College of Micronesia – FSM

Organizational Chart Evaluation

Office of Institutional Research & Planning
Office of Human Resources

June 2007

Background

In its review of the college's 2004 self study, the WASC accreditation team made a series of recommendations regarding improvement needed at the college. One of the recommendations dealt with the need for clear administered responsibility across instructional, student services and learning resource centers at all six campuses.

Recommendation 2: Improve Communication (June 25, 2004)
The college must develop, document, and implement an organization of administrative responsibilities across the six sites that ensures continuity in student support and instruction and gives a clear, consistent line of administrative authority such as,
- *For all instructional programs cross all sites to the Vice President for Instructional Affairs*
- *For all student service programs across the sites to the Vice President for Support and Student Affairs*
- *For all learning resources programs across the sites to the Director of Learning Resources Center.*

Since 2004 the college has developed and implemented a revised administrative structure for instruction, student services, learning resource center and administrative services.

WASC has also called for an evaluation of the impact of the revised administrative structure.

Recommendation 3: Improve Communication
Once the collaborative processes (Recommendation 1) and the organization of administrative responsibilities (Recommendation 2) are developed, documented, and implemented, they must be periodically and systematically evaluated to facilitate a cycle of continued improvement.

The following evaluation deals with instruction, student services and learning resource centers. As the changes for administrative services have only been in place for seven months, the evaluation of those changes will be conducted in the fall of 2007.

Evaluation design

The college developed an evaluation plan (Appendix E) in December 2006 based on the National Science Foundation model that formulates evaluation questions, determines data sources, sampling techniques, and analysis, and provides a timeline for conducting the evaluation.   The questions used to guide the college evaluation of its organizational chart follows:

Evaluation Questions 1:

Has the college developed, documented, and implemented an organization of administrative responsibilities across the six sites that ensures continuity in student support and instruction and gives a clear, consistent line of administrative authority such as,
- *For all instructional programs cross all sites to the Vice President for Instructional Affairs*
- *For all student service programs across the sites to the Vice President for Support and Student Affairs*
- *For all learning resources programs across the sites to the Director of Learning Resources Center.*

Evaluation Question 2:

Has the new organizational structure resulted in improved (a) coordination of activities and (b) clarity and consistency of decision making across all six campuses?

Summary of Findings

> **Evaluation question 1:** The college developed, documented, and implemented an organization of administrative responsibilities across the six sites that ensures continuity in student support and instruction and gives a clear, consistent line of administrative authority.

> **Evaluation question 2:** While there has been an improvement in consistency across the campuses for instructional affairs, student services and learning resource programs, there are still areas of concern with decision making, communications and reporting.

Summary of Analysis:

> The college responded quickly to develop a complex organizational structure to the WASC recommendation #2, but many of its implementation strategies were in line with a standard line of authority structure. Key elements of decision making, communications (information flow) and reporting were unclear and open to different interpretations. Training provided did not adequately address the lack of clarity in decision making, information flow and reporting. Implementation focused on vertical (Instructional affairs, Student Services & Administrative Services) but did not adequate determine how the campuses would still function as units. Large parts of the implementation were based directly on the organizational chart and did not adequately address how the structure would function as a whole.

Summary of Recommendations

General recommendation to accommodate the complex structure adopted by the college to meet WASC Recommendation #2:
1. The college should consider the organizational structure outlined in Appendix C that is based on matrix organizations that should have vertical coordination across all campuses for consistency, quality of operations, and lateral coordination to address the need for high quality teamwork for individual campus operations.
   a. Matrix organization tools such as decision making and communications grids (Appendix D) should be used to give structure for operations.

      b.   Improvement and operational plans should be developed yearly with Vice Presidents and implemented, at the campus level.

      c.   Clear charters for lateral and vertical units should be developed.

      d.   Matrix organization techniques should be used to provide training on how to function in a complex organization.

          i.   Conflict resolution

          ii.   Different roles

          iii.   Common work and business procedures

          iv.   integrated strategic leadership from top management team

          v.   Multiple input performance management systems

Specific recommendations:

2.   The findings and analysis for the organizational chart evaluation should be addressed in the development and implementation of the following::

      a.   Communications plan to implement the college's communications policy

          i.   Identify key indicators for reporting on a monthly, quarterly and yearly basis.

          ii.   Clarify who needs what information, and when and who is accountably for the ensuring the information flow

          iii.   Clarify responsibilities for decision making

          iv.   Clarify processes and procedures for routing of documents from state campuses.

      b.   Implementation plan for the shared governance policy

          i.   Address the role of standing committees in decision making

          ii.   Improve mechanisms from equitable representation from state campuses

      c.   Development of the institutional assessment plan for the college

          i.   Assessment/evaluation plans should be built into plans and implementation strategies.

          ii.   Establish benchmarks for major projects and activities.

