

COM-FSM Chuuk Campus
Mini-Summit Minutes

2016 VISIONING MINI-SUMMIT (DAY 1)

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Date: Friday, 08/19/16 | Time: 9:05 am – 4:30 pm | Location: L5 Conference Room (Weno) |
| Participants Present (as recorded in sign-up sheets): Administration (12), Student Services (5), Instruction (16), CRE (6), and Students (4) External Stakeholders (by name): Marcellus Akapito, Nick Andon, Domingko Asor, Johannes Berdon, Raisa Chiwi, Graceful Enlet, Danny Ham, Steioshy Manuel, Steve Marcus, and Jason Reiong | | |
| Agenda I. Call to Order II. Welcoming Remarks III. Topics of Discussion IV. Assessment of Day 1 V. Adjournment | Major Topics of Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Values • Mission Statement • Institution-Set Standards • Strategic Planning | Refreshment and Lunch: available |
| Discussion: Please see attached report. | | |
| Hand-Outs / Documents Referenced / Attachments: (1) Agenda, (2) Team Membership List, (3) “Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity”, (4) Team Chair COM-FSM Mission Fulfillment Indicator Review, (5) Mission Statement Review Worksheet, (6) “COM-FSM Core Values and Principles of Best Practices”, (7) “Institution-Set Standards (ISS) Worksheet”, and (8) “Strategic Planning Worksheet” | | |
| Prepared by: Alton Higashi | Date distributed: August 31, 2016 | |

2016 VISIONING MINI-SUMMIT (DAY 2)

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Date: Saturday, 08/20/16 | Time: 8:45 – 11:45 am | Location: Multi-Purpose Conference Room |
| Participants Present (as recorded in sign-up sheets): Administration (10), Student Services (4), Instruction (15), CRE (4), and Students (3) External Stakeholder (by name): Steve Marcus | | |
| Agenda I. Call to Order II. Topics of Discussion III. Assessment of Day 2 IV. Adjournment | Major Topics of Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best Practices and Student Perceptions • KICC Case Study | Refreshment and Lunch: available |
| Discussion: Please see attached report. | | |
| Hand-Outs / Documents Referenced / Attachments: (1) “COM-FSM Mission Statement (Accreditation Standards, Five Categories of COM-FSM Student Perceptions, Core Values and Best Practices Worksheet, and Strategic Planning: 6 Strategic Directions and 9 Strategic Goals)”, and (2) “Kawan Islands Community College (KICC) Case Study and Workshop: Using Data to Develop Action Plans and Strategies for an AANAPISI Grant to Improve Student Success” | | |
| Prepared by: Alton Higashi | Date distributed: August 31, 2016 | |

REPORT ON COM-FSM CHUUK CAMPUS 2016 VISIONING MINI-SUMMIT
August 19-20, 2016

Mission Statement

The College of Micronesia-FSM is a learner-centered institution of higher education that is committed to the success of the Federated States of Micronesia by providing academic, career and technical educational programs characterized by continuous improvement and best practices.

Value Statement

The College of Micronesia-FSM will provide educational opportunities of the highest quality and will embrace the life-long pursuit of knowledge and the enrichment of the diverse Micronesian communities we serve.

OVERVIEW

Chuuk Campus sponsored the two-day mini-summit on behalf of our community of external and internal stakeholders. On the first day (Friday, August 19, 9:00 am - 4:30 pm) at the L5 Conference Room, 54 participants reviewed and discussed four COM-FSM concerns and issues – namely, core values, mission statement, institution-set standards (ISS), and strategic planning. Documents, which provided background information on the four concerns and issues were distributed. On the second day (Saturday, August 20, 8:45 - 11:45 am) on our campus, 36 participants reviewed the core values and developed action plans and strategies for an AANAPISI grant to improve student success. More documents were distributed.

Campus Dean Kind Kanto opened the mini-summit by welcoming stakeholders. He further stated the purposes of the meeting – to review our concerns and issues and to suggest and recommend what we can do to improve our commitment to self-improvement. It was acknowledged that our commitment to the task-at-hand is a dedication to overarching communications in participatory governance and purposeful dialog. In the words (italicized) of an external stakeholder at the end of the first day, the *professional input* of a *diversity of participants* was *overwhelming and healthy*, engaged in the *process of “we agree to disagree”*, *concerned about the success of our community*. It appears that hidden purposes – to bring diverse communities together, to reach consensus, and to achieve one community – the Chuuk Campus Community – were realized.

Stakeholders – external (representing public and private sectors) and internal (representing administrators, staff, faculty, and students) – were divided into five teams, each with 9-11 participants, to allow for greater interplay of diverse ideas. The Dean labeled the five teams, as follows:

- Team A (Uwaw, or Truk Monarch), with team leaders Rick Chiwi and Memorina Yesiki;
- Team B (Siripw, or Caroline Islands Ground Pigeon), with team leaders Atkin Buliche and Genevy Samuel;
- Team C (Anga, or Micronesian Starling), with team leaders Mike Abbe and Lolita Ragus;
- Team D (Nikeitepar, or Cardinal Honeyeater), with team leaders Ben Bambo Sr. and Roger Arnold; and
- Team E (Nimesepwuun, or Chuuk Greater White-eye), with team leaders Danie Mamangon and Miuty Nokar.

In addition, the Dean served as Facilitator (Nitchok, or Nightingale Reed-Warbler) and designated Alton Higashi as Secretary (Nusupat, or Mudskipper).

CORE VALUES

At the system-wide Governance Summit in Palikir in January 2016, about 170 participants representing all campuses considered 15-17 potential values that should govern the way in which we work and serve the COM-FSM community and the larger FSM nation. This number of values was then narrowed down to seven, and a Core Values Working Group was tasked to restructure the seven into the five Core Values, as follows:

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|------------|-----------------|----------|
| Excellence | Learner-Centeredness | Commitment | Professionalism | Teamwork |
|------------|----------------------|------------|-----------------|----------|

Each Core Value has a set of best practices, with average number of seven best practices per Core Value. Our Mini-Summit participants, in each of the five teams, reviewed all 35 best practices, one at a time, and determined their agreement or disagreement with each best practice. In addition, all 54 participants agreed/disagreed with four general statements, as aggregated below:

| General | Statement | Agree | Disagree | Neutral |
|---------|---|--------------|----------|---------|
| #1 | Excellence, learner-centeredness, commitment, professionalism, and teamwork [and community] are core values that represent the “heart and soul” of COM-FSM. | 50 (93%) | 4 | 0 |
| #2 | This statement captures our core value of Community: We value the higher education community in which we work and those diverse island communities we serve. As members of these communities, we strive to embody these Core Values and to demonstrate them through the best practices. | 51 (94%) | 0 | 3 |
| #3 | The principles of best practices, as listed for each Core Value, are representative of beliefs that would influence employee and student behavior. | 38 (70%) | 0 | 16 |
| #4 | The principles of best practices, as listed for each Core Value, serve to guide behavior over time. | 54 (100%) | 0 | 0 |

