**College of Micronesia – FSM**

**Committee (Working Group) Minutes Reporting Form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee or Working Group:** | **Planning and Resource Committee** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date: 03/20/09** | **Time:** | **Location:**  |
| 03/20/09 | 10:00 AM – 12:00 Noon | President’s Conference Room |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Members Present:** | **Members Absent:** |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Joe Habuchmai (Chair)
 | * Dayle Dannis
 |
| * Spensin James, President
* Gordon Seagal
* Jim Currie
* Eddie Haleyalig
 | * Karen Nelson
* Joey Oducado
* Sue Caldwell
* Penny Weilbacher
 |
| * Rencelly Nelson
* Karen Simion(Jean Thoulag)
 | * Lourdes Roboman,
* Kalwin Kephas
* Joakim Peter
 |
| * Ringlen Ringlen
* Jimmy Hicks
 |  |

 | * Joe Saimon
* Francisco Mandiola
* Martin Mingii
* Danny Dumantay
* Mathias Ewarmai
* John Haglalgam
* Xavier Yarofmal
* Angelina Trednoff
 |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Additional Attendees:** | Raleigh Welly (Recorder) |

|  |
| --- |
| A**genda/Major Topics of Discussion:** |
| * Review of BOR discussion on restructuring talking points (VPAS)
* Agreement on planning guide for restructuring
	+ Categories for development of options
	+ Criteria for option review
* Webbing (drafting) of potential options
* Initial review of materials for Institutional Effectiveness Indicators and Institutional Learning Outcomes
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Discussion of Agenda/Information Sharing:** |
| * VPAS conducted an overview of concerns/discussion of Board of Regents from the March 2009 meeting at Chuuk Campus (summary attached). Criteria factors include ensuring mission is met and review of options against quality, relevance, sustainability, affordability and accessibility.
* A review of the planning guide for categories of options to develop and criteria for review of options.
* Agreement was reached to use the following broad categories:
	+ Campus structure of the college
	+ Quality, effectiveness, efficiency and productivity
	+ IDP/facilities
	+ Human resources
	+ College ready students
	+ Continuous improvement cycle
* Agreement was reached to use the following criteria to guide review of options once developed.
	+ Does the option reflect/impact/improve the ability of the college to meet its mission? NOTE: If the answer is no, the option should not be considered.
	+ Does the option meet the 4 C’s (compressive, clear, cost effective, and credible)
	+ BOR review: quality, relevant, sustainable, & affordable Plus accessibility
	+ Is the option addressing future and long term solutions to problems facing the college as opposed to short term fixes (not solutions)?
	+ Pros and cons of each option
		- From college standpoint
		- From key stakeholder standpoint
	+ What is **not** addressed in the option?
	+ Are all departments/offices/campuses affected?
	+ Are effectiveness and efficiency issues addressed?
	+ Are **details** of the impact on students, enrollment, quality, finances and human resources (faculty & staff) identified?
	+ What are unanticipated consequences of implementing the option that may arise in the future?
* A brief overview of “Learning Disabilities in Organizations” based on materials from Peter Senge’s The Fifth Discipline was provide by the vice chair
* The committee thank started the listing of potential options. At this stage discussion was limited. The idea was to get as many potential options in each area as possible. The next step will be to prioritize the various options for detailed review using the criteria listed above. The following were potential options posed by various committee members. Members were encouraged to contribute additional options prior to the next committee meeting.

**Options for restructuring the college – Initial (03\_20\_2009 PR committee)****Structure**1. Status quo
2. Status quo with streamlined use of human and physical resources
3. One campus each state based on system wide analysis on what is best for the college
4. Number of campuses based meeting need of the mission and review criteria
5. One campus
6. Specialized campuses based on state needs
7. Moveable faculty (rotate faculty and/or distance education)
8. Close national campus, maintain state campuses

**Programs**1. More programs such as HCOP leading into professions
2. Review programs for retention/modification
3. Modify what meant by a program (short term, etc.)
4. Move professional development programs
5. Adult education programs
6. Improve quality of programs to need employer needs
7. Develop adopt institutional learning outcomes

