student learning outcomes for 100 percent of its courses and programs (17 certificates, 20 associate degree programs, and over 350 courses). The team found that the College's two-year cycle for the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, certificate, and degree levels is on-going, promotes widespread dialog on the results of the assessments, and uses assessment results to improve programs and institutional processes. The team found that the College is operating at the level of sustainable continuous quality improvement as outlined by the Commission.

The team commends the College for demonstrating and institutionalizing the engagement of full-time faculty in student advisement, as evidenced by the development of individualized student educational plans for all students, including those with special needs, to establish pathways for degree and certificate completion. The College uses this to inform the scheduling of classes and services to meet student demand.

The team commends the College for its commitment to sustainability, noted in its seeking and obtaining funding for photovoltaics for its student services and allied health buildings, and in particular on its recently completed buildings and for attaining Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) "gold" certification for the Learning Resource Center opened in fall 2011.

The team commends the College and the Board of Trustees for their resilience and flexibility in managing financial resources by preparing for uncertainties in the appropriation process, as well as interruptions in budget allotments. The College used Foundation support, entrepreneurial efforts, and grants to meet irregular cash flow due to the uncertainties of the Government of Guam funding.

The team commends the College for supporting and encouraging a climate that promotes student involvement in personal and civic responsibility through active participation in campus and community wide activities.

The team commends the Board of Trustees and the Foundation Board of Directors for the level of cooperation and support in responding to the financial needs of the College. The mission statement is clearly understood and practiced by both organizations. This unity of purpose has had a positive impact on the ability of the College to raise funds and influence decision makers in support of the College's strategic plans.

The team commends the College on the rapid creation of a large number of new facilities. Through aggressive pursuit and successful attainment of grants, local government and federal

resources, the College has achieved an accelerated construction program that has created a learning environment that supports student success.

Recommendations

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop a process for systematically evaluating non-credit courses, workshops, and training sessions for content and effectiveness, in alignment with the assessment process that is in place for credit courses. (II.A.2)

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop a plan for distance education, including continuing education offered through distance education, and implement appropriate support services and procedures to deliver instruction online. (I.A.1, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.7, II, B.3.a, II.C.1.c, IIIC.)

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College review its resource allocation to the MIS area to ensure that there are sufficient funds to provide training, maintenance, equipment and software support and to implement its technology plan. (I.A.1, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, I.B.3, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.A.1.c, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.b)

In order to improve the effectiveness of participatory governance, the team recommends that the College evaluate existing governance policies and practices for faculty and students to ensure their opportunity for appropriate and ongoing participation in decision making. Additionally, the College should create and implement a corresponding formal structure for staff input and participation. The College should create and implement an evaluation process to examine the overall effectiveness of participatory governance policies and processes. (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

INTRODUCTION

Guam Community College (GCC) is a multi-faceted public career technical training institution established in 1977. It was created by public law in order to accomplish four purposes: 1) to consolidate and strengthen the existing workforce training programs administered by the government of Guam; 2) to strengthen career education and expand it within the territory; 3) to expand short-term and extension programs in skills training; and 4) to follow the public law by strengthening the formal secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical programs. The College operates a variety of programs in both secondary and postsecondary training environments, in addition to adult basic education, continuing education, community education, and specialized short-term training. It remains the only community college on Guam, with its main campus located in the village of Mangilao and a presence in five public high schools.

The population of Guam is just under 160,000 people. Guam has experienced a ten-year population increase of 2.9 percent. However, the population is expected to increase due to the U.S. Department of Defense decision to transfer assets from Okinawa, Japan to Guam over the next several years.

The island of Guam became a U.S. Territory in July of 1944 and its people became citizens of the United States with the passage of the Guam Organic Act of 1950. This created the first civilian government in Guam's history and transferred the jurisdiction from the U.S. Navy to the Department of the Interior. There are two military bases on the island that provide an American presence and stability in the Asia Pacific Rim, giving Asian investors access to U.S. investment and related banking. This relationship of Guam to the United States also provides access for Guam students to U.S.-accredited educational institutions.

The establishment of Guam Community College occurred as a result of legislative action, specifically the Community College Act of 1977. The University of Guam is also located in the village of Mangilao making it the higher education hub of Guam. The College is located on 29 acres of land and is undergoing a facilities overhaul – upgrading facilities, building new facilities, and demolishing older run down buildings.

The College offers 17 certificate programs, 20 associate degree programs, and over 50 apprenticeships. The staff of the College consists 112 full-time faculty, 74 part-time faculty, 103 staff, and 23 administrators. The average student to faculty ratio is 15:1.

The College serves approximately 2,500 students. Females comprise more than half of the student population. The ethnicity of 94 percent of the students is Pacific Islander. This group is disaggregated to include the indigenous population of Guam, Chamorro, making up over 50 percent of the Pacific Islander ethnic group. The remaining 6 percent is divided among white non-Hispanic, black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and not reported. Over 60 percent of the students attend the College on a part time basis. A large percentage of students are employed while attending GCC and the College indicated this significantly impacts scheduling of classes, facility usage, and support services.

The team felt the ISER was very well written and told the story of Guam Community College. The evidence was accessible electronically. Any evidence requested by the team or access to systems prior to the visit, was promptly provided by the College. The team found that the College was exceptionally well prepared for the site visit. The team also confirmed that there was excellent, widespread understanding by College constituencies of the accreditation process.

The administrators, faculty, staff and students of Guam Community College were gracious hosts. The staff assigned to facilitate the work of the team were friendly, knowledgeable, and accommodating. Those interviewed responded with openness and candor. The team also had the good fortune to experience the Spring Festival put on by the students that included an opportunity to view traditional dances of the region.

Guam Community College was initially accredited by ACCJC in 1979. The college was fully reaffirmed for accreditation at its last comprehensive review in 2006. The College regularly communicates proposed changes to ACCJC. The following actions have occurred since the last comprehensive review in 2006:

- April 2010 – a substantive change review was not required for the Certificate in Computer Aided Design and Drafting
- April 2010 – a substantive change review was not required for the Associate of Science in Pre-Architectural Drafting
- November 2009 – a Substantive Change was approved to add a Certificate in Medium/Heavy Diesel Truck Technology
- September 2009 – a substantive change review was not required for the additional forensic science concentrations to the existing Associate of Science in Criminal Justice
- December 2008 – a substantive change review was not required to divide the certificate in Practical Nursing that subsequently created a Certificate in Pre-Nursing
- October 2007 – a Substantive Change was approved for the Certificate and the Associate of Arts Degree in Emergency Management

The team reviewed past evaluation reports, as well as follow up and midterm reports, received and analyzed the self evaluation, requested and reviewed additional evidence provided by the College, and extensively viewed evidentiary information provided by the College on its web site.

Commendations/Recommendations

Commendations

The team commends the College for a genuine sense of family spirit on campus, which is evident in its commitment to student access and student success.

The team commends the College for establishing and clearly communicating to students and the community student learning outcomes for 100 percent of its courses and programs (17 certificates, 20 associate degree programs, and over 350 courses). The team found that the College's two-year cycle for the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, certificate, and degree levels is on-going, promotes widespread dialog on the results of the assessments, and uses assessment results to improve programs and institutional processes. The team found that the College is operating at the level of sustainable continuous quality improvement as outlined by the Commission.

The team commends the College for demonstrating and institutionalizing the engagement of full-time faculty in student advisement, as evidenced by the development of individualized student educational plans for all students, including those with special needs, to establish pathways for degree and certificate completion. The College uses this to inform the scheduling of classes and services to meet student demand.

The team commends the College for its commitment to sustainability, noted in its seeking and obtaining funding for photovoltaics for its student services and allied health buildings, and in particular on its recently completed buildings and for attaining Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) "gold" certification for the Learning Resource Center opened in fall 2011.

The team commends the College and the Board of Trustees for their resilience and flexibility in managing financial resources by preparing for uncertainties in the appropriation process as well as interruptions in budget allotments. The College used Foundation support, entrepreneurial efforts, and grants to meet irregular cash flow due to the uncertainties of the Government of Guam funding.

The team commends the College for supporting and encouraging a climate that promotes student involvement in personal and civic responsibility through active participation in campus and community wide activities.

The team commends the Board of Trustees and the Foundation Board of Directors for the level of cooperation and support in addressing the financial needs of the College. The mission statement is clearly understood and practiced by both organizations. This unity of purpose has had a positive impact on the ability of the College to raise funds and influence decision makers in support of the College's strategic plans.

The team commends the College on the rapid creation of a large number of new facilities. Through aggressive pursuit and successful attainment of grants, local government and federal

resources, the College has achieved an accelerated construction program that has created a learning environment that supports student success.

Major Recommendations

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop a process for systematically evaluating non-credit courses, workshops, and training sessions for content and effectiveness, in alignment with the assessment process that is in place for credit courses. (II.A.2)

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop a plan for distance education, including continuing education offered through distance education, and implement appropriate support services and procedures to deliver instruction online. (I.A.1, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.7, II, B.3.a, II.C.1.c, IIIC.)

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College review its resource allocation to the MIS area to ensure that there are sufficient funds to provide training, maintenance, equipment and software support and to implement its technology plan. (I.A.1, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, I.B.3, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.A.1.c, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.b)

In order to improve the effectiveness of participatory governance, the team recommends that the College evaluate existing governance policies and practices for faculty and students to ensure their opportunity for appropriate and ongoing participation in decision making. Additionally, the College should create and implement a corresponding formal structure for staff input and participation. The College should create and implement an evaluation process to examine the overall effectiveness of participatory governance policies and processes. (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Major Recommendation 1

The College has adopted new math and English course requirements for all certificate and degree programs. These requirements are unitary for all programs. The College should assess the effect of these new requirements on student access and success. Based on an assessment of the student learning outcomes for each program, the College should engage in a dialog about the appropriate levels of English and math to require for various programs. (Standard II.A.3)

A standardized general education pattern has likewise been established. To further opportunities for students to meet general education requirements at transfer institutions and to provide an opportunity for a greater breadth of understanding of the major areas of knowledge including humanities and fine arts, a dialog should occur to consider adding classes to the general education curriculum.” (Standard II.A.3.a)

It was evident that GCC’s Office of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness and Research (AIER) has an extensive array of research data and reports in order to support analysis of programs and services. In addressing this recommendation, the AIER examined longitudinal data in the area of student enrollment, grade distribution, and completion rates in developmental English and math courses. Although the focus of this recommendation was on new math and English courses, which were to be required for all certificate and degree programs, an unintended result of this recommendation was that the AIER study found students who were not successful in completing developmental courses were prevented from progressing to College-level courses. The report and data analysis increased dialog amongst faculty in all disciplines and resulted in three recommendations from the Council of Chairs:

1. The Council recommends that the general education requirements for all Certificate programs should be determined by each program, with input from the respective advisory committees.
2. The Council recommends the deletion of the general education policy limiting students to a certain number of credits unless English and math courses are completed.
3. The Council encourages the General Education Committee to include courses in the general education requirements that promote soft skills in their student learning outcomes, and to provide more choices for students (for example, under Social Sciences, PY120, SO130, PY100 OR PY125, instead of PY120 and SO130). In addition, the Council encourages the inclusion of a Humanities courses in the general education requirements. The College has reviewed the research data and made applicable recommendations for improvement.

The team found that GCC has sufficiently met the requirements identified in Recommendation 1.

Major Recommendation 2

“The College is considering a more formal organization for faculty participation in shared governance such as the initiation of a faculty senate. The College should finish its work on developing a formal system for faculty, staff, and student participation in the governance processes of the College. Such systems should provide clear lines of communication and contribute to timely decision making oriented toward the positive development of the institution.” (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3)

In its response, the College states that it has completed “full implementation” of the new Faculty Senate structure. Most of the response describes interactions with the faculty collective bargaining agreement in order to create this structure and to resolve initial College concerns regarding wording and the phrase “shared governance.” The Faculty Senate was created in fall 2006 and a new participatory governance article in the Board-Union contract was ratified in October 2008. No corresponding formal structure has been developed for staff participation in governance and there is no action plan to achieve this. In general, with additional time and participation by a greater range of faculty, the Faculty Senate should continue to grow as an integral part of governance to convey the academic and professional opinion of the faculty in a positive manner and to provide input prior to decisions being made. Student participation occurs using the Council on Postsecondary Student Affairs (COPSA). Staff has no governance structure of their own but participates at College Governance Council (CGC) and Board of Trustees (as do faculty and students).

The team found that GCC has sufficiently met the requirements identified in Recommendation 2.

Major Recommendation 3

“Working on the strength of its assessment infrastructure, the College should now fully undertake the process of developing student learning outcomes for courses, programs and the institution. As these student learning outcomes are developed, they should be communicated to students, the College community and the public.”

The College should be commended for the completion of all student learning outcomes for all its courses, certificates and programs. Additionally, adopting institutional learning outcomes and including them in the College Catalog 2011-2012 provides a mechanism for communicating these changes to the internal and external communities. The publication of a fourth edition of the *SLO and Curriculum Mapping Booklet* provides evidence of an iterative process of evaluation and assessment as identified in Standard II.