Mini-Summit participants added comments, including suggestions and recommendations, regarding the general statements above:

- **General Statements #1 and #2:** A few participants disagreed or remained neutral for three reasons. First, they expressed uncertainty that these five Core Values were the most important in characterizing COM-FSM’s “heart and soul”. Second, they questioned how and why “community” became a core value without justification. If 45 Governance Summit participants (January 2016) had identified “community” as a top value and yet it was not identified among the 5 Core Values, then why should General Statements #1 and #2 restore “community” as a core value? Third, we support the idea of celebrating “Community” as the sixth Core Value. *It is possible that Community can stand on its own merit as Core Value #6, with its own set of best practices.*
- **General Statement #3:** Although a large majority (70%) of Mini-Summit participants agreed, 30% remained uncommitted to the idea that the ones stated are the best “representative of beliefs”. For one thing, they questioned whether other best practices (i.e., those that are not listed) may better represent beliefs that influence employee and student behavior. This non-committal included a question of how the stated (and listed) best practices were identified and selected to represent beliefs. It seemed that the 35 best practices were listed because they sounded valid. At the same time, no participant doubted the fitness of stated best practices, and so no alternative best practices were offered. *It is therefore recommended that, for this present cycle of review, the existing 35 best practices be retained and assessed; and that COM-FSM employees be advised to consider replacement of the existing ones in the next few years, as necessary.*

Among the 35 best practices, 19 received full (100%) agreement. The 16, which did not, were as follows:

| Core Value | Best Practice, as Numbered in the Lists | Agree | Disagree | Neutral |
|-----------------|--|-------|----------|---------|
| Excellence | #2 = Complete all duties and assignments. | 47 | 6 | 1 |
| | #3 = Hold yourself accountable to high performance standards. | 41 | 1 | 12 |
| | #4 = Aim to meet or exceed standards of best practices. | 49 | 2 | 3 |
| | #5 = Set goals and endeavor to exceed them. | 45 | 5 | 4 |
| | #6 = Be positive and encouraging. | 53 | 0 | 1 |
| Professionalism | #8 = Accept responsibility for your actions. | 51 | 0 | 3 |
| | #9 = Maintain confidentiality. | 53 | 0 | 1 |
| | #10 = Do no harm, be ethical. | 46 | 8 | 0 |
| | #11 = Develop logical plans and foresee consequences. | 44 | 10 | 0 |
| Teamwork | #12 = Act in the best interest of the college and the communities you serve. | 52 | 1 | 1 |
| | #14 = Engage and contribute wholly to all team activities. | 53 | 0 | 1 |
| | #17 = Pursue an understanding of diverse points of view and ideas. | 53 | 0 | 1 |
| | #18 = Respond respectfully when others disagree with your views. | 53 | 1 | 0 |
| Commitment | #19 = Recognize the needs of others. | 52 | 2 | 0 |
| | #30 = Be dependable by being present and on time. | 53 | 0 | 1 |
| | #33 = Give back when you can. | 44 | 0 | 10 |

Specific comments, suggestions, and recommendations were received from the five teams. All best practices that failed to receive at least 90% agreement are discussed below:

- **BP #2** (87% agree): The term “all” may be a barrier to completion of duties and responsibilities by individual employees when the definition of Excellence requires Teamwork. In effect, the absence of Teamwork (as well as Professionalism) may hinder individual employee’s completion of his/her duties and responsibilities.
- **BP #3** (76% agree): No participant doubted the need for “high” performance standards; however, when performance standards are evaluated as “satisfactory” – as a minimum – does “satisfactory” define “high”? For instance, instructional faculty evaluation (Appendix G) requires that an instructor achieve “satisfactory”. Is “satisfactory” truly “high”? We acknowledge that Appendix E (for classified and professional staff) and Appendix F (for employee progress) attempt to define “high” performance standards. *We question how instructors can hold themselves to “high” standards and see a need to restructure Appendix G.*
- **BP #5** (83% agree): The practice of goal-setting is necessary; however, some participants feel that they are not trained in setting goals and that *such training be initiated immediately at Chuuk Campus*. In addition, the notion of exceeding goals goes beyond achieving goals. This assumes that goals are supposed to be stepping-stone benchmarks or baseline data – that goals are “stretchable”, hopefully upward. *The way this best practice is stated or written lacks clarity and needs to be rewritten.*
- **BP #10** (85% agree): The term “harm” raised questions about its definition – psychological, social, interpersonal, physical. It lacks appropriate fitness in professional attitudes and behaviors. *The term must be rewritten.*

- **BP #11** (81% agree): We can hope that any and all plans are logical. All the same, there was some disagreement. It is being recommended that *the term “logical plans” be replaced with a more current term “actionable improvement plans”*. It is easier therefore to assess and foresee consequences of actionable improvement plans if and when they do not reach goals.
- **BP #33** (81% agree): Almost 20% of the Mini-Summit participants asked, “Give back what?” If we expect employees to be committed – to contribute – then we need to be more specific about what is to be given back – service, salary, time, whatever. It is being suggested that *this is not a best practice and that it be eliminated*.

Our Mini-Summit wishes to submit additional comments, as follows:

- **Learner-Centeredness**: All seven best practices herein stated received 100% agreement. All the same, one team questioned BPs #25 and #27, particularly the terms “curiosity” and “collaboratively share”. Are there limits to curiosity – without prying? How much of our exploration of curiosity is to be shared with others? Should we look at the relationship – or balance – between curiosity and confidentiality?
- **Teamwork**: The overwhelming majority of Mini-Summit participants agreed with the best practices. All the same, we recognize that teamwork is not always easy for an individual to achieve. At times an individual may not learn from his/her own failures as quickly as others. In other words, we believe that teamwork is an essential value and that we will achieve it in increments over time.
Also, Teamwork overlaps with Professionalism. For the sake of discussion, Professionalism appears to be an individual’s personal mind-set, while Teamwork appears to be an individual’s social mind-set. We seek clarification on this matter.
- **Excellence**: One team pointed out that external stakeholders and internal stakeholders may not share the same perception of Excellence. Differential perceptions are inevitable; however, all internal stakeholders have a responsibility for sharing what we do on campus with those unaware of what we do.
Any differential between internal/external stakeholders and also among different internal stakeholders raises the question about the WASC/ACCJC standards – awareness, development, proficiency, and sustainability – not only of program review, planning, and student learning outcomes (SLOs), but also in the practice of communication – cooperation, collaboration, collegiality, and community – among all stakeholders, both internal and external alike.