**Human resources**1. Job audit
2. Faculty/staff salary schedule and benefits review/improvement
3. Audit of staff capacity
4. Succession plan for faculty/staff
5. Comparison of staffing patterns with peer institutions
6. Personnel audit and analysis
7. Decision grids

**College ready students**1. Increased programs with Departments of Education based on:
	1. TRIO program model
	2. Placing college staff in high schools to improve college ready programs
	3. Bridging programs
		1. Elementary to secondary
		2. Secondary to postsecondary
2. Use research data such as general studies review for decision making
3. Adopt developmental education proposal
4. Beef up teacher development programs
5. Reduce size/number of developmental programs based on working with State DOEs
6. Distance education approach

**IDP/facilities**1. Complete facilities master plan based on academic master plan
2. Current facilities upgraded to ADA
3. Adopt green and alternative energy strategies
4. Provide for facilities as state responsibilities for CRE facilities
5. Ensure that all new facilities meet current and future IT needs
6. College housing
7. Buy Snowland
8. Dormitories/cafeterias for state campuses to meet specialized needs of programs
9. Facilities designed to reflect needs for learning

**Improved quality, effectiveness and efficiency of programs**1. Ensure programs overlap only by design
2. Ensure interconnectivity of programs
3. Learning communities approach
4. Thinking in terms of system instead of individual campuses
5. Adopt institutional effectiveness indicators/progresses for all programs (look at UH model)
6. Bridging programs between faculty/staff/campuses for college programs
7. Improved transfer arrangements
8. Improved/increased program articulation with other IHEs
9. Pay attention to employers needs/concerns
10. Develop a job placement programs and improve counseling for career education
11. Improve student access and use of support services
12. Understand that we may need to reduce expenditures/programs in some areas but increase in other
13. Revise general education outcomes & delivery to better prepare students for the workplace
14. Limit courses to core needs
15. Improve seeking of outside funding to supplement improvement

**Continuous improvement**1. Develop progresses procedure to improve linking planning, evaluation and resource allocation

**Institutional Effectiveness & Institutional Learning Outcomes*** A brief overview was conducted of materials on:
	+ Institutional effectiveness (health) indicators using a UH community college model
	+ Institutional learning outcomes
	+ Materials for both areas were provided prior to the meeting
* Additional review and discussion on institutional effectiveness indicators and institutional learning outcomes will be conducted at the next committee meeting.

**Communications improvement*** To improve communications the committee meeting used Elluminate Live! Software that allowed state campus participations to view the same documents being presented on a Smartboard in the President’s conference room.
	+ The college’s IT office was able to put up the Smartboard in one day to allow its use during the committee meeting.
	+ The use of the Elluminate software and Smartboard was generally agreed to have enhance the quality of the discussions and input by all parties.
* Voice communications was via FSM Telecommunications to ensure sufficient quality.

The committee meeting was adjourned at 12:00 Noon. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments/Upcoming Meeting Date & Time/Etc.:** |
| * The next Planning and resources committee meeting is set for Wednesday, March 25, 2009 in the President’s Conference Room. Information on the teleconference and Elluminate Live! Connections will be provided prior to the meeting.
* Major topics of discussion/action will include:
	+ Prioritization of options for additional analysis
	+ Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (recommendations on approach for the college to use)
	+ Institutional Learning Outcomes
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Handouts/Documents Referenced:** |
| * Provided prior to the committee meeting
	+ Restructuring the college PR committee recommendations REVISED
	+ Institutional Effectiveness Indicators
	+ University of Hawaii Community College (Program review and health indicators)
	+ Examples of Institutional Learning Outcomes
* Referenced during the meeting
	+ Learning disabilities in organizations
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **College Web Site Link:** |
| IRPO web site |
| **Prepared by:** | Raleigh Welly & Jimmy Hicks | **Date Distributed:** | 3/20/2009 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Submitted by:** |  | **Date Submitted:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timeline & Responsibilities:** |
|  |
| **Action by President:** | **Item numbers:** | **Date:** | **Comments/Conditions:** |
| **Approved:** |  |  |  |
| **Approved with conditions:** |  |  |  |
| **Disapproved:** |  |  |  |