REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To the University of Guam

April 17-20, 2016

Team Roster

Joseph F. Sheley
Team Chair & President
California State University, Stanislaus

Laura E. Martin
Assistant Chair & Director, Periodic Review, Assessment and Accreditation Support
University of California, Merced

Linda Buckley
Associate Vice President for Planning
University of the Pacific

Erin S. Gore
Executive Vice President – National Manager
Wells Fargo Education & Nonprofit Banking

Seri I. Luangphinith
Professor of English & Chair of Humanities
University of Hawaii at Hilo

Barbara Gross Davis
Vice President & WSCUC Staff Liaison
WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

APPENDICES

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process

The University of Guam (UOG) is a public, open admissions, four year, land grant institution located on the island of Guam, the southernmost island in Mariana Islands chain. Founded in the early 1950's as the College of Guam, the university was first accredited as the University of Guam in 1968. Consistent with this long history, the university has general degree approval for bachelor's and master's degrees. UOG is governed by a nine member Board of Regents (BOR) led by the university's president. Under the guidance of BOR policy and Guam law, ongoing planning and decision making is realized through a strong partnership between the administration and the faculty senate.

Serving students mainly from the islands of Guam and Micronesia, UOG offers 34 bachelor's degrees and 14 master's degrees to over 4,000 students, through its single campus in the village of Mangilao on Guam, two online master's degrees, and an offsite location at the College of Micronesia - Federated States of Micronesia. Its business administration, education, nursing, and social work programs are programmatically accredited respectively by the International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education (IACBE), the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, formerly NCATE), the Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing, Inc. (ACEN, formerly NLNAC), and the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE).

The vast majority of UOG's students are undergraduates (95% by FTE[1]), who enroll as freshmen rather than transfers (~ 3% of undergraduates). Nearly three quarters of UOG students are full time (74%, as of fall 2014[2]). The student body reflects the region the university serves; 49% are Pacific

---

[1] WSCUC Institution Summary Report
[2] AY 2014-15 Factbook

Islanders (Chamorro, Micronesian, and Marshallese) and 42% Asian. According to the university, many of its undergraduates are first generation and 75% receive financial aid, with 59% on Pell grants. Since 2004, UOG's enrollments generally have steadily increased, with UOG's 2016 headcount of over 4,000 the largest in its history.

Over the last three years, first year retention rates for first time, full time freshmen averaged 74.5%, representing a six percentage point increase over the prior three year average, and comparing very favorably with the university's goal of 75% and with rates of its peer, open access institutions (62%). This is a commendable achievement.

The most recent six year graduation rate for first time, full time freshmen was 27%, down from 29% the prior year, for a three year average of 26.7%. The slight dip to 27% ended a three year period of one percentage point increases annually, leaving the university considerably short of its goal of a two percentage point increase annually and a 35% six year graduation rate. The university is actively engaged in improving retention rates and graduation rates. These efforts are described more fully in Section II.E of this report.

UOG's mission, *Ina, Diskubre, Setbe* (to Enlighten, to Discover, to Serve), is delivered by the equivalent of a 174 full time faculty members (FTF), 138 (79%) of whom are tenured or tenure track and 36 (21%) non-tenure track, together with 744 staff, and 34 administrators. UOG's academic programs are administered through two academic colleges, the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences and the College of Natural and Applied Sciences, and three professional schools, Business and Public Administration, Education, and Nursing and Health Sciences. UOG also supports eight research units, the faculty of which contribute primarily to graduate education: the Cancer Research

Center; Center of Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service; Center for Island Sustainability; Micronesian Area Research Center; Water and Environmental Research Institute; Western Pacific Tropical Research Center; and the Marine Laboratory.

UOG takes very seriously its status as a land grant university and its mission to serve the region, focusing its education, research, and service contributions on issues and challenges specific to Guam and Micronesia, including its indigenous Pacific Islander populations. In support of this commitment, in 2012-13, the university initiated Good to Great (G2G), a comprehensive mission-based self-examination to find the "proper connection between resources and quality, relationships and mission." The intention was to create "a great university that is regionally responsive, fiscally responsible, and a model for higher education in the region" in light of the conditions and challenges the university faces in the coming five to ten years. Central to this effort has been a comprehensive, data driven, program evaluation process through which all 65 academic programs and 30 administrative units were assessed and ranked according to four evaluation criteria: (1) Fit to a Great UOG, (2) Sustainability, (3) Quality, and (4) Demand and Relationships.

The resulting Good to Great Implementation Plan outlined the university's path forward. Five institutional transformations were identified and operationalized as strategic goals: (1) rebalancing the human resource portfolio, (2) strengthening the student-centered approach to the student experience, (3) harnessing technology for the region in support of connectivity, (4) ensuring financial sustainability, and (5) using big data for administrative and assessment processes. To achieve these goals, 204 tactical recommendations and tasks were articulated, including differential investment in and/or transformation of academic programs and administrative units. As demonstrated during the Accreditation Visit, the university community is deeply committed to Good to Great and significant progress is being made on these transformative plans.

UOG's status as an accredited university was re-affirmed in 2009 for a period of eight years. In the period since that review, the university submitted and had accepted two interim reports, both focused on progress related to finances, enrollment plans, academic programming and strategic planning, program review, the assessment process, and the alignment thereof. Guam also submitted and received approval for two online degree programs: the Master of Education with specialization in Reading (approved September 2, 2011) and the Professional Master of Business Administration (approved November 13, 2013). UOG's careful attention to the Commission's recommendations, as demonstrated through G2G, illustrates the university's serious commitment to the accreditation review process.

In conducting its review, the team carefully read, analyzed, and discussed UOG's institutional report and supporting exhibits, related materials on its website, as well as UOG's accreditation history as described by the university and summarized in documents provided by WSCUC. The team's review of the materials gave rise to lines of inquiry that formed the basis for interviews and meetings conducted during the two and one-half day Accreditation Visit of April 17-20, 2016.

During the visit, the team furthered its understanding of the university through meetings with faculty, staff, students, and administrative leadership, including the Accreditation Steering Committee, and via comments received through the confidential email account. The team also reviewed additional documentation, including student work samples, as well as materials necessary to complete the four federal compliance forms: Credit Hour and Program Length Review, Marketing and Recruitment Review, Student Complaints Review, and Transfer Credit Policy Review.

The university's two online degree programs, the Professional Master in Business Administration and Master of Education with specialization in Reading and its offsite degree, BA in Elementary

Education, were reviewed prior to the Accreditation Visit, the latter via a three hour videoconference conducted on February 3, 2016 (PST). The Distance Education and Offsite Campus Locations Reviews are appended as are the four federal compliance forms. No special follow-up related to substantive change was conducted in connection with this visit.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The team's contribution to UOG's review for reaffirmation of accreditation was executed in two stages, an Offsite Review (OSR) held November 11-12, 2015 at WSCUC's office in Alameda, California and the Accreditation Visit of April 17-20 on the UOG campus.

During the OSR, the team engaged in a structured discussion of the university's institutional report, evaluating each component of the report individually, and the report as a whole, to identify strengths of the university's work (commendations) and to develop lines of inquiry to guide the Accreditation Visit. This included an in-depth discussion of the institution's compliance with the WSCUC standards. The OSR concluded with a teleconference between the team and leadership from the University of Guam, during which the team orally communicated its commendations and lines of inquiry. A formal, written summary of the commendations and lines of inquiry was provided to the university seven days after the teleconference.

The Accreditation Visit involved two days of meetings with select campus constituents, including faculty, staff, administrative leadership, and undergraduate and graduate students. Meetings were structured to gather information and insights directly related to the lines of inquiry. Time was also set aside to review institutional documents and to complete the federal forms. Preparation for the visit included reviewing and discussing a preliminary draft of the team's report, examining additional documents requested from the university, and preparing questions specific to individual meetings. The

Accreditation Visit concluded with the exit interview, open to all campus constituents, in which the team communicated its commendations and recommendations.

Circumstances within the California State University (CSU) system left the team's chair unable to join the Accreditation Visit in person. The chair, instead, participated via teleconference in as many of the visit meetings and team executive sessions as possible. In the chair's absence, one team member assumed interim chair responsibilities. Despite these challenges, this report reflects the chair's considerable contributions.

For both the OSR and Accreditation Visit, the team prepared carefully and systematically, reviewing institutional materials, completing worksheets designed by WSCUC to guide analyses of these materials, and discussing the completed worksheets as a group to identify institutional strengths and to outline and/or refine areas for further inquiry. To ensure all aspects of the institutional report, and related review requirements, were carefully considered, pairs of team members assumed specific responsibility for particular elements of the review, leading the team through the analysis, soliciting input and reflection from all, and then summarizing the group's conclusions in draft sections of the team's report. To put their own responsibilities in context, all team members read UOG's institutional report in its entirety. All team members also read and edited the final team report. As such this report, represents the team's collective understanding and evaluation of the university.

C. **Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence**

Following the organizational structure outlined in the *2013 Handbook of Accreditation*, the university's institutional report consisted of eight essays, each with supporting documentation and evidence. The university did not complete the optional essay on an institution-specific theme. The

report, however, was thematically centered on the Good to Great initiative, which provided a compelling, unifying framework for the report, consistent with its role in charting the university's course for the next five to ten years. As noted by the university, the reaffirmation review was well timed, allowing the university to examine and align the various elements of the G2G initiative and implementation plan with the accreditation standards. Evidence of this alignment was apparent in each of the report's eight essays.

The team found the institutional report to be well organized, complete, and clearly written, with each required component responding to the expectations outlined in the *Handbook* and supported by relevant evidence. The institutional report included the two required exhibits, the Review under the WSCUC Standards and the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, each of which was carefully completed. The report, as well as material updates provided for the Accreditation Visit, provided a candid description and self-reflective analysis of the institution. Institutional strengths and challenges were described. In many instances, analyses of institutional progress concluded with recommendations for future actions, thereby illustrating genuine engagement with the self-study nature of the review process. The team found the report to accurately portray the condition of the institution, as confirmed through discussions and evidence reviewed during the Accreditation Visit.

The institutional report was developed under the guidance of a broadly representative steering committee, which included faculty, administrators, and representatives from the Student Government Association and the University Assessment Committee. Report components were drafted by writing teams, each of which was co-chaired by an administrator and faculty pair who were also members of the steering committee. The broader university community had opportunity to review and comment on final drafts of the report. The team praises UOG for its inclusive process in preparing its institutional report.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions (CFRs 1.1, 1.8)

In its 2009 action letter reaffirming accreditation, the WSCUC Commission identified four areas for institutional attention: (1) Enhancing Academic Quality, (2) Supporting Student Success, (3) Increasing Commitment to the Land Grant Mission, and (4) Sustaining and Improving Effectiveness and Efficiency. Topics within each of these four areas formed the substance of recommendations stemming from the interim reports of 2011 and 2013. Specifically, the 2011 Interim Report Committee requested updates on the university's financial position; development of a multi-year strategic enrollment plan and demonstrated progress toward specified goals; progress aligning the university's portfolio of academic programs with goals and objectives of its strategic plan; progress aligning enrollment, program review, academic planning and strategic planning; and evidence of "closing the loop" in response to assessment results. In its action letter, the 2013 Interim Report Committee noted "substantial progress" had been made in each of these areas and requested updates on the following in the institutional report for reaffirmation of accreditation: Guam's economic status and the prospects for future funding by the government; progress on the UOG $30 million capital campaign; enrollment trends and plans; the status of the university's efforts to reconfigure and renew its academic programs; and current retention and graduation data.