MISSION STATEMENT EVALUATION

Discussion and evaluation of the mission statement was set – to separate the statement itself into three general “aspects” with their own assessment indicators, as follows:

| Separate Aspects | No. of Indicators |
|---|-------------------|
| COM-FSM is a learner-centered institution of higher education... | 7 |
| ...committed to the success of the FSM... | 4 |
| ...by providing academic, career and technical education programs characterized by continuous improvement and best practices . | 7 |

- The 7 indicators (i.e., measures of success) of **learner-centeredness** include (1) SLO attainment shown in program-level assessment (PLA) and course-level assessment (CLA), (2) 100% faculty completion of all CLAs every semester, (3) student-faculty interaction, (4) support for learners, (5) % credit hours taught by full-time faculty, (6) average credit section size, and (7) % full-time students.

- The 4 indicators of **success** include (1) accessibility of all four FSM states, (2) number of students graduating each year (completing career-based programs) prepared for workforce, (3) % students completing career programs and being employed in related fields, and (4) programs linked to FSM development priorities.
- The 7 indicators of **A/C/T, continuous improvement, and best practices** include (1) active and collaborative learning; (2) academic programs and support services with guided pathways, graduation, and transfer; (3) persistence; (4) % full-time, first-time students in a cohort to complete in 3 years; (5) credit grades success-rate/completion-rate; (6) credit grades success-rate; and (7) meeting/exceeding WASC/ACCJC Accreditation Standards.

So, what was the purpose of this topic of discussion? It was to determine whether or not our participants, by team, agreed or disagreed with the indicators as “measures of success”. The five teams responded on the three separate aspects and several indicators (or measures of success), based on the following Likert scale: 0 = strongly disagree, 1 = disagree, 2 = uncertain, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree. The Likert-scale numbers below represent aggregated five-team consensus:

| Three Separate Aspects from the Mission Statement | Indicators (or Measures of Success) | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| Learner-centeredness | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Success of the FSM | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.5 | | | |
| ACT, Continuous Improvement, Best Practices | 2.3 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.5 |

- **Learner-centeredness:** In general, our Mini-Summit participants agree with the 7 indicators as appropriate measures of success. However, the **lowest** agreement was 2.1 (student-faculty interaction), and **highest** was 3.5 (support for learners, % credit hours taught by FT faculty, and average credit section size). This aggregated finding points to our participants’ general agreement regarding the 7 indicators.
- **Success:** In general, our Mini-Summit participants range from “uncertain” to “agree” – neither strong agreement nor strong disagreement. The **lowest** was 2.0, reflecting our uncertainty about the use of the second indicator (graduates prepared for the workforce) as an appropriate measure of success of the success of the FSM.
- **ACT, Continuous Improvement, and Best Practices:** In general, our Mini-Summit participants responded favorably; however, agreement was weak. The **lowest** was 2.0 (guided pathways, graduation, and transfer). The **highest** was 3.3 (persistence), reflecting an acceptable agreement with persistence as an indicator or measure of success in ACT, continuous improvement, and best practices.

To assist participants in determining whether the indicators (or measures of success) are appropriate, or not, our five teams answered eight “guiding questions”. The questions and team responses (with suggestions for modifying the mission statement to better meet each of eight criteria below) are cited:

- **Q#1:** *Does the mission statement clearly define the **broad educational purposes** of the college?*
 - Yes; however, the term “broad” is somewhat misleading inasmuch as “committed to the success of the FSM” seems to be much more specifically aligned with “workplace readiness” and “economic development” (i.e., Dimension of Learning 1) and less with “soft skills” (i.e., Dimension of Learning 3) and with “student engagement with their own learning” (i.e., Dimension of Learning 4). We suggest that **since COM-FSM has endorsed the Four Dimensions of Learning, the mission statement should reflect all four dimensions.**
 - We applaud our stated commitment, but this is a lot of “talk the talk” and not much “walk the walk”. A cursory overview of the seven best practices of the Core Value “Commitment” reveals a problem of assessment. If we ask our administrators, staff, and faculty, through a survey, if they are in fact performing these best practices, we will “demonstrate” an overwhelming commitment. How can we find appropriate

“measures of success” that can truly measure success in our commitment (both talk and walk)? This is a difficult task for us. We suggest that **COM-FSM assign a very high priority in finding appropriate assessment indicators of the best practices of “commitment”**.

- **Q#2: Does the mission statement clearly define the intended student population?**
 - No one doubts that our primary perception should focus on our own FSM students; however, as the world becomes globalized, we need to realize how our nation can benefit by recruiting non-FSM students and become more globalized. Maybe we have discarded the former mission statement (i.e., “globally connected”) and therefore made little effort to diversify our COM-FSM student population. We suggest that ***the intended student population be expanded to include non-Micronesian students as well.***
- **Q#3: Does the mission statement articulate the types of degrees and other credentials COM-FSM offers?**
 - Yes; however, what we consider ACT nowadays seems to discount the original practice of CTE with its support of non-traditional educational programs, such as traditional Micronesian knowledge and skills and non-formal skills. If we consider current certificate/degree programs, it would seem that we are working toward an “appropriate” decline in what has made us Micronesian. Therefore, we suggest that **COM-FSM find ways to support credentialing of traditional knowledge and skills and non-formal skills.**
- **Q#4: Does the mission statement articulate COM-FSM’s commitment to student learning and student achievement?**
 - Yes, of course; however, ***student learning and student achievement must incorporate the value and best practices in support of all Four Dimensions of Learning and also of traditional knowledge and non-formal skills.***
 - No one doubts the importance of commitment to the FSM as a nation, but we may be forgetting to raise a commitment to the nation’s four states. Each state has its unique needs, and ***career and technical educational programs should incorporate what each state deems as important.***
 - We acknowledge the importance of “commitment” (as a Core Value) as well as its general “best practices”. All the same, we question whether, or not, we can transform thinking and feeling of commitment into real-life implementing and measuring of “best practices”. We therefore suggest that **COM-FSM, through participatory governance and purposeful dialog, rethink how commitment may be truly transformed into contribution.**
- **Q#5: Does the 2013-2017 Strategic Plan align with and support the mission?**
 - We can offer no response nor suggestion, inasmuch as awareness of the strategic plan at Chuuk Campus and in external communities is lacking.
- **Q#6: How are we distinctive, and is that captured by the mission statement?**
 - We can offer no response nor suggestion, inasmuch as the term “distinct” is elusive.
- **Q#7: For any team suggestion to change the mission statement, what are specific measures of success to evidence mission fulfillment to stakeholders and WASC/ACCJC?**
 - We need to do ***post-graduation and follow-through tracking and data collection*** regarding “success” indicators 2 (preparation for workforce) and 3 (employment in related fields). We believe that tracking is a necessary “best practice” for our administrators to consider. There are models of success at many other colleges and universities. Let us ***incorporate tracking as a best practice.***
- **Q#8: What is the relevancy of our mission against our intended markets and the range of essential services necessary to adequately serve those markets?**
 - We choose not to respond to this question. All the same, some teams provided responses beyond the “guiding questions”. Three, in particular, were (1) lack of “fairness and consistency” of program offerings at Chuuk Campus, (2) lack of career counseling and placement of graduates, and (3) lack of coherent plans to prepare high school students for entry into COM-FSM. The three responses are presented below:
 - (1) **Fairness and consistency**: We may be talking a good story about being fair and consistent toward all campuses – at least we did a number of years ago. At the same time, statements of key administrators have continued to justify why the National Campus wins the gold in program offerings. The worst such talk was how the Oglala model (South Dakota) would have served the best needs of the nation – to keep one national campus and

