

<b>ChAWG Report on Chuuk Mini-Summit</b>
--

The Chuuk Campus Mini-Summit was held Friday, November 9, 2012. About 100 stakeholders, both external and internal, attended and participated in two separate break-out sessions – one for external stakeholders, SBA officers, and a few other students; and the second for faculty/staff and still other students. A worksheet, as attached, was presented to stakeholders at the end of both break-out sessions in order to receive their evaluative responses. Herewith presented is a composite analysis by the Chuuk Assessment Working Group (ChAWG) on worksheet findings.

Forty-four stakeholders submitted their worksheets – 10 external stakeholders, 24 faculty/staff, and 10 students. Inasmuch as the worksheets were distributed to stakeholders at the end of their break-out sessions, a small majority failed to complete and hand in their worksheets. Any findings, therefore, are not fully nor thoroughly comprehensive of the participants as a whole. All the same, certain findings are instructive.

Findings are presented in the same four categories, as shown in the worksheet: (1) mission statement, (2) values, (3) strategic goals, and (4) institutional student learning outcomes.

<b>MISSION STATEMENT</b>
--------------------------

<b>Options</b>	<b>External</b>	<b>Fac/Staff</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>Sub-Total</b>
The mission is well-stated.	9	12	4	25
The mission is acceptable.	0	12	6	18
The mission needs to be revised.	0	0	0	0
Not stated	1	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>44</b>

If these findings typify how participants, by group, responded, we may then conclude that external stakeholders pretty much considered the mission statement to be well-stated. That is not the case of the other two groups: faculty/staff were divided 50%-50% between “well-stated” and “acceptable”; and students were more inclined toward “acceptable” than “well-stated”. In effect, internal stakeholders (both faculty/staff and students) seemed to be similar in their responses, in contrast with external stakeholders. All the same, no one considered revision of the mission statement as desirable.

Second, responses to the question “*Is there evidence of achievement in student learning?*” varied by group, as follows:

<b>Options</b>	<b>External</b>	<b>Fac/Staff</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>Sub-Total</b>
a lot	2	2	8	12
some.	8	6	2	16
very little	0	15	0	15
not at all	0	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>44</b>

Here, marked differences separate the three groups. Both external stakeholders and students responded wholly to “a lot” and “some”; however, the groups were diametrically reversed – 80% of the external stakeholders rated “some”, and 80% of the students rated “a lot”. One can only wonder if there might have been a certain bias based on ignorance on the part of external stakeholders and on exaggeration on the part of students. Then, the faculty/staff group responded “very little” as its majority

response. One may wonder if there might have been a certain bias based on experience on the part of faculty/staff. This finding should provoke additional discussion by key personnel – to analyze the accuracy of ChAWG’s three words – ignorance, exaggeration, and experience.

**VALUES**

To assist in data-compilation, ChAWG has transformed the letter grades to numeric values: A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, D = 1, and F = 0. So, in each value, we have mean numbers, by group, as follows:

Values	External	Fac/Staff	Students	Sub-Total
learner-centeredness	2.8	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	2.9
professional behavior	2.2	<b>2.4</b>	2.3	2.3
innovation	2.3	2.4	<b>2.6</b>	2.4
honesty and ethical behavior	2.2	<b>3.0</b>	2.0	2.6
commitment and hard work	2.2	<b>2.7</b>	2.6	2.6
teamwork	2.0	2.6	<b>3.0</b>	2.6
accountability	2.3	<b>2.6</b>	2.0	2.4

These seven values are allegedly traits of COM-FSM administrators, faculty, and staff – not students nor external stakeholders. Therefore, it would be extremely instructive for us employees to understand these mean ratings.

- For one thing, if these were seven subjects, which we take, then our over-all “grade-point average” would be B-/C+. In general, as employees, we are not – I repeat, not – great models for students. ChAWG recommends that administrators, faculty, and staff engage in self-improvement in all seven values, particularly professional behavior, innovation, and accountability.
- We the faculty/staff tend to perceive ourselves more positively than the other two groups. In five values (excluding innovation and teamwork) it would appear that we have tended to inflate ourselves like balloons. ChAWG recommends that we learn to be a bit more humble in self-perception.
- However, the most embarrassing finding is that, in most values (five out of seven), external stakeholders tend to perceive faculty/staff in a less flattering light than the other two groups. ChAWG recommends that we self-improve in our public image.

