**(2) Assessment of the Mission Statement**
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*(a) The College of Micronesia-FSM is a learner-centered institution of higher education that is (b) committed to the success of the Federated States of Micronesia by (c) providing academic and career & technical educational programs characterized by continuous improvement and best practices.*

COM-FSM has 20 indicators – based on Institution Set Standards (ISS), Integrated Educational Master Plan (IEMP), and Strategic Directions and Goals) to measure/assess success in achieving our mission statement. We at Chuuk Campus are responsible for achieving 19 of the 20 benchmarks:

**(a) Indicators and Criteria Benchmark Person(s) Responsible**

(a)1 % of students passing each CSLO 60% - 80% IC and all FT/PT faculty

[to be incorporated into CLA] **(local)**

(a)2 % of all FT/PT faculty completing one CLA for each 88% - 90% IC and all FT/PT faculty

course (every semester) **(local)**

(a)3 CCSSE student-faculty interaction minimum All FT/PT faculty

[survey to be designed locally] 70% - 80%

(a)4 CCSSE support for learners minimum All staff/faculty/administrators

(survey to be designed locally) 70% - 80%

(a)5 % of credit hours taught by FT faculty minimum 85% IC and all FT faculty

(national)

(a)6 Average section size for each course 75% Dean and IC

[based on minimum 20 students/section] (national) (with Registrar)

(a)7 % FT students (12+ credits) of the total enrollment 67% Dean and IC

(national) (with Registrar)

**(b) Indicators and Criteria Benchmark Person(s) Responsible**

(b)1 Minimum 10% of total census population in Chuuk 500 (1%) Dean

(50,000 in 2015) **(local)** (with campus recruiters)

(b)2 Minimum 80 CTE student graduates each school year 80 Dean/IC/CTE coordinator

(F/S/Summer) **(local)** (with campus recruiters)

(b)3 % of CTE graduates each year employed in their fields minimum 50% Dean/IC/CTE coordinator

of study (national)

(b)4 Number of CTE programs offered each school year minimum 5 Dean/IC/CTE coordinator

(F/S/Summer) (national)

**(c) Indicators and Criteria Benchmark Person(s) Responsible**

(c)1 CCSSE active and collaborative learning minimum Dean/IC/all faculty

[survey to be designed locally] 70% - 80%

(c)2 Minimum 2 “guided pathways” programs to be esta- 2 Dean/IC/SSC

blished every school year (F/S/Summer) **(local)**

(c)3 Graduation rate minimum 16% VPIEQA/VPIA/Dean

[No. of graduates ÷ cohort size x 100%] (national) [to be defined by VPIEQA]

(c)4 Transfer rate maximum 17% VPIEQA/VPIA/Dean

(national) [to be defined by VPIEQA]

(c)5 Fall-to-fall persistence rate for each new cohort in minimum 66% Dean/IC/SSC

fall semester (national) (with Registrar]

(c)6 % of FT, first-time students that complete in 3 years or minimum 16% Dean/IC

less (national) (with Registrar)

(c)7 Success rate of students, by completion, in 3 years or minimum 92% Dean/IC/SSC

less (national) (with Registrar)

(c)8 Success rate of students, by passing grades, in 3years minimum 71% Dean/IC/SSC

or less (national) (with Registrar)

The original documents are found on our COM-FSM website:

• Institution Set Standards (ISS): under “Public Transparency & Accountability”;

• Integrated Education Master Plan (IEMP) and its Matrix: under “Academics”; and

• Strategic Goals and Directions: (i) under “Our College” → “About Us” → “Strategic Plan”, and (ii) under “Our College” → “President” → “Plans” → “Strategic Plan 2013-2017”.

**(3) ACCJC Rubrics for Chuuk Management Council**

In 2011 ACCJC required all IHEs to assess three general criteria: **Program Review** (PR), **Planning**, and **Student Learning Outcomes** (SLOs). COM-FSM was advised to implement the rubrics to measure institutional effectiveness in these three criteria. The original 2011 rubrics may be viewed at our COM-FSM website under “Accreditation”. In the absence of a Palikir-based, quantitative instrument, Chuuk Campus committed itself to rubric production for use by our own administrators, staff, and faculty.

The first time to field-test and implement the three rubrics was during the Summer of 2012. We had collected from all 2012 Management Council members baseline data. However, there was no follow-through nor commitment to continue annual implementation. One good news is that Chuuk Campus was the sole COM-FSM campus to design and implement the rubrics for ACCJC. We did something that no other campus dared to do. We now have a choice –

1. **to do a first-time follow-through in 2017 (five years later)**. The baseline data (2012) and the first-time follow-through (2017) will reveal strengths and weaknesses in the way Chuuk Campus administration oversees program review, planning, and SLOs.

