

President's Retreat 2009
May 12 – 14, 2009
FSM China Friendship Sports Center
Breakout Session Recording Form & Notes

Breakout Session 2: Review of Options for Restructuring

Purpose of Session: The session will review and expand upon the work that was initiated by the college's Planning & resources committee. The approach used was to use a structured review process to assist in developing and understanding the implication of various structures that would allow the college to meet its mission while dealing with reduced enrollment and financial constraints and continuously improving quality of programs and services. [This breakout session is intended for the audience to become acquainted with the review done so far and to expand on the work with additional data/evidence, pros and cons, etc.](#)

Grouping: Mixed

Notes: This session is intended to promote understanding of the various options along with review and expansion the associated data and evidence, pros and cons, and improve quantification of the impact on students, enrollment, budget/finances, faculty/staff and the nation/states. It is also meant to explore varying assumptions on the options and help understanding and appreciation of differing views, values and beliefs. **This session is not intended for promotion or advocacy of positions or options (there will be sessions when advocacy of positions is encouraged).** [Groups should use the options review developed by Planning & resources and expand on those view by including additional comments, data/evidence, pros and cons, etc. in a different color.](#) Completed forms should be emailed to rschplanning@comfsm.fm for compilation. Files should be saved in MS Word 2003 format using the following: S2 Options G_.

Group number/name:	#1
Group facilitators & recorder:	Rencelly Nelson & Karen Simion
Group members:	Kasiano Paul, Mariano Marcus, Paula Haglelgam, Gertrude Mangarwen, John Curly, Jennifer Yad, Bertha Reyuw, Ahser Edward, Iris Falcom, Semens James, Ringlen Ringlen, Rafael Pulmano, Nelchor Permitez, Marylou Gorospe, Romino Victor, Carilo Recana Stanely Etse, Spensin James

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 Not clear to some students[2] Faculty, staff & BOR do not understand Stakeholders do not understand
Cost effective?		x	Not sustainable (cost per student, facilities, enrollment not achievable)
Credible?		x	Funding not providing funding for future quality and continuous improvement Not enough action taken to address credibility
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?		x	Not meeting the WASC standards Some programs have quality than others
Relevant?	X		Mirrors the FSM political structure Are we still producing students that employers need? Mirroring the FSM political structure is not necessarily a good thing
Sustainable?		x	If we stay the course we will not be able to provide quality services & programs No long term funding commitment from the FSM Government – cannot do long term planning
Affordable?		x	High operational costs due to low enrollment Students can not afford without Pell Grants
Includes provisions for accessibility?	x		Low bandwidth
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 meet quality standards
Provide employment for non-FSM citizens	Too many programs

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
Two campuses on Pohnpei	Expensive
Competitions with student recruitment	Competitions with student recruitment

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 [students,]
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, rely on part-time faculty
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):
<p>4. One national campus with FSM State supported centers where courses can be delivered (VPAS model)</p> <p>1. Status quo – determine money to maintain status quo</p> <p>2. One college with centers – tribal college model</p> <p>3. Breakup College and have different colleges each state</p>

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		Well-defined function for each center Specialization of each center is easy to assess and control
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. With this option, no financial support from state government

Credible?	X		Natural resistance to change is expected
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?	x		More uniformity and consistency of services and delivery. Depends on implementation. Prospect of traveling to another campus will/may motivate students to excel Promotes national unity Equal learning opportunity for students
Relevant?	X		Summits and communiqués 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. One way of keeping up with rapid changes in technology
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. Recurring unavoidable costs are irrelevant
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. [“I want more” attitude] 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	Unaffordable needs
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 Elimination of redundant positions and new opportunities for other positions Resources are easy to manage Specialized center is easy to improve	

