



Assessment of the ACCJC Rubrics at COM-FSM

This paper outlines the status (as of October 2012) of COM-FSM on the three different ACCJC rubrics: Planning, Program Review, and Student Learning Outcomes.

COM-FSM first administered the rubrics to its employees in spring 2012. A second administration of the rubrics was done in September 2012. On this survey, respondents were asked to state their level of agreement with each of the rubric statements. The four possible responses were: yes, sometimes, no, and I do not know.

Based upon this Likert Scale, actual and valid percentages can be calculated for each of the statements, with a valid percentage including only those results that actually provided an opinion on the statement (i.e., not including the “I do not know” responses). These percentages may yield insights into the rubric stage at which the college is currently operating.

In addition to calculating percentages, point values can be assigned to the valid responses (no = 0 points; sometimes = 0.5 point; and yes = 1 point) and tallied among all of the valid responses provided for each statement. In this type of analysis, possible tallied results would be in the range of 0 to 1, with results closer to 1 indicating higher levels of agreement and results closer to 0.5 or less indicating areas possibly in need of attention.

The results of the September 2012 administration have been disaggregated via two methods: (a) by type of employee and (b) by campus location. Appendices 1, 2, and 3 contain the disaggregated results for each of the rubrics.

Disaggregating the rubric results should assist the college in identifying any notable differences in the perceptions of the employee groups and/or campus locations. Addressing these differences is an important aspect of the college’s commitment to purposeful, robust, and pervasive dialogue (as required by the ACCJC) around planning, program review, and student learning outcomes.

The survey also provided an area in which respondents could provide comments. All verbatim comments from the survey are in Appendix 4.

NOTE: Note that the ACCJC rubrics are not a test that the institution can pass by achieving high scores via a survey. Rather, the rubrics in survey format are only meant as a temperature taking device to indicate the rubric stage that the college believes it currently has achieved. The rubric results cannot and should not replace true evidence of planning, program review, and student learning outcomes assessment at COM-FSM. Rather, the rubric results should be used to help the college decide in which areas more purposeful, robust, and pervasive dialogue should occur.



Highlighted Results from Rubric 1: Planning

- Nearly 30% of the survey respondents were unable to respond to the survey due to lack of knowledge of the rubric statements. The lack of knowledge varied greatly among the employee types and campus locations and could indicate communication challenges at the college.

Average % of "I do not know" or BLANK responses provided to rubric statements

Category	Average Percentage
All Responses	29%
Administrators	23%
Faculty	17%
Staff	43%
Chuuk	34%
Fisheries and Maritime Institute	12%
Kosrae	7%
National	29%
Pohnpei	31%
Yap	37%

- Overall the college scored quite high in all aspects of the rubric, as the majority of the statements either had high percentages of “yes” responses and/or point values close to 1.0.
- The point value analysis revealed a three areas which the college may wish to explore further. These are the following:
 - Creating linkages between plans and a resource allocation processes
 - Identifying and using quantitative and qualitative data
 - Assessing progress toward achieving its education goals over time, particularly via longitudinal data and analyses

Detailed results from the planning rubric survey are in Appendix 1.



Highlighted Results from Rubric 2: Program Review

- 20% of the survey respondents (or one out of five) were unable to respond to the survey due to lack of knowledge of the rubric statements. The lack of knowledge varied greatly among the employee types and campus location and could indicate communication challenges at the college.

Average % of "I do not know" or
BLANK responses provided to
rubric statements

Category	Average Percentage
All Responses	20%
Administrators	20%
Faculty	14%
Staff	39%
Chuuk	31%
Fisheries and Maritime Institute	3%
Kosrae	11%
National	26%
Pohnpei	28%
Yap	32%

- Overall the college scored quite high in all aspects of the rubric, as the majority of the statements either had high percentages of “yes” responses and/or point values close to 1.0.
- The point value analysis revealed five areas which the college may wish to explore further. These are the following:
 - Developing a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement
 - Ensuring that program review processes are in place and being implemented regularly
 - Clearly and consistently linking the results of program reviews to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes – and providing specific examples of these linkages
 - Ensuring that program review processes are ongoing, systematic, and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement
 - Reviewing and refining the college’s program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness

Detailed results from the program review rubric survey are in Appendix 2.



Highlighted Results from Rubric 3: Student Learning Outcomes

- Nearly 30% of the survey respondents were unable to respond to the survey due to lack of knowledge of the rubric statements. The lack of knowledge varied greatly among the employee types and campus locations, and could indicate communication challenges at the college.

Average % of "I do not know" or BLANK responses provided to rubric statements

Category	Average Percentage
All Responses	29%
Administrators	30%
Faculty	13%
Staff	45%
Chuuk	30%
Fisheries and Maritime Institute	6%
Kosrae	14%
National	32%
Pohnpei	30%
Yap	36%

- Overall the college scored quite high in all aspects of the rubric, as the majority of the statements either had high percentages of “yes” responses and/or point values close to 1.0.
- The point value analysis revealed four areas which the college may wish to explore further. These are the following:
 - Ensuring that student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement.
 - Conducting evaluation of student learning outcomes processes
 - Evaluating and fine-tuning organizational structures to support student learning on an ongoing basis
 - Linking learning outcomes specifically to program reviews

Detailed results from the student learning outcomes rubric survey are in Appendix 3.



Summary Status

COM-FSM is already expected to be at the sustainable continuous quality improvement stage for both planning and program review. The college is also required to submit a report in March 2013 to the ACCJC that demonstrates that COM-FSM is at the proficiency stage regarding student learning outcomes.

It is anticipated that the college will administer the ACCJC rubric survey at least one more time before the March 2013 report is submitted. The results of the next administration may reveal progress that the college has made in the three planning; five program review; and four student learning outcomes assessment areas noted above.

Lastly, the results of this report should be used in conjunction with the communication strategies outlined in the Sandy Pond “Strengthening Purposeful Dialogue” report that was submitted in September 2012.



