COLLEGE OF MICRONESIA-FSM / ACCREDITATION

REFLECTIONS ON CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Evidence priorities for the March 2027 ACCJC Midterm Report

4 **Reflection domains**	**2** **Peer-review recommendations**	**2024** **Standards framework**

THE CORE MESSAGE

The report must demonstrate a complete improvement cycle: what COM-FSM learned, what it changed, what resulted, and how results informed subsequent decisions.

FOUR EVIDENCE DOMAINS

A | Continuous improvement

Document successful outcomes, integrated planning and personnel-management improvements.

B | Student achievement

Verify institution-set standards, trends, achievement gaps and institutional responses.

C | Student learning

Show assessment trends, disaggregation, actions taken and how results will be monitored.

D | Looking ahead

Prepare for expanded access, evidence capacity, operational resilience and workforce relevance.

Evidence readiness checklist

Use this page to organise the evidence needed to support the reflections. The checklist identifies what should be verified before the report is finalised.

01	**Integrated planning** Trace a need through prioritisation, funding, implementation and review.
02	**Personnel management** Confirm approval and rollout dates, completion rates, participation, results and next steps.
03	**Student achievement** Reconcile figures to the ACCJC Annual Report and identify approval dates for revised benchmarks.
04	**Equity analysis** Provide 2–3 verified comparisons showing affected groups, size, persistence and interpretation of gaps.
05	**Learning outcomes** Separate participation/reporting completeness from actual learning attainment.
06	**Future review** Establish representative governance, responsibilities, timelines and evidence organisation under the 2024 Standards.

Evidence discipline: Confirm all reported values against the submitted ACCJC Annual Report. Clearly label provisional 2025–26 results, document approval dates for revised benchmarks, and avoid inserting figures that have not been verified.

Detailed reflection prompts

A. Reflections on Continuous Improvement since Last Comprehensive Review

1. Major improvements and innovations/successful outcomes for students, educational quality and mission fulfillment.

> Update the status of selected projects and add one verified example showing how a completed improvement addressed an instructional or student-service need.

2. Recommendations for improving institutional effectiveness in the Peer Review Report (2023).

Recommendation 1 — Strengthen integrated planning and resource allocation.

> Add one documented example tracing an identified need through prioritisation, funding, implementation, and review of results.

Recommendation 2 — Strengthen personnel evaluation and management.

These actions respond to concerns about evaluation timeliness and consistency. Their effectiveness should be assessed through implementation records, evaluation completion rates, and feedback from users.

> Confirm policy approval and system implementation dates. Add the proportion of evaluations completed on time, training participation, and any changes made after reviewing implementation. Locate the March 2023 personnel audit and add evidence of actions taken, results and next steps.

3. How are the actions described above helping your institution deepen its practices for continuous improvement and transformation in relation to the 2024 Accreditation Standards?

Detailed reflection prompts

B. Reflections on Institution-Set Standards and other Metrics of Student Achievement

1. Review the most recent ACCJC Annual Report and other meaningful metrics of student achievement. Has the institution met its floor standards? Exceeded its stretch goals? Describe any patterns or trends you see in performance against your institution-set standards and other metrics of student achievement.

> Confirm all values against the submitted Annual Report. Identify the approval dates and rationale for revised benchmarks, and label any provisional 2025–26 results.

2. When you disaggregate the data for the institution-set standards and other meaningful metrics of student achievement, what do you see related to achievement for all students (i.e., achievement gaps)? What patterns or trends excite you? What patterns or trends concern you?
3. Provide verified findings before submission. Include two or three meaningful comparisons that identify the groups affected, the size and persistence of the differences, and the institutional interpretation.
4. Use this structure without inserting unsupported figures:

> “Across [period], course completion for [group] was [rate], compared with [rate] for [comparison group]. The difference [increased/decreased/remained stable]. Review of [supporting evidence] informed [specific response].”

C. Reflections on Assessments of Student Learning

1. Review the results of learning outcomes assessment. Describe any patterns or trends related to attainment of learning outcomes observable in these data that may be relevant as you implement improvements and innovations in the design and delivery of academic programs?
2. How (i.e., for what subpopulations, modalities, etc.) does your institution disaggregate its assessment results? When you review disaggregated assessment results, what patterns or trends do you see related to attainment of learning outcomes for all students? What patterns or trends excite you? What patterns or trends concern you?
3. What actions has your institution taken/is your institution taking in response to the patterns and trends discussed above? How will you monitor the results of these actions in order to inform future improvements and innovations in support of successful outcomes for all students?

D. Looking Ahead to the Next Self-Evaluation and Comprehensive Review

Your institution will begin its next comprehensive self-evaluation in 1–2 years. What opportunities, changes, or other internal or external factors do you see on the horizon that are likely to affect the context of your self-evaluation and/or comprehensive peer review?

Expanded access and changing student pathways

Open Admissions, dual enrollment, flexible instructional formats, and stackable credentials may change the preparation, needs, and enrollment patterns of the student population. COM-FSM will need evidence showing whether advising, instruction, and academic support enable these students to persist, attain learning outcomes, and complete credentials. Results should be examined across entry pathways and instructional settings where reliable data permit.

Evidence quality and assessment capacity

Incomplete program assessment, limited achievement disaggregation, missing employment data, and the transcript-request transfer proxy constrain evaluation. Strengthening these areas will improve the next self-evaluation's credibility. Proposed changes to institution-set measures also require documented approval, clear definitions, and explanations of how trend comparisons will be maintained. Assessment participation and reporting completeness must remain distinct from learning attainment.

Resources and operational resilience

Facilities projects, water and power reliability, personnel-management systems, and risk-based internal audit will shape the conditions under which COM-FSM delivers instruction and services. Self-evaluation should distinguish completed improvements from proposals and projects underway, then examine their effects on service continuity, educational quality, and student needs. Staffing and professional-development capacity will influence implementation.

Workforce and community relevance

Employer, industry, and community engagement offer opportunities to review program relevance and strengthen evidence of workforce preparation. COM-FSM's academic, technical, land-grant, and extension responsibilities provide complementary avenues for demonstrating mission fulfillment, provided activities are supported by appropriate participation and outcome evidence.

Preparation for review

A representative steering committee should coordinate responsibilities, timelines, and evidence organization under the 2024 Accreditation Standards. Priority work should focus on complete assessment records, consistent measures, documented responses to achievement gaps, and evaluated planning and resource decisions.

> The central task: Demonstrate the full improvement cycle — what COM-FSM learned, what it changed, what resulted, and how those results informed subsequent decisions.