

College of Micronesia – FSM
President's Retreat 2009
Review of Options for Restructuring



Option 1: Status quo

Option 2: One college with centers – tribal college model

Option 3: Breakup College and have different colleges each state

Option 4: One national campus with FSM State supported centers where courses can be delivered

Restructuring the College Criteria/review CHECKLIST

	Recommendation:	NO	
Reviewed by:	Planning & resources committee	Date of review:	4/23/2009/Updated 4/27/2009

Category/option (s): Status quo
Description/statement of option (s):
Status quo – determine money to maintain status quo One college with centers – tribal college model Breakup College and have different colleges each state One national campus with FSM State supported centers where courses can be delivered (VPAS model)

Criteria - Mission	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
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.		x	Note: This review is conducted to establish comparison information/data
Criteria – 4 C's	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Comprehensive?	x		
Clear?	x		Leaders do understand
Cost effective?		x	Not sustainable (cost per student, facilities, enrollment not achievable)
Credible?		x	Funding not providing funding for future quality and continuous impairment
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?		x	
Relevant?	X		Mirrors the FSM political structure
Sustainable?		x	
Affordable?		x	
Includes provisions for accessibility?	x		
Criteria – Long term	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Is the option addressing future and long term solutions to problems facing the college as opposed to short term fixes (not solutions)?	x	x	Funding, quality concerns Can address capacity building of state

Pros and Cons of the Option from the College Standpoint	
Pros	Cons
Less political pressure	Headaches to balance budget
Maintain high profile in state community	Difficult to meet continuous improvement needs
Create jobs (college employees)	Difficult to meet accreditation needs (quality and consistency of programs and services)
Provide employment for FSM citizens	High cost of operations
Provide financial assistance to states (housing, purchasing materials/supplies, equipment,, land rental, etc.)	Duplication of programs and services, facilities, etc.
Routine – less headache	Limited local responsibility for programs – no state ownership
Accessibility to students in each state	Difficult to met quality standards

Pros and Cons of the Option from the Standpoint of Key Stakeholders	
Pros	Cons
Routine	Do not have state ownership
Accessible	Two campuses on Pohnpei
States do not have to provide funding	Students have to travel to Pohnpei for many programs

What is not addressed in the option?
Who is affected by the option (campuses, programs, individuals, etc.)?
Positions, programs, line item expenditures will have to be eliminated or reduced due to budget pressure and freezes and across the board cuts
How are effectiveness and efficiency issues addressed by the option?
Not – probably reduction in effectiveness and efficiency due to low morale

What is the detailed impact (human, financial, etc.) of the option on the following?	
Students?	Not much
Enrollment?	Not much current downward trends continue
Budget/Finances?	Not affordable – massive cuts (20% immediately)
Faculty/staff?	Low morale, exit of faculty, administrators forced to teach
Nation/states?	Happy and not happy (less money will be going into the state)
Others?	

What are potential consequences of the option (including those that may not show up for several years)?
Loss of accreditation

Restructuring the College Criteria/review CHECKLIST

	Recommendation:		
Reviewed by:	Planning & resources committee	Date of review:	4/30/2009

Category/option (s):
Option 2 – One college with centers (tribal college model)
Description/statement of option (s):
4. One national campus with FSM State supported centers where courses can be delivered (VPAS model) 1. Status quo – determine money to maintain status quo 2. One college with centers – tribal college model 3. Breakup College and have different colleges each state

Criteria - Mission	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
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.	X		Impact on strategic plan – would need to redo the plan
Criteria – 4 C's	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Comprehensive?	X		
Clear?	X		Set up of the college before 1993/4. What were the reasons for the change? Campuses originally extension center, however "I want more" attitude. Under TTPI CCM (located in Pohnpei) with units in Palau and Marshall Islands. Split of system took place in 1990. 1993 set up of separate colleges 1994. Issue of PELL grant extension to centers and operation of centers. Only teacher training was offered at the centers. Questions of TRIO programs and Land Grant (CRE). Vocational and short term training needs? Kalwin issue of vocational needs expressed by summit. Grilly provided an overview of the vocational program situation. Issue of use of vocational classroom/facilities versus regular classroom. Expansion should be based on availability of facilities at different sites. Low enrollment for many of the vocational classes. Maximize use of Pohnpei campus through having students at dorm. Comments on breakeven costs of programs. Concern from Kosrae over age of students and appearance of maturity. Concern has been expressed over the impact of national campus over pregnancy, alcohol and violence.
Cost effective?	X		Would need expenditure for IT. Additional costs might be needed for additional site visits. Cost effective if model is applied as designed. Potential for income generation under the model.
Credible?	X		
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?	x		More uniformity and consistency of services and delivery. Depends on implementation.

