

# REPORT OF THE WASC SPECIAL VISIT TEAM

To Northern Marianas College

October 22, 2012 – October 25, 2012

## Team Roster

Dr. Clyde Sakamoto, Chair

*Chancellor, University of Hawaii Maui College*

Dr. Patricia L. Prado-Olmos, Assistant Chair

*Professor, California State University San Marcos*

Jill Ferguson, WASC Liaison

*Chief of Staff, WASC*

The team evaluated the institution under the WASC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. 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 WASC website.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page numbers
<b>SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT</b>	
A. Description of the Institution and Visit	3
B. The Institution's Special Visit Report: Quality of the Report and Supporting Evidence	6
C. Description of the Team's Review Process	7
<b>SECTION II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS</b>	
A. Issue: Recommendation #3: Integration of financial and institutional planning	8
B. Issue: Recommendation #4: Financial integrity and responsible use of resources	9
C. Issue: Recommendation #10: Governing board training and adherence to appropriate role	10
D. Issue: Supplemental Recommendation #1: Recruit a permanent Chief Financial and Administrative Office	11
E. Issue: Supplemental Recommendation #2: Schedule a process for the review of all College policies	11
F. WASC Standard 1	11
G. WASC Standard 2	12
H. WASC Standard 3	14
I. WASC Standard 4	16
<b>SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	18
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
Compliance audit	21

## **SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

### **A. Description of Institution and Visit**

Northern Marianas Colleges (NMC) was founded in 1981 under the oversight of the Board of Education in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands. Saipan is the site of the main campus with small outreach sites maintained on Tinian and Rota islands. In March 1985, NMC was re-established by law as a public corporation under the oversight of its own Board of Regents stipulating the mission and designation of the college to serve as the land-grant college within the Commonwealth. The mission statement of the College is:

*The mission of the Northern Marianas College shall be to provide the best quality and meaningful postsecondary and adult educational opportunities for the purpose of improving the quality of life for the individual and for the Commonwealth as a whole. The college shall be responsible for providing education in the areas of adult and continuing education, postsecondary and adult vocational education and professional development for the people of the Commonwealth.*

The College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). It offers a single baccalaureate program in Education that is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (ACSCU). During this joint special visit, the ACSCU team focused on the Bachelor of Science in Education program in the School of Education.

The main campus for NMC is located in Saipan, with small outreach sites maintained on Tinian and Rota islands. NMC enrolls approximately 1300 FTE students in a range of two-year degree programs, including Business, Liberal Arts, Nursing,

Business Administration and Criminal Justice among others. The School of Education enrolls just under 300 students in the Bachelor of Science in Education program in four concentration areas including Special Education, Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and Rehabilitation and Human Services. The mission statement for the SOE is closely aligned with the College mission statement:

*The mission of the School of Education is to promote excellence in the art and science of teaching through research-based pedagogy and assessment so as to assist in the improvement of the quality of life within the Commonwealth by providing superior educational program for aspiring and veteran professionals in the fields of Education and Human Services whilst in support of the mission of Northern Marianas College with understanding of regional and global diversity in a changing world.*

Accreditation of the School and the College are closely linked. Indeed, accreditation for the School by ACSCU depends on the College maintaining accreditation by ACCJC. Since the inclusion of NMC's BS in Education, NMC reviews have included team members from both ACCJC and ACSCU accrediting bodies. Northern Marianas College experienced an extensive accreditation history. From its Initial Accreditation granted in 2001, an ACCJC visit in April 2004 resulted in an October 2004 Warning and Special Visit. This visit resulted in a removal of the Warning and Reaffirmation of Accreditation with a follow up progress report. Upon receipt of the progress report in Fall 2005, ACCJC scheduled a special visit in November 2005. The team included one member from ACSCU. A Comprehensive Review followed the special visit in October 2006. Following this visit, the ACCJC placed NMC on Probation and ACSCU acted similarly to put the baccalaureate program in Elementary Education on

