Institutional Response Form

Institution: Gogebic Community College   Institutional ID: 1324

Evaluation Type: Monitoring, Focused Visits: The Board required that the College host a focused visit no later than July 1, 2019, specifically addressing the following:

• Progress on the continued implementation of the assessment plan;
• The usage of data for improving the quality of student learning, programs, and outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels;
• Where appropriate, documented changes made to curricular programs and the general education program based on a review of data gathered through assessment processes; and
• Progress on at least two years of using data for improvement in the above-mentioned areas and reports of progress in assessment and quality improvement to the College's Board of Trustees.


Date: 05/07/2019

Printed Name of President or Chancellor*: Mr. Erik Guenard, GCC Interim President

Phone: (906) 932-4231   Email: erikg@gogebic.edu

Signature of President or Chancellor:

(*HLC expects the response from the President, Chancellor, or chief executive officer if a different title is used.)

Instructions for Submitting Response

1. This form, and an additional written response if you choose to include one, must be submitted electronically on the following webpage: http://www.hlcommission.org/document_upload/.

2. If you choose to write an additional written response, it should be in the form of a letter to the
Institutional Actions Council, should not exceed five pages, and must be sent electronically with this form within the two-week timeframe.

If a response is not received within the two weeks, HLC will conclude that the institution concurs with the accreditation recommendation.

General Questions

Please indicate ONE:

☐ The institution concurs with the accreditation recommendations and chooses not to submit a further response.

☒ The institution concurs with the accreditation recommendations and has enclosed a written response (please return with this form).

☐ The institution does not concur with the accreditation recommendations and chooses not to submit a further response.

☐ The institution does not concur with the accreditation recommendations and has enclosed a written response (please return with this form).

☐ The institution does not concur with the accreditation recommendations and requests an in-person hearing in place of an Institutional Actions Council (IAC) meeting (see definitions below).

In-person hearings are restricted to specific types of evaluation recommendations by HLC policy. These are: reaffirmation of accreditation; biennial visits in candidacy; focused visits; and financial and non-financial indicator monitoring. All decisions regarding substantive change and staff recommended monitoring or changes to the Statement of Affiliation Status are not eligible for in-person hearings. Pathways designations recommendations are not eligible for in-person hearings. Contact your HLC staff liaison for more information. Fees for in-person hearings are found in the schedule of HLC Dues and Fees at hlccommission.org/dues.

Definitions

Institutional Response. HLC expects a written response from the President or Chancellor of an institution (or chief executive by a different title) within two weeks of receipt of an accreditation report or reaffirmation recommendation and provides the attached response form for this purpose. The institution may choose to include an additional written response in the form of a letter from the President or Chancellor to the Institutional Actions Council. These additional written responses should not be longer than five pages and must be received electronically with this form within the two-week timeframe.

Institutional Actions Council (IAC). The IAC is composed of Board-appointed peer reviewers and public members. The First and Second Committees of IAC conduct electronically mediated meetings and in-person hearings to review and act on accreditation recommendations.

IAC Meeting. IAC meetings consist of five or more members of the First or Second Committee of IAC, who read the full materials of the evaluation, discuss the findings, and act on the accreditation recommendations. IAC committees may agree with the accreditation recommendations they review or offer differing recommendations or decisions. The meetings are electronically mediated and held eight or more times per year. The majority of accreditation recommendations are reviewed at an IAC meeting. Exceptions include recommendations that are required by policy to be reviewed at an in-person hearing.
and recommendations that institutions request be reviewed at an in-person hearing instead of an IAC meeting.

**IAC Hearing.** In some circumstances, an institution may request or may be required to attend an IAC Hearing. IAC Hearings consist of five or more members of the First or Second Committee of IAC, who read the full materials of the evaluation, discuss the findings, and act on the accreditation recommendations. Conducted three times per year, IAC Hearings are held in-person and require the presence of institutional staff, HLC staff and evaluation team representatives. There is a fee for requested hearings. An institution that is considering an IAC Hearing should consult with its HLC staff liaison for more information, as not all accreditation decisions are eligible for review and action at a hearing.

**IAC First Committee.** Members of the IAC First Committee conduct meetings and hearings to act on accreditation recommendations. The First Committee is the initial group to review an institution’s case after an accreditation evaluation; the Committee may agree with the evaluation team’s recommendation or it may offer a different recommendation or render a different decision.

**IAC Second Committee.** In some circumstances, institutions or HLC staff may request that the First Committee’s decision be reviewed by the IAC Second Committee. Members of the Second Committee conduct meetings and hearings to act on accreditation recommendations forwarded on request or by policy after the action of the First Committee. The Second Committee may agree with the evaluation team’s recommendation or First Committee’s decision or it may offer a different recommendation or render a different decision. Institutions should consult with their HLC staff liaison for more information.
Members of the IAC,

I want to express my appreciation to the members of our peer review team, Dr. Daniel Wright and Dr. James Baber, on behalf of the faculty, staff and administration of Gogebic Community College. The visiting team was professional, thorough, inclusive and complete in their review of our processes and evidence. As an institution, we worked diligently to address all the issues noted in our most recent Systems Appraisal in addition to our efforts in implementing and sustaining a culture of assessment throughout our campus. We recognize that our work is not complete and I can assure you that GCC is fully committed to the HLC process of accreditation.

Gogebic Community College, values the input of the HLC in monitoring, appraising and reviewing all of our processes to reaffirm our commitment to student success and continued overall improvement. As an institution, we concur with the recommendations presented in this final report and look forward to our continued work towards improving our efficiency and effectiveness in our ongoing commitment to excellence.

Sincerely,

Erik Guenard
Gogebic Community College
Interim President
www.gogebic.edu