

College of Micronesia – FSM

Governance Policy Evaluation



Office of Institutional Research & Planning
January 2011

Contents

Overview & Summary of Findings & Recommendations.....	1
Evaluation Questions	5
1. Has greater participation in decision making occurred?	5
2. Has system communications been improved?	13
3. Has understanding of roles & responsibility of faculty, students and staff in governance of the college increased?.....	17
Appendix	21
Appendix: Governance Policy	21
Appendix: Assessment Plan Governance Policy Evaluation	26
Appendix: ACCJC Standards: Standard IV: Leadership and Governance	29
Appendix: COM-FSM Self Study Section IVA	31
Appendix: ACCJC Site Team Evaluation Report Standard IVA	41
Appendix: COMMITTEE REVIEW WORKING GROUP	47

Overview & Summary of Findings & Recommendations

This report represents a formal evaluation of the COM-FSM Governance Policy.

The governance policy as described in the college's Self Study 2010 is "The COM-FSM governance policy, approved by the board in December 2006, promotes a participatory governance environment for the development of policies and procedures constituencies and be guided by the college's value statements. Its fundamental premise rests upon active and responsible involvement of all college employees and students. The policy defines the responsibilities of the president's cabinet, standing committees, sub-committees, and ad hoc committees. The membership of all standing committees represents the college community, some with responsibility to a particular constituency. All have a responsibility to ensure that communication is frequent, thorough, clear, and timely. This system of committees and councils is designed to meet institutional needs and provide a conduit for communication within the system. "

As noted above, the current Governance Policy was approved by the college's Board of Regents on December 7, 2006. Terms of references for each committee were developed and approved by the cabinet generally during the spring semester 2008. Training was provided on the new governance structure, roles and responsibilities of committee chairs and members and committee terms of reference to all campuses in the summer of 2008. Implementation of the revised committee structure began during fall semester 2008.

The stated objectives of the new governance policy follow:

- The revised committee structure enhances participatory decision making to meet institutional needs.
- The revised committee structure creates an effective conduit for improving system communications.
- Participants in the revised committee structure demonstrate an understanding of roles and responsibilities of faculty, students, staff in governance of the college.

In preparing this evaluation a number of key documents were referenced.

- COM-FSM Governance Policy - as approved by the BOR (attached)
- COM-FSM Governance Policy Assessment Plan – developed in conjunction with the initial training component for the implementation of the governance policy in the summer of 2008 (attached)
- ACCJC Accreditation Standards Section IVA – accreditation standards Section IV: Leadership and Governance; Section IVA: Decision-Making Roles and Processes (attached)
- COM-FSM Self Study Report 2010 (Section IVA) – section IVA of the self study is viewed in his context as a structure review of the college decision-making roles and processes (attached)
- ACCJC Site Team Evaluation Report 2010 (Section IVA) – the evaluation report is viewed in this context as an expert external review of the colleges decision-making roles and processes(attached)
- COM-FSM Governance Policy Survey & follow up Focus Groups (administered in fall 2010)

Governance Policy Evaluation

- Governance Policy Implementation (PowerPoint presentation used as a training tool summer 2008)
- Miscellaneous emails and documents

The report structure is based on the college's Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP) process. The attached governance policy assessment plan is the IAP worksheet 2 and the assessment report itself is presented using the IAP Worksheet #3 format.

Major findings of the evaluation report:

- See the ACCJC Site Team Evaluation Report at <http://www.comfsm.fm/Accreditation/archive.html>

Major recommendations of the evaluation report:

OBJECTIVE 1: The revised committee structure enhances participatory decision making to meet institutional needs.

1. Improve standing committee structure and participation at all campuses by:
 - a. Establishing a common time for class schedules across all campuses to allow increased faculty input
 - b. Monitoring and report quality of state campus access to VOIP and Elluminate sessions for committee meeting
 - c. Provide funding for FSM Telecommunications based teleconferences for all standing committee members at state campuses
 - d. Establish standing committee meeting sites at all campuses:
 - i. Provides quiet, comfortable meeting space
 - ii. Is equipped with both phone line & VOIP connection
 - iii. Provides access to computer, Internet access and smart board/LCD projector
 - e. Provide for committee forums or other means of asynchronous communication and structured discussions on topics of interest to the committee
 - f. Establish a critical documents depository on the college web site for easy access
2. Incorporate into performance management work plans and evaluation key performance indicators for:
 - a. Committee Leadership
 - i. Communications
 - ii. Agenda development and dissemination
 - iii. Posting of minutes on web site
 - iv. Quality of meetings
 - b. Members
 - i. Participation in committee meetings
 - ii. Information dissemination
 - iii. Preparation for meetings
3. To improve transparency of decision making, adopt a formal decision making approach for the college such as PDCA (plan, do, check, act- see <http://www.answers.com/topic/pdca> for additional information) or other structured approach to decision making
4. Conduct formal periodic evaluation of the college's governance structure at the institution and committee level

Governance Policy Evaluation

5. Revise the committee structure and membership taking into account:
 - a. Requirements of the AACJC accreditation standards calling for wide participation (note: the different views of the national and state campuses on participator decision making has to be resolved – ACCJC evaluation report places an emphasis on the voice of state campus faculty being heard - Regardless of structure ensure full participation of state campuses in committees) in decision making
 - b. Role of the college’s master plan approval and implementation for committees
 - c. Clearly defined roles in decision-making of:
 - i. Faculty
 - ii. Staff
 - iii. Students
 - iv. administrators
 - v. taking into account what is a committee function versus an administrative function
 - d. impact of the structure and membership on improving:
 - i. communications,
 - ii. participatory decision-making and
 - iii. understanding of roles and responsibilities
6. Provide ongoing training for chairs and committee members in roles and responsibilities and conducting good meetings and establishing dialogue among committee members
7. Enhance dissemination of reports on enrollment, student achievement and other critical information and data for the college and improve design, analysis and timeliness of surveys (including an increased emphasis on focus groups), program assessment and program review information the college needs for evidence based decision making

OBJECTIVE 2: The revised committee structure creates an effective conduit for improving system communications.

1. Identify specific roles of faculty, staff, students and administers in decision making at the college with emphasis on understanding the roles of committees for:
 - a. Planning and tracking of results and improvement through assessment and resource allocation
 - b. Identify key performance indicators for communications and information dissemination and incorporate into work planning and performance evaluation
2. Post committee minutes on the college’s web site or a secure site that is password assessable to faculty, staff, students, and administrators
3. Provide monthly summaries of committee actions for the college community and quarterly summaries for stakeholders
4. Provide forum(s) or social media sites to encourage exchange of information and dialogue across the college
5. To improve transparency of decision making, adopt a formal decision making approach for the college such as PDCA (plan, do, check, act- see <http://www.answers.com/topic/pdca> for additional information) or other structured approach to decision making
6. Enhance dissemination of reports on enrollment, student achievement and other critical information and data for the college and improve design, analysis and timeliness of surveys (including an increased emphasis on focus groups), program assessment and program review information the college needs for evidence based decision making
7. Provide training:

Governance Policy Evaluation

- a. Micronesian culture and communication patterns and develop mechanisms that document all faculty, staff, students and administrator views.
- b. Ongoing training for chairs and committee member in effective dialogue as opposed to discussion
- c. Evidence based decision making

OBJECTIVE 3: Participants in the revised committee structure demonstrate an understanding of roles and responsibilities of faculty, students, staff in governance of the college.

1. Incorporate the roles and responsibilities of committee chair, members and support staff into the college's new work planning and performance evaluation system including:
 - a. Roles for information dissemination
 - b. Meeting attendance and preparation
2. Provide ongoing training for committee chairs and members in
 - a. Communications and information dissemination
 - b. Conducting effective meetings (as per Mary Allen's materials and with understanding of Micronesian culture, learning styles and compunctions patterns) with emphasis on creating dialogue among all faculty, staff, students, administrators and stakeholders
 - c. Micronesian culture, learning styles and patterns of communication

Governance Policy

Fall 2008 – Fall 2010

Unit/Office/Program (3-1)

Assessment Period Covered (3-2)

Formative Assessment (3-3)

IRPO December 2010

Summative Assessment (3-4)

Submitted by & Date Submitted (3-5)

Endorsed by: (3-5a)

Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Question (Use a different form for each evaluation question)(3-6):

1. *Has greater participation in decision making occurred?*

First Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan 3-7):

1a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success (3-8):

COM-FSM Self Study Report 2010 (Section IVA) – section IVA of the self study is viewed in his context as a structure review of the college decision-making roles and processes (attached)

“1b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected (3-9):

Items 2,4,5,7,and 8 of the Standard IV survey focused on ascertaining faculty and staff perceptions as to their role in governance and achieving the college’s goals, opportunities to participate in institutional planning, involvement in bringing forth ideas for institutional improvement, and exercising a voice in establishing institutional policies, planning, and budget development. Results of the survey indicate that approximately 70% of the faculty and staff feel they are provided opportunities to participate in planning. A slightly lower percentage (60%) of the faculty and staff feel they are involved in bringing forth ideas for institutional improvement and have an important and clearly defined role in the college’s governance. Approximately 60% of the staff respondents agreed with Item 8, “I exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to my area of responsibilities and expertise.” However, only 46.3% of the faculty agreed with Item 8, while 46.1% indicated disagreement. One respondent commented, “No one listens to faculty.” Another commented, “I do not get feedback from whatever I contributed,” while another commented, “Administration frequently makes unilateral decisions without involving/consulting/soliciting faculty input/experience/expertise.” One staff respondent expressed concern regarding the actual implementation of the plans that are developed. Although faculty and staff agree that opportunities for involvement in the college’s governance are made available, there is a need to provide feedback when contributions are made,

Governance Policy Evaluation

especially to the faculty.’

