**(9) CCSSE Assessment**

The “Community College Survey of Student Engagement” (CCSSE) is a student survey. It has 5 benchmarks (minimum 50% for each benchmark): (a) active and collaborative learning, (b) student effort, (c) academic challenge, (d) student-faculty interaction, and (e) support for learners. The 5 benchmarks have a total of 36 “best practices” which administrators/staff/faculty at Chuuk Campus should help students to engage in “access and success”. The 36 practices are shown on page 28.

CCSSE was established in 2001 as a national project of the U.S. Community College Leadership Program headquartered at the University of Texas at Austin. From 2001-2010, the CCSSE survey was given to millions of community-college students throughout the United States and Canada, including the Republic of the Marshall Islands. In 2013, COM-FSM students took the survey for the first time. The 2013 data, by campus, revealed the following comparison:



At our Visioning Mini-Summit (August 2016), CCSSE data (such as bar graph above) from VPIEQA Frankie Harriss were presented to and analyzed by participants. The conclusion was dismal. In 4 of the 5 benchmarks, Chuuk Campus scored the worst among COM-FSM campuses. In two cases (academic challenge and student-faculty interaction), Chuuk Campus performed below the 50% minimum standard.

Chuuk Campus has needed an assessment instrument of its own to reinforce the intent and purpose of improving student perception in all five benchmarks. In April 2017, our Chuuk Assessment Working Group (ChAWG) submitted a final draft instrument to measure student perception of all five benchmarks. At our own Assessment Convention (June 2017), participants contributed significantly to finalizing the assessment instrument. The 2017 participants collapsed the 36 practices into a total of 15 – three per benchmark. It was determined that any student survey with 36 items would be viewed as a negative activity by students, and that a survey form with 15 items would be more likely to obtain honest responses from students. The survey form with 15 items is shown on page 29.

We are to be reminded that the 15 selected items are not etched in concrete. Given 36, we are free to replace our original 15 (in 2017) by a new set of 10-15 items in upcoming years.

**Recommendation #9**: ***That the student survey (on page 29) be administered to all Chuuk Campus students near (i) the end of each semester or (ii) the end of the spring semester each year; and that professional development/training for all employees be scheduled to address low percentages in any of the five benchmarks.***

**CCSSE Benchmarks and Best Practices**

The five benchmarks include the 36 practices listed below:

(1) **Active and Collaborative Learning**

1.1 ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions

1.2 make a class presentation

1.3 work with other students on projects during class

1.4 work with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments

1.5 tutor or teach other students

1.6 participate in a community-based project as a part of a regular course

1.7 discuss ideas from assigned readings or classes with others outside (i.e., other students, family members, co-workers, etc.).

(2) **Student Effort**

2.1 prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in

2.2 work on a paper or project that requires integrating ideas or information from various sources

2.3 come to class without completing readings or assignments

2.4 use peer or other tutoring services

2.5 use skill labs

2.6 use a computer lab

2.7 read books on his/her own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment

2.8 spend a number of hours in a typical week preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, or other activities related to his/her program)

(3) **Academic Challenge**

3.1 analyze the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory

3.2 synthesize and organize ideas, information, or experiences in new ways

3.3 make judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods

3.4 apply theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations

3.5 use information he/she has read or heard to perform a new skill

3.6 read a number of assigned textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings

3.7 write a number of papers or reports of any length

3.8 do his/her best work on an exam/test/quiz that challenged him/her

(4) **Student-Faculty Interaction**

4.1 use e-mail to communicate with an instructor

4.2 discuss grades or assignments with an instructor

4.3 talk about career plans with an instructor or advisor

4.4 discuss ideas from your readings or classes with instructors outside of class

4.5 receive prompt feedback (written or oral) from instructors on your performance

4.6 work with instructors on activities other than coursework

(5) **Support for Learners**

5.1 receive the support needed to succeed at this college

5.2 receive encouraging contact from other students from different backgrounds

5.3 receive help to cope with non-academic responsibilities

5.4 receive the support needed to thrive socially

5.5 receive the financial support needed to afford his/her education

5.6 use academic advising/planning services

5.7 use career counseling services

**CCSSE Survey Form**

Directions: Please fill out this survey form as it applies to your course activities.

