

College of Micronesia FSM

Committee Minutes Reporting Form			
Committee or Working Group		<i>Council of Chairs</i>	
Date	Time	Location	
11 October 2013	13:00	Board Conference Room	
Members Present			
Titles/Reps	Name	Present	Absent
COC Vice Chair/Curriculum & Assessment	Gardner Edgar	X	
Human Resources	Morehna Rettin-Santos		X
COC Chair/Finance	Richard Womack	X	
Planning and Resources	William Haglegam	X	
Recruitment, Admission and Registration	Lucia Donre - Sam	X	
Information Communication and Technology	Shaun Suliol	X	
COC Secretary/Facilities & Campus Environment	Dana Lee Ling	X	
Faculty and Staff Senate Vice Chair	Ringlen Ringlen		X
Additional Attendees			
President	Dr. Joseph Daisy		
Vice President Administration	Joseph Habuchmai		
Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of minutes from 27 September 2013 • New business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VPA Habuchmai on FY 2014 and 2015 • Old business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VPIEQA recommendations • Information sharing 			
Discussion of Agenda/Information Sharing:			
<p>Chair Council of Chairs declared a quorum at 13:01. Finance Committee chair reported on elections in FC and the setting up of a meetings with the Vice President for Administration. Chair CoC turned to the matter of adopting the minutes. FC chair requested that an email sent to CoC be attached to the minutes as the FC report. The minutes of 27 September 2013 were moved for adoption, seconded, and approved by unanimous vote.</p> <p>Chair CoC brought the Vice President Institutional Effectiveness and Quality Assurance recommendations to the floor. Chair CoC noted his receiving not one but two emails from the VPIEQA stressing that the recommendations are not those of the VPIEQA but derive instead from her research. Chair CoC asked that all Council of Chairs members read <i>Work-based Learning: An Action Research Study for Enhancing Participatory Governance, Purposeful Dialogue, and Leadership to Meet Accreditation Standards</i>. Chair CoC noted that he did not want to "plunge" into a discussion until</p>			

members have all read the paper. Chair CoC then introduced an email from VPIEQA into the meeting.

Re item #2, I did do a verbal presentation to CoC a month ago, on the rationale behind recommendations for continuous improvement of our committees, but unfortunately, not all new CoC members were in place to benefit from the presentation.

The recommendations do not come from me, but from an action research project that included input from others and multiple other secondary data sources. The recommendations are based on collective input, not mine, alone. Yes, I did the research paper, but the ideas are not all mine. That is important to understand when weighing the recommendations.

The expectations are:

The CoC continue to be involved in this iterative AR project towards continuous quality improvement of our leadership, purposeful dialogue, and shared governance. The CoC are co-participants or co-researchers adding validity and reliability to data and future recommendations each year. Dana has proposed an interesting addition, and that is, *"I remain fascinated by the intersection of purposeful dialog, participative governance, and technology. I am particularly interested in understanding where dialog occurs, how it might be captured, and the channels through which perceptions flow and eventually congeal into opinions and positions. Having worked at a state campus, I am also always looking for ways in which our remote sites can join the ongoing conversation, be a part of the opinion and position forming process"*. It will be interesting to see if we can capture some survey data this year and interview data to begin to address this question as well. **So, will the CoC agree to continue as co-participants/co-researchers on this years iteration?**

Many of the recommendations do not require CoC endorsement and implementation, and are administrative decisions to improve. But, I welcome and encourage ongoing input from CoC in regard to the other recommendations that are implemented. For example, the ALO is back serving as the secretariat as I did the first year. Already implemented. But, if CoC wants to comment the secretariat should be someone else, for X reason(s)...feel free to offer input towards changes for the next AY. I am going to ensure recognition for service and trainings (as surveys noted training was critical). Etc..

I need CoC to immediately consider endorsement or adoptions of Recommendations (see final Rec #s in larger work, as based on collective input, original Rec 6 was removed, and so ordering number has changed):

Recommendation 1;

Recommendation 2;

Recommendation 5 (other specific types of training you all might want/there will be training, but do you have a special request),

Recommendation 6,

Recommendation 7

Recommendation 8 (just to recognise the importance of touching base on changes with the secretariat to prevent issues that have ripple affects and unintended negative consequences, not to be stifled and micro-managed);

Recommendation 9 (better other college position to serve as secretariat, in the future, or is the VPIEQA/ALO a good fit given the need to utilize committees to ensure adherence to standards, quality, and enhancing institutional effectiveness);

Recommendation 15;

Recommendation 16 (some CoC responsibility to assist, are you willing);

Recommendation 17 (some CoC responsibility to assist, are you willing);

Recommendation 18 (some CoC responsibility to assist, are you willing);

Recommendation 19 (CoC responsibility to deliver, and this is becoming a new accreditation standard - required to seek student input);

Chair CoC then asked the committee to consider item number one in the email, asking whether or not the committee wanted to be co-participant/researchers. Chair CoC noted that there had been a few comments on the recommendations in the Google Docs document. Chair CoC opened the floor for comments. Chair FCE noted that the phrase "agree to continue" implied that CoC had, as a body, previously agreed to participate in the research. Chair FCE clarified that individual committee chairs [three according the document] had agreed to participate, not the council as a body. Another member asked what participation would mean and entail.

Chair CoC said he would entertain a motion for CoC to agree to participate. A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously. The Curriculum and Assessment Committee chair suggested that committee chairs forward the recommendations to their committee members for comments and that those comments be brought back to the next CoC meeting. This would ensure that the process is participatory. Chair CoC noted that the recommendations would be item number one at the next meeting of the CoC.