Probation in 2007. After a special visit in November 2007, the college was placed on Show Cause subject to termination in January 2008. Accordingly, ACSCU acted to continue the accreditation of the bachelor's program in elementary education and require the College to satisfactorily address the ACCJC Show Cause order and retain accreditation with ACCJC for Senior College accreditation to continue. The Show Cause order persisted through a visit in November 2008 and was removed following an ACCJC site visit in April 2009. A Comprehensive visit in April 2010 resulted in a Show Cause order due to failure to comply with standards in three key areas: autonomy from outside interference, financial management and integrity, and governance and accountability. The Show Cause status was continued after a Show Cause visit in October 2010. ACCJC acted to remove the Show Cause order and impose Probation after a Show Cause report was submitted in March 2011. A Special Visit was conducted in November 2011 and ACCJC acted to continue Probation with a comprehensive review to be conducted in October 2012. ACSCU acted to: require the College satisfactorily address the recommendation in the ACCJC Special Visit letter and retain its accreditation with ACCJC, in order for ACSCU accreditation to continue; schedule an ACSCU review in October 2012 to evaluate the BS degree; require that all documents relating to the October 2012 ACCJC visit be made available to ACSCU; request a separate report due 12 weeks before the October 2012 review on the BS program.

This Special Visit was guided by the March 2012 letter to NMC President Hart from Ralph Wolff at ACSCU. The March 2012 letter from WASC also required a Special Visit team to evaluate the Bachelor of Science degree program under the WASC ACSCU Standards of Accreditation.

The Visit focused on five recommendations made by ACCJC in February 2012:

Recommendation #3: Integration of financial and institutional planning;

Recommendation #4: Financial integrity and responsible use of resources;

Recommendation #10: Governing board training and adherence to appropriate role;

Supplemental Recommendation #1: Recruit a permanent Chief Financial and Administrative Officer;

Supplemental Recommendation #2: Schedule and process for the review of all College policies

The Bachelor of Science degree program is not offered at any off-site facility or through a distance education model so no additional sites were reviewed. No special follow-up visits related to substantive change were conducted in connection with this visit. A compliance audit was conducted and found to be complete and accurate.

#### **B. Quality of the Special Visit Report and Supporting Evidence**

The School of Education submitted an institutional report and supporting evidence that addressed the WASC Standards. The report was structured around a self-evaluation process that includes evidence and conclusions as well as an Actionable Improvement Plan to address each WASC Standard. While the report presented a picture of the Bachelor of Science in Education, it was difficult for the team to discern the frame of the picture as well as details. The Special Visit report was difficult to follow and contained numerous grammatical and syntactical errors.

The Special Visit report was prepared through an inclusive process in the SOE. Faculty were organized into Standard teams and worked collaboratively to draft

preliminary responses. Two faculty members were identified to cohesively organize the report and drafts were shared with all faculty and administrators in the School. The report was organized by Standards and included six elements in each section. The elements included the Standard, WASC definitions, key issues to be addressed, a descriptive summary, a Self-Evaluation and an Actionable Improvement Plan. In each response to a Standard, the institution evaluated the evidence presented and their performance against the Standard. The report structure supports an appropriate methodology including the application of evidence to engage in a self-evaluation. The SOE followed their self-identified process. However, the report lacks detail and analysis of the evidence is superficial. For example, the Actionable Improvement Plans describe very reasonable plans based on the existing evidence. However, the plans do not include a detailed description of actions to be taken with benchmarks and dates of completion or progress expectations. There is no indication of how the institution will evaluate the effectiveness of their action steps.

### **C. Description of the Team Review Process**

Each team member engaged in an independent review of the School of Education Special Visit Report and all materials provided by WASC regarding previous NMC visits including the 2012 Commission letter. The team Chair divided areas of focus between himself and the Assistant Chair based on areas of expertise. Team members filled out a Team Worksheet for the Special Visit Review Conference Call that the Assistant Chair compiled into a single Worksheet prior to the conference call. During the conference call the team reviewed the four issues and discussed the SOE report response in detail. The team identified areas of strength, remaining questions and additional evidence needed.

