

CAC 'CLOSING THE LOOP' RETREAT REPORT

BEFORE

In CAC meetings in April and May, it was proposed that the CAC have a gathering of all CAC members towards the end of the semester/year to look at what we have done as a committee within the past year. Part of the proposal suggested that a survey be created and that all CAC members take the survey which would enable everyone to provide their feedback on three different areas that the CAC worked on: Course outline process, Program assessment process and overall functioning of the CAC. This proposal was made by Susan Moses in an effort to help the CAC 'close the loop' on all of our activities for the year. The committee endorsed the proposal and selected a working group consisting of the current and in-coming CAC officers and DAP (Karen Simion) to work out the details of the retreat. The working group, (Gardner Edgar-current acting and Chairperson elect, Susan Moses-Vice Chair elect, Resida S. Keller—current secretary and Delihna Ehmes-secretary elect and Karen Simion *Note: no current vice chair as Kathy Hayes -chair is on Maternity leave, putting Gardner into the acting chair position) met on May 8, 2013 at 2:00pm to 4:00pm in the National campus writing center to plan the retreat. As a result of the meeting, the working group was able to come up with goals/objectives of the retreat, organize the committee members into select breakout session groups with facilitators and also come up with an agenda for the day. Prior to the retreat, the chairperson, with the assistance of the IRPO team created a survey on SurveyMonkey for all CAC members to do. The CAC members were also encouraged to read and review the feedback so that the retreat would be productive. Karen Simion, with the support of the VPIA's office handled the logistics of making arrangements for the venue, the refreshments and lunch and travel arrangements for our State-campus counterparts to join us. The agenda and survey results are attached to this report (see below).

DURING

The retreat started a little after 8am and was attended by all members of the CAC except for one member from the Kosrae campus (airport problems) and two from the Yap campus who were unable to attend (one had work visa issue and the other was due to personal reason). We were fortunate to have the members from the Chuuk campus and the Pohnpei campus travel the distance to join the retreat. Additional attendees included VPIA Mariana Ben-Dereas, DAP Karen Simion and President Joseph Daisy during the beginning part of the retreat. With Chairperson Gardner Edgar conducting the retreat, the event started with brief welcoming remarks from President Daisy, a fun ice breaker activity called "Two truths and a Lie" by Professor Sue Moses and then it was work and discussion in breakout sessions. The results of the breakout sessions are attached to this report as "notes" from each of the three groups. After the breakout sessions, reports were done by the group facilitators to the whole committee. With each group presentation, feedback was given and open dialogue was carried out on various points that were raised by each group. The groups were able to review what we had done in the past year, reflect on each of our individual experiences and make recommendations which will be used and taken into consideration when planning the work of the CAC for AY 2013-2014.

After the breakout sessions, a buffet –style lunch was enjoyed by all during the lunch break. After lunch, the retreat started off with the presentation of the newly revised Curriculum handbook. DAP Karen Simion presented the handbook, highlighted some of the changes and informed all the members of what is currently available in the handbook. The committee endorsed the handbook with a motion for approval. The committee voted unanimously that the current curriculum handbook in its entirety be approved and made available to the college community via the website. All members must read and

review the handbook and send feedback and comments for any modifications/ improvements to Karen who will update as needed. The justification for this approval was that we cannot tell what the handbook is lacking and where we will need to improve unless we start to use the handbook as it was intended to be used. Karen provided a listing of all of the instructional policies that were available and Sue Moses provided a background to how and why she compiled this list of policies of the college. The executive Committee has tasked the VPIA's office (essentially VPIA and the DAP) with the task of reviewing all of the college's existing policies by 2015 and so they will need the feedback on these policies from respective committees like the CAC and other relevant parties. To expedite this task, the CAC members recommended that the DAP/VPIA prioritize the policies and send the policies for review to the CAC in that prioritized order. The DAP and VPIA will start on this prioritizing and will begin sending policies to the committee for review shortly.

