

**COLLEGE OF MICRONESIA-FSM**  
Committee Minutes Reporting Form

<b>Committee</b>		<b>Recruitment, Admissions, and Retention</b>		
Date: 3/28/12	Time: 1 – 2 pm	Location: President's Conference Room		
		National Campus		
<b>Members</b>				
<b>Title/Representative</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
1. Chair – NTL F	Ketiner Kenneth		x	
2. Vice Chair – NTL S	Dr. Sven Muller	x		
2. Secretary – NTL F	A.D. Ulm	x		
4. NTL F	Leilani Biza	x		
5. CHK F	Deva Senarathgoda	x		
6. NTL F	Lucia Donre Sam	x		
7. NTL F	Yen-ti Verg-in		x	in hospital
8. NTL F	Marlene Mangonon	x		
9. NTL S	Karleen M. Samuel		x	
10. CHK F	Richardson Chiwi	x		
11. PNI F (TT)	Xavier Yarofmal	x		
12. PNI F (TT)	Alan Alosima	x		
13. FMI S	Santus Sarongelfeg	x		
14. YAP – S	Cecilia Dibay		x	
15. KOS S	Dokowe George	x		
16. NTL S	Tetaake Yee Ting	x		
17. NTL S	Warren Ching	x		
18. PNI S	Yoneko Kanichy		x	
19. PNI	Joyce Roby	x		
20. CHK F	Memoria Yesiki	x		
21. PNI	Francisco Simram		x	
22. PNI	Edwin Sione		x	
23. PNI	Marlou Gorospe	x		
24. FMI F	Benjamin James		x	in hospital
25. NTL S	Lore Nena	x		
NTL S	Joey Oducado		x	ex-officio member

**Major Agenda or Topic of Discussion**

1) Concerns over proctoring complaints at PICS

**Discussion of Agenda and Information Sharing**

After the COMET was administered at PICS this year, there were many complaints (we were told about 90+) from the PICS students that the proctoring was done in an incorrect way and because of this their testing experience was unfair. The major complaints are as follows:

1. No time was set aside for the students to fill out their personal information. They had to fill out their personal information during the time allotted for a scored portion of the test.
2. The vocabulary and reading comprehension sections were combined into one large section. This confused students as the directions on the exam state that they may not move on to the next test section until the time for the prior section has expired and the proctor gives instructions to start again.

After receiving these complaints, the proctors were questioned. They said that they *did not* combine the time needed for filling out personal information with a scored portion of the exam; however, *they did* combine two sections of the test into one. They did not feel that this was problematic because they gave the students clear verbal instructions not to stop between sections. (In other words, students were told not to follow the written directions on their exam booklets.) This concerned the RARC committee for a variety of reasons.

- 1) The COMET is a standardized test and the point of a standardized test is that every student's testing experience is as similar to the others as possible. If the test is to be standard, time frames and test formatting should be exactly the same from testing group to testing group.
- 2) When a proctor decides to combine two sections he/she now has to deviate from the standard printed instructions in the examiners manual and the instructions printed on the student's booklets. Certainly, a contradiction such as this could cause a great deal of confusion. It should also be noted that one proctor's opinion of what "very clear instructions" are on how to deviate from the standard may be *very* different from another's. The PICS cafeteria is big and it is often hard to understand what presenters are saying - even with the PA system in use. Is it not only fair that the instructions that students hear be consistent with the instructions they see on the exam?
- 3) When sections are combined, the test is no longer standard. The test is designed to see how well students can perform a certain skill set in a specified period of time. A student's ability to manage time effectively can be negatively affected when two test sections that test different subject matters and are formatted quite differently are combined into one. Combining two sections is also not fair to the students because it gives select students extra time to demonstrate a skill set within a test section. For instance, if a student is a vocabulary whiz and finishes that section very quickly, he/she now has extra time to devote to the reading section because he/she is allowed to move ahead in

the booklet before others. Students who need all of the time allotted for the vocab section do not get the luxury of extra time in the next section.

The RARC members agree that proctors need to read instructions exactly as printed out of the testing manual. Because, in a standardized testing setting, all students should have an experience that mirrors others' experiences as closely as possible. There is a reason test makers aim to eliminate deviations from procedure.

After discussing these concerns, the RARC members asked the following:

- 1) How much freedom do proctors have to alter basic testing procedures as done in this case?
- 2) If proctors are not authorized to change standard testing procedure, how do we ensure they never do so again?
- 3) Why would a proctor decide to combine to sections in the first place? Is there any benefit to doing so?
- 4) Is there anything that can be done for the students who were rushed through the exam at PICS?

One of the RARC members was a proctor for the exam in question. He told the committee that on the first day of testing at PICS, the Chief of Secondary education entered the testing location (the cafeteria) and told the proctors the test needed to be completed earlier than scheduled so the cafeteria could be used to serve lunch to other students. The proctors combined sections and shorted breaks in between sections in order to adhere to the Chief's request. Because this happened on the first day of testing, the proctors did the same on the following days to make the testing experience uniform for all the PICS students. This means all of the students who tested at PICS had an experience that was different of those taking the COMET at other sites.