”Results of the 2008 evaluation of the organizational chart by the Department of Administrative Services showed that the college had developed, documented, and implemented an organizational structure for administrative responsibilities across the six sites that addressed issues of continuity in administrative services. Also, the 2008 evaluation report cites some improvement in coordination of activities. However, this report also cites less improvement in clarity and consistency of decision making across all six campuses. The report further cites a concern for the level of training provided to implement the new administrative structure and the lack of attention to the development of structures (policies, processes, procedures, etc.) that would support implementation of the new structure.

Preliminary results of the October 2009 satisfaction survey indicate that faculty and staff appear to feel informed about the activities the college undertakes, are aware of the areas where they can find information about the college, and have sufficient information about what is going on at the college. Rated poorly, however, were the items that state, “The college publicizes its decision making,” and “Different divisions at the college communicate effectively.” There appears to be a need to enhance the awareness of the college’s decision making processes among the faculty and staff and to improve communication among the various divisions within the college.”

1c: Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services[Closing the loop] (3-10):

Recommendations are combined under Second Means of Assessment (ACCJC Site Team Evaluation Report)

Second Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan) (3-11):

2a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:

ACCJC Site Team Evaluation Report 2010 (Section IVA) – the evaluation report is viewed in this context as an expert external review of the colleges decision-making roles and processes(attached)

2b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

“Recommendation 9. *Decision-making Roles and Process* To fully meet this standard, the team recommends that the college evaluate its organizational structure and governance processes to ensure that college stakeholders are involved in decision-making processes and that the results of systematic evaluations, meetings, and decisions are broadly communicated (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.b, IV.4.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.1.a, IV.B.2.a-b, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.2.e).” (page 7)

“This concern has been partially met. The Focused Midterm Report was submitted by the college in March 2007. The college has made good progress toward improving communication, but too often the resulting communication has been viewed by the college community as merely implementing telecommunication and establishing a governance process, as well as information sharing instead of engaging in dialogue that honors different points of view and analysis for reflective dialogue the informs a collective understanding of complex issues. The use of surveys to evaluate progress toward improved communication has been hampered by occasional lack of, or low, participation, particularly by the campuses not located in Pohnpei. Also hampering the effective use of surveys to

evaluate progress is the untimely analysis and untimely reporting of results. The development of monthly reports has been viewed as useful and helpful, as evidenced by team interviews with campus leaders across the college. While telecommunication and information sharing have improved communication, the fundamental issue to be examined is whether true interactive dialogue that reflects a comprehensive institutional perspective to promote continuous improvement of institutional effectiveness is being encouraged to promote participation that is vital to communication.”

“Recommendation 1: Improve Communication *The college must develop and implement a collaborative process that:*

Includes faculty, staff, students, and administrators at the college’s six sites (Standards IV.4, IVA, IVA.1, IVA2.a, IVA.2b, IVA. and IVB.2b),

Identifies the roles and scope of authority of the faculty, staff, students, and administrators in the decision-making processes (Standards IVA, IVA.1, IVA.2, IVA.2a, IVA.2b, and IVA.),

Identifies the roles and scope of authority of college committees in the decision-making processes (Standards IVA, IVA.1, IVA.2, IVA.2a, IVA.2b, and IVA.), includes dialogue as a means to develop, document, implement, and evaluate assessment plans for student learning outcomes in both instruction and student services (Standards IB.a, IB.5, IIA.1c, II B.4, and IIC.2), and

Includes formal pathways for effective communication links so that information and recommendations are distributed across the college’s six sites (Standards IVA.1, IVA.2, IVA., and IVB.2e).

This recommendation has been partially met. The committee structure is in place, but the practicality of having committee meetings include true participation from the six campus sites has been problematic. All major committees list members from the campuses, but all too often the only actual committee participation is from National and Pohnpei campuses, as evidenced in minutes of committees and in dialogue with committee members and leaders from the campuses. The good intention of using technology like VOIP to allow participation has had poor results. The removal of a voting voice by campus directors on president’s cabinet seems counter to this collaboration effort, both to the team and to the directors themselves. The role and scope of authority for decision-making is established in board policy. The disconnect between the actual limited of participation versus the written role of participation was of concern across the college except among the executive administration centralized on the National Campus. With travel so limited and technology so lacking, the reality is that very few voices are heard, especially from internal and external stakeholders from Kosrae, Chuuk, and Yap. Engaging dialogue has room for improvement; the college has responded to this recommendation to the extent that program review including assessment of learning outcomes is reviewed and analyzed by a broad base of faculty and administrators beginning at the program level and moving along from there.” Page 8 & 9

“A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

General Observations

The self-study described several initiatives to support its assertion that the college had made great strides to achieve effective leadership, communication, collegial consultation and defined, clear lines

of authority to support student learning and promote institutional effectiveness. The degree of the college's progress and achievement, however, was not appreciated until the accreditation team conducted its visits to the state campuses and the National Campus. Interviews with campus stakeholders supported the efforts implemented by college leadership and acknowledged the many attempts to increase communication (IV.A.1-2a-b, 3). It is clear that the college has made strides toward implementing a governance model that is inclusive and broad-based. The annual President's Retreat facilitates dialogue and is an excellent indication of the college's commitment to participatory governance (IV.A.3). Regardless of the many real attempts to facilitate participatory governance, the existing processes and practices require ongoing improvement to create an environment that genuinely encourages all constituent groups to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved (IV.A.1). There are two general areas that pose particular challenges to recognizing and utilizing the contributions of leadership to facilitate continuous improvement and institutional effectiveness. First, the state campuses are not able to participate as fully as necessary to best represent the needs of their populations. Second, the faculty at each campus do not participate as fully as the Governance Policy anticipates (IV.A.1, IV.B.2.a-b).”
Page 51

“Conclusions

The college partially meets the requirements of Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes. There is a cohesive management structure in place. There are structures and modes of telecommunication in place designed to increase stakeholder participation in governance processes. It is questionable, though, whether those structures are functionally effective. With the exception of management participation, active participation by constituency representatives in committees is negligible. There are three overarching reasons that these issues exist.

There are logistical issues associated with the geography of FSM. While improving technical capabilities will partially address this problem, correcting the current deficiency in posting to the college website committee meeting agendas, meeting minutes, and material important to decision-making brings into question the college's genuine interest in promoting participation in the governance process.

There appears to be neglect of faculty input, especially from the state campuses to the national campus.

There is no evidence of a well-designed and ongoing evaluation of the governance and decision-making processes, such that the issues that might be hindering participatory governance could be identified and resolved

Recommendations 1 and 3, noted in Standard I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness apply to the college to fully meet Standard IV.A. Decision-making Roles and Processes. **Recommendations to Fully Meet the Standards of Accreditation Recommendation 1. Recommendations to Fully Meet the Standards of Accreditation Recommendation 1.** *Improving Institutional Effectiveness* To fully meet this standard, the team recommends the college evolve its communications efforts to ensure broad-based and purposeful dialogue in which all stakeholders participate in the exchange of different points of view and reflections that lead to genuine communication and effective governance (I.B.4, IV.A.3).” Page 54

2c: Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services [Closing the loop]:

1. Improve standing committee structure and participation at all campuses

by:

- a. ***Establishing a common time for class schedules across all campuses to allow increased faculty input***
 - b. ***Monitoring and report quality of state campus access to VOIP and Elluminate sessions for committee meeting***
 - c. ***Provide funding for FSM Telecommunications based teleconferences for all standing committee members at state campuses***
 - d. ***Establish standing committee meeting sites at all campuses:***
 - i. ***Provides quiet, comfortable meeting space***
 - ii. ***Is equipped with both phone line & VOIP connection***
 - iii. ***Provides access to computer, Internet access and smart board/LCD projector***
 - e. ***Provide for committee forums or other means of asynchronous communication and structured discussions on topics of interest to the committee***
 - f. ***Establish a critical documents depository on the college web site for easy access***
- 2. Incorporate into performance management work plans and evaluation key performance indicators for:**
- a. ***Committee Leadership***
 - i. ***Communications***
 - ii. ***Agenda development and dissemination***
 - iii. ***Posting of minutes on web site***
 - iv. ***Quality of meetings***
 - b. ***Members***
 - i. ***Participation in committee meetings***
 - ii. ***Information dissemination***
 - iii. ***Preparation for meetings***
- 3. To improve transparency of decision making, adopt a formal decision making approach for the college such as PDCA (plan, do, check, act- see <http://www.answers.com/topic/pdca> for additional information) or other structured approach to decision making**
- 4. Conduct formal periodic evaluation of the college's governance structure at the institution and committee level**
- 5. Revise the committee structure and membership taking into account:**
- a. ***Requirements of the AACJC accreditation standards calling for wide***

- participation (note: the different views of the national and state campuses on participator decision making has to be resolved – ACCJC evaluation report places an emphasis on the voice of state campus faculty being heard - Regardless of structure ensure full participation of state campuses in committees) in decision making*
- b. Role of the college’s master plan approval and implementation for committees*
 - c. Clearly defined roles in decision-making of:
 - i. Faculty*
 - ii. Staff*
 - iii. Students*
 - iv. administrators*
 - v. taking into account what is a committee function versus an administrative function**
 - d. impact of the structure and membership on improving:
 - i. communications,*
 - ii. participatory decision-making and*
 - iii. understanding of roles and responsibilities**
- 6. Provide ongoing training for chairs and committee members in roles and responsibilities and conducting good meetings and establishing dialogue among committee members*
- 7. Enhance dissemination of reports on enrollment, student achievement and other critical information and data for the college and improve design, analysis and timeliness of surveys (including an increased emphasis on focus groups), program assessment and program review information the college needs for evidence based decision making*

Third Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan) (3-12):

3a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:
COM-FSM Governance Policy Survey & follow up Focus Groups (administered in fall 2010)

3b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

74% of respondents indicated attendance at committee meeting as OK or poor.