The Assistant Chair contacted the NMC ALO and requested additional evidence. The team reviewed the additional evidence prior to the visit.

The team met the first evening of the visit to review the evidence and develop appropriate lines of inquiry based on the evidence. Team members composed interview questions appropriate to the individuals and groups to be interviewed that probed into identified lines of inquiry. During the visit the team carefully reviewed evidence provided in the team room and conducted interviews with a variety of individuals and groups across the campus. The team debriefed regularly to triangulate interview evidence and to refine interview questions. Additionally, as both ACSCU and ACCJC teams were scheduled to review NMC during the same period of time, the ACSCU team coordinated the review schedule with the ACCJC team leadership. The ACCJC observations were shared with the ACSCU team and informed its deliberations and review.

During the visit, the ACSCU team reviewed the SOE's report, all evidence submitted with the report, and supplemental materials provided in the team room. Additionally, the team conducted interviews with the SOE full-time faculty, SOE part-time faculty, the Program Review Committee, SOE Acting Director, APS Dean, the President, Board of Regents, NMC Faculty Senate, NMC Management Team, Dean of Administration, NMC Academic Council, CNMI legislative leaders and others to provide additional evidence and verification of the materials reviewed.

## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS**

### *Recommendation #3: Integration of financial and institutional planning*

In support of the information and assertions provided in the SOE Special Visit Report, the SOE leadership and faculty provided displays and evidence of a systematic



procedure that seeks to improve student learning and program outcomes (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3). From plans developed since 2008, attention to SOE-wide participation in assessing program and learning outcomes related to its goals indicates overall progress despite a series of temporary appointments to SOE leadership. Even with changes in the SOE leadership, SOE faculty continued to implement the Nichols 5-Column model with positive results. Examples of this process affecting facilities' improvements and an imminent appointment of a permanent SOE director reveal an SOE process that effectively connects with the NMC institutional PROAC (Program Review Outcomes Assessment Committee) and resource allocation decision-making structure (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3). While financial, budget planning and leadership actions at the institutional level are underway through the advertising and prospective appointment of a chief financial officer, overall NMC resources are stable through CNMI support and NMC administrative advocacy and initiative. The development and implementation of the SOE bachelor's degree concentrations in Rehabilitation Services, Early Childhood Education, and Special Education indicate that the input and feedback from students, community and NMC colleagues supports new initiatives through the SOE system adopted to address continuous improvements to meeting its mission (CFRs 1.1, 4.2, 4.3).

*Recommendation #4: Financial integrity and responsible use of resources*

Overall the team found that the institution provides financial and budgetary development and reporting procedures that have resulted in effectively responding to CNMI's economic challenges while addressing NMC's mission (CFRs 1.1, 3.5). From active leadership from the regents, president, administrative, faculty and student government, the NMC organization supports the relationship between linking its plans

with the allocation of its resources (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). NMC regularly audits its financial performance with no findings in its most recent review (CFR 3.5). Faculty and staff report a consistent understanding of NMC financial, budget planning, communications and execution policies and procedures. NMC and SOE resources are stable through CNMI support and NMC administrative and board advocacy and initiative. SOE faculty and staff indicate that the budget planning process has effectively responded to SOE facilities renovation and director replacement needs (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

*Recommendation #10: Governing board training and adherence to appropriate role*

Evidence was provided and verified through interviews with the NMC Board of Regents Chair and members that American Association of Community College Trustee training was undertaken and attention to their roles as autonomous decisionmakers was clearly understood (CFRs 3.8, 3.9). Although a CNMI law requires a quarterly NMC report, Regents and legislators uniformly and consistently affirmed NMC's autonomy and the Board's independent authority. While the current CNMI legislative and NMC board composition expressed a commitment to NMC's autonomy, a more formal recognition would more completely address the WASC Standard and ensure NMC's autonomy into the future (CFRs 3.8, 3.9). Finally, it should be noted that the Board Chair, other regents and the NMC President successfully presented NMC's needs to the CNMI legislature. That CNMI legislatively responded and supported a recent 24% increase or about \$1.3 million to the NMC budget demonstrates both Board and administrative leadership as well as the legislators' commitment to its stated priority...especially given the presently challenged economy (CFR 3.9).

