

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 12²

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

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
<i>i.e. Research</i>	<i>List the primary</i>	<i>Insert the number</i>	<i>Insert the number</i>

² Adapted from Seattle Central Community College (accessed through

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

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</u> <u>a) at COM- FSM, b)</u> <u>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.]?

5.b.1) Bulleted listing of technology, software and etc. used to delivery services – currently being used

5.b.2) Bulleted listing of technology, software and etc. used to delivery services – future needs

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?

Identify facilities that are needed to support your program and the impact on improved effectiveness and efficiency from the additional facilities.

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
<u>Describe equipment/software needs</u>	<u>How will the equipment/software enable your office to work more effectively and efficiently</u>	<u>Estimate the cost</u>

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

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
<i>Indirect costs source</i>	Personnel	<i>Amount spent FY11</i>	<i>Amount spend FY12</i>
	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)	Rating³	Discussion/comments
			Ref: Item 6 applies to all criteria
1. Key Objectives and how they are measured	The program has a written mission.	Yes No	Ref ⁴ : 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? .

³ 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

⁴ 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*. 2nd 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?

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 Kephas 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.