74% of respondents indicated being neutral or dissatisfied with governance at the college.

In the comments 19 of 39 comments related to the need for “Establish communication protocols and standard operating procedures (turn around time, document flow and standards, standards for

Governance Policy Evaluation

office/division meetings, feedback, define and practice transparency, stakeholder, roles and procedures, etc.)” Two comments were “Administration as cowboys” and “Decision made at national campus.”

In the comments 5 of 39 comments related to training in governance and increase follow up to communications.

In the comments section 8 of 43 comments related to reduction in membership of committees.

Focus groups with Kosrae and Yap campuses indicated a lack of ability to participate in participatory decision-making. Comments reasons included:

- VOIP unreliable (most often cannot hear the discussions)
- VOIP not easily accessible for committee members
- For teleconferences through FSM Telecommunications there are no set aside funds – this is especially true when campus members of than campus directors are involved
- Elluminate either cannot be connected to or is slow in response
- Time of meetings conflicts with teaching schedule for faculty and ICs. (there is no common meeting-free or meeting time across the six campuses)
- Due to their smaller number Smaller campus faculty are expected to participate in multiply committees
- No rewards or consequences for standing committee participation

A major difference is seen between the views of the state and national (including administration) campuses. A simplistic summary is the state view of six campuses of equal importance; versus a view of the national campus as dominate in decision-making and direction for the college. The view is present for faculty, staff, students and administrators, but faculty has been singled out by the accreditation site evaluation reports numerous times. This ~~is~~ show in the different views of committees and committee composition. For example, the national view is to have a committee with primarily all national campus division chairs and instructional coordinators from the state campuses with an alternate view from the states of having the ICs and the DAP and DVCE from the national campus.

3c: Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services[Closing the loop]:
Recommendation under First means of assessment for this evaluation question

Fourth Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan) (3-12):

4a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:

ACCJC Accreditation Standards Section IVA – accreditation standards Section IV: Leadership and Governance; Section IVA: Decision-Making Roles and Processes (attached)

4b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

“Change focus of standing committees to Master Plans rather than specific office or division needs to force participants to include and represent their division Master Plan and the Plan-to-Plan links. Rationale: Standing committees have been functioning as working committees that focus on whatever direction the office that is closely related to them dictates. This change will force offices to take on their duties which are sometimes delegated to committees to do for or with them. The ultimate objective is

Governance Policy Evaluation

to create a committees whose main responsibility is to provide oversight on specific areas of the master plan. The committee will not focus on a specific office's needs but will then widen its oversight to include the needs of any office or department that might impact the particular committee's area of the master plan."

"Need to do: 1) identify all Master Plans to be involve; 2) chart the links; and 3) select people who can make and maintain the links from Plan-to-Plan' 3) increase the responsibility of representatives to report committee activities across their constituents across the whole system

- Reduce the size of committees by creating smaller committees with focused subcommittees.
- Rationale: Huge committees repel participants as they feel their input is not important; sub-committees with clear focus could help to reflect Plan-to-Plan links; get more people involved in committee work"

"Change the leadership for the standing committees.

- Rationale: To encourage participation of those who feel committee work is a waste of time or who think their voices are not important because committee work is directed from above and decisions are already made before presented to committees for discussion; free VPs and CDs to do their work.
- Need to do: 1) remove President, VPs and Campus Directors from all committees other than Cabinet; all, but the President, can be ex-officio members (non-voting) of PRC; and 2) have chairpersons of committees be elected and have offices serve as secretariat of the committee."

"Delete publications and accreditation committees"

"Other suggestions were made for various committees

- Planning and Resources
 - Considerable discussion took place over the need for the PRC. It was finally agreed that PRC should remain but there is a need to review the TOR and functions
 - Division/ Office heads should be on PRC (not the committee chairs???)
 - Prepare budget preparation guidelines through the President to BOR
 - Budget preparation should be a steering committee appointed under PRC
 - Finance Committee
 - Instead of CD and VPCRE, include Campus Fiscal officers and CRE-AO
- Personnel Committee
 - Does it need two representatives from each classification? National Campus overloads.
- We need consistency of names across all committees (ie) Staff rep., Faculty rep., Faculty/Staff Senate rep. unless specific needs such as Personnel Committee
- State Campus Reps should form campus level advisory councils at each campus
- Training on meeting organization, conducting meetings in place and via distance and the etiquette required for including unseen participants is needed.

4c: Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services[Closing the loop]:

Recommendations are combined under First Means of Assessment

Evaluation Question (Use a different form for each evaluation question)(3-6):

2. Has system communications been improved?

First Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan 3-7):

1a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success (3-8):

COM-FSM Self Study Report 2010 (Section IVA) – section IVA of the self study is viewed in his context as a structure review of the college decision-making roles and processes (attached)

1b. *Summary of Assessment Data Collected (3-9):*

“STANDARD IVA5: SELF EVALUATION

Results of the 2008 evaluation of the organizational chart by the Department of Administrative Services showed that the college had developed, documented, and implemented an organizational structure for administrative responsibilities across the six sites that addressed issues of continuity in administrative services. Also, the 2008 evaluation report cites some improvement in coordination of activities. However, this report also cites less improvement in clarity and consistency of decision making across all six campuses. The report further cites a concern for the level of training provided to implement the new administrative structure and the lack of attention to the development of structures (policies, processes, procedures, etc.) that would support implementation of the new structure.

Preliminary results of the October 2009 satisfaction survey indicate that faculty and staff appears to feel informed about the activities the college undertakes, are aware of the areas where they can find information about the college, and have sufficient information about what is going on at the college. Rated poorly, however, were the items that state, “The college publicizes its decision making,” and “Different divisions at the college communicate effectively.” There appears to be a need to enhance the awareness of the college’s decision making processes among the faculty and staff and to improve communication among the various divisions within the college.”

1c: *Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services[Closing the loop] (3-10):*

Recommendations listed under Second Means of Assessment

Second Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan (3-11):

2a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:

ACCJC Site Team Evaluation Report 2010 (Section IVA) – the evaluation report is viewed in this context as an expert external review of the colleges decision-making roles and processes(attached)

2b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

Recommendation 1. *Improving Institutional Effectiveness and Leadership and Governance* To fully meet this standard, the team recommends the college evolve its communication efforts to ensure broad-based participation and encourage purposeful dialogue in which all stakeholders participate

in the exchange of different points of view and reflections that lead to genuine communication and participatory governance (I.B.4, IV.A.3). (page 5)

“Recommendation 1: Improve Communication *The college must develop and implement a collaborative process that:*

Includes faculty, staff, students, and administrators at the college’s six sites (Standards IV.4, IVA, IVA.1, IVA2.a, IVA.2b, IVA. and IVB.2b),

Identifies the roles and scope of authority of the faculty, staff, students, and administrators in the decision-making processes (Standards IVA, IVA.1, IVA.2, IVA.2a, IVA.2b, and IVA.),

Identifies the roles and scope of authority of college committees in the decision-making processes (Standards IVA, IVA.1, IVA.2, IVA.2a, IVA.2b, and IVA.), includes dialogue as a means to develop, document, implement, and evaluate assessment plans for student learning outcomes in both instruction and student services (Standards IB.a, IB.5, IIA.1c, II B.4, and IIC.2), and

Includes formal pathways for effective communication links so that information and recommendations are distributed across the college’s six sites (Standards IVA.1, IVA.2, IVA., and IVB.2e).

This recommendation has been partially met. The committee structure is in place, but the practicality of having committee meetings include true participation from the six campus sites has been problematic. All major committees list members from the campuses, but all too often the only actual committee participation is from National and Pohnpei campuses, as evidenced in minutes of committees and in dialogue with committee members and leaders from the campuses. The good intention of using technology like VOIP to allow participation has had poor results. The removal of a voting voice by campus directors on president’s cabinet seems counter to this collaboration effort, both to the team and to the directors themselves. The role and scope of authority for decision-making is established in board policy. The disconnect between the actual limited role of participation versus the written role of participation was of concern across the college except among the executive administration centralized on the National Campus. With travel so limited and technology so lacking, the reality is that very few voices are heard, especially from internal and external stakeholders from Kosrae, Chuuk, and Yap. Engaging dialogue has room for improvement; the college has responded to this recommendation to the extent that program review including assessment of learning outcomes is reviewed and analyzed by a broad base of faculty and administrators beginning at the program level and moving along from there.” Page 8 & 9

2c: Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services [Closing the loop]:

Same basic recommendations as with evaluation question 1:

- 1. Identify specific roles of faculty, staff, students and administers in decision making at the college with emphasis on understanding the roles of committees for:**
 - a. Planning and tracking of results and improvement through assessment and resource allocation**
 - b. Identify key performance indicators for communications and information dissemination and incorporate into work planning and**

performance evaluation

- 2. Post committee minutes on the college’s web site or a secure site that is password assessable to faculty, staff, students, and administrators**
- 3. Provide monthly summaries of committee actions for the college community and quarterly summaries for stakeholders**
- 4. Provide forum(s) or social media sites to encourage exchange of information and dialogue across the college**
- 5. To improve transparency of decision making, adopt a formal decision making approach for the college such as PDCA (plan, do, check, act- see <http://www.answers.com/topic/pdca> for additional information) or other structured approach to decision making**
- 6. Enhance dissemination of reports on enrollment, student achievement and other critical information and data for the college and improve design, analysis and timeliness of surveys (including an increased emphasis on focus groups), program assessment and program review information the college needs for evidence based decision making**
- 7. Provide training:**
 - a. Micronesian culture and communication patterns and develop mechanisms that document all faculty, staff, students and administrator views.**
 - b. Ongoing training for chairs and committee member in effective dialogue as opposed to discussion**
 - c. Evidence based decision making**

Third Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan) (3-12):

3a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:

COM-FSM Governance Policy Survey & follow up Focus Groups (administered in fall 2010)

3b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

70% of respondents to the survey were either neutral or dissatisfied about the level of communication and coordination efforts between the various divisions at the college.