*Supplemental Recommendation #1: Recruit a permanent Chief Financial and Administrative Officer*

The team found that the financial and budgeting responsibilities have been temporarily assigned to a newly appointed Dean of Administration. A chief financial officer position has been unsuccessfully recruited and is now being re-advertised with a slightly and upwardly adjusted compensation range (CFR 3.10).

*Supplemental Recommendation #2: Schedule and process for the review of all College policies*

A review of the existing policies was initiated by the NMC President in the previous academic year, management team, college and academic councils. This process includes the pre-existing work by deans and department chairs (CFRs 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 3.3) as well as consideration of proposed new policies. This process enlists program faculty and staff input with opportunities for academic senate and student government participation. The review of policies that affect class sizes, professional development, a common time for college-wide meetings (“college hour”), and other emerging issues is underway. A six-year cycle of reviews of each policy has been scheduled (CFRs 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 3.3).

*WASC Standard 1 – Defining, Evaluating, and Enhancing Educational Effectiveness*

The School of Education presented a narrative that addressed appropriate institutional statements (CFR 1.1), clear educational objectives (CFR 1.2), and institutional leadership (CFR 1.3).

The team found the evidence indicated the SOE is diligent in its commitment and work regarding educational effectiveness. The SOE adopted a new mission statement in

July 2012. The newly revised SOE mission statement is linked to the student learning outcomes and guides curriculum and governance decisions in the School (CFR 1.1). Interviews corroborated the process for reconsideration of the mission statement and noted that the mission serves as a foundational framework for the program learning outcomes.

The educational objectives of the School are clearly recognized throughout the institution, linked to the mission and regularly measured through a comprehensive program review process, and student retention and graduation data (CFRs 1.2, 4.4, 4.6). The SOE faculty articulates a comprehensive and predictable process for course evaluation and review. They recently reviewed their Student Learning Outcomes and reduced the number of SLOs to those most cogent to their mission and standards. SLOs are noted in course syllabi and in classrooms (CFR 1.2).

Although NMC limits its contracts to two years, present institutional leadership appears to have some stability (CFR 1.3). The President and her Management Team consists of management area Deans, Acting Director of the SOE, Faculty Senate President, Staff Senate President and the Associated Students President. President Hart reported that all members of the Management Team have been at NMC longer than she has and carry important history and knowledge. Specifically SOE leadership has been in flux with two Acting Directors serving over the past year. Interviews indicate that a permanent Director appointment is expected to successfully conclude by December 2012.

*WASC Standard 2 – Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions*

The School of Education presented a narrative that addressed appropriateness of content, standards, and language for degree level (CFR 2.1), curriculum design and its

assessment (CFRs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7), and community service and service learning (CFR 2.5).

The team found that documents submitted and interview data show the School of Education regularly meets its educational objectives through its core functions as framed by the concentrations in the BS in Education program. The School of Education programs are guided by appropriate standards where applicable (CFR 2.1). For example, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards guide the teacher preparation program even though the program is not NCATE accredited. The programs in the SOE have clear admissions criteria as well as requirements for the successful completion of the programs. Learners in the SOE are fully informed about the four year program and benchmark points which include additional requirements such as successful performance on the PRAXIS I before admission to Teacher Candidacy (CFR 2.2).

Evidence and interviews indicated each concentration in the program follows a breadth and depth of study sequence that includes appropriate practicum experiences so graduates are able to apply for licensure in teaching and step into employment situations in teaching or other areas such as social work or counseling. The SOE follows a program review cycle that is consistent with other institutions and student-learning outcomes are transparent (CFRs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7). As a four-year BS degree in a two-year institution, the SOE courses are responsible for addressing SLOs in multiple areas. These areas include SLOs related to the educational content, General Education Learning Outcomes related to a College approved General Education curriculum and program learning outcomes related to the Education program. Syllabi list student-learning

outcomes related to each course. Analysis of course syllabi revealed assignments and assessment are linked to course SLOs. Consistent and reliable review and alignment is critical to maintain integrity for all SLOs and the SOE faculty regularly meets to review, analyze and discuss course content throughout the program. Evidence and interviews indicated curriculum mapping is a regular dynamic activity engaged by the faculty (CFRs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7).