The team found that GCC has sufficiently met the requirements identified in Recommendation 3.

Major Recommendation 4

“The Board of Trustees is now fully empanelled and evidences a commitment to further the development of the College. Provisions should be made to provide training for the Board to assist them in fulfilling this commitment. After the Board adopts its recently revised manual, it should engage in a review of Board policies.”

Since the 2006 team visit, the Board of Trustees (BOT) has seen the appointment of two new members as a result of the election of Eddie Baza Calvo as the new governor in the elections of 2010, and the change in a student trustee resulting in a midyear election. The Board of Trustees became fully seated in January 2011 when the legislature confirmed the governor’s appointment and the student representative joined the Board. The self evaluation indicates that these new Board members received a Board orientation, tour of the campus and, in the case of the governor’s appointment, a required Government Ethics workshop.

In interviews conducted with six of the Board members, including two prior incumbents, one of whom was the Board chairperson, the two newest members, the staff advisory member and faculty union representative, it was clear that there were various forms of informal training and some limited formal workshops. This formal training was a trip to Washington, D.C. in February 2012 to the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) summit. Informal training occurs at BOT retreats, one-on-one discussions with Board members outside the Boardroom, emails and other electronic communication, and the Board of Trustees’ Membership Handbook. The student trustee indicated that he received an orientation from the College prior to his first Board meeting and received the written materials on the Board member’s responsibilities and the Board handbook. Additionally, the College states that the Board receives training through an allocation of \$25,000 annually. In reviewing the online documentation, current training was not reflected; however, travel forms submitted by the Board members validate the trip to Washington, D.C.

GCC Board policies are organized into four broad policy categories: general, financial, curriculum, and employee. The Board reviewed and approved Board Policies in 2006, soon after the team visit, with an adoption date of 2008 for the vast majority of the policies. Although the Board should be commended for its thorough review and modification/amendment of its policies, the team noted in some instances, they also included administrative procedures, thereby operationalizing the policies. This practice is prevalent throughout the adopted Board policies. Although Commission Standard IV as well as Eligibility Requirement 3, clearly outlines a separation of the Board’s role and administrative operation, it does not prohibit the practice of combining policies and procedures.

Further, Recommendation 4 went on to identify six areas of emphasis as it relates to the Annual Institutional Assessment Report (AIAR); these included:

- *communication and information dissemination;*
- *assessment as an inclusive process;*
- *curriculum as a dynamic product and process;*
- *diversity as a key factor in improvement;*
- *holistic approach to assessing student services; and*
- *assessment leadership and support.*

The College responded to each of these areas individually, providing documentation that they have addressed each area of concern.

Communication and Information Dissemination. In the area of communication, the College has re-instituted their College newsletter, the *Chachalani*, in electronic form, with the Communications and Promotions Office taking the lead. Publications containing the mission have been standardized and the College refined its mission, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in March 11, 2009, and was further revised and translated into Chamorro May 5, 2011. Additionally, the College, in conjunction with the University of Guam, hosts a television public service show on the PNC television affiliate twice a month entitled “A Higher Degree.”

Assessment as an Inclusive Process. By adopting a participatory governance process and the creation of a Faculty Senate, GCC has made substantial progress to be more inclusive. Students now sit on governance committees of the Faculty Senate subcommittees Committee on College Assessment, the Resources, Planning and Facilities (RPF) committee and the College Governing Council (CGC). The College has recently negotiated a faculty contract whereby full-time faculty, as part of their contractual load, are released from one class assignment so that they can participate in College governance committee work. Faculty members who chair accreditation standard committees are released from an additional class three semesters prior to the self evaluation due date to insure their participation in the process and to alleviate the increased workload. The Faculty Senate has the responsibility for oversight and ensuring faculty compliance with this policy.

Although faculty and student involvement in the governance process was evident, involvement by classified staff is still evolving. Even though classified staff participates on various Boards/committees, it is not as systemically implemented as when compared to the other participatory groups. As one staff member indicated, “If we attend meetings, when we come back, our work is still there; it is a burden because there is no release for us.” This is an ongoing issue, not unique to GCC; however, the College should recognize this and look for positive incentives to increase staff participation.

Curriculum as a Dynamic Product and Process. By addressing the two points above, the College feels that this demonstrates a dynamic process in that it encourages dialog, disseminates information to the internal and external constituencies and ties curriculum to the mission of the College. Also, by clearly identifying GCC’s Two-Year Assessment Cycle Schedule, which consists of four groups: Group A-Associates Degrees; Group B-Certificate Programs; Group C-Administrative and Student Services Units, and Group D-Special Program, with specific dates for deliverables, processes are in place to facilitate an ongoing system of continual improvement.

Diversity as a Key Factor in Improvement and Holistic Approach to Assessing Student Services. The College has taken seriously the recommendations regarding student involvement and diversity issues as it relates to a systematic collection and analysis of student data. In 2006 an institutional researcher was hired and the Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Office was renamed to add Research to the title, thus becoming the Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness and Research Office

(AIER). Additionally, an incentive program was developed to entice faculty with small Academic Vice President's Small Assessment Grant Award (AVP SAGA) grants to engage in research that should inform their pedagogy and lead to program and course improvement. The College feels that these initiatives are building capacity within the institution that supports assessment through data-driven decisions. The College further feels that the new *Banner SCT* system as well as the *TracDat* database system for documenting SLOs and assessment provides the structural design to facilitate an integrated approach to assessing student support services, while addressing the team's recommendation on holistic assessment.

Assessment Leadership and Support.

Evidence contained in the self evaluation and interviews during the visit show that the Board of Trustees continues to be supportive of the president and the College's efforts as it relates to student learning outcomes and assessment which should lead to program and course improvement and ultimately student success improvement.

The team found that GCC has sufficiently met the requirements identified in Recommendation 4.

ELGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. AUTHORITY

Guam Community College meets the minimum requirement and has the requisite authority.

2. MISSION

Guam Community College has an established mission statement that contains information as specified in the accreditation Eligibility Requirements. This statement was last revised in March 2009 and most recently re-authorized by the Board of Trustees in February 2011. A translation into the Chamorro language was adopted in May 2011.

3. GOVERNING BOARD

Guam Community College substantially meets the minimum requirements in that it has a fully constituted Board of Trustees consisting of appointed members of the public, faculty, staff and elected student representatives; however, there are Board Policies without the companion administrative procedures, which would operationalize and ensure compliance with the policies.

4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Guam Community College meets the minimum requirement in that it has an incumbent CEO who has extensive experience in community colleges having worked at the College's Business Office prior to accepting the position as president.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

Guam Community College has the administrative capacity to support the chief executive officer, and College programs and services.

6. OPERATING STATUS

Guam Community College is operational, with students actively enrolled in degree and certificate programs.

7. DEGREES

Guam Community College offers 17 certificate programs and 20 Associate Degree programs. Enrollment data indicates that a substantial proportion of the College's postsecondary students are enrolled in courses leading to a degree.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The College offers educational programs in a variety of locations, including on and off-campus, in satellite programs at Guam's public high schools, and on site at businesses as needed. These programs prepare students for entry-level employment in career and technical fields or transfer to four-year institutions of higher learning. Likewise, the College offers a variety of community service and special programs to prepare students for successful College experiences.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT

All Guam Community College degrees, certificates and courses are listed in the catalog and on the website. A faculty-led curriculum approval process is in place to monitor the quality of course and program guides as they are newly introduced or revised to meet current community and industry standards. At the College, each credit hour represents one hour per week in class and two hours outside of class devoted to preparation. Credit is granted in recognition of successful work in attaining student learning outcomes (SLOs) in specific courses. All course- and program-level SLOs are published in the catalog. SLOs at the course and program levels map to the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

10. STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT

A review of the current catalog (2011-2012) verifies that learning outcomes are established and published for each course and program offered by the College. Reports from the College's assessment database system, *TracDat*, demonstrate that the College is well along in the process of systematically assessing its outcomes, with many areas into their second assessment cycle. That assessment cycle is clearly documented, and results are published annually in the College's Annual Institutional Assessment Report (AIAR).

11. GENERAL EDUCATION

Guam Community College provides high quality general education opportunities for all its students in support of democratic principles and practices and for a sound economy to flourish. The College continually evaluates the general education curriculum in order to assure that all degrees and certificates granted by the College support this vision of general education and that it serves as a means to inspire service, opportunity, and responsibility in all its constituencies.

12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Board Policy 460 on Academic Freedom reminds faculty and students that the College supports an atmosphere of independence to examine and challenge ideas that brings about intellectual freedom ultimately leading to discovery and knowledge.

13. FACULTY.

Information on faculty is contained in the College catalog.

14. STUDENT SERVICES

The wide range of student services provided to each and every Guam Community College student is described in detail on pages 12 to 18 of the College catalog. These services are consistently aligned with the College mission. Likewise, these services support student learning and achievement for all students at the College.

15. ADMISSIONS

Consistent with the institutional mission, the College admission practices are described in the catalog on pages 20 to 22. With an open access policy, the College, as the only

community College on the island, admits all students who possess a high school diploma from an accredited institution, recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

Students at Guam Community College are well served by the efforts of the staff and leadership who provide assistance in an informative and supportive atmosphere through the LRC and an array of instructional support services housed on the campus and in the surrounding community and high schools.

17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The College has several sources of revenue to support student learning, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability. The government of Guam and tuition and fees are the primary sources. Budgeting is tied to planning and assessment.

18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The College has received ten years of unqualified opinions from independent auditors Deloitte & Touche, LLP. The College has been recognized as the most fiscally responsible entity in the government of Guam.

19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

The commitment to College-wide planning and evaluation is clearly demonstrated by the results of assessment and evaluation published in the Annual Institutional Assessment Report (AIAR). In addition, program reviews published in the most recent Academic Vice President's Small Assessment Grant Award (AVP SAGA) report (fall 2011) affirm the College's use of assessment and evaluation in the improvement of its programs. Robust use of the *TracDat* system integrates student learning with institutional planning.

20. PUBLIC INFORMATION

Information is published in paper, CD, and online versions of the Catalog and in the Schedule of Classes. A complete list of locations is included in the response to Standard II.B.2.

21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

The College publishes accreditation information in paper, CD, and online versions of the Catalog. The College appears to have an excellent working relationship with the Commission including correspondence and attendance at training sessions.

Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard IA – Mission

General Observations

The College has maintained the commitment to review its mission statement regularly. In addition to widely publishing the mission in various College materials, posters, and on its website, the College demonstrates the centrality of the mission to College operations through regular repetition of the mission at College meetings. The mission was revised in March 2009 following campus-wide dialog, and was re-approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2011. Most recently, the Board approved a translation of the mission statement into the Chamorro language in May 2011.

The College's current mission is clear and concise, and identifies the College's intended student population and broad educational purposes. As identified in the mission, the College's programs focus on career and technical education, and most majors show obvious ties to specific career goals. The mission also indicates that the College will provide "the highest quality education" in the region, which is evident in strong general education requirements, revised effective fall 2010, to better align with the College's institutional learning outcomes (ILO's).

Findings and Evidence

The programs offered by the College, as published in the current College catalog, support the purpose of career and technical workforce development, as defined in the mission, and align with the student population, as described in annual fact books and student demographic data. Institutional learning outcomes link to course and program outcomes, as published in the College catalog, and reflect the focus established in the mission. (I.A.1)

The College appears to have consulted with its key constituents to determine how distance education is congruent with its mission. Distance education may be inferred in the mission if this mode of delivery is used to enable the College to provide the "highest quality education" for its target audience; further, distance education classes offered in the Continuing Education area apply directly to the vocational student mentioned in the mission statement but do not interfere with face-to-face enrollment. (I.A) There have been broad-based College-wide discussions about expanding distance education offerings which led to the adoption of Board Policy (BP) 340: Distance Education Policy. (I.A.1, I.B.1)

The mission is reviewed regularly by the Board of Trustees, as evidenced by dates published in its Board Policy 100, "Mission Statement." These dates indicate a pattern of regular review, amendment, and adoption over a number of years. (I.A.2, I.A.3) The most recent approval of the mission statement was recommended by the College Governing Council. However, while BP 100 indicates that review will occur annually, there is no evidence that the mission was reviewed in 2010. In addition to publication in the College catalog and on the College's website, the mission is highlighted across campus through use of posters; it is also commonly recited at the beginning of committee and trustee meetings. (I.A.2)

Institutional planning is closely tied to the mission through use of the *TracDat* application, which identifies links between course and program learning outcomes to College goals, institutional learning outcomes, and program review, as well as to the Institutional Strategic Master Plan. Use of *TracDat* has centralized the collection of data and assessment results for planning. (I.A.4)

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. Learning programs and services, including distance education, are aligned with the mission, character, and student population. The mission statement is approved by the governing Board and published. The institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary. The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making processes are in place for the mission statement to guide these efforts.

Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard IB – Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

As an institution, the College has embraced student learning outcomes and assessment; SLOs are published in the current College catalog for the institution and for all courses and programs. An assessment plan is in place to ensure full compliance with the need to assess learning; the assessment plan includes both academic programs and administrative and student services. The Office of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness and Research (AIER) has taken a leadership role in making data widely available, through regular publication of the College fact book and an annual Institutional Assessment Report.

Distance education is in its infancy at the College, with only three sections offered in the 2011-12 catalog. The College plans to use the same processes for the planning, approval, evaluation, and review of courses offered in the distance education mode. Similarly, fiscal, technical and human resources required for teaching distance education learning programs are identified, integrated, and assessed within the same planning processes. The Office of Assessment Institutional Effectiveness and Research plans to provide student admission, retention, assessment and satisfaction data related to distance education using the same procedures as in face-to-face courses and programs.

Findings and Evidence

Ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialog about student learning and institutional processes is evident in the many comprehensive committee minutes available on the College's accreditation website. Through forums such as town hall style meetings with students and others, the College president ensures that all constituents have an opportunity to be a part of that dialog. (I.B.1, I.B.4) In addition, reflection on the assessment of courses and programs is available to all College constituencies through *TracDat*; system users can access reports on the development and assessment of outcomes for courses, programs, and services, including the results of those assessments and planned improvements. (I.B.1, I.B.5)

The College's Institutional Strategic Master Plan for 2008-14 sets goals for the College that are consistent with its mission, including measurable tasks that will enable the College to meet those goals. (I.B.2) Strategic goals are linked to course and program outcomes through the *TracDat* system, where the results of outcomes assessment can be used to assess institutional progress towards its goals. (I.B.3) The Institutional Strategic Master Plan includes a two-year assessment planning cycle, which guides all departments and programs in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation. (I.B.3, I.B.4) Data collected in this system is used to assess how well students achieve expected learning outcomes and effectiveness of programs and services; the results of these assessments are used to improve programs and services, and those changes are published through an annual assessment report. (I.B.3, I.B.4, IB5) Further, per the College's Institutional Strategic Master Plan, funding is clearly tied to assessment; both faculty and administration agree that the statement reflects the actual process of resource allocation. (I.B.4)

Distance education (DE) classes were pioneered at the College by faculty in the Education department who received a grant to do so. The ongoing fiscal and human resources for DE have not been fully identified or integrated into the College's overall planning process. Board Policy 340: Distance Education Policy, was approved to support this work; the policy states that evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and evidence of institutional and program performance in distance education classes feed into the balance of the College's strategic planning and assessment process. (1.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5) However, the Institutional Self Evaluation Report notes a failed attempt to incorporate the evaluation of DE classes with the new tool used for face-to-face courses. The College does not separate DE data for success and retention.

Technical resources required for distance education are discussed in the Information Technology Strategic Plan, which reports that GCC has adequate broadband for the current online courses, but expresses the need for a thorough assessment of technical resources if DE offerings are to grow. The self evaluation update reports a new program specialist was assigned in January 2012 to handle a program of emergent technology training that includes distance education. (I.B.4) Continuing Education distance education classes target a broader group of students including career track training, applied computer skills, workplace soft skills, leadership, and others. These courses are offered through commercial vendors who are reputed for the quality and content of the courses. GCC has selected four vendors all of which are held in high regard. There is no evidence that the College has monitored the success of these students, or that data collected from the vendors has been used to affect future plans by assessing the quality of the content of these courses. Currently there are fewer than 15 students participating in online Continuing Education courses.

Another element of the annual assessment report is an evaluation of the assessment process, both on a course and program level and on an institutional level. Evaluations are reviewed on an annual basis to verify the effectiveness of the assessment process in improving programs and services. (I.B.6, I.B.7)

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. Ongoing, self-reflective dialog is central to the College's decision-making processes, especially as it relates to learning outcomes. The College's goals are widely published, with measurable objectives to help the College understand the extent to which those goals are met. The College Institutional Strategic Master Plan establishes an ongoing cycle of assessment and evaluation; use of the *TracDat* system provides opportunities for broad-based input. The team found that the College's process for the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, certificate, and degree levels is on-going, promotes widespread dialog on the results of the assessments, and uses assessment results to improve programs and institutional processes.

Recommendation

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop a plan for distance education, including continuing education offered through distance education, and implement appropriate support services and procedures to deliver instruction online. (I.A.1, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.7, II, B.3.a, II.C.1.c, III.C.)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services Standard IIA – Instructional Programs

General Observations

The College offers a variety of instructional programs that reflect the mission of the College. With a strong emphasis in Career Technical Education, the College offers 17 certificate programs and 20 associate degree programs.

Organizationally the Curriculum Committee merged with the General Education Committee to constitute the Learning Outcomes Committee (LOC). The charge of the LOC as outlined in the Board-Union Agreement is to ensure and regulate “curriculum that reflects the mission of the College and that is academically sound, comprehensive, and responsive to the evolving needs of the community.”

To ensure integrity across the curriculum, the program and course approval process involves approval at various levels in the organization. The office of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness and Research (AIER) and the Committee on College Assessment (CCA) ensure a systematic assessment process requiring that program and course SLOs relate to institutional and departmental goals.

In fall 2009 the College changed the English and math requirements for certificates so that individual programs can establish their own needs based on industry and advisory committee input. In order to set the stage for expansion of its distance education program, the Board of Trustees approved Board Policy 340 in July 2010. In fall 2010, as a direct response to the 2006 Evaluation Report, the College implemented revised General Education Requirements for associate degrees with the addition of a Humanities and Fine Arts section, as well as increased course options.

Findings and Evidence

The College ensures that all its offerings, regardless of delivery mode, fit its stated mission of the institution through its planning process. The College relies on the office of AIER to provide research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving student learning outcomes. This assessment rollout process began in 2004 with academic programs. In 2008 the College added assessment of course SLOs. By 2012 department plans for assessing all programs and courses were in place. (II.A.1)

The College has been active in identifying student learning outcomes since 2001. In 2008 SLOs were in place for 18 percent of the courses. This increased to nearly 100 percent in spring 2010 and fully 100 percent in fall 2011. The Committee on College Assessment (CCA) reviews and rates program- and course-level SLO assessment plans and provides feedback to faculty regarding curricular changes to be made. A consolidated feedback sheet (CFS) is used to inform assessment authors if plans need to be modified to ensure that SLOs are related to the mission. Both face-to-face and online classes have SLOs which are assessed within the time frame described within their program review process. (II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c)

The College ensures the integrity of its programs as evidenced by the list of signatories on the Course Approval Form Cover Sheet. The College catalog lists the SLOs for 100 percent of the instructional programs. The Curriculum Mapping Booklet provides evidence that course SLOs are mapped to programs. The SLO mapping process connects course level SLOs to program SLOs and institutional learning outcomes. From the beginning of the process to develop SLOs, the process has been faculty driven. Uniquely, the College has directly involved students in understanding the SLO process by creating ways to promote the importance of SLOs to students and the community (the SLO jingle, song, and music video contests carried out over the last year.) (II.A.1.c)

Each semester the department chairs and appropriate administrators review faculty syllabi to ensure that SLOs are properly identified in the course guides. Administrators also evaluate faculty on whether they provide a current syllabi to students at the start of the term. (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c)

The College uses its curriculum development and approval process to assure the quality and improvement of courses and programs. The LOC process involves faculty peer review of curriculum. Reviewers make recommendations for changes or forward the new curriculum to the committee for approval. Currency of curriculum is a faculty duty, and accountability is linked to faculty evaluation and pay increase, which provides an added incentive to maintain current curriculum. (II.A.2, II.A.2.a)

The College requires all regular semester, special project, or Continuing Education credited distance education courses and programs to be approved through the Curriculum Approval Substantive Change Process. That process determines whether the course is at the collegiate or pre-collegiate level. As a result, all courses include multiple ways of assessing student learning. To assure that this is being done, course syllabi for all courses must be submitted to the respective dean for review. A subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee developed a Distance Education Policy for online courses. Using the College's participatory governance process, students, faculty, staff and administrators provided feedback to the policy in a variety of forums. An important provision in the policy is to ensure that distance education courses contain the same rigor as traditional courses. In order to ensure consistency and uniformity in course delivery and eventual assessment of these courses, all online courses use the same course management system. Advisory committees make recommendations to their respective departments regarding SLOs and student success. Career and technical education advisory committees are expected to meet twice a year. All but one program advisory committee met at least once in the past year. (II.A.2.b, II.A.2.d)

Student learning outcomes have been established for all of the College's courses and programs. They are regularly assessed on a two-year cycle and the results of those assessments are used to make changes to improve student learning. These changes are then assessed to determine if the changes affected student performance. The College is now in its second cycle of this assessment process. (II.A.2.c, II.A.2.g)

Evaluation of all credit courses, regardless of delivery mode, includes faculty self-evaluation, evaluation of online instruction by students, student retention, student satisfaction and evaluation of the faculty member by the appropriate supervisor. There is no faculty peer review process. The College has a very small non-credit, workshop, or training sessions program and does not have a consistent process to ensure that these types of classes are evaluated for content and effectiveness. In December of 2008 the Office of Civil Rights cited the College for failure to provide academic adjustments and auxiliary aids to students with disabilities. As of fall 2011, the College has substantially complied with all terms of a resolution agreement. (II.A.2.d)

The most recent AIER report contains a section called “closing the loop” which explains how assessment data feeds back into course and program improvements, informing program review, planning, and budgeting; improving teaching and learning; promoting continuous improvement; strengthening programs; promoting collegiality; and enhancing retention and graduation rates. Items must be accounted for in planning documents as a condition for allocating resources to support instruction. The office of AIER produces reports to help with data analysis and interpretation for understanding by the College community. There is an awareness by the department chairs that there needs to be consistency among adjunct and full-time faculty when teaching different sections of the same course. (II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f)

As a result of new federal regulations, the Academic Vice President asked the LOC to address labs and credit hours. Specifically, the LOC was tasked with distinguishing lab hours. A subcommittee of the LOC was formed to review and analyze direct instruction versus facilitated instruction in the lab environment, and total hours and credit hours in each lab course. After completing this task, the subcommittee reported to the LOC. In the spirit of participatory governance, the report was forwarded to the Faculty Senate. After significant campus-wide dialog, the Faculty Senate voted to approve the proposal during the team visit. As a result of this process, the Faculty Senate has called for further dialog between faculty and the LOC to provide standards for creating and awarding course credit. (II.A.2.h)

The College ensures that achievement of stated program learning outcomes are the basis for awarding degrees and certificates. Program SLOs are listed in the curriculum guide and also mapped to ILOs. In addition, capstone courses, as well as practicum or internship experiences serve as indicators that students are making progress toward completion. (II.A.2.i)

The College recently revised the general education (GE) requirements for the associate degree programs to include Humanities and Fine Arts so that the College covers the traditional areas of knowledge in general education. During interviews with faculty, a team member found that faculty generally support this change, which has enriched the general education experience for students. The College assessed its mathematics and English general education requirements. Changes were made as a result of those assessments. The College should now assess the effect of most recent changes. The LOC has engaged in dialog to develop a process for deleting or including courses under the new GE requirements. There are no GE courses offered online. (II.A.3)

Student learning outcomes for general education courses, which require students to understand the basic content and methodology in the major areas of knowledge, are determined within the course approval process. Upon completion of GE requirements, students are able to communicate orally and in writing, interpret information digitally and non-digitally, make quantitative and scientific decisions, and seek and grasp information. Student learning outcomes concerning ethics and effective citizenship are determined by departments and are evaluated by the LOC. (II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)

The LOC assures that all degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. With respect to career and technical programs, the College acquires reliable information about its students' ability to meet employment competencies requirements through surveys of graduates to assess readiness and through reports from advisory committees. Each semester faculty department chairs and associate deans review syllabi to verify that SLOs have been listed accurately per the course guide. Also, providing each student with a syllabus is part of the faculty evaluation process. (II.A.5, II.A.6)

The College has clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies, which facilitate student transfer to the University of Guam. When accepting transfer credits from other institutions the Registrar's Office certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. The College assures that information about its distance education programs is clear and accurate by intentionally identifying online courses as such in the annually published College catalog and in the class schedule published every semester. Students enrolled in online courses receive information about the institution's degrees and certificates online. Regardless of the delivery mode, students receive a course syllabus that includes student learning outcomes and individual sections of courses adhere to the course objectives/learning outcomes. The College only accepts transfer of credit from other distance education programs if the school is recognized by either the Distance Education Training Council or by the accrediting body for the region in which it is physically located. (II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.A.6.c)

The College has a process it uses when programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed so students can complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption. The College adds instructional programs in response to input from industry and advisory committees and has a process for program discontinuance as well as a process for reconstituting previously archived programs as a result of a resurgence of need. (II.A.6.b)

Catalogs, statements, and publications, whether in print or electronic formats, published by the College are clear, accurate, and consistent. The College regularly reviews its institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services. (II.A.6.c)

There is a College-wide policy that addresses academic honesty. Faculty and students are prohibited from using illegally copyrighted materials. Expectations on student academic honesty are published in the catalog and in the Student Handbook. Faculty have procedures

for the reporting of ethics violations. Faculty have rights and responsibilities regarding academic freedom. Board Policy 460 on Academic Freedom states that the “faculty member is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results,” but fails to stipulate that academic freedom extends to teaching and learning in the classroom environment. In the case of online students, there are specific mechanisms used to verify students enrolled in the College’s online classes. These mechanisms include a secure login and password and students presenting photo identification during the orientation procedure. Only those enrolled students receive the enrollment key or password to enter the course. Students enrolled must agree, in writing, to be solely responsible for the completion of the course. (II.A.7.b)

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. The College offers high-quality instructional programs that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional credit programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The assessment of non-credit course offerings is necessary for complete compliance with this Standard.

