**Guam Community College**

**Addressing Team Recommendations and Actionable Improvement Plans (AIPs)**

**Standard II**

**Mini Report: March 2014**

**Introduction**

Standard II focuses on the instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes.

The following are the status updates of the Actionable Improvement Plans that were identified in the ISER and recommendation from the Accreditation Team during their evaluation of the College in March 2012 relevant to Standard II:

**Comments: Overall, the March mini report is a big improvement from the previous reports. Narratives are written that addresses and are aligned with the recommendations and AIPS. Please note the comments made on some of the AIPs (on bold) at the end of the write up. The highlighted sentences on the report are either a run-on or recommendation to change the context of the sentence.**

**Team Recommendations**

1. 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)

**Action Taken:**

The College has implemented a process for systemically evaluating non-credit courses, workshops and training sessions for effectiveness incorporating the College’s assessment system. In August 2012, the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (CE&WD) submitted a plan for the systematic evaluation process and was approved by the Academic Vice President. The plan was designed as part of the assessment process of the CE&WD office where data is provided and can be extracted on their spring 2013 report. On October 2013, a follow up memo was sent to all departments advising that CEU or non-credit courses initiated by departments must be assessed similar to credit courses of assessing student learning outcomes (SLOs). The assessment and evaluation of workshops and training sessions are done through surveys and the results are reflected in the respective department’s assessment report. The process of uploading survey results onto the department’s assessment report aligns with institutional assessment system.

**Status:** Closed.

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.)

**Action Taken:**

The College’s course and program documents specify delivery modes and teaching methodologies to be relevant to the student learning outcomes, and to reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of students.

In AY09-10, a subcommittee of the Learning Outcomes Committee developed a Distance Education Policy for course delivery through online or hybrid modes. Students, faculty members, staff and administrators were given the opportunity to provide feedback to the policy in different forums. The policy was approved by the Curriculum Committee and then sent through the governance process, i.e., the Faculty Senate, College Governance Committee (CGC), and the President.

The GCC Board of Trustees approved the policy in July 2010[[1]](#footnote-1). The policy was in response to an increase in demand from faculty and students for more distance education courses, and to ensure that distance education courses contained the same rigor as traditional courses.

In Spring 2014, it was announced that the Distance Education strategic plan development bid had been awarded to Ellucian. On February 10-14, 2014, representatives from Ellucian met with the administrators, faculty, and staff of Guam Community College to gather information and develop assessments, a strategic plan, and a Standard Operating Procedure.

On March 18, 2014, Ellucian submitted two assessment reports, *GCC Market Assessment and* *Needs Analysis* and *GCC Capabilities Assessment*. GCC administrators, faculty, and staff reviewed the reports and provided feedback. As of March 28, 2014, the DE report is still in draft format.

**Status:** Ongoing.

**Next Step:** The DE plan and scope of work needs to be approved and tasks need to begin to move DE forward at the College.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Increase compliance rate of curriculum revision process to ensure courses and programs are not over five years old, hence remaining current with community and industry standards. (Standard II.A.1)

***Action Taken:*** The institution identifies and seeks to meet and continuously update the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The College has taken several approaches to increasing the compliance rate of curriculum revision to ensure that courses and programs are not outdated or obsolete. One approach of ensuring that the curriculum is not outdated or obsolete is by making faculty directly responsible for its monitoring and oversight. Areas relating to the curriculum revision process are in the 2013-2014 faculty evaluation system for department chairs[[2]](#footnote-2) and instructional faculty[[3]](#footnote-3). Another approach that has been taken to ensure that curriculum is current is through conducting “Curriculum Writing Workshops”. The curriculum workshops are designed to provide faculty mentoring for updating and writing curriculum. As an added system to increase the compliance rate of curriculum currency, the Academic Vice President monitors courses and program to ensure that they are current with industry and national standards before they are offered or scheduled. Furthermore, the Academic Vice President may inform departments that courses and programs that are not in compliance cannot be offered or scheduled.