The RARC committee then asked the proctor if incidents like this has ever happened before. He said, "yes." Apparently in past years freshman, sophomores and juniors have been allow to enter the cafeteria during testing time to get food. He said the noise and activity created by letting lunch service take place in the testing location before the test is complete is very distracting for the test takers.

Once the RARC committee realized that proctoring issues were not limited to this year but have happen year after year at PICS, we decided that it is imperative that some change be made so these issues are never again a problem.

The following motions was made and carried:

- 1) The RARC recommends that the COMET no longer be administered at PICS unless some change is made to avoid problems that cause the testing experience not to be standardized and, therefore, not valid.
- 2) We recommend that a thorough investigation of options of how to correct this

problem take place.

3) We recommend that that no COMET test should be administered at PICS until such a change is in effect.

Of the 16 members present, 15 voted to recommend a change in testing at PICS before the next exam and 1 abstained from voting.

Though the RARC has not yet made an official recommendation on how to solve the problems with holding the COMET at PICS (we need input from others before doing so), we came up with some ideas. We encourage everyone who is involved with administering the COMET at PICS help by considering the benefits and drawbacks of each idea and then recommending one. Recommending other options that may solve the problem to the RARC for review would also be greatly appreciated.

Below are some potential changes that could be made to correct the problem:

- 1) The testing location could be moved from PICS campus to PNI campus. Even if students cannot be bused to PIN, they could walk their after getting dropped off at PICS, as the distance between the two sites is not very far.
- 2) The COMET exam could be held at PICS over a weekend when it will not interfere with other school activities. (Transportation may be a problem here.)
- 3) Aside from the proctors, an additional COM staff or faculty member could be present for the test. This additional person would be there to ensure the test is carried out as planned. He/she would write a report of the testing process which would then be signed by him/herself and all the present proctors to serve as a “standard of proof.”
- 4) Someone is assigned to meet with the Chief of Secondary and explain to him that if the COMET is to take place at PICS, COM needs to be assured that the standard time for the test will be allowed and that lunch and other preventable distractions not take place in the cafeteria until the last section of the test is complete. Maybe he will be happy to comply. What happens if he says that this won't happen again but it does?

As a final note the RARC would like all who are involved to realize that the COMET is our test and we have a duty to administer it as properly as possible. The students taking the test are our customers. When our customers complain about their testing situation, such complaints need to be addressed and taken seriously. It is our job to serve our future students by making their testing experience a controlled one which is fair, uniform and free from outside distractions while being as convenient as possible. After all, for many of these students the COMET is the most important test of their lives.

**Comments/Upcoming Meeting, Date, Time, and Others**

Next meeting: Wed., April 11, 2012

**Handouts/Documents Referenced**

**College Web Site Link**

www.comfsm.fm

Prepared by:  
A.D. Ulm

Date Distributed: 4/9/12

**Approval of the Minutes and Responses**

<b>Title/Representative</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Aye</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
1. Chair – NTL F	Ketiner Kenneth				did not participate
2. Vice Chair – NTL S	Dr. Sven Muller	×			
3. Secretary – NTL F	A.D. Ulm	×			
4. NTL F	Leilani Biza	×			
5. CHK F	Deva Senarathgoda	×			
6. NTL F	Lucia Donre Sam				did not participate
7. NTL F	Yen-ti Verg-in			×	
8. NTL F	Marlene Mangonon				did not participate
9. NTL S	Karleen M. Samuel	×			
10. CHK F	Richardson Chiwi	×			
11. PNI F (TT)	Xavier Yarofmal	×			
12. PNI F (TT)	Alan Alosima	×			
13. FMI S	Santus Sarongelfeg	×			
14. YAP – S	Cecilia Dibay	×			
15. KOS S	Dokowe George	×			
16. NTL S	Tetaake Yee Ting				did not participate
17. NTL S	Warren Ching	×			
18. PNI S	Yoneko Kanichy				did not participate
19. PNI	Joyce Roby	×			
20. CHK F	Memoria Yesiki	×			
21. PNI	Francisco Simram				did not participate
22. PNI	Edwin Sione				did not participate

23. PNI	Marlou Gorospe				did not participate
24. FMI F	Benjamin James				did not participate
25. NTL S	Lore Nena				did not participate

Submitted by	<b>Amy Delyla Ulm</b>	Date	<b>4/13/12</b>
--------------	-----------------------	------	----------------

**Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timelines and Responsibilities**

1) The RARC recommends that the COMET no longer be administered at PICS unless some change is made to avoid problems that cause the testing experience not to be standardized and, therefore, not valid. (See the Discussion of Agenda and Information Sharing of this document for a detailed explanation of the problem.)

2) We recommend that a thorough investigation of options that will correct such problem take place.

3) We recommend that that no COMET test should be administered at PICS until such a change is in effect.

Though the RARC has not yet made an official recommendation on how to solve the problems with holding the COMET at PICS (we need input from others before doing so), we came up with some ideas. We encourage everyone who is involved with administering the COMET at PICS help considering the benefits and drawbacks of each idea and then recommending one. Recommending other options for solving the problem to the RARC for review would also be greatly appreciated.

(Our initial ideas on how to correct these problems are also listed above in the Discussion of Agenda and Information Sharing section.)

**Actions by the President**

Item	Approved	Disapproved	Disapproved with Conditions	Remarks
1				
2				
3				

