



College of Micronesia – FSM  
**Prioritization of Nonacademic Programs 2013**

Director, Institutional Research & Planning; Dean Academic Programs &  
Acting Vice President for Student Services  
February 28, 2013  
[rschplanning@comfsm.fm](mailto:rschplanning@comfsm.fm)

**Report on the Prioritization of Nonacademic Programs 2013**  
**College of Micronesia – FSM**

**Table of Contents**

Introduction ..... 1

Background & Preparation..... 1

Methodology..... 1

Findings ..... 3

    Criteria & Indicators..... 3

    Rating Process..... 4

    Strengths and Weaknesses..... 5

Recommendations ..... 6

    Program Improvement ..... 6

    Process Issues ..... 6

Appendix A: Program Ranking ..... 8

Appendix B: Prioritization Master Chart of Ratings..... 9

Appendix C: Program Analysis and Viability Study Review FY 2011 – FY 2012 ..... 10

Appendix D: Program Rating Form ..... 16

Appendix E: Potential Rating Criteria..... 19

Appendix F: Non Academic Program Prioritization Group ..... 22

## Introduction

The following report provides background, methodology, findings and recommendations from the Prioritization of Nonacademic Programs conducted from October 2012 to February 2013. Additional information regarding the report can be obtained from Jimmy Hicks, Director of Institutional Research and Planning ([jhicks@comfsm.fm](mailto:jhicks@comfsm.fm)); Karen Simion, Dean Academic Programs ([ksimion@comfsm.fm](mailto:ksimion@comfsm.fm)) and/or Joey Oducado, acting Vice President for Student Services ([joducado@comfsm.fm](mailto:joducado@comfsm.fm)); phone: (691) 320-2480.

## Background & Preparation

In the spring of 2012 the College conducted its first prioritization of academic programs. The academic prioritization resulted in a ranking of programs with recommendations on what lower performing programs must do to make their programs viable.

A corresponding review of nonacademic programs was undertaken in late fall of 2012 and early spring of 2013. Major motivations for the prioritization of nonacademic programs included:

- Concern over across the board cuts to address budget reductions,
- Concerns by faculty and others that too much is being spent for administration,
- Desire for improving effectiveness and efficiency of operations, and
- Determining possibilities for streamlining services and operations.

## Methodology

Both the academic and nonacademic prioritization processes were guided by the work of Robert C. Dickeson's "Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance<sup>1</sup>".

The Society for College and University Planning's (SCUP) webinar and related materials on "Prioritizing Administrative Programs and Activities" by Robert C. Dickeson and Larry Goldstein was obtained in DVD. The webinar was used for developing understanding of the prioritization process and for training of the Nonacademic Prioritization Working Group. The webinar was presented to faculty and staff at all campuses during August – September 2012 to assist the college in its decision whether or not to undertake a nonacademic prioritization project.

Dickeson recommends a seven phase approach to prioritization:

---

<sup>1</sup> Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA 2010.

1. Preparation and readiness phase
2. Organization phase
3. Data collection phase
4. Analysis and assessment phase
5. Decision-making phase
6. Implementation phase
7. Evaluation phase

This report represents the college's efforts to date for phases 1 – 5.

On October 16, 2013 the college's Management Team designated a Non Academic Prioritization Working Group (see appendix F for members and mandate). Chairs organization meetings were held in October & November 2013 and formal meetings of the working group begin on December 6, 2013 to review Dickeson's materials, scope out the project and develop the specific methodology for data collection and analysis.

In developing its methodology for the prioritization process, the college also accessed information and models on prioritization from the Jossey-Bass website at <http://www.josseybass.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-403475.html> that were related to Dickeson's book on prioritization. Material from the University of Saint Francis was used a guide for developing criteria and indicators. Dickeson's recommendations on potential criteria (Appendix E) were reviewed and his "Alternative Criteria" was selected for use) and Material from Seattle Central Community College was used for developing the college's Program Analysis and Viability Study Review Form. The college's Program Analysis and Viability Study Review FY 2011 – FY 2012 Form can be found in Appendix C. The college's Program Review Form can be found in Appendix D.

An initial timeline for completion of the nonacademic prioritization was originally set for April 30, 2013, but later revised to January 31, 2013.

The college's Program Analysis and Viability Study Review FY 2011 – FY 2012 Form was sent to Vice Presidents and Program Coordinators on December 11, 2012 and data collection phase was extended through mid-February 2013.