Relevant?	X		Summits and comminutes go in somewhat different direction. Concern might be expressed over needs for local workforce development. Concept of state support at centers when population is diverse.
Sustainable?	X		Sustainable if maintained as designed.
Affordable?	x		If maintained as designed. What about reoccurring costs such as utilities, maintenance, etc. Clarify cost that needs to be funded by states.
Includes provisions for accessibility?	X		
Criteria – Long term	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Is the option addressing future and long term solutions to problems facing the college as opposed to short term fixes (not solutions)?	X		As long as creep does not occur. As long there is support from state and national leaders.

Pros and Cons of the Option from the College Standpoint	
Pros	Cons
Improve/ensure quality and services	Need more facilities at national campus – reallocation of IDP
More cost effective	
Improve communication	Loss of employment at state campuses (termination of certain staff)
Reduce number of employees and staff	Confusion in implementation – challenges in implementation
Maximize use of faculty and staff	Centralization of students in one area will be difficult to handle
Maximize use of facilities	May require change of structure at national campus
More diverse student population	Major improvement in IT needed
Opportunity to improve facilities	Resentment from students and leaders, parents
Major improvement in IT needed	
Greater interaction of students with other students from other states	

Pros and Cons of the Option from the Standpoint of Key Stakeholders	
Pros	Cons
OIA likely to support (centralized/alignment of vocational facilities)	Loss of status
	Collaboration may decrease between nation and states – may create more fiction
	Easy to be misunderstood
	Parents may not want students off island
	Parents may not want students in dorms
	Loss of control of refund (local)
	Loss of economic income for college
	Loss of employment in the state
	Less accessible to students

What is not addressed in the option?
Who is affected by the option (campuses, programs, individuals, etc.)?
How are effectiveness and efficiency issues addressed by the option?
Could be improved (depends on implementation).

What is the detailed impact (human, financial, etc.) of the option on the following?	
Students?	Dorm stay is higher cost; away from parents and friends; Might make students more likely to consider other institutions; greater interaction of students

Enrollment?	Might see an initial reduction in enrollment (overall) and increase as program is implemented; can improve enrollment by opening programs
Budget/Finances?	Reduction in overall finances with enrollment and possible reduction from FSM national (same level of support?); impact on TRIO programs? Potential improvement is funds per student; expenditure can be reduced due to changes at state campuses; cost of student travel increase
Faculty/staff?	Realize a reduction in faculty and staff; demoralized possible for faculty and staff; distance education delivery training needs; might increase the difficulty of recruiting faculty
Nation/states?	See pros and cons (stakeholder viewpoint)
Others?	

What are potential consequences of the option (including those that may not show up for several years)?

Restructuring the College Criteria/review CHECKLIST

	Recommendation:	
Reviewed by:	Planning & resources committee	Date of review: 5/5/2009

Category/option (s):
Option 3 – Breakup College and have the different colleges each state
Description/statement of option (s):
4. One national campus with FSM State supported centers where courses can be delivered (VPAS model) 1. Status quo – determine money to maintain status quo 2. One college with centers – tribal college model 3. Breakup College and have different colleges each state

Criteria - Mission	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
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.	x		
Criteria – 4 C's	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Comprehensive?	x		
Clear?	x		
Cost effective?		x	FSM cannot sustain the current structure
Credible?		x	Faculty staff quality, accreditation, financial support
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?	x	x	Only if adequate financial resources which is very, very unlikely
Relevant?	x		
Sustainable?		x	
Affordable?		x	
Includes provisions for accessibility?	x	x	Most current structures
Criteria – Long term	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Is the option addressing future and long term solutions to problems facing the college as opposed to short term fixes (not solutions)?		x	

