



6101 Grayson Drive ♦ Denison, Texas 75020

Response Report to the Visiting Committee

Prepared for the
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges
March 9, 2012

Committee Visit: October 10-12, 2011

Prepared by:

Dr. Alan Scheibmeir
President
903-463-8600
scheibmeir@grayson.edu

Dr. Debbie Smarr
Institutional Effectiveness Director and SACSCOC Liaison
903-415-2592
smarrd@grayson.edu



CS 3.2.8

Governance and Administration: Qualified Administrative/Academic Officers

The institution has qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience, competence, and capacity to lead the institution.

On-Site Committee Judgment

Compliant Non-Compliant Not Applicable

On-Site Committee Findings

The administrative and academic officers of the college possess adequate qualifications for their assigned positions and have the capacity, competence, and experience to complete their duties and responsibilities. An administrative and academic officers chart by position details degree required, degree held, and years of experience. To support the information provided in the chart, completed Performance Management Worksheets and resumes are furnished for administrative and academic officers.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee identified that the institution specifically outlines each administrative position and the minimum academic qualifications required to hold the position. According to the institution's own academic criteria, The Director of Continuing Education requires a minimum of a Bachelor's Degree. The individual assigned to that position currently possesses an Associate of Applied Science Degree and therefore is not academically qualified to hold that position. In reviewing the Performance Management Worksheet (2010 – 2011), no mention of a need to obtain a Bachelor's degree is stated. Interviews with the President and Vice President of Instruction determined that since this was an internal promotion, they did not review the job qualifications and therefore were not aware of the bachelor's requirement for this position. The President did advise that the current Director of Continuing Education would probably retire next year, and the next Director would be required to have the Bachelor degree.

Recommendation 1: The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that the college administrators meet the minimum academic qualifications required to hold the position.

College Response

In response to the recommendation by the On-site Committee regarding the Director of Continuing Education, GCC has an established hiring policy, [GCC Local DC](#), which sets guidelines for filing vacant positions at the college. GCC's policy allows for the creation of a list of competencies which are "essential for the successful performance of the job" and may include a preferred degree when posting the position. GCC reviews all position announcements and competencies required for each position as they are vacated and evaluates each candidate based upon education and/or relevant experience. GCC may hire individuals without the preferred degree when relevant experience is verified and documented.

In the case of the [Director for Continuing Education](#), GCC followed the established hiring process and promoted an internal candidate who possessed an associate's degree and had, at the time of hiring, vast amounts of experience in training and continuing education work. The hiring supervisor and the search committee for the Director of Continuing Education followed the process outlined in GCC Local Policy DC and recommended the promotion of Mr. Ron De Cento. As with all new hires, the college president reviewed the search committee recommendation and interviewed Mr. De Cento affirming the search committee's recommendation and approving his promotion. The college followed its hiring policy in promoting Mr. De Cento however; it failed to update the [2010-2011 Administrative Credential Record](#) to reflect the required degree as bachelors or equivalent experience instead of a bachelor's degree only. A [position justification](#) is provided to show Mr. De Cento's qualifications.

In preparing our materials for the SACS Compliance Certification, the [2010-2011 Administrator Credential Record](#) was not properly reviewed to ensure all positions were accurately reflected in the record. On [December 7, 2011](#), the President's Executive Council (PEC) discussed the issue and developed a process to ensure that all administrative employee credentials are discussed and approved with each new hire or promotion to ensure that all essential duties are met by the recommended candidate. All position qualifications will be included in proposals for administrator replacements that are brought to the council for approval and those qualifications will be captured in the minutes of the PEC meetings.

A revised [Personnel Request](#) form has been developed for use as new or existing positions are approved by the PEC, the Office of Human Resources will update the Administrator Credential Record to accurately reflect the necessary degree or experience required for the position. In addition, Human Resources will continue to maintain resumes/vitas, continuing education and/or ongoing position-related

training records of all administrators and academic officers. The [2011-2012 Administrator Credential Record](#) has been edited to specify that the Director of Continuing Education qualifications should require a “Bachelor’s Degree or Equivalent Experience.”