Recommendation

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop a process for systematically evaluating non-credit courses, workshops, and training sessions for content and effectiveness, in alignment with the assessment process that is in place for credit courses. (II.A.2)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIB – Student Support Services

General Observations

To support the learning and success of its students, Guam Community College (GCC), offers a comprehensive array of student services that are delivered through various programs and departments on campus. Student Services provides assistance to students, including those with special needs, with admissions and registration, placement testing, orientation, academic advising, personal and career counseling, financial aid, transfer assistance, project AIM (TRIO), health screening, bookstore, cultural and diversity opportunities, student activities, and other opportunities that develop student leadership potential. The primary goal of all programs and services is accessibility and responsiveness to a diverse student body to include: different language groups, diverse cultures, ethnicities, academic readiness, educational goals, socio-economic status, disabilities, gender, College preparedness, and learning styles in accordance with the College's mission statement. Most of the services are located in the new Student Center building. Assessment for course placement occurs on campus for math and English. (IIB.3.a)

Each program and service has an identified lead person for the purpose of coordinating a comprehensive group of quality services in a clear and consistent manner. The majority of student services report to the Dean of Technology and Student Services.

The College publishes a schedule of classes and College catalog that is accurate and current. Information includes requirements for admission, major policies affecting students, and locations or publications where other policies may be found. (II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d) The catalog is published annually and is available online. Free catalog CDs are available at the Admissions and Registration office. The class schedule is available in both print and web format. The printed schedule of classes contains course descriptions that are identical to those found in the catalog. Revisions are made when approved and are electronically posted online.

The College maintains copies of student records in the Registrar's office located in the Student Services and Administration Building. There is an expressed concern about the security of student records and personnel files. The team found evidence that the College is currently working toward a redundant network system for eventual permanent storage of all records. Records can only be accessed by College personnel with appropriate clearances and authorization for access based on criteria that is consistent with FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) regulations.

The College catalog outlines the educational and privacy rights of students, which adhere to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. GCC faculty and staff are provided information about FERPA and the College's established procedures for accessing and releasing student records.

In compliance with U.S. Department of Education Regulations, GCC has a Distance Education Policy. The policy originated from a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee and was distributed for comments to students, faculty, staff, and administrators. On July 10, 2010 it was approved by the Board of Trustees as Policy-340. The policy addresses the need for basic student support services such as advising, counseling, computer access, tutoring and financial aid. The policy states that faculty should have ongoing pedagogy support to develop and improve teaching skills and methods for DE courses. It further states that technology support should be provided including training on the use of DE tools, applications and systems. The policy recognizes the need for DE assessment strategies. It specifically says AIER should evaluate the DE courses through an institutionally standardized evaluation procedure which includes faculty self-evaluation, evaluation of online instruction by students, student retention, student satisfaction and evaluation of faculty member by the appropriate supervisor. Policy-340 was not operationalized in either a faculty manual or a DE strategic plan.

The College is committed to providing students with an environment that supports personal and civic responsibility through their active participation in student governance, campus clubs, student activities, and College committees. Currently there are 16 registered student clubs.

Findings and Evidence

Based on reviewing GCC catalog, class schedule, website and other College publications and brochures, interviewing students, and evidence provided by faculty and staff, the team confirmed that the College offers its students a wide array of student services that respond to diverse needs and support the College's mission. In addition, the College has a highly dedicated group of faculty and staff who deliver supportive services to students.

College wide forums, department meetings, regularly scheduled College committee meetings, student government meetings, and College council meetings have provided opportunities for on-going dialogs about student access, progress, learning, and success. The team found evidence that the College's program review framework for instructional programs, student support services, and administrative services provides a solid foundation for critical dialog on the adequacy, responsiveness, and effectiveness of student support programs and processes by collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. The team found a number of programmatic and procedural changes and improvements that have resulted from on-going research, data analyses, and program reviews. (II.B.1)

The team found evidence that the institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its students and provides services that address those needs. The College evaluates information from a variety of sources such as external scans surveys, assessment instruments, College research, student focus groups, and program review to understand the support needs of students and to provide the basis for designing new programs and/or revamping existing programs. The allocation of significant financial resources to build the new Student Services building, which houses all student support services, is evidence of the College's commitment to more effectively serving the support needs of students. The new Student Services building consolidated most student service support programs in a central location to improve access

for students. Since many students participate in more than one support service, the close proximity of all support services in the central location has been well received.

The team was impressed with the counseling staff's ability and willingness to respond to the counseling and advising needs of GCC students. The College's counseling staff members provide students with information related to admission procedures, assessment testing, academic advising, career counseling, financial aid, transfer, job placement, and community outreach. Counselors and full time faculty provide academic advising for all new students, including students with special needs, and also reach out to continuing students.

Advising, counseling, computer access, tutoring and financial aid are all well documented on the College website. Students can register and pay fees remotely through the Internet. There is a form page that includes downloadable versions of most forms students need. At this time, however, there is no e-advising, e-counseling, or e-tutoring available. Nor can students purchase their text books online. DE faculties have gone through the stipulated training to qualify for an online teaching. The College uses the Moodle as the delivery platform. The College offered at least one Professional Development seminar, "Bits & Bytes of ON-LINE Teaching from Moodle Teachers" in 2009, but ongoing training is initiated by the DE faculty themselves. The Moodle platform provider offers instruction and tutorials on managing a Moodle site or class. Moodle also has faculty forums that provide collegial support and professional exchanges. The ISER update of the Self Evaluation Reports that a program specialist was hired January 2012 to coordinate emergent technologies training including those for DE faculty. The IT infrastructure is able to accommodate the current low load of DE courses (three sections spring 2012). They are aware that if this area grows, a thorough assessment of bandwidth and other technical requirements will be needed.

There is no evidence that AIER has done any specific data collecting on DE courses or students although they are well aware that it is needed. The new faculty evaluation procedure does not include coverage of DE delivery nor does the College provide technical tools for doing so. The College is aware of this deficiency. The Distance Education Policy states that the DE courses should be of the same rigor and quality as the face-to-face courses. Courses currently taught in the distance mode include syllabi that show an equal rigor to those taught face-to-face. SLOs are included and so too are rubrics for assessment. There is, however, no formal process through the Learning Outcomes Committee to ensure quality and consistency in the Distance Education classes. In compliance with U.S. Department of Education Regulations students in all cases are verified with an ID and password.

The College catalog does not separately show online courses or services for DE students. Nor is "Distance Education," "online classes" or any other identifying phrase listed in the index or table of context. No DE terms are defined in Appendix F: Academic Definitions. (II.B2)

There is no DE strategic plan. The resolved DE manual in the Distance Education Policy has not been developed. Which classes get delivered in this mode is largely decided by individual faculty and departments. There does not appear to be a broad campus discussion on or interest in DE.

Continuing Education offers many classes and certificates in the distance mode. In all cases this training is provided by outside vendors. They include: *ed2go* (including classes in but not

limited to Accounting, Business, Computer, Grant Writing, and Test Prep), 650+ (including certificates and courses in but not limited to, Technical Support Training, Technical Writing, and Human Resource Management), *Gatlin* (including classes in but not limited to, Allied Health, Computer-Internet, Technical and Construction industries), and *UGotClass* (computer and technical “Skills for the 21st Century”). All four vendors used are held in high regard for the types of non-credit courses they provide. Technical help is provided by the platform vendor, but at this time the College does not support, assess, or monitor the Continuing Education courses. As with credit-based online courses, the MIS department has expressed concern that the bandwidth may not support continued growth in DE and that there needs to be a thorough assessment of the College’s technical infrastructure. At this time there are less than fifteen students taking Continuing Education online courses. (2.B.3.a)

Student Support Services does a good job in addressing issues of diversity and in promoting awareness and appreciation for the many different cultures represented on campus. With the support and guidance of full time faculty advisors, student clubs and student government are promoting a greater awareness and appreciation for different cultures. Workshops, field trips, presentations, social events, and other diversity related activities help with developing awareness and sensitivity of the different cultures represented on campus and in the community. (II.B.3.c)

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. The College has a solid Distance Education Board policy, and many web-based documents, but does not have an overall campus supported strategic plan for Distance Education. Also missing are e-based services in advising, counseling, tutoring, and information literacy. There is no effective means to assess DE faculty, and little or no separate data is collected on DE students.

Recommendation

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop a plan for distance education, including continuing education offered through distance education, and implement appropriate support services and procedures to deliver instruction online. (I.A.1, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.7, II, B.3.a, II.C.1.c, IIIC.)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIC – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

Students at Guam Community College are well served by the efforts of the staff and leadership who provide assistance in an informative and supportive atmosphere. This positive and welcoming environment is conducive to creating an engaged student population and a collaborative work setting for faculty and staff. The new 2-story LRC is a 22,000 square foot facility built in 2010, available for use by spring 2011. The LRC is located on the northwestern quadrant of the campus next to the Allied Health Building. It can accommodate 215 users, up by 80 users from the old facility. The new facility houses a number of conference rooms and two computer labs. The facility has 58 computer stations, both Mac and PC. The collection consists of 20,000 titles including books, periodicals, DVDs and approximately 1,000 videos. The LRC has requested an operating budget of \$37,461, of which \$10,700 is designated for contractual services for subscriptions and system security; \$8,500 for supplies and materials; \$18,261 for equipment. The LRC is open Monday/Tuesday 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.; Wednesday/Thursday 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; Friday 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; and a new timeslot on Saturday 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

The full-time staff consists of two librarians, one of whom is an assistant professor, the other an associate professor; one library technician supervisor and three library technicians. According to the self evaluation, the LRC houses career information to assist students in making decisions about their future role in the workforce. The College is host to a number of grants that support student learning in a variety of ways. Additionally, the College is in compliance with U.S. Department of Education regulations, reflected in the Distance Education Policy, which originated from a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee and was approved by the Board of Trustees as Policy-340 in 2010. The document acknowledges the need to provide distant education students with online library services including access to periodicals and the library catalog. (II.C.1.c)

Findings and Evidence

The College is fortunate in that so many of its facilities are either recently developed or coming on-line in the next few years, providing GCC students with a number of learning support services in support of its instructional programs. A tour of the LRC, and a number of instructional buildings provided evidence of tutoring labs, student study areas, and programs dedicated to support the success of GCC students. Federal grants provide, for example, TRIO support services through Project AIM and tutoring throughout the island through the College Access Challenge Grant Program. The Health Center is staffed by two full-time nurses and a support staff that is dedicated to fostering a climate of wellness for all students enrolled at the College and has the potential to support the instructional program through the employment of work-study students, two of which are currently applicants to the College's nursing program.