Pros and Cons of the Option from the College Standpoint	
Pros	Cons
Consistency not an issue	Quality issues in all areas
Communication not a problem	Communication is a problem
Each state can have all the programs they can fund	Difficult to implement
Reduction in administrative staff	What programs to offer?
Free to collaborate with other IHEs	Duplication of programs and services
Free to seek funding from other countries	Replication of administrative staff at each level
Accreditation of one college will not affect other colleges	Difficult for colleges to be accredited
	Very difficult to require needed human resources
	Will states be willing to set high/adequate wages for their own college
Alignment between DOE and college	Alignment between DOE and college
Unify state	Disunity nation
	States cannot support level of services currently being provided

What is not addressed in the option?
Who is affected by the option (campuses, programs, individuals, etc.)?
How are effectiveness and efficiency issues addressed by the option?

What is the detailed impact (human, financial, etc.) of the option on the following?	
Students?	Accessibility to campuses better, limited option for programs and degrees,
Enrollment?	Should increase in each state
Budget/Finances?	Uncontrollable, budget inflated for each state, require major changes in the way states budget
Faculty/staff?	Low quality faculty and staff, recruitment challenges
Nation/states?	Increase state pride, decrease concept of FSM as a nation
Others?	Constitution changes required

What are potential consequences of the option (including those that may not show up for several years)?

Restructuring the College Criteria/review CHECKLIST

	Recommendation:		
Reviewed by:	Planning & resources committee	Date of review:	4/28/2009

Category/option (s):
Option 4- One national campus with FSM state supported centers where courses can be delivered
Description/statement of option (s):
4. One national campus with FSM State supported centers where courses can be delivered (VPAS model)
1. Status quo – determine money to maintain status quo
2. One college with centers – tribal college model
3. Breakup College and have different colleges each state

Criteria - Mission	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
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.	x		Ownership expanded to states Constitution and enabling law basically still meet Would require substantive change (accreditation) Question – really improve/meet mission if states will not provide funding
Criteria – 4 C’s	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Comprehensive?	X		
Clear?		X	How finances will be handled is unclear – what will be the budget process with national and state governments? CRE provides model for structure (50/50) States must provide annual funding Could raise control issues with states over programs and personnel. States would need to invest in their own centers Issue might arise over unity of system
Cost effective?		X	Duplication would occur 100% control by COMFSM to receive PELL
Credible?	X	X	Will states actually be willing to fund their centers (states quote constitution as postsecondary is a national function) States could seek IHE assistance – none comfsm (competitive) National college still serves all states with States setting priorities Do states have the resources? Would require major changes in culture of the states over control. (example of SBDC) College could be seen only as serving Pohnpei
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?	X	X	National campus expanded; would FSM continue to provide funding at same level? Would we be seen as a Pohnpei not a national campus? 70 – 75% of students at national from Pohnpei (current)
Relevant?	X	X	

Sustainable?	X	X	Dealing with separate states Impact of one state not providing centers or not having funding At state – education funding set for K-12 PELL eligibility for students in centers ESG and SEG as sector funds – States set size of education sector (ESG) funds
Affordable?	X	X	What happens if there is no PELL? At national? At states?
Includes provisions for accessibility?	?	?	Don't know – up to states
Criteria – Long term	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Is the option addressing future and long term solutions to problems facing the college as opposed to short term fixes (not solutions)?	X		Each state in competition (open up to other IHEs) If centers offer short term courses (PELL eligible?) Issue of permanent employees Loss of employment in states

Pros and Cons of the Option from the College Standpoint	
Pros	Cons
Addressing the quality issue	Administrative issues
Involvement of states in ownership of postsecondary education	Involvement of states in ownership of postsecondary education
Autonomy of state sites	Control issues
Addressing the states needs	Political issues
Regular students sending to college	What pays for what?
Increase in enrollment at national	Use of PELL is questionable at the centers?
	Accreditation
	Differences of each state in setup and operation
	Equity issues
	In-service teachers will not be served on-site
No more national college	No more national college
	Difficult to improve
Funding (if maintained) increase for national	Eliminated current programs at states
	States would likely farm out postsecondary to other IHE
	Reduction in enrollment (loss of PELL)
	Comfsm will face fierce competitiveness with other regional colleges in Pacific
	Degree programs for vocational programs will be wiped out
	Drive disunity in the nation
	No nation building