In the comments section 20 of 43 comments related to the need for “Establish communication protocols and standard operating procedures (turn around time, document flow and standards, standards for office/division meetings, feedback, define and practice transparency, stakeholder, roles and procedures, etc.)”

In the comments section 4 of 43 comments related to the need for training and follow up on communications.

Governance Policy Evaluation

In the comments section 3 of 43 comments related to posting of minutes and need to see communications as part of a broader system.

3c: Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services[Closing the loop]:
Recommendations listed under Second Means of Assessment

Evaluation Question (Use a different form for each evaluation question)(3-6):

3. Has understanding of roles & responsibility of faculty, students and staff in governance of the college increased?

First Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan 3-7):

1a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success (3-8):
 COM-FSM Self Study Report 2010 (Section IVA) – section IVA of the self study is viewed in his context as a structure review of the college decision-making roles and processes (attached)

1b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected (3-9):

“The college will finalize, implement, and evaluate its communications improvement plan. Such plan will include mechanisms to enhance communication throughout the system between and among the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students as well as the constituencies served by the college in the community with particular emphasis on providing feedback on the college’s decision making process as well as enhancing communication within the various divisions of the college. The Vice President for Administration will assume the primary responsibility in the finalization, implementation and evaluation of this plan which will be implemented by the end of January 2010. Such efforts will be evaluated no later than one year from the time of implementation.” Page 58

1c: Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services[Closing the loop] (3-10):

Second Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan (3-11):

2a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:
 ACCJC Site Team Evaluation Report 2010 (Section IVA) – the evaluation report is viewed in this context as an expert external review of the colleges decision-making roles and processes(attached)

2b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

There were four meetings and at none of the meetings was a senate representative present. Attendance by proxy, video conference, and voice over Internet protocol (VOIP) was included in the tally. BODY

	MEETING DETAIL			TOTAL ATTENDANCE/TOTAL POSSIBLE ATTENDANCE	
State Campus	Faculty/Staff Senate	Student	Employee Grp Reps		
Student services	3 mtgs Fall 09	1/15	1/6	1/6	NA
Human Resources	1 mtg	0/5	NA	NA	2/6

Governance Policy Evaluation

Planning&Resources	Dec-09	4	2/16	0/8	NA	NA
	mtgs F09- S10					
Curriculum	4	1/16	22/40	NA	NA	
	mtgs F09					

This data indicates that representatives do not regularly participate, resulting in functional committees dominated by management at the National Campus, at least as reflected by the minutes. Also, data presented on page 227 of the self-study indicates that one-third to one-half of respondents are unclear as to their roles and responsibilities as committee members. This evaluation is consistent with the sample meeting attendance results. Contributing factors to the apparent lack of participation in governance venues should be sought through outreach and assessment with stakeholders (IV.2.b, IV.2.e). The most obvious challenges impeding state campus participation

2c: Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services [Closing the loop]:
Regardless of committee structure and membership, all committee members must be active participants. Special attention must be given to ensuring state campus participation. See section 1 – evaluation question #1

Roles and responsibilities of chair, members and support staff should be included into the college’s new work planning and performance management tool with specific key performance indicator established and

Third Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan) (3-12):

<p>3a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success: Standing committee Terms of Reference & Presentation on Governance Policy Implementation</p>
<p>3b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:</p> <p>Included in all standing committee terms of reference (reviewed periodically by all committees): Responsibilities of committee members are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regularly prepare for and attend committee meetings; • Actively participate in meetings; and • Share information on committee discussions, recommendations and decisions with and gather input from their area of representation. <p>From Governance Policy Implementation Presentation (presented at all campuses summer of 2008) Responsibilities of Committee Members (general)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Regularly prepare for and attend committee meetings; ■ Actively participate in meetings; and

Governance Policy Evaluation

- Share information on committee discussions, recommendations and decisions with and gather input from their area of representation.
- Support decisions of the committee or ensure that minutes include concerns/reservations with decision (s)

Communication and dissemination of information

- Agenda items may be submitted to the chairperson by other members, other committees, or the President.
- The chairperson compiles the agenda and forwards it to committee members prior to meetings.
- All meetings are to have minutes which are to be distributed electronically within three working days of the meeting to members for their review. Members are to comment within the next three working days. The minutes are officially adopted at the next meeting. The President must approve all minutes.
- Accomplishments of committee meetings included in monthly and quarterly reports (special committee section in quarterly report)
- Committees are encouraged to have documents related to committee work and minutes available through web access

Responsibilities of the chair (general)

- Preside over meetings;
- Ensure the terms of reference for the committee are met and matters brought before the committee are judiciously addressed;
- Prepare and distribute the agenda prior to each meeting;
- Ensure committee minutes, reports, and recommendations are completed and appropriately disseminated in a timely manner; and
- Forward subcommittee recommendations to the President within three working days.

Responsibilities of the chair (from Mary Allen)

- Before the discussion begins, consider establishing ground rule that promote an open discussion and that encourage participants to be respectful if they disagree over issues
- Encourage all participants to present their views and to explain the rationale for their opinions
- Role model support for the airing of differences viewpoints and repeatedly seek our differences of opinion by inviting everyone to contribute
- Avoid a win-lose atmosphere. Instead, remind participants that the purpose is not to see whose ideas are the best, but to develop the best solution for the college/committee as a whole.
- Avoid conflict reducing techniques that prematurely terminate discussion, such as voting for each item separately
- Regularly summarize positions in a fair way and seek common ground among them. Continue to question members about their reasons for support certain items and recommendations and not others
- Once decision appear to be agreed upon, check with all members to see if everyone can support the final selection of goals and objectives. If everyone support the choices, you have reached consensus.

While the terms of reference provide the roles and responsibilities for each committee for purpose, chair and member responsibilities there appears to be a lack of understanding or application of roles.

3c: Use of Results to Improve Program/Unit Impact/Services[Closing the loop]:

3. Incorporate the roles and responsibilities of committee chair, members

and stupor staff into the college's new work planning and performance evaluation system including:

- a. Roles for information dissemination***
- b. Meeting attendance and preparation***
- 4. Provide ongoing training for committee chairs and members in***
 - a. Communications and information dissemination***
 - b. Conducting effective meetings (as per Mary Allen's materials and with understanding of Micronesian culture, learning styles and compunctions patterns) with emphasis on creating dialogue among all faculty, staff, students, administrators and stakeholders***
 - c. Micronesian culture, learning styles and patterns of communication***

Appendix

Appendix: Governance Policy

College of Micronesia-FSM

Governance Policy

1.0 Policy:

It is the policy of the College of Micronesia-FSM to promote a shared governance environment which involves the commitment and participation of all campus constituencies and to be guided by the college's value statements in the development of policies and procedures.

2.0 Purpose:

The purpose of the College of Micronesia-FSM Shared Governance Model is to ensure participatory decision-making. Its fundamental premise rests upon active and responsible involvement of all college employees and students. An inherent characteristic is a commitment made by the President as well as members of all constituency groups to engage in interactive communication. The Shared Governance Model is a system of committees and subcommittees which address institutional needs and provide a conduit for system communication. Through this model, details of issues and policy matters are to be brought into a forum where full participation in the decision-making process can be assured. This model presumes that there will be timely response to all recommendations and resolutions.

The goal of the Shared Governance Model is to engage all members in the college community in guiding the college to achieve its mission of "assisting in the development of the Federated States of Micronesia by providing academic, career and technical educational opportunities for student learning." Recognizing that everyone's time is valuable, it is important for each committee to have meaningful issues to address and for a structure to exist that will ensure committee issues are heard and appropriately addressed. Subcommittee recommendations are forwarded through appropriate standing committees and ultimately to the President and his Cabinet for action. Operations under the Shared Governance Model shall conform to the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order. Attendance at committee meetings is part of an employee's responsibilities when assigned to a committee and is

necessary for the model to be successful; therefore attendance at committee meetings is to be considered in the employee's performance evaluation.

3.0 Application:

This policy applies to all standing committees, subcommittees and ad hoc committees and the college community at large.

4.0 Responsibilities:

The President has the overall authority of implementing the Governance Policy.