**Status:** Closed.

**Next Step:** Review the number of outdated courses and program documents to see if there is an increase in compliance.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Develop a process for the systematic evaluation of non-credit courses, workshops and training sessions, in alignment with the formalized assessment process that is already in place at the college. (Standard II.A.2)

**Action Taken:**

The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

Course and program documents contain course level and detailed student learning outcomes. Since course and program guides are initiated at the department level, faculty members are almost always responsible for the identification and design of student learning outcomes for courses and programs. Advisory committee members review and provide feedback to course guides as well. Authors submit their course or program documents to the respective department chairperson, the registrar, and dean. If approved, the respective dean forwards the document to the LOC.

The LOC reviews and acts on all proposals for new courses and programs, and reviews and approves all revisions of established courses and programs. Authors follow the process set in the curriculum manual, which is updated annually. When the final versions of the curriculum documents have been approved, the course is added to the College catalog and may be scheduled. A copy of the official curriculum document is kept on file in the academic vice president’s office. Copies of approved curriculum documents are provided to AIER and are uploaded onto TracDat in their respective programs and/or departments.

Courses for credit that are not part of a program are processed through the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development. There is a separate, but similar course guide template for these courses[[4]](#footnote-4). The main difference is that approval of the LOC is not needed for credited courses run only through Continuing Education. A syllabus is required with specific student learning outcomes for non-credited courses. For other workshops and training programs, such as those for continuing education units, a course guide or syllabus is not required. However, these offerings are still processed through Continuing Education, with the academic vice president providing the final review and approval.

Evaluation of courses, training programs and workshops are conducted when the course or program is near completion. This feedback assists the faculty and departments in making improvements for future offerings.

In August 2012, the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (CE&WD) submitted a plan for the systematic evaluation of non-credit courses, workshops, and training sessions. The plan was approved by the Academic Vice-President that same month. [[5]](#footnote-5) The plan was incorporated as part of the assessment of the CE & WD office. Their assessment report for Spring 2013 provided data on the plan.[[6]](#footnote-6)

In October 2013, a memo was sent to all departments that the CEU or non-credit courses initiated by departments must be assessed by the initiating department through their Group D department courses assessment unit.[[7]](#footnote-7) Similar to credit courses, effective Spring 2014, the departments would select the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to be assessed and input the results into TracDat.

As of March 2014, the monitoring of assessment of CEU and non-credit courses, trainings, workshops, and other events offered through CEDWD is incorporated into the regular operations and cycle of assessment. However, evidence on this process is lacking and must be obtained through the CE&WD office. The 14th Annual Institutional Assessment Report is promised to contain the summary of the assessment work completed for 2013-2014. (despite repeated requests to Victor Rodgers) **Note: Refrain from writing any negative comments about a person or a department.**

**Status:** Closed.

**Next Step:** Review and assess feasibility and/or necessity for conducting full assessment on CEUs and no credit courses.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Use the online version of the IDEA rating survey for online courses, in alignment with this teaching modality’s goals of providing an alternative for students to evaluate their own learning. (Standard II.A.2c)

**Action Taken:**

The Office of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness and Research (AIER) spearheads the assessment of courses and programs, and provides a structure for ongoing systematic review of courses and programs using a two-year assessment cycle. Program assessment has been practiced consistently since 2001. In fall 2012, the Office of Assessment, Institutional Research and Effectiveness developed an online survey that mirrors the IDEA rating survey used in traditional courses. Students enrolled in the 3 online courses offered fall 2012 were surveyed through an announcement and link in the course. Out of the 52 students enrolled, 12 students responded. The AIER staff transferred the responses from the online survey to the IDEA bubble sheet. These were then submitted along with the responses for traditional courses. This is the mechanism and process by which online courses will be evaluated.