Course Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Sex: □Male □Female Today’s Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

For each item below, circle the number that best represents your own perception of learning in that course. The numbers are, as follows:

1 = rarely, if ever, this semester

1. = about once a month
2. = about once every two weeks
3. = once a week
4. = more than once a week

**ACTIVE AND COLLABORATIVE LEARNING**

(01) ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions 1 2 3 4 5

(02) work together with other students outside of class on group projects 1 2 3 4 5

(03) tutor or teach other students outside of class 1 2 3 4 5

**STUDENT EFFORT**

(04) prepare two or more drafts of assignment before turning it in 1 2 3 4 5

(05) work on a paper or project that requires integrating ideas or information 1 2 3 4 5

 without “cut and paste”

(06) use peer or other tutoring services 1 2 3 4 5

**ACADEMIC CHALLENGE**

(07) analyze the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory 1 2 3 4 5

(08) write a number of papers or reports of any length 1 2 3 4 5

(09) do your best work on an exam/test/quiz that challenged you 1 2 3 4 5

**STUDENT-FACULTY INTERACTION**

(10) use e-mail to communicate with an instructor on grades or assignments 1 2 3 4 5

(11) talk about career plans with an instructor or advisor 1 2 3 4 5

(12) receive prompt feedback (written or oral) from instructors on your 1 2 3 4 5

 performance on tests, discussions, or presentations

**SUPPORT FOR LEARNERS**

(13) receive financial support needed to afford your education at Chuuk Campus 1 2 3 4 5

(14) receive other, non-financial support needed to succeed at Chuuk Campus 1 2 3 4 5

(15) use academic advising/planning services, including career counseling 1 2 3 4 5

**(10) Evaluation of Faculty**

Who at Chuuk Campus evaluates the faculty? An administrator does – the IC. He uses an eval-uation form that **fails to fulfill** our COM-FSM mission statement, value statement, the core values, the strategic directions and goals, and ACCJC requirements. Why? Is there something wrong with the faculty evaluation form, as shown in the COM-FSM website under “Public Reports” → “Manuals and Handbooks” → “Faculty Handbook 2015” (latest edition), page 34.

In all COM-FSM documents is a call for **excellence** among employees. Yet, the instructional faculty evaluation form records either “satisfactory” or “needs improvement”. At best, “satisfactory” performance cannot define “excellence”. In other words, the form had to be revised in order to effectuate the call for excellence. Look at a revision of the form on page 31.

The revised form is a vast improvement over the Palikir-approved form.

• First, it uses a Likert-scale from 1 to 5 where 5 = excellent. Now, with Chuuk’s revision, we know how to evaluate “excellence” in performance of duties and responsibilities.

• Second, the Palikir-approved form’s use of the dichotomy (satisfactory vs. needs improvement) cannot offer quantitative evidence of an instructor’s performance. The revised form obviously lends itself to quantification of data collected. Since 3 = satisfactory, that is the minimum acceptable for an instructor, and he/she can be advised to move forward/upward from 3 to 5.

• Third, quantification allows the IC to assist (a) any one instructor to self-improve, and (b) all instructors taken as a whole group to improve on any one criterion with relatively “low” scale value. So, for example, if one instructor gets a 3 on “rapport”, he/she alone can be advised by the IC, individually and privately, to move forward/upward toward 5. For another example, if the average of all instructors is a 3 on “rapport”, then at a faculty workshop the topic of “rapport improvement” can be discussed in order to help most of the instructors at one time. Such workshop discussion could then include ways for instructors to upgrade the four sub-topics:

1. holding student interest,
2. commanding respect from students,
3. demonstrating fairness and impartiality, and
4. encouraging student participation.