The overall working group agreed on a criterion model for the ratings and use of smaller ratings groups to reduce the work load. Each working group had approximately 11 programs to review and rate. The composition of the ratings working groups:

#### **Rating Group Review Teams:**

1. Arthur, Kalwin, Joey\*, Danny
2. Jeff, Grilly\*, Magdalena
3. Karen\*, , Arinda, Monica
4. Jimmy\*, Ankie, Kind
5. Gordon\*, Penseleen, Shermik

\* Team Leader

A series of Ground Rules for the rating groups were established as part of the calibration process.

**Ground Rules:**

1. Majority rules
2. If three different ratings, then send back to Jimmy, Joey or Karen for another person to rate the item.
3. Base ratings on information provided in form – nothing else. Not everyone shares the same knowledge set. Ratings must be repeatable from group to group.

The rating groups reviewed all submissions during the week of February 18 – 22, 2013 and submitted summary sheets of their program ratings. The ratings were based on a scale of 4 to 1 indicating congruence with the identified criterion.

**Ratings**

Rating scale:

- 4 Indicators suggest highest congruence with identified criterion
- 3 Indicators suggest moderate high congruence with identified criterion
- 2 Indicators suggest moderate congruence with identified criterion
- 1 Indicators suggest low congruence with identified criterion

The Director of Institutional Research, Dean Academic Programs and the Acting Vice President of Student Services reviewed submissions of the ratings groups on February 26 & 27 and made the following findings and recommendations.

**Findings**

**Criteria & Indicators**

The following table provides a summary by criteria and indicator for the average ratings from all rating groups.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Indicator(s)</b>	<b>Average Rating</b>
1. Key Objectives and how they are measured	The program has a written mission.	Yes 51 No 2
1a.	The program mission is congruent with the college mission.	3.6
2. Services provided and to which customers, internal and external	The services provided are aligned with the needs and desires of internal stakeholder.	3.7
2a.	The services provided are aligned with the needs and desires of external stakeholder	3.3
3. Position-by-position	The number of program employees is aligned with	3.5

Criteria	Indicator(s)	Average Rating
analysis	the functions and responsibilities (from mission).	
3a.	The number of program employees is aligned with the internal and external demand for the program.	3.8
4. Unmet needs and demands	The programs resources and staffing allow it to meet internal and external demands.	3.1
5. Opportunities for collaboration and restructuring	The program is taking advantage of opportunities for collaboration and cooperation.	3.0
6. Opportunities to share skill sets and resources	The program is taking advantage of opportunities to share skills sets and resources.	2.8
7. Opportunities for cross-training	The program is taking advantage of opportunities to share cross training.	2.9
8. Technological improvement that are cost-effective	The program effectively uses technology to improve effectiveness and efficiency of services.	3.4
8a.	The program effectively uses technology to enhance service delivery.	3.2
9. Process improvements to streamline operations	The program has processes in place that provide for effective and efficient service delivery.	3.0
10. Outsourcing exploration to improve services and cut costs	The program takes advantage of outsourcing to cut costs while maintaining quality services.	2.5

Key points from the criteria and indicators:

- Item 1 & 1a - Programs have missions (51/53) and those mission statements are related to the overall college missions.
- Item 2 & 2a – Programs tend to address the needs of internal better than external stakeholders.
- Item 3 & 3a – Programs generally are felt to have sufficient personnel to meet their mission.
- Item 4 – Programs tend to have fewer non personnel resources to meet their mission.
- Items 5 – 9 – These items can be grouped under improving effectiveness and efficiency of operations. The area of effectiveness and efficiency of operations can be areas of major improvement but there is limited evidence that the college and individual programs are taking active steps to improve effectiveness and efficiency of operations, streamlining and other efforts that can reduce overall costs of the programs while maintaining quality of services.
- Item 10 – Outsourcing of various functions may not be possible in many cases due to a weak private sector.

## Rating Process

A review of the rating group average scores shows a variation in each group's programs ratings. While a calibration process with a group review and rating of a program, time constraints prevented additional calibration efforts. Additionally, the process did not have a second stage of calibration after the ratings groups were formed.

Programs rankings were affected by which rating group was assigned to the program.

<b>Rating Group</b>	<b>Group Average Rating</b>
Rating Group 1	3.57
Rating Group 5	3.56
Rating Group 4	3.24
Rating Group 3	3.04
Rating Group 2	2.88

## **Strengths and Weaknesses**

The following is a summary of strengths and weaknesses of nonacademic programs drawn from the review process:

### **Areas of strength:**

There are major areas that stand out as strengths of nonacademic programs.