As demonstrated through its institutional report and confirmed through the Accreditation Visit, UOG has responded seriously, thoughtfully, and purposefully to previous Commission and Interim Report Committee recommendations, and much good progress has been made in all areas. As discussed more completely in Section II.G of this report, the university's financial position is solid, reflecting the campus' own good fiscal management, progress on its capital campaign (now at $12 million), and continued improvement to Guam's economy, which has permitted increased government commitment

to the university. Similarly, as discussed more comprehensively in Section II.E, the university has achieved its first year retention goals. Six year graduation rates, however, have not advanced, and remain an area in need of focused and sustained attention.

With respect to integrative planning, the university has developed and is implementing its Good to Great initiative, a comprehensive plan for realizing the "proper connection between resources and quality, relationships and mission." The G2G Implementation Plan articulates a comprehensive vision for the university involving five transformational, strategic goals together with 204 tactical recommendations. Inevitably, the university has found some strategic goals more difficult to advance than others, with rebalancing the human resource portfolio perhaps the most immediately challenging. Nevertheless, as the team witnessed during the visit, the university community is deeply committed to Good to Great, and campus leadership continues to focus on strategies to advance progress, including where challenges have arisen. Progress on additional aspects of the G2G process is described elsewhere in this report.

In terms of the 204 tactical recommendations, 56 are complete; 128 are in progress; seven have been revised and are ongoing, and a final 13 are being reconsidered.[3] The tactical recommendations are organized into six categories, which align with concerns raised by the Commission: (1) academic program benchmarks, (2) program prioritization, (3) investment in higher ranked programs, (4) transformation for lower ranked programs, (5) new ideas for instruction and research, and (6) investment in faculty and staff development.

Of special note is the program prioritization process, which is challenging for any university. The process, which led to the elimination of six programs and consolidation of another three, has been

---

[3] Two were duplicates.

handled with great sensitivity, including opportunities for lower ranked programs to work with administrative leadership to identify the most productive way forward in light of the prioritization outcomes.

Consistent with recommendations stemming from its 2011 Interim Report, G2G-related planning also reaches down into the colleges and schools through the 2013-2018 Academic Master Plan (AMP) and, ultimately, to individual academic programs through newly revised program review policies. Significantly, each AMP addresses four strategic commitments that correspond directly to four areas of focus outlined in the Commission's 2009 letter: (1) Academic Quality, (2) Student Success, Enrollment Growth, and Institutional Stature, (3) the Land Grant Mission and Engagement, and (4) Institutional Effectiveness and Efficiency. For each commitment and associated objectives, AMPs describe how objectives will be met and achievement measured, together with timelines and descriptions of the resources required for action. Deans reported actively stewarding her/his school or college's AMP, which includes providing progress reports to the senior vice president at least quarterly. The team was impressed by how well UOG has consistently integrated the findings and recommendations from WSCUC reviews with the institution's vision for its future directions.

UOG is also making progress in documenting learning results and student achievement over time, on a program by program basis. An annual assessment inventory is required for all academic programs, undergraduate and graduate, and evidence provided during the Accreditation Visit indicates that, over the last two years, inventories have been submitted for 70% and 80% of undergraduate and 50% and 65% of graduate programs. In meetings, faculty and deans provided concrete examples of how assessment results are being used to improve student learning.

The program review policies, undergraduate and graduate, require reflection on program-level learning outcomes assessment including evidence of "closing the loop." However, the university struggles with timely completion of program reviews, particularly at the graduate level. As described more fully in Section II.F of this report, program assessment, annual and periodic, is an area for continued investment and development as an instrument for enhancing program quality.

At the graduate level, and through G2G, significant institutional infrastructure been put in place that addresses the Commission's recommendations to address quality and consistency across graduate programs, engage faculty and students more closely in the research enterprise, and ensure there are uniform and appropriate policies and procedures governing graduate program offerings. For instance, G2G has refocused the university's research agenda on work that is regionally responsive and intentionally designed to enhance student learning. This required each UOG research program to identify an academic home and clarify its contribution to the teaching mission of the university. G2G has also enhanced the stewardship of graduate programs, and made degree requirements more consistent, by requiring a minimum of one core faculty per graduate program and benchmarking master's degree requirements to 33 units. Further, the AMPs include plans to assure the "rigor, quality and consistency of expectations about student performance in the University of Guam's graduate programs" and to "foster[ing] scholarship among all faculty, and among graduate faculty in particular." More recently, institutional graduate learning objectives (IGLOs) have been developed to unify degree expectations among programs and support graduate program assessment, thesis evaluation, and timely submission of program reviews. The new IGLOs are expected to be published in the fall 2016 edition of the Graduate Bulletin, the institution's graduate catalog.

The university has also made considerable progress addressing the Commission's expectation to increase its commitment to its land grant mission. While the Commission's recommendations in this

area focused on closer collaboration with local community colleges and expansion of technology-assisted distance education, the university has addressed its commitment to the land grant mission at the most essential level, the question of mission and fit to mission as defined and examined through the G2G process. This included the development of the "Statement of a Great University of Guam," and the prioritization of all academic and administrative units in part by their "Essentiality, e.g. fit to the great UOG." Thus, the university's response to the recommendation to increase its commitment to the land grant mission has been addressed and is being realized through a wholesale re-envisioning of the university's role in the region and the subsequent re-alignment of its academic programs, administrative organization, resource allocation, and workforce deployment to these ends. This includes expansion by 2025 to a university of 11,000 students, 5,000 on site and 6,000 online.

As relates to the Commission's specific recommendations regarding UOG's land grant mission, the university has initiated its transition into online education, implementing professional online master's degrees in Business Administration and Education with specialization in Reading in 2012 and 2014 respectively. Details on the status of these programs are provided in the Distance Education appendix of this report. The G2G process has led to the hiring of a chief information officer and an IT strategic plan that includes establishing a high speed Research and Education Network with connection to other such networks. Finally, as per the Commission's recommendation, course and institution specific articulation matrices for the five regional community colleges now appear on the university's website. The institution indicated that efforts were underway to revisit the current course transfer articulation matrix, which does not take into account more recent curricular development at feeder schools. Efforts to examine the comparative success of native and transfer students are still pending, as G2G has placed institutional priority on improving the success of its native students, which currently constitute approximately 97% of its undergraduates.

In summary, the team concluded that UOG has provided compelling evidence to demonstrate that it has satisfactorily addressed the Commission's recommendations.

B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Component 2 of the institutional report provides evidence of UOG's compliance with the WSCUC standards and federal requirements, and evaluates the university's completion of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators. In making its assessment, the team carefully and systematically reviewed all three elements.

UOG's Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) was fully completed. All programs were listed together with whether they have learning outcomes and where they are published, what evidence is assessed, who assesses these outcomes, and how the findings are used. For each degree program, the IEE provides the date of the last program review.

UOG's Review under the Standards was equally well completed. To ensure the document accurately represented the university's condition, scores were examined twice during the reaffirmation process, near the beginning to provide guidance to writing teams and after the institutional report was drafted. No gaps in policies and procedures related to the Criteria for Review were identified. The university also meets federal requirements for credit hour, marketing and recruitment, student complaints, and transfer of credit policy, as verified in appendices A: 1-4.

The sections that follow describe the results of the team's review of each standard. The section concludes with the team's overall finding regarding the university's compliance with the standards.

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Education Objectives

Institutional Purposes. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2) The team noted that UOG defines its mission, institutional purposes, and educational objectives in a clear and transparent manner. The mission statement expresses a commitment to the learners and communities in the area, a commitment for lifelong learning through its core curriculum, degree programs, and research and a commitment to acquire indigenous and global knowledge. The mission statement is published on the website and addresses both values and a focus on the contribution to the public good. With regard to educational objectives, the Good to Great process required all programs to align their program learning outcomes and student learning outcomes with the institutional outcomes (ILOs). The core commitments of the ILOs are available online.

Information on retention and graduation, along with much other institutional information, is in the Factbook, which is available on the website, and, while the institution gathers a significant amount of data, it has not yet analyzed these data thoroughly enough to guide its responses to the issues of retention and graduation. Further exploration and understanding of the data through additional analysis will enable the university to gain a better understanding of its students' success challenges.

Integrity and Transparency. (CFRs 1.3-1.8) There is evidence on the website and in the catalog and Student Handbook on the programs offered, credits required, and costs. Policies articulating grievances and complaint procedures are accessible. The university publishes its statement of academic freedom in the UOG Regulations, Rules, and Procedures Manual. It is also published in the faculty senate bylaws. Due process procedures are also covered in these documents. The university has non-discrimination policies that are published in the catalog.

Diversity is defined broadly at UOG to include race/ethnicity, income level, gender, language, disability, culture and so on. Faculty diversity is an issue that has been given attention, particularly in the hiring process.

The institution does not have a history of adverse findings against it. It also has stated policies on grading and student evaluation.

The University of Guam has an engaged and independent Board of Regents that has worked assiduously during the present administration to establish and maintain independence in its decision authority from the legislature. The recently developed and more independent relationship with the legislature has served the institution well in terms of its board governance structures and fiscal sustainability.

Regular audits have been submitted with the annual reports and operational information such as approved budgets, audited financials, and staffing patterns routinely posted on the UOG website. The audited financial statements, audited compliance reports, budgets, financial management plan, and monthly financial statements are online on the administration and finance webpage. The webpage also explains the vetting process for budgets and financial information. The institution's prior interactions with WSCUC indicate a commitment to integrity.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning. (CFRs 2.1-2.7) UOG has undertaken significant work to ensure the quality of its degrees and to expand on the "richness of student learning environments." At the undergraduate level, program and institutional-learning outcomes help to define the meaning of the degree as more than simply an accumulation of credits; a capstone course or experience has been identified for each

major, and students are required to complete a service learning experience in the major. The General Education program is being revised as a four year experience that systematically cultivates development of the WSCUC Core Competencies, ensures experience and knowledge of the local region, addresses a set of skills reflecting the diversity of intellectual traditions and cultural perspectives, and concludes with a high impact final course in the major (e.g. capstone, thematic course, research). The latter will bring together three program objectives, which must address at least two of the WSCUC core competencies and one value articulated in CFR 2.2a related to diversity, civic responsibility, ability to work with others, or lifelong learning. This formulation of the culminating experience will necessitate revisions to the majors, which is seen as an opportunity for programs to more closely align their PLOs to these larger institutional objectives.

The university's graduate programs have objectives differentiated from and more advanced than those for undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student leaning outcomes. G2G emphasizes further development of the university's graduate education and research mission, which has led to an increased focus on research in all graduate degrees, and on the scholarly activities of faculty. Each graduate program and concentration in a graduate program must be supported by at least one core, fulltime faculty member.

Program learning outcomes have been developed for all graduate degrees, although, as noted in the institutional report, not all are available in the Graduate Bulletin. There is also some inconsistency in form; some read like outcomes, others like goals. The team encourages the university to pursue its own recommendation to ensure PLOs are publicly available in the catalog at a minimum. To unify learning expectations among graduate programs and support thesis evaluation, institutional graduate learning objectives have been developed and are expected to be published in the 2016-17 Graduate Bulletin.

Learning outcomes are widely shared among faculty, students, and staff. ILOs and all undergraduate PLOs appear in the catalog and all syllabi are required to include course, program, and institutional learning outcomes. Evidence presented in the institutional report illustrated good progress in this direction, and the team encourages continued attention to integrating learning outcomes into all syllabi to the benefit of students.