Pros and Cons of the Option from the Standpoint of Key Stakeholders	
Pros	Cons
OIA likely to support (centralized/alignment of vocational facilities) Promotes unity	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 Greater peer pressure, increased need for student services to be proactive Less accessible of programs to some students who prefer to stay at home state Culture shock Promotes independence & self reliance More diversity 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 Long term effect is cost effective Additional cost for IT Additional cost to accommodate housing needs for students at other campuses
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		Required us to change the FSM Government constitution & enabling law
Criteria – 4 C's	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Comprehensive?	x		Each state will manage its own Does not promote national unity
Clear?	x		Promotes state pride
Cost effective?		x	FSM cannot sustain the current structure Expensive Separate accreditation- \$8,800 annual fee
Credible?		x	Faculty staff quality, accreditation, financial support Unconstitutional
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?	x	x	Only if adequate financial resources which is very, very unlikely
Relevant?	x		Each campus can respond more quickly to unique needs of each state
Sustainable?		x	
Affordable?		x	Expensive
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
Promotes competition and improves quality of services & programs	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? Will the college retain ownership of the state campuses?	
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, takes time to get accredited and become Pell eligible, more choices of colleges within FSM to choose from
Enrollment?	Should increase in each state, decreased in diversity
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, stressful on faculty dealing with wider range of students academic problems? more responsive instructional approach, greater familiarity with students, better faculty and student ratio
Nation/states?	Increase state pride, decrease concept of FSM as a nation, decreased in budget from National Government
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 There should be no issue over unity of system since there will be only one college
Cost effective?		X	Duplication would occur 100% control by COMFSM to receive PELL Reduced funding from National Government for the National Campus and imbalance among the states
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 Competing for the same funding source from FSM Government
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)
	COM-FSM 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
	Availability of personnel
	Different rate of services?
	Accreditation will be a problem since there is no control on the centers

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; more students may stay at the centers if other IHE are present at centers
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?	Centers may affiliate themselves with other accredited institutions – reduced human resources at the states due to relocation to affiliated institutions

	Reduced credibility of the National College
--	---

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

Criteria	Status Quo	National campus w/ Centers	One college per state	One college for the Nation
Financial Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -If declining trend of enrollment persists, then resources will be depleted. -Current level of operation may not be sustainable at \$11 m per year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduction of operation cost at centers - decline of enrollment at the centers - higher cost of monitoring visits to centers - higher cost of administrative costs at national campus - Reduce the cost of delivery of programs - Big investment in IT - WASC Issues; Accreditation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who pays???? Will the State Government step up to cover the cost of the college in their respective State? - Big funding issues??? - Post secondary funding is with national government. May have to be allocated to States to support the State Colleges. - WASC issues for new state colleges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more college students enrolled from States - get all the money 3.8 m from FSM gov't - States may request for some of the 3.8 m
Impact on Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed with IDP Address equity issues re facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -will continue with IDP but on a limited scale -need to review the IDP in relation to programs at centers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -increase the level of facilities at states -turnover of IDP fundings to States -turnover of facilities to State Governments -National & Pohnpei Campuses will be called Pohnpei State College 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - turn over of state campus facilities -need more facilities, classrooms, workshops, dorms, cafeteria, etc.
Impact on Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -reassessment of programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -focused core programs available at centers based on needs -more programs delivered via 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -accreditation -more programs available - need standards in delivery of programs and services for each 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - better control of quality and consistency of programs and services -

		distance ed -	state college	
Impact to students	-more accessible to students at State and National -more PELL refunds to students attending State Campuses – no dorm cost	-Concept of student-centeredness is a concern -students will be more responsible	Students will have more choice of programs and colleges -healthy competition among the colleges -needs of state may not be addressed by the state college due to limited funds	- students & families will bear higher cost of attendance -more off island students -year round PELL for students will help with cost of attendance -on campus students have better success rate than off campus students
Operational Issues	-delays in development of schedules and courses - Communications -textbook orders -delay in hiring and other HR issues -certification of instructors -	-concerns in the administration and control of administrative services -more flexibility in addressing needs of the States -States can select what programs they need and can afford -accessibility of students to online services must be in place -involvement of States is more visible / more sense of ownership -	-independent and autonomous -better communication -freedom of choice -immediate action - more flexibility in addressing needs of the States -States can select what programs they need and can afford -involvement of States is more visible / more sense of ownership -politically driven by each state -state salary scales not attractive	-more efficient and effective -possible Higher standards - quality of programs and services -programs may not address state needs -