- Programs do generally have written missions (51/53 programs) and those missions are generally aligned with the overall college mission.
- Programs are generally felt to be adequately staffed.

### **Areas needing improvement:**

A number of areas stand out as potential areas for improvement.

- Understanding who are external stakeholders for individual programs and how to address their needs and increase involvement in the college
- Items 5 – 9 can be grouped under improving effectiveness and efficiency of operations. These criteria and indicators are generally ranked lower than other categories. Program can improve their overall effectiveness and efficiency by increasing:
  - Collaboration and cooperation both internally and externally to the college,
  - Cross training of staff within programs,
  - Skill sharing with other programs and organizations,
  - Improved use of technology, and
  - Enhancing processes and procedures
- Generally programs are felt to lack adequate non personnel resources to adequately address their mission and continually improve.

### **Ranking of Programs:**

Programs were divided into three categories (High, Medium & Low). Appendix A provides the rankings by program based on the average overall rating.

Ranking of programs was somewhat influenced by which rating group reviewed a particular program. This is likely results from inadequate training and calibration of the rating review process.

## Recommendations

Recommendations are provided in two sections. The first section addresses recommendations from the prioritization findings. The second section addresses ways to improve the process for future prioritization efforts.

### Program Improvement

- All nonacademic programs will select at least one of the following:
  - Revise FY 2014 Improvement and Assessment Plans to include at least one of the following:
    - Collaboration and cooperation with internal or external partners
    - Cross training within a program staff
    - Skill sharing with other programs, offices and external stakeholders
  - Revise FY 2014 Improvement and Assessment Plans to include specific actions and activities to improvement effectiveness and efficiency of operations.
  - Revise FY 2014 Improvement and Assessment Plans to include professional development activities. This professional development might include formal in-house training, directed readings in journals or other materials directly related to their mission, free online courses or other methods to improve professional capacity of staff.
- All nonacademic programs must determine who are their major external stakeholders and their specific needs and design interventions to address those needs.
- A formal review will be conducted by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness and Quality to review current distribution of non-personnel resources and make recommendations regarding adequate distribution of resources and materials for programs to meet their mission. This review will be coupled with how improved effectiveness and efficiency of programs can help reduce overall programs costs. Recommendations should be considered in development of the FY 2015 budget.

### Process Issues

To improve future prioritization of nonacademic programs a number of improvements can be made in processes and procedures related to the development of the Program Analysis and Viability Study Review Form and the rating process itself.

- Adequate time need to be allocated to the prioritization process to ensure quality at each step. Dickeson recommendation

- Forms must be reviewed based on the content of the forms and not on individual knowledge of the program. To ensure accuracy and completeness of the forms, supervisory review must be conducted prior to submission and certify or endorse the forms as a true reflection of the status of the program.
- Formal training needs to be conducted to address:
  - Overall process
  - Program review and development of the program review form to ensure completeness and accuracy of information without being overly wordy.
  - NOTE: Training might be provided in a variety of ways: 1) coordinated with visioning summit, 2) during site visits, and or 3) using technology to delivery training either directly (real time) or recorded via programs such as Camptasia (accessible through National IT) and placed on the college web site or distributed through electronic media.
- Calibration of the ratings can be improved by using a two stage process:
  - First stage: Whole group calibration of the same program reviews.
  - Second stage: After establishment of rating groups do a second calibration exercise with all groups using the same program form.