The program review cycle is multilevel and links to College processes for establishing planning priorities and budget allocations related to the priorities. Indeed, interviews revealed that the SOE utilized the program review process to prioritize office and classroom facility needs that resulted in a redesign and remodel of part of a building and subsequent move for the School. The new location includes faculty offices, administrative and administrative support office, and dedicated SOE classrooms (CFR 4.2). Building from this success, the SOE faculty continues to prioritize other needs such as relocation of the recently moved Curriculum Resource Center (CRC). The CRC had been space highly utilized by students and provided a gather/study area for education students. Students and faculty describe the current space as small and inadequate for student and faculty needs.

*WASC Standard 3 – Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability*

The School of Education presented a narrative that addressed workload (CFR 1.3), leadership (CFR 2.1), organizational structures (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4), and technological resources to sustain a collaborative learning environment (CFR 3.7)

The team found that the School of Education has created a culture of collaboration that effectively develops and applies resources to ensure sustained educational effectiveness within the purview of the department curriculum and organizational structures.

The workload expectation for SOE faculty is guided by College policy and applied across all College departments and programs (CFR 1.3). Data from 2009-2011 show the unduplicated headcount for the BS in Education ranged from 208 in Fall 2009 to 292 in Fall 2011. The AA degree ranged from 343 to 292 in the same time period and the AS degree ranged from 132 to 187. These data indicate the BS in Education degree is the second largest program on campus and maintains a consistent number of students in the program. Interview data revealed that classes are often filled with wait lists and instructors are often asked to exceed course enrollment caps due to student need.

The SOE recently hired three full-time faculty. These hires bring the total number of faculty to seven. Faculty have consistently carried overload each semester in order to meet the teaching and administrative demands of the program. Faculty reported that the low number of full-time faculty has influenced increased workload exacerbated more recently, by the lack of a Director since faculty have been serving as Acting Directors with the accompanying administrative workload (CFRs 3.1, 3.11). The leadership of the School has been in flux for approximately three years. Full-time Directors have departed for personal and professional reasons and Acting Directors have been in place for more than a year. The Acting Director in place at the time of this Special Visit will step down from the position in another week (CFR 3.1). Hiring and retaining a highly qualified Director is a critical step in supporting the SOE to sustain the progress and forward

looking activities undertaken by the faculty. Interviews indicate the search for a permanent Director is in the final stages and the institution hopes to name a new Director by December 2012 (CFRs 3.1, 3.10, 3.11).

The organizational structure of the SOE is best described as “faculty-driven” and a collaborative community. Faculty meets weekly to share information and work on tasks including curriculum alignment, student learning objective analysis and review, professional development and learner performance. Evidence also indicated that SOE faculty actively participate in governance committees for the College as representatives for the School as well as at-large members (CFR 3.11).

Interviews revealed that the SOE is engaged in careful consideration of how to utilize on-line learning in its concentrations. Faculty report movement in the direction of online learning across the College and the Micronesia region, though the School describes itself as in an “infancy” stage. The faculty is closely monitoring the educational effectiveness of current hybrid course offerings (CFRs 3.7, 3.11). Challenges cited include the unreliable wireless connections, limited hours for the campus computer labs, cost of Internet access and sustaining an applied focus for some course content.

*WASC Standard 4 – Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement*

The School of Education presented a narrative that addressed institutional reflections and planning processes (CFRs 4.5, 4.8). Through a careful review of evidence presented in the document room and gathered through interviews, the team found that the SOE is an organization fully committed to learning and improvement.