Impact to faculty/staff	-need for job audit to streamline operation and cut costs	-termination /transfer of employment at state campuses -loss of good faculty and staff -	-uncertainty of employment -uncertainty of many things	-need more staff and faculty -
Impact on accreditation	-currently accredited -have difficulty in addressing accreditation issues	-accreditation issues in terms of equity of services for students -requires substantive change for WASC review	- need separate accreditation -accreditation of one college does not affect another's -each college decides its own partnership, affiliation, etc.	-currently accredited -May require substantive change -easier to deal with accreditation issues -
Timeline of Implementation	-Immediate improvements depending on issues and needs -Job Audit needs to be done SOON!	3-5 years -need to have a transition period	-unknown due to accreditation issues, state's and national government approvals	3-5 years -need to have a transition period

Facilitator: Danny
 Presenter: Jeff Arnold
 Recorder: Lourdes

President's Retreat 2009
May 12 – 14, 2009
FSM China Friendship Sports Center
Breakout Session Recording Form & Notes

Breakout Session 2: Review of Options for Restructuring

Purpose of Session: The session will review and expand upon the work that was initiated by the college's Planning & resources committee. The approach used was to use a structured review process to assist in developing and understanding the implication of various structures that would allow the college to meet its mission while dealing with reduced enrollment and financial constraints and continuously improving quality of programs and services. This breakout session is intended for the audience to become acquainted with the review done so far and to expand on the work with additional data/evidence, pros and cons, etc.

Grouping: Mixed

Notes: This session is intended to promote understanding of the various options along with review and expansion the associated data and evidence, pros and cons, and improve quantification of the impact on students, enrollment, budget/finances, faculty/staff and the nation/states. It is also meant to explore varying assumptions on the options and help understanding and appreciation of differing views, values and beliefs.

This session is not intended for promotion or advocacy of positions or options (there will be sessions when advocacy of positions is encouraged). Groups should use the options review developed by Planning & resources and expand on those view by including additional comments, data/evidence, pros and cons, etc. in a different color. Completed forms should be emailed to rschplanning@comfsm.fm for compilation. Files should be saved in MS Word 2003 format using the following: S2 Options G_.

Group number/name:	Group 3
Group facilitators & recorder:	Gordon & Eddie
Group members:	Grilly Jack, Phyllis, Eddie, Deeleeen, Reedson, Nena Mike, Herman Semes, Jean Ranahan, Henry Wilson, Morehna Santos, Joseph Felix Jr., Martin Mingii, Lt. Gov. Churchill Edward, Susan Moses, Dennis Gearhart, Burnis Dannis, Skipper Ittu, Joel Suda, Eopen Castro, Kun Elley, Robert Jonas, Jennifer Hainrick, Pelma Palik, Regina Faiman, Jon Berger, Taylor Elidok, Dr. Cuboni

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	X	Note: This review is conducted to establish comparison information/data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should be a yes but we don't have enough money. We are meeting our mission but we are spending too much to meet our mission. We need to be able to make quick budget adjustments based on the results of enrollment data, managers need to operate within their budgets, standard business model. Resources are directly tied to accreditation, our current course raises red flags.
Criteria – 4 C's	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Comprehensive?	x		
Clear?	x		Leaders do understand (which leaders) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear how we didn't catch the fact that we have lost money for 3 years without reacting sooner.
Cost effective?		X	Not sustainable (cost per student, facilities, enrollment not achievable) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maybe it could be cost effective if the college had better fiscal control We need change sustainable indicators mentioned if they are not achievable. If we want to keep the status quo, leadership needs to take a fresh look at the way they lead and manage the college.
Credible?	X	X	Current funds not providing sufficient funding for future quality and continuous improvement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are credible because we have existed this way since 1993, we exist, we operate, we function, we are accredited.
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because of the budget situation, quality of services will be limited. We are providing quality services now, we have room to improve if provided adequate funding.

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 states

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 meet 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

<p>What is not addressed in the option?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to be able to make quick budget adjustments based on the results of enrollment data. • National campus could offer a general studies certificate; they will instantly get 100 to 150 certificate students. Most of our students cannot test into the college level on the COMET. • We need an effective fundraiser. We need better coordination for fundraising throughout the college. • We need to restructure the developmental programs we currently have to have something in place. We need bridging improvement to move them into the college level. We need better alignment with 2ndary schools systems.