5.0 Procedure:

The President is charged by the Board of Regents to responsibly manage the affairs of the college in accordance with their wishes and in line with the Federated States of Micronesia enabling legislation that established and authorizes the college. A system of standing committees and employee and student organizations are established to allow faculty, staff, students and administrators to participate in the generation of ideas and to discuss and make recommendations on matters relative to the college. All committees and organizations are ultimately advisory to the President to assist him in carrying out his responsibilities.

A. Shared Governance Process

The shared governance process occurs through the standing committee structure, Faculty/Staff Senate and Student Body Association. These structures are defined in the attached Appendix A. This committee structure and organizations afford broad-based participation in the governance process by all campus constituencies.

B. Assuring Representation

Governance Policy Evaluation

- Each state campus is to institute the following extension of standing committees: management council, curriculum committee, student services committee, and personnel committee. The state campus director is to serve as the chairman of the management council. The responsibilities of the management council include that of the planning and finance committee, and membership includes the director, instructional coordinator, student services coordinator, fiscal officer, Faculty/Staff Senate president, Student Body Association president, and a faculty or staff representative depending on whether the F/SS president is a member of the faculty or staff. The instructional coordinator is to chair the curriculum committee; the student services coordinator is to chair the student services committee; and secretary or administrative officer to the campus director is to chair the personnel committee.
- These state campus committees are to appoint at least one representative to the main standing committees. These representatives have two major responsibilities. They are responsible for bringing the state campus faculty, staff, and students' interests and concerns to the attention of the main standing committees. They are also and perhaps especially responsible for bringing the issues that are under consideration of the main standing committees to the attention of the state campus community.
- The Faculty/Staff Senate and Student Body Association are to appoint their representatives to standing committees as appropriate. These representatives are responsible for bringing the Senate and SBA's interests and concerns to the attention of the standing committees and for bringing issues that are under consideration of the standing committees to the attention of the Senate and SBA.
- The main standing committee chairs and all members of the committees are to establish appropriate timelines for discussion, information gathering and dissemination, and consideration of the issues before their committees.
- All main standing committee members represent the college community, some with particular responsibility to particular constituency. All have a responsibility to ensure that communication is frequent, thorough, clear and timely.

6.0 Definitions:

- Cabinet: the primary vehicle to foster collaborative development or review of college procedures.
- Standing committees: representative groups that focus on a specific area of college operations. These groups are intended to be on-going groups that identify issues, collect facts, and recommend solutions to appropriate departments and the President.
- Ad hoc committees: groups appointed for a limited time period to review specific issues or concerns and to make recommendations on the issue or concern to a committee. These groups may also be called working groups or task forces.

Approved BOR 12/7/06.

College of Micronesia-FSM

Standing Committees

The main standing committees of the College of Micronesia-FSM are established as follows:

1. Cabinet

2. Planning and Finance Committee
 - a. Subcommittees
 - 1) Assessment Committee
 - 2) Auxiliary Services Advisory Committee
 - 3) Endowment Fundraising Steering Committee
 - 4) Facilities and Campus Environment Committee
 - 5) Finance Committee
 - 6) Information Communications Technology Committee
 - 7) Personnel Committee
 - 8) Staff Development Committee
 - 9) Sponsored Programs Committee

3. Curriculum Committee
 - a. Subcommittees
 - 1) Learning Resources Committee

4. Student Services Committee
 - a. Subcommittees
 - 1) Financial Aid Committee
 - 2) Non-resident Life Committee
 - 3) Resident Life Committee

5. Admissions Board

6. Cooperative Research and Extension Committee

7. Accreditation Committee

8. Publications Committee

Appendix: Assessment Plan Governance Policy Evaluation

Governance Policy

Fall 2008 – Summer 2010

Unit/Office/Program (2-1)

Assessment Period Covered (2-2)

() Formative Assessment (2-3)

IRPO 2010.12

(x) Summative Assessment (2-4)

Submitted by & Date Submitted (2-5)

Endorsed by (2-5a)

Institutional Mission/Strategic Goal (2-6):

Mission: Historically diverse, uniquely Micronesian and globally connected, the College of Micronesia-FSM is a continuously improving and student centered institute of higher education. The college is committed to assisting in the development of the Federated States of Micronesia by providing academic, career and technical educational opportunities for student learning.

Strategic Goal (*which strategic goal(s) most support the services being provided*) (2-7):

SPG9. Provide for continuous improvement of programs, services and college environment.

- a. Improve institutional assessment and evaluation
- b. Integrate planning, evaluation and resource allocation for continuous improvement
- c. Increase research and data driven decision making
- d. Develop an integrated data system
- e. Enhance decision making and communications at the college through implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the new governance policy and revised standing committee structure.

Unit/Program Mission Statement (2-8):

3.0 Policy:

It is the policy of the College of Micronesia-FSM to promote a shared governance environment which involves the commitment and participation of all campus constituencies and to be guided by the college's value statements in the development of policies and procedures.

Unit/Program Goals (2-9):

- A. Shared Governance Process
- B. Assuring Representation

Governance Policy Evaluation

Unit/Program Outcomes/Objectives (2-10):

- The revised committee structure enhances participatory decision making to meet institutional needs.
- The revised committee structure creates an effective conduit for improving system communications.
- Participants in the revised committee structure demonstrate an understanding of roles and responsibilities of faculty, students, staff in governance of the college.

Evaluation questions (2-11)	Data sources (2-12)	Sampling (2-13)	Analysis (2-14)
1. Has greater participation in decision making occurred?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Frequency of meetings ▪ Minutes showing participation ▪ Dissemination of information ▪ Accomplishments of committee in monthly & quarterly reports ▪ Self study 		Descriptive statistics
2. Has system communications been improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Surveys (student & staff satisfaction) ▪ Interviews & focus groups ▪ Availability of information on web and other media ▪ Self study 		Descriptive statistics
3. Has understanding of roles & responsibility of faculty, students and staff in governance of the college increased?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Surveys ▪ Interviews & focus groups ▪ Evidence of support for committee working structure ▪ Self study 	Structured sampling	Descriptive statistics

Timeline (2-15)

Activity (2-16)	Who is Responsible? (2-17)	Date (2-18)

Governance Policy Evaluation

Collection and review of committee minutes, presidents update monthly & quarterly reports, website, student & staff satisfaction and self study.	IRPO	June – July 2010
Interviews & focus groups	IRPO with IT support	July & August 2010
Draft governance evaluation report	IPRO	August 2010
System review at President’s retreat	IRPO	August 16 – 18, 2010
Review & finalization	IRPO/assessment committee/planning and resources committee	August & September 2010

Comments (2-19):

Appendix: ACCJC Standards: Standard IV: Leadership and Governance¹

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

- 1.** Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.
- 2.** The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.
 - a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.
 - b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.
- 3.** Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies.
- 4.** The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

¹ Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) - Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accreditation Standards

5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Appendix: COM-FSM Self Study Section IVA

Self Study Report 2010

INSTITUTIONAL SELF EVALUATION

STANDARD IVA

DECISION-MAKING ROLES AND PROCESSES

College of Micronesia – FSM

STANDARD IVA: DECISION-MAKING ROLES AND PROCESSES

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

STANDARD IVA1

Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

STANDARD IVA2

The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrative, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

STANDARD IVA2A

Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

STANDARD IVA2B

The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

STANDARD IVA: DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

A revised college mission statement, vision and values statements, and goals were approved by the board at its September 2005 meeting. Revised strategic goals were approved in March 2006.

One of the college's core values states: "We live in a community where collaboration, open-mindedness, respect, and support for each other help us achieve our mission." The college's organization and policy structures are designed to reflect this core value.

A major tool for implementing the strategic plan and integrating planning, evaluation, and resource allocation is the president's retreat which has been held in the spring for the past three years. Documents from these retreats show that faculty, staff, administrators, students, and community stakeholders from all six sites examined the progress made on various components of the college's strategic plan and brought forward ideas for institutional improvement. Minutes show that the results of retreat discussions and presentations were summarized and used by the Planning and Resources Committee. [IVA1]

The COM-FSM governance policy, approved by the board in December 2006, promotes a participatory governance environment for the development of policies and procedures constituencies and be guided by the college's value statements. . Its fundamental premise rests upon active and responsible involvement of all college employees and students. The policy defines the responsibilities of the president's cabinet, standing committees, sub-committees, and ad hoc committees. The membership of all standing committees represents the college community, some with responsibility to a particular constituency. All have a responsibility to ensure that communication is frequent, thorough, clear, and timely. This system of committees

and councils is designed to meet institutional needs and provide a conduit for communication within the system.