The university has a thoughtfully developed infrastructure to assess student learning at program and institutional levels. Each school and college has a committee responsible for assessment. Deans are responsible for ensuring programs complete an annual assessment inventory. The University Assessment Committee (UAC), a committee of faculty representing all schools and colleges and key committees of the faculty senate, facilitates assessment at the program and institutional levels through, among activities, its reviews of annual assessment inventories, coordination of WSCUC core competency assessment, and support for the integration of program assessment into the program review process. Discussions with deans and the UAC revealed a robust culture of program-level assessment that is leading to curricular improvement. Assessment culture has advanced beyond simply bringing the campus into compliance, and now seems more focused on continuous improvement. Much of the success in institutionalizing assessment within the schools and colleges is attributed to the integration of assessment-related expectations into performance evaluation for both faculty and deans, with the latter being directly accountable for supporting and promoting assessment efforts.

All academic programs at the university are subject to systematic program review, which, by policy, is expected to address student learning outcomes assessment and student success metrics. The university struggles with timely completion of reviews, however, particularly at the graduate level. The institution's successes and challenges with program review, including related recommendations, are discussed in Section II.F of this report.

Notwithstanding the need to ensure timely and meaningful completion of the program review process, overall the university demonstrates a clear commitment to assessment as a means for continuous improvement. In doing so, the university has significantly advanced its capacity to link educational and institutional effectiveness and to ensure that students are achieving institutionally recognized levels of achievement upon graduation.

Scholarship and Creative Activities. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9) Through G2G, the university has prioritized enhancing scholarship and creative activities for both faculty and students, undergraduate and graduate. The transformation from Good to Great involves strengthening regionally focused research consistent with the land grant mission of the university, and concrete plans for doing so are supported by the Academic Master Plans required for each school and college together with improvements to the university's capacity to acquire and manage grants.

The university is also focused on enhancing the student experience through efforts to promote off-island and international experiences for all students as well as to infuse more community-centered research into the curriculum. For example, the Child Health Assessment in the Pacific, a USDA funded project, underwrites summer study at the University of Hawaii, Mānoa for two undergraduate students for three years, which will culminate in a local project.

The faculty evaluation system clearly recognizes these efforts. However, the university's faculty evaluation policy is fifteen years old, and assigns regional relevance to the categories of extension and community service only. The university's G2G efforts may benefit from further alignment of the faculty evaluation system with G2G priorities, including perhaps considering regional relevance in the category of creative/scholarly activity or research.

Student Learning and Success. (CFRs 2.10 – 2.14) The University of Guam has made student success an institutional priority through G2G's focus on the student experience. At the undergraduate level, institutional goals for first year retention and six year graduation rates have been developed, and the university has undertaken a number of initiatives to improve the student experience and, in turn, retention and graduation rates. Examples include a One-Stop Student Services Center to co-locate admissions and records, financial aid, and the bursar's office, efforts to simplify and expedite financial aid, and a Developmental Skills Task Force to address college readiness. Alignment of these and other student success-related efforts is part of the responsibility of the newly established Student Success Innovation Team (SSIT), an ad-hoc task force to develop recommendations to improve student retention, persistence, and degree completion on an institution-wide basis.

Student success is also addressed by the Academic Master Plans, achievement of which is guided by school and college deans. Outside of the schools, student success is the responsibility of the new dean of Enrollment Management and Student Services (EMSS), who is a member of the SSIT, and who oversees the Division of Enrollment Management and Student Success, which includes a number of student support units and programs, including Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Residence Halls, Student Counseling Services, and the Career Placement Office.

The institution routinely runs reports on student enrollment. These summarize resident and non-resident FTE, the high schools of incoming students, majors by ethnicities, and retention and graduation by program, which is disaggregated by gender and by ethnicity. Data analyses have led the university to develop programs and initiatives focused on student success, for instance, an early alert system to connect at-risk students with institutional resources. Through the SSIT, the university is gathering quantitative and qualitative data on the student experience to better understand barriers to degree progress and completion and, in turn, to identify appropriate interventions and/or strengthen

existing efforts. These efforts have revealed issues with institutional data management, including data entry and reporting, as well a related need for staff professional development, all of which will need to be addressed to achieve the university's commitment to data-informed planning and decision making for student success.

The university has in place an academic advising system that it is actively strengthening as part of its efforts to improve retention and degree completion rates. For example, improved advising is a focus of every AMP.

As the team learned during the Accreditation Visit, the university has initiated annual assessment of its co-curricular programs, and this is an area for continued development. Periodic program review of student services and other non-academic departments has yet to be regularized, following the first reviews conducted as part of the G2G program prioritization process.

Transfer students constitute a small minority of students at UOG and the institutional report did not provide much information on this student population. The 2014 Student and Course Enrollment Report indicated a 29.5% decline in transfer student enrollment from fall of 2013 to fall of 2014, but no study was undertaken to see if the loss was due to graduation or non-enrollment, and no profile was compiled on the types of students lost (i.e. non-degree seeking, non-Guamanian Micronesian students, etc.).

An open session of non-Guamanian Micronesian and Filipino students revealed some difficulties facing transfer students, including delays in financial aid deployment (which adversely affected their ability to register for space in the residential halls) and the lack of transferability of certain classes from the Northern Marianas College and the College of Micronesia - Federated States of Micronesia. Students suggested that university support go beyond just remedial coursework and instead better facilitate more seamless transitions to the larger university, including better advising on which classes

are not acceptable as prerequisites for certain majors. Since many of UOG's transfer students are from at-risk populations, the university is encouraged to undertake a more intensive study of transfer issues to ensure they are not unduly burdened by the transfer process.

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

Faculty and Staff. (CFRs 3.1-3.3) The University of Guam employs the equivalent of 174 full-time faculty members (FTF). Of these, 96 are tenured, and 42 have tenure-track appointments; non-tenure-track instructors represent about 21% of the faculty. UOG thus has a faculty whose size is suited to the size of the student body. The ratio of tenured/tenure-track faculty members to non-tenure-track members of the faculty is commendable. The university's financial sustainability goals, the thoughtfulness demonstrated in its management of finances, and its plans to grow the faculty as it grows enrollment indicate a healthy approach to instructional staffing.

The University of Guam also is mindful of diversity within faculty ranks. Of the full time faculty, 43% is White Non-Hispanic, 24% Asian, and 26% Pacific Islander. Females comprise 44% of the faculty, and males 55%. Further indication of UOG's commitment to its teaching and learning mission is seen in additional funds recently allocated for faculty development, and a permanent home for these enhanced development activities is expected to reside in the planned student services center.

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5) The University of Guam's Vision 2025 indicates the quality of the university's planning process and its ambitions for its physical campus. As it continues to plan for additional facilities, the university is encouraged to examine its course-scheduling practices, including the current practice of scheduling most classes on Tuesdays and

Thursdays, with an eye toward making the most of its instructional space and better meeting course demand.

The current capital campaign is focused upon development of a student services center and engineering annex. Information technology's foundational elements have taken a significant leap forward with the addition of a new chief information officer who brings new ideas as well as networks to campus. Strengthening of standard email and network capacity is being pursued and needs to be completed. As this baseline infrastructure is put in place, additional hires in the university's institutional research unit will provide more consistent data to further the university's culture of evidence.

Organizational Structure and Decision-Making Processes. (CFRs 3.6-3.10) The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes have been well demonstrated by the G2G initiative. Decision-making throughout the organization, including by the Board of Regents, is clear, consistent, and appropriate. The comprehensive prioritization of academic programs and administrative units is ambitious, and the university has done a commendable job focusing on what makes it unique, what is financially sustainable, and what it takes in an environment of limited resources to transform academic programming from good to great.

The Board of Regents meets regularly and is involved in setting direction for the university, while leaving the management of the institution to the campus. The faculty senate, another key body within the decision-making framework, is active and effective. As new committees and initiatives touching on the academic enterprise are developed, it is important they continue to be integrated into the senate committee structure.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement.

Quality Assurance Processes. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2) UOG is committed to and has in place processes to assure the quality of both academic and, increasingly, non-academic programming. It is clear that UOG has travelled a great distance in this regard through development of its Good to Great (G2G) initiative which has placed the quest for high quality, clear regional impact, and fiscal responsibility under a single evaluative lens. UOG is to be commended for its effort. The commitment to establishing goals commensurate with the institution's relationship to its external environment and the prioritization of academic programs and administrative units in pursuit of those goals are progressive and, in many ways, daring.

Against this backdrop, and the emphases of Standard 4, the team found itself highly focused on evidence of progress in the implementation of the G2G initiative. During the visit, the institution provided the team with a comprehensive inventory of all 204 G2G recommendations and their status. It is clear that UOG is moving forward in accomplishing its G2G goals. As the movement occurs, the university will benefit from a detailed implementation plan with timelines and specification of accountability. Equally beneficial will be a clear institution-wide communication mechanism to update constituents on progress and to celebrate G2G accomplishments. The team urges the institution to create a single website or similar means of communication in conjunction with its implementation plan in order to maintain the extraordinary momentum and accomplishments of G2G.

Policies are in place to govern and facilitate new curriculum and program development. The linkage between faculty governance, curriculum development, and the program-review processes is clear. Appropriate chains of authority are well-respected in the sense that the faculty senate's overall responsibility for curriculum oversight is well-honored and program accountability is expected and achieved. UOG has worked hard to engage the faculty in student learning assessment and to integrate it into program review. Looking forward, the university intends to integrate the G2G program evaluation

criteria into the program review process, undergraduate and graduate, thereby ensuring ongoing focus on the transition from a good to a great University of Guam.

Administrative responsibility for assuring that elements of quality assurance in the academic realm occur is appropriately assigned to the deans of colleges and schools and, ultimately, to the senior vice president of academic and student affairs. Institutional learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and course learning outcomes are the foci of reviews of all academic quality-assurance efforts. The strength of reviews has increased as the overall umbrella of G2G has brought every aspect of quality, regional impact, and cost of institutional programming into focus.

The above notwithstanding, as is common in most universities, the depth and corresponding focus of the academic program review process are evolving rapidly. Though the processes employed in reviews of academic programs generally meet the test of sufficiency, the team noted unevenness in the strength of reviews across programs, and urges attention to this issue. Further, the team noted and urges UOG to examine elements of the program review process that unnecessarily complicate it at the program level, especially for programs that also are reviewed by outside accreditation bodies. As noted in Section II.F of this report, elements of the program review process need to be clarified and better executed. Perhaps as important, those at ground level in all reviews could benefit from a better understanding of what actually is needed to undertake a high-quality program review.

Quality assurance processes in non-academic areas are an emerging practice. Significantly, administrative units were evaluated during the G2G program prioritization process along the same four dimensions as academic programs, in effect functioning as the first ever periodic reviews. Annual assessment of both process and student learning outcomes have also been initiated for student services units. The institutional report indicated intention to move forward with periodic program review of

administrative units, while interviews suggested that this next step was still under consideration. The team strongly encourages UOG to implement a periodic program review process for non-academic units to the benefit of these units and the university and to fully meet CFR 4.1.

UOG recognizes the importance of its institutional research capacity to the accomplishment of its G2G goals and the strengthening of a culture in which decisions are clearly informed by evidence. Movement in this direction has produced a commitment to advancing the university's information technology level both technically, and in terms of the development of easily accessible data by which to assess and chart progress toward G2G (and division and department) goals. To this end, the university has established the position of chief information officer (CIO) and has filled that position with an experienced individual. The team was encouraged by the commitment of the new CIO, and the support of his efforts by the president and cabinet colleagues, to put in place the components of an effective data warehouse.