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

What is the detailed impact (human, financial, etc.) of the option on the following?	
Students?	Not much
Enrollment?	Not much, current downward trends continue (we need a study on why enrollment is declining, we need more aggressive recruitment)
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?	

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

Loss of accreditation

- Closure of the college.
- Emergence of post 2ndary alternative institution to take our place.
- We could be ok to continue as is in the long run with some changes.

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):
<p>4. One national campus with College supported centers where courses can be delivered (VPAS model)</p> <p>1. Status quo – determine money to maintain status quo</p> <p>2. One college with centers – tribal college model</p> <p>3. Breakup College and have different colleges each state</p>

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		<p>Set up of the college before 1993/4. What were the reasons for the change? This is misleading, the extensions were under the COM, COM wanted to offer programs but CCM and MOC were the accredited entities. The reason to change was to be more responsive to the centers and offer programs in a more organized manner. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Comments on breakeven costs of programs. Concern from Kosrae over age of students and appearance of maturity.</p> <p>Concern has been expressed over the impact of national campus over pregnancy, alcohol and violence.</p>

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. It's a business decision. It is a difficult model to discuss because it may mean job losses.
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	Reduce number of employees and staff; negative effect on economy and morale.
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

<p>What is not addressed in the option?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to be able to make quick budget adjustments based on the results of enrollment data. • What does this mean in terms of levels of employment, programs offered etc.? • Is this model financially supportable? • Put in place a study to see if each current campus would be better if changed to this model. We may not have time to wait for a study.
<p>Who is affected by the option (campuses, programs, individuals, etc.)?</p>
<p>How are effectiveness and efficiency issues addressed by the option?</p> <p>Could be improved (depends on implementation).</p>

<p>What is the detailed impact (human, financial, etc.) of the option on the following?</p>	
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?	

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

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? This is a give up option, we do not want to consider this 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)?

President's Retreat 2009
May 12 – 14, 2009
FSM China Friendship Sports Center
Breakout Session Recording Form & Notes

Breakout Session 2: Review of Options for Restructuring

Purpose of Session: The session will review and expand upon the work that was initiated by the college's Planning & resources committee. The approach used was to use a structured review process to assist in developing and understanding the implication of various structures that would allow the college to meet its mission while dealing with reduced enrollment and financial constraints and continuously improving quality of programs and services. This breakout session is intended for the audience to become acquainted with the review done so far and to expand on the work with additional data/evidence, pros and cons, etc.

Grouping: Mixed

Notes: This session is intended to promote understanding of the various options along with review and expansion the associated data and evidence, pros and cons, and improve quantification of the impact on students, enrollment, budget/finances, faculty/staff and the nation/states. It is also meant to explore varying assumptions on the options and help understanding and appreciation of differing views, values and beliefs.

This session is not intended for promotion or advocacy of positions or options (there will be sessions when advocacy of positions is encouraged). Groups should use the options review developed by Planning & resources and expand on those view by including additional comments, data/evidence, pros and cons, etc. in a different color. Completed forms should be emailed to rschplanning@comfsm.fm for compilation. Files should be saved in MS Word 2003 format using the following: S2 Options G_.

Group number/name:	Group 4 Options for Restructuring
Group facilitators & recorder:	Jojo Peter – Facilitator, Sue Caldwell -Recorder
Group members:	Jackson Phillip, Paul Gallen, Emmanuela Garan, Raynaldo Garcia, Doman Daoas, Soledad Reynoso, Warren Ching, Salpasr, Diaz Joseph, Castro Joab, Lihno Paulino, Engley Ioanis, Tim Franklin, Kiyosi Phillip, Penny Weilbacher, D J Huruomai, Jonathan K, Ceciilia Dibay, Mayliza Ariote

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 Yes, but need for improvement
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) It can be improved
Credible?		x	Funding - not providing funding for future quality and continuous improvement
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?		x	There is quality; but it needs to be improved
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, including nontraditional students	Difficult to meet quality standards
Ability to meet specific needs of students in each state	Too much bureaucracy