[IVA1; IVA2; IVA2a]

The Faculty/Staff Senate (FSS) was reorganized in 2008 to include all sites. According to FSS bylaws, one of the primary purposes of this organization is to serve as a forum to discuss and debate new and existing policies with respect to all issues affecting the college, especially those affecting faculty and staff. Article III Section 2 of the bylaws state that "[t]hrough its appointments of faculty and staff representatives to the College's standing committees and the other decision-making bodies, the Senate makes recommendations to the President and/or the Board of Regents. The Senate also can communicate directly to the President and/or Board of Regents." Per the governance policy FSS recommends members from the various employee categories to nearly all standing committees. The FSS president sits as a voting member on the president's cabinet. Minutes of meetings of the FSS Executive Committee, documents from FSS subcommittee meetings, and minutes from standing committee meetings confirm the active participation of FSS in the college's policy making process. [IVA2a]

Every student who is currently enrolled in the college as a full-time student is a member of the Student Body Association (SBA). According to Section III of the SBA bylaws, the purposes of this organization are to: present the views of the students to the administration and faculty of the college; recommend policies relating to student conduct and behavior; recommend improvements to policies; and recommend changes in the student related services. Like the FSS, the SBA appoints membership to nearly all standing committees. These representatives are responsible for bringing the SBA's interests and concerns to the attention of the standing committees and for bringing issues that are under consideration of the standing committees to the attention of the SBA. The SBA president sits as a voting member on the president's cabinet. [IVA2a]

Section 5.0 of the governance policy stipulates that each state campus is to institute the following extension of standing committees: management council, curriculum committee, student services committee, and personnel committee. The state campus director is to serve as the chair of the management council. The responsibilities of the management council include that of the planning and finance committee, and membership includes the director, instructional coordinator, student services coordinator, fiscal officer, FSS president, SBA president, and a faculty or staff representative depending on whether the FSS president is a member of the faculty or staff. These state campus committees are to appoint at least one representative to the main standing committees. Representatives on these committees have responsibility for bringing the state campus faculty, staff, and students' interests and concerns to the attention of the main standing committees and for bringing the issues that are under consideration of the main standing committees to the attention of the state campus community. As noted in the President's Update, logs of travel activities, and trip reports, administrators and staff travel to campuses to deliver training, assist with the implementation of various procedures, meet with local leadership, monitor progress, and listen to the college community including the students. [IVA1]

The Curriculum Committee, comprised of the vice presidents, directors, campus instructional coordinators, National campus division chairs, faculty representatives, and a student representative, advises the president on matters relating to programs, curricula, and academic

policies and procedures, and provides oversight and assists with setting the agenda for the Learning Resources Committee, which functions as a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee. The Learning Resources Committee has responsibility for developing or revising policies and procedures for learning resources and making recommendations for improvement of library and learning support, archives, and audio-visual services. Membership on this committee includes directors, a library representative, an audio-visual representative, campus librarians, two faculty appointed by the FSS, and two students. The Student Services Committee advises the president in all matters relating to student services, including student support services, the quality of life of residence hall students, and the well-being of all students. This committee also promotes student awareness of and participation in the decision-making process of the college and provides oversight and assists with setting the agenda for the Financial Aid Committee. Members of the Student Services Committee include the vice president for student services, the directors, campus student services coordinators, other student services representatives, two FSS representatives, and two students.

STANDARD IVA: SELF EVALUATION

A Standard IV survey was administered during the spring of 2009. Separate instruments for faculty, staff, government, parents, business, and community were used. The Standard IV survey, however, suffered severe limitations with no results from the Chuuk, Kosrae, or Pohnpei campuses and therefore the survey reflects only the opinions from the National and Yap campuses. A total of 26 faculty, 62 staff, 162 students, 52 government workers, 39 parents, 28 business persons, and 27 “others” completed the survey on which they offered their opinions on the college, college administration, and the Board of Regents.

Item 1 on the Standard IV survey states: “I understand COM-FSM’s institutional goals and values.” Of the faculty respondents, 88.5% agreed with the statement, while only 7.7% disagreed. An even higher level of agreement was noted in the staff respondents’ results with 91.1% indicating agreement and 1.6% indicating disagreement. Similar percentages were realized in the student survey data. Although community respondents also indicated agreement with Item 1, a significant percentage of respondents checked “I don’t know.” It appears there is a need to provide information on the college’s goals and values to the community.

According to the preliminary results from an October 2009 satisfaction survey, the item “I am satisfied with the college’s mission and goals” rated a high positive response among the faculty and staff.

Items 2,4,5,7,and 8 of the Standard IV survey focused on ascertaining faculty and staff perceptions as to their role in governance and achieving the college’s goals, opportunities to participate in institutional planning, involvement in bringing forth ideas for institutional improvement, and exercising a voice in establishing institutional policies, planning, and budget development. Results of the survey indicate that approximately 70% of the faculty and staff feel they are provided opportunities to participate in planning. A slightly lower percentage (60%) of the faculty and staff feel they are involved in bringing forth ideas for institutional improvement and have an important and clearly defined role in the college’s governance. Approximately 60% of the staff respondents agreed with Item 8, “I exercise a substantial voice in institutional

policies, planning, and budget that relate to my area of responsibilities and expertise.” However, only 46.3% of the faculty agreed with Item 8, while 46.1% indicated disagreement. One respondent commented, “No one listens to faculty.” Another commented, “I do not get feedback from whatever I contributed,” while another commented, “Administration frequently makes unilateral decisions without involving/consulting/soliciting faculty input/experience/expertise.” One staff respondent expressed concern regarding the actual implementation of the plans that are developed. Although faculty and staff agree that opportunities for involvement in the college’s governance are made available, there is a need to provide feedback when contributions are made, especially to the faculty.

On the student version of the Standard IV survey, students consistently rated their involvement highly resulting in 80 - 85% agreement. It appears that students perceive that they have a significant role in the way the college plans for improvement, that they have important part in the governance of the college, and that they are extended opportunities to actively involve and participate in leadership and governance of the college. Notable is the 89.4% of the students who agreed to Item 6 on the student survey that states, “I understand COM-FSM policies, rules, and regulations.” External stakeholders (parents, government personnel, and members of the business community) rated student involvement with similar high levels of agreement.

In the spring of 2009, members of the COM-FSM Board of Regents were interviewed to gain their perceptions on a variety of issues related to Standard IV. In response to the question “What mechanisms (policies) does the Board have in place to ensure faculty, staff and students have input into policies,” one member pointed out that the board rotates its meetings to allow regents the opportunity to visit the state campuses. During these visits time is set aside to meet with faculty, staff and students at each campus. Two other members added that the board holds public hearings and meets the students, parents, and the college community on issues affecting the college.

Faculty respondents on the Standard IV survey expressed 84.6% agreement with Item 6, “I participate in committees of the college,” while 79% of the staff respondents expressed agreement with the same item. Although there appears to be a rather high level in involvement in the work of the college’s committees, one respondent commented, “Committee work is a waste of time, the committee’s decisions and recommendations are ignored.”

In response to Item 5 on the student version of the survey, “I understand how college committees work,” 54.3% of the subjects expressed agreement, 25.4% expressed disagreement, and 20.4 % indicated “I don’t know.” There appears to be a need to establish a mechanism to involve students in the work of the various committees of the college.

When asked to respond to external stakeholder survey Item 5, “I understand how college committees work,” 46.8% expressed agreement as against 53.2% who indicated disagreement and neutrality. One subject pointed out, “I cannot say I agree on the survey because we the community never know what’s going on.” There appears to be a need to more fully inform the community regarding the college’s governance structure.

In response to Item 9 on the faculty survey, “The college clearly communicates its policies on governance procedure,” 42.3% of the faculty expressed agreement, but a fairly significant number of the respondents (57.7%) indicated disagreement, checked “I don’t know,” or left the item blank. According to one faculty respondent, “Although there is so-called organizational structure, but the protocols are not properly observed nor are constituents discouraged from by-passing people in order to communicate to higher levels of the organization.” Another faculty respondent commented, “There is minimal communication between admin and faculty.”

On the same item (Item 9), 66.2% of the staff expressed agreement. However, staff comments from the survey indicated continued concern regarding communication at the college. One staff respondent commented, “Communication does not reach all division on the campuses,” while another commented, “Strongly recommend that communication be improved at all levels within the system.” A third staff member commented,

Communication is still a big problem although it is viewed to be much better nowadays. It still needs improvement. We need the communication plan done to include mechanics for communicating within the college.

STANDARD IVA: PLANNING AGENDA

- The college will finalize, implement, and evaluate its communication improvement plan. Such plan will include mechanisms to enhance communication throughout the system between and among the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students as well as the constituencies served by the college in the community with particular emphasis on providing feedback on the college’s decision making process as well as enhancing communication within the various divisions of the college. The Vice President for Administrative Services will assume the primary responsibility in the finalization, implementation and evaluation of this plan which will be implemented by the end of January 2010. Such efforts will be evaluated no later than one year from the time of implementation.
- The Vice President for Student Services will develop, implement, and evaluate a mechanism for increasing the level of student participation in the college’s committees.

STANDARD IVA3

Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

STANDARD IVA3: DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

One of the primary recommendations from the spring 2004 comprehensive visit deals with the need for clearly administered responsibility across instructional, student services and learning resource centers at all six sites.

After the receipt of the recommendation from ACCJC, the college immediately convened an all campus meeting which resulted in a revised organizational chart for review and approval of the board at its September 2004 meeting. Training on the organizational changes was conducted for

all sites on December 13, 2004, at the National campus. From January to April 2005 implementation plans were developed by the state campuses and submitted to the president. Changes in existing job descriptions, descriptions for new positions, revised committee assignments, and other structural changes were implemented to support the new organizational chart from July to October 2005.

Trip reports show numerous site visits to all state campuses and FMI by the vice president for instructional affairs (VPIA) and vice president for student services (VPSS) throughout the remainder of 2005. Travel logs and trip reports show that such visits continue to be made to all campuses by administrators on an ongoing basis.

Details of the development, documentation and implementation of the revised organizational chart can be found in the ACCJC progress reports of October 15, 2004, March 15, 2005, March 15, 2006, and in the midterm report of March 15, 2007. A formal evaluation of the college's organizational structure was carried out during February and March 2007 through the use of an institutional survey and focus groups conducted during the National campus staff development day and the president's retreat. A report of this evaluation was published and disseminated in June 2007. A further evaluation of the revised organizational chart was conducted within the Department of Administrative Services in 2008.