The committee then moved on to the discussion and planning of a timeline and calendar for the work of the CAC for the upcoming year. It was identified that the CAC was responsible for reviewing the following (to name a few):

- course outlines (at least 40/semester) so that all course outlines will have been reviewed within a 5-year period; divisions needed to work to ensure that 25% of their programs' course outlines are reviewed (to ensure 100% completion of review within 5-year period)
- Program Reviews (32 programs=16/ year) Since program reviews are due every 2 years, reviewing half of the program reviews each year will help to keep the load light for the CAC while completing the review of all program reviews within the two-year time frame.
- Program Assessments (32 program assessments done yearly): These are the assessment worksheets—each program does assessments each year. Worksheet 3 (Assessment report) is completed in May and should be reviewed prior to the Fall semester since this worksheet helps to inform Worksheet 1 (Improvement plan) and Worksheet 2 (assessment plan) for each current year.
- Course modifications (how, when will modifications be done?)
- Academic Policies (following the prioritized listing from VPIA's office) by 2015.

Because of time limitations, it was agreed upon that the CAC will need to meet during the summer term. Also, a planning meeting to complete the CAC timeline/calendar will need to be determined so that everything is set prior to the beginning of the Fall semester. The committee moved and seconded a meeting to be held on June 21st (Summer Mid-term break) from 9:30am-3:00pm in the BOR conference room to continue the discussing and planning of the calendar of activities. All who will be teaching during the summer term will need to attend this planning meeting as feedback from all is needed.

An evaluation of the event was done by all present. Results of the evaluation are also included as part of this report.

AFTER

Here are a few items that were agreed upon by the committee that will be done after the retreat:

- A report will be written up, shared with committee members and posted for the college community.

- A planning meeting will be held on June 21st of committee members during the summer to complete the CAC calendar
- During the week of August 5th-9th (when faculty are to report back), a training session for writing and reviewing course outlines will be held as part of the faculty meetings which all are required to attend prior to the start of the semester. This will be conducted by the DAP. If more specific training requests are given to the DAP, she can try to accommodate those requests.
- By August 12th, reader teams for reviewing course outlines should be assigned (Chair and officers will be responsible for this) as the committee membership should be finalized by then. The first CAC meeting for the new school year will be held on this day—1:00pm in the BOR conference room.
- By August 26th, the second CAC meeting will be held and a list of courses that each division will be reviewing for the Fall semester will be provided by the Division Chairs. Keep in mind that 25% of your courses should be completed by the end of the year. The reviewing process begins.
- Other planning items and activities to be determined.

*Supporting documents are available on the next pages.

CAC's "Closing the Loop" Retreat

Monday May 20, 2013

8:30am-4:00pm

MITC AV Rooms National Campus

AGENDA

AM Session Overall Goals/Outcomes:

- Complete an evaluation for the work of the CAC for AY 2012-2013
- Make recommendations for the improvement of CAC for AY 2013-2014

8:30am.....Coffee/Light Refreshments

9:00am.....Welcoming Remarks (President or Rep)

9:15am.....Ice Breaker (Sue Moses)

9:30am.....Review of Agenda/Break out

Breakout Sessions (9:35-10:35)

<u>Grp A: Facilitator Sue Moses</u>	<u>Grp B: Facilitator Gardner Edgar</u>	<u>Grp C: Facilitator Resida Keller</u>
-------------------------------------	---	---

(Course Outline process)

(Program Assessment)

(CAC Function/Processes)

Kathy Hayes

Ross Perkins

Debra Perman

Snyther Biza

Maria Dison

Charles Aiseam

Paul Dacanay*

Lynn Sipenuk

Mariano Marcus

Shirley Jano

Nena Mike*

Joseph Felix Jr.