Pros and Cons of the Option from the Standpoint of Key Stakeholders	
Pros	Cons
Routine	Do not have state ownership (not necessarily)
Accessible	Two campuses on Pohnpei

States do not have to provide funding	Students have to travel to Pohnpei for many programs
State needs are met	
Two campuses on Pohnpei	

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, incentive to make hard decisions to improve

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):
<p>4. One national campus with FSM State supported centers where courses can be delivered</p> <p>1. Status quo – determine money to maintain status quo</p> <p>2. One college with centers – tribal college model</p> <p>3. Breakup College and have different colleges each state</p>

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		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
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. Insufficient student support (due to distance)
Relevant?	X		Summits and communiqués 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. Challenge of maintaining long-term technology support

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	Reduction of hands on student support services
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	Less interaction of students with other students from other states
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 friction
	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? Student body associations, organizations, etc. on each campus
Who is affected by the option (campuses, programs, individuals, etc.)? State campus staffs, students, communities, local stakeholders, local businesses, sponsored programs, land grant

How are effectiveness and efficiency issues addressed by the option?	
Could be improved (depends on implementation). Technology support and capacity, state government support and infrastructure	

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; Students at centers may not feel equal to those at the main campus, Students may act more responsibly, Students may lose community support
Enrollment?	Might see an initial reduction in enrollment (overall) and increase as program is implemented; can improve enrollment by opening programs. Enrollment may be erratic
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; increase in faculty and staff at main campus
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)?	
Other institutions may move in to the region, community backlash	

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 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		It's not necessarily breaking up the college, still a system with separately accredited campuses, maintaining the overall administration with some modification in system wide functions
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 acquire 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

Aligning of state and local needs with college services	Increase in administrative staff
Funding is more specific to needs	More time to implement
More likely to meet student needs in a timely fashion	
What is not addressed in the option?	
Who is affected by the option (campuses, programs, individuals, etc.)? System wide functions States, State governments Current staff	
How are effectiveness and efficiency issues addressed by the option? More effective and efficient in services	

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, more accessible to college services, services are more focused on needs of students (less variety)
Enrollment?	Should increase in each state, competition from other IHEs
Budget/Finances?	Uncontrollable, budget inflated for each state, require major changes in the way states budget, Each college would have its own budget guidelines
Faculty/staff?	Low quality faculty and staff, recruitment challenges, each college would have its quality assurance
Nation/states?	Increase state pride, decrease concept of FSM as a nation
Others?	Constitution changes required Will require an amendment to the enabling law that created the college system

What are potential consequences of the option (including those that may not show up for several years)?
Not sustainable for all states and the nation

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
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 met 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 Training institutes belong to the states (government is in control)
Cost effective?		X	Duplication would occur 100% control by COM-FSM 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 – non COM-FSM (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	Less relevant in terms of state stakeholders
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 Depends on willingness of states to support and potential of political interference
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)
	COM-FSM 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
	Addressing the quality issue

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 accessible 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 significant time (3 – 10 years)
	No refund checks

What is not addressed in the option?
Who is affected by the option (campuses, programs, individuals, etc.)? State and national campuses, faculty and staff
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)? Loss of credibility at the state level

President's Retreat 2009
May 12 – 14, 2009
FSM China Friendship Sports Center
Breakout Session Recording Form & Notes

Breakout Session 2: Review of Options for Restructuring

Purpose of Session: The session will review and expand upon the work that was initiated by the college's Planning & resources committee. The approach used was to use a structured review process to assist in developing and understanding the implication of various structures that would allow the college to meet its mission while dealing with reduced enrollment and financial constraints and continuously improving quality of programs and services. This breakout session is intended for the audience to become acquainted with the review done so far and to expand on the work with additional data/evidence, pros and cons, etc.

Grouping: Mixed

Notes: This session is intended to promote understanding of the various options along with review and expansion the associated data and evidence, pros and cons, and improve quantification of the impact on students, enrollment, budget/finances, faculty/staff and the nation/states. It is also meant to explore varying assumptions on the options and help understanding and appreciation of differing views, values and beliefs.