A second major recommendation from the 2004 comprehensive visit focuses on the need for enhanced communication in the system. In specific response to this recommendation, a communications working group was established, a series of evaluations of the organizational chart have been made, and the adoption of decision and communication grids was recommended to improve the flow of communication. A log of campus visits documenting communication is being maintained. Technology has been deployed to assist in communication including a voice-over-internet protocol (VoIP) phone system (SIS) linking all sites. A new student information system assists in the flow of student records information among the six sites. An on line forum has been established to pilot the use of forums as a way to improve student and staff communication among the campuses.

In March 2006 the board adopted a communications policy in response to the findings of a communications survey conducted in 2005 and 2006. This policy contains specific communications pathways and calls for development of a communications improvement plan.

STANDARD IVA3: SELF EVALUATION

On the 2005 communication survey, approximately 60% of the respondents indicated that they have a good understanding of what goes on at the college. A similar percentage was reported in the summary of the 2006 follow-up survey. Respondents were asked to indicate how they would like to receive information. Results show that a little over 60% indicated they preferred the use of e-mail with newsletters and meetings coming in between 40 and 48% respectively. Respondents indicated that they would like to receive more information about the long-term plans of the college and course offerings, with information about committee work coming in as a last choice.

In March 2009 members of the Board of Regents were asked if information about the college's performance was readily available to the board, the faculty, the staff, the students, and the community. Generally, the members of the board indicated that information is provided through the college's administration and that information such as monthly updates, test data, and audit reports was readily available. However, they also indicated that more information sharing is desirable.

Item 10 on the Standard IV survey states, "The college has effective communication." Only 30.7% of the faculty respondents agreed with this statement, while 69.2% disagreed. Of the staff respondents, 58.1% agreed with the statement, while 40.4% disagreed. Of the students surveyed, 67.9% agreed, while 14.2% disagreed in response to the same question.

Although the March 2009 follow-up report cites an increase in volume of VoIP connections, many times the parties connected are unable to hear one another clearly enough to communicate effectively. It is hoped that once the undersea fiber optic cable is laid and connected in early 2010, enhanced internet connectivity will improve this means of communication. Comments on the Standard IV survey from faculty included a concern that the degree/level of communications from college leaders to faculty and staff is not matched by corresponding feedback from "down-up." Another faculty respondent commented that there is minimal communication between the administration and faculty and that the administration frequently makes unilateral decisions without consulting faculty.

Survey comments from staff respondents included: "Need more communication among staff, faculty and the president;" "Communications do not reach all divisions on the different campuses;" "Communications are still a big problem, although it appears to be much better nowadays;" "A communications plan is needed, and with it a definition of what communications should be among College levels and its stakeholders;" and "Strongly recommend that communications be improved upon at all levels, within the system."

Among the comments provided by business community respondents on the survey were: "I really do not know much about COM-FSM" and "I think the College needs to improve on the provision of information to the general public." A government respondent commented that the college "should inform the general public as well as parents [of students] regarding tuition breakdowns of students."

STANDARD IVA3: PLANNING AGENDA

- See Standard IVA: Planning Agenda Item 1

STANDARD IVA4

The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

STANDARD IVA4: DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Since the time of the last comprehensive evaluation visit, the college has demonstrated honesty and integrity in its relationship with the ACCJC by immediately attending to areas of concern expressed in recommendations, submitting all required reports on time, and filing substantive change reports prior to implementing significant changes at the college.

STANDARD IVA4: SELF EVALUATION

Although the follow-up report submitted in October 2008 was rejected by the commission, a revised follow-up report submitted in March 2009 was approved. Records of communication with the commission, submission of required reports, and submission of substantive change reports provide evidence that the college has made every effort to advocate and demonstrate honesty and integrity in its relationship with the commission.

STANDARD IVA4: PLANNING AGENDA

- None

STANDARD IVA5

The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement

STANDARD IVA5: DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

The college conducted five primary studies since the implementation of the revised organizational chart in 2004. The first of these studies was a communications survey conducted in the spring of 2005 with a follow-up communications survey conducted in the spring of 2006. A survey on the effectiveness of the organizational chart was conducted in February of 2007 with a further evaluation of the effectiveness of the revised organizational chart conducted within the Department of Administrative Services in 2008. Items regarding communication and governance were included on the Standard IV survey, and an institution-wide satisfaction survey was conducted in October 2009.

Findings from the communication surveys and first evaluation of the organizational chart were disseminated to the college community and used as a basis for improvement.

For example, in response to survey findings, a communications working group was created by the president in 2006 to develop a communications improvement plan that identified formal communication pathways and their corresponding procedures. According to the March 2009 follow-up report, recommendations and findings from the group were incorporated into the

development of the governance policy, developing of decision grids to improve understanding of the decision-making processes at the college and the development of the institutional assessment plan. Further, the work of the group led to the use of standardized institutional surveys, standard committee minutes reporting form, standardized use for the VOIPin committee meetings, and guidelines for use of communication technologies. Terms of reference for each standing committee were finalized during the past two years. Minutes of committee meetings show that discussions during this process prompted a critical review of the roles and responsibilities of each committee.

STANDARD IVA5: SELF EVALUATION

A summary of results and comments on the 2005 and 2006 communication surveys and the Standard IV survey is included under the self evaluation section of Standard IVA3. above. According to the 2007 report on the revised organizational chart survey, 71% of the respondents felt that the chart had improved communication flow, both ways, between employee and supervisor. Of the respondents, 55% agreed that the chart had improved their awareness of the college, 74% agreed that the chart had helped clarify to whom the respondent reports, while 51% felt that the chart had provided them with the opportunity to participate in decision making.

Results of the 2008 evaluation of the organizational chart by the Department of Administrative Services showed that the college had developed, documented, and implemented an organizational structure for administrative responsibilities across the six sites that addressed issues of continuity in administrative services. Also, the 2008 evaluation report cites some improvement in coordination of activities. However, this report also cites less improvement in clarity and consistency of decision making across all six campuses. The report further cites a concern for the level of training provided to implement the new administrative structure and the lack of attention to the development of structures (policies, processes, procedures, etc.) that would support implementation of the new structure.

Preliminary results of the October 2009 satisfaction survey indicate that faculty and staff appear to feel informed about the activities the college undertakes, are aware of the areas where they can find information about the college, and have sufficient information about what is going on at the college. Rated poorly, however, were the items that state, “The college publicizes its decision making,” and “Different divisions at the college communicate effectively.” There appears to be a need to enhance the awareness of the college’s decision making processes among the faculty and staff and to improve communication among the various divisions within the college.

STANDARD IVA5: PLANNING AGENDA

- See Standard IVA: Planning Agenda Item

Appendix: ACCJC Site Team Evaluation Report Standard IVA

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance²

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

General Observations

The self-study described several initiatives to support its assertion that the college had made great strides to achieve effective leadership, communication, collegial consultation and defined, clear lines of authority to support student learning and promote institutional effectiveness. The degree of the college's progress and achievement, however, was not appreciated until the accreditation team conducted its visits to the state campuses and the National Campus. Interviews with campus stakeholders supported the efforts implemented by college leadership and acknowledged the many attempts to increase communication (IV.A.1-2a-b, 3).

It is clear that the college has made strides toward implementing a governance model that is inclusive and broad-based. The annual President's Retreat facilitates dialogue and is an excellent indication of the college's commitment to participatory governance (IV.A.3). Regardless of the many real attempts to facilitate participatory governance, the existing processes and practices require ongoing improvement to create an environment that genuinely encourages all constituent groups to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved (IV.A.1).

² Evaluation Report: A Confidential Report Prepared for The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges Western Association of Schools and Colleges; based on the finding of the evaluation team that visited COM-FSM on March 8—12, 2010 Sandra Serrano, Team Chair

There are two general areas that pose particular challenges to recognizing and utilizing the contributions of leadership to facilitate continuous improvement and institutional effectiveness. First, the state campuses are not able to participate as fully as necessary to best represent the needs of their populations. Second, the faculty at each campus do not participate as fully as the Governance Policy anticipates (IV.A.1, IV.B.2.a-b).

Findings and Evidence

There is a governance structure outlined in the Governance Policy document, and the college has aligned itself with the governance structure described in that document. However, within the defined structure it is apparent that existing opportunities for participation are not integrated into the culture of the institution as evidenced by meeting attendance, survey results, and interviews with various stakeholders.

The table below is derived from meeting minutes for the Student Services, Human Resources, Planning and Resources Committee, as well as the Curriculum Committee for fall 2009 and early spring 2010. From the minutes, it was possible to ascertain who attended the meetings and their position classification—faculty, student, classified staff, or administrator. The number of representatives for a group for a committee was multiplied by the number of meetings for which there were minutes. Then the number of the representatives for each committee was totaled for the meetings. For example, there are two representatives of the Faculty and Staff Senate on the Planning and Resources Committee. There were four meetings and at none of the meetings was a senate representative present. Attendance by proxy, video conference, and voice over Internet protocol (VOIP) was included in the tally.

