

**College of Micronesia – FSM**

**Committee Minutes Reporting Form**

<b>Committee or Working Group</b>		<i>Curriculum and Assessment Committee</i>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Time:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	
March 19, 2012 <i>(Regular MEETING)</i>	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.	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
<b>Additional Attendees:</b>	Karen Simion, DAP; Rafael Pulmano, Business Division		
<b>Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:</b>			
<p>I. Old Business</p> <p>1. FEEDBACK:</p> <p>    i.) Memo to the President</p> <p>    ii.) Educational Master Plan</p> <p>    iii.) Seat cost formula</p> <p>II. New Business:</p> <p>2. Recommendations on “how to improve the course outline and program review process”</p> <p>3. Spring 2013 report for proficiency levels in SLOs</p> <p>4. Approval of February 20<sup>th</sup> minutes and March 5<sup>th</sup> minutes</p> <p>5. Next meeting: April 2, 2011 (May change due to Founding Day??)</p>			
<b>Discussion of Agenda/Information Sharing:</b>			
<p>1.) FEEDBACK</p> <p>    i.) <b>Memo to the President:</b> Kathy reported that the drafted memo to the President regarding the CAC’s concerns about the Education master plan has been emailed out to the president. She will share the memo with the council of chairs</p>			

(CoC) and the President will be meeting with cabinet and with the CoC to discuss concerns.

ii.) **Educational Master Plan:** Karen reported that what the CAC saw in the previous meetings (the Educational master plan) has changed and is not what was shared with the CAC previously. The new version of the EMP follows the format of the Lassen College Integrated Master Plan and will be shared with the CAC and other committees later. For now, need for feedback from the CAC is put on hold.

iii.) **Seat Cost Formula:** The CAC was able to hear/see a powerpoint presentation by Rafael Pulmano, faculty member from the Business division on a proposal for a seat cost formula that we can all use in order to come up with a consistent way of calculating seat cost for our courses. In general, the total cost of the program and the total enrollment will allow us to come up with seat cost [**Total Program Cost / Program Enrollment = Seat cost**]. This formula allows the instructional department to come up with a standard for all to follow and it takes the “guess-work” out of calculating the seat cost. It also uses data that is already readily available (i.e. SIS enrollment data and Faculty workload forms from each division). This formula allows more consistent accountability and recording and there is no transfer of funds. After the presentation, the following discussion was held:

Kasiano asked for clarification on where the student enrollment numbers came from and was informed that all student enrollment came from the number of students enrolled and their majors as provided in the SIS. Raleigh wanted clarification on data needs and if the IRPO was needed to provide additional data. The answer was no and that data was already in the SIS and workload forms. Kathy asked the CAC in comparison to how other’s have done this calculation if this was a clearer and easier way of doing this. Kasiano wanted to know how this relates to the presentation that Danny did at Yap campus which involved direct and indirect costs: Where does teaching supplies come in?

Sue moved that the CAC adopt this process of calculation/seat cost formula and Magdalena Hallers seconded the motion. Discussion: Paul mentioned that he thinks that the main reason for the need to calculate seat cost and to use the supply budget is to perhaps see how efficient we are in using supplies. This may be the rationale behind the previous worksheets and also to see that the needs of the program are met or if there is a need for more resources. Karen clarified that seat cost calculation is a separate issue from the budget. Kasiano wanted to know if seat cost calculation was only based on salary and Pulmano clarified that it was not. The CAC voted on the adoption of the seat cost formula: FMI abstained; Yap and Kosrae voted Yes; there were no votes from PNI campus and CHK campus; all other members present voted YES. The motion passed and will now be sent to the PRC for their recommendations.

- 2. Recommendations on “how to improve the course outline and program review process”:** Based on feedback and discussions about how to improve the process, six recommendations came out of the interaction. The six recommendations were (summarized) that there be: 1. a generic template approved/used for the program review; 2. Improvement to the Data system; 3. an established general timeline for the CAC; 4. clarification of program coordinator roles and responsibilities; 5. training for the program coordinators and 6. Update to the curriculum handbook. Kathy asked how the CAC would like to approach this task. Resida suggested that the CAC start with the timeline and then incorporate other recommendations into the timeline so that they can all be done according to immediate needs and move from there. Some recommendations are already being worked on and some may not be the CAC’s responsibilities (i.e. Training could be the HR committee’s duty). Sue also

expressed concern that there is a backlog on Policies: the CAC needs to set aside time to look at policy as that is part of the CAC's TORs. This was echoed by Karen and so supported the fact that a timeline needs to be worked on. Karen expressed concern that the focus of the CAC and the recommendations seem to be more faculty-focused and not necessarily student-centered: what are we doing to help out the students (i.e. There is a need to improve the writing and reading skills of our students across the curriculum yet no program review made any recommendations on what we should do about it). Faustino agreed and mentioned that for most programs, there seemed no link between the students and the coordinators/limited interaction. Sue added that there is a need for leadership to drive changes: what are we doing at the high schools? This need to help bridge the gap with the high schools is mentioned at every President's retreat/strategic plan, yet nothing is done about it, except for a few voluntary activities that have been done in the past. She was concerned from the apparent move away from developmental education as we should be focused on student learning and how to assess their learning: How can we help our students learn?

Kathy suggested that she start the work on a draft for a timeline which will then be sent out to the CAC and we will move forward from there.

Other items were tabled for the next meeting as there was not enough time:

3. **Spring 2013 report for proficiency levels in SLOs**
4. **Approval of February 20<sup>th</sup> and March 5<sup>th</sup> minutes**
5. **Next meeting: April 2, 2011 (May change due to Founding Day??)**

**Handouts/Documents Referenced:**

1. Memo to the President
2. Rafael's Seat Cost calculation Presentation

**College Web Site Link:**

<b>Prepared by:</b>	<i>Resida S. Keller</i>	<b>Date Distributed:</b>	3/27/12
---------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	---------

- 6. Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:** Approval of February 20<sup>th</sup> and March 5<sup>th</sup> minutes deferred till next meeting TBA.

(3/19/12 MINUTES APPROVED: 4/16/12)

<b>Submitted by:</b>	<i>Resida S. Keller</i>	<b>Date Submitted:</b>	4/16/12
----------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	---------

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

- 1.) Sue moved that the CAC adopt this process of calculation/seat cost formula and Magdalena Hallers seconded the motion. VOTE on the seat cost formula: FMI abstained; Yap and Kosrae voted Yes; there were no votes from PNI campus and CHK campus; all other members present voted YES. The motion passed.
- 2.) Kathy will start the work on a draft for a CAC general timeline which will then be sent out to the CAC.