## Appendix A: Program Ranking

Rank	Program	Averages*
High	5-7 national VPAS	4
High	1-7 kosrae IT	3.9
High	5-2 national BO	3.9
High	5-10 yap Upward Bound	3.9
High	1-2 chuuk DEAN	3.8
High	1-6 kosrae AE & CRE	3.8
High	1-10 pohnpei Dean	3.8
High	1-11 yap CRE	3.8
High	3-10 yap Student Services	3.8
High	4-5 kosrae Student Services	3.8
High	4-9 national VPIA	3.8
High	5-4 national Main administration mail	3.8
High	5-3 national Facilities Grounds Transportation	3.7
High	4-10 pohnpei Instructional Coordinator	3.6
High	5-8 pohnpei Student Services Combined	3.6
High	1-9 national Sports	3.5
High	5-1 chuuk SHC	3.5
Medium	1-5 fmi Administration	3.4
Medium	1-8 national DCR	3.4
Medium	4-7 fmi Student Services	3.4
Medium	5-9 national VPSS	3.4
Medium	1-1 chuuk Counseling	3.3
Medium	1-3 chuuk IC	3.3
Medium	1-4.chuuk Maintenance	3.3
Medium	2-9 yap IT	3.3
Medium	2-10 yap LRC	3.3
Medium	3-3 kosrae Dean	3.3
Medium	3-5 national CRE VPCRE	3.3
Medium	3-6 national IRPO	3.3
Medium	3-8 national VPIEQA	3.3
Medium	4-8 national IT	3.3
Medium	2-4 chuuk SAO	3.2
Medium	3-4 kosrae CRE	3.2
Medium	4-6 national FAO	3.2
Medium	5-5 national OARR	3.2
Medium	2-11 yap Maintencne	3.1
Medium	4-3 fmi Maintenance	3
Low	3-1 chuuk OARR	2.9
Low	2-1 chuuk FAO	2.8
Low	2-5 fmi BO	2.8
Low	2-6 kosrae BO	2.8
Low	2-8 national HRO	2.8
Low	3-11 yap Dean	2.8
Low	4-2 kosrae LRC	2.8
Low	4-4 kosrae Maintenance	2.8
Low	4-1 fmi IT	2.7
Low	2-7 kosrae Security Services	2.6
Low	4-11 chuuk lrc	2.6
Low	5-6 national Resident Hall	2.6
Low	3-2 chuuk SSC	2.5
Low	3-7 national security	2.5
Low	3-9 yap BO	2.5
Low	2-3 chuuk IT	2.1
* Averages do not include Item 10		

## Appendix B: Prioritization Master Chart of Ratings

RatingGroup	Program	Item1	Item1a	Item2	Item2a	Item3	Item3a	Item4	Item5	Item6	Item7	Item8	Item8a	Item9	Item10	AVERAGES*
G5	5-7 national VPAS	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
G1	1-7 kosrae IT	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3.9
G5	5-2 national BO	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.9
G5	5-10 yap Upward Bound	Yes	4	4	4	4	na	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.9
G1	1-2 chuuk DEAN	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3.8
G1	1-6 kosrae AE & CRE	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3.8
G1	1-10 pohnpei Dean	Yes	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3.8
G1	1-11 yap CRE	Yes	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3.8
G3	3-10 yap Student Services	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	na	3.8
G4	4-5 kosrae Student Services	Yes	4	4	4	4	2	2	1	1	1	14	4	4	4	3.8
G4	4-9 national VPIA	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3.8
G5	5-4 national Main administration mail	Yes	4	4	na	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	2	3.8
G5	5-3 national Facilities Grounds Transportation	Yes	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.7
G4	4-10 pohnpei Instructional Coordinator	Yes	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	2	4	4	4	4	3.6
G5	5-8 pohnpei Student Services Combined	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	3	3	3	4	3.6
G1	1-9 national Sports	Yes	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3.5
G5	5-1 chuuk SHC	Yes	3	4	na	4	na	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	3	3.5
G1	1-5 fmi Administration	Yes	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.4
G1	1-8 national DCR	Yes	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3.4
G4	4-7 fmi Student Services	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3.4
G5	5-9 national VPSS	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	2	2	4	3.4
G1	1-1 chuuk Counseling	Yes	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	1	3.3
G1	1-3 chuuk IC	Yes	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	2	3	4	3.3
G1	1-4.chuuk Maintenance	Yes	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	2	3.3
G2	2-9 yap IT	Yes	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	3.3
G2	2-10 yap LRC	Yes	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	1	4	4	2	2	3.3
G3	3-3 kosrae Dean	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	1	4	3	1	3.3
G3	3-5 national CRE VPCRE	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	1	2	4	2	3.3
G3	3-6 national IRPO	Yes	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	4	4	4	4	2	1	3.3
G3	3-8 national VPIEQA	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	1	1	3.3
G4	4-8 national IT	Yes	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	3.3
G2	2-4 chuuk SAO	Yes	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	1	2	3.2
G3	3-4 kosrae CRE	Yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	1	4	2	2	3.2
G4	4-6 national FAO	Yes	4	4	na	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	3	3.2
G5	5-5 national OARR	Yes	4	4	4	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	3	3.2
G2	2-11 yap Maintencne	Yes	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	1	4	1	1	4	2	3.1
G4	4-3 fmi Maintenance	Yes	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
G3	3-1 chuuk OARR	Yes	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	4	3	2	2.9
G2	2-1 chuuk FAO	Yes	4	4	2	3	3	4	1	1	1	4	4	3	2	2.8
G2	2-5 fmi BO	Yes	3	4	2	4	3	4	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	2.8
G2	2-6 kosrae BO	Yes	3	4	3	4	3	4	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.8
G2	2-8 national HRO	Yes	4	4	4	3	3	4	1	2	2	2	2	3	1	2.8
G3	3-11 yap Dean	Yes	4	1	1	4	4	1	4	4	1	4	4	1	na	2.8
G4	4-2 kosrae LRC	Yes	4	3	4	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	na	2.8
G4	4-4 kosrae Maintenance	Yes	2	3	3	4	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	2.8
G4	4-1 fmi IT	Yes	3	2	na	4	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	4	2.7
G2	2-7 kosrae Security Services	Yes	3	4	3	2	3	3	1	1	2	3	3	3	2	2.6
G4	4-11 chuuk lrc	No	1	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	4	3	3	1	2.6
G5	5-6 national Resident Hall	Yes	4	4	na	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	1	4	1	2.6
G3	3-2 chuuk SSC	Yes	4	2	2	4	2	2	1	1	1	3	4	4	1	2.5
G3	3-7 national security	Yes	4	4	na	4	4	2	1	1	1	4	2	1	1	2.5
G3	3-9 yap BO	Yes	4	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	4	1	2.5
G2	2-3 chuuk IT	No	1	2	1	1	3	4	2	1	1	3	4	2	2	2.1
	<b>AVERAGES</b>		<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.5</b>	
* does not include item 10	G2	2-2 chuuk HR - Rating Group could not open file														