This session is not intended for promotion or advocacy of positions or options (there will be sessions when advocacy of positions is encouraged). Groups should use the options review developed by Planning & resources and expand on those view by including additional comments, data/evidence, pros and cons, etc. in a different color. Completed forms should be emailed to rschplanning@comfsm.fm for compilation. Files should be saved in MS Word 2003 format using the following: S2 Options G_.

Group number/name:	5
Group facilitators & recorder:	Joseph Saimon, Faustino Yarofaisug (Facilitators)
Group members:	Xavier Yarofmal, Eugene Edmund, Dana Lee Ling, Fr. Francis Hezel, Mary Figir, Joana Nanpei, Magdalena Hallers, Sylvia Henry, Arinda Swingly-Julios, Babyano Retuleilug, July Nimea, Memorina Yeseki, Inda Maipi, John Haglelgam, Richard Womack, Edgar Gardner, Bruce Robert, Maureen Harongorus, Ricky Cantero, Martin Mingi

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):
<p>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)</p>

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	X x	<p>Note: This review is conducted to establish comparison information/data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do meet the mission but the current structure is not "sustainable." • We are not continuously improving • Could the option be made viable with quasi-radical changes? • Definite need for change. Staying the course will lead to a big crash that no one will survive. Quality is a big concern. But when you get down to it, it is finance. The FSM cannot afford to run six different colleges. Compact fund decreasing. Loss in compact cannot be offset by local revenue growth. • Downsize the status quo. Accrediting commission did us disservice when they suggested building out the state sites. The result is an unaffordable system. We must downsize. • The structure of the forms and the retreat do not permit meaningful decisions on the restructure. To actually look at sources of deficits, look at individual trade-offs that could be made. "If one gave up this, then this could be improved." The word "status quo" turns everybody off from looking at changes. Cut this, remove that, stop doing that. Cut programs, shut down program expansion. The retreat really does not provide concrete data by which to make meaningful and informed decisions. • Before the state campus system we have extension system. From there we expanded. When did that take place, how did that take place, how did that contribute to our present problem. [Board decisions drove this] •

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 Board members think that they are representing their states, but they do NOT represent their state. The governor only makes a recommendation. The board member is confirmed by national government. The board does not reflect the political structure. That is a misimpression. People think the college should mirror the FSM structurally with each state having a campus, but this is not the case . This is a unitary system controlled by board and those board members do not represent the state but the nation . The states did not create the college, the nation created the college. There is no political nor legal guarantee of a campus in every state.
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):
<p>4. One national campus with FSM State supported centers where courses can be delivered (VPAS model)</p> <p>1. Status quo – determine money to maintain status quo</p> <p>2. One college with centers – tribal college model</p> <p>3. Breakup College and have different colleges each state</p>

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	x	<p>Impact on strategic plan – would need to redo the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to know why they said “yes” and/or “no” (rubrics?) • We want to see projections, e.g., income statements, projected costs, etc. • Option 2: Should be “downsize administration/programs” • Role of the campuses • This option depends highly on technology (very expensive) • We need more clear understanding of our mission statement, the impacts/effects of this option (or all of these options)
Criteria – 4 C’s	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Comprehensive?	X	?	Comprehensive in terms of what? More information (It is confusing)

Clear?	X	x	<p>It is not clear because this is a very important decision; we need more information how this structure will work</p> <p>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.</p>
Cost effective?	X	x	<p>Too expensive; not cost effective (see Table 1, p. 2) We don't know. We need to see figure. Note that these tribal colleges are heavily funded by government money ... we need to see their sources of income/funds</p> <p>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.</p>
Credible?	X	?	It is not clear
Criteria – BOR concerns/issues	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Quality?	x	?	<p>It depends</p> <p>More uniformity and consistency of services and delivery. Depends on implementation.</p>
Relevant?	X	x	<p>It is not relevant.</p> <p>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.</p>
Sustainable?	X	x	<p>No (not sustainable and affordable), see Lakota data Sustainable if maintained as designed.</p>