Alex Raiuklan*

Maggie Hallers

Joy Guarin*

Delihna Ehmes

*those who were absent; highlighted are members from State campuses

10:40am.....Break (10 minutes)

10:50am.....Breakout Session Reporting/Sharing (to all members)

11:45am.....LUNCH (VPJA's Office—Thanks to Karen for arrangements)

PM Session Goal/Outcomes:

- Complete a plan of Activities for CAC for AY 2013-2014

1:00pm.....Discussion/Review: [Outcome—CAC Calendar/timeline]

- Overview of new Curriculum Handbook.....DAP Karen Simion
- Policy Review (as it relates to CAC).....DAP Karen Simion
- Review of Course outline Processes
- Review of CAC TORs
- Program Review Process

3:40: Closing.....CAC chairperson: Gardner Edgar

Plan for implementation/Report to the college community

EmCee: Gardner Edgar, CAC Chairperson 2013-2014

Breakout Session #1: Notes

Summary of Comments Re: the Course Outline Process *Items in bold were discussed in presentation to the committee.

What worked	What didn't work/ Recommendations for Improvement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All members now understand new format (2) • Reviewing course outlines outside of own area (3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> per Kathy – outlines were assigned outside of area to avoid bias; still relevant even as CAC shifts to emphasis on content; have to put trust in authors that they know their subject area; need to make rubric clear as to exactly what the reviewers should look for; Division Chairs should play more active role in ensuring that all format issues are handled before being submitted to CAC • Setting time limits/clearly set deadlines (3) • Reader teams expedited process (active); continue to pair NC and SC members as much as possible • CAC Review Tracking system (3) • Template/rubric with clear expectations (2) • Updating of course outlines including assessment strategies and links to program outcomes (SLO matrix); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> courses posted on website (2) • Process encouraged faculty outside of CAC to get involved improving awareness and cooperation (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be more emphasis on content rather than format (3) • Need to turn attention to higher level curricular issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> such as how courses in a particular program contribute to achievement of PLOs (3) • Need to document requirements of new format (update template) with examples in Curriculum Handbook; need to establish consistent terminology; need to establish clearer guidelines(3) • Need training for CAC (refresher) and for faculty on the course outline development process using the new format (3) • Courses should be assigned to readers in their areas of Expertise (See comment under first column) • Need consistency in level of assessment strategies • Improve the alignment of CLOs/PLOs/ILOs (2) • Find a way so that the process is not so rushed; need specific deadlines between steps of the process(3); 25% of outlines for each division completed per academic year beginning in August 2013; need to add a sheet saying what changes

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assignment of reader teams (4)• Assessment strategies are now more authentic• Course outcomes are now more measurable• Involvement of State Campuses in the process <p>25% of course outlines in each division to be updated each year.</p>	<p>were made, i.e.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">credits, prerequisites, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop a rigid, inflexible timescale for course outline review• Should be penalties when authors do not comply with deadlines and/or fail to update outlines using comments from reader teams• Division chairs need to be more active in the process• All prerequisites need to be reviewed for accuracy and consistency with catalog• Need way for author to specify changes made when updating a course outline• Need way to track outlines approved by VPIA• Level of workload engagement needs to be fair• Instructors should make recommendations on all courses as to what worked, did not work, not done (course level assessment?); process needs to be repeated every 2 years using course level assessment (2)• 50% of the assessment strategies on course outlines will be authentic; training will be provided
---	---

BREAK OUT SESSION #2 NOTES:

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT GROUP

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE CAC IN THE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PROCESS?

-LOOKS AT THE QUALITY OF THE ASSESSMENT

- ◇ **LOOKS AT THE CONSISTENCY OF THE FORMAT**
- ◇ **LOOKS AT THE RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND MAKE SURE THAT THOSE THINGS HAPPEN**

WHAT WORKED FOR PA:

- ◇ **READER TEAMS**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **THERE NEEDS TO BE SOME CROSS-TRAINING TO ADDRESS CONFUSIONS ON: INTENTION OF THE PROCESS (E.G ASSESSMENT, COURSE OUTLINE, ETC.), EVEN THOUGH THERE WAS A TEMPLATE AND RUBRIC TO EVALUATE THE WORK.**
- **USE PDF WHERE EVERYTHING IS FORMATTED. MORE SECURE, WITH A PASSWORD**
- **HAVE IC'S OR PC'S/CHAIRS TO GIVE AN OVERVIEW OF THEIR ASSESSMENT TO THE CAC FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE.**
- **CHECKLISTS FOR PC'S/CHAIRS/ICS TO ENSURE COMPLETION OF ASSESSMENTS**
- **CHECKLIST FOR CAC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PRODUCED FROM THE TRACDAT.**
- **CAC NEEDS TO OVERSEE THAT THERE IS RECORDED DIALOGUE BETWEEN DIVISIONS ACROSS CAMPUSES-TO ADDRESS CONCERNS THAT SOMETIMES STATE CAMPUSES ARE LEFT OUT ON DIVISION MEETINGS**

