COM-FSM Chuuk Campus
Instruction Department
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT DAY MINUTES

Date: Thursday, 08/04/16	**Time**: 9:50am-2:55pm	**Location**: Comp Lab & MultiPurp Conf

Members Present			**Absent** (excused and non-excused)	
•Cecile Oliveros	•Genevy Samuel	•Alton Higashi	•Rick Chiwi	•Atkin Buliche
•Miuty Nokar	•Danie Mamangon	•Ben Bambo Sr.	•Lynn Sipenuk	•Kersweet Eria
• Herner Braiel	•Andita Meyshine		•Abraham Rayphand	•Edson Asito
Guests: Marylene Bisalen, Hattie Raisom, John Dungawin			•Roger Arnold	

Agenda / Major Topics of Discussion:	
I. Call to Order	* (1) TracDat
II. Attendance	(2) Faculty Evaluation Formatting
III. Minutes of Previous Meeting: None.	(3) Duties and Responsibilities
IV. FDD Schedule of Seminars*	(4) Spotting Our Strengths and Weaknesses
V. Miscellany	(5) Student Individual Development Plan for Chuuk
VI. Adjournment	

Discussion on Agenda / Major Topics of Discussion

I. **Call to Order**: By FDD coordinator Miuty, as assigned by Acting IC Atkin last week.

IV. **FDD Schedule of Seminars**:
   A. **TracDat Training**: By 9:00am, the Computer Lab was not set up, as scheduled, to receive the TracDat Version 5. With Sinbad's help, we began at 9:30, with only VOIP audio, and later video transmission. It was not Jimmy Hicks' presentation, but that of Richard Andrews, our new COM-FSM Dean of Assessment.
   1. We watched a tutorial video presentation entitled "TracDat Trainging – Chuuk: Navigating the Portfolio". It was intended to be an introduction and overview, but there was no opportunity for us to respond to what we were watching.
   2. **CONSENSUS**: *That the video be sent to Chuuk or, by next month, Dr. Andrews come to Chuuk and conduct the training in person.*
   3. The video offered a TracDat sample on criterion-based PLO/CLO by a Bailey Watson for a course on speech communication. Although some data were quantitative – as measured by percentages – the sample displayed primarily qualitative post-test data that measure group success, not individual student learning.
   4. A TracDat application for us at COM-FSM is program review (PR) – not program-learning assessment (PLA) nor course-level assessment (CLA). We question whether this application is of value for those not directly involved in PR and/or individual student learning.
   5. Sinbad explained that our use begins with the password "chkinstructor".
   B. **Faculty Evaluation Formatting** (9:55-11:15am): Alton presented three forms to evaluate staff – Appendix E (for classified/professional staff), Appendix F (for employees), and Appendix F (for faculty). He compared/contrasted the three in terms of "improvement in teaching and learning".
   1. Appendixes E/F, revised May 9, 2016, directs classified/professional staff and employees to be assessed on how well they improve teaching and learning by the use of assessment findings on SLOs. First, we question how non-faculty employees are expected to improve teaching and learning. They are not trained to be instructors and are not deemed qualified, by employment, to improving teaching/learning of SLOs. Second, by definition, these employees have no SLOs of their own, and their duties and responsibilities (or tasks) should therefore be transformed into administrative and student services SLOs.
   2. **CONSENSUS**: *That our Administration and Student Services departments be directed immediately to develop their own SLOs based upon their own duties and responsibilities.*