At present, the university's work to detail and accomplish the goals of the G2G initiative are somewhat ahead of its institutional research capacity. The team was encouraged by the university's efforts to expand the capacity and goals of its institutional research unit. The demands upon this unit will increase rapidly as G2G goals are pursued and criteria applied, including through program review. The strengthening of the institutional research unit is being linked appropriately to the strengthening of its information technology levels and organization.

Institutional Learning and Improvement. (CFRs 4.3-4.7) In addition to the G2G planning process, each school and college has developed an Academic Master Plan (AMP) for the 2013-18 period that addresses a set of strategic academic goals underpinned by four core commitments: (1) Academic Quality, (2) Student Success, Enrollment Growth, and Institutional Stature, (3) the Land Grant Mission

and Engagement, and (4) Institutional Effectiveness and Efficiency. Importantly, the AMPs extend attention beyond goal setting to emphasize implementation, monitoring, and overall improvement. The AMPs define in measurable terms each of the four core commitments and integrate mission, academic curricular focus, expected standards of quality, and resources to guide development of programs at UOG. The Academic Master Plan, an often overlooked planning tool in many institutions, serves to highlight the thoughtful and intentional planning that characterizes UOG's efforts in most arenas.

Conclusions

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with all four of the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

C. **Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the Degrees** (CFRs 2.1, 2.2a, 2.2b)

At the institutional level, undergraduate education is largely defined through the newly developed General Education (GE) framework, which, has been carefully crafted through the integrated work of extraordinarily committed faculty members, working in subcommittee groups. The visiting team had an opportunity to meet at length with the full GE revision team, and was impressed by its thorough research and dedication to the effort. They were committed to the project and proud of their achievements.

The new GE framework is composed of three tiers. The primary tier responds to the five WSCUC core competencies, and the assessment of those competencies will be accomplished through course embedded assessment, which is currently in development.   The second tier articulates a core commitment to diversity and direction and is theme based. The intent of this tier is to educate students

in the diversity of human knowledge, defined broadly as the humanities and the sciences, while providing pathways for students to discover how they may improve themselves, serve their communities, and build humanity. Students choose a theme and courses that are aligned with their intended major.

The third tier of "Exceptional Experience" embraces a commitment to community public service and global understanding and is embedded wholly within the major. Programs are expected to fulfill this requirement using one or more high impact practices to enhance the major experience and better prepare students for life after graduation. This level of the GE program formalizes fulfillment of the WSCUC expectations for higher-order learning and the university's learning outcomes. It will also provide the vehicle to further develop and assess the core competencies at advanced levels. Taken as a whole the new General Education framework defines the meaning of an undergraduate degree at the University of Guam. The framework was approved by the faculty senate and adopted by the university in November 2014. Coursework and assessment are currently in development. A plan for the transition to the new framework has been developed and implementation will begin in fall 2017.

The development of graduate education is a major focus of the G2G initiative. UOG has focused on the development of a strong regional research platform that is tied into its responsibility for sociocultural and economic development and student success. The university currently offers 14 master's degree programs. Land grant and sea grant designations allow substantive, in-depth analysis by faculty and students of the dynamics of the region's natural and marine resources and their connections to an island community's sustainability. Major grants such as the EPSCoR[4], NIH[5] Cancer Grant (U54), and LSAMP[6] have provided the institution with a platform to further develop the research capabilities

---

[4] National Science Foundation's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research
[5] National Institutes of Health
[6] National Science Foundation's Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation

needed for quality graduate education. The intersections of local, regional, and global systems guide the humanities, social, and applied sciences research agenda.

The institution also defines graduate education through its faculty and research. Faculty must be evaluated and deemed qualified for inclusion on the graduate faculty. The institutional report states that the graduate faculty insures graduate quality through the ongoing evaluation not only of its research efforts, but also evaluation of curricula with regard to the WSCUC core competencies. During the visit, the team met with a group of graduate faculty and administrators to verify documentation and clarify remaining issues. Over thirty faculty people attended the meeting and spoke passionately about their commitment to the development of graduate programs that are particularly suited to the mission and region. The development and sustaining of these programs is supported by the faculty senate's Committee on Institutional Excellence, the Graduate Curricula Review Committee (GCRC), the Graduate Council, and the Research Council.

D. **Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation** (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)

The university has carefully attended to the WSCUC five core competencies, reflecting the value placed on these skills for post-graduate success. Five of the seven institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) directly address the WSCUC core competencies, and all undergraduate programs have identified program courses that introduce, reinforce, and result in student mastery of these ILOs. Assessment of ILOs is required by the Academic Master Plan, with a focus on the performance of graduating seniors. The new General Educational curriculum will further strengthen this focus by scaffolding student development of these core skills through all four years of the curriculum. In keeping with WSCUC expectations for this review, UOG provided evidence of their strategy for, and outcomes of, the assessment of three of the five WSCUC competencies: written communication,

critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning. The institution has also identified and is piloting instruments for assessing information literacy and oral communication.

The university's approach to developing strategies for assessing the competencies has been thoughtful and measured. Colleges with relevant disciplinary expertise have led the identification and piloting of standardized instruments to enable the university to benchmark student performance to external standards. Members of the University Assessment Committee (UAC), the hub for coordinating and advancing this work for the campus, discussed their interest in triangulating evidence of core competency achievement, including to better interpret the results from standardized instruments. Care is also being taken to ensure the long-term affordability of standardized exams, which will aid in longitudinal data collection, and where possible psychometrically valid, but freely available, instruments are being piloted. With respect to external instruments in particular, the university is also working to promote testing conditions that will increase the likelihood that results are truly representative of student abilities. The team was impressed with and commends the institution for its commitment and strategic approach to this work.

Consistent with this approach, the university used standardized instruments to assess the first three core competencies: the California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) for critical thinking, the CLA+ instrument for writing, and the Quantitative Reasoning and Literacy Assessment (QRLA), a National Science Foundation-supported instrument for quantitative reasoning. Both the CCTST and CLA+ instruments were administered to separate cohorts of first year and senior students, with over 200 students from each level taking the CCTST and 100, again from each level, the CLA+. The QRLA was piloted with over 200 students from across the university who were enrolled in lower division math courses; results were used in part to compare the performance of students who had and had not taken developmental math courses.

Across all three competencies, results revealed strengths and areas to strengthen and, in some instances, encouraged examination of the alignment of the curriculum with exam priorities. To wit, CCTST results showed seniors outperforming first year students in the skills of induction and inference, outcomes the university has attributed to increased attention to argumentation and reasoning in writing classes. CLA+ results also showed seniors performing well in argumentation. However, in other areas, seniors demonstrated "basic" as opposed to "proficient" competency, and, for some subcategories, little to no difference was observed in the performance of seniors and first year students. The university is responding with revisions to its first year writing course, while remaining sensitive to the fact that the entering skill level of the tested graduating seniors was unknown. Finally, QLRA results revealed that UOG students did well in comparison to two-year institutions and non-selective four-year schools. As both the CCTST and CLA+ are costly instruments, the university is considering the need to identify alternatives.

During discussion with the team, the UAC described the university's plans to advance its assessment of the core competencies. Next steps include improving dissemination of exam results, including disaggregation of data by school/college and program, to promote responsive action. For exams that thus far have been piloted with subsets of students (e.g., writing), testing efforts will be expanded to ensure all schools and colleges receive data on the performance of their students. The university is also actively piloting instruments for assessing oral communication and information literacy. The team is impressed with, and praises UOG for, the thoughtful, long-term view it has taken in developing, successfully implementing, and learning from its strategies to assess the core competencies.

E. **Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation** (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 4.2, 4.3)

Undergraduate student success is an institutional priority at the University of Guam. It is a core component of "the student experience," one of the five strategic goals of G2G, realization of which is anticipated to transform the university and its impact on and contribution to Guam and Micronesia. Student success is also one of the four strategic initiatives that form the framework for the campus' 2013-2018 Academic Master Plan (AMP), the document outlining school and college-specific efforts to strengthen the campus' academic programs in support of the campus' G2G ambitions. Institutional goals for first year retention (75%) and six year graduation rates (35%) have been established, and with respect to the former, achieved. Most recently, student success has become the focus of the Student Success Innovation Team (SSIT), a highly motivated, institutionally representative, sixteen member ad-hoc task force, to advance and better coordinate student success efforts institution-wide.

Consistent with this institutional emphasis, the university promotes a holistic and student-centered view of student success. Priority is placed on understanding the UOG experience from the student's point of view as a means for ensuring access and affordability, facilitating retention, degree completion, and achievement of intended learning outcomes, and preparing graduates for lifelong learning as alumni. The AMP reflects these emphases, requiring strategies, timelines, required resources, and outcome indicators for assessing student achievement of institutional learning outcomes and for improving student recruitment and retention and graduation rates in support of the institution's goals. Student success-related G2G outcomes included implementing capstone courses for all majors, limiting credit hour requirements for undergraduate (124) and graduate degrees (33), emphasizing student engagement and travel opportunities, and benchmarking program learning outcomes to external standards. Beyond the degree program, outcomes of the focus on the student experience include the One-Stop Student Services Center slated to open in fall 2016, renewed efforts to simplify and expedite the student

financial aid process, and the organization of a Developmental Skills Task Force, which thus far has led to curricular revisions in both Fundamentals in Math and English courses and to aligning the schedules of students taking these courses to improve attendance and participation and, ultimately, student outcomes. The impact of these revisions to the developmental courses are being assessed.

Notably, and perhaps distinctively, UOG's definition of student success also places priority on recruiting faculty and staff who are appropriately prepared for and committed to advancing the institution's contribution to the region and who, in turn, are held accountable for establishing the conditions for student success and for achieving intended outcomes. Toward this end, the deans of the schools and colleges regularly report progress on AMPs to the senior vice president. The deans, along with the dean of Enrollment Management and Student Services (EMSS), are also held accountable for improvements in retention and graduation rates in their annual performance reviews. The team was impressed with university's comprehensive definition of student success, including the attention to attendant organizational structures and incentives.

The university's focus on recruitment and retention has coincided with an average increase in enrollment of 2.1% per year over the 2012-2014 period, suggesting that these collective efforts are having the desired impact. The university's goal for retention rates for first time, full time, freshmen has been realized with the most recent three year average of 74.5%. This is a commendable accomplishment, particularly as it exceeds the mean for its open admission peer institutions (62%) and falls squarely within the range of rates of the vast majority of its aspirational institutions (70-82% for 2011-12). The most recent available three year averages indicate essentially equivalent first year retention rates for females (74%) and males (75%). However, there is a nine percentage point discrepancy between the rates (averaged over three years) for each of the two biggest populations,

Asians (79%) and Pacific Islanders (70%). At 73.5%, rates for Pell grant recipients are nearly indistinguishable from the overall three year average.