Appendix 1

Survey Results for Rubric 1: Planning



All Responses

Rubric Area		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	2%	22%	75%	27%	183	134	0.87
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	1%	23%	76%	28%	183	132	0.88
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	3%	28%	68%	34%	183	120	0.83
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	13%	30%	57%	30%	183	128	0.72
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	4%	41%	55%	35%	183	119	0.75
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	9%	36%	55%	39%	183	112	0.73
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	3%	19%	78%	37%	183	116	0.88
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	6%	28%	66%	23%	183	140	0.80
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	9%	38%	53%	27%	183	134	0.72
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	5%	29%	66%	27%	183	134	0.80
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	7%	20%	73%	22%	183	142	0.83
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	2%	15%	83%	29%	183	130	0.91
	Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	8%	29%	63%	34%	183	120	0.78



Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	3%	23%	74%	26%	183	136	0.86
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	4%	29%	66%	27%	183	134	0.81
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	4%	27%	69%	31%	183	127	0.83
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	6%	32%	62%	29%	183	130	0.78
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	9%	39%	53%	23%	183	140	0.72
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	4%	26%	69%	23%	183	140	0.83
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	6%	33%	61%	23%	183	140	0.77
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	8%	36%	56%	27%	183	133	0.74
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	9%	34%	57%	36%	183	118	0.74
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	10%	32%	58%	30%	183	128	0.74



Administrators		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Sometimes	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	6%	12%	82%	15%	14	17	0.88
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	0%	13%	88%	20%	14	16	0.94
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	0%	15%	85%	35%	11	13	0.92
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	29%	18%	53%	15%	9	17	0.62
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	7%	20%	73%	25%	11	15	0.83
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	19%	31%	50%	20%	8	16	0.66
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	7%	13%	80%	25%	12	15	0.87
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	0%	13%	87%	25%	13	15	0.93
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	7%	29%	64%	30%	9	14	0.79
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	0%	25%	75%	20%	12	16	0.88
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	0%	31%	69%	20%	11	16	0.84
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	0%	50%	50%	20%	8	16	0.75



Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	0%	38%	63%	20%	10	16	0.81
Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	13%	63%	25%	20%	4	16	0.56
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	0%	25%	75%	20%	12	16	0.88
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	13%	31%	56%	20%	9	16	0.72
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	0%	46%	54%	35%	7	13	0.77
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	7%	47%	47%	25%	7	15	0.70
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	0%	77%	23%	35%	3	13	0.62
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	0%	50%	50%	20%	8	16	0.75
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	0%	50%	50%	20%	8	16	0.75
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	0%	38%	63%	20%	10	16	0.81
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	0%	38%	63%	20%	10	16	0.81



Faculty		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		Rubric Area	No	Some-times		Yes	I do not know or Blank	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	3%	20%	77%	14%	54	70	0.87
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	1%	23%	75%	15%	52	69	0.87
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	6%	32%	62%	22%	39	63	0.78
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	13%	34%	53%	21%	34	64	0.70
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	7%	47%	46%	27%	27	59	0.69
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	10%	43%	47%	28%	27	58	0.68
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	4%	23%	74%	30%	42	57	0.85
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	1%	19%	80%	14%	56	70	0.89
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	9%	34%	57%	17%	38	67	0.74
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	6%	25%	69%	11%	50	72	0.82
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	7%	39%	54%	14%	38	70	0.74
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	6%	24%	69%	23%	43	62	0.81



Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	10%	31%	59%	16%	40	68	0.74
Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	14%	30%	57%	9%	42	74	0.72
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	8%	30%	62%	10%	45	73	0.77
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	9%	38%	53%	9%	39	74	0.72
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	13%	36%	51%	14%	36	70	0.69
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	15%	36%	49%	27%	29	59	0.67
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	19%	27%	54%	17%	36	67	0.67
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	11%	29%	60%	10%	44	73	0.75
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	13%	43%	44%	14%	31	70	0.66
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	9%	33%	59%	14%	41	70	0.75
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	9%	24%	67%	7%	50	75	0.79



Staff		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		Rubric Area	No	Some-times		Yes	I do not know or Blank	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	0%	30%	70%	43%	33	47	0.85
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	0%	28%	72%	43%	34	47	0.86
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	0%	27%	73%	46%	32	44	0.86
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	9%	28%	64%	43%	30	47	0.78
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	0%	40%	60%	45%	27	45	0.80
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	3%	26%	71%	54%	27	38	0.84
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	0%	16%	84%	46%	37	44	0.92
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	2%	11%	87%	45%	39	45	0.92
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	5%	21%	74%	52%	29	39	0.85
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	0%	19%	81%	41%	39	48	0.91
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	2%	15%	83%	41%	40	48	0.91
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	2%	22%	76%	40%	37	49	0.87
Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	2%	30%	67%	44%	31	46	0.83	



Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	0%	44%	56%	39%	28	50	0.78
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	0%	22%	78%	38%	40	51	0.89
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	0%	26%	74%	39%	37	50	0.87
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	2%	34%	64%	39%	32	50	0.81
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	2%	27%	70%	46%	31	44	0.84
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	0%	27%	73%	41%	35	48	0.86
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	0%	20%	80%	38%	41	51	0.90
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	6%	27%	67%	41%	32	48	0.80
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	2%	21%	77%	41%	37	48	0.88
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	6%	10%	84%	38%	43	51	0.89



Chuuk

		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes		I do not know or Blank	Total Count	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	0%	19%	81%	30%	30	21	0.90
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	0%	26%	74%	23%	30	23	0.87
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	0%	33%	67%	30%	30	21	0.83
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	17%	39%	44%	40%	30	18	0.64
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	11%	42%	47%	37%	30	19	0.68
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	6%	63%	31%	47%	30	16	0.63
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	0%	30%	70%	33%	30	20	0.85
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	0%	16%	84%	37%	30	19	0.92
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	6%	33%	61%	40%	30	18	0.78
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	5%	20%	75%	33%	30	20	0.85
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	6%	33%	61%	40%	30	18	0.78
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	6%	22%	72%	40%	30	18	0.83
	Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	6%	29%	65%	43%	30	17	0.79



Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	9%	39%	52%	23%	30	23	0.72
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	4%	35%	61%	23%	30	23	0.78
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	4%	26%	70%	23%	30	23	0.83
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	10%	43%	48%	30%	30	21	0.69
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	10%	35%	55%	33%	30	20	0.73
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	10%	52%	38%	30%	30	21	0.64
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	5%	26%	68%	37%	30	19	0.82
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	15%	55%	30%	33%	30	20	0.58
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	11%	32%	58%	37%	30	19	0.74
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	10%	19%	71%	30%	30	21	0.81



Fisheries and Maritime Institute

Rubric Area		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	0%	30%	70%	9%	11	10	0.85
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	0%	50%	50%	9%	11	10	0.75
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	0%	44%	56%	18%	11	9	0.78
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	10%	50%	40%	9%	11	10	0.65
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	0%	70%	30%	9%	11	10	0.65
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	25%	38%	38%	27%	11	8	0.56
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	11%	33%	56%	18%	11	9	0.72
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	0%	22%	78%	18%	11	9	0.89
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	0%	43%	57%	36%	11	7	0.79
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	0%	20%	80%	9%	11	10	0.90
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	0%	45%	55%	0%	11	11	0.77
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	0%	25%	75%	27%	11	8	0.88
	Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	10%	30%	60%	9%	11	10	0.75



Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	0%	44%	56%	18%	11	9	0.78
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	0%	20%	80%	9%	11	10	0.90
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	0%	36%	64%	0%	11	11	0.82
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	0%	55%	45%	0%	11	11	0.73
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	0%	38%	63%	27%	11	8	0.81
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	0%	30%	70%	9%	11	10	0.85
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	0%	30%	70%	9%	11	10	0.85
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	0%	30%	70%	9%	11	10	0.85
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	0%	27%	73%	0%	11	11	0.86
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	0%	9%	91%	0%	11	11	0.95



Kosrae		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		Rubric Area	No	Some-times		Yes	I do not know or Blank	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	0%	17%	83%	0%	12	12	0.92
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	0%	0%	100%	0%	12	12	1.00
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	0%	25%	75%	33%	12	8	0.88
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	20%	30%	50%	17%	12	10	0.65
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	0%	18%	82%	8%	12	11	0.91
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	9%	45%	45%	8%	12	11	0.68
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	0%	27%	73%	8%	12	11	0.86
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	0%	18%	82%	8%	12	11	0.91
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	0%	25%	75%	0%	12	12	0.88
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	0%	9%	91%	8%	12	11	0.95
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	0%	18%	82%	8%	12	11	0.91
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	0%	8%	92%	0%	12	12	0.96



Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	0%	27%	73%	8%	12	11	0.86
Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	0%	17%	83%	0%	12	12	0.92
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	0%	8%	92%	0%	12	12	0.96
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	0%	18%	82%	8%	12	11	0.91
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	0%	9%	91%	8%	12	11	0.95
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	0%	27%	73%	8%	12	11	0.86
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	0%	20%	80%	17%	12	10	0.90
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	0%	17%	83%	0%	12	12	0.92
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	0%	25%	75%	0%	12	12	0.88
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	0%	25%	75%	0%	12	12	0.88
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	0%	9%	91%	8%	12	11	0.95



National		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	4%	25%	71%	26%	65	48	0.83
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	2%	21%	77%	34%	65	43	0.87
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	7%	24%	69%	35%	65	42	0.81
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	13%	25%	63%	26%	65	48	0.75
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	5%	35%	59%	43%	65	37	0.77
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	9%	27%	64%	32%	65	44	0.77
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	0%	10%	90%	38%	65	40	0.95
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	2%	19%	79%	26%	65	48	0.89
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	9%	35%	56%	34%	65	43	0.73
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	4%	32%	64%	23%	65	50	0.80
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	4%	33%	63%	26%	65	48	0.79
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	5%	36%	59%	32%	65	44	0.77



Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	10%	39%	51%	25%	65	49	0.70
Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	10%	45%	45%	25%	65	49	0.67
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	4%	27%	69%	25%	65	49	0.83
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	10%	44%	46%	23%	65	50	0.68
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	9%	40%	51%	31%	65	45	0.71
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	10%	44%	46%	37%	65	41	0.68
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	14%	32%	55%	32%	65	44	0.70
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	8%	36%	56%	23%	65	50	0.74
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	13%	43%	45%	28%	65	47	0.66
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	7%	31%	62%	31%	65	45	0.78
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	10%	25%	65%	22%	65	51	0.77



Pohnpei		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		Rubric Area	No	Some-times		Yes	I do not know or Blank	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	4%	19%	77%	33%	39	26	0.87
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	0%	18%	82%	28%	39	28	0.91
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	4%	31%	65%	33%	39	26	0.81
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	16%	16%	68%	36%	39	25	0.76
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	4%	50%	46%	33%	39	26	0.71
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	5%	26%	68%	51%	39	19	0.82
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	9%	17%	74%	41%	39	23	0.83
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	4%	7%	89%	31%	39	27	0.93
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	15%	15%	69%	33%	39	26	0.77
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	3%	17%	79%	26%	39	29	0.88
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	10%	24%	66%	26%	39	29	0.78
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	7%	25%	68%	28%	39	28	0.80



Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	4%	23%	73%	33%	39	26	0.85
Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	17%	24%	59%	26%	39	29	0.71
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	10%	24%	66%	26%	39	29	0.78
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	11%	21%	68%	28%	39	28	0.79
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	14%	25%	61%	28%	39	28	0.73
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	21%	13%	67%	38%	39	24	0.73
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	19%	15%	67%	31%	39	27	0.74
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	10%	23%	67%	23%	39	30	0.78
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	7%	39%	54%	28%	39	28	0.73
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	7%	30%	63%	23%	39	30	0.78
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	10%	23%	67%	23%	39	30	0.78



Yap

Rubric Area		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Sometimes	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
Planning	Planning: A1: The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.	0%	24%	76%	35%	13	17	0.88
	Planning: A2: There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.	0%	38%	63%	38%	10	16	0.81
	Planning: A3: The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources).	0%	21%	79%	46%	11	14	0.89
	Planning: A4: Planning found in only some areas of college operations.	6%	41%	53%	35%	9	17	0.74
	Planning: A5: There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.	0%	38%	63%	38%	10	16	0.81
	Planning: A6: There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money".	7%	36%	57%	46%	8	14	0.75
	Planning: A7: The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.	0%	15%	85%	50%	11	13	0.92
	Planning: D1: The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.	0%	13%	88%	38%	14	16	0.94
	Planning: D2: The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.	0%	29%	71%	46%	10	14	0.86
	Planning: D3: Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.	0%	19%	81%	38%	13	16	0.91
	Planning: D4: The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.	0%	18%	82%	35%	14	17	0.91
	Planning: D5: Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.	0%	24%	76%	35%	13	17	0.88
	Planning: D6: Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.	0%	29%	71%	35%	12	17	0.85



Planning: P1: The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.	0%	56%	44%	31%	8	18	0.72
Planning: P2: The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness.	0%	35%	65%	35%	11	17	0.82
Planning: P3: The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.	0%	35%	65%	35%	11	17	0.82
Planning: P4: The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).	0%	41%	59%	35%	10	17	0.79
Planning: P5: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).	0%	43%	57%	46%	8	14	0.79
Planning: P6: The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.	0%	44%	56%	38%	9	16	0.78
Planning: C1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	0%	21%	79%	27%	15	19	0.89
Planning: C2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.	6%	18%	76%	35%	13	17	0.85
Planning: C3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	0%	24%	76%	35%	13	17	0.88
Planning: C4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	0%	17%	83%	31%	15	18	0.92



Appendix 2

Survey Results for Rubric 2: Program Review



All Responses

All Responses		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Sometimes	Yes		I do not know or Blank	Total Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	29%	71%	22%	183	142	0.86
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	4%	28%	68%	24%	183	139	0.82
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	3%	36%	61%	25%	183	137	0.79
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	8%	23%	68%	42%	183	107	0.80
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	5%	24%	71%	16%	183	153	0.83
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	9%	27%	65%	24%	183	139	0.78
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	10%	31%	59%	23%	183	141	0.74
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	4%	32%	64%	20%	183	146	0.80
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	9%	40%	50%	23%	183	141	0.71
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	5%	29%	66%	30%	183	129	0.80
	Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	16%	36%	48%	33%	183	122	0.66



Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	5%	35%	60%	28%	183	131	0.77
Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	9%	32%	59%	28%	183	131	0.75
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	5%	38%	57%	19%	183	148	0.76
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	9%	43%	48%	27%	183	134	0.69
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	9%	33%	58%	26%	183	136	0.75
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	14%	44%	43%	27%	183	133	0.65
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	17%	46%	37%	28%	183	132	0.60
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	11%	33%	56%	23%	183	141	0.73



Administrators

Administrators		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes		Total Count	Valid Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	27%	73%	25%	11	15	0.87
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	6%	24%	71%	15%	12	17	0.82
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	0%	20%	80%	25%	12	15	0.90
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	7%	14%	79%	30%	11	14	0.86
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	0%	38%	63%	20%	10	16	0.81
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	6%	47%	47%	15%	8	17	0.71
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	0%	31%	69%	20%	11	16	0.84
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	20%	40%	40%	25%	6	15	0.60
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	0%	41%	59%	15%	10	17	0.79
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	7%	27%	67%	25%	10	15	0.80
	Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	0%	53%	47%	15%	8	17	0.74



Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	0%	75%	25%	20%	4	16	0.63
Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	0%	50%	50%	20%	8	16	0.75
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	6%	63%	31%	20%	5	16	0.63
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	6%	69%	25%	20%	4	16	0.59
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	0%	38%	63%	20%	10	16	0.81
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	6%	47%	47%	15%	8	17	0.71
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	7%	40%	53%	25%	8	15	0.73
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	6%	47%	47%	15%	8	17	0.71



Faculty		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Sometimes	Yes		I do not know or Blank	Total Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	25%	75%	10%	55	73	0.88
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	6%	26%	69%	14%	48	70	0.81
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	4%	41%	55%	10%	40	73	0.75
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	11%	20%	70%	31%	39	56	0.79
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	8%	32%	59%	9%	44	74	0.76
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	14%	49%	38%	9%	28	74	0.62
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	8%	31%	61%	21%	39	64	0.77
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	18%	35%	47%	23%	29	62	0.65
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	11%	31%	58%	20%	38	65	0.74
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	16%	24%	60%	17%	40	67	0.72
	Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	5%	29%	66%	5%	51	77	0.81



Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	14%	38%	48%	20%	31	65	0.67
Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	12%	33%	55%	10%	40	73	0.71
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	22%	43%	35%	15%	24	69	0.57
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	24%	41%	35%	16%	24	68	0.56
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	21%	28%	51%	12%	36	71	0.65
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	6%	21%	73%	4%	57	78	0.83
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	12%	30%	58%	10%	42	73	0.73
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	15%	32%	53%	11%	38	72	0.69



Staff		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Sometimes	Yes		Total Count	Valid Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	35%	65%	34%	35	54	0.82
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	0%	33%	67%	37%	35	52	0.84
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	2%	35%	63%	40%	31	49	0.81
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	5%	32%	62%	55%	23	37	0.78
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	0%	29%	71%	32%	40	56	0.86
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	4%	26%	70%	39%	35	50	0.83
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	4%	24%	71%	40%	35	49	0.84
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	11%	36%	53%	45%	24	45	0.71
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	0%	39%	61%	40%	30	49	0.81
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	0%	45%	55%	40%	27	49	0.78
	Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	6%	46%	48%	34%	26	54	0.71
	Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	6%	40%	55%	35%	29	53	0.75



Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	6%	28%	66%	43%	31	47	0.80
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	4%	38%	58%	41%	28	48	0.77
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	10%	46%	44%	41%	21	48	0.67
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	0%	39%	61%	34%	33	54	0.81
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	2%	22%	76%	29%	44	58	0.87
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	4%	18%	78%	38%	40	51	0.87
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	4%	25%	71%	37%	37	52	0.84



Chuuk		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes		Total Count	Valid Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	28%	72%	17%	30	25	0.86
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	5%	26%	68%	37%	30	19	0.82
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	0%	30%	70%	23%	30	23	0.85
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	0%	32%	68%	37%	30	19	0.84
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	4%	46%	50%	20%	30	24	0.73
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	10%	52%	38%	30%	30	21	0.64
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	11%	44%	44%	40%	30	18	0.67
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	17%	50%	33%	40%	30	18	0.58
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	5%	53%	42%	37%	30	19	0.68
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	6%	50%	44%	40%	30	18	0.69
	Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	8%	33%	58%	20%	30	24	0.75



Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	5%	68%	26%	37%	30	19	0.61
Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	11%	37%	53%	37%	30	19	0.71
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	5%	65%	30%	33%	30	20	0.63
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	10%	60%	30%	33%	30	20	0.60
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	5%	45%	50%	27%	30	22	0.73
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	4%	32%	64%	17%	30	25	0.80
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	10%	33%	57%	30%	30	21	0.74
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	9%	41%	50%	27%	30	22	0.70



Fisheries and Maritime Institute

Rubric Area		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	30%	70%	9%	11	10	0.85
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	0%	40%	60%	9%	11	10	0.80
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	9%	45%	45%	0%	11	11	0.68
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	25%	38%	38%	27%	11	8	0.56
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	0%	36%	64%	0%	11	11	0.82
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	0%	45%	55%	0%	11	11	0.77
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	9%	27%	64%	0%	11	11	0.77
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	9%	45%	45%	0%	11	11	0.68
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	0%	50%	50%	9%	11	10	0.75
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	9%	36%	55%	0%	11	11	0.73
	Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	0%	73%	27%	0%	11	11	0.64



Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	0%	50%	50%	9%	11	10	0.75
Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	9%	45%	45%	0%	11	11	0.68
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	9%	27%	64%	0%	11	11	0.77
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	9%	55%	36%	0%	11	11	0.64
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	9%	18%	73%	0%	11	11	0.82
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	0%	36%	64%	0%	11	11	0.82
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	0%	18%	82%	0%	11	11	0.91
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	0%	27%	73%	0%	11	11	0.86



Kosrae		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		Rubric Area	No	Some - times		Yes	Total Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	50%	50%	0%	12	12	0.75
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	10%	0%	90%	17%	12	10	0.90
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	0%	33%	67%	0%	12	12	0.83
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	10%	20%	70%	17%	12	10	0.80
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	0%	27%	73%	8%	12	11	0.86
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	0%	50%	50%	0%	12	12	0.75
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	0%	11%	89%	25%	12	9	0.94
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	0%	50%	50%	17%	12	10	0.75
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	8%	0%	92%	0%	12	12	0.92
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	9%	9%	82%	8%	12	11	0.86
Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	0%	33%	67%	0%	12	12	0.83	



Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	0%	0%	100%	25%	12	9	1.00
Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	0%	9%	91%	8%	12	11	0.95
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	0%	22%	78%	25%	12	9	0.89
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	13%	63%	25%	33%	12	8	0.56
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	0%	20%	80%	17%	12	10	0.90
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	0%	8%	92%	0%	12	12	0.96
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	8%	17%	75%	0%	12	12	0.83
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	0%	18%	82%	8%	12	11	0.91



National		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes		Total Count	Valid Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	30%	70%	29%	65	46	0.85
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	4%	24%	71%	25%	65	49	0.84
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	4%	40%	56%	26%	65	48	0.76
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	10%	20%	71%	37%	65	41	0.80
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	7%	24%	69%	17%	65	54	0.81
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	16%	40%	44%	23%	65	50	0.64
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	7%	36%	58%	31%	65	45	0.76
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	18%	30%	52%	32%	65	44	0.67
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	4%	35%	61%	29%	65	46	0.78
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	12%	31%	57%	25%	65	49	0.72
	Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	2%	37%	61%	22%	65	51	0.79



Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	10%	46%	44%	26%	65	48	0.67
Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	6%	35%	58%	26%	65	48	0.76
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	21%	49%	30%	28%	65	47	0.54
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	19%	48%	33%	26%	65	48	0.57
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	17%	35%	48%	26%	65	48	0.66
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	7%	28%	65%	17%	65	54	0.79
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	13%	29%	58%	26%	65	48	0.73
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	14%	39%	47%	25%	65	49	0.66



Pohnpei

	Rubric Area	Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	20%	80%	23%	39	30	0.90
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	3%	23%	73%	23%	39	30	0.85
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	0%	43%	57%	28%	39	28	0.79
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	10%	15%	75%	49%	39	20	0.83
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	4%	36%	61%	28%	39	28	0.79
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	10%	34%	55%	26%	39	29	0.72
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	4%	21%	75%	28%	39	28	0.86
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	27%	31%	42%	33%	39	26	0.58
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	11%	30%	59%	31%	39	27	0.74
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	8%	27%	65%	33%	39	26	0.79
	Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	13%	30%	57%	23%	39	30	0.72
	Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	21%	28%	52%	26%	39	29	0.66



Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	21%	29%	50%	28%	39	28	0.64
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	18%	43%	39%	28%	39	28	0.61
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	28%	34%	38%	26%	39	29	0.55
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	17%	30%	53%	23%	39	30	0.68
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	3%	19%	77%	21%	39	31	0.87
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	4%	29%	68%	28%	39	28	0.82
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	17%	21%	62%	26%	39	29	0.72



Yap		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		Rubric Area	No	Sometimes		Yes	Total Count	
Program Review	Program Review: A1: There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.	0%	26%	74%	27%	14	19	0.87
	Program Review: A2: There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.	0%	52%	48%	19%	10	21	0.74
	Program Review: A3: There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.	7%	20%	73%	42%	11	15	0.83
	Program Review: A4: The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	0%	33%	67%	65%	6	9	0.83
	Program Review: D1: Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.	0%	28%	72%	31%	13	18	0.86
	Program Review: D2: Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.	0%	28%	72%	31%	13	18	0.86
	Program Review: D3: Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Committees, Etc.)	0%	17%	83%	31%	15	18	0.92
	Program Review: D4: Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.	0%	31%	69%	50%	9	13	0.85
	Program Review: D5: Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.	0%	41%	59%	35%	10	17	0.79
	Program Review: D6: Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	6%	38%	56%	38%	9	16	0.75
	Program Review: P1: Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.	0%	40%	60%	23%	12	20	0.80
	Program Review: P2: Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.	0%	53%	47%	27%	9	19	0.74



Program Review: P3: The program review framework is established and implemented.	0%	37%	63%	27%	12	19	0.82
Program Review: P4: Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	6%	28%	67%	31%	12	18	0.81
Program Review: P5: Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.	6%	31%	63%	38%	10	16	0.78
Program Review: P6: The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	0%	35%	65%	23%	13	20	0.83
Program Review: C1: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	5%	15%	80%	23%	16	20	0.88
Program Review: C2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	11%	21%	68%	27%	13	19	0.79
Program Review: C3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	0%	26%	74%	27%	14	19	0.87



Appendix 3

Survey Results for Rubric 3: Student Learning Outcomes



All Responses

	Rubric Area	Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Sometimes	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
SLOs	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	1%	16%	83%	23%	183	141	0.91
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	6%	94%	24%	183	139	0.97
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	2%	22%	76%	33%	183	123	0.87
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	1%	20%	79%	40%	183	110	0.89
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	10%	90%	32%	183	125	0.95
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	3%	26%	71%	22%	183	143	0.84
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	7%	32%	61%	26%	183	136	0.77
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	4%	27%	69%	30%	183	129	0.83
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	6%	26%	68%	31%	183	127	0.81
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	5%	33%	62%	28%	183	132	0.78
	SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	2%	25%	73%	27%	183	134	0.85



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	2%	17%	81%	31%	183	127	0.89
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	3%	24%	73%	26%	183	135	0.85
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	2%	19%	79%	27%	183	134	0.88
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	6%	14%	80%	34%	183	121	0.87
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	6%	32%	62%	36%	183	118	0.78
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	4%	30%	67%	25%	183	138	0.82
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	3%	21%	76%	25%	183	138	0.87
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	11%	35%	53%	28%	183	131	0.71
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	6%	27%	66%	28%	183	131	0.80
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	8%	41%	51%	36%	183	117	0.72
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	10%	41%	50%	32%	183	125	0.70
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	3%	21%	76%	32%	183	125	0.86
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	12%	39%	49%	30%	183	129	0.68



Administrators

	Rubric Area	Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
SLOTS	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	0%	19%	81%	20%	13	16	0.91
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	13%	87%	25%	13	15	0.93
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	0%	21%	79%	30%	11	14	0.89
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	0%	9%	91%	45%	10	11	0.95
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	8%	92%	35%	12	13	0.96
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	8%	8%	85%	35%	11	13	0.88
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	7%	20%	73%	25%	11	15	0.83
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	0%	7%	93%	30%	13	14	0.96
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	0%	7%	93%	30%	13	14	0.96
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	0%	50%	50%	30%	7	14	0.75
	SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	7%	43%	50%	30%	7	14	0.71



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	7%	14%	79%	30%	11	14	0.86
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	7%	50%	43%	30%	6	14	0.68
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	0%	43%	57%	30%	8	14	0.79
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	0%	60%	40%	25%	6	15	0.70
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	7%	67%	27%	25%	4	15	0.60
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	0%	15%	85%	35%	11	13	0.92
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	7%	36%	57%	30%	8	14	0.75
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	7%	27%	67%	25%	10	15	0.80
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	8%	31%	62%	35%	8	13	0.77
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	9%	36%	55%	45%	6	11	0.73
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	0%	36%	64%	30%	9	14	0.82
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	7%	33%	60%	25%	9	15	0.77
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	0%	50%	50%	30%	7	14	0.75



