

College of Micronesia – FSM
Concerns and Issues on Streamlining
From Chuuk, Yap and FMI Campuses

Below are the concerns and issues from Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses concerning the streamlining and restructuring of the college. The information was gathered as an appointed member of the Task Force Committee tasked to address the following directive from the board of regents on May 18 – 19, 2011:

“The Board halted further realignment of programs and services and implementation of the reporting procedures so a task force appointed by the Board can address areas of confusion and recommend a clear implementation plan to complete the streamlining/restructuring process to the Board at its next meeting.”

Concerns and Issues:

1. On the justifications of the recommended streamlining/restructuring

- a. Is the college heading in the right direction? (Yap campus)
- b. Was there other alternative that was considered to evaluate that the recommended structure is the best option? (Chuuk campus)
- c. The board did not direct the administration to restructure. The board only directed the administration to streamline the structure to save costs and to control expansions. (Yap and FMI campuses)
- d. What are the benefits of the recommended structure compared with the current structure? (Chuuk and FMI campuses)
- e. The recommended structure removes the excellent spirit of teamwork, cooperation and multi tasking in providing services to students at state campuses. The strong teamwork at state campuses was commended by the accrediting commission. (Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses)
- f. What is the savings of the recommended structure? (Chuuk and FMI campuses)
- g. What is the total manpower complement and total salary of the recommended structure as compared with the current structure? (Chuuk and FMI campuses)
- h. Did the streamlining address improvements of programs and services? If so, in what way? (FMI campus)
- i. Why pursue with the changes if there are lots of negative challenges being faced by the college. (Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses)
 - i. The one – year implementation and evaluation period may result to more serious problems at the college. (Yap campus)

2. On the changes of the recommended streamlining/restructuring

- a. Changes on the recommended structure as compared with the current structure are not clear. (Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses)
- b. What are the changes in programs and services? (Chuuk campus)
- c. The new reporting structure did not mention the assessment processes and cycles. (Yap campus)
 - i. How assessment fits under the recommended reporting structure?
 - ii. How the assessment be handled if units at state campuses are operating independently.
 - iii. Assessment plan was developed linking various offices at Yap campus. Each office could not function effectively and independently from other offices. Student services has to work hand in hand with instruction, business office, IT, maintenance.
 - iv. How the objectives of the assessment will be developed, will it be by state campus objectives or by system wide objectives?
 - v. Who will handle the assessment process at state campuses? Will it be state campus directors (SCD) or national campus directors (NCD)?
- d. How will the budget development, processes, control and accountability be handled? (Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses)
 - i. How will the budget be consolidated? If at state campus level or at Department level?

- ii. Who will handle the revenue projection and who will be accountable in achieving the revenue projection at state campuses?
- iii. SCD could not be held accountable in achieving revenue projections because SCD has no direct authority to state campus units.
- iv. Who will be responsible in reallocating budget of one office to another office at state campuses to address the needs and priorities at state campus? (example: reprogramming of budget from instruction to maintenance to address the immediate needs of repairs at the campus)
- e. The recommended structure is no longer student centered. (FMI campus)
- f. The reporting structure is adopting the centralization of responsibilities which is an old school, instead of decentralization which is based on trust at the ground level. (Chuuk campus)
 - i. Centralization of authority limited the efficiency in servicing students at state campus. (Yap and FMI campus)

3. On the change of the line of authority from solid line to dotted line between SCD and state campus units

- a. Clarify the accountabilities of the NCD as denoted by the solid line, and the accountabilities of the SCD as denoted by the dotted line. (Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses).
- b. Who is primarily responsible on the over-all operations and performance at state campuses? (Chuuk campus)
- c. What is the accountability of the SCD on the day to day operations of the campus vis-à-vis the accountability of NCD for the operations of the respective units at state campus. (Chuuk campus)
- d. Clarify the SCD task as stakeholder management.
 - Stakeholder management is a broad term. Need to define the stakeholders (both internal and external stakeholders). (Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses)
 - Define Key Performance Indicators (KPI) of SCD with respect to stakeholder management. (Chuuk campus)
 - SCD will not be effective in handling stakeholder management if no direct authority in the operations at state campus. Commitments on programs and services could not be provided by SCD as it has to be referred to national campus. (Chuuk campus)
 - SCD are willing to be responsible and accountable in the day to day operations of the campus and with stakeholder management. (Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses)
 - Defining responsibilities and activities at states in promoting the programs and services between SCD, President and DCR. (Yap campus)
- e. Efficiency and productivity of SC operations will be greatly affected.
 - The need for an immediate response on various problems and concerns at campuses may not be handled;
 - Services may not be performed by an employee/office due to delays in communication with NCD;
 - Priorities for the needs at campuses may not be handled properly and on time.
- f. Written guidelines and procedures in the implementation of the new reporting structure are not available for consistent implementation by state campus. (Yap campus)
 - i. At this time, there are no uniform and consistent guidelines and procedures to be followed by the state campus units in reporting to national campus.
 - ii. Signing of timesheets and other documents:
 - 1. NCD are not comfortable signing timesheets as they are not physically present to validate that the employee is present. (Maintenance and Business Office)
 - 2. Some SCD are not willing to sign timesheet as they are not the direct supervisor for the state campus personnel.
 - iii. Clarify the role and supervisory link of the Administrative Assistant with regards to HR duties. (Yap campus)
 - iv. Clarify the role of the VCC/SSC at FMI. (FMI campus)

4. On the salary conversion

- Personnel Actions (PA) for the conversion of salary for some employees indicated a reduction of salary from existing rate. (Chuuk campus)
- The PA for pay differential for the conversion was not processed at the same time. There are still employees who have not received the differential pay from the conversion of salary. (Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses)

Recommendations:

1. Provide justifications on the recommended structure that will document that it is the best option and that the college is heading in the right direction. This will remove the fears and doubts that the recommended structure is not a good option. (Chuuk, Yap and FMI campuses)
 - a. List the objectives and benefits that can be achieved by the recommended structure in terms of accomplishing the mission of the college, and effectiveness in providing services and programs as compared with the current structure.
 - b. Provide the analysis on the costs of salary and manpower complement of the recommended structure as compared with the current structure.
 - c. Quantify enrollment and revenue of the recommended structure as compared with the current structure.
2. Adopt the following changes if the recommended structure will be implemented and no other alternative will be considered:
 - a. Give SCD the direct authority and accountability on the day to day operations at state campuses in addition to stakeholder management.
 - b. Change the lines of authority from SCD to state campus units from dotted to solid lines, and the line of authority from NCD to state campus units from solid to dotted lines.
3. Develop, control and monitor budgets and assessment plans per campus and not per department.