to re-label the state campuses as “sites”. In effect, states’ educational needs (such as those at Chuuk Campus) could not be fairly and consistently offered, in comparison with the nation’s educational needs (such as those at the National Campus).

The issue of “fairness and consistency” includes the issue of “equity”. Chuuk Campus employees may not know all the facts about how the budget is used, but some Mini-Summit participants question whether, or not, the lack of budgetary equity is, in part, a practice of unwitting, or possibly deliberate, discrimination.

Some Mini-Summit participants considered an “if-then” notion: *If Chuuk State cannot fulfill its educational needs at COM-FSM Chuuk Campus, then an alternate plan to become more independent of a centralized structure may be more desirable.*

(2) Career counseling and placement of graduates: If ACT educational programs are to be provided, we should be more cognizant of a complementary program of career counseling and placement on behalf of graduates. In effect, as good as the mission statement may sound, real implementation lags behind the talk.

Success of the FSM (and its states) requires both commitment (the talk) and contribution (the walk). Again, this is a concern that we are good at talking, and not good at walking.

(3) High school preparation: COM-FSM is just one educational system in the nation. For the mission statement to commit us to the success of the nation, then a proper context for educational development requires discussion with departments of education, particularly the high schools, in how we must prepare secondary students for entry into COM-FSM. For instance, if COMET is a valid indicator, the nation and its states are not going to be beneficiaries of any success at COM-FSM. We need to consider the use of COMET not for admission but for placement.

We need to design, develop, and implement routine actionable improvement plans, in consonance with departments of education, in order to prepare high school students to pass COMET and to enter COM-FSM without heavy reliance on remedial coursework.

INSTITUTION-SET STANDARDS (ISS)

In an action letter (dated July 8, 2016), ACCJC recommended that COM-FSM do something about its Institution-Set Standards:

“In order to improve, the College should re-evaluate its ISS and provide evidence showing that standards and measures of success are appropriate for its student population, reflect improvement, and support its stated mission.”

We are therefore tasked to discuss the need for more vigorous standards and stretch goals (targets) to address ACCJC expectations. We were given a chart of 14 criteria (i.e., “measures of success”) with their baseline ISS, as follows:

| 14 Criteria Measures of Success | ISS (baseline) | 2013 target | 2015 (actual) | 2017 target |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| (1) Percent of students enrolled full-time (enrolled for 12 or more credits) fall semesters | 60.0% | 64.6% | 64.7% | 66.6% |
| (2) Percent of students earning 12 or more credits fall semester | 36.0% | 38.1% | 40.1% | 39.3% |
| (3) Average student credits enrolled fall semester | 10.3 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 11.4 |
| (4) Average student credits attempted fall semester | 9.0 | 9.9 | 10.4 | 10.2 |
| (5) Average student credits earned fall semester | 8.0 | 8.5 | 9.1 | 8.8 |
| (6) Percent of students in good academic standing (with 2.0 GPA or above) | 72.0% | 76.9% | 81.9% | 79.3% |
| (7) Retention rate (percent of new full-time students who return to school the next fall semester) | 50.0% | 53.4% | 66.0% | 55.1% |
| (8) Course completion percent A/B/C or P | 62.0% | 66.3% | 71.8% | 68.3% |

| | | | | |
|---|---------|-------|-------|-------|
| (9) Percent withdrawals (not to exceed) | ≤ 10.0% | 6.6% | 6.3% | 6.8% |
| (10) CSLO completion rates (General Education courses) | 65.0% | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| (11) PSLO completion rates (General Education programs) | 65.0% | 75.0% | 67.5% | 80.0% |
| (12) Persistence rate (fall to spring) | 71.0% | 76.0% | 87.9% | 78.4% |
| (13) Graduation rate (full-time cohort) 100% | 4.0% | 3.9% | 6.1% | 4.0% |
| (14) Graduation rate (full-time cohort) 150% | 12.0% | 12.8% | 16.1% | 13.2% |

In plenary discussion, participants asked a number of pertinent questions. First, by whom were these 14 criteria set and determined as the baseline ISS? Are the criteria necessary and sufficient? On what bases were the baseline figures sets? How much system-wide participatory governance was involved in establishing the criteria and determining the baseline? Second, inasmuch as we were shown these ISS on Friday, August 19, how are we supposed to react and respond professionally in short notice to the task required of us? How are we expected to determine the appropriateness of each criterion, to reflect on improvement from baseline (2013) to 2017, and to defend the importance of each criterion in support of our mission statement? Third, given the fact that COM-FSM may be informed of non-compliance with any standards, are we certain that our effort in this task will successfully ward off non-compliance and avoid termination of accreditation?

