

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

<b>Committee</b>		<b>Recruitment, Admissions, and Retention</b>		
Date: 3/14/12		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		
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	
25. NTL S	Lore Nena	x		
NTL S	Joey Oducado	x		ex-officio member

### Major Agenda or Topic of Discussion

1) Joey Oducado will present data for the RARC to use for consideration when deciding whether or not to recommend the proposed COMET criteria which were recommended by the CAC.

### Discussion of Agenda and Information Sharing

1) Joey followed the fall 2010 1<sup>st</sup> time freshman ACE cohort to compile the data presented. The population of these students numbered 181 and the sample that was followed numbered 122. The number of 122 represents the 1<sup>st</sup>-time-freshman only.

Joey followed this cohort through the ACE program keeping track of all their grades, majors, withdrawals, second attempts at classes, etc.

#### Fall 2010 semester

-Of the 122 students who registered ESL 091A, 91 (or **75%**) failed with only 29 (or **24%**) advancing to ESL 092A. 2 students withdrew the courses.

-Of the 90 students who repeated ACE I English (ESL 091B), 55 (or **61%**) failed with only 35 (or **39%**) advancing to ESL 092A.

-Of the 74 students who registered MS 091A, 46 (or **62%**) failed with only 26 (or **35%**) advancing to MS 092A

#### End-of Spring 2011 semester

-Two students appeared to have registered ESL 091A. One eventually withdrew while the other passed. One of these students may have re-taking the COMET during November 2010. Concurrently, these two students are in the CA programs.

-Of the 19 students who registered ESL 092A, only 5 (or 26%) passed while 12 (or 63%) failed and had to repeat ACE English II (ESL 092B).

-Additionally, of the 7 students who registered ESL 092B (repeat) – 5 (or 51%) passed and 2 (or 29%) failed.

-22 students registered EN 110. 10 of these students (or 45%) passed EN 110 and 8 (or 36%) failed. However, of the 10 students who passed EN 110, 6 (60% of pass count A-D) received D grades.

-12 students registered EN 120A after completing the ACE I and II prescribed courses. Of these 12 students, 8 (or 67%) passed and 2 (or 17%) failed. However, of the 8 students, 5 (or 63% of pass count A-D) received D grades; as such, they were required to repeat EN 120A.

After carefully considering this and additional data, Joey stated that it is clear that the college is accepting too many applicants at levels where they are not equipped to succeed academically.

The impact of raising COMET criteria, as presented by Karen Simion in a prior meeting, was also considered.

### Impact of Raising Entrance Criteria

**Revenue:**

860 students invited vs. 1,352

If 50% of invited students attend, then revenue =  $430 \times \$105 \times 12 \text{ credits} = \$541,800$ .

If 60% of invited students attend, then revenue =  $516 \times \$105 \times 12 \text{ credits} = \$650,160$ .

If 70% of invited students attend, then revenue =  $602 \times \$105 \times 12 \text{ credits} = \$758,520$

Fall 2011 new students 975 (roughly 70%), revenue =  $975 \times \$105 \times 12 \text{ credits} = \$1,228,500$ .

Difference at 70% attendance = (\$469,980)

**Faculty:**

Less overload for full-time faculty

Reduce need for adjunct faculty

\*College will need to address the issue of building stronger bridging programs to help better prepare students for college.

**• Alert high schools of the change.**

• Align curriculum

• Hold workshops on teaching strategies

• Certify two COM-FSM faculty to become TESOL trainers/ TESOL certify elementary and high school teachers

**• Request fund balance to design and implement immediate intervention strategies before Spring COMET**

The committee discussed the impact to prospective students and some were concerned about the higher number of non-admit students the proposed criteria would create. Some are worried because they believe that, as a community college, COM is responsible for serving all members of the community who want a college education.

Others brought up the point that higher education is a privilege and not a right – it presupposes certain academic ability and work ethic. Additionally, the ethics of accepting students into programs that they are not realistically equipped to complete was discussed. Various faculty members spoke of having student after student who cannot (or will not) do the work involved to show proficiency in the SLOs that their courses require. Many students appear to be “fed through a system” where they cannot actually complete the required work to rise to the next level. Yet, in some cases, they are passed into higher level courses regardless. They either graduate with an incomplete mastery of their major or at some point run into a faculty member that refuses to give them a passing grade if they cannot honestly demonstrate SLO proficiency. So, for a period of time, starting from when they “pass” the COMET to whenever it is made clear to them that they cannot honestly pass their classes, a large number of students are given the false impression that they have the tools and work ethic required to succeed at this college when, in fact, they do not.