Faculty		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
SLOs	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	1%	16%	83%	5%	64	77	0.91
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	6%	94%	4%	73	78	0.97
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	3%	18%	79%	17%	53	67	0.88
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	0%	21%	79%	25%	48	61	0.89
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	9%	91%	14%	64	70	0.96
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	2%	18%	80%	19%	53	66	0.89
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	3%	23%	74%	10%	54	73	0.86
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	3%	23%	74%	10%	54	73	0.86
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	10%	16%	75%	22%	47	63	0.83
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	9%	29%	62%	20%	40	65	0.76
SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	4%	28%	68%	7%	51	75	0.82	



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	4%	23%	73%	7%	55	75	0.85
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	14%	41%	45%	12%	32	71	0.65
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	11%	29%	60%	11%	43	72	0.74
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	11%	42%	47%	23%	29	62	0.68
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	14%	38%	48%	19%	32	66	0.67
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	6%	21%	73%	14%	51	70	0.84
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	13%	42%	45%	12%	32	71	0.66
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	4%	28%	68%	6%	52	76	0.82
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	7%	36%	57%	9%	42	74	0.75
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	6%	26%	68%	15%	47	69	0.81
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	9%	24%	67%	14%	47	70	0.79
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	6%	29%	65%	16%	44	68	0.79
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	4%	17%	79%	11%	57	72	0.88



Staff		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		Rubric Area	No	Some-times		Yes	I do not know or Blank	
SLOTS	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	0%	17%	83%	41%	40	48	0.92
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	4%	96%	44%	44	46	0.98
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	2%	29%	69%	49%	29	42	0.83
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	3%	21%	76%	54%	29	38	0.87
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	12%	88%	49%	37	42	0.94
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	2%	17%	81%	41%	39	48	0.90
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	2%	26%	72%	43%	34	47	0.85
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	2%	15%	83%	43%	39	47	0.90
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	2%	14%	84%	46%	37	44	0.91
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	3%	31%	67%	52%	26	39	0.82
	SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	2%	29%	69%	40%	34	49	0.84



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	0%	20%	80%	40%	39	49	0.90
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	9%	22%	70%	44%	32	46	0.80
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	0%	20%	80%	45%	36	45	0.90
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	5%	33%	63%	51%	25	40	0.79
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	5%	36%	59%	46%	26	44	0.77
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	0%	21%	79%	49%	33	42	0.89
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	14%	34%	52%	46%	23	44	0.69
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	0%	23%	77%	37%	40	52	0.88
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	6%	27%	67%	40%	33	49	0.81
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	0%	27%	73%	40%	36	49	0.87
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	5%	26%	70%	48%	30	43	0.83
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	4%	37%	59%	40%	29	49	0.78
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	0%	29%	71%	41%	34	48	0.85



Chuuk

		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes		Total Count	Valid Count	
SLOs	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	0%	16%	84%	17%	30	25	0.92
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	4%	96%	20%	30	24	0.98
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	10%	24%	67%	30%	30	21	0.79
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	0%	21%	79%	37%	30	19	0.89
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	14%	86%	30%	30	21	0.93
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	16%	11%	74%	37%	30	19	0.79
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	10%	24%	67%	30%	30	21	0.79
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	5%	40%	55%	33%	30	20	0.75
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	16%	32%	53%	37%	30	19	0.68
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	11%	53%	37%	37%	30	19	0.63
	SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	0%	32%	68%	27%	30	22	0.84



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	4%	25%	71%	20%	30	24	0.83
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	8%	38%	54%	20%	30	24	0.73
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	5%	45%	50%	27%	30	22	0.73
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	6%	47%	47%	43%	30	17	0.71
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	12%	47%	41%	43%	30	17	0.65
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	5%	26%	68%	37%	30	19	0.82
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	24%	38%	38%	30%	30	21	0.57
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	4%	44%	52%	17%	30	25	0.74
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	17%	39%	43%	23%	30	23	0.63
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	5%	36%	59%	27%	30	22	0.77
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	5%	37%	58%	37%	30	19	0.76
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	14%	27%	59%	27%	30	22	0.73
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	5%	33%	62%	30%	30	21	0.79



Fisheries and Maritime Institute

	Rubric Area	Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes	I do not know or Blank	Total Count	Valid Count	
SLOTS	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	9%	18%	73%	0%	11	11	0.82
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	9%	91%	0%	11	11	0.95
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	0%	50%	50%	27%	11	8	0.75
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	0%	44%	56%	18%	11	9	0.78
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	13%	88%	27%	11	8	0.94
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	0%	36%	64%	0%	11	11	0.82
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	0%	27%	73%	0%	11	11	0.86
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	9%	18%	73%	0%	11	11	0.82
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	10%	10%	80%	9%	11	10	0.85
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	0%	22%	78%	18%	11	9	0.89
	SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	0%	27%	73%	0%	11	11	0.86



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	0%	9%	91%	0%	11	11	0.95
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	0%	40%	60%	9%	11	10	0.80
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	0%	18%	82%	0%	11	11	0.91
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	0%	60%	40%	9%	11	10	0.70
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	9%	45%	45%	0%	11	11	0.68
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	10%	40%	50%	9%	11	10	0.70
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	18%	27%	55%	0%	11	11	0.68
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	0%	0%	100%	0%	11	11	1.00
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	0%	36%	64%	0%	11	11	0.82
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	0%	18%	82%	0%	11	11	0.91
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	0%	22%	78%	18%	11	9	0.89
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	0%	40%	60%	9%	11	10	0.80
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	9%	9%	82%	0%	11	11	0.86



Kosrae		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		Rubric Area	No	Sometimes		Yes	I do not know or Blank	
SLOs	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	0%	0%	100%	0%	12	12	1.00
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	0%	100%	8%	12	11	1.00
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	0%	40%	60%	17%	12	10	0.80
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	0%	25%	75%	33%	12	8	0.88
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	0%	100%	8%	12	11	1.00
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	0%	0%	100%	17%	12	10	1.00
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	0%	9%	91%	8%	12	11	0.95
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	0%	0%	100%	8%	12	11	1.00
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	0%	0%	100%	17%	12	10	1.00
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	0%	11%	89%	25%	12	9	0.94
	SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	0%	0%	100%	8%	12	11	1.00