Mini-Summit participants, by team, expressed much difficulty in re-evaluating the ISS and in providing evidence of the appropriateness of the 14 criteria and of their baseline ISS figures. We did notice, however, that the figures from baseline to 2015 were indicative of “improvement”. In effect, it would be easy for COM-FSM to conclude that we are highly successful in achieving success in meeting the ISS and to congratulate itself. If so, why then would ACCJC tell us in July 2016 that we need to re-evaluate the ISS and provide evidence of appropriateness? We reached a tentative conclusion that something remains wrong in the way we established the criteria and determined their baseline figures. Also, we believe that the baseline figures may be too easy to achieve and do not encourage much challenge for us to work harder to improve. We therefore began our task by setting higher standards as a way to challenge us in the next few years to self-improve. The following chart (under an assumption that the criteria are appropriate) reveals a range of baseline figures, which we seek in order to increase challenge, and to self-improve:

| 14 Criteria (Measures of Success) | ISS stated | Range preferred |
|--|-------------------|------------------------|
| (1) Percent of students enrolled full-time (enrolled for 12 or more credits) fall semesters | 60.0% | 60% to 77% |
| (2) Percent of students earning 12 or more credits fall semester | 36.0% | 40% to 70% |
| (3) Average student credits enrolled fall semester | 10.3 | 11.3 to 12 |
| (4) Average student credits attempted fall semester | 9.0 | 11 to 12 |
| (5) Average student credits earned fall semester | 8.0 | 9 to 12 |
| (6) Percent of students in good academic standing | 72.0% | 80% to 92% |
| (7) Retention rate (percent of new full-time students who return to school the next fall semester) | 50.0% | 60% to 75% |
| (8) Course completion percent A/B/C or P | 62.0% | 62% to 85% |
| (9) Percent withdrawals (not to exceed) | ≤ 10.0% | ≤ 7% |
| (10) CSLO completion rates (General Education courses) | 65.0% | 65% to 75% |
| (11) PSLO completion rates (General Education programs) | 65.0% | 65% to 80% |
| (12) Persistence rate (fall to spring) | 71.0% | 71% to 90% |
| (13) Graduation rate (full-time cohort) 100% | 4.0% | 5% to 15% |
| (14) Graduation rate (full-time cohort) 150% | 12.0% | 13% to 25% |

The five teams of Mini-Summit participants, in general, agreed that the existing ISS figures are low, and that ISS should be higher, as shown in the range preferred by the teams. For instance, let us look at the “graduation rate (full-time cohort) 100%”, or a mere 4%. We have chosen to raise the bar to a figure between 5% and 15%. We admittedly cannot justify that the range is fully appropriate, but we do have a logical reason for raising the standards. When standards are low and when we achieve them, we may be guilty of believing in our own self-fulfilling prophecy, and, more so, we become guilty of not trying harder in our commitment to succeed. Those who aim low may be guilty of not trying hard, afraid of failing to reach higher. We are not afraid of failing, because, as we know from life, failure is a great teacher for self-improvement. We are just afraid of failing to try harder.

We recommend that all of us at COM-FSM rethink both the 14 criteria and their ISS. More specifically, here are our aggregated thoughts:

- We assume, first and foremost, that, when we measure student achievement on the 14 criteria, these students are not only degree students but also certificate students. It should also be **desirable for us to know if there are differential student achievements on the 14 criteria by their programs**. For instance, do students in a particular field or program (i.e., business administration) have higher achievement than students in another field or program (i.e., marine science)?
- Are transfer students – those who did not start in a cohort at COM-FSM but who joined a cohort by transferring into it – included in these data? We need to figure out **some kind of accommodation to include them, maybe calling them “transfer cohort”**.
- Among certificate and ACE students, do we measure them as **a separate cohort, or are they included into a degree-entry cohort**? We need an answer to this question as well.
- Most importantly, we need to **set our standards higher**. Failure to achieve them within a time span (such as five years) is not a bad thing. Assuming that, within the five-year period, there is some improvement, then we know that we may be on the right track toward self-improvement and that we should make some adjustments here and there to accelerate our efforts toward helping students learn and achieve. If that is the definition of “stretch goals”, then let us admit to ourselves that we all need to work harder, to try more, to stretch our commitment. We can do this.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Our Mini-Summit participants admitted as much that they were generally unaware of COM-FSM’s strategic directions and goals. They also admitted that, given this initial awareness, they are now much better prepared to begin a development effort. These admissions are what we call the ACCJC criteria – awareness, development, proficiency, and sustainability – which need to be measured, among as many stakeholders as possible, so that we can work as a community in fulfilling our shared mission.

We attempted to evaluate the 6 strategic directions and 9 strategic goals. We have assumed that our effort is appropriate and will fulfill the intent and purpose of the Visioning Summit 2016. Here are our aggregated thoughts:

Strategic Direction One: Focus on student success

- We are concerned that the term “**access and success**” is more a focus on administrative tasks, less a focus on student learning and achievement. “Access” conforms to the so-called definition of “student success” – recruitment, retention, and graduation. In particular, recruitment and retention are what administrators must do, not what students learn or achieve.
- 1.1.1 In our review of the ISS, we concluded that our COM-FSM community may be much more concerned and interested in **obtaining data to validate administrative success in the 14 criteria**, rather

than to determine student success in learning and achieving – what we normally would call “student learning outcomes”. We really do not need to pat ourselves on our backs by setting low standards that are easy for us to achieve. Let us get back to our commitment to help our students succeed, not to praise ourselves for doing so little to achieve student-learning outcomes.

- 1.1.2 We found the **CCSSE data** to be quite compelling insofar as they demonstrate our need to improve. We look at the 50% baseline as too low. Students have perceptions, but their perceptions may not be as empirical as we may want. All the same, the 50% baseline should be raised, so that we may have a greater awareness of and commitment to self-improvement. For instance, it was obvious that Chuuk Campus has a dire dilemma in Academic Challenge and Student-Faculty Interaction (without mention of the other three benchmarks). Mini-Summit participants spent much time in discussing ways and means for overcoming this dilemma. **We have agreed to resolve this matter among ourselves, as part of efforts in self-improvement, during the school year 2016-2017.**
- 1.1.3 We find the March 2016 ACCJC commendation on “**guided pathways**” to be less than useful. By definition, four-semester suggested schedules are extremely difficult to follow at Chuuk Campus. To be sure, we try to set up these schedules; however, we also realize that students’ family and cultural needs often interfere in keeping students on track. In effect, as clear as the pathways are, students are often unable to balance what they must experience off-campus with what we – in good conscience – use “in scheduling course offerings to meet students’ needs”. If stretching targets is an acceptable means to an end, then we must figure out how to stretch the pathways as well. How? At this point in time, we have no definitive answer, but we need to explore pathway-stretching strategies during the school year 2016-2017. We look forward to working with the entire COM-FSM community in figuring out answers to our “how” question.