As one interview revealed, the SOE is in “constant dialogue about constant challenges” for the express purpose of improving the educational outcomes for their



“learners,” (CFRs 4.6, 4.7). To this end, the SOE actively adheres to the Northern Marianas College PROA Strategic Plan 2008-2012. The plan identifies four goals: 1) **Promote** student learning and success; 2) **Respond** to professional development, continuing education and personal enrichment needs of the Commonwealth; 3) **Optimize** financial and human resources; and 4) **Accelerate** the upgrade of physical and technology infrastructure.

As an academic unit, the SOE works within a Program Review framework to identify program outcomes aligned with the NMC’s PROA Strategic Plan (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). The program review process moves from course level student learning outcomes to consideration of program level student learning outcomes and identification of program level academic, personnel, fiscal, physical and technological needs as identified through an analysis of learner outcome data (CFR 4.2, 4.3). Through this process, the SOE aligns prioritized program needs with budgetary allocations for consideration by the Program Review Outcomes Assessment Committee (PROAC). The SOE utilizes data produced by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to inform their program review including course evaluations (CFRs 4.3, 4.5). The SOE also utilizes a Be Blunt process wherein instructors request feedback from students, and ongoing communication and dialogue with the Public School System and other community agencies related to the concentrations of study in the School.

Evidence indicates the SOE’s relationships with external constituencies appear strong and dynamic (CFR 4.1). The faculty is working on establishing a redesigned Program Advisory Council. The Council was reorganized to better support the diversity in program concentrations. New community members from all concentrations have been

identified and are currently being solicited to participate. In addition to the Advisory Council, The SOE regularly works with major constituents through occasional strategic planning meetings, contact by the Director, and faculty and student teacher supervisors (CFR 4.1, 4.8).

### **SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Northern Marianas College has made progress in addressing all areas of concern previously noted by WASC. Despite the somewhat limited descriptions in the SOE Special Visit Self-Study Report, the School of Education is a vibrant part of the College community. The importance of the role of the SOE is evidenced by the fact that faculty have been called upon to provide leadership in a number of areas including pedagogy, development of student learning outcomes, assessment and shared governance.

#### *Commendations*

The SOE provided clear evidence of its commitment to improving its “educational effectiveness.” Examples of strengthening student learning through continuing and comprehensive examination of its performance through program reviews, faculty engagement in assessment, follow up on its graduates with the Public School System, and the development of new concentrations with the B.S. in Education degree were available.

Collaboration seems to be the default expectation for faculty relationships in the SOE. Faculty has stepped forward to take on administrative responsibilities as needed given the lack of consistent leadership in the Director position. This has resulted in a dynamic department culture where faculty lead as needed, work together in all tasks and support each other in continuing and new endeavors.

The Program Review process in the SOE is well established and can serve as a model for the College at-large. Indeed, SOE faculty demonstrates leadership for the institution in pedagogy and assessment. They offer workshops for other units across the College and freely share their knowledge, experience and resources.

The SOE maintains strong collaborative relationships with the Public School System and other partner agencies that have a role in all concentration areas. These relationships support the strong applied practice focus of the School. SOE graduates retain a vibrant loyalty to the School and the College. The SOE has leveraged these relationships to build a cadre of master teachers and an adjunct pool.

The SOE faculty are grounded in the local social and economic context in all the work they do. They actualize the mission statement through the curriculum and support for students across the campus. The SOE faculty are prepared to capitalize on emerging educational and economic opportunities that will contribute to the overall well being of Saipan.

### *Recommendations*

1. The team recommends that NMC continue professional development for its faculty and staff in key areas including data management, institutional research, academic and financial reporting offered by professional associations and organizations. The College must improve the ways in which their institutional narrative is constructed and supported by appropriate evidence (CFR 1.2).

2. Given the progress evident in the breadth of the responses to the previous WASC recommendations and standards, a focus on the “depth” of understanding and addressing NMC’s challenges and strategies would be useful. The team recommends that

greater attention including professional development aligned with the College's strategic goals and direction be undertaken to reinforce the recent NMC advances in meeting WASC standards. It is critical that the institution improve how they identify, collect and analyze evidence according to the WASC standards (CFR 1.9).