Breakout session #3:

Review, Reflect and Recommend: Effectiveness of CAC functioning:

Members: Debra Perman, Charles Aiseam, Mariano Marcus, Joseph Felix Jr., Joy Guarin, Resida Keller

<p>What is the 'function' of the CAC?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop and revise policies assigned or identified by the committee• Review and recommend for approval for all new and existing programs and outlines• Review instructional program assessments and evaluations and make recommendations	<p>How well did we perform that function this year?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More focused on accreditation issues whereas functions of CAC were kind of put on the backburner
<p>What did we do well?</p> <p>-----></p>	<p>What did we not do so well?</p> <p>SEE: Summary results of the reflection survey (next page)</p>

<p>Recommendations for change/improvement and implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More assessment training • Sharing of resources by providing samples of assessment and other work done across campuses so that people will know what is expected. • Create a timeline of CAC functions and CAC work for the year so that all are aware of the 'bigger picture' of our purpose and tasks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The modification process needs to be more clear <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ i.e. Changing of textbooks (DAP mentioned that these processes are available in the curriculum handbook which should be more accessible to all faculty once it gets online) • For membership for faculty and staff reps, process of nomination needs to be more clearer or criteria needs to be determined to clarify who may join CAC (the current TORs list who are to be members but does not clarify criteria for membership, especially for faculty/staff reps who are members based on a voluntary basis) • To have a student rep but as a non-voting member (so that this does not affect quorum and effectiveness of CAC but so that we can also have student input) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Good for their careers ○ SBA can select their own member from their own student leaders • CAC members to send proxy if one cannot join meetings that way meetings can take place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proxy members will/must be briefed by CAC member before joining the meeting • Reviewing and voting of minutes should take place electronically and be done a Friday before the Monday meetings as minute approval takes up a lot of time during meetings. • CAC chairperson needs to update members of the approved or recommended course outlines, and the stages (channels) of where our CAC recommendations are and what is being done about what we have recommended/VPIA's website should contain an update of actions related to CAC (and other committees') recommendations. • Adding a little section to the agenda of what was discussed in the previous meeting (where we left off from last meeting) so in case meeting agenda was not completed, members would know where to continue (we already have that in place in our agenda that is sent out) • When chair is sending out an agenda, he/she needs to remind members to at least respond and acknowledge it or share other comments • Assessment coordinator and IRPO rep should be added to the membership of the CAC (non-
--	--

	<p>voting) to increase input from other areas of the college and also since they have access to data, this can allow the CAC to have data immediately to make decisions/recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members' should try to make sure that their classes are not to be scheduled right before/after the CAC scheduled meetings (so that business is conducted on-time and people don't leave prior to end of meeting).
--	--

CAC Summary Results of Reflection Survey for question #3:

QUESTION: Major changes were made I the college's committee structure including the way the CAC functions. Please provide your comments on the functioning of the CAC (the way the committee conducts its business). Please be complete and detailed in your response.

- a. List and describe two things about the functioning of the CAC that 'worked.'
 - Inclusion of the ICs as members of the CAC
 - Officers (Chair) who kept the meeting on track with what needed to be discussed; Active leadership (8)
 - Sending out the agenda PIN and associated documents prior to the meeting (2)
 - Ensuring that there was input from all members (full participation), especially more inclusion of state campus feedback (3).
 - Excellent teamwork and collaboration; active participation (3)
 - Accomplishing tasks in a timely manner and meeting (or even beating) deadlines
 - Development of rubrics to expedite work
 - Time of meetings: having meetings every other week and having it for one hour (3)
 - Limiting the membership number—smaller but still well represented and functional (2)
 - Observing proper quorum in approving documents such as minutes and motions
 - Teleconferencing which ensured off-campus participation

- b. List and describe two things about the functioning of the CAC that need to be improved. Provide suggestions for improvement.
 - Having too full an agenda/improve/prioritize on agenda—makes the committee worried about trying to 'finish' in time everything on the agenda even though some items need more discussion and consensus (3)
 - Secretary or chair needs to send out an "actions to do" part from the minutes after the meeting to remind members of what they need to do.

