

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. R. Ray D. Somera, Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Wendell M. Roden

DATE: 5/11/2017

SUBJECT: Governance Committees' Year End Report for AY 2016-2017

Instructions: Update the committee's accomplishments for the 2016-2017 year. Complete the self-assessment. Make recommendations for 2017-2018 for this or other committees.

NOTE: The committee chair (co-chairs) is (are) responsible for completing reports following dialogue with the committee. As a committee, please assess progress toward these goals. Assessment of the committee's progress toward these goals is a critical part of the annual cycle of assessment where outcomes lead to change and improvement.

- **Standards 1 Committee**
- **Wendell Roden (Chair), Dean Gary Hartz, Dean Pilar Williams, Dean Michael Chan, Maria Cecilia Delos Santos, John Payne, Norman Aguilar, Therese Datuin, Barbara Blas, Christine Quinata**

Initiatives		Completed	Carried Forward	Will Not Pursue	Status Description
1.	Bring each Standard in Section A Draft to 9-10 rating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4/4 Achieved
2.	Bring each Standard in Section B Draft to 9-10 rating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5/9 Achieved
3.	Bring each Standard in Section C Draft to 9-10 rating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5/14 Achieved
4.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
10.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Self Assessment

Standards 1 Committee Accomplishments

The draft from Standards 1 Committee SY 2015-2016 was reviewed over the summer of 2016. Each standard was given a rating 0-10. Standards 1 started SY 2016-2017 off with almost all Standards given a 0 or 3 rating from reviewers. By the end of the year,

14/27 Standards are estimated to be at a 9-10 rating

5/27 Standards are estimated to be at a 6-8 rating

8/27 Standards are estimated to be at a 5 or below rating

(Please see attached Excel Sheet that shows each standard, how the work was divided, and the status of each standard)

As you can see, the committee started with almost nothing viable to work with in the previous draft. All sections had to be re-written during SY 2016-2017. If we had to self asses ourselves as a committee and how much improvement we made to the draft, then yes, we achieved a huge improvement – more than 100% improvement. If the Goal was to bring each standard from 0 to a 9-10 rating, then percentage-wise, we achieved approximately 50%, if that was the Goal.

Obstacles to reaching 100% of our Goal

The biggest obstacle to reaching our Goal was the laziness, indifference, or incompetence of some committee members. In the beginning of the school year, we all agreed to break up the work load and each would be assigned standards to write. We agreed to meet every Friday and work on standards together which we did.

However, when it came to working on their own, some committee members (not all), for whatever reason, basically did not do the work they promised to do. The committee chair organized working sessions every Friday from 3-5pm and the next Monday, would e-mail everyone a status on what was achieved that week and gave members instructions on what to keep working on. As you can see from the attached Excel spreadsheet, each member was assigned 3-4 sections to write at best, with the chair volunteering to write 10/27 sections.

Insight to why some members were lazy, indifferent, or incompetent

The following section of the narrative is written solely as the opinion of I, Wendell Roden (Chair). Let me first say that for the most part, a majority of the committee gave 100% effort and as chair I am pleased with their performance. As for a few others, I do not mean my statements to “throw anyone under the bus”, but it would be a great injustice to sugar-coat what goes on in committee work. Administration should know everything. It is a part of true Self Assessment. It is also imperative for improvement for the next Standards I committee as they move forward.

I will address the claim that there were lazy or indifferent committee members first. In the first meeting of the new school year, we were all ready to go with guns a blazing. Then a committee member said “Why are we in such a hurry? Whatever we don’t write, Dr. Ray will end up writing himself anyway”. That was my first indication that the attitude in some members of the committee (again not all) was of indifference. That was also a big blow to team morale. Maybe I’m the new kid on the block, but where I come from, if you have an assignment, you do it to the best of your ability – especially if you are getting paid for it. And, furthermore, if you are not willing or capable of accomplishing the vital work of writing the ISER, then a member should step down and let someone come in who is willing to try their hardest.

Now, to address the claim that there were “incompetent” members, don’t get me wrong, I will be the first to say that I will include myself as “incompetent”. As a Faculty member, my whole career revolves around the classroom and the students. I understand that there is supposed to be participatory governance, but when I was asked to be in a committee, I knew nothing of what went on in the school outside of the classroom. As I started to learn more, I volunteered to be chair because I thought I could contribute. I consider myself a good writer, but I found myself staring at the computer screen because for 2 years, I really didn’t know how to answer the questions in the ISER fully. I find it odd that it is the administrators who sit at all the meetings and know everything that goes on in the school, yet it is the Faculty who are given the task of writing the drafts of the ISER. It is like asking a fish to climb a tree.