3.   The role of Faculty/Staff Senate and Student Body Associations (SBA) need to be clarified in terms of organization and their role in decision making:

      a.   Is there a single Faculty/Staff Senate for the college or does each campuses have its own Faculty/Staff Senate?

          i.   If there are multiple Faculty/Staff Senates who represents them in cabinet level decision making?

          ii.   If there is a single Faculty/Staff Senate how do they obtain needed information from other campuses?

      b.   Same questions (i, ii) for Student Body Association

4.   Processes and procedures for the management team for the National campus should be established – distinct from college wide management team functions.

Detail for Organizational Chart Evaluation – College of Micronesia - FSM

Evaluation Questions 1:

Has the college developed, documented, and implemented an organization of administrative responsibilities across the six sites that ensures continuity in student support and instruction and gives a clear, consistent line of administrative authority such as,
- *For all instructional programs cross all sites to the Vice President for Instructional Affairs*
- *For all student service programs across the sites to the Vice President for Support and Student Affairs*
- *For all learning resources programs across the sites to the Director of Learning Resources Center.*

To answer evaluation questions one, the review of the following documents were undertaken:

- Accreditation files and progress reports for WASC recommendation #2;
- President's updates and BOR minutes for information related to WASC recommendation #2; and
- Personnel files for instructional (division chairs and ICs), LRC director and campus librarians, student services staff (SSC) (not support staff) and campus directors

Note: Appendix A shows the revised organizational chart in response to WASC recommendation 2. Appendix B shows the organizational chart prior to the revision.

Major events:

Date	Event
6/26/04	Warning issued by WASC requiring – requires an October 15, 2004 progress report on recommendation #2
8/30 – 9/3/04	All Campus meeting held at national campus to develop organizational chart in response to recommendation #2
9/7-9/04	Board of Regents adopts modified chart based on responsibilities
9/22/04	Notification of organizational chart changes to college community through Presidential Update #240
10/15/2004	Progress report to WASC
12/13/04	All campus training on organizational structure at national campus
1-4/05	Implementation plans developed by state campuses and approved by President, revised job descriptions and positions
3/15/2005	Progress report to WASC
3/15/2005 – present	Full implementation of reorganization Site visits by VPIA, VPSS and LRC director to all campuses Clarification of communication Focus on consistency of services across all campuses
5/24/2005	Presidential memorandum on implementation at campuses
12/06	Organizational chart evaluation plan adopted
2/1-16/07	Organization chart survey
2/28/07	Staff Development Day 2007 (national campus) follow up to specific issues from the organizational chart survey
3/19-23/07	President's Retreat Breakout sessions on evaluation
4/07	Draft Evaluation Plan

Findings for evaluation question 1

After the receipt of the warning letter from WASC the college immediately convened an all campus meeting. The result of the all campus meeting was a revised organizational chart developed in time for board review and approval. (June – September 2004)

The college community both participated in the development of the organizational changes and were formally notified through Presidential Update #240 (9/22/04) of the BOR approval.

All campus training was conducted on December 13, 2004 on the organizational changes at the national campus.

Implementation plans were developed by the state campuses and submitted to the President during the period of January to April 05. Changes in job descriptions and new job description (IC, SSC), committee assignment and other structural changes were implemented to support the new organizational chart in the period of July to October 2005.

Numerous site visits to all state campuses and FMI were conducted by the Vice President for Instructional Affairs (VPIA) and Vice President for Student Services (VPSS) to oversee the transition to the new structure in 2005 which continues through the present time. The new Director of the Learning Resource Center (LRC) also began site visits in 2006 to all campuses to implement the revised organization chart/structure. The Vice President for Administration (VPA) was hired in May 2006 and has also instituted a series of campus visits.

Overview of the development, documentation and implementation of the revised organizational chart can be found in the WASC Progress Reports of October 15, 2004, March 15, 2005, March 15, 2006, and in the Midterm Report of March 15, 2007. Details to support the progress reports and Midterm report can be found in the accreditation evidence located in the President's Conference Room

Summary of findings for evaluation question 1

The college developed, documented, and implemented an organization of administrative responsibilities across the six sites that ensures continuity in student support and instruction and gives a clear, consistent line of administrative authority.