Strategic Direction Two: Emphasize academic offerings in service to national needs

- 2.1 Our Mini-Summit participants seek to add the term “and **state**” between “national” and “needs”. We believe that Chuuk State has its own unique needs that require priority at Chuuk Campus. To be sure, Chuuk State is part of the FSM nation and we want to play a role in service to national needs; however, we at Chuuk Campus need to have academic offerings in service to Chuuk needs as well.
- It is quite apparent that this strategic direction intends to help the National Campus, almost exclusively, to offer **4-year program opportunities**. It also helps Chuukese students to go to CCPI, rather than the National Campus, to enter bachelor’s degree programs. So, we must ask a difficult question: Is it part of Strategic Direction Two to undermine state campuses and to operationalize the Oglala plan by looking at state campuses as mere extension sites for the National Campus? We think so.
- 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 We have nothing to say about articulation agreements and partnership programs.
- 2.1.3 We were disappointed that **AR 101** was discontinued as a distance-learning course for Chuuk Campus. We were equally surprised to learn at our Mini-Summit that ACCJC had recommended “either develop a distance education approval process or discontinue offering the AR 101 course in an online modality”. Obviously, COM-FSM chose to do the latter. We can only hope that COM-FSM will make an effort to go the former – to develop a DE approval process. Let us not forget that AR 101 is a requirement of the A.A. degree for Teacher Preparation. If we cannot be guaranteed to have a qualified instructor at Chuuk Campus and if we cannot be fully assured of having one such instructor in Chuuk at least once a school year (i.e., during the summer session), then the discontinuation of AR 101 in an online modality serves to undermine the A.A. degree program in Chuuk. We do not and cannot appreciate this fact.
- 2.2.1 Regarding CTE, we need to know who Chuuk’s representatives are on the **advisory councils for CTE programs**, such as the Third-Year Certificate for Teacher Preparation, and Certificates of

Achievement for Secretarial Science and for Basic Public Health? We seek your disclosure on this information requested.

- 2.2.2, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4 We have nothing to say about these measures of success.

Strategic Direction Three: Be financially sound, fiscally responsible, and build resources in anticipation of future needs

Our Mini-Summit participants failed to discuss in great length the goals and their measures of success regarding Strategic Direction Three. All the same, our limited discussion may provoke COM-FSM to consider our aggregated thoughts:

- 3.1.1 We are happy to know that the FSM National Government offset the 2011 **JEMCO decrements**, even though the decision to do so is made on an annual basis.

However, we want to understand, regarding **AANAPISI**, why COM-FSM “failed to submit the additionally required, annual grant eligibility application”. What happened?

- 3.1.2 In 2013 the **Friends of COM-FSM Foundation** (an allied foundation) received \$625,000. We wish to see an **audit report** on how the Friends expended such funds since 2013 and how much money it has raised for our endowment fund.
- 3.1.3 We are happy to endorse the March 2016 ACCJC visiting team’s commendation.
- 3.1.4 If COM-FSM cannot touch its endowment fund until we have **accumulated endowment assets** of at least \$20,000,000, we seek to understand how the balance dropped from 2014 (\$4,375,829) to 2015 (\$4,122,830). Also, we seek to know why the 2015 BOR target of \$100,000 a year was not met in 2015.

Strategic Direction Four: Invest in and build a strong capacity in human capital

- 4.1 and 4.2 We are pleased with the March 2016 ACCJC visiting team’s commendations.
- 4.1 and 4.2 Nonetheless, one team scrutinized Table 12 of the Evaluation Report for 2014-2016 (May 2016) and noticed how it defines “target”. For instance, the targets were 68/75 for 4.1.1 and 24/24 for 4.1.2, while they were 0/1 for 4.1.3 and 1/1 for 4.2.1. We see clearly that the 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 targets were specific individuals, and that the 4.1.3 and 4.2.1 targets were lump-sum groups.
 - Bullet #4: There were 306 persons in online webinar training and other training opportunities. We wonder what percent of all persons was not in such training.
 - Bullet #6: To be sure, faculty workshops were conducted. Do we keep a record of attendance at each workshop to verify a percentage of faculty in attendance? What were the topics at these on-campus training workshops? Holding workshops is one thing, attending them is another, and, of course, learning and applying what they learn is still unknown.

Strategic Direction Five: Become a learning organization through development of a learning culture guided by learning leaders

- 5.1.1 We notice that COM-FSM admits that it “cannot readily tally the number of employees who demonstrate lifelong learning skills, but the college can foster lifelong learning by designing a work environment that offers this support”. So, yes, we appreciate the act of fostering, but we really do need to see quantitative evidence that the fostering has indeed produced curiosity, initiative, independence, transfer, and reflection.
- 5.1.2 Likewise, COM-FSM can foster critical reflection and experimentation; however, given the “evidence” presented in the Evaluation Report for 2014-2016 (page 25) as well as the December 2015 ISER report, how can we prove quantitatively that COM-FSM personnel have truly achieved success in critical reflection and experimentation?

- 5.13 and 5.14 We note that the targets were not achieved; however, our primary concern lies in the phrase “evaluate its success”. As far as we are concerned, without quantitative evidence or “explicit measure of success”, COM-FSM should eliminate these sub-goals.
- 5.2.1 One team took a straw poll on whether we had read “Strengthening Purposeful Dialogue”. The result was dismal – one participant heard about the handbook, but no one had read it at all. We shall encourage our Campus Dean to provide us staff/faculty training on the handbook’s contents.
- 5.2.2 We are basically unaware of Standard I.C. Institutional Integrity and its continuous improvement model. We shall encourage our Campus Dean to provide us staff/faculty training on this standard and its continuous improvement model.
- 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 We have no comment at this time on these two sub-goals.

Strategic Direction Six: Evoke an image of quality

Given this strategic direction, we have only one remaining question to ask: Why then is student enrollment declining in recent years?

- 6.1 The nature of this direction compels us to look at administrative practices, and we have no doubt that COM-FSM must make the **image** real and to maintain accreditation standards. All the same, we seek to understand, then, why student enrollment has declined in recent years.