CS 3.3.1.1

Institutional Effectiveness

The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

3.3.1.3 educational support services

3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate.

On-Site Committee Judgment

Compliant Non-Compliant Not Applicable

On-Site Committee Findings

The college provided documentation that it develops mission-driven Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO's) that are embedded within both the Academic Studies and Workforce Education Curricula. However, the evidence for the Academic Studies Curriculum presented student learning outcome results for specific general education courses (e.g. Arts, Geology, Biology, etc.) and not student learning outcomes at the program level. Program student learning outcomes are provided for the Workforce Education Curriculum; however, there is no evidence that student learning outcomes are being assessed and/or achieved.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee's review of learning outcomes assessment documents confirms the Off-Site Review Committee's findings that while learning outcomes have been developed, learning outcomes assessment results could not be found for Academic Studies degree program. There is, however, also a lack of evidence to support assessment, development of improvement plans, and implementation of improvement actions at the degree program level for both the Workforce Education degree programs and the Academic Studies degree program.

The Committee recognizes that the institution is awaiting communication from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board regarding format/content for program review; the program review cycle at the institution has been suspended for the last two years. A review of selected program review reports in process from a previous cycle revealed varied levels of data and analysis reports regarding program level outcomes.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recognizes that the institution has recently developed an identified committee structure/ process for planning units to evaluate assessment data and to establish and revise objectives, indicators and activities for improvement purposes. However no results are available yet from the implementation of this new process. Thus, comprehensive assessment reports of educational programs including data related to learning outcomes, retention, resources, and completion rates could not be found.

Recommendation 2: The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that it assesses the extent to which it achieves its identified program-level outcomes to include student learning outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results.

College Response

Grayson County College (GCC) began a comprehensive assessment process during the spring 2010 semester with new leadership at the dean's level in both Academic Studies and Workforce Education. A response for both the Academic Studies and Workforce Education educational programs is provided below with a summary of findings for each division notated.

Academic Studies

Summary of Findings

(1) "However, the evidence for the Academic Studies Curriculum presented student learning outcome results for specific general education courses (e.g. Arts, Geology, Biology, etc.) and not student learning outcomes at the program level." (2) "Learning outcomes assessment results could not be found for Academic Studies degree programs," (3) "there is, however, also a lack of evidence to support assessment, development of improvement plans, and implementation of improvement actions at the degree program level for both the Workforce Education degree programs and the Academic Studies degree program."

1. GCC has identified [Program Learning Outcomes](#) for all of its Academic Studies degree programs. Beginning with the spring 2010 semester, GCC began assessing student learning outcomes in the Academic Studies Core Curriculum. The Academic Studies degree program learning outcomes are in fact tied to the Institutional Learning Outcomes contained in the Core due to the fact that [70% to 100%](#) of the courses in the Academic Studies degree programs are contained within the Core Curriculum with one exception, Music. Music has only 35% of its degree program in the Core with the majority of its courses being performance based.

Based upon the concern of the On-site Visiting Committee that GCC had not been conducting Student Learning Outcomes in its Academic Degree programs, GCC has [mapped](#) the course level assessments done within the Core to each of the academic programs and their respective Program Learning Outcomes as evidence of student learning outcome assessment at the program level.

2. GCC provided evidence of student learning outcomes assessment and improvement plans based upon those assessments in both its [compliance certification](#) and its [focused report](#). A summary of the spring and fall 2010 results and use of results as well as the spring 2011 assessment results are provided in the timeline below. In the fall 2011 semester, GCC transition to an [annual assessment cycle](#). The semester based and annual assessment process has followed the format listed below.