A member noted the request for immediate endorsement or adoption of the recommendations and sought clarification on the proposed process. Chair CoC noted that the matter would have to wait until the committee chairs could obtain input from their committees. Chair CoC instructed the chairs to send the recommendations to their membership for comment.

At this point the Vice President for Administration entered to brief the committee on the budget process and Chair CoC turned the floor over to him.

The VPA noted that the college is at stage IV in the process specified in the budget manual. The vice presidents are still discussing 2015 allocations by department. A vote taken [on the tenth of October] selected scenario number four. Scenario number four presumes that the decline in enrollment continues at 10%, that revenues will be 10,859,450 including a \$10 per credit hour increase in tuition from \$115 to \$125 and a facilities fee for fall 2014 and spring 2015 of \$175 for full time and \$50 for part time. Key points driving this decision [in a document introduced in the meeting] are retention back to 63.8% for fall 2013, a decline in headcount across all sites and semesters, a decline in headcount across all sites for new and continuing students in the fall semesters, a decline in new students fall 2013 to 481 from 700 in fall 2012, and a decline in the FTE (currently the average credit load is 11.4 credits per student). At the start of the process the FY 2015 budget request was 12,360,833.

The VPA then turned to a sheet titled "Fixed Costs for Budget 2015" noting that personnel, total cost of ownership for facilities, communication costs, lease for the Chuuk campus, insurance, and TracDate represented \$9,380,256 in fixed costs. This would leave \$1,469,194 to cover travel, special contracts, OCE, and fixed asset costs. The VPA noted that the college is examining where consolidation might cut costs. The college is also examining best practices for the ratio, the cost, for personnel as practiced in other organizations. About 60% of a budget will be personnel. The VPA also noted that the college is focusing on equivalency of services across sites (as opposed to equal services). The VPA spoke about cross-training of personnel in this regard.

Chair CoC noted that scenario four is the most difficult scenario, the most conservative scenario. The Chair of CoC noted his approval of this approach as opposed to an overly-optimistic "best case" scenario. Chair CoC asked whether the program priority review is continuing. Trimming programs and personnel could lead to cost savings.

The President then spoke. He noted that he had purposefully sat out of the earliest discussions in order to allow his vice presidents to make decisions. He noted that based on a briefing in the morning he is pleased with the direction that the vice presidents have taken. He concurs that scenario four is a good guide. He noted the five year best case. He also noted that efforts at mitigation still did not achieve the best case scenario. He said that he was not inclined at this time to put weight on mitigation strategies. Strategies such as "enhanced advising" - what does that mean? Scenario four is good, solid fiscal discipline. There are no sacred cows. Everything is open for discussion. If one looks at colleges in financial difficulties, the percent of the budget dedicated to personnel is high. The president cited an institution appealing termination of accreditation and noted that personnel represented 90% of their costs, leaving too little budget for everything else. He noted that 7.4 million in fixed costs is a high ratio. Total Cost of Ownership was underestimated in the past, those costs are now accurately reflected. TCO, fixed costs, are hard to touch, cannot be touched.

Program priority review, the President continued, did give programs time to demonstrate they are effective. Some programs are expensive and are subsidized by other programs. Some courses are more expensive than other courses. Science with laboratory is expensive, other courses subsidize those courses. Cabinet noted that if that process was now completed, then the college can now look at those programs which have not improved and put them on a watch list. Another member said that this would be like akin to "show cause" for a program. The President noted that these were difficult decisions.

The President also noted that he wanted to see student support services integrated into all areas. A restructuring was being contemplated and discussed. One option would be to eliminate the VPSSA. Integration would also bring together instructional affairs and student services.

The revenues versus cost for each site was also being examined. Chair FCE noted that energy costs were a large part of the total cost of ownership for facilities. He explained his own ongoing use of a computer in a non-air conditioned environment, and the background that in 1993-1995 when the campus was being designed computers needed air conditioning, hence the air conditioned computer laboratories. Better insulation in the roofs, better ventilation, could allow the campuses to move to non-air conditioned classrooms with significant long term cost savings.

The President referred to the BECA study, a \$350,000 comprehensive facilities study looking at every building on every site. A study that would include integration into the educational master plan, a fifteen year facilities plan, and ways to reduce energy consumption. The study included an energy audit. Real discussions would be held based on the findings. Discussions will be held on personnel, increasing full-time enrollment, and the scheduling of classes. The fall in the average FTE may in part reflect scheduling difficulties for the students. The college will also move away from "equal services" on all sites and towards "equivalent services" on all sites. The accrediting commission concurs in this interpretation and wants to see equivalent, not necessarily equal, services.

Chair CoC chimed in asking "How big should the college be?" Chair CoC then noted that during information sharing time he thought it might be best if chairs reported "What's on your agenda that is being moved to a recommendation, that is moving up." The chair entertained a motion to adjourn, the Council of Chairs stood adjourned at 14:01.

Handouts/Documents Referenced:

- Work-based Learning: An Action Research Study for Enhancing Participatory Governance, Purposeful Dialogue, and Leadership to Meet Accreditation Standards.
- Budget 2015 Assumptions and Scenarios

- Fixed Costs for Budget 2015

• Fixed Costs for Budget 2015			
College Web Site Link:	http://wiki.comfsm.fm/Committee_Minutes/Council_of_Chairs		
Prepared by:	Dana Lee Ling	Date Distributed:	12 October 2013
Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:			
Submitted by:		Date Submitted:	
Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timeline & Responsibilities			