Evaluation Question 2:

Has the new organizational structure resulted in improved (a) coordination of activities and (b) clarity and consistency of decision making across all six campuses?

To answer evaluation questions two, the following were undertaken:

- Organization chart survey;
- Staff Development Day (National campus) 2007 (discussion sessions);
- Organizational chart & the President's Retreat 2007 (discussion sessions); and
- Document review.

Note: Appendix A shows the revised organizational chart in response to WASC recommendation 2. Appendix B shows the organizational chart prior to the revision.

Organizational chart survey and discussion groups

Major components of the organizational chart evaluation included an online and hard copy survey (February 1 – 16, 2007) with follow up discussions and clarification of the survey results at the Staff Development Day 2007 (National campus sessions) and the President's Retreat (March 2007) at the National campus that included survey and discussion by representatives from all six campuses.

Organizational chart survey

To assist with the evaluation of the organizational chart a survey was opened February 1 to February 16, 2007 for input from faculty and staff for all six campuses of the college. Following is demographic information related to the survey.

As an important note, administrative services were included in the survey, but are not a focus of this evaluation. The Vice President for Administration came on board in spring 2006 and has not had sufficient time for determining impact. The administrative data will be used to assist with a follow up evaluation on the organizational chart to occur in fall semester 2007.

Survey demographics – 124 total respondents

Gender	Campus
Male 50.4%	National campus.............................43.1%
Female... 49.5%	Chuuk campus 4.1%
Position	Pohnpei campus 20.3%
Faculty.. 29.8%	Yap campus.....................................21.1%
Instructional support staff 6.6%	FSM FMI...4.1%
Instructional supervisor 5%	
Administrative staff........................... 19%	
Administrative supervisor 10.7%	
Student services staff...................... 14.9%	
Student services supervisor 4.1%	
Other 9.9%	

A series of statements were made where respondents were asked to indicate levels of agreement or disagreement.   The following table provides percentages of those who agreed or strongly agreed to the statements. Relative high percentages of respondents also indicated either neutral or no opinion.

	Agree or Strongly Agree (%)	Neutral or No Opinion (%)
1. Has improved communication flow from employee to supervisor	71	17
2. Has improved communication flow from supervisor to employee	71	16
3. Has improved my awareness of college	55	31

happenings		
4. Has reduced the time spent processing documents	39	29
5. Has clarified the document flow within offices	50	26
6. Has helped clarify who I report to	74	19
7. Has provided me opportunity to participate in decision making	51	32
8. Has improved decision making at the college	44	42
9. Has led to improvement in continuity of programs and services across all six sites	45	39

Of note in the survey results are relatively high levels of satisfaction with communications related directly to job responsibilities (questions 1 & 2 both at 71%, but a lower level of understanding for general communications (question 3 at 55%).

The lowest satisfactions rates were listed for processing of documents (questions 4 at 39%) and decision making (questions 8 & 9 at 44% and 45%).

A question was asked regarding training to support implementation of the new organizational chart/structure. The level of agreement indicates training in the organization chart could improve implementation.

Question – Sufficient training to support the new organization structure/chart in each of the following areas has been provided across all six campuses.	Agree or Strongly Agree (%)	Neutral or No Opinion (%)
Instructional Affairs	39	42
Student Support Services	51	39
Administration	33	41

In terms of overall effectiveness by department, rates ranged from 49% to 54%.

Question – How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the organizational structure in each of the 3 areas?	Effective or Very effective (%)	Neutral or No Opinion (%)
Instructional Affairs	51	37
Student Support Services	54	42
Administration	49	41

Comments to the survey

Sixty-one participants in the survey provided comments. The comments generally provided comments on communications related issues. A number of individuals indicated they either had limited or no information on the organizational structure. Some said it likely affected other people more directly involved. A specific concern was also raised over textbooks purchasing and availability of textbooks for instruction.

Staff Development Day (National campus) 2007

To assist in clarification of certain aspects of the survey, discussion sessions were held at the Staff Development Day (National campus) 2007. Issues specifically addressed included (1) What is the current state and how do we improve the effectiveness of decision making; (2) What is the current state and how do we improve information flow; (3) What is the current state and how do we improve document processing.

The discussion supported the findings of the survey and the detail collected during the Staff Development Day will assist with design of processes and procedures related to decision making, information flow and document processing.