The LRC appears to have a sufficient collection to support the diverse needs of its student learners. There appears to be an informal process for seeking the input of faculty to identify

additions to the collection, though the evaluation of the existing resources rests primarily with the librarians. At least one survey revealed that instructional faculty do not think there are sufficient resources regarding current trends and industry practices to support the instructional programs, despite efforts on the part of the librarian to seek that input from faculty by way of email and informal dialog. As a result of interviews with faculty it was noted that there is a strong interest to bridge communication between program development and the acquisition of resources to support the instructional programs through the amendment of course guides for new and revised curriculum. The annual budget request process, which is directly tied to performance indicators and proposed outcomes, provides the LRC staff and administrators an opportunity to request resources to support operations; however, it was noted that resources for newly enacted programs are borne out of the existing library resources, the costs for which can significantly affect the ongoing maintenance and replacement of existing resources. (II.C.1.a)

The College identifies a Reference and Bibliographic Instruction Librarian who provides training to faculty on an as-requested basis which according to the self evaluation totaled 20 presentations in 2009-2010. There are no instructional courses, workshop schedules, or research guides to help students develop information competency skills, despite an institutional learning outcome that would be supported by this: ability to access, assimilate and use information ethically and legally. Evidence provided in response to the question of how students are provided other forms of information on techniques to conduct research and become critical users of information was limited to two handouts (GCC Library Quick Facts and Using the EBSCO Electronic Database) which were kept behind the circulation desk and available to students upon request. (II.C.1.b)

The hours of the LRC were recently expanded to respond to student input. Through regularly administered surveys, students requested evening and weekend hours. Access is provided to students with disabilities as needed, which includes closed captioned media, an adjustable study carrel, large display monitors, and specialized software for magnifying text. Students have access to an open computer lab and tutoring is provided in accounting at the LRC and for other disciplines throughout the campus. In total there are nearly 60 labs, inclusive of high school locations, that provide students access to computers. The iLibrary provides access to all the digital and online services of the library including EBSCO databases and Knowledge Portal which, among other things, provides students with Pathfinders, a repository of book and electronic resources in support of each academic area at the College. The tutoring support provided through the College Access Challenge Grant provides further evidence that the College is committed to serving students regardless of location. A Reserves section houses a collection of books on Micronesian history, but is rarely used by faculty to reserve textbooks for students unable to purchase their own textbook. Although students can go through the library staff to request books from the public library and the University of Guam Library, due to a reduction in public libraries across the island, and limited access to the library at the University of Guam, the LRC serves as the sole point of access for many Guam residents for computer access and research to support instruction for its students. The opportunities to develop collaborations with these and other entities should be explored to strengthen the academic support needs of GCC students and faculty and position this

wonderful facility to serve as the hub of information literacy for the citizens of Guam. (II.C.1.c)

It was clearly evident that the College takes pride in its facilities; and maintenance of the LRC and other areas appears to be sufficient with noted comments from team members about the cleanliness of the grounds and buildings. While security in the LRC is limited to gated entrances, with no security cameras or motion detectors in place, personnel did not report concern about theft or vandalism of equipment, books or personal property. Inventory control in its current form appears to be sufficient. Log-on procedures appear to be consistent with industry security standards and the College is exploring remote password recovery options so that students do not have to be on campus to have their password reset. The maintenance of the computers, printers, hardware, software, and the network falls under the purview of MIS and is part of a regular review cycle. Book and material maintenance is managed by the librarian and processed by the technicians, while replacement of items removed from circulation rests primarily with the librarian who reviews the collection annually and sends discards to Materials Management. (II.C.1.d)

The LRC is regularly reviewed as part of the two-year assessment cycle. Personnel are very clear on the importance of data collection and the acquisition of resources to support service delivery. (II.C.2)

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. The information needs of students are changing rapidly. As the amount of information increases, there is a pressing need to provide students and College employees with the skills to navigate through and critically evaluate its use. Library services can serve as the leader in building information competency at the College and throughout the region. Through the LRC and a number of instructional support services, GCC provides its students with a learning environment that supports the institution's mission through intellectual, aesthetic and cultural activities.

Going forward, the LRC should strengthen their efforts in the integration of their services with the instructional program and in the curriculum development process. The LRC staff and faculty need to take an active role in assisting the College in the intentional development of information competency skills instruction. Finally, as the collection grows, attention needs to be given to the security of the facility as well as to the materials and equipment therein.

Standard III – Resources

Standard IIIA – Human Resources

General Observations

The College has a systematic and organized human resources policies and procedures. The self evaluation cites and documents policies outlining practices and documents outlining eligibility for employment, systematic evaluations, ethical professional conduct, equitable treatment of all personnel, systematic evaluations and diversity in hiring of personnel. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning through its planning, performance budgeting, assessment process and program review. The Board of Trustees recognizes the importance of continued growth and retention of employees through support of professional development funding. The self evaluation has four actionable improvement plans for the human resources area that relate to changing processes.

Findings and Evidence

The human resources office is responsible for determining the eligibility of employment of all applicants including determining acceptable qualifying experience and academic credentials. All job announcements are publicly posted in Guam newspapers, through the College website and in professional publications when appropriate. The hiring eligibility criteria for staff positions are established by the Government of Guam's merit system. Hiring criteria for faculty is based upon the Faculty Classification Procedures established in Article XI of the collective bargaining agreement. The human resources staff initially screens the applications to determine if the applicant meets the stated eligibility criteria then the applicant's packet is referred to an odd numbered interview committee. The human resources staff is required to determine if the credentials claimed are acceptable to WASC and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). Degrees and transcripts from non-U.S. institutions are evaluated by the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services. The committee makes recommendation to the president for final review and selection. (III.A.1, III.A.1a.)

It does not appear that the College advertises specifically for personnel with expertise and experience in distance education. Thus, the College doesn't seem to look for candidates with distance education experience in the recruitment of new faculty. Distance education faculty are evaluated in the following way: faculty self-evaluation, online student evaluation of instruction, student retention, student satisfaction and supervisor evaluation. These procedures are similar to how on-campus faculty are evaluated. Staff development emphasizes pedagogy. (III.A.1.a, III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c)

By Board Policy, in addition to the ethical standards applied to faculty who teach in a face-to-face environment, faculty who teach online courses are expected to comply with specific professional ethical standards:

1. Adherence to the U.S. Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), which protects the privacy of all faculty and students enrolled in distance education courses.

2. Distance education faculty members must deliver accurate and current information.
3. Faculty shall not include in the content or delivery of a course any information which he or she knows to constitute libel, invasion of privacy, of copyright infringement or other literary rights, or otherwise violate the legal rights of others.
4. Instructors must demonstrate how student work is monitored to assure integrity.
(III.A.1.d)

The College recognizes that in order to expand its online offerings it will have to provide professional development opportunities to empower the faculty in the design and delivery of online courses and the development and production of online materials. (III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)

The self evaluation describes three distinct evaluation processes for academic administrators, faculty, and staff. The full-time faculty are evaluated based upon the guidelines established in Article X – Performance Appraisal of the GCCFU/BOT Agreement. Adjunct faculty evaluation is based upon formal and informal classroom observation by the adjunct associate dean. The evaluation process for administrators and staff is based upon the performance evaluation instrument where effective execution of duties and responsibilities are listed on the job description for the position, which is aligned with the College’s mission, vision, policies and procedures. Administrators and staff are evaluated by their respective supervisors and faculty are evaluated by their respective deans.

A new evaluation process has been instituted for academic administrators effective January 2012, patterned after a pay-for-performance model. The evaluation process for staff and administrators utilizes a formal instrument which covers specific performance factors such as quality, productivity and reliability to assess areas of performance and effectiveness. The process has an established time table depending on length of service and pay step.

The faculty job specifications identify duties and responsibilities unique to full-time faculty to include expectations of performance. The self evaluation details the evaluation process for adjunct faculty and for full-time faculty, the evaluation is formalized in the collective bargaining agreement.

While the College self evaluation describes all evaluation processes as designed to encourage improvement by giving faculty, staff, and administrators meaningful feedback on the established criteria of positions they hold, there is lack of evidence to link evaluations to improved job performance. (III.A.1.b)

The self evaluation describes the process in which faculty are observed in the classroom to see if they use a sufficient number and variety of methods to assess learning and whether the assessments mirror the goals that are stated in the learning outcomes and classroom activities. The descriptive summary further says as part of the classroom observation process, formal observation reports and discussions are provided to faculty members to make appropriate adjustments and improvements in their teaching methods. There is no identification in the descriptive summary on the role of academic support personnel or student services personnel who may also be responsible for student progress toward achieving student learning

outcomes. Further there is no indication how student learning outcomes are a component of faculty and staff evaluations. (III.A.1.c.)

The College had relied on Government of Guam policies and procedures to guide the code of conduct of employees in the past. Those policies and procedures have been deemed both outdated and obsolete. The Professional Ethics Committee of the Faculty Senate created a new Code of Ethics Policy. The new policy was adopted by the Board of Trustees on March 6, 2008. The Board of Trustees created its own Code of Trustees Ethics and Conduct Policy. (III.A.1.d)

The College reports a total of 238 full-time employees in the fall of 2010. Forty-seven percent (112) were faculty, 43 percent (103) were staff and 10 percent (23) were administrators; adjunct faculty number 74. Sixty percent of the faculty are full time and 40 percent are adjunct. The faculty teach both in secondary and postsecondary programs. The self evaluation indicates the College has encountered difficulty hiring instructors in the professional and technical fields, specifically teaching positions in nursing and carpentry. The College continuously evaluates the effectiveness of the number and organization of its faculty, administrators and staff to support its programs and services via its institutional assessment process and program review. The hiring of faculty, administrators, and staff continues to be in direct response to program review and the continuous growth in enrollment. (III.A.2)

The College has developed a wide range of policies, rules and procedures which provide a clear set of guidelines for the fair and impartial treatment of faculty, administrators and staff. Many of the policies are set forth in collective bargaining agreements and the College's personnel rules and regulations for staff and administrators. The policies ensure fair treatment of employees in disciplinary action, grievance, performance evaluation, advancement in rank/promotion and leave policies. The College systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are reviewed and approved by the Board. The College community is provided the opportunity for comment and feedback in print and electronic formats. (III.A.3)

The College is committed to comply with all Guam and federal statutes, rules and regulations which prohibit discrimination. The College conducts EEO (Equal Employment Opportunity) training for all its employees on an annual basis. The College assesses its employment record on equity and diversity on a regular basis and submits its report to governing agencies such as the Guam Department of Administration.

The College fills vacancies from the best qualified candidates without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, sex, age, medical condition, mental disability, physical disability, marital status, sexual orientation or veteran status. The panel that interviews job candidates includes a certified EEO representative to ensure that the interview process is conducted in a non-discriminatory manner. (III.A.3.a)

The human resource office of the College ensures that all personnel records are kept confidential and locked in a secure environment. Only authorized personnel have access to

the personnel records. All employees have the right to review their employee record. An authorized staff member of the human resource office must be present during the review to ensure that the security of the records is not compromised. The College is considering, as an actionable improvement plan, backing up all employee records electronically and storing records off-campus for additional security. (III.A.3.b)

The College demonstrates a concern and understanding of issues of equity and diversity through a number of policies, practices, and initiatives. The College is committed to employing qualified administrators, faculty, and staff who are dedicated to student success and reflect the diverse multi-cultural student population. The College's EEO related policies reiterate the College's zero tolerance with regard to discriminatory or harassing behavior towards employees or students. (III.A.4)

The College promotes and supports the diversity of the campus community including students, faculty, administrators, and staff. The campus supports and sponsors a number of activities such as health, professional development and social events for its diverse personnel. The College sponsors social events to enhance the morale and welfare of its employees. The College believes that these events reflect the College's deep concern for the social, professional, mental and physical well-being of its employees. (III.A.4.a)

The College's human resource office annually assess its record in employment equity and diversity for all personnel when submitting its report the Guam Department of Labor as required by law. The report includes both a workforce utilization and analysis as mandated by local and federal regulations. The College points out that the College has an approximate 10 percent Micronesian student population yet no faculty members of Micronesian descent. The College has an action improvement plan to advertise in Micronesia to recruit teachers of Micronesian descent. (III.A.4.b)

The College is committed to treating its members fairly in accordance with its mission statement and Board approved policies and procedures such as Affirmative Action Policy 160, and Discrimination-Sexual Harassment Policy 185. Policies and procedures governing student rights and responsibility are clearly communicated in the College catalog. The College demonstrates integrity in the treatment of administrators, faculty, staff, and students by abiding with its policies and procedures covering fair treatment of its members and students. Complaints or grievances are investigated thoroughly. The College demonstrates fair treatment of its employees by advocating and promoting a respectful work environment. (III.A.4.c)

Professional development is fully institutionalized and supported by the College. The Board of Trustees recognizes the importance of a well-trained faculty, administrator, and staff to effectively carry out the mission of the College. The Board also is committed to providing the resources to support professional development activities. The goal is to retain a competent workforce within the College by encouraging and facilitating the training and education of its employees. The College's professional development program allows full-time staff and administrators to pursue their studies at Guam Community College, the University of Guam or other approved educational and/or training programs. Both faculty

and staff have their own professional development committee with its own policies and procedures governing professional development of its members.

The College's staff/ administrator development procedure sets priority in approving staff requests for professional development support. Priority is given to employees who have not obtained a credential, but may possess valued industry experience. Financial assistance is provided for training and educational costs such as registration, tuition, textbooks, airfare, per diem and other required fees. Tuition assistance is limited to three courses and limit staff/administrator off-island development activity to one approved request per year. (III.A.5)

All personnel are provided appropriate opportunities for continued professional development consistent with the institutional mission and based upon teaching and learning needs. All employees identify professional development goals through the performance evaluation process. The College's Professional Development Review Committee is instrumental in bringing in new ideas and topics that enhance the College's professional development program. (III.A.5.a)

The College assesses its professional development activities through its institutional assessment and program review process to ensure that the needs of faculty staff and administrators are met. The College recognizes the value of a workforce committed to life-long learning and is committed to the professional growth of all employees through staff development training, in-service training and workshops. The professional development committees of both faculty and staff/administration require their members to submit an evaluation report regarding the professional activities they attended so their feedback can be used for planning purposes. Evaluation is made part of the trip report to capture the feedback of all employees attending off-island conferences and workshops as well. Trip reports have been compiled and are used as an important data source for program assessment purposes. (III.A.5.b)

The College assesses the use of its human resources through its planning, performance, budgeting, assessment process and program review. Human resource planning is systematically assessed for continuous improvement through each unit/department assessment plan and report. Additional staffing needs are discussed in management team meetings attended by the College president, vice president for academic affairs, vice president for finance and administration, deans and administrators of the different departments. (III.A.6)

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. The four actionable items identified in the self evaluation: (1) to revise the performance evaluation tool for staff to improve and enhance the performance evaluation process, (2) to evaluate and amend the Code of Ethics, (3) to electronically back up all employee records, and (4) to recruit faculty of Micronesian descent, are admirable and are in response to improving and sustaining the College's human resources. As with any enterprise, human resources are the most important asset of the organization. Although the College puts high priority on professional development and has

identifiable activities, it is uncertain how effective these professional development activities are in relation to teaching and learning.