I know my fellow committee members who are Faculty felt the same way. I know from a pure numbers point of view, our committee only achieved 50-60 percent of the ideal goal, but to do that, many of us had to transform ourselves to a hybrid employee of Faculty/Admin/Support Staff who knew the ins and outs of the school. I feel that is a huge accomplishment in and of itself. This took me personally countless hours reading all public documents of GCC for the past 5 years in order to feel as though I could write anything of substance in the ISER. As chair, I was happy to have 2 releases, but honestly if you count the hours I spent educating myself, it is my personal opinion that during the 2 years leading up to the Accreditation visit, committee chairs be given even more of a release from teaching. After teaching three classes in a row in a

day, how is one supposed to change hats so quickly and focus their attention on the ISER again. It is extremely difficult because your mind is constantly split.

Other Obstacles for Standards 1

Sometimes there was inconsistency with the format of what was expected in the writing. For example, at the end of SY 2015-2016, we were given a timeline and on it, it specifically said we don't have to worry about footnotes for Fall of 2016 YET. So in the Spring of 2016, we didn't work on footnotes. Then come the Fall of 2016, we were marked down by reviewers that summer because there were no footnotes. Then we added all the footnotes that Fall. Then come Spring 2017, we were told to remove all the footnotes and insert hyperlinks instead. It is very frustrating and time-consuming to a committee member to be told one thing one semester, and then have it changed the next semester.

The old Standard 1 only had 13 standards in it. During SY 2014-2015, section C was added with 13 more standards to address. This was a huge obstacle for the committee in SY 2015-2016 and SY 2016-2017 because there was no previous ISER we could refer to. If we had known there was going to be a Section C earlier, we could have worked on it earlier.

For most of SY 2016-2017, we were undergoing contract negotiations, so our Administrative advisors for Standards 1 were not available during our Friday work sessions. That also did not help our situation.

Improvement for future Committees

It is the opinion of the committee that the following should be stressed for future Standards committees in general.

- 1) Inform future incoming members clearly of the duty they have before them.
 - a) That they must have a basic understanding of the governance and assessment process at GCC.
 - b) They must also be able to write and communicate effectively.
- 2) More frequent training leading up to the Accreditation visit on how to address a standard.
- 3) Mentorship from an experienced committee member to a new one.
- 4) Faculty should not have the sole responsibility of writing.
- 5) Enlist the assistance of more "volunteer" members not necessarily officially on the committee. Therese Datuin for example, was an example of a volunteer who put in a lot of work on a volunteer basis.
- 6) Regular training on the public documents found on our website.

Please upload this document to the appropriate GCC site page, and submit an electronic copy to the Office of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness and Research (AIER) at aier@guamcc.edu

GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Faculty Accountability Report for Committee Work
AY 20 16__ to 2017__

Standards 1 Committee

Wendell M. Roden (Chair)

Goal #1) Bring Standards 1 Section A ISER draft to 9-10 rating

Goal #2) Bring Standards 1 Section B ISER draft to 9-10 rating

Goal #3) Bring Standards 1 Section C ISER draft to 9-10 rating

	Name of Committee Member	Attendance*	Goal 1**	Goal 2**	Goal 3**	Goal 4**	Goal 5**	Goal 6**	Goal 7**	Goal 8**	Attendance %	Participation %
1	Wendell Roden	8/9	Y	Y	Y						89%	100%
2	Dean Gary Hartz	5/9	Y	Y	Y						56%	100%
4	Dean Michael Chan	0/9	Y	Y	Y						0%	100%
5	Dean Pilar Williams	1/9	Y	Y	Y						11%	100%
6	Maria C. Delos Santos	8/9		Y	Y						89%	100%
7	John Payne	5/9		Y	Y						56%	80%
8	Norman Aguilar	3/9		Y	Y						33%	50%
9	Therese Datuin(volunteer)	2/9		Y	Y						22%	100%
10	Barbara Blas	6/9	Y	Y	Y						67%	100%
11	Christine Quinata	4/9	Y	Y	Y						44%	100%

12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												

* Number of meetings attended out of 9 meetings.

** Full Participation in Specific Committee Goals.

Additional Information:

Chairperson: Please detail the core substance of each of the above-mentioned goals. Indicate (Y or N) whether or not the faculty member fully participated in efforts to accomplish the goal. Please submit this document to the Faculty Senate President by _____ .

This report is due no later than the last duty day _____ (date) of the Fall semester (mid-year) and due no later than the second Monday of April _____ (date) (end of the year).