Cycle 1 – Spring 2010

First SLO/PLO introduced and assessed with suggested improvement plans reported ([Results and Use of Results](#))

Academic Studies Dean reviewed reports and improvements for implementation fall 2010

Cycle 2 – Fall 2010

First SLO/PLO improvements incorporated

Second SLO/PLO introduced and assessed with suggested improvement plans reported ([Results and Use of Results](#))

Academic Studies Dean reviewed reports and improvements for implementation spring 2011

[CAAC Review of Instructional Services Annual Assessment Report](#)

Cycle 3 - Spring 2011

Second SLO/PLO Improvement plan implemented

Third SLO/PLO Introduced and assessed with suggested improvement plans reported ([Results and Use of Results](#))

Academic Studies Dean reviewed reports and improvements for implementation fall 2011 in the new annual assessment cycle.

Cycle 4 – Fall 2011 and Spring 2012

Third SLO/PLO Improvement plan implemented

Fourth SLO/PLO Introduced and assessed with suggested improvement plans reported ([Results and Use of Results](#))

Annual program assessment report with suggested improvement plans due
May 2012

ISAC Committee review of program learning outcomes assessments and recommended
improvement plans June/July 2012

ISAC reports back to the VP of Instruction any recommended revisions for implementation
Fall 2012

CAAC Review of Instructional Services Annual Assessment Report September 2012

The [annual assessment cycle](#) will continue until all program learning outcomes have been assessed and improvement plans implemented and assessed. Once all program learning outcomes have been assessed, the cycle will start over with PLO #1 being introduced and assessed, etc.

Workforce Education

Summary of Findings

(1) “Program learning outcomes are provided for the Workforce Education Curriculum; however, there is no evidence that student learning outcomes are being assessed and/or achieved.” (2) “There is, however, also a lack of evidence to support assessment, development of improvement plans, and implementation of improvement actions at the degree program level for both the Workforce Education degree programs.”

1. GCC provided evidence of student learning outcomes assessment and improvement plans based upon those assessments in both its [compliance certification](#) and its [focused report](#). The Workforce Education Division has [mapped](#) its Program Learning Outcomes and identified the Institutional Learning outcomes that PLO supports. This may have led to some confusion in our reporting of PLO assessments in the Workforce Education programs. It is important to note that in all Workforce Education programs, program level assessments are required for Perkins funding. To further clarify, the outcome measure listed in each assessment report is a PLO for the educational program and not an ILO. Beginning with the fall 2010 semester, GCC began a semester based assessment plan and transitioned to the [annual assessment cycle](#) in fall 2011. The assessment process followed the format below for each of its workforce education programs.

Cycle 1 – Spring 2010

First SLO/PLO introduced and assessed and improvement plans reported
([Results and Use of Results](#))

Workforce Education Dean reviewed reports and improvement plans for implementation
fall 2010

Cycle 2 – Fall 2010

First SLO/PLO improvements incorporated

Second SLO/PLO introduced and assessed with improvement plans reported (Results and
Use of Results) – Contained in the [Workforce Education Comprehensive Assessment
Report for Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011](#)

Workforce Education Dean reviewed reports and improvement plans for implementation
spring 2011

[CAAC Review of Instructional Services Annual Assessment Report](#)

Cycle 3 - Spring 2011

Second SLO/PLO Improvement plan implemented

Third SLO/PLO Introduced and assessed with improvement plans reported
([Results and Use of Results](#))

Workforce Education Dean reviewed reports and improvement plans for implementation
during the new 2011/2012 Annual Assessment Cycle

Cycle 4 – Fall 2011 and Spring 2012

Third SLO/PLO Improvement plan implemented

Fourth SLO/PLO Introduced and assessed with improvement plan reported (Results and
Use of Results)

Annual program assessment report with suggested improvement plans due
May 2012

ISAC Committee review of program learning outcomes assessments and recommended
improvement plans June/July 2012

ISAC reports back to the VP of Instruction any recommended revisions for implementation
Fall 2012

CAAC Review of Instructional Services Annual Assessment Report September 2012

The [annual assessment cycle](#) will continue until all program learning outcomes have been assessed and improvement plans implemented and assessed. Once all program learning outcomes have been assessed, the cycle will start over with PLO #1 being introduced and assessed, etc. GCC recognizes that we have not closed the loop on assessment in the Workforce Education programs and will begin to assess the improvement plan the year after it is implemented to determine if additional improvements are necessary based on results of the reassessment. In the meantime, in order to catch up with the improvement plans already implemented, GCC will reassess PLO #1, PLO #2, PLO #3 and PLO #4 one per semester beginning fall 2012 and ending Spring 2014.

