**College of Micronesia – FSM**

**Minutes Reporting Form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Meeting Group:** | ***Workshop: Completing Program Reviews: Recommendations, Action Plans, Using Results***  Instructional Program Review –Lead Writers 2021 Workshop 4 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | **Time:** | **Location:** |
| 04/28/21 | 3-4:30 P/K. 2-3:30 Y/C | Zoom |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of Recommendations with Suggested Timeline & Responsibilities:** |
| * Assessment Team to update template according to recommendations in this workshop:  1. Separate program goals and program learning outcomes into two sections 2. Add wording in section 3.1 to make the # and % clearer. 3. Propose to input the assessed periods (Certificates, and AS) and writers delete as necessary .  * Lead writers to complete program reviews with support of ICs. Once ICs are satisfied, they submit to the DAP and the reader teams. Each step aims for a maximum 2-week turnaround. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Members:** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Titles/Representative** | **Name** | **Present** | **Absent** | **Remarks** | | Educational Coordinator / 3rd Year Teacher Prep writer | Taylor Elidok |  |  |  | | Acting CTEC IC | Phyllis Silbanuz |  |  |  | | CTEC Carpentry Lead Writer | Xavier Yarofmal |  |  |  | | CTEC Electronic Technology Lead Writer | Danilo Ibarrola |  |  | Already submitted IPR | | CTEC Motor Vehicle Maintenance | Nestor Mangubat |  |  |  | | CTEC Refrigeration & Air Conditioning | Bertoldo Esteban |  |  |  | | CC IC | Genevy Samuel |  |  |  | | NC IC & 3rd Year Accounting writer | Felix Jnr. |  |  |  | | OIE | Francis Alex |  |  |  | | DAP | Maria Dison, |  |  |  | | VPIEQA | Caroline Kocel |  |  |  | | KC IC | George Tilfas |  |  |  | | YC IC | Thomas Foruw |  |  |  | | FMI Marine Engineering Lead Writer | Michael Mailuw |  |  |  | | CTEC Building Technology Lead Writer | Cirilo Recana |  |  | Already submitted IPR | | CTEC Telecommunications Lead Writer | Nelchor Permitez |  |  | Already submitted IPR | | KC Pre-Teacher Prep | Rosalinda Bueno |  |  |  | | NC Pre-Teacher Prep | Pearl Habuchmai Olter-Pelep |  |  |  | | KC Agriculture & Food Technology | Tara Tara |  |  |  | | CC Bookkeeping | Herner Braiel |  |  |  | | NC 3rd Year General Business | George Mangonon |  |  |  | | CC Secretarial Science | Atkin Buliche |  |  |  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Additional Attendees:** |  |
| Agenda  1. Welcome, Minute of Silence, Reading of COM-FSM Mission Statement  2. Completing recommendations, action plans.  3. Open Q&A: your questions answered. DAP, ICs, and OIE ready to support.  4. Faculty expectations from administration on using program review results.   * This workshop is mandatory for lead program review writers due Spring 2021. Please communicate with your IC if you expect difficulty in attending * If you have already completed your program review, please submit it to your IC. If they are happy with the completeness and quality, you do not need to attend. | |
| **Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:**  **1. Welcome, Minute of Silence, Reading of COM-FSM Mission Statement**  **2.**    **3. Open Q&A: your questions answered. DAP, ICs, and OIE ready to support.**  Faculty: question about phasing out 3rd year program as we go towards a BA. Answer: Include this in your recommendations in the program review. By looking back at past program reviews we can actually trace how the program came about.  Faculty: how to deal with a program review for discontinued program?  VPIEQA: the general principles for all Lead Writers to follow are to make best efforts to get **all** the data and evidence possible, and make an analysis based upon that. This could involve digging for data and asking different people who know – but don’t get blocked. Make clear in your analysis what data and information you used to reach your conclusions.  Faculty: CSLO data is incomplete – what should I do?  DAP: Do your very best to get the data with support from the relevant ICs. If you provide data from another source (not TracDat), state what the sources are.  Faculty: confusion in section 2.2 which talks about program goals and program learning outcomes. It will be clearer if these two sections are separated out.  Faculty: if there was no fulltime instructor, what do I do? Answer: write this out to make it clear that’s the reason.  Faculty: section 3.1 – there is a column for “# enrolled” and then under each SLO is also #. Should the percentage be based upon the number of students who were assessed and succeeded, or should the percentage be based upon the data in TracDat, which measures the percentage of all enrolled students who succeeded at the CSLO?  DAP: use the number and percentage from TracDat.  VPIEQA: we can revise the template to include that “#” is the number of students who successfully completed the CSLO, as shown in TracDat.    **4. Faculty expectations from administration on using program review results.**  VPIEQA: For faculty information and accountability – your Assessment team readers are listed.    VPIEQA: introduced the ‘swiss cheese model’ which is used as a ‘layered security’ method to **prevent** coronavirus…. But unfortunately, our program review process has many opportunities for program reviews to get ‘stuck in the holes of the cheese’ and not make it through to the end of the process.  Instead of a prevention method, we would prefer a clear pipeline….  VPIEQA: Opened out to faculty and IC inputs on what they hope to get back from administration once the program review gets submitted to assessment team.  Also noted that the 9 steps are often written in ‘passive tense’ eg. step 7 “recommendations and action improvement plans are sent to CC for recording” – but **WHO** sends it is not clear.  IC: When I completed program review (as faculty) I expected to hear back from administration to start working on the program modification.  Faculty: I submitted program reviews in the past – then I heard nothing back, no feedback, it was like it disappeared.  VPIEQA: I accept and apologize for my role in ‘leaving things stuck in the holes in the cheese’. When we look at all the different steps in the process, I think many of us can see our contribution to the problem…. Sometimes all we need to do is send an email onwards, but other times, there is a problem that needs fixing.  Faculty: Where do the Deans come in this process? It is important they are aware of the progress and expectations.  VPIEQA: let’s make sure this is clear as we look at any revisions to the 9-step process with the assessment team.  ……   * FINAL DEADLINE for instructors to submit to ICs Friday July 30th 2021 – to allow one month for IC to provide recommendations and feedback. *Remember – ICs have a lot of reviews to review – if you hand it in on deadline day, they will have less time to provide the feedback necessary. Please avoid waiting for deadline day.* * FINAL DEADLINE for ICs to submit **Approved** Program Reviews to Assessment Team – **August 31st 2021** | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments/Upcoming Meeting Date & Time/Etc.:** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Handouts/Documents Referenced:** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **College Web Site Link:** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Prepared by:** | C. Kocel | **Date Distributed:** | 02/27/20 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Action by President:** | | | | |
| **Item #** | **Approved** | **Disapproved** | **Approved with conditions** | **Comments** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of Recommendations with Suggested Timeline & Responsibilities:** |
| * DAP – work with IT to ensure old program reviews are posted on website before March 3rd. * OIE – update Excel sheet by March 3rd * VPIEQA – alert all ICs and writers on March 3rd once these updates are made * ICs and DAP – together decide on date of May workshop. Tell VPIEQA before March 3rd. |