

College of Micronesia FSM

Committee Minutes Reporting Form			
Committee or Working Group		<i>Council of Chairs</i>	
Date	Time	Location	
Friday, April 11, 2014	13:00	Board Conference Room	
Members Present			
Titles/Reps	Name	Present	Absent
COC Vice Chair/Curriculum & Assessment	Gardner Edgar	P	
Human Resources	Morehna Rettin-Santos		At program priority review committee meeting.
COC Chair/Finance	Richard Womack	P	
Planning and Resources	William Haglelgam represented by Arman Mariano	P	
Recruitment, Admission and Registration	Lucia Donre - Sam		At PTK meeting
Information Communication and Technology	Shaun Suliol	P	
COC Secretary/Facilities & Campus Environment	Dana Lee Ling	P	
Faculty and Staff Senate Vice Chair/Faculty representative	Ringlen Ringlen		At PTK meeting
Additional Attendees			
Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:			
<p>Approval of minutes Committee updates What has the Council of Chairs done? What has the council not done and why? What improvements can be made so we are more effective?</p>			
Discussion of Agenda/Information Sharing:			
<p>13:14 quorum for discussion obtained. TOR does not note a separate quorum for voting. Chair declares that in the absence of specific language, a voting quorum is a discussion quorum. Chair discussed attendance and committee effectiveness. Chair CAC joins the meeting. Chair continued with a description of the need for members to have "content area" training. Finance committee members would benefit from a training by the comptroller at academic year</p>			

start. A number of members were unfamiliar with budgeting.

Chair expressed concern over minutes getting posted, perceived intervention into committee deliberations. He references concern he expressed in an email on deliberations in a particular committee.

He noted a matter that disturbed him and he was further concerned that the minutes did not reflect whether the matter was discussed. The minutes only mention that a matter was introduced ostensibly from another committee. The minutes are then silent on whether the matter was discussed and, if discussion did occur, what was that discussion. For participatory governance to work, discussion must be documented in the minutes.

Coupled with this was the concern that the particular item that concerned the chair was not mentioned in the committee minutes of the committee that was alleged to the source. The chair noted that the source was actually not the alleged source.

The secretary must be able to capture both the recommendations made in a committee and the discussion that led to that decision. Capturing the discussion provides context.

The chair then asked what the council of chairs thinks that it has accomplished. The chair also expressed the opinion that when the college chose to put the program priority review committee, of which he is also a member, at the same time as the council of chairs, the college sends the message that participatory governance is not a priority. Note that CoC meetings are scheduled on the wiki at http://wiki.comfsm.fm/Committee_Minutes/Council_of_Chairs through December 2014. This schedule is also known to the college in the college calendars.

Discussion of the role of the council. Looking at a specific example, program review. CAC looked at program review. Chair noted he was chosen to be on the committee, the one that is meeting in another room at the same time as the council of chairs.

PRC representative notes that meetings are proceeding on a monthly basis. PRC sent out recommendations but did not get any feedback on those recommendations. The committee makes recommendations, but thus far no feedback on those recommendations. Recommendations get sent "up", but nothing comes back "down." Chair CoC asked whether matters ought to also be sent up through CoC.

Chair noted the need for better inter-committee communication.

FCE chair notes the effectiveness of action memorandums, a recommendation of the director of facilities. The recommendation is sent out as an action memo to the administrator who needs to know that recommendation was made, along with the regular reporting path for the committee. FCE chair recommends the use of action memos in addition to

ICT also notes ensuring communication gets to those who are in the position to make the decision.

Discussion turned to low summer registration numbers. Some members noted that the students

have not been communicated with on the summer options. No communication on what financial aid options might exist, no effort to encourage students to take summer classes. No marketing of the college's summer session. Discussion then of whether the college supports marketing. Some members reported leadership noting the need for better marketing of the college, other member reported leadership saying the college is not a private business and will not have a marketing division.

The chairs returned to the topic of what it is the role of CoC.

Chair reintroduced the topic of having a student services committee.

A member moved for the resurrection of student services committee. Another member recommended not calling the committee the student services committee. Student services cannot adequately be addressed by parceling out that functionality to existing committees. Student services is a sufficiently important area as to warrant a committee. The assertion was made that the students are being under-served. The VPSSA is the only vice president that does not have a committee that reports up through them. While the VPSSA position could be eliminated in a "re-engineering" process, that process remains a hypothetical construct. There are pending policy development matters that would logically belong to a students services or student life committee such as the student conduct code. No second was obtained pending development of a list of specific tasks for that committee.

The chair also wanted to see a recommendation that service as an advisor to a registered student organization counts as participatory governance committee service. The chair noted that being an advisor to a student organization is participating in the governance of the college. This participation is as useful, if not more useful, than being on a participatory governance committee. The undertone here is that the participatory governance committees are effectively talking shops.

The committee moved, seconded, and unanimously endorsed a recommendation that service as an advisor to a registered student organization be counted as participatory governance committee service.

The finance committee wanted training by both the comptroller and VPA. Not just the officers, the whole committee. More broadly, all committees should have August training in the area of the committee. HRC members should receive training from HR, PRC members should receive training from IRPO, ICT members should be trained by IT, FCE members should be trained (briefed?) by the director of facilities and the chief of security, RAR committee members would be trained by OAR.

The chair also asked where the college is at in terms of learning communities – were they developed? The chair clarifies, the college was going to become a learning community. Where is the college in that effort?

There was also a broad concern that while the committees have done some good work, ultimately there is not participatory governance.

Documents Referenced

- http://wiki.comfsm.fm/@api/deki/files/2592/=00_coc_2012_03_16_terms_of_reference.pdf

College Web Site Link:http://wiki.comfsm.fm/Committee_Minutes/Council_of_Chairs**Prepared by:**

Dana Lee Ling

Date Distributed:

04/11/14

Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:**Submitted by:**

Dana Lee Ling

Date Submitted:

04/11/14

Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timeline & Responsibilities

Next meeting: 25 April 2014