BODY	MEETING DETAIL	TOTAL ATTENDANCE/TOTAL POSSIBLE ATTENDANCE			
		State Campus	Faculty/Staff Senate	Student	Employee Grp Reps
Student services	3 mtgs Fall 09	1/15	1/6	1/6	NA
Human Resources	1 mtg Dec-09	0/5	NA	NA	2/6
Planning&Resources	4 mtgs F09-S10	2/16	0/8	NA	NA

Curriculum	4 mtgs F09	1/16	22/40	NA	NA
------------	------------	------	-------	----	----

This data indicates that representatives do not regularly participate, resulting in functional committees dominated by management at the National Campus, at least as reflected by the minutes. Also, data presented on page 227 of the self-study indicates that one-third to one-half of respondents are unclear as to their roles and responsibilities as committee members. This evaluation is consistent with the sample meeting attendance results. Contributing factors to the apparent lack of participation in governance venues should be sought through outreach and assessment with stakeholders (IV.2.b, IV.2.e).

The most obvious challenges impeding state campus participation are the geographic distance of the campuses coupled with the difficult air travel schedule, as well as cost and time for travel. The college is making efforts to improve its ability to hold technology-assisted meetings, but technical difficulties associated with limited bandwidth prevent success. There is, however, reason to expect that in the near future successful VOIP will be the rule rather than the exception. The college has also conducted more face-to-face meetings with participants at each of the state campuses, yet the associated travel costs and time needed to travel continue to restrict their number.

Technical difficulties that hinder effective communication do not fully explain the lack of faculty/staff senate participation, however. For most college meetings the faculty and staff senate representatives are located on the same campus as the meeting location. National Campus faculty cited two factors that hinder their participation in college governance. First, at the National Campus there is a limited pool of faculty with the experience and motivation to participate on the great number of committees. The result is an overextension of those faculty members inclined to volunteer. Second, meeting times often clash with class times, and when faced with choosing to teach their students or attend a meeting, faculty choose the students. Again, circumstances should be identified and solutions found to encourage active participation in governance (IV.A.5).

Other factors that impede effective governance include the lack of clear directions for distributing committee agendas and minutes to the college community; the barriers to functional representation and participation by faculty and staff senate representatives; and the barriers to functional participation of state campus administrative leadership in effective discussion, planning, decision-making, and implementation (IV.A.3).

Though the formal structures that are supposed to facilitate dialogue are currently problematic, there is a great deal of informal communication, primarily via email, and therefore unreported. Since this unreported communication is not followed up by parallel dialogue in scheduled meetings, different points of view that may enrich dialogue and influence decision-making are often not communicated (IV.A.2.a.)

Finally, there appears to be a need to assess whether the geographic distance between the campuses fosters functional isolation. Many state campus faculty report that they do not feel like they are members of a larger collegewide academic discipline. In fact, many report that they feel colleagues and peers at the National Campus disregard their connection with COM-FSM. To some extent this feeling also applies to staff and administration (IV.A). .

Despite problems in implementing the governance policy and facilitating effective communication as noted above, it is clear that “through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution” (IV.A.3). The informal discussions, the President’s Retreats, and the *esprit de corps* displayed on each of the campuses are evidence that there is a great deal of unity of purpose and a can-do attitude.

The college has been very responsive to the Accrediting Commission. The various reports to the Commission between the 2004 accreditation team visit and the 2010 Accreditation Self-Study clearly demonstrate that the focus of the college over the last six years has been to address each Commission recommendation. Indeed, the college moved expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission (IV.A.4).

Evidence of external relationships is noted with agencies such as the national Department of Education (FSM DOE). For example, the Kosrae campus has an existing partnership with the FSM DOE. Interviews with the U.S. Ambassador to FSM and the FSM Vice President revealed that relationships do exist with these external agencies. Both the Ambassador and the FSM Vice President were aware of issues affecting education in general and COM-FSM in particular. Established working relationships with existing business and industry, however, were not evident, and while relationships with some public schools were revealed, the relationships do not reflect a level of effective partnership that might address the dismal rates of K-12 student success. The noted examples support the “institution’s role as advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies and to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements” (IV.A.4).

Conclusions

The college partially meets the requirements of Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes.

There is a cohesive management structure in place. There are structures and modes of telecommunication in place designed to increase stakeholder participation in governance processes. It is questionable, though, whether those structures are functionally effective. With the exception of management participation, active participation by constituency representatives in committees is negligible.

There are three overarching reasons that these issues exist.

- There are logistical issues associated with the geography of FSM. While improving technical capabilities will partially address this problem, correcting the current deficiency in posting to the college website committee meeting agendas, meeting minutes, and material important to decision-making brings into question the college's genuine interest in promoting participation in the governance process.
- There appears to be neglect of faculty input, especially from the state campuses to the national campus.
- There is no evidence of a well-designed and ongoing evaluation of the governance and decision-making processes, such that the issues that might be hindering participatory governance could be identified and resolved

Recommendations 1 and 3, noted in Standard I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness apply to the college to fully meet Standard IV.A. Decision-making Roles and Processes.

Recommendations to Fully Meet the Standards of Accreditation

Recommendation 1. *Improving Institutional Effectiveness*

To fully meet this standard, the team recommends the college evolve its communications efforts to ensure broad-based and purposeful dialogue in which all stakeholders participate in the exchange of different points of view and reflections that lead to genuine communication and effective governance (I.B.4, IV.A.3).

Recommendation 3. *Improving Institutional Effectiveness and Leadership and Governance*

To meet this standard, the team recommends that the college advance the institution's movement toward proficiency in the cycle of continued improvement, by completing the development of the student information system (SIS) and providing for additional research design, analysis, and reporting (I.B.6, IV.B.2).

Recommendation 9. *Decision-making Roles and Process*

To fully meet this standard, the team recommends that the college evaluate its organizational structure and governance processes to ensure that college stakeholders are involved in decision-making processes and that the results of systematic evaluations, meetings, and decisions are broadly communicated (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2b, IV.4.A3, IV.A.5, IV.B.1a, IV.B.2a, IV.B.2b, IV.B.2e).

Appendix: COMMITTEE REVIEW WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

- Change focus of standing committees to Master Plans rather than specific office or division needs to force participants to include and represent their division Master Plan and the Plan-to-Plan links.
 - Rationale: Standing committees have been functioning as working committees that focus on whatever direction the office that is closely related to them dictates. This change will force offices to take on their duties which are sometimes delegated to committees to do for or with them. The ultimate objective is to create committees whose main responsibility is to provide oversight on specific areas of the master plan. The committee will not focus on a specific office's needs but will then widen its oversight to include the needs of any office or department that might impact the particular committee's area of the master plan.
- Need to do: 1) identify all Master Plans to be involve; 2) chart the links; and 3) select people who can make and maintain the links from Plan-to-Plan' 3) increase the responsibility of representatives to report committee activities across their constituents across the whole system
- Reduce the size of committees by creating smaller committees with focused subcommittees.
 - Rationale: Huge committees repel participants as they feel their input is not important; sub-committees with clear focus could help to reflect Plan-to-Plan links; get more people involved in committee work
 - Need to do: 1) Determine which committees can be divided into focus groups; 2) ensure members understand their own Plan and the links to others; 3) have sub-committee reports provided through the Chair and not just Department heads
 - Suggestion: 1) Recruitment, Admissions and Retention could be divided into three subcommittees with Recruitment focusing on marketing and recruitment of students and including program coordinators, faculty and staff, Admissions on SIS, testing and entry process; and Retention on services that will enhance retention of students; the standing committees would be the chairs of the subcommittees and others if needed. 2) Facilities and Campus Environment Committee could have sub-committees for IDP, Campus Environment, Security and others. 3) Could Staff Development committee become a sub-committee of Personnel Committee and other subcommittees identified to expedite the work of the Personnel Committee?
- Change the leadership for the standing committees.

- Rationale: To encourage participation of those who feel committee work is a waste of time or who think their voices are not important because committee work is directed from above and decisions are already made before presented to committees for discussion; free VPs and CDs to do their work.
- Need to do: 1) remove President, VPs and Campus Directors from all committees other than Cabinet; all, but the President, can be ex-officio members (non-voting) of PRC; and 2) have chairpersons of committees be elected and have offices serve as secretariat of the committee.
- Rename Endowment Fundraising Steering Committee to Development Committee.
 - Rationale: To broaden the scope of the committee, not limiting it to Endowment fundraising; include alumni relations and other fundraising and development efforts.
 - Need to do: 1) redo TOR and determine number and focus of subcommittees with a greater role with alumni, stakeholder groups and funding sources.
- Delete Accreditation Committee
 - Rationale: Too many accreditation related committees with overlapping responsibilities; responsibilities of current committee can be absorbed by Cabinet and other committees as they address accreditation issues that relate to their areas.
 - Need to do: Ensure other committees are aware of the need to address accreditation issues that relate to their area.
- Delete Publications Committee
 - Rationale: Standards can be done by DCR office with input from college community without a committee; editorial review can be done through ad hoc committee with members depending on the topic.

Other suggestions were made for various committees

- Planning and Resources
 - Considerable discussion took place over the need for the PRC. It was finally agreed that PRC should remain but there is a need to review the TOR and functions
 - Division/ Office heads should be on PRC (not the committee chairs???)
 - Prepare budget preparation guidelines through the President to BOR
 - Budget preparation should be a steering committee appointed under PRC
- Finance Committee
 - Instead of CD and VPCRE, include Campus Fiscal officers and CRE-AO
- Personnel Committee
 - Does it need two representatives from each classification? National Campus overloads.
- We need consistency of names across all committees (ie) Staff rep., Faculty rep., Faculty/Staff Senate rep. unless specific needs such as Personnel Committee
- State Campus Reps should form campus level advisory councils at each campus

- Training on meeting organization, conducting meetings in place and via distance and the etiquette required for including unseen participants is needed.