Retention rates beyond the first year have also improved. For the 2010 and 2011 freshman cohorts, the average second and third year retention rates of 60% and 54% both exceed the prior three year averages by six percentage points, consistent with a five percentage point increase in average first year retention rates for the same period, suggesting that the university's efforts are positively impacting retention into subsequent years. A review of school and college specific rates suggest that the AMP-driven focus is having local impact, particularly on first year retention rates. Assuming these gains are propagated through to graduation, it is just enough to realize the university's goal of a six year graduation rate of 35% in several years' time. To benefit from this progress, it will be critical for the university to focus on supporting and ensuring degree completion, intentions consistent with each school and college's AMP, while sustaining its focus on the success in the first year of school. Toward this end, the university is encouraged to continue the initial efforts, undertaken by the SSIT, to examine trends in persistence rates for all cohorts annually with the goals of celebrating and reinforcing successes and to correct course if gains are not realized as anticipated.

The most recent six year graduation rate for first time, full time freshmen was 27%, down from 29% the prior year, for a three year average of 26.7%. Rates were down for all undergraduate populations. This slight dip in degree completion reversed a three year trend in which six year graduation rates increased one percentage point annually, thereby slowly advancing the institution's goals for degree completion, although not at the desired rate of two percentage points per year. The most recent available three year averages indicate that Pell grant recipients graduate at rates equivalent to the overall all rate (26.1%), but that males graduate at rates about six percentage points lower than females (22.9% versus 29.4%, respectively). Off-island and indigenous populations (including Guam-based Chamorro)

have six year graduation rates that fall below that of the rest of the population, with 0% graduation rates for students from the Micronesian states of Chuuk, Kosrae, Marshall Islands, and Pohnpei. The most recent eight year graduation rate was 36%, and the three year average 34%, which suggests the 35% six year goal is within reach.

Looking forward, it is imperative the university sharpen its focus to better understand both barriers to and successful pathways for degree progress and timely completion, particularly after the first year. Such a project seems well matched to the focus of the newly formed SSIT. Since forming in January 2016, the SSIT has begun gathering quantitative and qualitative data to develop a student profile, examine retention patterns, and better understand the student experience, particularly in the first few years of the degree path. Thus far, the SSIT's analyses suggest that the third and fourth semester may be critical retention points, with undeclared students, students with financial need, and students in academic difficulty, particularly likely to attrit at this point. These analyses, however, were restricted to a single year's cohort. It will be important to strengthen the institution's analytic and predictive capacity to further work the work of this task force and, in turn, the campus' goals.

The SSIT has also conducted research on high-impact educational practices that might benefit the university's students. Emerging recommendations include a focus on student belonging as a fundamental aspect of all SSIT recommendations, initiating a first year convocation, and transitioning from faculty-centered to student-need-based scheduling. The team strongly encourages the latter, as this theme also emerged in discussions with students during the Accreditation Visit.

Members of the SSIT spoke passionately about their work and it is clear that the group feels empowered to affect change. What was less clear to the team was the extent to which the work and focus of the SSIT and that of the schools and colleges through the AMPs is actively coordinated at an

institutional level, including with respect to institutional priorities for improving graduation rates. Given that the university's goals for first year retention are being met at a macro-level, the team encourages the university to consider the extent to which efforts may need to shift to retention beyond the first year and to degree completion, particularly in light of the university's goal of a 35% graduation rate, and the very limited progress made to date in this critical area. Consistent with its G2G focus on serving the region, including its island communities, the university is also strongly encouraged to continue to work to address discrepancies in completion rates that continue to exist among select ethnic groups. While it is clear that programs exist specifically to assist these students, e.g. Kubre, the university is encouraged to ascertain more completely the sources of these challenges and to design interventions specifically to address them. This might include, as noted in the institutional report, one or more counselors with experience and preparation specific to the needs of the students.

Much as at the undergraduate level, graduate student success is understood as a continuum from access to completion and post-graduate placement paired with a focus on high quality learning. The institutional report provides impressive metrics describing the intellectual productivity of its students; since 2008, UOG graduate students have contributed to 213 peer reviewed publications and conference presentations and 71 students have gone on to pursue an advanced degree, 37 of whom have earned a Ph.D.

G2G's focus on graduate education and the university's research endeavors has energized faculty around the future of graduate education at UOG. Increased grant revenue is anticipated to positively impact graduate student recruitment and retention, as is the university's new ability to administer the Guam Student Financial Aid Program, which has allowed the university to increase the number of teaching and research assistantships for graduate students. Looking forward, the university is organizing a committee of relevant academic leadership to promote coherence and consistency across

graduate programs and to attend to issues of academic quality and student success. Importantly, the committee will report to the senior vice president. The university also intends to develop a strategic plan for graduate education, a step the team wholly endorses.

The team strongly encourages these plans as, to date, less attention has been paid to systematically addressing graduate student success. Data provided in anticipation of the Accreditation Visit suggest that recruitment success varies considerably across years and that degree completion rates vary greatly among programs, with those for professional degrees generally being higher. In order to realize its goals for regional impact, it will be important for graduate programs to establish goals for and regularly examine recruitment, degree progress, and degree completion data. It will also be important for institutional research to expand its capacity to regularly generate and provide these data to programs.

Through G2G, and recent developments like the SSIT, the university's organizational framework for supporting, and its understanding of its own and its students' needs in support of, student success has advanced dramatically. The team was impressed with the transition being made to data and evidence-informed planning highlighted during the Accreditation Visit. University faculty and staff are eager for growth in the university's capacity for data reporting and analysis. As the university is aware, this will require improvements to its data management practices, its data systems, and to the professional development of the staff. The team strongly encourages investment in these areas, as all will be essential to realizing the regional impact inherent in the transformation from a good to a great University of Guam.

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1-4.7)

Considerable thought and planning have been devoted to developing a structure and culture of quality assurance, sustainability, and improvement of the teaching and learning process, particularly at the upper administrative level. Commitment to assessment ultimately is demonstrated through the development and organization by which ongoing, evidence-based assessment is accomplished. At UOG an institution-wide culture of assessment is a work in progress, and one in which progress is clearly being made.

For both academic and co-curricular units, an annual reporting expectation is in place. Two years of data summarizing assessment inventory submission rates indicate that assessment is better established in undergraduate relative to graduate programs, with 70 and 80% of undergraduate programs submitting inventories in the last two years as compared to 50 and 65% of graduate programs. Immediate administrative oversight for annual assessment is the responsibility of the school and college deans.

Assessment in non-academic units is an emerging practice. About 50% of units submitted an inventory in the most recent assessment cycle. During discussion with the team, staff in Enrollment Management and Student Services described expectations for annual assessment and an emerging culture of learning and process-oriented outcomes assessment. Given G2G's emphasis on student success, the team praises these efforts and strongly encourages the university to continue to advance this work. This includes providing staff with professional development as needed. As practices evolve, the university is also encouraged to examine the relationship between co-curricular efforts and their academic programmatic counterparts. Combined work in these two areas should pay off in increased student retention and student success.

To build assessment-related capacity at program and institutional levels, the University Assessment Committee (UAC) has implemented a rubric-based process for reviewing each program's annual assessment inventory, academic and co-curricular. Similarly, the UAC has also facilitated the integration of learning outcomes assessment into the program review process, encouraging and tracking the use of rubric-based review of program assessment practices during the review process.

Outcomes of the UAC's review of annual assessment inventories include program-specific feedback together with a set of overarching recommendations to the senior vice president that address ongoing institutional needs and that identify programs whose practices deserve special recognition and may serve as models to others. In the aggregate, the UAC's reviews suggest that most programs demonstrate an initial level of assessment practice (versus developing or highly developed), as scored using the institution's rubric. Discussions with the UAC and school and college deans, however, revealed a much more developed practice of program assessment than revealed through program reports. This includes implementing curricular and pedagogical change in response to results. The University Assessment Committee is following up with units to provide additional support to further build practice and capacity, including with a focus on reporting. The team praises the UAC's thoughtful efforts to develop UOG's capacity for meaningful assessment and encourages the university to continue to these efforts. Looking forward, the university will want to continue to foster regular engagement with learning outcomes assessment, particularly but not exclusively for graduate programs. It will also want to continue to integrate learning outcomes results into periodic program review in support of its efforts to ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees.

Among its impacts on the university, the G2G process gave rise to the first periodic reviews of non-academic units, with continuing review called for by the G2G implementation plan. Discussions during the site visit suggested some uncertainty about the future of periodic reviews for these types of units.

The team encourages the campus to continue to implement the practice initiated through G2G and to consider the value of integrating external expertise into the process, much as is done for academic programs. Co-curricular units in particular may benefit from the insights of professionals external to the university, thereby maintaining and even strengthening connections to evolving directions in the profession.

With regard to academic program review, the university has clearly stated policies and processes. However, examination of a number of program review self-study documents and discussions during the visit indicated that the fundamental purposes of program review are not evenly understood or implemented across the university. The separate reviews of graduate and undergraduate programs and the lack of alignment of program review and specialized accreditation lead to much redundancy in the quality assurance processes. Moreover, the absence of a single individual tasked with accountability for the implementation of educational effectiveness across the university leads to delays in meeting program review timelines. This issue was exacerbated recently by the additional, yet necessary, reports that occurred during the prioritization process. The conclusion of that process gives the institution an opportunity to reset its attention to quality assurance with renewed attention to the structure of the process, a review of the self-study requirements, and inclusion of the newly developed criteria that were a product of prioritization. The university is encouraged to streamline these processes in ways that minimize the additional administrative work while maximizing the meaningfulness of program review.

As the university begins the process of re-envisioning program review, it will also want to take stock of the data needs of departments as they undergo program review. The Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research should be a valuable resource to departments by providing them with a package of data that will allow them to analyze their enrollments disaggregated by level, their

faculty student ratio, their course rotation schedules, degrees granted, etc. While the aggregated learning outcomes assessment data should paint a rich picture of student learning, the quantitative production data should give an indication of the efficiency of the program as well as its offering of the courses needed for graduation in a timely manner.

While the Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research has been instrumental in the development of student learning outcomes assessment and program review, it is in the nascent stage of responding to the deep analysis of data that will inform the student success efforts. The team believed that the current data on student retention and graduation does not accurately reflect the "story" of the UOG undergraduate experience. For instance, the current coding of data does not account for non-degree seeking students. Moreover, additional data analysis such as time to degree, attrition, and the graduation of transfer students (from the National Clearinghouse source) could portray a much clearer picture of student success. The analysis of D, F, and Withdrawal rates across courses and the migration of students through majors could also provide a clearer understanding of student flow. The newly hired and experienced CIO, in the Office of Technology, working in conjunction with personnel in institutional research, can provide leadership in using data to attain the university's student success goals. The institution will want to focus attention on the organizational structures of those offices and their resources.

G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment (CFRs 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 4.7)

The University of Guam, fiscally a component unit of the Government of Guam (GovGuam), has demonstrated fiscal stability with multiple years of operating surpluses. The university has had audited surpluses 12 of the last 13 years, averaging $3 million or 3.6% of revenues. As of Fiscal Year 2015, UOG's revenues are $90 million, with the university generating 62% of revenues and GovGuam

providing 38% (included in the university generated number are grants which may come from the GovGuam). Fiscal discipline and adequate financial reserves are important given this period of institutional aspirations, economic challenges, a changing higher education environment and the cyclical nature of GovGuam allotments.

Such fiscal discipline is prudent, given the limited Guam economy and the resulting challenges in Guam governmental finances. The key drivers of the Guam economy include tourism, concentrated heavily from Japan (approximately 75%), Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, as well as the US Military. In addition the government of Guam receives significant transfers from the US Government. As a result of the concentrated island economy, Guam's financial flexibility has been constrained. According to Standard & Poor's, Guam's fiscal stability in 2014 follows a good progression where the general fund deficit was practically eliminated.