New Assessment Review Process

Summary of Findings

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recognizes that the institution has recently developed an identified committee structure/ process for planning units to evaluate assessment data and to establish and revise objectives, indicators and activities for improvement purposes. (1) “However, no results are available yet from the implementation of this new process.” (2) “Thus comprehensive assessment reports of educational programs including data related to learning outcomes, retention, and completion rates could not be found.”(3) The Committee recognizes that the institution is awaiting communication from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board regarding format/content for program review; the program review cycle at the institution has been suspended for the last two years. A review of selected program review reports in process from a previous cycle revealed varied levels of data and analysis reports regarding program level outcomes.

1. Prior to the 2011-2012 academic year GCC was conducting a semester based assessment process. Under this semester based process, each of the deans were responsible for reviewing the assessment results and improvement plans in conjunction with the respective Program Director to ensure effective assessments and improvement plans were being implemented. Beginning with the 2011-2012 academic year an [annual assessment process](#) was created. As part of this process, two new committees, the [Instructional Services Assessment Committee](#) (ISAC) and the [College Assessment Advisory Council](#) (CAAC), were created to evaluate assessment data, improvement plans, etc. Based upon our annual assessment cycle, these

committees will not review assessment results for the first time until the end of the spring 2012 semester. GCC failed to clarify this process and the timing for implementation of this process during the On-site Committee visit. Because of the change in the process, GCC provided proof of improvement plans in both the Academic Studies and Workforce Education divisions based upon review of assessment data by the respective deans.

2. Previous program reviews were provided in the Focused Report and to the On-site Visiting committee. GCC recognized that its Program Review process was not perfect and has opted to participate in the THECB pilot program for its proposed program reviews. GCC is in the process of closing out its old program review process in order to transition to the new program review process identified by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under its proposed program review process. Following the committee structure previously mentioned, the ISAC committee will review all Program Review reports, and will make recommendations for improvements based upon the data provided in the Program Review Process to ensure a cycle of continuous improvement is inherent in our academic and workforce education programs. The final stage of assessment data review will occur at the institutional level with the CAAC reviewing all program review reports.
3. GCC hired an [Institutional Research Analyst](#), March 5, 2012, who will be available to assist departments with program review data analysis. The Institutional Research Analyst will work with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, the Dean of Academic Studies, and the Dean of Workforce Education to develop a standard data report and training on data analysis to ensure that all program reviews contain a consistent and comprehensive data as well as quality data analysis.

CS 3.3.2

Quality Enhancement Plan

The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement.

On-Site Committee Judgment

Compliant Non-Compliant Not Applicable

On-Site Committee Findings

The institution did not satisfactorily address components 1 and 3 of this standard.

Recommendation 3: The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that the Quality Enhancement Plan provides appropriate direction for adequate facilities, faculty professional development, and quality assessment of the goals and objectives of the plan. For example, the institution should identify the format and process for the assessment of the newly established “Recipe for Success”. See Part III for additional information.

College Response

In order to address the recommendation and suggestions for improvement from On-site Visiting Committee, Grayson County College (GCC) identified eleven items for clarification, revision, and improvement. These eleven items are enumerated below with major headings as documented in the On-site Visiting Committee report.

Institutional Capability

1. Future Expansion of the Math Hub

The existing [configuration](#) of GCC’s Math Hub, including the allocation of space, equipment, and trained staffing, provides structured support for all developmental math students. When the new sections of the piloted developmental math classes (Math 0420 and Math 0340/0140) are offered for all sections of developmental math in the Fall 2012 semester, there will not be a net change in student traffic, since then as now, it is supporting all of our developmental math students. Growth, however, is inevitable, and the current Math Hub location is nearing capacity with its current configuration.