Standard III – Resources

Standard IIIB– Physical Resources

General Observations

Guam Community College is located in the village of Mangilao, one of the 19 villages of Guam. The Guam Community College and the University of Guam are located adjacent to each other in Mangilao to create a higher education hub of the island. Guam Community College was created by the Community College Act of 1977 (Public law 14-77) with four purposes: First to consolidate and strengthen many of the existing manpower training programs administered by the government of Guam under one governing Board; second to expand and strengthen career education within the territory; third to expand and strengthen short-term and extension programs in skill training; fourth to strengthen the formal secondary and post-secondary education program in the vocational-technical fields. In addition to delivering its programs on the Mangilao campus, career and technical program instruction is delivered to five public high schools.

Fifteen permanent buildings sit on the College's 29-acre campus in Mangilao. Three new buildings have been constructed in the last three years: the Anthony A. Leon Guerrero Allied Health Building was completed in December 2009, the Learning Resource Center was completed in December 2010, and the Student Center opened in December 2011.

The development of physical facilities is guided by its integrated 2005 Physical Master Plan and the Guam Community College Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP) which serves as the link between institutional planning and physical facilities. The College ensures that physical resources are planned and constructed to support educational programs.

The College has been aggressive and persistent in securing available federal and local funding to proceed with its capital improvement program and the build-out of the Mangilao campus. The College has used the planning process to maintain the highest level of grant eligibility to receive the maximum amount of funds.

Findings and Evidence

The College has been able to effectively maintain its current physical resources while planning for the future needs of its educational programs and services. The College's Physical Master Plan completed in 2005 maps out the general growth of the campus facilities necessary to accommodate the College's anticipated needs over the next 15 years. The plan has been instrumental in the College's strategic package when applying for federal grants and other funding sources. The College's Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP) serves as the institutional planning document upon which the physical master is based. Completion of key projects in the master plan will increase building area of the campus by 75 percent and allow the College to accommodate the anticipated 15 percent increase in student enrollment through 2020. The College is anticipating the enrollment growth in direct correlation with the impending military relocation of troops from Okinawa to Guam. The College has exhibited responsible and responsive leadership in identifying and securing resources for construction

of facilities, yet adhering to fundamental planning assumptions established in the ISMP. (III.B, III.B.1.a)

The College employs numerous safeguards to ensure that adequate access, safety, security and a healthful learning and working environment are being achieved on both on-site and off-site facilities. The College adheres to all federal and local building codes. All new and remodeled facilities are fully accessible and meet all Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. All on campus facilities are constructed and maintained by the Planning and Development Office, which oversees the Facilities Department. Through a memorandum of agreement, the Guam Department of Education, maintains all off-site facilities (four public high school career and technical programs) in the same manner and level of priority as on-site facilities of the campus. The self evaluation does not reflect on the campus preparedness for natural disasters that intermittently occur on the islands. (III.B.1.b)

The College evaluates the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources through its institutional assessment and program review process. The results from these two evaluation mechanisms are utilized to plan budget for equipment replacement and facilities upgrades. The College also evaluates facilities and equipment on a regular basis in order to consider utilization, depreciation, and other relevant data. Requests for funding for equipment are made during the annual budget process, as supported by assessment data. (III.B.2)

The College relies upon the integration of its ISMP and Physical Master Plan to identify long-range capital needs. The College has been aggressive and persistent in securing available federal and local funding to proceed with its capital improvement program and the build out of the Mangilao campus. The plan is flexible enough to accomplish the build out without having to wait in sequence for the completion of the previous phase of the plan. Individual projects will progress as funding sources are identified and secured. The plan supports the goal of ensuring adequate planning based upon enrollment and facilities build out. The total cost of ownership analysis includes as assessment of the total project cost that ascertains that the initial building design and specified equipment will be more efficient, last longer, and be more easily maintained than any other alternative. The life cycle costs of any improvement are, therefore, given highest priority when making final determination on any capital improvement project. (III.B.2.a)

In March 2009, the College introduced the ISMP to key community stakeholders, including members of the Guam Legislature, government agency directors, consuls general, and current and potential business partners. The ISMP has four major initiatives: Pioneering, Educational Excellence, Community Interaction, and Dedicated Planning. As envisioned, these initiatives will be accomplished through measures such as curriculum expansion, physical plant improvements, community outreach, and self assessment reports. (III.B.2.b)

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. Guam Community College has appropriate facilities to support its programs and services and meets the needs of its students. The College has been able to make substantial improvements by utilizing federal and private funds to fund capital

construction and infrastructure improvements. Physical resource requests are integrated in the College planning process through the Campus Physical Master Plan that identifies and prioritizes facility needs.

Standard III – Resources

Standard III.C – Technology Resources

General Observations

The College created the Information Technology Strategic Plan (ITSP) in 2009 to guide the institution for the next five to ten years. The plan was developed after a technology audit was performed and enterprise architecture was agreed upon. The ITSP ensures compatibility of software applications and minimize labor to maintain, track and share data between departments. The ITSP is a top down, enterprise wide strategic plan created to achieve the College's strategic educational and business goals. Prior to the establishment of the ITSP the College was using a wide array of software applications to operate its major functions. The increasing costs associated with training, maintenance and support and limited available funds drove the College to establish a foundation to guide the future development of the information technology (IT) infrastructure.

Findings and Evidence

The College has established an Enterprise Architecture (EA) and Information Technology Strategic Plan (ITSP) to evaluate and guide the investment of funds in technology resources. Prior to the development of these standards and plans, the management information systems unit was tasked with overseeing pockets of technology and was often incapable of satisfying the various needs of departments, administrators and faculty who procured and maintained their IT systems necessary for their own needs. Although this method satisfied the needs of the departments, it posed a significant problem due to the lack of integration of the College's technology infrastructure as a whole. The ITSP and the EA are not intended to limit or constrain creativity among the College community users, but to provide a stable, robust and modern infrastructure. The EA will create a future IT environment that will allow for communication, inter-operability, and data sharing while reducing costs associated with training, maintenance and support. The College recognizes that in order to fully implement the EA and the ITSP training of IT personnel is a priority as evidenced in the actionable improvement plan. (III.C, III.C.1)

The College's MIS department is in charge of operations related to information technology services, computing and communications facilities and information technology hardware and software. The College Technology Committee (CTC) serves as the College's main recommending body insofar as technology implementation is concerned. Technology support staff, facilities and equipment are adequate to meet the needs of the institution. The College has increased the number of computer labs on campus in response to the need for additional computing space and the growth in the student population. There are a limited number of distance education courses being offered. Although the Board of Trustees has recently adopted a policy that would allow the College to expand its distance education offerings, the College recognizes the current limitations with respect to trained faculty and technological limitations with respect to bandwidth. (III.C.1.a)

The College recognizes that its faculty are at widely varying levels with regard to use of technology in the educational process. Some instructors are adept at using technology in the classroom, while others are afraid of technology and do not use it at all. The self evaluation does not address the staff or student competency levels with respect to technology nor is there recognition of what training is available for those constituencies. There is no evidence of student requirements of the IT infrastructure as it relates to instruction except that it appears to be dependent on the competency of the faculty. Hence there is no clear assessment of the needs from the student perspective and what resources would be needed to meet any deficiency. The College's actionable plan is to increase technology training for all College constituents so that they become familiar in the latest instructional technologies that would gradually lead toward an expanded distance education program. This actionable item would appear to be limited in terms of measurable improvement. (III.C.1.b)

The College has plans to maintain and upgrade its technology infrastructure as evidenced by the EA and ITSP documents. However due to the economic slowdown and severe restricted cash flow situation, the College has not received expected appropriated budget in its entirety. The College is finding alternative sources of revenue to upgrade its technology infrastructure. The GCC MIS department is responsible to provide maintenance support to all campus users. (III.C.1.c)

The College's decisions about the distribution of technology resources are made by the CTC committee and MIS. Office computer replacement, software installation and procurement are determined by the faculty and administrators in each department according to the needs of their instructors or staff. The MIS department and the CTC establish standards and the departments are allowed to make procurement decisions within the standards. The ITSP and the EA provide a focus for the College and its departments and come to agreement on the application of information technology to address the College's needs. These two documents serve as the framework for budgeting, planning, and managing the College's IT resources. The self evaluation describes the modernization of its infrastructure as evidenced by the increase in bandwidth and the number of network routers. However, the self evaluation is lacking in description and evidence as to service to students. (III.C.1.d)

The College relies on the ITSP to implement the EA and achieve GCC's vision for its IT future. By following the plans in the ITSP, the College is expecting to develop the technical environment its needs, the human resource skills necessary to manage the new environment, and the oversight and leadership mechanisms required for fulfilling its strategic goals. Although the College has established the technological guidelines, goals and needs within the ITSP, funding to implement the plan has, understandably, been lacking. Thus any reflection or expectation for measurable progress or improvement on the plans is premature. (III.C.2)

Conclusion

The College substantially meets this standard. The College is forward looking in terms of establishing the ITSP and EA for the institution. Lack of trained staff and finances are limiting factors. As the technology on campus has increased, the staffing levels for the MIS department has remained relatively flat and is often stretched to meet the needs of faculty,

staff and students. Lack of funding has impacted the training of the MIS staff and the faculty. The self evaluation focuses on how technology plans affect the administrative and instructional infrastructure. There appears to be little linkage between the ITSP and student learning.

Technology planning is ongoing and continues to be developed and improved. The lack of funding to implement the plans is a concern especially if the College expands its distance education offerings.

Recommendation

In order to improve, the team recommends that the College review its resource allocation to the MIS area to ensure that there are sufficient funds to provide training, maintenance, equipment and software support and to implement its technology plan. (I.A.1, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, I.B.3, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.A.1.c, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.b)

Standard III – Resources

Standard IIID – Financial Resources

General Observations

The College has been recognized as one of the most well-managed and fiscally responsible entities within the Government of Guam. The College has been able to meet the needs of the students and the community through diligent planning and management of both federal and local funds. The College reports that it received ten consecutive years of clean audits. Total revenues for the College have risen 58.7 percent from \$24.0 million in AY 2006 to \$38.1 million in AY 2010. Comparably, total expenditures have increased 33 percent from \$22.8 million in AY 2006 to \$30.3 million in AY 2010. Revenue from tuition and fees increased 87 percent and federal grants and contracts increased 70 percent during the same period. Government of Guam appropriations increased 49 percent from \$11.1 million to \$16.5 million. The College continues to take appropriate steps to plan for the unpredictability of its funding sources to ensure that institutional priorities are addressed.

Findings and Evidence

The College manages and allocates its financial resources to meet the goals and objectives of its Institutional Strategic Master Plan. Resource allocation is based upon and prioritized in accordance with each department's assessment and program review results. Financial planning is based upon student enrollment projections and anticipated growth and capital improvement reflected in the Campus Master Plan.

Budget input is initiated at the department level, reviewed by the department's dean then by the Faculty Senate's Resource and Budget Committee. The President's management team serves as an additional tier of review; the Board of Trustees has final review and approval of the overall financial needs of the College. For AY 10-11 the College's operating budget as appropriated by the Guam Legislature was \$16.5 million to cover payroll expenses, benefits and contractual services. Combined with other sources of revenue, the College's operating revenue was approximately \$38.8 million. Total expenditures for the academic year were approximately \$30.4 million leaving a positive operating balance of approximately \$7.8 million or 25.6 percent reserve over expenditures. (III.D.1)

The College's budget development and financial planning processes are guided by its five-year Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP), which incorporates the College's Physical Master Plan and Technology Plan. These institutional planning documents are the planning tools utilized to develop the College's annual budget requirements and establish priorities of resource allocation. The College's biannual program review and assessment process are used to assess the effective use of financial resources that lead to institutional improvement.

