

College of Micronesia – FSM

Committee Minutes Reporting Form

Committee or Working Group		<i>Curriculum and Assessment Committee</i>		
Date:	Time:	Location:		
March 5, 2012	1:00 p.m.	BOR Conference Room		
Members Present				
Titles/Reps	Name	Present	Absent	
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.	Delihna Ehmes		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	
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 Faculty	Rosalinda Bueno	X		
Chuuk Campus Faculty Rep	Lynn Sipenuk	X		
Additional Attendees:	Karen Simion, DAP			
Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:				
<p>I. New Business</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Education Master Plan 2. FEEDBACK: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i.) COMET-RAR ii.) Roles and Responsibilities of the Program Coordinator iii.) Meeting times iv.) Meeting of Chairs—next one is scheduled 23rd March 2012 v.) Program Prioritization—may not be ready to be included for this meeting as it is pending PRC meeting on Thursday 30th of March. 3. Recommendations on “how to improve the course outline and program review process” 4. Spring 2013 report for proficiency levels in SLOs 5. Approval of February 20th minutes 6. Next meeting: March 19, 2012 				
Discussion of Agenda/Information Sharing:				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Education Master Plan <p>The CAC was tasked to look at the revised 2006-2011 strategic plan that had been sent out by Kathy</p>				

from Karen and the Education Masterplan working group. Kathy asked if there was any feedback on the strategic goals that the CAC was required to look at and the following concerns were brought up:

- Sue asked if Kathy or Karen could provide some background on what has happened, what is happening with regards to the masterplan so as to provide a context from which she could work from in providing feedback.
- Karen explained that when the working group met on the first day, the President met with them it was agreed upon that they would look at the strategic plan from 2006-2011. From this meeting, it was agreed that they would not throw out what was in the strategic plan but that they would use it as a starting point to move forward and to improve what is already there.
- There were also requests for clarification if whether the “strategic plan” was/and is the same as the “educational master plan,” if the core programs here at the college will be reflected in the Master plan (Kathy), if recommendations from the program reviews are reflected in the master plan and has any bearing in the creation of the master plan (Kasiano), and if the education master plan incorporated the prioritization process, helping to identify what programs the college will be focused on and what direction the college will be headed in the future (Sue).
- Karen shared the discussion between the VPIA and the DCCE and how they took the strategic plan and used that as a starting point for the creation of the document that the CAC was to review.
- Sue further expressed her concern that the revised strategic plan document had no “accountability system” in place which would link and align the PLOs to CLOs to SLOs and that there was no feedback from stakeholders. The accreditation priorities did not appear to be “threaded into the fabric of what we do here at the college.”
- Kasiano expressed that the CAC was supplying data especially in the form of the prioritization process and yet the suggestions and recommendations did not seem to be considered by other committees and felt that the CAC’s efforts in prioritization was wasted.
- Karen shared that the PRC does not seem to want to use the CACs recommendations from prioritization, especially since they saw deficiencies in the data, yet their concerns are the same as the CAC’s concerns and had been acknowledged. Karen shared the prioritization recommendations that were given to the PRC and they were (in summary): 1. The certificate programs which were ranked low in the prioritization process had one year to graduate remaining students, 2. Although Agriculture was also ranked low that because it is an economic and national priority that more effort would be given to enhance the program; there had also been a lot of improvement and growth so this should be continued, 3. The ACE program would become a summer program with 6 weeks of intensive instruction, 4. Programs needed to review the number of credits required for graduation so that students are able to realistically graduate within the required 2 ½ years that they are allotted; 5. Advisory councils for programs should be re-established; 6. Low performing programs have 1 year (from now to 2013) to work on recruiting a cohort and improving the program; if the program had less than 10 students, it may be the first to be considered to be shelved/discontinued when the time comes. The CAC felt that these were reasonable and logical recommendations that would help in the prioritization of programs and was concerned that the PRC did not want to use these recommendations as they would help to decrease deficiencies in the process.
- Kathy suggested that these following concerns will be brought up in her next council of chairs meeting: CACs concerns with regards to PRCs recommendations not to accept/use CACs prioritization recommendations; need for the President to come to the committee to provide a clearer direction on the planning process and direction of the college with regards to the Education Masterplan.
- Debra moved that the CAC allow Kathy to send an email to the President expressing concerns about the Education master plan, and request that he come to the committee meeting to provide insight on the plan. Kasiano seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. Nena suggested that the email/request to the President contain a timeline so that we are able to get a

timely response. Kathy may call a special meeting next Monday (March 12) to continue the discussion and to consider other committee issues and business.

All other items on the agenda were tabled for the next meeting as there was no time to discuss each item:

2. FEEDBACK:

- COMET-RAR
- Roles and Responsibilities of the Program coordinator
- Meeting times
- Meeting of Chairs—next one is scheduled 23rd March 2012
- Program Prioritization—may not be ready to be included for this meeting as it is pending PRC meeting on Thursday 30th of March.

3. Recommendations on “how to improve the course outline and program review process”

4. Spring 2013 report for proficiency levels in SLOs

5. Approval of February 20th minutes

- Next meeting: March 19, 2012

Handouts/Documents Referenced:

1. 2006-2011 Strategic Plan

College Web Site Link:

Prepared by:

Resida S. Keller

Date Distributed:

3/21/12

Approval of Minutes Process & Responses: Minutes distributed for comments

Minutes approved: 4/16/12

Submitted by:

Resida S. Keller

Date Submitted:

4/16/12

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

- 1.) Debra moved that the CAC allow Kathy to send an email to the President expressing concerns about the Education master plan, and request that he come to the committee meeting to provide insight on the plan. Kasiano seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.