## Appendix C: Program Analysis and Viability Study Review FY 2011 – FY 2012

College of Micronesia – FSM

Program Analysis and Viability Study Review FY 2011 – FY 12<sup>2</sup>

### Nonacademic programs Data Collection Form DIRECTIONS in *italic*

Program Name/Unit/Function: *name of program/office & functional area(s) i.e. Research and Planning/Planning or Research & Planning/Research, etc.*

**SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR LISTING OF WHAT IS A NONACADEMIC PROGRAM.**

Administrator: *name of office head & name of lead person for the office function*

1. History and Development of the Services

1.a. Has your mission changed substantially since 2010? Yes ( ) No ( ) ***put a X in the appropriate box***

1.b. If yes, what drove the changes to the mission of the program? ***Provide an explanation of the change in the mission of the program***

1.c. What is your current mission?

Mission
<b><i>Insert your currently approved program/office mission statement</i></b>

2. Size and Scope of the Program

2.a. Please provide a brief description of each service/function your program provides, its primary users/stakeholders and the nature of demand.

		Demand: a. # of people served/unit time (e.g. 10/day) b. Increasing/Stable/Decreasing	
Description of Service/Function	Primary Users - Stakeholders	Internal	External
<b><i>i.e. Research</i></b>	<b><i>List the primary</i></b>	<b><i>Insert the number</i></b>	<b><i>Insert the number</i></b>

<sup>2</sup> Adapted from Seattle Central Community College (accessed through

	<u><i>users of the function or stakeholders for the function</i></u>	<u><i>of people services per unit time (day, week or month) an if that number is increasing, stable or decreasing for internal users</i></u>	<u><i>of people services per unit time (day, week or month) an if that number is increasing, stable or decreasing for external users</i></u>
<u><i>i.e. Planning</i></u>			

2.b. How many positions were assigned to the program over the last two years?

*Inset Personnel listing each program/function*

2.c. How does the size and scope compare with similar/same programs at peer institutions?

*Two types of comparison are possible 1) comparison against Pacific IHEs (PCC, CMI, CNMI and/or GCC, 2) comparison against organizational standards (if available)*

3. External Demand for the Program

3.a. Are there any current or proposed state, regional or local mandates or new policies or laws that may impact external demand for the program’s services?. Yes ( ) No ( ) *put a X in the appropriate box*

If yes, identify and describe the expected impacts.

*Identify and describe the expected impacts of state, regional or local mandates, new policies or laws such as the Guam Buildup being back on, IDP plans from FSM, economic development and priorities from FSM, etc.*

4. Internal Demand for the Services (College/District)

4.a. Are there any current or proposed state or regional mandates or new policies that may impact internal demand for the program’s services? Yes ( ) No ( ) *put a X in the appropriate box*

If yes, identify and describe the expected impacts.

*Identify and describe the expected impacts of state, regional or local mandates, new policies or laws – i.g. new FAO requirements, JEMCO decisions on reduction of scholarship funds, new IPEDS reporting requirements,*

5. Program Support

5.a. What are the qualifications of the program staff?