For Spring 2013, IDEA rating surveys were not administered in any courses, either traditional or online due to lack of funds change to (budgetary constraints). However, the Office of AIER will continue to administer surveys consistent with traditional courses. In Fall 2013, the Office of AIER administered surveys from October 22 through November 9, 2013 for both the online classes and traditional courses. The IDEA survey is being given online to distance learning students. However, evidence is lacking and instructors were not informed or are aware of when this occurred**. Note: Check with the AIER office as to the accuracy of the statement.**

**Status:** Closed.

**Next Step:** Review the response rate for IDEA rating surveys.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Foster dialogue among program faculty and the Learning Outcomes Committee (LOC) to provide standards for grading and awarding of credit by strengthening language in the course guide. The awarding of credit discussion should be guided by the federal definition of credit hour. (Standard II.A.2h)

**Action Taken:** The need to standardize the awarding grades and credits has been brought upon to the Learning Outcomes Committee. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

The grading policies and the criteria for awarding credit for courses are clearly stated in the College catalog. Additionally, the course guide document also defines the means of evaluation, and how credit is awarded for each course. Faculty are required to distribute syllabi to all students at the beginning of the course. Syllabi must define the expectations of the students for each class and the evaluation and standards required to achieve a certain grade. The syllabi functions as a contract between faculty and students for the semester and may be used as a critical reference in addressing and settling student grievances. Adjunct faculty members are provided model syllabi by the department chairperson to ensure consistency.

The Learning Outcomes Committee placed the issue on their fall 2013 agenda and the strengthening of language for standardizing grades was discussed. As a result, the 2013 curriculum manual incorporated changes to better address substantive and non-substantive changes. These changes now need to be routed through the Learning Outcomes Committee for review. Furthermore, the college credit hour policy can now be found in the online catalog, ACALOG. However, evidence is lacking on the specific link to the data on grading and awarding of credit**. Note: Consult with the AIER office regarding the link for the standards of awarding grades and credits that are in line with federal standards.**

**Status:** Closed.

**Next Step:** Review the written response for standardizing grades.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Provide a systematic process for standardizing identification, use and reporting of service learning to align with the broad goals of general education. (Standard II.A.3c)

**Action Taken:**

Service learning at the College was initiated through the Hawaii Pacific Islands Campus Compact (HPICC) grant. Many courses, such as American Sign Language and Introduction to Philosophy, have the additional element of service learning (SL), which can serve as a stepping stone toward civic engagement and provides skills in developing into effective citizens. Some of these courses are identified in the Schedule of Classes as SL. Implementation of service learning, however, is dependent on the instructor. Different sections of the same course may have different or no service learning requirements. In addition, not all courses that use service learning are identified as such in the schedule. These courses, along with the other general education requirements, provide a platform to introduce students to ideas pertaining to cultural diversity, civic, political, and social responsibilities and aesthetic appreciation.

The implementation of the revised and additional general education requirements and the adoption of the ILOS clearly provide a mechanism for departments to more clearly promote what it means to be an ethical human being. Opportunities are identified through the SLO mapping process where courses address the different skills in being an ethical human being and an effective citizen. General education requirements only apply to degree programs. Thus, departments must evaluate their SLO mapping to ensure that students who are not in degree programs still have opportunities to learn about being an ethical human being and effective citizen.

In Spring 2013, the Learning Outcomes Committee (LOC) formed the General Education Committee working group under LOC. According to the Chairperson at that time, it will be the task of the General Education working group to determine whether general education courses introduce, emphasize and/or reinforce institution learning outcomes related to service learning. The committee revised the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Mapping Matrix for General Education to distinguish skills crucial to General Education courses. At the end of Spring 2012, the revised ILO and a survey were distributed. Thirty-three surveys were sent out, and thirty-two surveys were returned. Findings were that there were no issues related to meeting the ILO’s for courses which had more than one instructor.

In Fall 2013, the General Education Committee was re-institutionalized as a formal committee under the Faculty Senate. As of March 2014, the General Education Committee is currently working on establishing their guidelines and criteria. The matrix created was set to focus on the General Education connection to the ILOs. There is yet to be specific wording about service learning.

**Status:** Ongoing.

**Next Step:** Follow-up on the status of wording about service learning.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Bolster academic advisement process and procedures for all faculty so that student support through advisement remains strong and effective. (Standard II.B.3c)

**Action Taken:**

The College is continuously exploring ways to strengthen and enhance its student support service. One area in need for continuous improvement is student advisement. In Fall 2012 an Academic Advisement Task Force was formed to look at how the academic advisement process can be strengthened. The formed task force consists of faculty, including traditional and non-traditional (counselors), and the TSS Dean and Associate Dean. The task force analyzed the current process and worked on the GCC Academic Advising Model, an Academic Advisor Handbook, and a flowchart for Advising Delivery.