Organizational chart & the President's Retreat 2007

A President's Retreat was held from March 19 – 23, 2007 at the National campus FSM – China Friendship Sports Center. Two breakout sessions were held during the Retreat to address "How is the new organizational structure affecting the college?" The breakout sessions were designed to follow up and clarify key issues identified by the organizational chart survey. All state campus directors, instructional coordinators, and student service coordinators were present at the discussion sessions. A series of questions were raised.

What is the new organization structure? Participants indicated that roles and responsibilities were better understood and allow more focus on jobs. However, concerns were raised over clarity of the organizational chart and the role of "dotted" lines (dual reporting and responsibility).

Did you receive training on the new organizational chart? Generally the answer was no – although there was agreement that discussions had occurred.

How does the new organizational structure affect decision making at the college? Generally the organizational structure was considered unclear with the "dotted" lines. Improved support was seen for the Learning Resource centers across state campuses. There was also concern that decision making was top down. Concern was raised as to the role of Student Body Association (SBA) and Faculty/Staff Senate in decision making.   Additionally, who represents the various campuses SBA and Faculty/Staff senates was of major concern (Is the National campus SBA and Faculty/Staff senate to represent all campuses or should each campus have their own direct input and voice?).

Has the organizational structure helped clarify who you report to and when you report? Generally the answer was yes in clarification of reporting, but duplication was seen in reporting and a lack of procedures and guidelines are hampering implementation of the new structure.

Has the new organizational structure assisted with information flow? Generally the answer was yes for student services and in some cases for instructional services. However, bottom up information flow was seen to be improving, but some problems can be noted with top down information flow. Concern was raised as to the role of the SBA and Faculty/Staff senate in decision making.

Has the new organizational structure resulted in improved document flow and processing? Problems were seen in this area due to additional routing through vice presidents, some loss of documents and problems in transmittal of documents from state campuses to the college administrative office in Palikir were noted.

Additional issues from the Retreat relevant to the organizational structure

The issue of who represents the National campus was raised and who talks for the campus in meetings and decision making.

Document review

The following materials were consulted in the document review.

- Job descriptions
- State campus implementation plans
- Minutes of curriculum and student services committee
  - o Participation of state campuses in discussions
  - o Participation in decision making
- Class schedules
- Quarterly reports
- Organizational chart
- Governance policy
- Communications policy

Job Descriptions

A review of the job descriptions provided a number of key points:
- A new job description was created for the Vice President for Administration, but there were no changes in the job descriptions for the Vice President for Instructional Affairs or the Vice President for Student Services.
- Job descriptions were not changed for the campus directors even though the revised organizational chart presented major changes in their position.
- Job descriptions for both instructional coordinators and student service coordinators indicate supervision by the respective vice president and co-supervision by the campus director:
  - o The students services coordinator job description did provide a description of it role under campus administration
  - o The instructional coordinator position clarified instructional coordination and program development issues, but did not indicate campus specific
- Job description for the Director of LRC indicates direct report to VPIA and responsibility for MITC at the National campus and for support and supervision of all state campus libraries. There is limited indication of how the LRC interacts with the National and state campus programs, faculty and staff. LRC staff at state campuses report through the IC.

Campus Implementation Plans

A review of campus implementation plans indicated the focus was on personnel issues and direct reports. For example, the Yap campus implementation plan provided clarification of direct reports to the instructional coordinator, department chairs etc. The implementation plan did not deal with decision making changes or communications issues.

Curriculum & Student Services committees

Governance structures for instructional services and students services are implemented through the Curriculum and Student Services Committees. As a result of the organizational changes the curriculum committee now includes state campus and FMI instructional coordinators and the student services committee includes state campus and FMI student service coordinators.

The curriculum and student services committees operate in different fashions regarding state campuses (except for Pohnpei campus whose representatives directly participate in meetings). Both committees physically meet at the national campus administrative offices. Participation of state campuses for the curriculum committee is via email comments on materials that are transmitted to the instructional coordinators by the director of academic programs usually a week in advance of the meeting. The DAP reads out any comments from campuses as part of the discussion and decision making process in the curriculum committee. The student services committee state campus participation is via teleconference. The VPSS sets up a teleconference call and pin number and emails that information to the student services coordinators prior to meeting time. Student services coordinators directly participate in voting via teleconference.

A review of both the curriculum and student services committees indicate limited involvement of state campuses in the committee functions. As indicated through twelve student services committee meeting in 2006 and early 2007, the participation per state campus is low. Pohnpei participated in 7/12 meetings, Kosrae 0/12, Chuuk 4/12, Yap 3/12, and FMI 2/12. For 15 curriculum committee meetings in 2006 and 2007 Pohnpei attended 13/15, while Kosrae campus indicated participation through ending two email comments to the committee.