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	0%	0%	100%	8%	12	11	1.00
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	0%	13%	88%	33%	12	8	0.94
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	0%	10%	90%	17%	12	10	0.95
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	0%	30%	70%	17%	12	10	0.85
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	0%	45%	55%	8%	12	11	0.77
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	0%	0%	100%	8%	12	11	1.00
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	0%	18%	82%	8%	12	11	0.91
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	0%	0%	100%	8%	12	11	1.00
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	0%	9%	91%	8%	12	11	0.95
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	0%	0%	100%	25%	12	9	1.00
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	0%	20%	80%	17%	12	10	0.90
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	0%	0%	100%	17%	12	10	1.00
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	0%	0%	100%	17%	12	10	1.00



National		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		Rubric Area	No	Some-times		Yes	I do not know or Blank	
SLOs	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	0%	22%	78%	29%	65	46	0.89
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	11%	89%	28%	65	47	0.95
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	2%	17%	81%	35%	65	42	0.89
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	0%	14%	86%	43%	65	37	0.93
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	10%	90%	35%	65	42	0.95
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	0%	9%	91%	34%	65	43	0.95
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	2%	30%	68%	28%	65	47	0.83
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	2%	16%	82%	31%	65	45	0.90
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	8%	8%	85%	40%	65	39	0.88
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	5%	33%	63%	38%	65	40	0.79
	SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	4%	36%	60%	28%	65	47	0.78



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	2%	28%	70%	28%	65	47	0.84
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	13%	46%	41%	29%	65	46	0.64
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	9%	36%	55%	32%	65	44	0.73
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	8%	48%	45%	38%	65	40	0.69
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	12%	44%	44%	34%	65	43	0.66
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	2%	20%	78%	31%	65	45	0.88
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	12%	42%	47%	34%	65	43	0.67
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	4%	29%	67%	25%	65	49	0.82
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	7%	42%	51%	31%	65	45	0.72
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	7%	37%	56%	37%	65	41	0.74
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	9%	30%	61%	32%	65	44	0.76
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	7%	46%	48%	29%	65	46	0.71
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	0%	36%	64%	28%	65	47	0.82



Pohnpei

		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes		Total Count	Valid Count	
SLOTS	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	0%	10%	90%	26%	39	29	0.95
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	0%	100%	26%	39	29	1.00
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	0%	8%	92%	33%	39	26	0.96
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	4%	13%	83%	41%	39	23	0.89
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	4%	96%	28%	39	28	0.98
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	0%	26%	74%	31%	39	27	0.87
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	3%	21%	76%	26%	39	29	0.86
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	0%	20%	80%	23%	39	30	0.90
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	0%	19%	81%	33%	39	26	0.90
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	10%	34%	55%	26%	39	29	0.72
	SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	10%	34%	55%	26%	39	29	0.72



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	7%	19%	74%	31%	39	27	0.83
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	23%	19%	58%	33%	39	26	0.67
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	11%	14%	75%	28%	39	28	0.82
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	15%	31%	54%	33%	39	26	0.69
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	12%	28%	60%	36%	39	25	0.74
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	4%	20%	76%	36%	39	25	0.86
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	7%	52%	41%	31%	39	27	0.67
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	4%	25%	71%	28%	39	28	0.84
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	7%	21%	72%	26%	39	29	0.83
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	4%	19%	78%	31%	39	27	0.87
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	11%	14%	75%	28%	39	28	0.82
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	4%	30%	67%	31%	39	27	0.81
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	4%	11%	86%	28%	39	28	0.91



Yap		Valid Percentage			Percentage of Total	# of Responses		score
		No	Some-times	Yes		Total Count	Valid Count	
SLOs	Rubric Area							
	SLOs: A1: There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.	0%	22%	78%	31%	14	18	0.89
	SLOs: A2: There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.	0%	12%	88%	35%	15	17	0.94
	SLOs: A3: There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.	0%	31%	69%	38%	11	16	0.84
	SLOs: A4: Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.	0%	29%	71%	46%	10	14	0.86
	SLOs: A5: The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.	0%	20%	80%	42%	12	15	0.90
	SLOs: D1: College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.	0%	24%	76%	35%	13	17	0.88
	SLOs: D2: College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.	0%	19%	81%	38%	13	16	0.91
	SLOs: D3: Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.	0%	12%	88%	35%	15	17	0.94
	SLOs: D4: Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.	0%	12%	88%	35%	15	17	0.94
	SLOs: D5: Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.	0%	17%	83%	54%	10	12	0.92
SLOs: D6: Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.	0%	22%	78%	31%	14	18	0.89	



SLOs: P1: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.	0%	22%	78%	31%	14	18	0.89
SLOs: P2: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps.	6%	35%	59%	35%	10	17	0.76
SLOs: P3: Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.	0%	19%	81%	38%	13	16	0.91
SLOs: P4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.	7%	29%	64%	46%	9	14	0.79
SLOs: P5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.	6%	39%	56%	31%	10	18	0.75
SLOs: P6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.	0%	20%	80%	42%	12	15	0.90
SLOs: P7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.	13%	31%	56%	38%	9	16	0.72
SLOs: C1: Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.	0%	26%	74%	27%	14	19	0.87
SLOs: C2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.	0%	29%	71%	35%	12	17	0.85
SLOs: C3: Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.	0%	26%	74%	27%	14	19	0.87
SLOs: C4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.	0%	29%	71%	35%	12	17	0.85
SLOs: C5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.	0%	24%	76%	35%	13	17	0.88
SLOs: C6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.	0%	29%	71%	35%	12	17	0.85



Appendix 4

Survey Comments



Employee Type	In the space below, please add any additional information, comments, or feedback you would like to share regarding program reviews, planning, and/or student learning outcomes.
Administrator	An glossary of applicable and appropriate terminologies that provide how the institution define these terms should be made available.
Administrator	I am not sure if the processes of assessment are established or not across all campuses. I am not sure if evaluation of results of assessments are analysed uniformly with the same analytical tool or not. We really need to be uniform in the methods used in assessment, and have an office to analyse the results and report back to the analyser so the information can be used for student, course and program improvement.
Administrator	Is the wiki the only place to find assessment activities and reports?
Administrator	It is hard to do this survey when you continue to delineate between program reviews and program assessment when dealing with academics and nonacademic areas. I do know that we have done program reviews and planning by department and division within the nonacademic areas of the college. We are also making linkages to SLO and ILO for the first time.
Administrator	There is definitely a need for workshop or training in assessment so that all units across all campuses have a better understanding of what student learning outcomes are and how they relate to units, divisions, departments responsibilities / objectives. I found this survey to be a bit difficult to understand many of the statements given. Thank you.
Faculty	All faculty members need to know about how program review is conducted. Workshop on this process should be conducted. Plans that are developed and approved need to be disseminated to all employees for awareness purposes. Student learning outcomes for all programs and services need to be clearer and attainable.
Faculty	Answers to many of the questions are not known to ordinery inatructors. There might be in-placed the tools/measures mentioned but I don't really have knowledge about them.