In the fall semester of 2013, a draft of the advisement handbook was sent to the Department Chairs to disseminate to faculty for review. Upon receiving feedback the task force sought the Academic Vice-President’s approval via the TSS Dean on the deliverables and then developed a plan for training. As of spring 2014 the Academic Advisor Handbook has been made available to all faculty via Banner and the task force plans to hold trainings for faculty.

**Status:** Closed.

**Next Step:** Task force should finalize and obtain approval from Academic Vice-President via TSS Dean on the deliverables, and then develop plan for training.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Evaluate the safety and security of physical records, and consider various alternative ways (including electronic means) to protect the integrity of student records at all times. (Standard II.B.3f)

**Action Taken:** The College’s Registrar reported that the College has two vaults which are fire proof, but these are at capacity. Due to the current vaults being at capacity forces the Registrar to use a container/office to hold some other physical records that do not fit within the vaults. It has been recognized that more vaults, which are fire proof and climate controlled, are needed to hold records. The College is discussing alternatives, including a system where an outside vendor digitizes records to that physical records are kept to a minimum. As of Spring 2014 the Registrar has been contacted and no vaults were purchased and the alternative to storing physical records by digitizing them has not been finalized.

The registrar has identified that the vault containing records has reached its limit and therefore has been seeking alternatives outside physical containment to resolve the issue. A BDMS dedicated scanner was received in January 2014 and is currently in the MIS Room pending installation by IBSS.

**Status:** Ongoing.

**Next Step:** Follow through with plans to digitize students’ records and store electronically.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Revisit recommendations to examine how the survey findings have been used to implement a more efficient delivery of student programs and services. (Standard II.B.4)

**Action Taken:**

Student support services conduct regular assessment of their units as part of the College’s two-year assessment cycle. Through assessment and feedback, the College assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services support student learning.

The *Faces of the Future Survey* is nationally-norm and results from the College are compared with other colleges at the national level, for both credit and non-credit students. These results provide useful information that enables GCC to make informed decisions when planning for programs and services and allocating resources to address the needs and concerns of students. The *Faces of the Future Survey* produces data that gives the College information on the socio-demographic profile of credit and non-credit students and their current college experience. AY09-10 was the fourth year that GCC has administered the survey. Previous surveys were administered in fall 2002, fall 2005, and fall 2007.

According to the AY09-10 Faces of the Future report[[8]](#footnote-8) (pp. 2-5), the following are common concerns shared by GCC students:

* Availability of courses at times when students can take them
* Lack of ease in navigating the GCC website
* Limited availability and convenience of tutoring services for math and English classes, and impact of general education requirements on program completion
* Availability of instructors outside of class time
* Quality of academic advising
* Sense of general safety and security while on campus

The following are common successes shared by students, according to the survey:

* Over 80 percent of survey respondents are satisfied or very satisfied with the College.
* Students reported that their experience at the College contributed to their growth by increasing their academic competence and developing their self-confidence.
* The top five factors that influenced students to attend the College are:
1. A particular program of study
2. Cost of attending the College
3. Availability of financial aid or scholarship
4. Variety of courses offered
5. Academic reputation of the College

The report also made the following recommendations (pp. 23-26):