To address our future demands we have identified the large classroom next door to the current Math Hub (SC-113), space A, for workshops on targeted math topics. This room contains spacious tables and ample seating, and it will accommodate up to 100 students comfortably. Access to this classroom is a simple scheduling issue at present, and it is frequently available. In a more distant future, as need demands, this location could become a preferred place for a larger Math Hub. In the short term, we have relocated some of the non-math personnel who had offices in spaces B, C, D and F in the existing Math Hub to other locations on campus. This has created additional space in the main room as well as private spaces to facilitate more one-on-one tutoring. Since the On-site visit, the furniture layout in the hub has been reconfigured with an additional 20 to 25 seats added for student use. We believe that the increase in supplemental instruction (workshops) and the newly created space in the Math Hub will address near-term student needs, and we have a plan to expand or relocate the Math Hub if needed to address long-term student needs.

2. Institutional Resources Identified or Committed for Future Expansion

In order to document evidence of the institutions support and commitment to the QEP, the Grayson County College Board of Trustees, at its [January 17, 2012](#), meeting, took official action to document its support of the QEP with both financial and physical resources as necessary for the success of the QEP. This support includes and is not limited to the allocation of additional funding, the relocation of the math hub to a larger more accommodating location on campus, and the hiring of additional faculty/personnel as the plan moves forward.

3. Full-time and Part-Time Faculty Development

In order to address the necessary professional development of its full-time and part-time faculty, its math tutors, and math hub personnel at both the main and south campuses, Grayson has identified the following professional development activities which have been or will be

implemented throughout the spring and summer 2012 semesters in preparation of the full implementation of the QEP beginning fall 2012. [A log](#) of all professional development activity for the math faculty, tutors, and part-time staff is provided.

The full-time and part-time faculty, Math Hub staff and tutors have received and will continue to receive ongoing professional development in the form of monthly meetings where discussions on new teaching/tutoring techniques will take place. In addition, all full-time and part-time faculty, teaching developmental mathematics, will be required to observe one pilot class meeting to observe and learn the newly adopted pedagogy and use of manipulatives inherent in inquiry driven pedagogy. All Math Hub staff and tutors have been encouraged to sit in on one of the pilot courses as well to observe the newly adopted pedagogy and the use of manipulatives in action. All of the student tutors in the math hub are participating in the [CRLA training](#) to become a [certified](#) tutor.

To further aid in the professional development of part-time math faculty, the math department created a new [Super Tutor](#) program for training adjuncts to teach the new sequence of developmental courses and for assisting students in the current sequence. This program is paying adjunct math instructors a full course stipend to attend every class period of MATH 0420 and MATH 0340. While in these classes, the Super Tutors are learning the new teaching strategies from a full-time faculty member experienced in the new teaching methods. In addition to observing the entire semester, the Super Tutors are assisting students outside of class in scheduled one-on-one tutoring sessions. These trained adjuncts will teach sections of the new Math courses next semester. There are currently two adjuncts in the Super Tutor Program and two more will be added each semester until all adjuncts are trained.

GCC's math hub coordinator and a mathematics faculty member attended the NADE Conference in February 2012, where they participated in professional development training on executing math redesign and classroom strategies (i.e.: Teaching the Teachers: Multi-modal Training for

Developmental Faculty). These individuals will be providing on-campus mandatory professional development for all developmental mathematics faculty during the spring and summer 2012 semesters.

All full-time and part-time faculty have participated in or will participate in a [Carnegie Foundation Webinar: *It's Not Just the Curriculum: Developing Pathways for Student Success in Community Colleges*](#) which was presented January 24, 2012 and recorded and sent to all math faculty for viewing. The webinar focused on an alternate and accelerated pathway with an innovative quantitative literacy focus in which students use mathematical skills and quantitative and algebraic reasoning to make sense of the world around them.