Faculty	As a faculty member, I find that too much focus is placed on developing multiple strategies to measure CLOs and SLOs. After analysis, if we cannot show that the students have done well on these rubrics, then the burden falls on the teacher. The students are not "assimilating" what was described in the syllabus (or at least not at an acceptable level).... And Bang!!!! OH, OH... The faculty is perceived as not doing her or his job conveniently and should consider adopting new teaching approaches hoping that this time around, a miracle method will be the solution in overcoming low grades and lack of interest. Shouldn't we start looking at the situation under a different angle? Shouldn't we ask ourselves what is the role of the students in this college wide process? After all, are they not at the College to learn and acquire new knowledge. If this is so, then, the question that arises is: how many of the students sitting in a given classroom are simply there to get their grant money? How many are truly captivated by knowledge and are attending classes to learn to "master" what is being taught? (Likely not many. They can easily be spotted and counted in a classroom setting.) Until students start taking their own responsibilities by studying what is presented to them, then there is not much we can do. There is no miracle cure. Acquired knowledge does not "fall" from the sky. There is no magic wand. The secret word is "work". In the case of a student work means "study". Unfortunately, a large number of our students simply do not have such drive. This has a major overall effect on the learning process -- it slows it down sometimes almost to a halt.
Faculty	Definitely need improvements on program assessment reporting
Faculty	efforts to engage faculty in this process should be more continuous, not just a once a year thing before the school year starts
Faculty	Feedback on the submitted course assessments should be provided so we as faculty will know if we did the right thing or not.
Faculty	good job
Faculty	I satisfy with all information provided in this survey.
Faculty	I think the College of Micronesia - FSM is doing a good job in meeting students' needs.
Faculty	I think the college should look carefully at who participated in the program reviews. Some folks never help in the process. Some individuals did the program review for two programs alone and that's a lot of time consuming. It will be fair for everyone who teach in a program to do this process together.
Faculty	I'm not quite familiar with program review thus work on one before.
Faculty	It would be helpful to see all of this survey data in a visible chart or table so that we can see what perceptions the college community has about learning outcomes and planning and whether we 'think' we are aware, proficient or sustainable. It would also be useful to see how employees view these--i.e. how do all faculty view these areas and is there consistency across college campuses and from top to bottom. Basically, it would be good to see the big picture as we are seeing small parts of the whole process.
Faculty	Lets keep up the on going program review, planning ans student learning outcome assessment.



Faculty	My "I do not know" answers indicate that I did not understand the wording of the answer. This survey confused me. Directions indicated that I should choose answers but I had not read a question. My negative responses for the most part come from what I see on my campus; specifically, the continual failure of the secretarial science program and the ACE program. the secretarial science certificate is full of students who do not want to be secretaries. Additionally, the program does not prepare them to be secretaries, because no one hires certificate level secretaries. New certificate students are invited to the college and then told that the only options for them are T&T, Ag, or SecSci/Bookkeeping. If they are not inclined to the first two then they choose the last. The large majority of ACE students fail so then are left in the same situation as the new certificate students. There is no demand for certificate sec sci graduates, no desire on the part of students for the program, and low successful completion rate, but we offer the program year after year. The rational for sec sci program that I hear from chairs and admin is, "What else are they going to take?" I see no evidence of data or assessment used to modify programs.
Faculty	Please encourage advocacy and transparency across the board. Emphasize open communication across the system. Let's live in an egalitarian society where everybody is treated equally and fairly. Thank you very much.
Faculty	Program Reviews and Assessment Reports should have feedback from the Institution.
Faculty	SLOs are vital to our college. We should meet regularly in our department to talk about what is and is not working concerning the SLOs so we can refine/amend/accentuate the SLOs. This is not happening, and until it does, delivery and assessment of SLOs is hampered.
Faculty	Some of the questions pertain to faculty only so the answer has to be No because they are asking for both Staff and faculty. Some questions wordings are such that the answer has to be No because some parts of the question do not apply. The survey should have been circulated to the community for feedback before implementation.
Faculty	The Chuuk Campus management is determined to support the improvement of the student learning outcomes.
Faculty	The program review process is too large and too complicated to be understood, improved, and implemented. It may make sense to a few administrators and faculty, who have created the process, but it does not make sense to the greater college community.
Faculty	The rubrics are good, yes, but they do not reflect authentic assessment at all. Yes, sometimes, no, IDK are false measurements to determine how much we do in the three general areas.
Faculty	The truth is for the most part, I don't quite understand the content of the survey. My main concern is that we do our course assessment every year, but nothing seems to come out of it. The course level assessment I do in my classes help me to be a better teacher, but I am unable to find put my finger on how "effective" the program is. Every year at the registration, we encountered the problems of not having enough needed classes or spaces for students. How do we "improve" our program when a freshman can't even find enough classes to take in order to be a full time students? Maybe this is in a different category than the content of the survey. I need someone to hold my hand or point out what our institution has done toward using the assessment to improve the effectiveness of the program. (From my limited view at the bottom of the "well", I don't seem to see much of "blue sky.")



Faculty	There a need for more workshops made in regard to program review or student learning outcome
Faculty	There are a number of questions where my answer is "I do not know" because they involve the whole institution and what I know is only about our campus.
Faculty	There is always room for improvement, what is important is we keep on doing our best to get the best result!
Faculty	This Institution has not improved it's student learning outcome by upgrading resources due to financial difficulties.
Faculty	Timely feedback on draft program evaluations, assessment plans, or even reports is highly needed to refine reviews, plans, and reports. Furthermore, there is still a need to refine/reclarify or maybe set in place some specific models or rubrics to improve data collection on some program review health indicators (e.g., seat cost, student satisfaction).
Faculty	We need all programs reviews to be consistent across the six sites and be updated regularly on COM's website.
Staff	continue the best work effort to our system!!
Staff	I know that it is difficult to get committee members having a meeting together personally atleast once.. because our issues here seems to be critical. I know that tele-conference cost less but how can eveyone face each other and discuss our problems. Sometimes only some are aware of it..while others are new and still wondering what's going on..well..it may sound silly but I am willing to take part as a team.
Staff	I would suggest routine of processing of documents be understood to the college community for improving services effectively and betterment of the college.
Staff	In what areas of COM-FSM are considered programs?
Staff	On Chuuk Campus, we are working on our ILO's, PLO's, and have our CLO's done, We are currently working on making our Assessments for our ILO's an PLO's.
Staff	The timeline for program review was very short last year and it's not clear to me how the results have been used in future planning and budgeting.
Staff	This is a very efficient and effective tool to measure the services daily to students utilizing our services and attending our programs. It also allows room for making recommendation and improvements.