**STRATEGIC GOALS**

Again, ChAWG has transformed the letter-grade ratings into mean numeric values, by group, for each of the nine strategic goals, as follows:

Goals	External	Fac/Staff	Students	Sub-Total
1	2.3	2.7	<b>2.9</b>	2.7
2	2.2	2.3	<b>2.6</b>	2.3
3	<b>2.6</b>	2.3	2.0	2.3
4	2.1	2.0	<b>2.2</b>	2.0
5	<b>2.5</b>	2.2	2.2	2.3
6	<b>2.4</b>	2.3	2.3	2.3
7	<b>2.2</b>	1.9	2.0	2.0
8	<b>2.3</b>	2.2	1.9	2.1
9	2.4	2.6	<b>2.7</b>	2.6

It goes without saying that each and every one of us administrators, faculty, and staff is held responsible for implementing all nine strategic goals. Let us see how the three groups rate the way we implement the goals:

- For one thing, if these were nine subjects which we take, then our over-all “grade-point average” would range between B and C. In general, as a group, we are not doing a proficient job in achieving the nine goals. ChAWG recommends that administrators, faculty, and staff engage in self-improvement in all nine goals, particularly Goals #4, #7, and #8. They are, as follows:
  - Goal #4: Foster effective communication,
  - Goal #7: Build a partnering and service network for community, workforce, and economic development, and
  - Goal #8: Promote the uniqueness of our community, cultivate respect for individual differences, and champion diversity.
- We the faculty/staff tend to perceive ourselves less positively than the other two groups. In four goals (#1, #2, #4, and #9), students see us as more successful than we see ourselves. ChAWG recommends that we give ourselves a bit more credit for doing what we can in achieving all nine goals.
- However, the most flattering finding is that, in five goals (#3, #5, #6, #7, and #8), external stakeholders tend to perceive faculty/staff in a better light than the faculty/staff themselves. ChAWG recommends that we do what we have to do to live up to how external stakeholders perceive us in goal achievement.

**INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

Again, ChAWG has transformed the letter-grade ratings into mean numeric values, by group, for each of the five ILOs, as follows:

ILOs	External	Fac/Staff	Students	Sub-Total
1	2.3	2.1	<b>2.5</b>	2.2
2	<b>2.5</b>	2.2	1.9	2.2
3	2.2	<b>2.4</b>	2.1	2.3
4	2.2	<b>2.3</b>	2.1	2.2
5	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.3</b>	2.2

There is a remarkable consistency among the three groups. On average, all three groups rate the COM-FSM graduate just about C+/C. This time ChAWG presents findings for each ILO, by group, as follows:

- **Communicate effectively:** Students had the highest rating (2.5) while faculty/staff had the lowest (2.1). In other words, faculty/staff were less inclined to believe that the COM-FSM graduate could communicate effectively. If we claim that, as faculty/staff, we know the graduate best in terms of student learning outcomes, then students tended to inflate the graduate’s ability to communicate effectively.
- **Employ critical thinking and problem-solving:** Here, external stakeholders rated the graduate higher (2.5) than the other two groups. What is surprising is that students rated the graduate lowest (1.9). In fact, this rating is the only one in the matrix above which is below 2.0. One must begin to wonder whether students have projected themselves as future graduates, or not.
- **Possess specific knowledge and skills in a major discipline or professional program of study:** Our Chuuk Campus has only three academic programs: 2 certificate and 1 degree. Faculty/staff rated the graduate close to C+. Yet, students rated the graduate lowest (2.1). One must begin to wonder whether faculty/staff inflate letter grades or students acknowledge this reality better.

- **Take responsibility and develop skills for learning:** The same finding, as for the third ILO above, is found herewith.
- **Interact responsibly with people, cultures, and their environment:** Here, both faculty/staff and students agreed (2.3). External stakeholders rated the graduate lowest (2.0). One must begin to wonder whether external stakeholders know best, or not.

## SUMMARY

ChAWG's first summary discusses research methodology. The 44 completed worksheets are less than half expected. All the same, if the worksheet is defined as a post-survey instrument, then 44% is not bad – to be sure, not excellent, but good enough to determine limited conclusions. Unfortunately, statistical analysis (such as factor analysis) could not be applied. It would have been better if a larger number of completed worksheets were submitted by external stakeholders (10) and students (10).

Second, in the earlier discussion on “Mission Statement” (above), ChAWG hypothesized on how respondents might have completed the worksheet – ignorance, exaggeration, and experience. This hypothesis does not, in any manner, devalue the respondents' perceptions. Rather, ChAWG accepts the responses as baseline data. Therefore, it would be wise on the part of Chuuk Campus to hold annual mini-summits in order to determine, over time (such as a minimum of three years), trends, especially among external stakeholders. Too often we have heard anecdotes by faculty/staff and students regarding the mission statement, values, goals, and ILOs. However, to have quantitative data for the first time is exciting. With such data, we can truly begin data-driven self-improvement, and ChAWG wholeheartedly recommends that we invite participants to more mini-summits – not because we are under any obligation to do so because of WASC/ACCJC and/or Palikir instructions, but because we are committed to self-improvement. ChAWG therefore recommends that one of the values -- innovation – be amended to read “innovation and self-improvement”.