Name	Job Title	Terminal Degrees/Prof. Certificates	Years' experience
<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Degrees and/or certificates</u>	<u>Years of work experience a) at COM- FSM, b) Total</u>

5.b. What technology do you use to accomplish the work of this program? What types of applications would enhance your service to stakeholders [e.g., document imaging, activity tracking, online appointment/relationship management, etc.]?

<b><u>5.b.1) Bulleted listing of technology, software and etc. used to delivery services – currently being used</u></b>
<b><u>5.b.2) Bulleted listing of technology, software and etc. used to delivery services – future needs</u></b>

5.c. Are the program's facilities adequate to serve this program? Yes ( ) No ( ) **put a X in the appropriate box**

If not, what is needed?

<b><u>Identify facilities that are needed to support your program and the impact on improved effectiveness and efficiency from the additional facilities.</u></b>
---

5.d. Does the program have unmet equipment/software needs? Yes ( ) No ( ) **put a X in the appropriate box**

If yes, complete chart below.

Description of what is needed	Role of the needed item in fulfilling program mission	Approximate cost
<b><u>Describe equipment/software needs</u></b>	<b><u>How will the equipment/software enable your office to work more effectively and efficiently</u></b>	<b><u>Estimate the cost</u></b>

6. Program Outcomes and Assessment

6.a. Summarize your accomplishments for the past two years.

**Summarize your major accomplishments from your program assessment/review (worksheet #3)**

6.b. What was the result of your most recent annual assessment of the achievement of your operational goals? Did you make any changes based on that assessment? **(attach worksheets 1, 2 & 3 for FY 2012)**

7. Program Revenues and Costs

7.a. Does the program have any operations that generate revenue? Provide a list of financial resources generated by the program: Yes ( ) No ( ) **put a X in the appropriate box**

Revenue source	Amount \$
<b><u>List the source of any revenue collected, i.e. gym, consultancy, etc.</u></b>	<b><u>List amount per unit/year/quarter, etc.</u></b>

7.b. What were the budgeted costs of the program, actual expenditures, and difference for FY 2012? **Note this data is to be provided by the business office and will be attached to this form**

Category	Budget 2012	Expenditure 2012	Difference
Personnel			
Travel			
Contracts			
OCE			
Fixed Assets			
Total			

7b(1). What amounts were spent from indirect costs or other nonoperation funds in FY 2012?

Source	Category	Budget 2011	Budget 2012
<b><u>Indirect costs source</u></b>	Personnel	<b><u>Amount spent FY11</u></b>	<b><u>Amount spend FY12</u></b>
	Travel		
	Contracts		
	OCE		
	Fixed Assets		
	Total		

7.c. List and describe any expenditures the program made on professional development for faculty/staff.

**List participants and professional development activities – attach impact data if available**

7.d. Are there any external mandates that will affect the costs of the program in the next two years? Yes ( ) No ( ) **put a X in the appropriate box**

If yes, please describe.

**List any expected external mandates that will affect program costs in the next two years, i.e. changes in eligibility for Pell grant, actions of JEMCO, etc.**

7.e. Provide an update, if applicable, regarding the relationships, partnerships and collaborations that the program has cultivated over the past two years that benefit the institution and/or assist in fulfilling the college's mission and values?

**List any partnerships, relationships, or collaborations that have been cultivated over the past two years and the impact on meeting the college mission**

About this form

Briefly describe the process your program used to complete the template and who was involved.

**Indicate who was involved in the preparation of the form and how it was developed**

Program Dean/Director: **name of program director, dean, etc.**

Date: **date submitted by program to VP**

Vice President: **appropriate vice president signature**

Date: **date submitted by VP**

Adapted from Seattle Central Community College

## **What is a nonacademic program?**

President's Office

VPIA & DAP, DCTE, LRCs, Deans, ICs, SSCs, State campus administrative, student services and CRE programs

VPAS& Administrative services programs

VPSS & Student services programs

VPIEQA & Institutional Effectiveness and Quality assurance programs

VPCRE Cooperative Research and Extension programs + researchers

NOTE: Programs need to be broken down by function, i.e. IRPO (research, planning, data & reporting, etc.)

NOTE: For positions such as Deans, DAP, ICs this review is for their respective office.

NOTE: Any program that is not considered an academic program.