Pros and Cons of the Option from the Standpoint of Key Stakeholders	
Pros	Cons
More control	Reduce funding to national campuses – Operations and infrastructure
We will partner with outside if you do not partner with us	States will have difficult to handle
Want share of national funds	Pohnpei campus not national campus
Tailor need to fit manpower needs	Congress will not support national campus
	New governance system set up needed
	Loss of employment positions at states
	Center will become politically driven
	Resentment from students, parents who want students to get a degree at home
Better higher education to nation and building manpower to met the needs of the states	Degree and non degree programs no longer assessable to students

	States may not be able fund programs that they need
Rental fees reduced	Credits earned at centers are not transferable to other institutions
Easier to be accredited	States asking national government greater share of ESG grant
	Harder to be accredited
	Can national campus accommodate increase in students?
	Reduction in infrastructure funding from Congress.
Communication focuses on national	Communication more difficult with 4 states
	Yap likely to merge with Palau
Program consistency	Program consistency
	Transition will take signification time (3 – 10 years)
	No refund checks

What is not addressed in the option?
Who is affected by the option (campuses, programs, individuals, etc.)?
How are effectiveness and efficiency issues addressed by the option?

What is the detailed impact (human, financial, etc.) of the option on the following?	
Students?	Fewer degree options at states; improvement of programs and services at national (if funding is maintained); higher cost of education (more dorm students); Older students impacted (unlikely to move to Pohnpei); Distance education; Vocational education at states would be non credit; Apprenticeship programs etc. impacted; Students away from families
Enrollment?	Reduction in enrollment long term; Danger of national being seen as Pohnpei campus; Largely unpredictable;
Budget/Finances?	Reduction in budget from lower PELL and congress; Reduction in IDP; reallocation of future funding (IDP);
Faculty/staff?	Demoralized; elimination of state campus personnel; reduction in administrative and support staff at national campus;
Nation/states?	Unity issue; 80% of Chuuk graduates have no where to go; Acceptable of model at state level; Reduction of funding at state level programs and services; States may not be able to respond to model; States may not be able to provide all positions needed; Higher unemployment at state level; loss of Pell grant refund at state level; Issues on distribution of property at states; One institution everyone can be proud of; Easy to manage; Will one campus be seen as a national campus?; complex to implement; TRIO programs would be eliminated at state levels; State campuses could not apply for Title III; Accreditation fall out
Others?	

What are potential consequences of the option (including those that may not show up for several years)?

OPTION 4 RESTRUCTURING One National Campus with FSM States supported Centers where courses can be delivered

Under this structure, the primary cadre of educators (faculty) would be based at the National campus and supported by FSM funds. The current State campuses will be renamed and be called Training Institutes; (Kosrae State Training Institute, Pohnpei State Training Institute, Chuuk State Training Institute, and Yap State Training Institute)

This structure requires that the State Governments/stakeholders would identify the specific programs based on each State Economic Summit and administer that through the Institutes like program beyond high school for instance a 5th year developmental program, specific training needs by all sectors in the state with educators

provided by the National College and other regional institutions in the region. This will provide good healthy competition between regional institutions to better address the needs of each state. This model will create a sense of collaboration and competitiveness in the region. These Institutes will be funded 100% by the State Governments for each state. (Core funding from college?)

Where does the National Campus fit into this structure? All of our resources in terms of technical assistance and educators will be available to support the institutes upon request. First priority will be given to the COM-FSM National college to determine its capacity to deliver the services requested.

The Institutes will have the capability to offer short terms training tailored to the states needs in manpower development, economic development projects, apprenticeship, vocational trainings, tour guide trainings, tourism, agriculture customized for each state. The model would be more responsive to local identified priorities and determined by local fund availability. Responsibility would be very direct to local supervision and ownership would be more local. The model will receive adequate funding because most of the funding now are shifted to the state government in terms of trainings and local capacity development. This approach is consistent with the public finance perspective that suggests that the unit of government that should pay for a service is the smallest one that allows the benefits to be internalized.