

**College of Micronesia – FSM**

**Committee Minutes Reporting Form**

<b>Committee or Working Group</b>		<i>Curriculum Committee</i>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Time:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	
October 17, 2011	1:00 p.m.	BOR Conference Room	
<b>Members Present</b>			
<b>Titles/Reps</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
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.	Mariana Ben Dereas	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 (via Email)	
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 Student Rep	Henry Benjamin		X
Kosrae Campus Faculty	Rosalinda Bueno		X
<b>Additional Attendees:</b>	Grilly Jack, Acting VPIA		
<b>Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:</b>			
<p><b>I. New Business</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review of “Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services at the College of Micronesia-FSM” document</li> <li>2. Course outlines update</li> <li>3. TORs</li> <li>4. Approval of October 3<sup>rd</sup> minutes</li> <li>5. Next meeting : Monday Oct. 31· 2011</li> </ol>			
<b>Discussion of Agenda/Information Sharing:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.) Kathy opened the meeting by informing the committee of the voting results on the “Prioritizing” document that the committee was to review and make recommendations on. Because there was not a majority vote for the recommendations, the issue was again brought forth for discussion. Results of electronic voting were as follows: 12 yes; 0 No;</li> </ol>			

2 Abstain and 9 non-votes (did not communicate a preference or did not respond to the call to vote).

- Kathy also shared emailed comments from Alton: he abstained from voting as he was concerned about data sources available. Mainly, the criteria should depend on the types of data that is available and that we do not have enough evidence or data to truly claim a culture of evidence.

Other comments that were shared:

- Gardner Edgar: We are working for a process that will help set what will be done in the future (10yrs. Or so) and so, we are not looking for a “quick fix” as this is to address not only accreditation but to ensure an effective process for prioritization in the future.
- Grilly Jack: If we endorse this process, this will help determine the types of data that we will need, and will allow the college to look into getting data that is required. In the future, we will be required to get data such as “gainful employment” data, which we do not have now but will need to start getting. So this is a start, a step towards establishing an effective process.
- Joy Guarin: Wanted clarification on whether this prioritization process was going to be done “by campus” since we are comprised of campuses. It was clarified that this process was to be done by programs, regardless of campus, so it is a college-wide process.
- For membership of the prioritization working group, it was agreed upon that in the recommendations sent to the President that additional members be all VCs (and not just ICs since some campuses may have one or the other), DAP (Karen Simion) and DVCCE (Grilly Jack).
- For voting in the future: if there is a tie, who breaks the tie. Joy said the chair should break the tie. Others mentioned that that will then give the chair two votes? No consensus was reached so Kathy suggested to put out again to the committee the issue that was being voted on.

It was agreed upon that the changes in membership be added to the memo recommendations be re-circulated for another electronic vote be done and that all members be required to vote since recommendations do need to come from the CAC in order to move the process along as it will be linked to the budgeting process.

2.) Course Outlines Update: Kathy mentioned that she had put together a list of all inactive/shelved courses and will be forwarding the list to the division chairs to determine action (whether there needs to be a re-write, revision, etc or just put in the new format); a list of courses that had already been approved by the previous Curriculum Committee was also being compiled so that they can be put in the new course outline format.

- Other reminders about the course outlines: the cover page needs to indicate the change of committee name from curriculum committee to Curriculum and Assessment committee, a clarification email will be sent out by Kathy about the reading/reviewing process: Reader teams will read then send comments/concerns to author; Author will make changes and send back to team—this process will continue until reader team is satisfied with course outline; Reader teams will send the finalized copy of the course outline to the CAC, the CAC will send comments to the reader teams which they will relay/forward to the author of the course outline. When all changes/revisions are done, the reader team forwards the final copy of the course outline to the CAC chair to file as ready for approval (RFA) at the next meeting.
- FONT: does it need to be in the Times New Roman, 12 size font? A discussion

ensued and Kathy mentioned that it may eventually need to be put in a consistent font/size when publishing/posting on the website so it is important to be consistent and perhaps keep that font requirement for now. Basically for now, all may need to use own judgment in ensuring that all the course outlines look good before being posted.

- Kasi asked if all book references need to be in MLA/APA format—the consensus from previous discussions was that it did need to be in these formats.
- Sue asked about deadlines for comments from the CAC---Kathy responded that this should be determined by each reader team.

3.) TOR—this was not discussed as there was no time for this item.

4.) Minutes for Oct. 3 were discussed/voted on for approval:

- Mariana B. moved for adoption of Oct. 3<sup>rd</sup> minutes; Gardner E. seconded the motion; no discussion. Vote was unanimous for approval.

5.) Next meeting is **scheduled** for Monday October 31, 2011

**Handouts/Documents Referenced:**

1. “Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services at the College of Micronesia-FSM”

**College Web Site Link:**

<b>Prepared by:</b>	<i>Resida S. Keller</i>	<b>Date Distributed:</b>	<i>10/21/11</i>
---------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

**Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:** Minutes distributed for comments 10/24/11  
 .Approved: October 31<sup>st</sup> 2011

<b>Submitted by:</b>	<i>Resida S. Keller</i>	<b>Date Submitted:</b>	<i>10/21/11</i>
----------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

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

1. Re-vote on the prioritization document (with changes) will be done via Email
2. Minutes for Oct. 3 were discussed/voted on for approval:
  - Mariana B. moved for adoption of Oct. 3<sup>rd</sup> minutes; Gardner E. seconded the motion; no discussion. Vote was unanimous for approval.
3. Next meeting: Monday Oct. 31, 2011 at 1pm