The RARC is also worried about the financial impact that the proposed criteria would have. Certainly, the school will bring in less money if the criteria pass. Although, if we continue to accept so many students who are not able to be successful, due to accreditation standards, there may not be a college in the future. As a student-centered institution, we have a duty to be honest with the students we accept.

After much consideration, the RARC makes the following recommendation:

1) The RARC recommends the below proposed COMET scores to be used as the new admissions criteria for COM beginning spring, 2013. (The current criteria are also provided for reference.) This recommendation stands only if it is approved of by the finance committee before being passed to the President for action.

(Of the fifteen members present at the meeting, nine voted “aye” to recommend the criteria. The remainder abstained and asked for three working days to consider. After three working days none of the present members changed their votes from “abstain.” All documents referenced were also forwarded to absent members. Absent members were also given three working days to vote. All absent members forfeited their right to vote by not participating within the three working day time frame with the exception of one who voted “nay.” Therefore, the recommendation passes with a majority vote of nine to one.)

### **Proposed and Recommended Criteria**

#### **Degree Bound**

essay 40-50  
Reading comp 10<sup>th</sup> grade and up  
MS 99 placement  
EN 120A/110 placement

#### **ACE Bound**

essay 35-39  
Reading comp 8<sup>th</sup> – 9.9  
MS 96 placement

#### **Certificate Bound**

essay 28-34  
Reading comp 6-7.9  
MS 96 placement

#### **Non – Admit**

essay – below 28  
Reading comp below 6<sup>th</sup> grade  
math placement below MS 96

### **Current Criteria**

#### **Degree Bound**

Essay 34-50  
Reading Comprehension Grade Equivalency 9th grade up

#### **ACE Bound**

Essay 28-33  
Reading Comprehension GE 7th to 8th grade

#### **Certificate Bound**

Essay 20-27  
Reading Comprehension GE 5th to 6th grade

#### **Non-Admit**

Essay below 20  
Reading Comprehension GE below 5th grade

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

Next meeting: March 28<sup>th</sup> at 1:00pm

**Handouts/Documents Referenced**

- RAR-ON COMET PDF
- Wksheet #3 ACE-DAP PDF
- Impact of raising entrance criteria – DAP PDF
- ACE #1 DAP PDF

All of the above were presented by Joey Oducado.

**College Web Site Link**

www.comfsm.fm

Prepared by:  
A.D. Ulm

Date Distributed:

**Approval of the Minutes and Responses**

Title/Representative	Name	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Remarks
1. Chair – NTL F	Ketiner Kenneth	×			
2. Vice Chair – NTL S	Dr. Sven Muller	×			
3. Secretary – NTL F	A.D. Ulm	×			
4. NTL F	Leilani Biza				did not participate
5. CHK F	Deva Senarathgoda	×			
6. NTL F	Lucia Donre Sam	×			
7.NTL F	Yen-ti Verg-in				off island for medical emergency
8. NTL F	Marlene Mangonon	×			
9. NTL S	Karleen M. Samuel	×			
10. CHK F	Richardson Chiwi				did not participate
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				did not participate

21. PNI	Francisco Simram	×			
22. PNI	Edwin Sione				did not participate
23. PNI	Marlou Gorospe	×			
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>3/28/12</b>
--------------	-----------------------	------	----------------

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

1) The RARC recommends the below proposed COMET scores to be used as the new admissions criteria for COM beginning spring, 2013. (The current criteria are also provided for reference.) This recommendation stands only if it is approved of by the finance committee before being passed to the President for action.

**Proposed and Recommended Criteria**

**Degree Bound**

essay 40-50  
 Reading comp 10<sup>th</sup> grade and up  
 MS 99 placement  
 EN 120A/110 placement

**ACE Bound**

essay 35-39  
 Reading comp 8<sup>th</sup> – 9.9  
 MS 96 placement

**Certificate Bound**

essay 28-34  
 Reading comp 6-7.9  
 MS 96 placement

**Non – Admit**

essay – below 28  
 Reading comp below 6<sup>th</sup> grade  
 math placement below MS 96

**Current Criteria**

**Degree Bound**

Essay 34-50  
 Reading Comprehension Grade Equivalency 9th grade up

**ACE Bound**

Essay 28-33  
Reading Comprehension GE 7th to 8th grade

**Certificate Bound**

Essay 20-27  
Reading Comprehension GE 5th to 6th grade

**Non-Admit**

Essay below 20  
Reading Comprehension GE below 5th grade

**Actions by the President**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Approved</b>	<b>Disapproved</b>	<b>Disapproved with Conditions</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<b>1</b>				
<b>2</b>				
<b>3</b>				