## Appendix D: Program Rating Form

### Prioritization of Nonacademic Programs 2013

College of Micronesia - FSM

Reviewed by (individual or team):		Date of Review:	
-----------------------------------	--	-----------------	--

#### Ground Rules:

4. Majority rules
5. If three different ratings, then send back to Jimmy, Joey or Karen for another person to rate the item.
6. Base ratings on information provided in form – nothing else. Not everyone shares the same knowledge set. Ratings must be repeatable from group to group.

#### Review Teams:

6. Arthur, Kalwin, Joey\*, Danny
7. Jeff, Grilly\*, Magdalena
8. Karen\*, , Arinda, Monica
9. Jimmy\*, Ankie, Kind
10. Gordon\*, Penseleen, Shermik

\* Team Leader

Program:			
Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rating <sup>3</sup>	Discussion/comments
			<b>Ref: Item 6 applies to all criteria</b>
1. Key Objectives and how they are measured	The program has a written mission.	Yes No	Ref <sup>4</sup> : Item 1c
a.	The program mission is congruent with the college mission.	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: Item 1c How might the mission be improved? .

<sup>3</sup> Rating scale:

4 Indicators suggest highest congruence with identified criterion

3 Indicators suggest moderate high congruence with identified criterion

2 Indicators suggest moderate congruence with identified criterion

1 Indicators suggest low congruence with identified criterion

<sup>4</sup> Program Analysis and via Viability Study Review FY 2011-FY Nonacademic Programs

2. Services provided and to which customers, internal and external	The services provided are aligned with the needs and desires of internal stakeholder.	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: Item 2a, 2c, 3a, 4 How might services be improved to support internal stakeholders?
a.	The services provided are aligned with the needs and desires of external stakeholder	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: Item 2a, 2c, 3a, 4 How might services be improved to support external stakeholders?
3. Position-by-position analysis	The number of program employees is aligned with the functions and responsibilities (from mission).	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: 2b, 5a, 7b, 7c, 7e What positions might be added or eliminated due to meeting functions of the program?
a.	The number of program employees is aligned with the internal and external demand for the program.	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: 2b, 5a, 7b, 7c, 7e What positions might be added or eliminated due to meeting internal and external demands of the program?
4. Unmet needs and demands	The programs resources and staffing allow it to meet internal and external demands.	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: Item 5 (all), 7b Which demand are not being met?
5. Opportunities for collaboration and restructuring	The program is taking advantage of opportunities for collaboration and cooperation.	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: 5 (all), 7c, 7e What areas might the program emphasize to improve cooperation and collaboration?
6. Opportunities to share skill sets and resources	The program is taking advantage of opportunities to	4 3 2	Ref: 5a, 5b, 7a, 7c, 7e What areas might the program emphasize

	share skills sets and resources.	1 NA	to improve sharing of skill sets and resources?
7. Opportunities for cross-training	The program is taking advantage of opportunities to share cross training.	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: 5a, 5b, 7a, 7c, 7e What areas might the program emphasize to improve cross sharing?
8. Technological improvement that are cost-effective	The program effectively uses technology to improve effectiveness and efficiency of services.	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: 5b, 5c What technology might improve effectiveness and efficiency?
a.	The program effectively uses technology to enhance service delivery.	4 3 2 1 NA	REF: 5b, 5c What technology might enhance service delivery?
9. Process improvements to streamline operations	The program has processes in place that provide for effective and efficient service delivery.	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: 5d, 7b, What program processes and procedures might be a focus for improvement?
10. Outsourcing exploration to improve services and cut costs	The program takes advantage of outsourcing to cut costs while maintaining quality services.	4 3 2 1 NA	Ref: Item 7e What areas might be considered for outsourcing?

**General Comments:**

## Appendix E: Potential Rating Criteria

### Potential Criteria for Prioritization of Nonacademic Programs

#### Approach C: Dickeson Alternative

11. Key Objectives and how they are measured
12. Services provided and to which customers, internal and external
13. Position-by-position analysis
14. Unmet needs and demands
15. Opportunities for collaboration and restructuring
16. Opportunities to share skill sets and resources
17. Opportunities for cross-training
18. Technological improvement that are cost-effective
19. Process improvements to streamline operations
20. Outsourcing exploration to improve services and cut costs

#### Approach B: Used by One Institution, with Weights

- Importance to the institution
- Demand (External/Internal Combine)
- Quality (input, outcomes)
- Cost-Effectiveness
- Opportunity Analysis
  - Centrality to Mission (20 percent)
  - Quality of Outcomes (19 percent)
  - Cost-Effectiveness (38 percent)
  - Opportunity Analysis (23 percent)