Third, in general, the mission statement is well-stated or acceptable. That is good; however, we cannot predict how participants in a future mini-summit will respond. All the same, for the next year or two, there needs to be no revision of the mission statement.

Fourth, the strategic goals are not well-understood. For instance, the over-all ratings for goals ranged from a low 1.9 to a high 2.9. If a whole-group mean of 2.4 is assigned, we must remember that these figures are averages – about 50% of the respondents understood somewhat the nine goals, and at the same time about 50% did not. It is so essential that all stakeholders, both external and internal, have a firm understanding of the goals. Therefore, ChAWG recommends that, during the Spring Semester 2013 and thereafter, All-Campus Assemblies include discussions (at least once a month) on the goals. We can never assure ourselves that understanding of the goals will be proficient, but we must make an all-out effort to inform our own internal stakeholders.

Fifth, regarding the five ILOs, the general impression of respondents does not lend itself to success or satisfaction. Group mean ratings from 1.9 to 2.5 tell us that we are perceived as “average”. Is that what Chuuk Campus can claim – average? Have we no higher goals to achieve?

ChAWG submits this report in good conscience and faith. Permission is freely granted to have this report submitted to all external and internal stakeholders as well as our colleagues at WASC/ACCJC and Palikir.

Thank you very much.

/s/

Alton Higashi  
ChAWG Chairman

**Worksheet #1: MISSION STATEMENT, VALUES, STRATEGIC GOALS, AND INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

**Breakout Group**       External Stakeholders       Faculty/Staff       Students

(1) **Mission Statement:** *Historically diverse, uniquely Micronesian and globally connected, the College of Micronesia - FSM (COM-FSM) is a continuously improving and student-centered institute of higher education. The college is committed to assisting in the development of the Federated States of Micronesia by providing academic, career and technical educational opportunities for student learning.*

- This statement defines COM-FSM’s purposes, student population, and commitment to achieving student learning.
  - The mission is well-stated.
  - The mission is acceptable.
  - The mission needs to be revised. ;

- Is there evidence of achievement in student learning?
  - a lot       some       very little       not at all

(2) **Values:** COM-FSM is governed by seven values, as listed below. In your observation, how would you grade COM-FSM in its practice of each value?

A = superior      B = above average      C = average      D = passing      F = failing

learner-centeredness	A	B	C	D	F
professional behavior	A	B	C	D	F
innovation	A	B	C	D	F
honesty and ethical behavior	A	B	C	D	F
commitment and hard work	A	B	C	D	F
teamwork	A	B	C	D	F
accountability	A	B	C	D	F

(3) **Strategic Goals:** COM-FSM has to achieve 9 goals, as listed below. In your observation, how would you grade COM-FSM in its achievement of each goal?

A = superior      B = above average      C = average      D = passing      F = failing

Promote learning and teaching for knowledge, skills, creativity, intellect, and the abilities to seek and analyze information and to communicate effectively	A	B	C	D	F
Provide institutional support to foster student success and satisfaction	A	B	C	D	F
Create an adequate, healthy and functional learning and working environment	A	B	C	D	F
Foster effective communication	A	B	C	D	F
Invest in sufficient, qualified, and effective human resources	A	B	C	D	F
Ensure sufficient and well-managed fiscal resources that maintain financial stability	A	B	C	D	F
Build a partnering and service network for community, workforce and economic development	A	B	C	D	F
Promote the uniqueness of our community, cultivate respect for individual differences and champion diversity	A	B	C	D	F
Provide for continuous improvement of programs, services and college environment	A	B	C	D	F

- (4) **Institutional Student Learning Outcomes**: A COM-FSM graduate must demonstrate five learning outcomes, as listed below. In your observation, how would you grade COM-FSM graduates in the following outcomes?

A = superior    B = above average    C = average    D = passing    F = failing

Communicate effectively	A	B	C	D	F
Employ critical thinking and problem-solving	A	B	C	D	F
Possess specific knowledge and skills in a major discipline or professional program of study	A	B	C	D	F
Take responsibility and develop skills for learning	A	B	C	D	F
Interact responsibly with people, cultures, and their environment	A	B	C	D	F