3. The team notes that the SOE will benefit from consistent and stable leadership in the form of a permanent Director with appropriate orientation, mentorship and support from the College administration. The team recommends the current search result in a timely and talented appointment in the near future (CFRs 3.8, 3.11). As well, the team urges the College to consider ways in which to maintain and increase faculty with appropriate content credentials in the SOE, contingent upon projected increased enrollment in the four concentration areas of study (CFRs 3.1, 3.2).

## Compliance Audit Checklist for Special Visits and Pathway B Visits

Instruction to team:

Please attach this form to the team report. Missing documents should be noted in the recommendations section of the team report.

Name of Institution: Northern Marianas College

Date of Visit:

CFR	Documents Required	✓ Available - N/A
<b>Standard 1</b>		
1.1	Mission statement	Website/ Catalog
1.2	Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels (PLO's)	Catalog, Website, Student Teacher Handbook
1.2.1	Public statement on student achievement (retention, graduation, student learning)	Fact Book/Key Performance Indicators & Benchmarks
1.3	Organization chart (X 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)	Institution Excellence Guide
1.4	Academic freedom policy	nmcnet.edu-our college-academic freedom
1.5	Diversity policies and procedures; Procedures for Special Accommodations	Catalog, pg. 78
1.6	-	-
1.7	Catalog (online <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , hard copy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies (X 2.10.1)	nmcnet.edu
1.7.2	Student complaint and grievance policies	Catalog, pg. 76/Student Grievance Procedures brochure/Student Complaint and Grievance Policies
1.7.2.1	Policy for grade appeals	Catalog, pg. 70/Policy for grade appeals
1.7.2.2	Records of student complaints	Student Services-Brochure
1.7.3	Faculty grievance policies	Grievance Policy
1.7.3.1	Record of faculty grievances	HRO
1.7.4	Staff grievance policies	Grievance Policy
1.7.4.1	Record of staff grievances and complaints	HRO
1.7.5	Employee handbook	Faculty Handbook
1.7.6.1	Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc.	OAR
1.7.6.2	Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files	OAR
1.7.6.3	Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades	OAR Standard Operating Procedures
1.7.6.4	Tuition and fee schedule	Catalog, pg. 44/Tuition and fee schedule
1.7.6.5	Policies on tuition refunds	Catalog, pg. 46/Tuition and Fees

CFR	Documents Required	✓ Available - N/A
1.7.6.6	Policy on credit hour/award of credit Processes for review of assignment of credit Review of syllabi/equivalent for all kinds of courses	BOR Policy 303 Policy on Credit hour/award of credit/Process of review of assignment of credit
1.8	Regular independent audits of finances (X 3.5)	Dean of Adm. Services
1.9	WASC-related policies to ensure sub change policies	-
1.7-1.9	Documents relating to investigations of the institution by any governmental entity and an update on the status of such investigation A list of pending legal actions by or against the institution, including a full explanation of the nature of the actions, parties involved, and status of the litigation	Legal Counsel
<b>Standard 2</b>		
2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each (X 1.7 )	Catalog, pg. 79
2.2	Complete set of course syllabi for all courses offered	Syllabi
2.2.1	(For associate and bachelor's degrees) statement of general education requirements (X 1.7)	Catalog, pg. 106-114
2.3	SLOs for every program	SOE Course Guides, Syllabi
2.4	-	-
2.5	-	-
2.6	-	-
2.7	Program review process with clear criteria, which include assessment of program retention/graduation and achievement of learning outcomes	PROAC
2.7.1	Regular schedule of program review (including for non-academic units)	Program Review Schedule
2.8	Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity	-
2.9	-	-
2.10	Data on student demographics	Fact Book
2.10.1	Data on retention and graduation, disaggregated by demographic categories and programs	Fact Book
2.10.2	Collection and analysis of grades at the course or program level, as appropriate	
2.10.3	Policies on student evaluation of faculty	APS
2.10.4	Forms for evaluation of faculty by students	nmcnet.edu
2.11	List of student services and co-curricular activities	Catalog, pg. 8-19/Policies on Financial Aid
2.11.1	Policies on financial aid	Catalog, pg. 51
2.12	Academic calendar (X 1.7 catalog)	Catalog, pg. 1
2.13	Recruitment and advertising material for the last year	HRO
2.13.1	Registration procedures	OAR
2.14	Registration forms	OAR
<b>Standard 3</b>		
3.1	Policies on staff development	Professional Development for Staff
3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, tenure track, by program	Faculty Hiring Policies/Adjunct/Recruitment of Full-time Faculty