Quarterly Reports

In the discussion at the President's Retreat of 2007, it was noted that the organizational chart has clarified direct reporting requirements, but has dual reporting requirements. A review of the quarterly reports themselves has also indicated a lack of consistency in what is reported across all departments and campuses.

Class Schedules

All course schedules must be approved by the VPIA. The DAP and ICs are responsible for the development of the schedules. The main impact is that there is now a definite contact person at each campus when changes need to be made in the schedules. The VPIA has always had final approval. The timeline for tentative summer and fall schedules is March and the spring tentative schedule is end of September or early October. No schedule is final until after late registration. Timeline is generally being met with 1 or 2 campus schedules coming in 2-4 weeks late.

Organizational Chart

The organization chart has been seen as the primary guide for implementation of the new organizational structure. Based on interviews and discussions with vice presidents and campus staff, it is clear a great deal of discussion over lines of authority has taken place, but primarily those discussions have taken place n the context of the organizational chart itself. Supporting documents to help clarify issues of decision making and communications (information flow) appear to be lacking.

Summary of Findings

General

There was no evaluation plan developed as part of the organizational chart revision, nor were benchmarks established to gauge progress and impact during implementation.

The organizational chart changes appeared to have improved coordination of activities within the instructional and student services while less agreement is on improvement in decision making.

Improvement in communications and clarification of roles and responsibilities were seen through the survey and in the retreat discussions.   Seventy one per cent (71%) of survey participants did see improvement in communications both to and from supervisors. However, the figure dropped to 55% for awareness of college happenings. The retreat discussions did see more clarity in understanding of roles and responsibilities

There was less agreement about improvement in decision making. Only 44% of survey participants saw improvement in decision making and 51% saw increased opportunity for participation in decision making.

The issue of how to interpret "dotted line" authority raised concern in a number of individuals.

Training provided to support implementation of the organizational chart was generally deemed insufficient in the survey (39% for instructional affairs and 51% for student services) and in retreat discussions. However, in answering evaluation question 1, it was found that training was provided and site visits conducted on a regular basis. This issue will be addressed in the analysis.

Overall effectiveness for both instructional and students services was around 50% (51% instructional & 54% student services).

There was concern over processing of documents with only 39% of survey participants feeling document process had improved. Special concern was raised over processing of documents for textbooks and contracts. The Staff Development Day 2007 (National campus) indicated concern with processing of documents (especially contracts and textbooks) but also indicated a lack of clarify about how documents are transmitted from state campuses to the college's administrative offices.

Of note was the high percent of survey participants who indicated neutral or no opinion as to overall effectiveness of organizational structure (37% to 42%). This also was noted in the retreat and in comments to the survey. Seemingly a large number of respondents did not feel they have sufficient information or knowledge about the organizational changes to make comments and assessments.

There are no clear processes and procedures for dealing with National campus issues distinct from college wide issues.

Job Descriptions and Implementation Plan

- Job descriptions were prepared or revised for Instructional and Student Services coordinators, but not for Campus Director, VPIA or VPSS.
- Limited detail provided to guide co-supervision roles of the Campus Directors for Instructional and Student Services Coordinators.
- Communications and information flow defined primarily in silos.

- Implementation plans primarily dealt with personnel issues
- Communication flow for bottom up clear, but sharing of information and top down communications less clear
- LRC Director's position is responsibility for support and supervise LRCs at State campuses and FMI is hampered by lack of funding.

Curriculum and Student Services Committees

Limited participation of State campuses personnel is seen in curriculum and student services committees. It should be noted that this level of participation is similar for other standing committees of the college.

Quarterly reports

There is a lack of consistency in what is reported across departments and campuses. This lack of consistency affects the ability to compare and contrast activities at the various campuses to ensure consistency of services. This lack of consistency is also seen in LRC services.

Class schedules

Class schedule development has improved with the identification of ICs at the state campus, but some delays are seen in finalization of schedules.

Organizational chart

The organizational chart itself appears to be the prime driver for implementation of the revised organizational chart/structure. Decision making and communications have been extensively discussed but those discussions have not resulted in clear understanding of decision making responsibilities and communications (information flow).

As noted earlier, the organizational chart has helped address to continuity of programs and services and quality issues across campuses, but the function of campuses as units has been hampered. .