Diversification of revenue sources over the last decade, including enrollment and tuition growth, is a strength. Enrollment has grown from 3,720 headcount in 2012 to over 4,000 in Fiscal Year 2016. Looking forward, university plans include growth to 6,000 on site and 5,000 online students eventually. In pursuing these goals, university leadership must balance growth with affordability given a 12.3% default rate, with 75% of students on financial aid and 59% of students receiving Pell grants.

The second tenant of sustainability is alignment. The institutional report described a fiscal management plan that prioritizes student learning and is consensus-driven, using the University Planning and Budget Committee as the focus for discussion. The alignment of resources with the G2G process involves broad consensus on the priorities including the recently hired CIO, more faculty lines, and focus on big data and additional institutional research support.

The Good to Great initiative was a strategic planning process that involved all UOG constituents in a

data-driven, participatory, and institutionally encompassing process of program prioritization and resource allocation to transform a good university into a great one. This process allowed the university to realign its current operating goals, priorities and resources, and to prepare and reposition the university in the changing environment.

With over 200 tasks and recommendations, the G2G initiative continues to focus alignment of resources to priorities. With the costs of many of the priorities being fixed in technology as well as people, the continued focus on the capital campaign, lines for data and the CIO, and enrollment growth are important. In the university's ambitious G2G plan, fiscal sustainability is one of the five institutional transformations, marrying resource allocations to academic and programmatic priorities. New budget lines have been funded, as called for by G2G, to hire faculty for research and enrollment growth as well as several other key positions, including the new CIO.

The high aspirations of G2G will require continued financial discipline, balancing investment with the ongoing support of the students and building in enough financial flexibility for disruptions in governmental funding.

With the limited economy of Guam, it is important that UOG continue to diversify its revenue. Key to this will be continued expansion of enrollment in both online and on-campus programs, focus on the capital campaign, as well as additional grant funding to support research as well as graduate students. The capital campaign success has been impressive, with $12 million raised to date. Care is being taken that such resources are used appropriately and match to one-time expenses. There is much excitement on campus around their research activity, stimulated in part by the university's recent grant success, including in 2015 a $6 million grant from the National Science Foundation's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR). The university is being disciplined and thoughtful in

continuing to build out more research infrastructure and understands both the opportunity and expense associated with these larger grant programs.

As a community, the University of Guam's success in moving ahead and succeeding in unpredictable times is linked to a fiscal management plan that prioritizes student learning and is consensus-driven, using the University Planning and Budget Committee as the focus for discussion.

H. Component 8: Reflection and Plans for Improvement (CFRs 1.1, 1.5, 3.6, 2.7, 4.1-4.7)

The University of Guam has provided significant evidence of compliance with the WSCUC standards and federal requirements. The institution is committed to delivering an education of distinctive quality to its students and its region. It is focused on continuous improvement and the prioritization of resources in a manner that enhances the uniqueness of the university, strengthens its service to the region, and further develops its program offerings. These pursuits are being accomplished within a sound and successful approach to management of funds and resources.

The level of commitment across all sectors of the university to the goals and processes of the Good to Great initiative is impressive and commendable as is the degree of collaboration and consultation needed to launch it. It demonstrates the capacity of this university, perhaps more than most, to create the level of community, purpose, and participation necessary to continuous improvement and attention to the changing landscape of higher education, including significant global economic challenges. Further, the initiative has encouraged a more developed and integrative sense of mission generally and a framework for more purposeful development of graduate education.

Improvement in all areas of interest since the 2008 Educational Effectiveness Review has been amply demonstrated. The autonomy of the university has been strengthened within the basic framework of its

funding from the Government of Guam. The university now controls its financial aid policies and resources, for example. The Board of Regents has developed and continued a cooperative though still independent relationship with the legislature and governor. Similarly, the board works with the president to set direction for the institution but also affords the president and his administration a high level of autonomy in the management of university affairs. All segments of the university appear committed to increased pursuit of external funding to move the institution forward.

Challenges and opportunities remain, to be certain. The university must continue its thoughtful dedication to the needs of all undergraduate students -- those well prepared and those less well prepared (an important element of the University of Guam's mission as an "open-admissions" institution). In this vein, the importance of attention to student retention, success, and college completion becomes even more significant. This focus will require significant resources and institutional commitment especially as the university moves forward in realizing its regionally oriented graduate and research programs.

The university could and should further its culture of assessment through examining its program review process with an eye to clarifying the purpose, strengthening the impact, simplifying the procedures, creating accountability, ensuring timeliness, removing redundancies, and integrating the priorities from G2G into the review criteria. This will require cultural commitment to change and added resources toward growing capacity in the area of institutional research.

Now that G2G has moved into its implementation stage, UOG should remain attentive to integrating the many unit-level initiatives and routine activities that characterize the institution. Pursuit of institutional aspirations cannot overwhelm necessary budgeting, curriculum improvement, program review, and human resource management.

Challenges notwithstanding, the University of Guam has developed an impressive blueprint for change and progress. The G2G initiative serves to bring vitality to the institutions aspirations, big and small, and to reinforce the vital role that the university plays in its region and in the lives of the individuals who pursue enhanced life opportunities as its students.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As summarized in Section II.H of this report, the University of Guam has substantially fulfilled the intended outcomes of the comprehensive review. The institution's commitment to the review process, and, more importantly, to benefitting from the opportunity afforded by this comprehensive review, was evinced through a comprehensive and candid institutional report, assiduous follow-up on the team's requests for additional information following the Offsite Review and, finally, a broadly participatory Accreditation Visit in which institutional representatives were fully prepared and able to articulate the work of the university in clear, remarkably consistent, and authentic ways. Most impressive was the unity in the message of the value of G2G and the energy and focus it has brought to the university, even as the cultural change it has required has not been without its difficulties. As the university itself noted, the review was well timed, affording the opportunity to consider the ambitions of its Good to Great initiative through the lens of the standards and expectations of accreditation and, in turn, to align its efforts with WSCUC accreditation, a critically important element of its contribution to Micronesia and the Western Pacific.

That the university has been able to undertake successfully this transformative re-envisioning of what it is and what it aspires to be is a tribute to its leadership and to a remarkably effective system of shared governance.

In light of the university's many successes as it moves along its path from good to great, and beyond what has been praised throughout the report, the team highlights the following accomplishments and practices as particularly worthy of commendation:

1. Its Good to Great initiative. The team was impressed by this significant, comprehensive, progressive, and ambitious integrative planning effort. The stated objective of prioritization is particularly commendable, as was the inclusion of the university's stakeholders, internal and external, in shaping the initiative. The team looks forward to the continued implementation of G2G, ensuring that timelines are communicated to those with responsibility.

2. Its fiscal stewardship, in particular, the achievement of multi-year financial surpluses. The diversification of revenue streams has been critical to the university's financial sustainability. Keep doing what you are doing.

3. Its engaged, independent, autonomous, and highly supportive Board of Regents.

4. Its focus on and commitment to regional needs and the public good through education, research and service.

5. Its exceptional pursuit and attainment of its first year retention goals.

6. Its development of a remarkably inclusive, collaborative culture focused on good university citizenship. The G2G process, in addition to a number of university initiatives, reflects this approach to collaborating across constituencies, in order to break down silos, create synergies, and forge a new unified direction for the university.

As the university moves forward the team understands the following as being particularly important to realizing the aspirations embodied in Good to Great. Specifically, the team recommends the university:

1. Extend its focus to undergraduate graduation rates. This includes examining why students don't return, more detailed record keeping, including coding of non-degree seeking students, and more sophisticated analyses of attrition (CFR 2.10).

2. Expand the institutional research function to include research and analysis of trends related to completion, undergraduate and graduate, in addition to scheduled data reporting. This will enhance the already developing culture of data-informed decision making (CFR 4.2).

3. Clarify the connections among multiple campus initiatives focused on student success, including the Student Success Innovation Team and the Academic Master Plans, with the intent to understand the diversity of student educational goals; develop and assess student support services; and improve graduation and completion rates. This includes designating an institutional locus of responsibility for student success to align and coordinate initiatives and ensure accountability (CFR 2.13).

4. Examine the academic program review process with an eye to clarifying the purpose, strengthening the impact, simplifying the procedures, creating accountability, ensuring timeliness, removing redundancies, and integrating the priorities from G2G into the review criteria (CFR 2.7).

5. Continue to develop co-curricular assessment and implement periodic review (CFR 2.11).

Institution: University of Guam
CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Where is the policy located? Rules, Regulations, and Procedures Manual (RRPM) and web
	Comments: Data exhibit on Credit Hour Policy included as evidence in the IR Report
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒YES ☐ NO
	Comments: When a course is proposed or modified substantially, then the number of credit hours assigned for the content material in the course is part of the review by the Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee or the Graduate Curriculum Review Committee. If the course is then passed by the Faculty Senate, it then goes on to the Senior Vice President for further review before approval. The number of credit hours assigned to each course is published in the catalog, notifying the community of the credit hours assigned to a particular course. Changing the number of credit hours for a course is considered a substantive change and triggers the review process described previously. When a course is only modified slightly, then that modification of the course does not pass though the Faculty Senate but is reviewed directly by the Senior Vice President.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: For each course, the course schedule includes the number of units and weekly meeting times.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 5
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors and Master's
	What discipline(s)? English, Political Science, Health Sciences, Business Administration,
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? x YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Syllabi very clearly describe hours of work required for the units earned, together with descriptions of assignments, assessments, etc. and a summary of the hours per types of course activities. Hybrid syllabi were paired with a checklist breaking down contact vs non-contact hours and total contact hours by lecture and other types of course activities (e.g. discussion, assessments, etc.).
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 3
	What kinds of courses? Internship, and practicum
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors and Master's
	What discipline(s)? Business, Nursing, Public Administration
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ☐ NO
	Comments: All three syllabi provided detailed information on the amount of time students were expected to devote to the internship or practicum to earn the associated units, together with descriptions of all assignments, assessments, grading policy, etc.

Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? > 20
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Undergraduate majors across all three schools and two colleges; master's degree programs
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors and Master's
	What discipline(s)? Representative majors from sciences, humanities, business and social sciences; all graduate degree programs.
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? x YES ☐ NO
	Comments: As part of Good to Great (G2G), the university has mandated 124 credit hours for undergraduate programs and 33 credit hours for graduate programs, except for clinically based programs. Every program review must show compliance with this number of credit hours (which is checked by the Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Review Committee, UCCR and GCRR, respectively). In addition, programs that currently exceed the credit hour expectations are being encouraged by their respective deans/directors to modify their programs as soon as possible. Many of these revisions have already passed through the UCRC and GCRC as well as the Faculty Senate and on to the Senior Vice President. Programs are expected to come into compliance within the next semester (fall 2016). As of the date of this review, an examination of the catalog shows that UOG degree programs meet, and in some cases exceed (pending revisions that will bring programs into compliance; see preceding paragraph), UOG's G2G-mandated credit hours caps for both degree levels. In doing so, UOG's programs exceed the generally accepted program length of 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree.