CFR	Documents Required	✓ Available - N/A
3.3	Faculty hiring policies	HRO
3.3.1	Faculty evaluation policies and procedures (X 2.10)	
3.3.2	Faculty Handbook if available	HRO
3.4	Faculty development policies	-
3.4.1	Faculty orientation policies and procedures	BOR Policy 4020a
3.4.2	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty	HRO
3.4.3	Statements concerning faculty role in assessment of student learning	HRO
3.5	Audited financial statements (X 1.8)	Dean of Admin of Services
3.5.1	Appropriate financial records	Audited Financial Statements
3.5.2	Appropriate policies and procedures for handling of financial aid (X 2.11)	Financial Aid, Standing Operating Procedures
3.5.3	Campus maps	Catalog, pg. 70 Nmcnet.edu
3.6	Inventory of technology resources for students and faculty	Technology Inventory
3.6.1	If online or hybrid, information on delivery method	APS
3.6.2	Library data/holdings, size	NMC library
3.7	Inventory of technology resources and services for staff	Technology Inventory
3.8	Organization chart (X 1.3 and 3.1)	ACCJC Report, 2012/Institutional Effectiveness Guide
3.9	Board list	nmcnet.edu-our college-regents
3.9.1	Board member bios	nmcnet.edu-our college-regents Frankie Eliptico
3.9.2	List of Board committees	BOR/nmc website
3.9.2.1	Minutes of Board meetings for last two years	BOR mins
3.9.2.2	Governing board bylaws and operations manual	nmcnet.edu-Our College- BOR
3.10	CEO bio	nmcnet.edu
3.10.1	CFO bio	-
3.10.2	Other top administrators' bios (e.g., cabinet, VPs, Provost)	-
3.10.3	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president/CEO	BOR
3.11	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority	nmcnet.edu-our college-governance
3.11.1	Faculty organization chart (if applicable)	-
3.11.2	Minutes of last year's faculty meetings	SOE mins 9.26.12
<b>Standard 4</b>		
4.1	Strategic plan (Currently renewing 1 year, 3 year, & 5 year)	PROA Strategic Plan 2008-2013
4.1.1	Operations plan	Operation Plan Template and sample
4.1.2	Academic plan	-
4.2	Description of planning process	Strategic Planning Task Force
4.2.1	Process for review of implementation of strategic plan	Strategic Planning Task Force
4.3	-	-
4.4	New program approval process	BOR Policy 3009
4.4.1	Program review process (X 2.7)	Evidence of Program Review Process/Flow
4.5	Description of IR function and staffing	OIE/Institutional Effectiveness Guide

CFR	Documents Required	✓Available - N/A
4.6	Process for review and analysis of key data, such as retention, graduation (X1.2)	OIE
4.7	-	-
4.8	-	-

Comments

Related to Substantive Change		
1	Locations of all off-campus sites and programs offered at such sites (more than 50% of program)	-
1a	Number of students enrolled at such sites	-
1b	Date of first offerings	-
2	Names of all programs for which 50% of the program is offered through distance education	-
2a	Number of students enrolled in each	-
2b	Date each was first offered	-
3	Names of all hybrid programs	-
3a	Number of students enrolled in each	-
3b	Date each was first offered	-
Accuracy and Availability of Records		
	Policies and procedures for students, faculty and staff are stated consistently in all media	ERO
	Policies, procedures, and information are readily available to relevant constituents	ERO
	Records are accurate and up to date	ERO/BOR/HRO