* Continue to utilize the GCC website to disseminate financial aid information.
* Communicate the availability of financial aid and scholarships to students, faculty, staff, and administrators.
* Post faculty office hours in the GCC public website (i.e., under the *Offices* channel in the *Student Resources* section).
	+ Include faculty contact information and office location
	+ Create a poster consolidating all this information and place in areas that students regularly visit (i.e., Student Support Services Office, library, Student Services and Administration Building-Rotunda).
	+ Continue to ensure that office hours are included in course syllabi.
* Departments should solicit students’ input on class scheduling by surveying them about the most convenient times for them to take a course(s).
* Provide students with safety and health information that would make them feel safe and secure on campus.
	+ Information should be included in the GCC website and the student handbook.
	+ This information should also be disseminated through student newsletters or email messages and posted throughout the campus.
* Security personnel should be visible around campus.
* Redesign the GCC website with the intent of making it easier for students to navigate.
	+ Make sure to include student input
* Ensure that all advisors, especially new faculty members, are provided with Advisor/Banner Training
* Offer more tutoring services for Math and English.
	+ Identify a location on campus where tutoring services can be offered and inform students of this location and the times tutoring services are available.

All concerns on the Faces of the Future surveys have been addressed. The College has no plans to administer the Faces of the Future surveys. Information will be obtained by other means for future reports. **Note: There should be some type of transitioning of why the College no longer uses the Faces of the Future Survey e.g. change for a better survey instrument etc.**

**Status:** Closed.

**Next Step:** None.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Allocate a percentage of funds for supporting additional resources in the LRC when new programs are developed or when existing programs are significantly modified. (Standard II.C.1a)

**Action Taken:**

The LRC maintains a productive dialogue with teaching faculty regarding additions to the print and electronic collections and are invited to collaborate in collection development through personal contact, via e-mail and through surveys. Faculty members are encouraged to suggest appropriate materials in any format for purchase by the LRC. Prioritization of these listings is also requested due to limited funds.

The effectiveness of the LRC collection is contingent upon input provided by faculty. The LRC department chairperson has frequently requested lists of needed resources from chairs of the different programs. The services, collections and policies of the LRC are developed in coordination with the College’s Institutional Strategic Master Plan and the student learning outcomes as provided by the College’s respective career and technical education programs.

The effectiveness of the LRC collection appears to be satisfactory to student users. The spring 2010 survey indicated that 80 percent of students felt the library collections met their instructional and curricular needs. Forty three percent of faculty surveys, however, reveal that there are not enough resources available to support the current trends or industry practices for instruction in their respective programs.

Budgetary challenges continue to limit resources available for the LRC. As stated previously, the LRC does not have direct access to student library fees. In addition, when the College begins a new program or revises existing curriculum, the LRC is not made aware of the new developments. Often library resources are not included as part of start-up budget costs.

Suggestion was given AY12-13 to the LOC chair to add a section to the program and course guide forms that directly addresses the need for additional LRC resources.[[9]](#footnote-9) Review of the Curriculum Manual indicates that this suggestion was not part of the latest revisions to the Curriculum Manual. The current LOC chair has stated that allocation of funds to the LRC is listed for the next revised curriculum manual by Fall 2014.

**Status:** Ongoing. There is still no mechanism to request for funding the LROC when new programs are developed or when existing programs are significantly modified.

**Note: Work with the Dean of TSS for some kind of resolution on how the funding issue can be resolved or perhaps plans in the working to resolve the issue.**

N**ext Step:** Follow up on LOC regarding revised curriculum manual.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

Research the need and demand for additional electronic resources including e-book readers and computer tablets to facilitate the use of enhanced electronic services. (Standard II.C.2)

**Action Taken:**

The College evaluates the LRC through surveys, focus groups, and other appropriate

measures. The LRC regularly and consistently participates in the College‘s assessment

process. The LRC conducts student and customer services surveys every semester on quality of assistance and instructional services, and sufficiency of learning resources and library technology.

The LRC has consistently been assessed as part of the College‘s two-year assessment cycle. Assessment has involved setting outcomes for the unit, aligning goals with the mission, vision, and other aspects of the College, providing different means of assessment, collecting data, and using the data to effect or advocate for change. The spring 2010 survey revealed 97 percent of patrons agreed or strongly agreed that LRC employees were respectful and helpful. In response to the needs of students and faculty members, new computers and faster network services have been implemented. The need for more enhanced technology however has been raised as an issue by student and faculty Library users

In its new location, the LRC has expanded to provide customers comfortable room

temperature and adequate study rooms and seating. The LRC also continues to maintain the high level of customer service by providing staff training in customer service, time management, and library technical skills to student users. The completion of the new LRC building, which more than doubled the space, has enhanced the overall learning environment for GCC students outside of the classroom.