## Resource C: Criteria for Measuring Administrative Programs

### I. Suggested Questions for Administrative Units

1. What are the main objectives of your unit, and how do you measure success in achieving them?
2. What are the services that your unit provides and to which customers (students, faculty, staff, donors, others)?
3. List each position in your unit, and briefly describe the responsibilities of each. Include part-time and work-study student hours.
4. Do you see needs and demands for services that your unit cannot currently meet? If so, what are they, and how do they relate to the university's mission?
5. How could the university help your unit do its job better?
6. In what ways does your unit relate to other units of the university, academic and nonacademic? For example, what services do you provide to other units? What services do other units provide to you? On what tasks do you collaborate with other offices?
7. What skill sets and resources does your unit possess that can be shared with other units at slack times?
8. Which individuals in your unit are cross-trained and in what areas?
9. What resources do you need to improve your services to a superior level?

Reprinted with permission by the author, Robert C. Dickeson, from *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services – Allocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. 2010, Jossey-Bass, ISBN978-0-470-55968-0.

10. What technologies are available to you to provide your services better? What training do you need to be more effective users of the technology?
11. What one thing do you wish you could do differently to improve your effectiveness but have not had the opportunity, time, or resources to do?
12. How do you review and evaluate your department's yearly performance?
13. Explain how your unit could function with
  - a. A 10 percent reduction in staff
  - b. A 20 percent reduction in staff
  - c. A 30 percent reduction in staff
  - d. A 10 percent reduction in nonpersonnel resources
  - e. A 20 percent reduction in nonpersonnel resources
  - f. A 30 percent reduction in nonpersonnel resources
 What would be the consequences or other effects on service delivery in each case?

## II. Suggested Questions for Analysis

1. What opportunities exist for greater collaboration and team approaches in the delivery of services?
2. How many "middle managers" do we have? Are there opportunities to reduce middle strata in the organization and expand the span of control?
3. What technological improvements could be made that would result in labor savings?
4. How can a service be more efficiently delivered?
5. What processes do we have that can be streamlined or eliminated to improve service delivery?
6. Restructuring: What efficiencies might be gained by consolidating similar entities?

## RESOURCE C: CRITERIA FOR MEASURING ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAMS 163

7. Personnel: Have we "worked around" or "structured around" deadwood and other personnel issues, and is this the time to stop indulging and start confronting them?
8. Outsourcing: Are there other opportunities to outsource non-mission-critical services to private contractors who could do it better, faster, or cheaper?
9. Customer focus: How might our services be structured or delivered to meet the needs of students, faculty, staff, donors, and others better?
10. Benchmarking: Compare your unit with similar units at other institutions or with national norms.

## Appendix F: Non Academic Program Prioritization Group

From the October 16, 2013 minutes of the Management Team Minutes:

### ▪ Non Academic Program Prioritization Group

The chair reported insufficient electronic voting results on the recommended members to be appointed to the working group. The number of votes cast online didn't reflect the membership of this team. Thus, at this meeting the committee voted and finalized the rest of the working group as followed:

1. 2 Deans - Kalwin Kephass and Kind Kanto
2. 2 Instructional Administrations -Grilly Jack and Karen Simion
3. 1 IT staff - Shaun Suliol
4. 1 Business Office -Danilo Dumantay
5. 1 OAR -Joey Oducado
6. 1 FAO -Arinda Julios
7. 1 IRPO - Jimmy Hicks
8. 1 Facilities/Maintenance - Francisco Mendiola
9. 2 Student Services - Penselyn Sam and Lore Nena
10. 2 Faculty -Monica River and Magdalena Hallers
11. 1 Student Representative - SBA Vice President Shermick Rieuo
12. 1 Faculty or staff representative from each state campus
  - a. Chuuk Campus -Mika Tuala
  - b. Pohnpei Campus- Jeffrey Arnold
  - c. Yap/FMI Campus -Cecilia Debay
  - d. Kosrae Campus -Arthur Jonas

This working group is to hold separate meetings from this team and should begin soon to get things going. They will elect officers to get organized. It was shared that Magdalena Hallers may have too much on her plate already this semester; she is serving as a division chair, supervising more than 10 students as interns, teaching and serving on other committees. It was agreed that she will be invited to attend the first meeting and she will decide and inform then if this is too much for her. At that time, a replacement may be then recommended and voted in again this team. One campus representative is determined to be appropriate for Yap and FMI as they are now one campus.