Governance Policy

A shared governance process has been adopted by the college BOR in December 2006. The implementation of the policy will address a number of the decision making related issues seen in implementation of the revised organizational chart.

Communications Policy

A communications policy has been adopted by the college BOR in September 2006. The implementation plan for the communications plan is under development and will address a number of the issues seen in implementation of the revised organization chart.

Analysis

A number of key issues stand out in the review of the organizational chart development and implementation at the college:

- The college responded quickly to the WASC recommendation #2;
- There is evidence of wide participation in the decision making process on the revised organizational chart;
- The lack of benchmarks to gauge implement and a clear process for evaluating the implementation process hampered the assessment/evaluation of the organizational chart implementation;
- In a number of areas, the depth of planning and decision making lead to different assumptions regarding how the organizational chart would be implemented. For example, in what areas would campus directors co-supervise ICs and SSCs was unclear. Information flow and information dissemination was not clarified except for direct reports;
- The organizational chart changes in response to the WASC recommendation to provide *continuity in student support and instruction and gives a clear, consistent line of administrative authority* addressed the continuity and consistent lines of authority across the campuses, but gave less emphasis to the fact that the campuses will also continue to function as units and that coordination across instructional, students and administrative services is still a vital function at all campuses;
- The organizational chart itself in many cases was seen as the main guide for implementation. There was more emphasis on the organizational chart itself than to changes in the college's operating structure;
- Implementation plans primarily dealt with personnel changes and direct reports;
- Job descriptions were prepared for new positions and clarified for others, but there was no revision of the VPIA, VPSS or campus director's job descriptions;
- Even thought the new organizational structure is more complex with multiple layers for decision making and reporting, many college personnel still looked for a single line of authority and decision making. The single line of authority is neither consistent with the more complex organization chart adopted nor the recently adopted governance policy. The revised organizational chart is similar in many cases to a matrix organization. There is a rich body of literature (including training methods and implementation tools) on the Internet that can assist the college with implementation of the organization chart;
- Reporting, including what to report and ensuring consistency of reporting across campuses and programs could have a major impact on implementing the revised organizational structure;
- Training was provided on the organization chart implementation, but generally did not address how the new system would actually function. Issues such as conflict resolution were not addressed; and
- The issue of Faculty/Staff Senate and Student Body Association (SBA) role in the college organization was not addressed.

Summary of Recommendations

General recommendation to accommodate the complex structure adopted by the college to meet WASC Recommendation #2:

1. The college should consider the organizational structure outlined in Appendix C that is based on matrix organizations that should have vertical coordination across all campuses for consistency, quality of operations, and lateral coordination to address the need for high quality teamwork for individual campus operations.
    a. Matrix organization tools such as decision making and communications grids (Appendix D) should be used to give structure for operations.
    b. Improvement and operational plans should be developed yearly with Vice Presidents and implemented, at the campus level.
    c. Clear charters for lateral and vertical units should be developed.
    d. Matrix organization techniques should be used to provide training on how to function in a complex organization.
        i. Conflict resolution
        ii. Different roles

        iii.   Common work and business procedures
        iv.   integrated strategic leadership from top management team
        v.   Multiple input performance management systems

Specific recommendations:

2. The findings and analysis for the organizational chart evaluation should be addressed in the development and implementation of the following::
   a. Communications plan to implement the college's communications policy
      i. Identify key indicators for reporting on a monthly, quarterly and yearly basis.
      ii. Clarify who needs what information, and when and who is accountably for the ensuring the information flow
      iii. Clarify responsibilities for decision making
      iv. Clarify processes and procedures for routing of documents from state campuses.
   b. Implementation plan for the shared governance policy
      i. Address the role of standing committees in decision making
      ii. Improve mechanisms form equitable representation from state campuses
   c. Development of the institutional assessment plan for the college
      i. Assessment/evaluation plans should be built into plans and implementation strategies.
      ii. Establish benchmarks for major projects and activities.
3. The role of Faculty/Staff Senate and Student Body Associations (SBA) need to be clarified in terms of organization and their role in decision making:
   a. Is there a single Faculty/Staff Senate for the college or does each campuses have its own Faculty/Staff Senate?
      i. If there are multiple Faculty/Staff Senates who represents them in cabinet level decision making?
      ii. If there is a single Faculty/Staff Senate how do they obtain needed information from other campuses?
   b. Same questions (i, ii) for Student Body Association
4. Processes and procedures for the management team for the National campus should be established – distinct from college wide management team functions.