As part of the financial planning strategy, the College continues to invest prior-surpluses into capital improvements outlined in the Physical Master Plan. A majority of the funding for the College's capital improvements come from federal grants and private contributions. A five-year Strategic Resource Plan has also been developed to display the integration of the

College's financial planning with institutional planning, the mission and goals and its considerations of short and long-term planning. (III.D.1.a)

Members of the Board of Trustees, the president's management team and members of the Resource and Budget Committee of the Faculty Senate have responsibility to ensure the financial integrity of the College and ensure that resources are available to operate efficiently and accommodate growth. Institutional planning and budgetary reports are accessible to the public and stakeholders through the College's main website under Public Report. *TracDat* is an assessment data management software that allows faculty and staff to conduct continuous assessment of student learning outcomes. The information from *TracDat* is used to justify resources for the enhancement or execution of student learning outcomes. The College ensures that no expenses are encumbered or expended unless funding is available and the source of funds is identified within the College's financial resources. (III.D.1.b)

The College's annual expenditure plans, as with any other government agency of Guam, are influenced by the appropriations made by the Guam Legislature. The island's fragile and volatile economy affects all government agencies. The College has been able to minimize the impact of shortfalls through justified tuition increases, increase in federal funds through successful grant applications and diversification in other sources of funding. The College takes into account its long-term financial priorities before committing to short-term financial plans and obligations to assure financial stability. The College recognizes the uncertainty with respect to its largest source of revenue, Guam government appropriations, and has properly planned for that uncertainty both for the short and long term. (III.D.1.c)

The College's financial planning is clearly defined and driven by its institutional plans. The self evaluation identifies the stakeholders of the Resource, Planning and Facilities Committee that play an active role in the College's planning and budget development process. Before financial plans and budget documents are finalized, they are reviewed by the governance structure. The College's Institutional Strategic Master Plan is the primary planning document referenced for program and facilities development. All documents relating to the College's plans and budgets are accessible via the College website. The president keeps the campus community up-to-date on the status of the College's finances during regularly scheduled meetings with students and employees. (III.D.1.d)

The expenditure of funds at the College is controlled by a multi-layer review and approval process. Expenditures under \$1,000 are approved by the department or division manager, commitments over \$1,000 must be approved by the appropriate vice president and commitments over \$5,000 are reviewed and approved by the Vice President for Finance and Administration. Purchases and contracts over \$250,000 must be approved by the Board of Trustees. The College has achieved the goal of assuring financial integrity and responsible use of financial resources by making sure the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and by instituting procedures with fiscal, purchasing, payroll, and budget department staff to disseminate dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making. (III.D.2)

The College's financial documents reflect the appropriate use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. The College's annual audit reports have been submitted with unqualified opinions for the last ten years. Any audit findings have been corrected. The College has maintained its fiscally responsible status through systematic planning and control of local and federal funds. The College follows strict local and federal procurement procedures. Appropriate use of financial resources is documented throughout the budget development process and assessed through regular program review. (III.D.2.a)

The College's financial information is provided throughout the institution via its website. The Board of Trustees is given regular updates with regard to changes to the current budget and reports on the projected impact of legislation that might affect the appropriations to the College and the consequence to its overall budget. The president, through various meetings with students and employees, shares information about the financial status of the institution and about expansion plans and capital improvement projects. The president holds open meetings at least four times a year for faculty and staff to provide information about the current goals and accomplishments of the College. In addition to meetings, the College's financial information is published in the College's annual report. Expenditures are posted against budget allocations and distributed to departments and units by the business office. (III.D.2.b)

The College has maintained or exceeded the five percent cash reserve requirement over the past three years. The College has maintained an average year-end unrestricted fund balance of approximately \$9.6 million over the three-year period. The Government of Guam has experienced a budget deficit during the same period. Although operating costs have continued to increase, the Government of Guam appropriations have remained level since FY 09. The College recognizes that, although appropriations have remained the same, actual allocation of funds from the Guam government are uncertain and subject to the changing economic environment. The self evaluation points out the year-to-year inconsistencies in the release of appropriations. The business office staff monitors cash flow on a weekly basis and takes steps to restrain expenditures temporarily when appropriate. The College continues to take steps to plan for the unpredictability of funding sources and yet still be able to address institutional priorities. For the past four years (FYs 08, 09, 10, 11) the College has not received its full allotment of appropriations. Emergencies are covered by the five percent reserve. (III.D.2.c)

The President and the Vice President of Finance and Administration ensure that budget planning is tied with the mission, goals and Strategic Master Plan of the College. The College's budget is approved by the Board of Trustees. Appropriations are approved by the Guam Legislature. Non-appropriated funds and federal grants are administered and monitored by the business office. Revenues from student tuition and fees and auxiliary operations are held in a non-appropriated fund. College budgetary needs that are not met by the Government of Guam allocation are prioritized and brought to the Board of Trustees for expenditure approval. An increase in tuition and student fees was implemented in fall 2011 to assist in funding capital projects. (III.D.2.d)

All auxiliary activities to raise funds for the College fall under the auspices of the Guam Community College Foundation. The Foundation is considered a non-profit, public benefit corporation and operates under a separate Board of Governors from that of the College. The Foundation provides financial support for the objectives, purposes and programs of the College. The Foundation Board of Governors has oversight of all revenues generated from fundraising activities and donations. The Board of Governors also has oversight and approval authority over how foundation monies are allocated and utilized for the benefit of the College. This oversight includes the assurance that financial resources are being utilized in a manner that is consistent with the mission and goals of the College. The President and the Vice President of Finance and Administration are ex-officio voting members on the Foundation Board of Governors. The Foundation is annually audited. (III.D.2.e)

The College has a variety of contractual agreements ranging from purchase orders, construction contracts, consultant contracts, service contracts, and lease purchase agreements. Contracts with external agencies follow a specific format established by the Government of Guam's Central Services Agency. The President and Vice President of Finance and Administration with the assistance of legal counsel, review all contractual language to ensure that the language in the contract conforms with established procurement laws and regulations and consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. The President can approve contracts up to \$250,000 and the Board approval is required for contracts exceeding \$250,000. The self evaluation includes an actionable plan to consider developing a standard operating procedure for writing and executing contractual agreements. The College's contract instrument and review process are to be re-evaluated. (III.D.2.f)

The College's financial management is assessed regularly through independent audits and through department/unit program reviews. These two evaluation processes provide the College with the guidance and tools to effectively and efficiently manage its financial resources. The College's investment in *Banner* has created an environment in which systems, individuals and respective College communities interact seamlessly. The *Banner* software allowed the College's financial information to be integrated across programs and functions. (III.D.2.g)

The assessment of the effective use of financial resources occurs at many levels and happens at regular intervals. The College's *TracDat* website provides evidence of the College's financial integrity in meeting the needs of students and the community workforce. *TracDat* allows faculty to conduct annual assessments of student learning outcomes and express tangible evidence of needed resources for the enhancement or execution of SLOs to maintain the vision and mission of the College. *TracDat* assessment and the budget process allows the institution to review the effectiveness of fiscal planning by establishing a system for identifying goals, conducting assessment measures, and a re-evaluating process to close the loop for financial planning and review. The College provides regular updates to its various committees and constituents as a method of assessing the effective use of financial resources. The feedback is incorporated into its planning processes to evaluate the use of resources and the impact of planning. (III.D.3)

In response to the Commission's memo October 6, 2011, the College has provided the required evidentiary documents for financial review. All of the documents were provided in supplement to the self evaluation.

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. The College is commended for managing its financial resources well. The team found numerous examples of exemplary decisions and actions by the administration to meet anticipated cash flow interruptions. The College has prepared for uncertainties in the appropriation process as well as interruptions in allotments during the budget execution process. The College has been able to offset the uncertainties of the Government of Guam funding through increase in the revenues from tuition and fees and federal funds.

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance

Standard IVA – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

In response to the 2006 accreditation report, there have been significant changes in the participatory governance structure. Suggestions for improved effectiveness in implementing and using this structure to help the College move forward appear in the following sections. The Faculty Senate was created in fall 2006 and a new participatory governance article in the Board-Union contract was ratified in October 2008. No corresponding formal structure has been developed for staff participation in governance and there is no action plan to achieve this. In general, with additional time and participation by a greater range of faculty, the Faculty Senate should continue to grow as an integral part of governance to convey the academic and professional opinion of the faculty in a positive manner and to provide input prior to decisions being made. Student participation occurs using the Council on Postsecondary Student Affairs (COPSA). Staff have no governance structure of their own but participate at College Governance Council (CGC) and Board of Trustees (as do faculty and students).

Findings and Evidence

The College cites the Institutional Strategic Master Plan and annual Effectiveness Surveys as evidence, along with participation in the production of reports, presentation of information and open invitations to events such as town hall meetings with the president. The Self Evaluation Report mentions that “attendance was poor despite continuous invitations” to these ad-hoc opportunities. Team members heard comments that the governance mechanism often failed to provide input to the initial creation of such planning documents, relying instead on the ability to comment after the fact.

The Self Evaluation Report states that the leadership of the College consists of several bodies: Board of Trustees, President, College Governing Council (CGC), Faculty Senate, Council on Postsecondary Student Affairs (COPSA). Each of these bodies has a regular meeting schedule (Board: monthly, Senate: weekly, COPSA: bi-weekly, CGC: monthly.) There are also regular meetings of the Council of Department Chairs (CDC).

With additional experience in the future, the participatory governance mechanism should grow into a more effective ongoing mechanism for producing regular systematic input that reflects the considered opinion of faculty, staff and students prior to the production of a document or to a decision.

Staff participation seems to be of particular concern. Staff members participate in College Governance Council and have a representative on the Board of Trustees but they lack a structure of their own to discuss issues and produce recommendations for their representatives. There is also the common issue of ability to participate in governance activities without disrupting normal work flow. Although there is a statement in the self evaluation that “the mechanism for staff governance or participation, however, still needs

development,” there is no action item in this area or suggestion of how staff participation will be achieved in the future. (IV.A.1)

The Board of Trustees includes a voting student trustee elected annually by the students and one advisory member each for faculty and staff, appointed by those groups. Faculty, staff, students and administrators all participate in the regular meetings of the College Governance Council and regular minutes are published. Faculty Senate minutes are available to faculty on the College website. COPSA minutes contain reports from the student Board representative and from CGC. However, those minutes are not distributed to students and communication of issues waits for the once a semester forum. Although not identified to the team by students, this appears to result in the same inability to give input prior to decisions being made that was identified by the Council of Department Chairs. Students at large can only use their governance participation mechanism to comment after the fact.

The self evaluation again states that there is no mechanism established for staff participation in governance. However, the action plan does not address this deficiency.

Adjunct faculty do not participate in either the Faculty Senate or the faculty union. It is unclear whether either the adjunct faculty or the College thinks that opportunities for increased participation would be beneficial. At present their only avenue for input is through the department chairs. Team members heard several comments that improved communication might result from occasional attendance by the College President at governance meetings, and regular meetings between the College President and the presidents of the faculty, student, and (future) staff participatory organizations. (IV.A.2)

The self evaluation contains the statement here that the Board solicits input from stakeholders when needed. Increasing experience and comfort with the participatory governance system should result in the provision of input from faculty, staff, administrators and students in a systematic, consistent, ongoing process. While faculty, staff and student representatives are present at Board meetings it's not clear that their input is the result of any close connection with the participatory governance process.

The self evaluation describes “budgetary constraints” as “beyond the control of faculty.” This should not prevent faculty (and staff and students) participation in the discussion of budget issues in the assessment, planning and budget cycle. The self evaluation response to Standard III.D.2.b talks about occasional public budget reports, but ongoing access to budget detail suitable for ongoing assessment and planning seems to be available at the faculty Senate and College Governance Council meetings.

The earlier controversy over “shared governance” appears to have been largely semantics, and to have been resolved satisfactorily.

Team members heard several examples where administrative decisions were apparently made at management meetings and transmitted downwards for implementation via the management/department chair structure. Chairs commented that the governance mechanism then allowed them to comment after the fact using the CDC /Senate / CGC pathway, but that

it had not been used in the first place to solicit their input prior to the original decision.
(IV.A.2.a)

Under the new participatory governance structure, curriculum recommendations originate with the department faculty and flow through the Senate committee structure for integration and coordination. The previous Curriculum Committee and General Education Committees have been replaced by the Learning Outcomes Committee which is a committee of the Faculty Senate. The Council of Department Chairs is also a committee of the Faculty Senate.

The self evaluation contains a substantial list of curriculum documents. There does not appear to be any default position that the Senate's recommendation on curriculum issues would carry any greater weight than that of other participants in the governance process. However, discussions with faculty union leaders, College administrators and members of the Board of Trustees indicated that in practice the Senate's recommendation would prevail, or unresolved issues would return to the Senate and College Governance Council for further discussions. (IV.A.2.b)

The self evaluation describes an assortment of mechanisms for disseminating information. Team members heard the comment that it is still difficult to locate important information items, such as agendas and minutes because they appear in different formats and different locations.

The participatory governance structure provides an avenue for regular input that is perhaps most effective for faculty and least effective for staff. Conversations with individual faculty suggest that a desired improvement would be the participation of a greater number and range of faculty in Senate activities. In particular it was suggested that new, young faculty members should be actively encouraged to join this leadership arena. Team members also received suggestions that both faculty and student organizations would appreciate opportunities to meet directly with the President since she is not a participant in College Governance Council.

The removal of Professional Development Day is cited as a problem in the self evaluation here and elsewhere. It was not cited as a problem to team members during the visit. There are no action plans to revive it or find a replacement mechanism.