3. Appendix G uses a categorical rating system of "satisfactory" and "needs improvement". It needs to be revised, by using a Likert scale, to measure quantitatively how instructors perform their duties and responsibilities. Since the Management Council has already agreed to such revision, all faculty are advised that the "newly revised" purpose of Appendix G, without violating the intent and purpose of the appendix set by our Palikir administration, is two-fold:
   • to identify strengths and weaknesses of the individual instructor in performance of duty; <u>and</u>
   • to determine group (all faculty taken together) needs in training to capitalize on strengths and to self-improve.
4. **ENDORSEMENT**: *That the acting IC begin using the revised Appendix G during this Fall Semester 2016.*
5. Alton distributed a draft "administration accountability checklist" based on the WASC/ACCJC-format for measuring three criteria (program review, planning, and SLOs) with four criteria (1=awareness, 2=development, 3=proficiency, and 4=sustainability). Among 8 workshop participants (very small sample), the group mean scores were, as follows:
   • Program Review = 1.8 (high awareness): Participants are in need of training in developing applicable program review;
   • Planning = 2.1 (low development): Participants are in need of greater development; and
   • SLOs = 2.5 (average development): Participants are now developing SLOs.
6. **CONSENSUS**: *That, if we expect WASC/ACCJC to believe that COM-FSM is concerned about professional development in these three criteria and if Chuuk Campus seeks to demonstrate a commitment to the core value of professionalism, then all Chuuk Campus must be guided toward improving their efforts in all three criteria at proficient/sustainable levels.*
7. Finally, Alton "tricked" participants by testing them in their over-all knowledge of several documents: mission statement, vision statement, core values, IEMP, strategic plan, and ISLOs. Results were essentially a disaster – lack of fundamental knowledge (based on recall).
   • Mission Statement: Only one participant could remember, word for word, the entire mission statement. Three could not remember anything.
   • Vision Statement: No one could recall it at all.
   • Core Values: No one could recall all five; however, two remembered two values.
   • IEMP: No one knew the label "Integrated Educational Master Plan".
   • Strategic Plan: No one knew that there were 6 strategic directions and 9 strategic goals.
   • ISLOs: Surprise, surprise! No one knew all 8 institutional SLOs.
8. **CONSENSUS**: *That this lack of knowledge reflects the level not of participant knowledge but of administrative direction; and that our Chuuk Campus Dean, acting IC, and Management Council begin a campus-wide actionable plan for what these documents require before critiquing what employees do not know.*
C. **Faculty Duties and Responsibilities** (11:20am-12:05pm): Marylene led a discussion on Board Policy No. 6026 (Faculty Workload). The discussion was very lively and enlightening.
   1. For one thing, Marylene focused not only on direct classroom-related activities but also on non-classroom activities, such as participating in standing committee (including ad hoc), assessment activities and professional development, and other assignments (including service to campus and community).
   2. Also, in the case of "underload", participants acknowledged that the parameters of "equivalent alternative work assignment" are undefined. They should be operationally defined.
D. **Spotting Our Strengths and Weaknesses** (1:00-1:55pm): Genevy and Ben led the group in identifying our own strengths and weaknesses. This task was initiated with a great deal of humor and resulted in significant learning by faculty about themselves.
   1. Each participant was asked to identify on paper any one strength of a particular instructor and one weakness of the same or different participant. Then, we took turns reading what we had written. Several of us were identified, and discussion focused on how we can share strengths with each other (through the practice of collegiality) and how we can self-improve as well.

2. We did not have enough time to complete this seminar, but we spent a few minutes identifying how we can contribute our own ELL skills in faculty development. After all, each instructor has unique skills which other instructors may learn to self-improve their own teaching.

3. **CONSENSUS**: *That Herner Braiel will conduct a seminar at our next Faculty Development Day, probably on Friday, September 2.*

E. **Student Individual Development Plan for Chuuk** (1:55-2:40pm): Danie showed us on Microsoft Excel how he developed a holistic matrix to help any instructor advise all of his/her advisees at a glance during course selection and registration. The matrix lists all advisee names and identifies each and every course required for graduation.

1. Danie explained how an advisor can monitor all advisees on courses to be taken, and therefore can help them graduate faster. He uses a coding system to indicate which courses have already been taken, in progress, and still to be taken.