Another professional development activity will be the identification of a math consultant to contract with for the fall 2012 semester to come to campus and review teaching techniques and provide professional development activities for all full-time and part-time math faculty and Math Hub staff to ensure continuous improvement in teaching and learning.

Assessment of the Plan

4. No identified format or process to assess the Recipe for Success

The [Recipe for Success](#) has been formally developed and math faculty has been trained on how to implement the Recipe for Success in preparation for the spring 2012 semester.

Beginning with the spring 2012 semester, all developmental mathematics faculty are utilizing the Recipe for Success to facilitate student responsibility in their educational process. The Recipe for Success will be introduced the first week of classes with students and faculty having open dialogue on the importance of student responsibility and necessary skills for success. Following the discussion, the faculty member will provide students with a “The Recipe for Success” which the students will use to self-assess their motivation, responsibility, and skill level for success. The students will submit their completed Recipe for Success to

their faculty member for score tracking. Throughout the semester, faculty will be encouraged to review the Recipe for Success as a reminder to the students of these very important factors to their success.

At the end of each semester the students will be asked to complete another rating based on their experiences throughout the semester to determine if the continuous review and reminder of the items necessary for success has made an impact. These scores will be recorded and compared to the beginning of the semester rating with an expectation that there will be an increase in the self-assessment rating. A secondary analysis will be conducted to determine if a correlation exists between the self-assessment rating and the end of course grade.

5. No Assessment Measure for Goal 1

GCC has purchased Estudios, a data warehouse. A component of the software is a customized developmental education tracking module which will allow Grayson to track individual student's time to completion for the developmental mathematics courses and completion of the required college-level mathematics course over time. GCC will use this data to compare the time to completion of the developmental mathematics sequence prior to implementation of the plan to that of the time to completion under the new sequence. The Institutional Researcher will work with the Director to establish the baseline data five years prior to implementation and a standard report which will continually be updated to reflect time to completion by co-hort.

6. PLO identified (students will progress onto their first college-level mathematics course within one year of meeting developmental mathematics requirements) – Not included in the assessment matrix for Goal 1 or Goal 2

The above mentioned PLO has been added to the [assessment matrix](#) in the QEP Proposal for

Goal 1 as well as the listing of [goals](#) for the QEP found in the QEP Proposal. This PLO is vital to the assessment of the QEP and will be assessed using the assessment measure listed above.

7. Overall Evaluation Process for the Implementation of the QEP beyond SLO's and Assessment

The transformation of the developmental mathematics sequence will evolve over time with regular assessment and improvements based on these assessments being made throughout the process. Achievement of the plan will be based upon the continued progression of the plan and the evolution of the developmental mathematics sequence into a successful program which provides a gateway to student success instead of being a gatekeeper. An accelerated time to completion and the attainment of program learning outcomes by students as exhibited by student success in their college level math course will signify achievement of the plan. The test of the level of achievement will be exhibited by an increased level of satisfaction with the developmental math program as evidenced by the completion of the campus-wide confidential survey, which was originally completed at the onset of this project, at the end of the project.

Analysis and Comments for Strengthening the QEP

8. QEP Steering Committee

Beginning with the spring 2012 semester, the [QEP Steering Committee](#) has been convened. Upon further reflection, the QEP leadership has redefined the QEP steering Committee. This committee, which will be responsible for the work of the QEP, consists of all full-time math faculty, the Dean of Academic Studies, the QEP Director, and the Math Hub Coordinator. This steering committee has been meeting regularly to discuss issues and concerns as the pilot program has continued. The QEP Steering Committee has worked to revise the plan to address all of the On-site committee concerns and other changes as necessary based the first

semester of course offerings and end of the semester analysis. The committee will work with the director to in providing direction for the plan as it unfolds. During the summer 2012 semester, the committee will review the first year of assessment data and will provide recommendations for improvements to be implemented fall 2012. Each year, the Steering Committee will review the improvements made, the yearly assessment data and previous data to make continual improvements based on results.

