College of Micronesia FSM

Committee Minutes Reporting Form	n	I	
Committee or Working Group		Council of Chairs	
Date	Time	Location Board Conference Room	
Friday, October 25, 2013	13:00		
Members Present			
Titles/Reps	Name	Present	Absent
COC Vice Chair/Curriculum & Assessment	Gardner Edgar	X	
Human Resources	Morehna Rettin-Santos (Alfred Olter representing)	x	
COC Chair/Finance	Richard Womack	X	
Planning and Resources	William Haglegam		X
Recruitment, Admission and Registration	Lucia Donre - Sam	X	
Information Communication and Technology	Shaun Suliol	X	
COC Secretary/Facilities & Campus Environment	Dana Lee Ling	X	
Faculty and Staff Senate Vice Chair/Faculty representative	Ringlen Ringlen	X	
Faculty and Staff Senate Vice Chair/Staff representative	Ross Perkins	X	
Additional Attendees			
Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion	•		
1. Approval of minutes			

- 1. Approval of minutes
- 2. Budget presentation by Vice President for Adminstration
- 3. Communication
- 4. Secretariat recommendations

Discussion of Agenda/Information Sharing:

At 13:05 with a quorum present, Chair call the meeting to order.

1. Member Ringlen noted that his absence had been due to not having been informed of the meeting. With that note, the minutes of 25 October 2013 were moved, seconded, and approved unanimously.

2. Budget. The VPA was out ill. The chair asked what the committees were doing in regards the budget. The chair noted that in our committees we wear the hat of committee chair, in the council of chairs we wear the hat of a member. The budget matter is of a serious magnitude. Chair noted that he had, as Finance Committee chair, specific questions for the VPA. Chair asked the council of chairs as to where the budget discussions fit into each committee's discussions.

A member asked the chair what the role would be and what is the council of chairs being specifically asked to do?

The chair asked whether the committees might have suggestions, recommendations. Chair also asked whether the human resources committee should look at the layoff policy language. If there are going to be layoffs, is the language in the policy satisfactory? The chair then spoke about the development of the professor emeritus policy and asked how matters are moved by the human resources committee.

The HR committee representative said that the committee tackles issues from wherever they come into the committee.

The faculty representative of the Faculty Staff Senate asked about faculty performance evaluations. The facilities chair asked if the faculty evaluation system existed. The representative said, no, the system does not yet exist. He noted that the system would likely be similar to that used by Guam Community College. A variant of the GCC system was apparently submitted to the HR committee by the HR office. The faculty representative asked the HR committee to follow-up on this matter.

The curriculum and assessment chair noted that CAC understands the budget issues and views the matter as an executive decision.

The facilities chair indicated that at this time the budget issue is not a matter before his committee. He reported that the committee had recommended the single largest fee in the history of the college, a fee that would increase over the coming academic years. The fee was now in place. The fee was a form of cost recovery. The chair noted that the information and communications side of the college also had a dedicated cost recovery fee that was increased a few terms ago.

The council chair asked if these fees covered all costs in those areas. [For facilities, at present, no, the current fee does not cover all costs].

The facilities chair asked that the matter of recruitment and retention of qualified faculty not be forgotten in the midst of the budget shortfall. The chair noted that the faculty were still on a 1995 salary schedule, and inflation has eroded the earning power of those salaries. He mentioned that increasing course completion and student retention meant having a salary schedule that would attract not just qualified faculty but faculty with the skill sets that lead to improved student completion and retention rate. He noted that this was a sensitive area. He also reminded the committee that the consult admitted to having mistakenly calculated that the faculty was on the fifth percentile when the faculty were actually on the twentieth percentile. Thus when the schedules were "lifted" to the twentieth percentile, the result was neither an increase start pay nor track life.

The council chair commented that faculty and staff retention were not addressed in the budget plan. He noted that although the college does not have the money at this time to address the salary issue, the matter should not be dropped.

The committee then entered closed session for private discussions.

The committee exited closed session.

A member asked how the percentages were obtained/decided upon that allocated the \$700,000. [After handling fixed budget items, about 700,000 is available to handle 1.2 million in remaining budget items. A process involving parceling out portions of that 700,000 to areas on a percentage basis apparently occurred.]

The question arose as to whether the college was also exploring ways to expand the income side of the equation, and not just focus solely on cutting costs.

The council chair noted that repercussions of the enrollment impact was the only that had been discussed. There had been a call for better recruitment and retention, but the calls were short on specifics.

The recruitment, admissions, and retention chair spoke about the enrollment management

recruitment and retention plan. Members had been divided into two subgroups, recruitment and retention. The acting vice president for student services and affairs had given a presentation on the retention problems. The retention plan is in need of updating. A new plan will be developed, new mitigation efforts.

The facilities chair then apologized for saying the same thing since 2003, and again asked the RAR committee to explore a more open admissions policy for students from academic sections at high schools with a known track record of academic quality. The facilities chair noted that as an instructor, he had more confidence in any A1 or A2 section PICS, NHMS, or MHS student than in a specific score on a single test taken during a single morning. He noted that the academic section students and those from schools such as Xavier, CCA, OLMHS, and PSDA, were students who knew how to study and to succeed academically. The entrance test is, for them, a less reliable predictor of future performance, retention, and graduation from college. He suggested that while they could sit the test, those students would be admitted and placed based on their transcripts.

The council chair said that this is what he wanted to know – how does something like the above suggestion get put into a committee? The facilties chair said that he just did send that to the RAR committee via the RAR chair in this meeting.

The CAC chair noted that CAC would be addressing the matter of a framework for short term noncredit training. What currently exists to support that is not clear at present. The college wants to encourage this. The council chair noted that this effort could also provide continuing education for teachers.

3. [While three was not specifically separately addressed, the issue of inter-committee communication and information flow was indirectly addressed above.]

4. Secretariat recommendations. The Assessment Coordinator and Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officer and committees secretariat representative noted that a key aspect of the recommendations was to try to create continuity by having the vice chair serve with the understanding that the vice chair would serve as the chair the following year.

In the discussion that followed two chairs noted their committee's disagreement with the single year term limit for a committee chair. Others members of the council concurred. The council chair noted that if a committee wanted to turn over the chairmanship annually, then that would be up to the committee through the electoral process in place. The council chair noted that during this time of budget issues some committees might not want to change leadership. The metaphor that was not mentioned was changing horses midstream.

The council discussed a May election for committee officers, a summer transition to new leadership, and the change of officers at the end of training in August. There was a general consensus that the new chair should step up at the end of the August training session. Elections in May would choose a chair-elect. During the summer the outgoing chair would continue to serve as chair and ensure the continuity of committee work in the summer, the chair-elect would during the summer also attend the council of chairs to help provide continuity in the council. Thus the summer council of chair meetings would include both the outgoing chair and the chair-elect. There were no specific recommendations as to how to handle a faculty chair who was not contractually obligated to be present on Pohnpei during the summer. The suggestion was that a faculty chair who is present on Pohnpei should continue to helm their committee in the summer even if that chair is not teaching summer session.

The committee made a formal recommendation for committee terms of reference to be altered to

reflect May elections of a chair-elect, the dual attendance in summer, and the installment of new officers in August at the end of the training session.						
The committee adjourned at 14:07.						
Handouts/Documents Referenced:						
•						
College Web Site Link:	http://wiki.comfsm.fm/C	Committee_Minutes/C	ouncil_of_Chairs			
Prepared by:	Dana Lee Ling	Date Distributed:	12 October 2013			
Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:						
Submitted by:		Date Submitted:				
Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timeline & Responsibilities						