2. He added that he can easily share his matrix template with all of us.

3. **CONSENSUS**: *That Danie send by email the template to all of us.*

4. Further discussion indicated that it would help us, during registration, to see on the registration form COMET scores on ESL and MS. We used to do this a few years ago, but the practice was discontinued. We seek to reinstate the scores on registration forms.

5. **CONSENSUS**: *That the ESL/MS COMET scores be written on each student's registration form.*

V. **Miscellany**: We assessed our own FDD program and structure/organization.

A. **Conflict in the Schedule**: Thursday, August 4, was both Freshman Orientation and Faculty Workshop – on the same day. Under normal conditions, the faculty members are expected to participate in the orientation. However, it was impossible – due to the lack of coordinated planning on the part of key administrators, including the Management Council. This concern is less a conflict and more a mark of irresponsibility on the part of our Administration and Management Council. We request that this concern not be faced again in the future. In addition, the Faculty Workshop was scheduled to use the Multi-Purpose Conference Room, beginning 10:00am. We could not because the Freshman Orientation needed the same venue at the same time.

B. **Organization of the Faculty Workshop**: We were unable to begin at 9:00 because the Computer Lab was not yet set up to receive the TracDat training from Palikir. Sinbad did not have the logistical and technical support from our acting IC with the proper instruction on how to set up the lab equipment. We request that this concern not be faced again in the future.

C. **Lunch**: To be sure, we are grateful that lunch (no empty plates) was provided; however, there were 20 lunches for not more than 10 persons. This raises a concern about how poorly we manage our budget and overspend.

Next Meeting: To be announced [likely date = Friday, September 2, 2016 (12 noon to 1:00 pm)]

Hand-Outs / Documents Referenced / Attachments:
(2) Faculty Evaluation Formatting: (a) Over-All Discussion on our August 4 Faculty Workshop, (b) General Education (Gen/Ed) Requirements, (c) TracDat Training, (d) Forms to Evaluate Employees (with Appendixes E/F/G), (e) a revised Appendix G, (f) Administration Accountability, and (g) Various COM-FSM Guidance Documents (Parts 1/2)
(3) Duties and Responsibilities: Board Policy 6026 (reviewed 30 April 2015) – Faculty Workload
(5) SIDP matrix template

Prepared by: Alton Higashi | **Date distributed**: Monday, August 8, 2016

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

• Kind/Atkin: to ensure that Dr. Richard Andrews comes to Chuuk and provides TracDat training, with the proper video (including entitlement) – hopefully, by Friday, September 2.

• Kind and Management Council: to direct Administration and Student Services to begin developing SLOs for their own departments, inasmuch as they cannot improve teaching and learning for Instruction, no later than Fall 2016.

- Atkin: to begin using the revised Appendix G during Fall 2016.
- Kind: to direct all employees, as soon as possible, to move toward proficiency and sustainability in their commitment toward program review, planning, and SLOs at Chuuk Campus.
- Kind/Atkin/Management Council: to commit themselves, as soon as possible, to COM-FSM's mission/value statements, core values, implementation of IEMP and Strategic Plan, and focus on the 8 ISLOs.
- Kind/Atkin: to ensure that all faculty members are duly involved, as soon as possible, in performance of all of their duties and responsibilities, as identified in Board Policy No. 6026.
- Marylene: to check with Human Resources Committee, at its next meeting, on the definition of parameters for "equivalent alternative work assignment".
- Ben/Herner/Atkin: to ensure that Herner will indeed sponsor a seminar at our next FDD, hopefully on Friday, September 2.
- Danie: to send the matrix template to each faculty member as soon as possible.
- Kind/Atkin: to inform all appropriate persons (including Tandy) to enter each student's ESL/MS COMET score onto the registration form so that we may better advise our advisees on course selection before pre-registration and registration for Spring 2016.
- Kind and Management Council: to coordinate and plan campus activities to avoid conflict in schedule, such as Freshman Orientation and Faculty Workshop, on a routine basis.
- Atkin: to ensure that any training, such as our TracDat training, from Palikir be given prior logistical and technical support as soon as possible.