LRC received funding for an e-book higher education database, the EBSCO Academic E-book Collection and the EBSCO periodical database. Employees and students can set up a free account with EBSCO which allows them to download e-books.

On October 2013, LRC surveyed faculty and students as part of its regular assessment cycle. On November 2013, the survey results were reviewed and uploaded on TracDat. LRC survey results for fall 2013 and spring 2014 (N=424) showed that 65% of the survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I am able to find books and e-books I need for research" and 54% of the survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I am able to find the journals, magazines, newspapers I need" (GCC TracDat, 2014, pg. 39)

**Status:** Closed.

**Next Step:** None.

**Directory of Evidence**

E1. [Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (CE&WD) Plan for Assessment Memo (Approved)](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E1.Std2.CEWDAssessmentProcess.pdf)

E2. [Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development Assessment Report - Spring 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E2.Std2.CEWDAssessmentReport.pdf)

E3. [Distance Education Plan and Scope of Work - Draft](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E3.Std2.DE%20Project%20ScopeDRAFT.pdf)

E4. [Evaluation Rubric – Department Chairs](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E5.Std2.RubricDeptChair.pdf)

E5. [Evaluation Rubric – Instructional Faculty](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E4.Std2.RubricInstructionalFaculty.pdf)

E6. [Curriculum Manual – Spring 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E6.Std2.CurriculumManualSpring2013.pdf)

E7. [Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (CE&WD) Plan for Assessment Memo (Approved)](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E1.Std2.CEWDAssessmentProcess.pdf)

E8. [Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development Assessment Report - Spring 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E2.Std2.CEWDAssessmentReport.pdf)

E9. [Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes of November 09, 2012](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E7.Std2.LOCMinutes11092012.pdf)

E10. [Email from G. Hartz, LOC Chair, December 2012](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E8.GHartz.Email.12052013.pdf)

E11. [Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes of January 25, 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E9a.Std2.LOCMinutes01252013.pdf); [Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes of February 15, 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E9b.Std2.LOCMinutes02152013.pdf); [Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes of April 5, 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E9c.Std2.LOCMinutes04052013.pdf)

E12. [Academic Advisement Task Force Minutes March 6, 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E10a.Std2.AcademicAdvisementTaskforce30613Minutes.pdf); [Academic Advisement Task Force Minutes April 4, 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E10b.Std2.AcademicAdvisementTaskforce40413.pdf); [Academic Advisement Task Force Minutes April 17, 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E10c.Std2.AcademicAdvisementTaskforce41713.pdf); [Academic Advisement Task Force Minutes May 1, 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E10d.Std2.AcademicAdvisementTaskforce050113.pdf)

E13. [Email sent to LOC November 12, 2011](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E11.Std2.EmailtoLOC1112011.pdf)

E14. [Memo on Assessment and Reporting of Credit, CEU, and Non-credit Courses Offered By Departments through CEWD](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/cewd/CEWDmemoonassessmentandreporting.pdf)

1. [Board Policy 340 – Distance Education](http://www.guamcc.edu/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=2700) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [Evaluation Rubric – Department Chairs](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E5.Std2.RubricDeptChair.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [Evaluation Rubric – Instructional Faculty](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E4.Std2.RubricInstructionalFaculty.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [CE Course Guide Template](http://www.guamcc.edu/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=3911=607) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (CE&WD) Plan for Assessment Memo (Approved)](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E1.Std2.CEWDAssessmentProcess.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. [Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development Assessment Report - Spring 2013](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/standard2/20122013/spring2013/E2.Std2.CEWDAssessmentReport.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. [Memo on Assessment and Reporting of Credit, CEU, and Non-credit Courses Offered By Departments through CEWD](http://ifs.guamcc.edu/adminftp/academics/services/aad/aier/cewd/CEWDmemoonassessmentandreporting.pdf)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. [2010 Faces of the Future Report](http://www.guamcc.edu/aier/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=1215) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)