**Recommendation #10**: ***That the revised Instructional Faculty Evaluation Form, with its Likert scale 1-5, be used immediately by the IC, beginning Fall Semester 2017 and thereafter.***

**Recommendation #11**: ***That the IC, after completing each semester’s faculty evaluation, conduct data analysis for review by all faculty and schedule professional development/training workshops to overcome “low” scale values, as necessary.***

**(11) Evaluation of Non-Teaching Staff**

COM-FSM uses two forms to evaluate non-teaching staff. They are Appendixes J (Performance Evaluation for Classified & Professional Staff) and K (Employee Progress Report). Both are found in the COM Personnel Policy Manual, at <http://www.comfsm.fm/jobs/personnelmanualp.htm>.

**Recommendation #12**: ***That the Dean, IC, and SSC begin utilizing Appendixes J and K, at appropriate and necessary times, in order to evaluate non-teaching staff.***

**Recommendation #13**: ***That the three administrators conduct data analysis for review by all non-teaching staff and schedule professional development/training workshops to overcome “low” scale values, as necessary.***

**(10) Evaluation of Faculty**

**A Revised Instructional Faculty Evaluation Form**

Instructor’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Period covered: From \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ To \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]Annual Review [ ]Step Increase [ ]Contract Renewal [ ]6-Month Review [ ]Other

 Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Very Satisfactory, 3 = Satisfactory, 2\* = Needs Improvement, 1\* = Ineffective

 [NOTE: Asterisk (\*) = “include specifics in comments”]

 **Supervisor’s summative review section**  **Satisfactory N.I.**

 (Chair, state campus dean, or other supervisor. Respond to applicable sections.) 5 4 3 2 1

 **1 SUBJECT MATTER CONTENT**

 (shows good command and knowledge of subject matter of the course)

 **2 STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

 (shows responsibility for student progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes,

 communicates desired learning outcomes to the students, shows a commitment to

 effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes)

 **3 ORGANIZATION**

 (organizes subject matters; methods of presentation, evidence of preparation; thoroughness;

 clear objectives; emphasis and summary of main points; and meets class at scheduled time)

 **4 RAPPORT**

 (holds interest of students; commands their respect; demonstrates fairness and impartiality;

 and encourages participation)

 **5 TEACHING METHODS**

 (uses teaching aids, materials, and techniques; and demonstrates variety, balance, and

 imagination)

 **6 PRESENTATION**

 (demonstrates delivery, projection, clarity and precision, and use of English)

 **7 MANAGEMENT**

 (demonstrates attention to classroom routine, leadership ability, discipline and control)

 **8 PROFESSIONALISM**

 (adheres to the professional code of ethics)

 **9 SENSITIVITY**

 (exhibits sensitivity to students’ and colleagues’ personal culture, and gender differences,

 in a non-threatening learning environment)

 **10 ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS**

 (assists students with academic problems, and participates in college advising system)

 **11 PERSONAL**

 (demonstrates self-confidence and professional appearance)

 **12 DIVISION RESPONSIBILITIES**

 (recommends textbooks, performs assigned duties during registration, presents problems and

 recommendations to supervisor, prepares course outlines, submits syllabi, maintains regular

 office hours, submits deficiency lists, submits grades, and submits other required reports)

 **13 SERVICE TO COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY**

 (attends and participates in commencement exercises, attends assigned committee meetings

 and provides service to the community)

**(12) Evaluation of Administrators**

Evaluation of employees is done by administrators. That is called “**top-down**” communication. Yet, according to President Joseph Daisy’s messages on communications networking, “participatory governance” also requires “**bottom-up**” communication. In other words, who should be evaluating our administrators? At the present time, no one at Chuuk Campus participates officially in any “bottom-up” evaluation of our three administrators – Campus Dean, IC, and SSC.

We, at the bottom of the hierarchy, must begin participating in evaluation of our administrators. Look at the survey form called “administration accountability checklist” below. When faculty/staff are able to self-evaluate themselves – based on the three ACCJC rubrics – we are sending a message to our administrators that we may lack sustainability, proficiency, or development because our administrators do not provide such training opportunities to us. In effect, since WASC/ACCJC wants us to self-improve, our administrators must ensure that there are opportunities to self-improve through training workshops. The “administration accountability checklist” holds our administration accountable for over-all campus-wide self-improvement.

