2012 Evaluation Visit

March 19-22, 2012

Interviewee: Dr. Clare Camacho

Interviewer(s): Adam Karp, Rhea Riegel, Victoria Rosario, Dr. Ian Walton, and Dr. Roger Welt

Venue: Faculty Senate Office

Other Participants:

1. Observed by team while having the CGC meeting. – no conversation, was just observed.
2. Observed by Karp, Riegel and Walton at Faculty Senate meeting and then they met with us and interviewed us. With FS, we were asked about the governance process in general, how items are brought for discussion. We also discussed the governance chart and how it flows.
3. Met with Walton with Tony SN for questions on history of FS and governance process, academic freedom, and ethics regarding faculty and the rest of GCC.

History of governance was provided and the differences and changes that have been made – both because of the governance process and because of the different leaders we now have. He asked if we had a process for “grievance” when our suggestions are not heard. I told him we usually compromise and come to a consensus. He asked for examples. I told him about how GenEd had a set of recommendations, FS forwarded to AVP and then we discussed deleting some courses. We came to an agreement. He suggested we strengthen the process by having certain areas that faculty decision overrides management. He suggested we look at the one in California.

He asked about a time that we didn’t get what we wanted. Told him about FS recommendation on hiring DE personnel went to CGC but that the recommendation didn’t go through, but instead went through CTC who did not agree with the recommendation. But FS understood the reasons (lack of technology audit/plan, etc.). Therefore, we didn’t push it. He asked about decisions being made without our input. Told him this rarely happens with the Academic Vice-President. The only time we saw this was the review of the board policy on academic freedom, that it was not coursed through Faculty Senate.

He asked for examples of when communication and governance was lacking. We gave several examples, involving mostly the Business and Finance side of the house. We told them that it has improved (for example, budget and travel policy are now coursed through CGC), but there is always room for improvement.

We were asked if we had a Code of Ethics and who it was for. We told them about the board policy on ethics. Faculty are the only ones that have a process for anyone to file a grievance complaint about a faculty member.

Questioned if there was “negative undertones” with Standard IV section on Faculty Senate. Told him I didn’t see any negative undertones, but that there were different writers for the different sections, so it may have been an issue with the flow of the report.

1. Met with Karp, Rosario, Walton and Welt on governance, then other issues raised

We were asked about library resources. They asked if the library is consulted when new programs are added. We told them no but it was a suggestion already provided for the next curriculum manual revision.

We were asked if students were allowed to use phones/iPads/notebooks in class. I said yes as long as it is in the silent mode and that it doesn’t disturb others. Exceptions are made for exams or for activities where teacher wants to assess background knowledge.

**Interviewer’s comments:**

Almost all comments were positive.

**Open Forum**

Students spoke about their positive experiences. Many made comparisons with the University of Guam, and how they preferred the classes, teachers, and environment here.

Adjunct faculty member from Education spoke about her positive experiences, and she has the resources to teach and has support from faculty and staff when needed.

**Other comments:**

Assessment is way ahead of their respective colleges

Good comments about the student involvement and turnout at the Spring Festival (they were surprised)