BEST PRACTICES AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

Our Mini-Summit planners took the initiative to discuss in greater detail the CCSSE results of student perceptions (2013-2016) in the five categories of institutional practices: active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners. In particular, we looked at the 2013 data for Chuuk Campus. Given the data, we wanted to know which best practices (BP), as presented in the Core Values, would help us to improve the way Chuuk Campus students perceived the five categories. In five teams, we selected the top three best practices within each Core Value. Here are the aggregated selections:

| Core Value | Excellence | Learner-Cent. | Commitment | Professional. | Teamwork |
|------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| #1 Top BP | (4) | (6) | (15) | (20) | (26) |
| #2 Top BP | (2) | (9) | (14) | (21) | (33) |
| #3 Top BP | (1) | (10) | (17) | (25) | (30) |

For each Core Value, we restate the top three best practices:

| |
|---|
| Excellence |
| (4) Set goals and endeavor to exceed them |
| (2) Hold yourself accountable to high performance standards |
| (1) Complete all duties and assignments |
| Learner-Centeredness |
| (6) Dedicate time for learning |
| (9) Continuously assess your knowledge, skills, and abilities |
| (10) Collaboratively share information and skills |
| Commitment |
| (15) Contribute your best and inspire others to do the same |
| (14) Dedicate your time, energy, and enthusiasm |
| (17) Connect, participate, and be involved |
| Professionalism |

| |
|--|
| (20) Be honest and transparent |
| (21) Accept responsibility for your actions |
| (25) Act in the best interest of the college and the communities you serve |
| Teamwork |
| (26) Respect yourself and others |
| (33) Recognize the needs of others |
| (30) Pursue an understanding of diverse points of view and ideas |

According to our Campus Dean, these 15 best practices will be submitted to one of our Chuuk Campus committees, the Chuuk Assessment Working Group (ChAWG), to design and develop a self-assessment instrument, using a Likert scale, which administrators, staff, and faculty will take in order to determine their practice of each best practice. These personnel will assess themselves each semester, at the end of that semester. Sometime, late in the Fall Semester 2016, we will begin field-testing the instrument and attempt to establish baseline data on how well we apply the 15 best practices on campus. We realize that each employee should be applying as many of the 35 best practices each semester; however, we intend to check on the top 15 best practices every 2-3 years.

The first draft of the self-assessment instrument is attached, as a post-summit activity.

KAWAN CASE STUDY

The final Mini-Summit activity was to prepare a portfolio of Action Plans and Strategies to improve student success – for a so-called make-believe Kawan Islands Community College (KICC), not unlike our own COM-FSM. By definition, student success would focus on student recruitment, retention, and graduation. In effect, our Mini-Summit teams worked as best as possible on three action plans, one for each of the three foci (recruitment, retention, and graduation). Once compiled, these action plans would then assist COM-FSM in submitting a five-year grant application for funding from the U.S. Department of Education’s program entitled Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institutions (AANAPISI).

To assist our five teams in completing their Action Plans and Strategies, our Mini-Summit facilitator distributed KICC institutional profiles, including the following data:

- Basic KICC demographics;
- KICC mission statement, core values, and published definition of “student success”;
- 2009-2011 cohort graduation rates (150% of normal time) to compare KICC with the College of the Marshall Islands, Palau Community College, and Windward Community College (Hawaii); and
- AANAPISI guidelines regarding recruitment, retention, and graduation.

A number of Mini-Summit participants, particularly internal-stakeholding administrators, staff, and faculty, commented that the KICC-oriented information looked like COM-FSM data. Although the teams were expected to prepare 50-word stories to describe how their work contributes to student success at KICC, they went directly into designing the portfolios of their Action Plans (goals, tasks, and strategies), as submitted on the next three pages:

Team A (Uwaw)

| Action Plan Goal 1 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
|--|--|--|
| For learners to be physically, mentally, and socially healthy | 1.1 To have healthy food awareness 1.2 To be aware of health hazards 1.3 To engage in extra-curricular activities | 1.1.a To conduct workshops 1.1.b To build a cafeteria 1.2.a To conduct workshops 1.2.b To have a health office fully accessible to medical supplies 1.3.a To encourage participation in sports activities 1.3.b To provide sports activities free |
| Action Plan Goal 2 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
| To have adequate resources (financial and academic) | 2.1 To be eligible for PELL grants 2.2 To provide instruction based on SLOs 2.3 To make available all necessary learning resources (such as textbooks) | 2.1.a To complete required PELL applications 2.2a To provide course syllabi 2.3a To conduct and maintain inventory of available materials |
| Action Plan Goal 3 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
| To have safe and sufficient facilities for learning | 3.1 To repair and maintain all facilities conducive to student learning 3.2 To maintain campus safety and security | 3.1.a To comply with Maintenance Plan and Accreditation Standard 3B.2 3.2.a To provide 24-hour security and safety services 3.2.b To participate in campus clean-up and beautification |
| Action Plan Goal 4 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
| To increase student enrollment | 4.1 To sponsor outreach and bridge programs in order to recruit actively 4.2 To provide for additional programs | 4.1.a To conduct school visitations 4.1.b To provide community awareness programs 4.1.c To revisit standards of COMET 4.2.a To provide for CTE programs in vocational education 4.2.b To provide students with transportation services to campus |

Team B (Siripw)

| Action Plan Goal 1 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
|--|--|---|
| To provide adequate resources and services to promote successful learning | 1.1 To increase the budget for additional funding | 1.1.a To write and submit proposals for grant applications that encourage recruitment of students |
| Action Plan Goal 2 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
| To provide for continuous training in capacity-building | 2.1 To allocate additional funding of professional development workshops | 2.1.a To improve capacity of staff in order to maintain high retention rate |
| Action Plan Goal 3 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
| To review and update student IDPs | 3.1 For counselors to assume responsibility for reviewing and updating student IDPs 3.2 To create programs that relate to student interests | 3.1.a To provide academic counseling for all advisees |

Team C (Anga)

| Action Plan Goal 1 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
|---|--|---|
| To have more effective recruitment and enrollment programs | 1.1 To implement a social marketing approach | 1.1.a To prepare and distribute brochures 1.1.b To hire well-trained recruitment staff 1.1.c To sponsor college fairs 1.1.d To offer students more scholarships and grants 1.1.e To invite participation of municipal governments and local communities in recruitment and enrollment activities 1.1.f To offer appropriate and relevant courses that match community and private-sector needs |
| Action Plan Goal 2 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
| To accelerate entry certificate and degree programs | 2.1 To work with various high schools in curriculum offering for smooth transition to college | 2.1.a To collaborate with various high schools with college-based training and workshops for high school personnel 2.1.b To sponsor with high school personnel course review sessions for COMET preparation |
| Action Plan Goal 3 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
| To improve graduation and transfer rates | 3.1 To design MOUs with other IHEs to ensure minimum accreditation requirements 3.2 To sponsor on-the-job training, job placement, and employability skills | 3.1.a To provide appropriate incentives to retain qualified faculty 3.2.a To develop appropriate curriculum and course offerings for non-formal skills development |

