

LESSONS, OBSERVATIONS, & SUGGESTIONS FROM SPRING 2018 F4

1. **OBSERVATION:** In the morning of April 20 (the F4 day), many business students were absent in school because they were busy preparing for the event. In the Business Division, only three instructors showed up for work, and one had to cancel class and stay in the office because of F4-related tasks that needed to be completed before the 4:00 pm event. In the F4 survey, one student recognized F4's contribution to the improvement of COM-FSM's public image, recommended to the Business Division that it should do more advertising for the event.

SUGGESTIONS: COM-FSM administration should consider the following:

- (a) Rather than sending emails requesting instructors to excuse affected students from their classes (which is non-binding since discretion to excuse is still up to each instructor), declare F4 day as no-school day so both students and instructors could prepare well for the event;
- (b) Hold F4 in spring each year instead of every semester, and make it part of National & Pohnpei campuses' week-long founding day celebration, where other recurring college activities, i.e, faculty convocation, staff development day, incentive awards day, endowment fundraising, etc., college fair, CTEC exhibits, etc. could be held. This is a welcome break as well as great opportunity for both students and instructors.

2. **OBSERVATION:** One judge to the F4 competition could no longer find some tables while the event is still in progress.

SUGGESTION: Instruct participants who sell out goods and finish early that should stay until end of the program, or at least one member should remain in the table until judging is completed.

3. **OBSERVATION:** Judging twenty-six groups (one a no-show) which competed for the Best in Table/Booth Design category was a lot of work for the judges, yet it looked like some groups didn't take the competition seriously. Their tables showed little evidence of effort in terms of decorations, posters, etc.

SUGGESTION: Qualifying as contestant shouldn't be automatic. Groups desiring to join the table/booth design competition must first register at least one week before the F4 event.

4. **OBSERVATION:** It wasn't clear whether the table/booth designs reflected the F4's theme for this semester, which was "Fusing Forces for FSM's Future."

SUGGESTIONS:

- Require students to integrate F4's theme in their table/booth designs
- Make sure students clearly understand the theme, and
- Include this in the updated version of the F4 competition rating rubric.

5. **OBSERVATION:** There was no official data on number of student participants and public participation.

SUGGESTIONS: For students, require them to sign up at the gate upon arrival; For the public, give them tickets at the entrance when they first arrive, with half of the ticket or stub dropped in a box (for possible raffle draw), and these stubs can then be counted at end of event to determine extent of public participation.

6. **OBSERVATION:** Some groups have more or bigger tables than others.

SUGGESTION: For the competition to be fair, assign the same number and size of tables to all participating student groups (sponsors and other third-party participants are exempt). If this is not possible, each group should designate one "main" table, and only that table will be considered by the judges for the "Best in Table/Booth Design" category.

7. **LESSON:** In the F4 Competition Rating Rubric, one judge asked for clarification about the term "Efficient" in the criteria "Efficient use of resources" for the "Best in Table/Booth Design" category.

SUGGESTIONS: Revise or delete rubric component that is not clear, or provide separate document for definition of terms and examples.

8. **LESSON:** In the F4 survey forms, some students gave conflicting responses, specifically to questions 3 and 6, in which they checked box #3 or "Strongly Agree" both for their participation in F4 Project being a valuable learning experience and a waste of time.

SUGGESTION: Improve survey questionnaire wordings or manner of presentation to avoid confusion.

9. **OBSERVATION:** One instructor was designated to formulate a rating rubric for each of the three categories of competition during the F4 Event. The instructor did so, and asked YES! to help in the distribution of the rubric forms to the five judges and getting these forms back afterwards. Since there were originally 26 tables, to be evaluated by five judges for each of the three categories, the instructor told YES! president that it would be better to do the tallying and announcing of winners next week, adding that he did not bring his laptop for the purpose. One of the event organizers, nevertheless, announced during the program that the winners would be announced that day. Luckily, YES! (either on their own or as directed by someone else) manually did the tabulating and summarizing job while the program was in progress, and came up with the list of winners on time. YES! tabulators, however, weren't given proper instructions about how it should be done, considering that one of the judges didn't judge some tables that she was unable to find. This should have been considered in the tallying of scores.

SUGGESTION: Clarify scope of work assigned to whoever would be in charge of a particular task, or tasks, for better planning, supervision, control and implementation.

Prepared by:

Rafael Pulmano

April 22, 2018

Sunday