Team members also heard concerns about insufficient input to facilities planning and seemed to feel that they were often presented with a completed document rather than asked for initial planning input.

In the self evaluation Appendix F, the language on participatory governance leans heavily towards faculty commitment to make it successful but appears to have no similar expectation from administration or other constituencies. Appendix D has a very detailed effectiveness survey for the Senate but there does not seem to be comparable evaluation for other governance groups.

The self evaluation does not specify whether the participatory governance processes explicitly include opportunities for students enrolled in distance education. All written

governance communications are available digitally and therefore accessible to distance education students. The College has a Distance Education Policy that grew out of the curriculum committee. It was vetted through the normal College process and approved by the Board on July 10, 2010. (IV.A.3)

The self evaluation states that the four recommendations from the previous visiting team have been addressed. In the governance area, a structure has been put in place for faculty participation but ongoing encouragement of participation by more people on more issues would be helpful. There is no structure for formal staff participation, except on the College Governing Council, Resource, Planning, and Facilities Committee, College Committee on Assessment, and the Board of Trustees.

The self evaluation also mentions many examples and vehicles for public cooperation and disclosure ranging from the public website to a wide range of interactions with other agencies. (IV.A.4)

There is no mechanism in place to evaluate the overall integration and effectiveness of the new participatory governance structure. The new Faculty Senate component has been recently evaluated. There is no staff component to evaluate. Cited documentation only shows assessment of the administrative component prior to 2009. Apparently a new administrative evaluation process is about to be implemented but has not yet produced results. (IV.A.5)

Conclusion

The College substantially meets this standard. Since 2006, considerable work has been done to create a participatory governance structure, most notably with the Faculty Senate representing faculty opinion and the Council on Postsecondary Student Affairs (COPSA) representing students. Recommendations from both of these groups flow through the College Governing Council (CGC) for implementation, or if need be, to the Board of Trustees for policy changes. Staff still lack a formal structure comparable to the Faculty Senate or COPSA in which to discuss and formulate their recommendations. They do participate in College Governing Council. All three groups have representatives at the Board of Trustees – advisory in the case of faculty and staff, and an elected voting member in the case of students. Both the College President and the Chair of the Board of Trustees indicated that in the case of disputed or altered recommendations an issue would be referred back to the originating group for further discussion and amendment. The changes since 2006 have, with the possible exception of staff, created a structure suitable for sustained participation in College governance. Active and earlier participation by a wider range of faculty and staff on a wider range of issues would be beneficial.

Recommendation

In order to improve the effectiveness of participatory governance, the team recommends that the College evaluate existing governance policies and practices for faculty and students to ensure their opportunity for appropriate and ongoing participation in decision making. Additionally, the College should create and implement a corresponding formal structure for

staff input and participation. The College should create and implement an evaluation process to examine the overall effectiveness of participatory governance policies and processes. (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance

Standard IVB – Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The Board of Trustees appears to be engaged with the College, specifically, the College President, as evidenced by regularly scheduled meeting minutes and observations. When asked about the College’s mission, members of the Board of Trustees confirmed that they recite the new mission at the start of every Board meeting. Board members interviewed also indicated that they understood the importance of student learning outcomes in the success of students, and were aware of the substantial work the College has done in meeting the standards in program review, planning, outcomes and assessment. They were also aware of their role, and stated that “...the only employee we have is the President.” (IV.B.1.a)

The Board has adopted several policies that uphold the standards of quality and integrity, while reinforcing the College’s commitment to improved student learning. Board Policy 100 approved the College’s new mission. And the Board has actively been involved in adopting policies that support institutional and program effectiveness, examples include BOT Policy 306, approval of the updated ACCJC Standards of 2002 and BOT Policy 105 – “Reaffirmation of Autonomy of the Board” as cited in Public Law 14-77 (now PL 31-99). (IV.B.1.a.) The Board should be recognized for its adoption and revision of policies that uphold the standards and support the College’s effort towards fulfilling its mission and ensuring institutional effectiveness as it relates to completion of course and program SLOs, institutional learning outcomes, and improved student. (IV.B.1.b)

The Board, comprised of six appointed officials and one elected student trustee, is charged with the responsibility of compliance and the mandates of Public Law 14-77 (now PL 31-99) which created the Guam Community College. The Board functions independently and is ultimately responsible for the educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity of the College. (IV.B.1.c)

Public Law 14-77, the College’s enabling legislation, identifies the eligibility requirements for Board service while the duties and responsibilities of the Board members are clearly outlined in GCCs “Board of Trustees’ Membership Handbook” adopted in 2008. The Board provides oversight of the College’s operations, and monitors the budget and implementation of expenditures. Also, the Board is kept apprised in its regularly scheduled monthly meetings on funding opportunities the College may seek to augment its operational budget. (IV.B.1.d)

The re-write of Board Policies is referenced numerous times in the self evaluation and was corroborated. The Board regularly reviews and updates Board Policies as evidenced by Board minutes, agendas, interviews and observations. Board retreats are used to develop goals and provide training to Board members. Board Policy 110 establishes the guidelines for policy review to assure quality and effectiveness in support of the College’s operations; however, not every policy is reviewed during the two-year cycle as outlined in policy. (IV.B.1.e)

Newly elected/appointed Board members are provided a Board orientation that includes a tour of the campus, and in the case of the governor's appointment, a required Government Ethics workshop, which is spelled out in Board Policy 120 and Public Law 14-77(now PL 31-99). Upon closer review, it appeared that the most prevalent method of orienting new members was primarily experiential learning acquired through more informal participation as a member of the Board, although the Board has adopted a five year training schedule (2009-15). The College may want to expand and develop more formal in-house orientations, that would better prepare new members, especially students and appointed members from the community, with a more holistic view of the community college system, College-specific operations and the College's organizational structure, as well as Robert's Rules of Order as they relate to the functions/roles and responsibilities of members of the Board of Trustees. (IV.B.1.f)

Board Policy 306, "Comprehensive Assessment of Instructional Programs, Student Services, Administrative Units and Board of Trustees" was adopted September 4, 2002, and amended in November, 17, 2008. This policy provides a top to bottom assessment plan for the College. Board Policy 306 superseded BOT 305 adopted in 1994 which provided a five year cycle to:

- Assess program quality, productivity, and need and demand;
- Improve the quality of academic offerings and vocational training;
- Ensure wise allocation of resources; and
- Determine the program's effectiveness and to implement program improvement strategies.

At the time of its adoption, BOT 306 also included the Board's sub-group, the Foundation. Since its revision, the Board has gone through the following:

- GCC Board of Trustees' Third Assessment Report (AY 2007-2008)
- GCC Board of Trustees' Fourth Assessment Report (AY 2010-2011)
- GCC Foundation Board's Second Assessment Report (AY 2007-2008)
- GCC Foundation Board's Third Assessment Report (AY 2010-2011)

The AIER conducts Board assessment studies which consist of self- surveys (Board Self Evaluation Questionnaire) and a survey from various constituency groups who complete the Governing Board Assessment Questionnaire (GBAQ). (IV.B.1.g)

Public Law 28-76, which requires all appointed Board members to attend training entitled, "Ethics in Government Program" are required to submit a workshop attendance certification within the first six months of their appointment and every two years thereafter. Board Policy 115, "Code of Trustee Ethics and Conduct", clearly identifies a Board code of ethics and provides policy for dealing with behavior which violates the code. There were no reported instances wherein there was a need to invoke the code. (IV.B.1.h)

There is evidence of periodic reports to the Board in regard to the accreditation process and indeed, in the last year the College provided a report on the status of the self evaluation and

the accreditation process at every meeting, as part of the President's report. The Board indicated that it is *very* involved in the accreditation process as it too, goes through an assessment and evaluation process as well as the Foundation. To ensure continuity and collaboration, two members of the Board of Trustees also sit on the Foundation Board. In addition, the Board President was an active participant in the activities of the steering committee for accreditation on Standard IV. (IV.B.1.i)

As noted previously, the College president was hired in June 2007. The process by which the College president was appointed was in direct keeping with Board Policy 455 and said policy was, upon review, found to be participatory, thorough and inclusive. Board Policy 455 further describes the process by which the president is reviewed in regard to progress towards meeting agreed upon goals and performance requirements. The Board last performed a comprehensive evaluation of the president May 2011 and involved the various employee groups in so doing. (IV.B.1.j)

The President has been very adept at managing the institution, including implementing administrative evaluations and an effective institutional organizational structure. According to the Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP), assessment of administrative units, including the Office of the President, focuses on four themes: support for institutional programs, quality of service, interaction with other departments/units and planning/budgeting processes. These themes align throughout the evaluation and assessment reports of the Boards of Trustees and GCC Foundation, the Office of the President, and the management staff. The administrative structure, reorganized in October 2010, allows for appropriate delegation of authority consistent with each managers respective areas of responsibility. Each managerial unit has functioned effectively to carry out the mission of the College, and has provided guidance and instruction to facilitate the completion of 100 percent of the institutional and program/course learning outcomes while maintaining a culture of data-based decision making grounded in assessment. The administrative leadership should be commended for its resilience and flexibility in managing the institution's fiscal resources and promoting continuous improvement for the betterment of student success. (IV.2.B.1.a, IV.2.B.2.b)

As noted previously, the Board of Trustees exercises the rights and responsibilities granted them by Board policy and public law. The Board of Trustees members are cognizant of their roles as evidenced by meeting minutes and interviews. They have oversight of the College by approving expenditures, curriculum and budget, and insuring organizational job descriptions to meet the human resources requirements. (IV.B.2.c)

An Annual Fiscal Year Calendar is presented and adopted by the Board of Trustees each year. The last calendar was adopted on September 7, 2011. The fiscal calendar is used to establish deadlines and communicates to the Board, and the community at large, the cycle of budget reports and approval processes in place at the College. When asked about the interface between the budget and the College's planning and assessment processes, it was widely validated amongst various stakeholders that the policy is "no plan -- no budget." Requests for resources (human, physical, technology or fiscal) are linked to the planning and assessment documentation on *TracDat*. The effectiveness of ongoing planning and resource

allocation is systematically reviewed by the Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness and Research (AIER) office. (I.B.6, IV.B.2.d)

The President is thoroughly involved in numerous committees within the community (Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, other service clubs and involvement with local K-12 schools). In an effort to increase communication and visibility on campus, the President holds a “Meet the President” time with students on a regular basis. According to interviews with student leaders, the President is visible at College activities and is supportive of their concerns and takes appropriate action when necessary. An example, cited by GCC students, was the lack of student parking; based upon this issue, funds were allocated to lay asphalt over a vacant grassy area; the paving of this area effectively increased the number of student parking stalls. Additionally, improvements to buildings and facilities on campus, in most cases, acquired through external funds and leveraging resources, allowed the President to maintain and/or increase the level of services to students. These examples were cited as evidence of the President working with the community and with her internal constituency groups - students, staff, faculty and administrators. (IV.B.2.e)

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. The College appears to have very sound governance structures from the Board level to the unit level. The last visiting team had one major recommendation, and the College seems to have addressed this recommendation since that last visit.

The current team validated the documentation within the area of Board and administrative organization through observations, review of documentation, and interviews with faculty, staff, Board of Trustee members and senior administrative managers. The team feels that the College substantially met the standards.

Still, there are some issues that bear further scrutiny. Documentary evidence in the form of reports, studies, memoranda and committee minutes support the claim that the College has taken an aggressive approach to address recommendations cited in the 2006 visiting team’s report on governance. The Board has effectively reviewed and updated its policies. However, as was reported in the 2006 report, a review of the Board policies did not clearly indicate that procedures exist to ensure compliance. The visiting team found upon further review that contained within some Board policies were administrative procedures that operationalize the policy or in other instances administrative procedures are articulated through committees, memoranda, electronic means and/or through committee minutes.

While the Commission Standard IV as well as Eligibility Requirement 3, clearly outline a separation of the Board’s role and administrative operations; it does not prohibit the practice of combining Board polices with administrative procedures. However, if the College continues to include administrative procedures within the context of Board policy, as procedural changes become necessary, it will require Board action before these changes can be implemented. The College may want to separate the procedural portion of the policies into a companion document of administrative procedures in order to consolidate and facilitate administrative changes without unduly taxing the Board to act upon changes that do not affect the integrity of the policy itself.

In the area of Board training, the current Board has only been fully constituted since January 2011 with two new members out of a nine member body. Although ample opportunity is provided for informal Board members' training through retreats, one-on-one interactions and written procedural manuals, the visiting team found that a more formalized training or series of training workshops would greatly benefit new members in reducing the learning curve.

In approving Board Policy 306 the Board established a lead-by-example policy for the entire College community. GCC's Two-Year Assessment Cycle Schedule, divided into four groups: Group A- Associates Degrees; Group B-Certificate Programs; Group C-Administrative and Student Services Units and Group D-Special Programs; with specific dates for deliverables, make clear the delineation of processes the College has established to facilitate continual improvement and student success. And, with the completion of several Board assessments, the Board of Trustees has demonstrated that it is vested in the process and committed to continual improvement.