In addition to the QEP Steering Committee, has created an [advisory committee](#) which will serve as representatives of key academic programs where mathematics and the course re-design have affected their programs. This group will review a semi-annual report on the QEP and will make recommendations for improvement based on their review as is relates to student success and mathematics preparation in their programs.

9. Administrator with Budget and Planning Authority

[Dr. Debbie Smarr](#), Director of Institutional Effectiveness currently serves as the QEP Director. Dr. Smarr has an extensive background in project management and leadership within higher education. She works closely with and is housed in the same office suite as the Vice President for Business Services. Together they facilitate the budget and planning process at the college. As a college administrator, who reports directly to the college president, Dr. Smarr will fill the role as the budget and planning authority for the QEP. She will work closely with the Dean of Academic Studies, Vice President for Instruction, and Vice President for Business Services to ensure a sound and committed budget, as well as adequate facilities are made available to meet the needs of the Math Hub and QEP. The budget for the QEP has been further detailed with Math Hub budgets clearly defined. Dr. Smarr worked with the Vice President for Instruction to secure the commitment of the Board of Trustees to the financial and physical resources necessary for a successful QEP.

10. South Campus – Develop Similar Classes, Resources, and Support

To ensure all services related to our new developmental mathematics courses at the South Campus, a full-time mathematics faculty member has been assigned on a permanent basis to the South Campus. GCC is offering a section of MATH 0420 at the south campus during the spring 2012 semester and will continue to offer, based on demand, sections of MATH 0420 and Math 0340/0140 in the future. Additional supplemental math resources have been placed in the south campus Academic Success Center and all math hub workshops were presented at the south campus with many students availing themselves of these workshops. Beginning with the Fall 2011 semester, a full-time math faculty member housed at the south campus will be available during peak hours at the south campus to provide the same supplemental instruction and tutoring to mathematics students at this campus. In addition, all south campus math hub staff will participate in professional development activities to improve their ability to serve students at the south campus.

11. IR and Other Staff Should Begin Working Routinely with Math Faculty to Assist in Pilot Phase and Beyond

A strong network has been developed between the IE/IR staff, mathematics faculty, math hub staff, and instructional services administrators. This network will continue to work together for the improvement of student learning through the Got math? Quality Enhancement Plan. Grayson College has hired a full-time [Institutional Research Analyst](#) who will work directly with the QEP Steering Team and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, who has been working closely with the math faculty throughout the development of the QEP to ensure adequate data and tracking of student success is documented and analyzed for improvements. The Institutional Research Analyst, who reports to the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, along with the math faculty will play an integral role in data collection, analysis and assessment of the QEP.

CS 3.7.1

Faculty: Faculty Competence

The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (See Commission guidelines "Faculty Credentials.")

On-Site Committee Judgment

Compliant Non-Compliant Not Applicable

On-Site Committee Findings

Some faculty members provided on the Faculty Roster appear to be lacking the proper credentials to teach in the areas assigned to them. Specific notations are listed on the Faculty Worksheet.

The Off-Site Review Committee found that some faculty members provided on the Faculty Roster appeared to be lacking the proper credentials to teach in the areas assigned to them. Specific notations were listed for 12 faculty on the Faculty Worksheet. In the focused report, Grayson indicated they no longer will use 4 of those faculty listed. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee agrees with this decision. Grayson provided further credential documentation for the other 8 faculty in support of continued employment. However, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee still has concerns that two of the eight do not have the proper credential to teach the courses listed for them (See specific concerns on attached faculty roster).

Recommendation 4: The Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that it employs qualified faculty. See [Appendix D](#) for additional information.

College Response

Grayson County College (GCC) provides an updated [Faculty Roster](#) form for the two faculty members identified by the On-site Committee. A summary explanation for each faculty member follows:

1. Susan Daley- Last taught during the spring 2010 semester. Ms. Daley did not teach during the fall 2010 semester because of a family illness. GCC has made the decision to not rehire Ms. Daley anytime in the future without evidence of additional graduate level hours in Psychology. Ms. Daley's last semester to teach at GCC was spring 2010.

