College of Micronesia – FSM
Committee Minutes Reporting Form

Committee or Working Group	*Curriculum Committee*			
Date:	**Time:**		**Location:**	
January 23, 2012	1:00 p.m.		BOR Conference Room	

Members Present				
Titles/Reps		**Name**	**Present**	**Absent**
Committee Chair		Kathy Hayes	X	
Committee Vice-Chair		Taylor Elidok		X
Secretary		Resida Keller	X	
National Faculty Rep.		Snyther Biza	X	
National Faculty Rep.		Mike Dema	X	
National Faculty Rep.		Paul Dacanay	X	
National Faculty Rep.		Delihna Ehmes	X	
National Faculty Rep.		Faustino Yarofaisug	X	
National Faculty Rep.		Susan Moses	X	
National Faculty Rep.		Madalena Hallers	X	
National Faculty Rep.		Joseph Felix Jr	X	
Cooperative Research Extension (CRE) Rep.		Jackson Phillip		X
Chuuk Campus Faculty Rep.		Alton Higashi		X
Kosrae Campus Faculty Rep.		Nena Mike	X	
National Campus staff Rep (IRPO)		Raleigh Welly		X
National Campus staff Rep		Lore Nena	X	
Pohnpei Campus Faculty Rep.		Gardner Edgar	X	
Pohnpei Campus Faculty Rep		Debra Perman	X	
Pohnpei Campus Faculty Rep		Shirley Jano	X	
Pohnpei Campus Staff Rep		Maria Dison	X	
FMI Campus Faculty Rep.		Kasiano Paul	X	
FMI Campus Faculty Rep.		Alex Raiuklur	X	
Yap Campus Faculty Rep.		Joy Guarin	X	
Kosrae Campus Faculty		Rosalinda Bueno	X	
Chuuk Campus Faculty Rep		Lynn Sipenuk	X	

Additional Attendees:	Marian Medalla for Joseph Felix Jr. (Business division), Karen Simion, DAP

Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:

I. New Business
1. Program Review Checklist presented by Karen
2. Program review process and deadlines
3. Approval of Nov, 28th,Dec. 13th minutes and January 9th minutes (if time permits)
4. Next meeting: February 6, 2012

Discussion of Agenda/Information Sharing:

1.) Karen presented to the CAC a checklist that could be used to evaluate the program reviews that had been submitted. She explained the process, indicating that the checklist basically came from Appendix T from the curriculum handbook and was modified into a checklist for the CAC. The checklist is to help the CAC look at trends and make recommendations on suggestions for improvement of all programs.

- Discussion: Kasiano inquired about section H, asking where data on seat cost, transfer data and employment data was to come from. Karen explained that

there has never been consensus on how to calculate seat cost and Gardner mentioned that there needs to be some mechanism put into place to help track our graduates—perhaps an office dedicated to just this type of data collection. Resida mentioned that perhaps all divisions share their way of calculating seat cost to Kathy and the CAC as a way of informing others; Marian shared how the third-year certificate in business program calculated their seat cost. Joy asked if it was possible to know the source of the data and it was shared that for now, most of the data was from IRPO. Karen mentioned that after this cycle, the data for program review should align with prioritization data; the general consensus was that the data that is put out for the public or for program reviews should be presented in the way that the CAC or the program review writers requests it so that it will make the process easier; and IRPO data should be more accessible.

- Maria asked if the checklist can be reviewed and voted on first before further discussion is carried out since the checklist is familiar to most members. Shirley moved that the CAC adopt the checklist that was provided by Karen to use as a working tool for evaluating the program reviews. Gardner seconded the motion, and a vote was held. Votes from all present were unanimous in approving the checklist.

Discussion: Kasiano asked if there was a need for the "NI" (need improvement) section of the checklist—It was agreed that the NI section will allow for specific comments for the writers and other reviewers so that section remained on the checklist. Marian asked if the readers were responsible to check for the accuracy of the data and Gardner requested that he be assigned his own programs' (vocational programs at PNI campus) reviews to work with.

2.) The process for reviewing the program reviews was presented by Kathy and deadlines for all the tasks to be completed shared: deadline is Feb. 13th, Kathy shared what was available in the TORs about quorum and it was stated that twenty-five percent of the membership must be present for any action to be performed in the meetings and votes will be approved upon agreement by a majority of those present. No comments or discussion for changing the TORs so what we have in the TORs will stay the same.
3.) Approval of Nov. 28, Dec.13 and Jan. 9 minutes: Approval of Minutes were deferred to the next meeting or may be voted on electronically.
4.) Next regular meeting: Feb. 6th ; 1pm; BOR

Handouts/Documents Referenced:			
1. Program review checklist 2. Process of reviewing the Program reviews and deadlines			
College Web Site Link:			
Prepared by:	*Resida S. Keller*	**Date Distributed:**	*1/30/12*
Approval of Minutes Process & Responses: Minutes distributed for comments 1/30/12			
Submitted by:	*Resida S. Keller*	**Date Submitted:**	
Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timeline & Responsibilities			
1.) Shirley moved that the CAC adopt the checklist that was provided by Karen to use as a working tool for evaluating the program reviews. Gardner			

seconded the motion. Votes from all present were unanimous in approving the checklist; motion carried.

2.) No vote on minutes

3.) Next meeting: Feb. 6, 2012; 1pm BOR conference room