Among our 31 participants on June 16, only 22 (71%) completed the checklist: 9 (69%) Instruction, 7 (62%) Administration, 3 (75%) CRE, and 3 (100%) Student Services. Look at the bar graph on page 33. Among the 22, as a total, no group achieved “Proficient”. Since this is the first time Chuuk Campus personnel have had this opportunity to self-assess their involvement in the three ACCJC standards, we should define these data as baseline.
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**ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTABILITY CHECKLIST** Today’s date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(1) Please identify yourself: □Administration □Instruction □Student Services □SBA □CRE

(2) Please circle only one ACCJC standard for each criterion. **The four standards are: A = awareness, D = development, P = proficiency, and S = sustainability.**

**Criterion #1: PROGRAM REVIEW A D P S**

*[Select one bullet below to describe yourself.]* **1 2 3 4**

• I am becoming **a**ware of how to do program review in my realm of responsibility.

• I am **d**eveloping knowledge/skills in doing program review.

• I am now **p**roficient in doing program review in my realm of responsibility.

• I do **s**ustainable program review quite well at least once every 2-3 years.

**Criterion #2: PLANNING A D P S**

*[Select one bullet below to describe yourself.]* **1 2 3 4**

• I am becoming **a**ware of how to plan campus activities in my realm of responsibility.

• I am **d**eveloping knowledge/skills in planning in my realm of responsibility.

• I am now **p**roficient in planning for activities in my realm of responsibility.

• I do **s**ustainable planning quite well at least once every 2-3 years in self-improving my duties.

**Criterion #3: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs) A D P S**

*[Select one bullet below to describe yourself.]* **1 2 3 4**

• I am becoming **a**ware of preparing SLOs in my realm of responsibility.

• I am **d**eveloping knowledge/skills in writing SLOs to fit my duties.

• I am now **p**roficient in writing/following SLOs in my realm of responsibility.

• I implement/review/revise SLOs in a **s**ustainable fashion at least once every 2-3 years.

How do we interpret the graphic data above? First, on the horizontal X-axis are the four departments: Instruction, Administration, CRE, and Student Services. The parenthetical numbers are the number of participants, from each department, who completed the checklist on June 16. Second, for each department, there are three bars – one for each ACCJC rubric: PR, PL, and SLOs. Third, on the vertical Y-axis are the rubric levels: 1 = aware, 2 = developing, 3 = proficient, and 4 = sustainable. We can easily see that no department, as an aggregate of its own staff, achieved “Proficient”.

Below are preliminary findings of data collected from the checklist:

• Program Review: The highest was CRE (2.67 = between “Developing” and “Proficient”). The remaining three groups averaged between “Aware” and “Developing”: Instruction (1.44), Administration (1.43), and Student Services (1.0).

• Planning: The highest was, again, CRE (2.33 = between “Developing” and “Proficient”), followed by Administration (2.0).

• SLOs: Again, CRE (2.33) averaged higher than Instruction (2.11). This is somewhat surprising, inasmuch as all instructors are supposed to be fully proficient and/or sustainable in the use of SLOs in classroom instruction.

It goes without much saying that Chuuk Campus personnel (A/I/SS/CRE) are inadequate in meeting the three ACCJC standards – PR, PL, and SLOs.

**Recommendation #14**: ***That much more professional development/training workshop sessions be provided in order to upgrade employees; that our lead Administrators (Dean, IC, SSC, and CRE Coordinator) collaborate as soon as possible in scheduling such training sessions during the up-*** ***coming school year 2017-2018; and that the highest-priority training contents be Planning and SLOs.***

**SUMMARY**

A timeline of assessment-related activities, based on the 14 recommendations found in this plan, is attached (on page 34). It reflects an overriding purpose of assessment – to direct us toward self-improvement.