(b) **to disregard ACCJC’s requirement**. If we disregard these rubrics, we lose sight of any direction in which we may help ourselves to improve. We can always move forward (or backward) blindly. As the saying goes, ***“The blind (administration) leading the blind (all others at Chuuk Campus).”***

The three criteria are repeated on pages 11-13. The three quantitative rubrics (with a very rudimentary Likert scale) for our Management Council are found on pages 14-16. The 2012 field-tested data are found on pages 17-19, and the first-time baseline follow-through data are found on pages 20-22.

Let us do some analysis findings from the 2017 follow-through data among the participants of the June 16th Convention.

• **Rubric #1 (Program Review)**: It is obvious that, for the past five years (2012-2017), there has been very little professional development/training on “Program Review”. The rubric (on page 20) contains 19 qualitative benchmarks (4 As, 6 Ds, 6 Ps, and 3 Ss). Unfortunately, the mean rating on each benchmark is less than satisfactory, especially for D/P/S benchmarks.

**Recommendation #1**: ***That immediate training be designed for those responsible for program review (PR) and program-level assessment (PLA). Training contents come directly from Rubric #1 benchmarks, such as A1, A2, A3, A4, D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, and D6, during the Fall 2017 semester; and such as P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, and P6, during the Spring 2018 semester.*** Since PLAs (every year) and PRs (once every two years) are required, this training is urgent.

• **Rubric #2 (Planning)**: It is obvious – again – that all key administrators/staff/faculty are weak in “Planning” and that they need immediate training. Rubric #2 contains 23 qualitative benchmarks (on page 21): 7 As, 6 Ds, 6 Ps, and 4 Ss. What is most discouraging is the very first benchmark (A1): preliminary investigative dialog about planning processes – a mean rating (0.9) < minimum 1.0.

**Recommendation #2**: ***That immediate training be designed for all key administrators, staff, and faculty who are tasked with daily/weekly/monthly/semestrially planning activities, and be implemented during the school year 2017-2018. Training contents come directly from Rubric #2 benchmarks, such as A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, and D6, during the Fall 2017 semester; and such as P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, and P6, during the Spring 2018 semester.***

• **Rubric #3 (SLOs)**: Among its 24 benchmarks (5 As, 6 Ds, 7 Ps, and 6 Ss) on page 22, we at Chuuk Campus do not fare well. We must remember that SLOs are essential and necessary for each office on campus – not only in instruction but also in administration, student services, and CRE. I want to presume that every instructor knows how to deal with SLOs, but that would be a false presumption. For instance, in the self-assessment, not only administrators/staff lack SLO awareness, development, and proficiency, but also instructors!

**Recommendation #3**: ***That all administrators and staff be trained in converting their duties and responsibilities into true “student learning outcomes”; and that their training contents come dir-ectly from Rubric #3 benchmarks under “awareness” and “development” during the entire school year 2017-2018.*** Former SSC Maika Tuala initiated the process of training but left Chuuk without completion of training. We must begin anew in this effort.

**Recommendation #4**: ***That all faculty (FT and PT) be trained in becoming proficient in dealing with Rubric #3 benchmarks (5 As, 6 Ds, and 7 Ps) during the entire school year 2017-2018.*** Let no instructor be smug about his/her knowledge/skills/disposition/practice of SLOs. Let us achieve instructional communications networking through cooperative, collaboration, collegiality, and community (our 4Cs).

We have a long way to go in order to ensure achieving ACCJC’s “sustainability” in program review, planning, and SLOs. No one – absolutely, NO ONE – must shirk his/her duties and responsibilities in becoming sustainable in performance of such duties and responsibilities.

**(4) Assessment of Vision Statement** = None.

*“We provide quality education today for a successful tomorrow.”*

This task is the responsibility of the Board of Regents, not state campus administration/staff/faculty/ students. All the same, any individual administrator/staff/faculty member may suggest to the Dean how the vision statement may be revised, as necessary, and he shall be responsible for sharing your suggestion with appropriate Palikir administrators and Board of Regents members.

**(5) Assessment of Core Values**

*Excellence Learner-Centeredness Commitment Professionalism Teamwork*

Participants at the August 2016 Visioning Mini-Summit reviewed the 5 core values and their 35 related attitudes and behaviors. There are three noteworthy thoughts about these core values:

• The core values and their 35 related attitudes and behaviors are stated, in full, on our COM-FSM website – under “Our College” → “About Us” → “Core Values”.

• The 35 were scaled down to 15 “high priority” attitudes and behaviors which Chuuk Campus employees must demonstrated minimally in performance of duties and responsibilities. These 15 attitudes and behaviors are found on page 23.

• Over time, we are all responsible for fulfilling the 35 attitudes and behaviors. However, our August 2016 Mini-Summit set high priority onto the 15 for the next few years. The 15 may be replaced by Chuuk Campus administrators/staff/faculty with other attitudes and behaviors. Any such replacement should be the responsibility of our Faculty/Staff Senate on campus.