Team D (Nikeitepar)

| Action Plan Goal 1 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
|---|---|--|
| To set up a Rainbow Bridge Program for recruitment | 1.1 To create SBA-based outreach to high schools 1.2 To allow advanced high school students to audit KICC classes 1.3 To use Bridge Program “Learning Skills Space” facilities and programs | 1.1.a For KICC students to demonstrate classroom teaching at high schools 1.2.a To let high school students register for and audit KICC courses in proposed fields of study 1.3.a To offer college exposure to those deemed “not yet” ready for college entry, at-risk students, and transfer students |
| Action Plan Goal 2 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
| To retain students enrolled in degree and developmental programs | 2.1 To hire a “retention coordinator” (RC) 2.2 To train “skills coaches” from among KICC students 2.3 To set up “Learning Skills Space” | 2.1.a To supervise “Learning Skills Space” activities 2.2.a To identify and select criteria for subject matter and grade-point averages among the “skills coaches” 2.2.b To begin a faculty referral of potential “skills coaches” and a self-referral system 2.3.a To fund program, including purchase of equipment 2.3.b To track progress or improvement among “skills players” |

Team E (Nimesepwuun)

| Action Plan Goal 1 | Action Plan Tasks | Action Plan Strategies |
|--|---|--|
| To establish partnership with public and private schools to prepare for COMET entry and retention at KICC | 1.1 To approve appropriate MOUs between KICC and high schools 1.2 To assist high schools in improving and expanding instructional pedagogy | 1.1.a To evaluate and revise high school curriculum 1.1.b To train high school personnel in partnership implementation 1.2.a To set up after-school tutorial programs at the high schools 1.2.b To provide academic challenge to high school students 1.2.c To increase instructional repertoire among high school teachers in: → differentiated instruction, recursive teaching, multi-grade instruction, and multi-sensory materials development → classroom management, time management, scheduling, formative assessment strategies, and life/survival/health skills → capacity-building for improved student perception and for campus community development |

FINAL ASSESSMENT OF THE MINI-SUMMIT

A total of 37 participants (69% among the 54 total) filled out the “Assessment of Visioning Summit 2016: Outcomes Achieved”. The cumulative ratings are herewith presented, on the following scale: SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = neutral, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree, and NR = no response.

| TOPICS OF DISCUSSION and Outcomes Achieved | SA | A | N | D | SD | NR |
|---|----|----|---|---|----|----|
| KICC CASE STUDY | | | | | | |
| (1) Team members created a 50-word story. | 13 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| (2) Team members shared and discussed their 50-word stories. | 16 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| (3) The team compiled and transcribed those stories into a folder. | 13 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| (4) The team analyzed and interpreted comparative institutional data. | 13 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| (5) The team developed action plans and strategies. | 15 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| (6) The team communicated results with at least one other team. | 7 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 10 |
| (7) The team compiled a portfolio of the action plans and strategies. | 9 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| CORE VALUES | | | | | | |
| (8) Assessed COM-FSM core values and discussed if they are representative of beliefs that would influence behavior. | 9 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| (9) Assessed COM-FSM core values and discussed if they are representative of the essence or “heart” of the college. | 6 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| (10) Assessed whether COM-FSM core values are principles that best guide behavior over time. | 7 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| (11) Assessed COM-FSM core values to identify any gaps in the beliefs and principles that require consideration for revision. | 7 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| MISSION EVALUATION | | | | | | |
| (12) Reviewed required components of the mission statement and discussed how well the mission aligns with and meets those criteria. | 9 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| (13) Reviewed the mission fulfillment indicators and evaluated whether or not COM-FSM delivers on its promise. | 7 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| (14) Discussed the mission fulfillment measures of success. | 7 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| (15) Discussed the relevancy of our mission against our intended markets and the range of essential services. | 8 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| INSTITUTION-SET STANDARDS | | | | | | |
| (1) Review ACCJC recommendation 1 (ACCJC action letter). | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| (2) Be able to define the term Institution-Set Standards (ISS). | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| (3) Be able to describe how ISS are used. | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| (4) Discuss more vigorous ISS and stretch targets. | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| (5) Understand trying to improve and failing is okay, but failing to try is not okay. | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 |
| STRATEGIC PLANNING | | | | | | |
| (6) Review the current strategic plan and strategic directions. | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| (7) Briefly review the Quality Focus Essay (QFE). | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 29 |
| (8) Be able to describe the use of the Strategic Plan. | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| (9) Identify components of the Strategic Plan. | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| (10) Identify and prioritize five potential strategic directions 2018-2023. | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

Here are general findings of the over-all assessment of the Mini-Summit, by topic of discussion:

KICC Case Study

- Approximately 85% among the respondents were “strongly agree” or “agree”. However, it should be noted that, even though the 50-word stories were not written, team members did oral stories (without counting the number of words per oral story) and shared them with each other, within teams.
- Only two teams actually communicated their results with another team (i.e., between the two teams).
- Four teams had enough time to compile their own portfolios of action plans and strategies. The Secretary compiled the portfolio of the fifth team and later integrated all five portfolios.
- In general, the primary enjoyment about the Mini-Summit was the opportunity for stakeholders, both internal and external, to get together and to see how participatory governance works. However, there was one sour note – that there was not enough preparation time. Some participants explained that they did not have enough time (only a few minutes) to receive the KICC case study and to review its institutional data.

Core Values

- Approximately 90% among the respondents were “strongly agree” or “agree”. Although a few were “neutral”, no one was “disagree” or “strongly disagree”. However, it should be noted that a relatively large number of participants did not respond at all.
- In general, some respondents claimed that, prior to the Mini-Summit, they had no idea that COM-FSM even had core values. Because of that, they also expressed enjoyment in learning about core values and saw how they could influence stakeholders’ behavior toward COM-FSM.

Mission Evaluation

- Approximately 86% among the respondents were “strongly agree” or “agree”. Again, there were a few “neutral” and no “disagree” nor “strongly disagree”.
- It should be noted that, even though more respondents were “agree” than “strongly agree”, a few commented that they did not realize that the mission statement could be fulfilled through the use of measures of success and that were pleased to know that such measurement could be made.

Institution-Set Standards

- We should be reluctant to draw any conclusions, inasmuch as the number of non-respondents was far greater than respondents. More than half of all participants did not respond.

Strategic Planning

- Again, we should be reluctant to draw any conclusions, inasmuch as the number of non-respondents was far greater than respondents. More than half of all participants did not respond.