Affordable?	x	x	No (not sustainable and affordable), see Lakota data 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. [Choice of option may require a change in mission statement]		X (not in present form)	[We are supposed to make data driven decisions, but data not provided. Projections of impact, cost.] [What are the real sources of the deficits.] [No data on the different options, presentations data did not include projections] [Trying to understand the options, whether they may be a viable option that we can research. What is the new restructure that we would like to see to avoid disaster.] [We let the mission remain the same? And then let the structure fit the mission? The mission fits the present structure. We are trying to fit the geni back into the bottle. If we are going to change the structure then we must change the mission] [This is not about deficit, this is affordability, ...] [I am interesting in only one thing is quality. We are restructuring because we cannot deliver what is in the catalog with quality. We should not get hung up on money. Restructure for quality] [We need to make fact based decisions] [Is this a financial disaster or a quality disaster?] [Quality, it is a quality disaster]

Criteria – 4 C’s	Yes	No	Comments/evidence/data
Comprehensive?	x		
Clear?	x		
Cost effective?		x	FSM cannot sustain the current structure, let along this option which would require an additional 10 to 20 million dollars in funding.
Credible?		x	Faculty staff quality, accreditation, financial support [There are only 400 associate degree capable students in the nation. Not enough to support four independent institutions.]
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):
<p>4. One national campus with FSM State supported centers where courses can be delivered (VPAS model)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
--------------------	-----	----	------------------------

<p>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.</p>	<p>x</p>	<p>Ownership expanded to states [No – how can national center control the state “owned” campuses.] {We have trouble maintaining consistency now, this will not improve this situation} [There is a need for the college to revisit its mission to set up a restructure. What are the state centers going to be? What are these going to be? A fifth year of high school? Feeders for a national site? What is the role of the state center?] [As we get into the state campus thing you might have each state having its own mission statement. The high schools need our assistance, cooperation. When we restructure we should help the high schools. Maybe that should be part of our mission. One state needs this more than anything else. Anything other than this assistance is “Tylenol for cancer.”] [Ownership to states? Will the states accept this solution? States say national gov responsible for funding.] [Devil’s advocate: states that fund retain their campus, states that cannot fund lose their state site. Some state campuses survive, others die. Those that survive may attract students from the state w/o campus. Survival and growth of the fittest] [DA counter: state may not fund students from neighbor state] [Counter-counter: there will be in-state and out-of-state tuition just as is the case in many other nations.] [The four centers are detached but associated with us] [Kosrae Training Institute, etc] Our courses delivered on campus.] [Would they be accredited?] [[As long as we looked at distant ed criterion we would meet accreditation requirement.] [Who handles operation and maintenance? The state. They run and operate it. The state runs and operates the TRAINING center for their citizens.]</p> <p>Constitution and enabling law basically still meet [States will say that post-secondary ed is responsibility of national gov] Would require substantive change (accreditation) Question – really improve/meet mission if states will not provide funding</p>
---	----------	--

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 [How would programs such as the two year prep in teacher education and the follow-on four year partnership function in a model where the state is funding only local state training?]
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	Involvement of states in ownership of postsecondary education

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)?

Open discussion on other options

[Pohnpei campus] came up with an option but they did not even discuss or consider the option in planning and resources. In outline: What ain't broke, don't fix it. There were six options at one time.

1. Close PNI campus merge students into national
2. Close except vocational
3. merge FMI and Yap
- 4 Restructuring under current structure
5. Specialized campuses
6. Redefine roles and responsibilities

So the committee came up with a response option: a merging of national and Pohnpei campus. Streamlining of administration. All degree programs to national, certificate/vocational on Pohnpei. All admin at "national"

No option says, "Close the national campus" [No boarding students, tuition could rise without concern for affordability of room and board, all students are "day" students nationwide] Why isn't the national campus "on the table?"
[concern: national unity. Palikir is last place students from across FSM get together]

Pohnpei campus saw these options as "close the Pohnpei campus" We are trying to do a good board. We have advisory councils. The challenges include the students we are getting. The admissions process selects off the best students into associate degree programs, so job skill valuable certificate and vocational programs are automatically relegated weaker students.