- Communication between and among members, college community and stakeholders still problematic (3)
- Hasty decision-making for the sake of getting things done
- Need a retreat at the end of the year for training and closure and preparation for the new academic year (3)
- Have division chairs report/highlight and update on program assessments at the beginning of the year (worksheet #1 w/improvement plan), middle of the year (worksheet #2), and end of the year highlights/recommendations (worksheet #3) so all are aware of what is happening in programs
- Clarify our purpose/role: are we to create policies, procedures, and responsibilities or to just review and provide recommendations on these?
- Meeting time too short
- Have an agenda circulated and approved prior to meeting to decide whether items are to be discussed in the meeting or via email
- Start meetings on time/cut meetings to once a month
- Improve attendance in every meeting/on-time attendance (2)
- Create a timeline/calendar so that all are aware of what needs to be done and when within the academic year and to address other outstanding issues/ Closing the loop activities should be an established part of the CAC's function (2)
- We need a student representative—establish incentives for the student to increase participation from students
- We need an assessment coordinator to be a member as well as an IRPO rep.
- Membership—how is membership determined? The TORs only designate who should be and how many members but does not indicate how a member is selected (i.e. faculty reps)

Evaluation Results (next page)

Curriculum and Assessment Committee Retreat
May 20, 2013

Evaluation of Retreat/Summit/Recap/

1. Being assigned to working groups before the retreat started was helpful?
 - a. Not helpful at all- (1)
 - b. Not very helpful
 - c. Neutral- (1)
 - d. Somewhat helpful -(5)
 - e. Very helpful- (9)

2. The goal for the morning session was achieved?
 - a. Not helpful at all- (1)
 - b. Not very helpful
 - c. Neutral- (1)
 - d. Goal Somewhat helpful -(5)
 - e. Goal fully achieved- (9)

3. The information from the two sessions in the afternoon were useful?
 - a. Not useful at all-
 - b. Not very useful-
 - c. Neutral- (1)
 - d. Somewhat useful- (6)
 - e. Very Useful- (9)

4. Afternoon goal #2 was achieved?
 - a. Goal not achieved at all-
 - b. Goal minimally achieved- (1)
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Goal somewhat achieved- (11)
 - e. Goal fully achieved -(4)

5. Overall, this retreat was?

- a. Not useful at all
 - b. Not very useful
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Somewhat useful- (3)
 - e. Very useful- (13)
6. The Venue and refreshments for this retreat were?
- a. Very poor
 - b. Poor
 - c. Neutral- (1)
 - d. Good- (6)
 - e. Very good- (9)
7. Comments:
1. It was a productive meeting, although some of the afternoon agenda addressed/completed! Thank you organizing committee
 2. Repeat the same summit at the end of every Academic year.
 3. I think it is okay, we kinda accomplish the goals we set out to do.
 4. The Summit clearly identified outcomes and each outcome was addressed. The Overall summit was very productive and will help make CAC effort next year.
 5. Clearly identified what needs to be done by the committee. Although there is much to do, the chair has done a commendable job. Goals are clear it's just a matter of how much time can the committee meet all the goals. **GOOD JOB!!**
 6. Long day, but a lot got discussed/done. Have better feeling of where we'll be heading this upcoming year.
 7. It's very helpful for members to have this retreat. This kind of open up members to what is really going on in the committee. Should do this every spring.
 8. **VERY GOOD!** Should repeat this Every Spring
 9. This should take place every May

Thank you!!

Respectfully submitted by: Resida S. Keller