Review Completed By: Laura E. Martin   Date: April 19, 2016

Institution: University of Guam
MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? ☒ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Marketing is primarily done though networking and outreach both in the community and bringing the community to University of Guam on campus and thorough a newly revamped website. There are procedures and practices in place with program marketing, branding, and recruitment that are in lines with federal regulations.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ☒ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? ☒ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: University of Guam posts the number of credits required for each degree; however, time to degree must be calculated. Institution posts retention and graduation rates, http://www.uog.edu/sites/default/files/ay2014-2015-student-retention.pdf Tuition and fees and cost of attendance are posted : http://www.uog.edu/tuition-and-fees
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ☒ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?☒YES❑ NO
	Comments: The university surveyed its alumni in 2014 and asked questions about the value of their experiences at the University of Guam and about their current employment and salary levels. Results are posted on the university website: http://www.uog.edu/news-announcements/uog-releases-results-of-alumni-survey In addition, the university lists the names and current jobs of alumni and their majors at the university: http://www.uog.edu/alumni/resources

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)
**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Erin Gore   Date: April 18, 2016

Institution: University of Guam *(April 2016)*
STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? The policy and procedures are specified in the <u>Rules, Regulations, and Policy Manual</u> (RRPM, page 70), <u>Student Handbook</u> (page 22 and 34). Both publications are available on the web. The RRPM is located on the Campus Policies and Protocols section of the Violence Against Women Prevention Program web page. http://www.uog.edu/schools-and-colleges/college-of-liberal-arts-and-social-sciences/vawpp/campus-policies-and-protocols The Student Handbook is located on the Students main tab of the University's home page. The direct link is http://www.uog.edu/sites/default/files/uog-student-handbook-sept2015.pdf Rules pertaining to student conduct in the Residence Halls (i.e., dorms) are available on the "Living on Campus at UOG Residence Hall" website: http://www.uog.edu/sites/default/files/Rules%20RH.pdf and http://www.uog.edu/life-at-uog/residence-halls/rules-and-regulations A <u>Quick Reference Guide</u> on the student appeals process is posted on the Enrollment Management and Student Success page: http://www.uog.edu/sites/default/files/quick_reference_to_the_student_academic_grievance_appeals_procedure.pdf
	Comments: The team encourages the university to make it more convenient for students to find the grievance and complaint procedures through a search on the website using the terms "student grievance" or "student complaint." Currently a search on the website using those terms does not yield the information listed above.
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ☒YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly:
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: When students have a complaint, they are referred to the Student Life Office to obtain the student handbook and the procedures. Should the complaint escalate to a grievance, the party sends a request to the Chair of Student Disciplinary and Appeals Committee (the chair is from the EMSS Counseling Office). The process for addressing student grievances is described at http://www.uog.edu/sites/default/files/quick_reference_to_the_student_academic_grievance_appeals_procedure.pdf The institution follows its own process.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, where? Enrollment Management and Student Success Division
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: Tracking and reporting is done by the Enrollment Management and Student Success (EMSS) Counseling Office.
	Comments: The volume of complaints (grievances) is usually one to three per academic year.

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.
Review Completed By: Erin Gore   Date: April 30, 2016

Institution: University of Guam
TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Is the policy publically available? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, where? The information is outlined under the transfer section of the University of Guam website www.uog.edu/admissions/transfer-students
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: The university website describes the process for any transfer credit evaluation in addition to a matrix for institutions that have an articulation agreement with the institution. The university is continuing to review its articulation agreements and plans to make additional information available on the web in the future.

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.
Review Completed By: Erin S Gore   Date: April 18, 2016

<p style="text-align:center">OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX</p>

Institution: University of Guam
Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit
Name of reviewer/s: Laura Martin
Date/s of review: February 3, 2016

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed[7]. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. **Site Name and Address:**

   College of Micronesia – FSM
   National Campus
   Kolonia, Pohnpei, FM 96941

2. **Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)**

   The Partnership B.A. in Elementary Education Program is the only program offered at the College of Micronesia – Federated States of Micronesia (COM-FSM), Pohnpei. The site is designated as a standalone location by WSCUC. The program, which was WSCUC-approved and implemented in 2007, is designed for students with an associate's degree in Teacher Preparation from the College of Micronesia (COM), a 2-year community college program on the island of Pohnpei in the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM). The FSM has four individual states separated by hundreds of miles of ocean: Yap, Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Kosrae. COM's main/national campus is located in Pohnpei. The partnership program leads to a Bachelor of Arts degree in Elementary Education. It is the only onsite bachelor's degree available to FSM students, many of whom cannot afford to pursue education off-island. As such, the program is highly valued by the institution, students, faculty and administration, and is carefully stewarded.

   Courses are taught throughout the year with most courses taught during the summer by full-time University of Guam (UOG) faculty who travel to Pohnpei. Fall and spring semester courses are taught by adjunct Pohnpei-based faculty, who are held to the same hiring and review standards as University of Guam adjuncts. No full-time faculty FTEs are used for this program. The University of Guam's School of Education does have one staff FTE, a Program Coordinator, to handle logistics with the assistance of the Professional and International Programs (PIP) office. Standardized testing (Praxis) requirements are not taken as no authorized computer testing centers exist on Pohnpei. The FSM state teacher licensure exam replaces this UOG School of Education requirement.

---

[7] See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

Since the program's implementation in 2007, 220 students have enrolled in the program, 59.5% have graduated. Seventy-seven of these students within the last five years.

3. **Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)**

On February 3, 2016 (PST), a Skype-based teleconference was conducted with faculty, staff, and administrative leadership involved with the program at the College of Micronesia – Federated States of Micronesia (COM-FSM). Current students and alumni were also interviewed. The schedule for the call was as follows.

Time	Name	Position
8:00 - 8:45	Karen Simion	Vice President of Instructional Affairs
	Jody Oducado	VP Enrollment Management & Student Services
	Sylvia Henry	Chairperson, Division of Education
	Pelsihner Elias	Education Program Coordinator
	Arinda Swingly	Acting Director, Financial Aid
9:00 -9:45	Jennifer Hainrick	Alumni
	Nixon Soswa	Alumni
	Leslie Robert	Student
	Jessica Gilmete	Student
10:00 – 10:45	Susan Moses	Adjunct faculty
	Magdalena Hallers	Adjunct faculty

Further, as part of the Accreditation Site Visit to the University of Guam, a team member also met with the following representatives from the School of Education.

- John Sanchez, Dean of the School of Education
- Unsaisi Nabobo-Baba, Faculty
- Lourdes Ferrer, Faculty
- Joanna Diego, Program Coordinator

All meetings were informed by the lines of inquiry provided in this document as well as the following materials provided by the university specifically for the review of this off-site location and degree:

- The MOU between the University of Guam and COM-FSM
- Application, enrollment, retention, and graduation statistics for the program for the period 2007-2015.
- The NCATE[8] team report for the UOG School of Education dated December 2014
- The NCATE/CAEP[9] institutional report for the UOG School of Education dated 2014

---

[8] National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
[9] Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation.

- Two three minute videos: one provides a visual overview of the exterior of the campus' physical plant. The second was a short news story, by Oceania TV, on the campus' upcoming accreditation review by WASC AJCC.
- Photographs of students engaged in student teaching.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	N/A this site was approved in 2007.	None.
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	As stated explicitly in the MOU, the program is grounded in the mission of the University of Guam, which is to serve the people of the Western Pacific. The program is administered collaboratively by UOG's School of Education (SOE) and COM-FSM from admissions through to degree completion. For example, COM-FSM faculty review student applications, making recommendations to SOE where final admissions decisions are made. UOG faculty teach 12 units of courses onsite in Pohnpei each summer. This arrangement enables the program's students to meet UOG's residency requirement and pay UOG resident tuition (as per the MOU). Course offerings are also carefully planned by COM-FSM to promote timely degree progress and completion.	None.
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	The program's COM-FSM-based faculty work closely with UOG faculty; face-to-face discussions about courses take place each summer when UOG faculty are onsite. Both COM-FSM and UOG faculty, for instance, described exchanging course materials with their respective colleagues. Course content is established by UOG faculty via syllabi; COM-FSM faculty assess student performance for student teaching and internships using UOG's rubrics and these data are provided to UOG SOE to ensure student performance meets SOE expectations. Students described the long-term professional relationships developed with UOG-based faculty, and the support these faculty have provided for their careers. Faculty report that the program helps to increase awareness about post-graduate degree opportunities, and increasingly program graduates are considering and/or pursuing master's degrees. Program faculty, administrators, and students also conduct research collaboratively.	None.
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	The program is small (somewhere between 5 and 15 students begin the program each semester) and very high touch as described by all representatives from both COM-FSM and the University of Guam. Students and faculty alike described having regular contact, with students regularly "going in and out of their [faculty] offices". The onsite program coordinator meets regularly outside of class with students to review rubrics, discuss needs, answer questions, and help students stay on track. As needed, she will refer students to other support services provided by COM-FSM. As noted above, the UOG faculty are onsite each summer instructing students, and working with their COM-FSM faculty colleagues. As per UOG- established	None.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
	program requirements, syllabi, and rubrics, student learning data are gathered and returned to Guam. COM-FSM faculty are hired and evaluated according to UOG personnel standards; students complete course evaluations specifically for UOG, and these are returned to Guam.	
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	COM-FSM provides advising, counseling, library, computing services, and other needed services including tutoring, financial aid, etc. As per the MOU, which required development of an "advisement system that would facilitate the eventual completion" of the degree, advising is provided by the onsite program coordinator who works closely with students to promote timely degree completion through appropriate course selection, support for interpreting rubrics, other types of academic-related advising, and personal support as needed, including directing students to other resources available to all COM-FSM students (e.g. counseling, tutoring, etc.). Students were extremely complementary of the advising support they received from the program coordinator and faculty. Students reported the library provides the resources they need to complete their degrees, including access to the computers and to research databases. The library recently extended its hours, including on weekends, to accommodate working students, like those in this program, after data revealed student need. The library is also working to expand resources in partnership with UOG. Over the life of the program, nearly 60% (59.5%) of the program's students have completed their degree. When discussing those students who have not completed their degrees, faculty and administrators identified several factors that hamper degree completion, including that students are working professionals with families and other responsibilities that sometimes delay timely degree progress, being from an FSM island other than Pohnpei, and financial aid difficulties, particularly if students took several years to complete the associates degree, thereby consuming financial aid eligibility. All students are supported by Pell grants. The program coordinator maintains a database of students who have not completed and works diligently to encourage "inactive" students to resume their coursework and complete their degrees, contacting them when planning the course schedule or when present at schools where these students teach.	None.
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	The program's courses are taught by both tenured faculty from UOG's School of Education and COM-FSM adjunct faculty. UOG faculty teach 12 units of courses on location each summer. COM-FSM faculty teach courses offered during fall and spring terms, following syllabi and instructional materials (e.g. rubrics, textbooks, etc.) as per UOG's specification. The program's COM-FSM based faculty work closely with UOG faculty; face-to-face discussions about courses take place each summer when UOG faculty are onsite. Both COM-FSM and UOG faculty, for instance, described exchanging course materials with their respective colleagues. Course content is established by UOG faculty via syllabi; COM-FSM faculty assess student performance for student teaching and internships using UOG's rubrics and these data are provided to UOG SOE to ensure student performance meets SOE expectations. One COM-FSM faculty member noted that the COM-FSM faculty work hard to ensure the courses taught in the partnership program are educationally equivalent to those of Guam so that no one can ever question the quality of their graduates' bachelor's degrees. Students highlighted the quality of the teaching in this program as a real strength,	None.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
	including both COM-FSM and UOG faculty.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	The curriculum of this partnership program is designed by faculty from UOG's School of Education in keeping the SOE's Conceptual Framework as required by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)/NCATE its programmatic accreditor. According to the most recent NCATE Visiting Team Report (12/2014), "Governance of the partnership program enacts the standards for on-campus Elementary Education candidates and ensures the same rigor by following the SOE Conceptual Framework." (p. 26). Course content is established by UOG faculty via syllabi; COM-FSM faculty assess student performance for student teaching and internships using UOG's rubrics and these data are provided to UOG SOE to ensure student performance meets SOE and accreditor expectations. The program's COM-FSM based faculty work closely with UOG faculty; face-to-face discussions about courses take place each summer when UOG faculty are onsite. Both COM-FSM and UOG faculty, for instance, described exchanging course materials with their respective colleagues.	None.
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	UOG's WSCUC external review team received data describing program retention and graduation statistics for the period since the program's implementation. Over the life of the program, 59.5% (n=131) of the program's students have completed their B.A. degree, a rate that is slightly more than twice the rate of the most recent statistic for the main campus as a whole. Within at least the last two years, 32.6% (n=29) of students have continued their enrollment but not graduated. When discussing those students who have not completed their degrees, faculty and administrators identified several factors that hamper degree completion, including that students are working professionals with families and other responsibilities that sometimes delay timely degree progress, being from an FSM island other than Pohnpei, and financial aid difficulties, particularly if students took several years to complete the associates degree, thereby consuming financial aid eligibility. All students are on Pell grants. The program coordinator maintains a database of students who have not completed and works diligently to encourage "inactive" students to resume their coursework and complete their degrees, contacting them when planning the course schedule or when present at schools where these students teach. COM-FSM faculty were gratified to see the graduation data provided as part of this review, which confirmed to them the success of the program.	None.
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these	Student learning is assessed following the expectations established by the School of Education (SOE), adhering to CAEP/NCATE requirements. For instance, the partnership program requires all teacher candidates to meet the same program student learning outcomes as the on-campus Elementary Education students. Students prepare paper portfolios, which are scored using SOE rubrics. Rubric scores and portfolios are sent to UOG on a regular schedule. The most recent NCATE Visiting Team Report (12/2014) described the partnership program, including that the team was provided with three years of entry, midpoint, and exit data for this program. No concerns	None.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	were raised specific to the performance of students in this program relative to on-campus expectations. In other words, students were performing at equivalent levels.	
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	The program is integrated into School of Education's (SOE) quality assurance processes. For instance, in keeping with SOE's quality assurance systems, student learning outcomes data are provided to SOE, and evaluated as part of the school's annual assessment data report (ADR). The most recent NCATE Visiting Team Report (12/2014) raised no concerns about the program, finding it educationally equivalent to the Guam-based program. The NCATE review examined the program, its governance, alignment with SOE requirements, its quality assurance mechanisms, and evidence of student outcomes performance. Looking forward, UOG faculty plan to share COM-FSM student performance results as discussed by annually by SOE faculty, with COM-FSM administrators, program faculty, and staff, thereby complementing ongoing conversations focused on courses, including content and pedagogy, with a programmatic perspective on student achievement.	None.

DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: UNIVERSITY OF GUAM
Name of reviewer/s: JOSEPH SHELEY
Date/s of review: April 14, 2016

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs[10] and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. **Programs and courses reviewed (please list):**

Masters in Reading	*Professional Masters of Business Administration*
ED640	*BA621*
ED641	*BA620*
ED642	*BA613*
ED643	*BA611*
ED644	*BA601*
ED645	*BA711*
ED646-01-SP15	*BA710*
ED647-SUB15	*BA610*
	BA632
	BA630

2. **Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance ; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)**

   WASC approval was received for the Masters in Reading program in 2011; it was launched in 2012. The Professional Masters of Business Administration received WASC approval in 2013 and was launched in fall 2013. These were the first real efforts to offer fully online programming by the University of Guam. Both are cohort-based programs. The reading program has 30 students enrolled in 2015-16. After an initial cohort of 13 students, the PMBA program did not offer the program in 2014-15 and 2015-16. It is now recruiting a cohort for 2016-17.

   In addition to these programs, University of Guam offers numerous courses on line for its undergraduates. In 2015-16 (i.e., fall and spring semesters), 1,320 students enrolled in such

---

[10] See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

courses – up from 625 in 2015-16. Approximately 15% of all course offerings were offered fully on line and another 5% were hybrid offerings. The numbers of each are growing as more faculty members become interested and trained to offer such courses. Platforms, technology, formats, and methods of delivery have evolved quickly are in line with contemporary standards. Indeed the University has moved very rapidly from relatively underdeveloped online programming to very competitive programming. Faculty and students are very satisfied with the Moodle platform. Within the next 18 months, improvements in fiber optics will bring Micronesia on par with all cohort audiences for the two programs (they now are a bit behind in speed of broadcast and response).

In short, the development of the Masters programs is occurring within a rapidly changing and highly supportive culture of delivery of curricula in online modes.

3. **Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)**

Online access to the University of Guam course portal and the Institutional Report were used in this review. Further, via phone conference, the following persons were interviewed regarding online program delivery at the University of Guam:

Anita Borja Enriquez
Senior VP, Academic and Student Affairs

Annette Santos
Dean, School of Business and Public Administration

John Sanchez
Dean, School of Education

Catherine Stoicovy
Faculty/Chair, M.Ed. Reading Program

John Rivera
Faculty/Chair, Professional Masters in Business Administration Program

Manny Hechanova
Associate Director, Telecommunications and Distance Education/Online Learning Center

Deborah Leon Guerrero
Director of Academic Assessment and Institutional research

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. Q: How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? Q: How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	University of Guam is a "commuter school" that serves not only residents of Guam but those of multiple other islands as well. The University's mission is to increase access to both baccalaureate and graduate degrees. Travel options for many on the sister islands are limited. This is especially the case for those who have received bachelor's degrees at UOG, returned to their home islands, and now seek professional graduate degrees. Further, many two-year colleges in the region hope to move to selective delivery of four-year degrees. University of Guam hopes to team with them to offer some of the upper-division course work needed for these newer programs and to partner to achieve fiber optic cable connection to all islands. Funding of online programming has been low and static for many years. More recently the University has budgeted for growth and has underwritten the two online graduate programs. Further, each UOG student pays a $20 fee in communication costs. This amount serves to underwrite much of the online learning technology. An increase in the amount of the fee is now being sought. Operationalization of online programming is accomplished from the ground up rather than top down. Offerings are conceived by academic programs and then are subjected to scrutiny on both academic and administrative sides in terms of quality, need, size of demand, cost, and quality. Monitoring is ongoing.	None.
Connection to the Institution. Q: How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Given that so much of the online delivery is outward to other islands, this is a particular challenge. For the Reading program, every effort is made from the start to pull students into a cohort and team culture. Website and Facebook options are used. Chatrooms, a cyber café, and links to tutorials are employed. Personal calls routinely are made to students. Projects are collaborative. For the Business program, personal outreach is critical. Faculty and administration routinely visit each island to meet personally with the students. Students are encouraged to meet with each other. Social media have been especially effective in building networks and affiliation. Contact is maintained with prior cohorts in order to foster an	None.

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
	alumni sense among graduates.	
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Q: Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Q: Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	Platform and infrastructure are both adequate and conducive. Tech support is excellent. Integration of infrastructure, academic and support personnel, and oversight and support committee structure is high. Senior administration is standing by its commitment to support technology. Backup systems are in place and are more than adequate to respond to problems.	None.
Student Support Services: *Q:* What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? Q: What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	Program accreditation processes required these capacities, especially regarding library resources. Guam online students can and do come to campus for many services. All students have a web advisor by which to track their progress regarding requirements. All have online or email contact capacity regarding enrollment and management and student services. Academic advising occurs primarily through program faculty and staff. Moodle homepage provides links to online resources. Mandatory sexual conduct training is accomplished for all online students. In addition, periodic visits to the islands are made by faculty and staff to further personal contact. Students are technologically savvy and seem to be using these offerings to their benefit. Satisfaction with provision of services seems high but sophisticated tracking of actual effectiveness has yet to occur – programs are only now in full swing.	None.
Faculty. Q: Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Q: Do they teach only online courses? Q: In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution?	Each college dean makes determination of who teaches. First pick goes to full time; second pick goes to adjunct faculty. There are no faculty members who teach exclusively online. Thus, faculty members who teach online are well integrated into the academic life of the university. Important: no one teaches in a graduate course with University special clearance as a "qualified" graduate instructor. Deans of the respective colleges evaluate	None.

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Q: How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? Q: How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	competency of individual faculty to engage in online delivery. All faculty members are referred to the online learning office for training. G2G emphasized online learning and teacher training. Hiring of new faculty is done with an eye to capacity to deliver curricula online. Training supplements the hiring capacity level. Personal training for faculty members is provided as well as group training sessions. Most of the faculty members in these programs are full-time and are well-engaged and involved. All faculty members who teach in these programs are required to conduct assessments and understand the overall curriculum. Both programs look routinely at assessment outcomes to determine curriculum effectiveness. Important to note that the Senior Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs oversees all elements of distance education through a team of deans and technology service programs and staff. Further, the new CIO is approaching service delivery and technology adequacy in a highly integrative fashion, working directly with the colleges and their faculty. G2G demands high integration of personnel, divisions, and functions.	
Curriculum and Delivery. *Q:* Who designs the distance education programs and courses? Q: How are they approved and evaluated? Q: Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	Interested faculty members initiate program ideas and courses. These then move through the vetting and capacity processes. As with all courses and programs, appropriate faculty senate committees review and recommend outcomes of online course proposals. Online programs and courses are highly comparable to on-ground offerings in content, outcomes, and quality. Credit hour reports have been submitted.	None.
Retention and Graduation. *Q:* What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? Q: What do these data show? Q: What disparities are evident?	This is an area that is evolving. Reading program thus far has 100% retention rate for the cohorts of 15 each semester. Completion rate is 100%. The initial offering of the PMBA saw 4 of 13 students withdraw and the remaining 9 complete the degree. (Interviews indicate that work schedule rather than program demands produces completion rate.)	

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Q: Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions online offerings? Q: If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	Business Degree is too new to have data but program acknowledges that it needs to get ahead of the data issue. Business program used as its initial model the reading program which started first. Rates for online programs appear superior to those of on-ground programs. Data are reviewed by the deans whose task is to align programs with strategic goals in the academic master plan.	
Student Learning. *Q:* How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Q: Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? Q: What are the results of student learning assessment? Q: How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	Professional accreditation agencies set the primary terms of assessment of learning outcomes and ambitions. The Council of Deans oversees administration of assessment policy. Deans review results and evaluate quality of assessment tools. They work directly with key partners on the faculty senate and appropriate committees. The results to date are favorable. Students in the online programs appear to be performing at a higher level than students in on-ground programs. This will be known more definitively as the two programs age and produce more cohorts.	None.
Contracts with Vendors. *Q:* Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? Q: If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	Moodle has been hosted by a 3rd party vendor for 6 years. This allows UOG to focus on faculty and students. Vendor takes care of data and management to keep system running. Students are required to purchase one program account. Vendor relationship comports with policy on Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations	None.
Quality Assurance Processes: *Q:* How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? Q: What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	UOG's approach to quality assurance and assessment of learning outcomes is the same for both online and on-ground programs. The reading program has been approved through 2019 regarding quality assurance. A program review is to occur soon so quality will again be tested. The general business program had very positive results in its last assessment review. The key now is to determine the extent to which those on-ground results translate to online delivery.	None.

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
	While it is now a bit early to state definitively that the two online programs are educationally effective, evidence available to the reviewer suggests that academic quality is not presently a problem.	