2. Laura Newland – Ms. Newland has taught basic Psychology courses the past three years at GCC. Her [credentials](#), both at the Bachelor and masters level, support a vast background in Psychology with a focus in Counseling. All 29 credit hours of her graduate coursework are under a Psychology prefix and related to Psychology. She has proven competent in the classroom and her [2008](#) and [2011](#) faculty evaluations are excellent. **However, Based on the On-site committee’s question, Ms. Newland will not be utilized to teach.** Ms. Newland was [informed](#) that the College will be requesting the Commission to re-evaluate their decision and allow GCC to utilize her in the future. GCC respectfully appeals the On-site decision and requests a re-evaluation and response regarding the use of this adjunct.

CS 3.13.1

Compliance with other Commission Policies

The institution complies with the policies of the Commission on Colleges.

“Collaborative Academic Arrangements: Policy and Procedures” Applicable Policy Statement

Member institutions are responsible for notifying and providing SACSCOC with signed final copies of agreements governing their collaborative academic agreements (as defined in this policy). These arrangements must address the requirements set forth in the collaborative academic arrangements policy and procedures. For all such arrangements, SACSCOC- accredited institutions assume responsibility for (1) the integrity of the collaborative academic arrangements, (2) the quality of credits recorded on their transcripts, and (3) compliance with accreditation requirements.

On-Site Committee Judgment

Compliant Non-Compliant Not Applicable

On-Site Committee Findings

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee determined that Grayson County College has not documented the appropriate disclaimer for maintaining the integrity of the collaborative academic agreement with L-3 Communications Corporation.

Recommendation 5: The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution comply with student disclaimer as specified in the SACS Collaborative Academic Arrangements: Policy and Procedures for substantive change submissions.

College Response

In the establishment of the partnership between Grayson County College and L-3 Communications Corporation, all policies and procedures required by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and SACSCOC were followed in the development, proposal, and execution of the program except for the inclusion of the appropriate disclaimer in public publications identifying L-3 as not being accredited SACSCOC. In keeping with these policies, GCC, revised its [2011-2012 GCC Online Catalog](#), [GCC Schedule of Classes](#) (next print, summer 2012) and the [GCC Air Traffic Control Program Brochure](#). In addition, a sample [academic credential](#) is provided.

Each academic credential issued to a student from this program will have the # to the right of the degrees and/or certificate awarded. The # will appear at the bottom of the transcript with the following statement, “Not a SACSCOC Accredited Program, see disclaimer.” Another denotation on

the transcript will be ****Partial Transcript – Not all Academic History Computerized****. Each transcript will have the complete disclaimer notice attached with the Registrar's signature (See disclaimer below).

In preparing for our response to the On-Site Committee recommendation, GCC contacted L-3 Communications and added the disclaimer to its partnership agreement which was then sent to L-3 Communications for review and signature. GCC also requested the disclaimer be placed on the L-3 Air Traffic Control website and in all L-3 ATC program promotional materials. Effective Wednesday, March 6, 2012, L-3 Communications and GCC have cancelled its joint partnership to offer the Air Traffic Control (ATC) degree and certificate programs. GCC will begin work on the deactivation of the degree program and will submit notification to SACSCOC as soon as the official paperwork between L-3 and GCC has been completed. There have been no new students enrolled in the program since September 2011, and every student who has entered the program has completed their academic credential.

Disclaimer Notice

"Grayson County College is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Colleges to award Associate of Science and Associate of Applied Science degrees. L-3 Communications (Link Simulation & Training) is not accredited by the Commission on Colleges and the accreditation of Grayson County College does not extend to or include L-3 Communications (Link Simulations & Training) or its students. Although Grayson County College accepts certain course work in transfer toward a credential from L-3 Communications (Link Simulations & Training) or collaborates in other ways for generation of course credits or program credentials, other colleges and universities may or may not accept this work in transfer, even if it appears on a transcript from Grayson County College. This decision is made by the institution subsequently considering the possibility of accepting such credits."