Dear PRC Members,

I will also attach this to the Wiki to begin the migration away from email only or having to dig this out of your “trash” later.  
  
Here are my thoughts on the following:  
  
**Here is the general run-down with program prioritization:**

1. Program prioritization data needs compiled.
2. Program prioritization data needs to be reviewed by the working group.  There are something like 40 programs that will need to be ranked, so this process will be long.  I was told it seems as if this would take the working group focused on this task every day for a week in order to carefully complete the ranking process.  PRC cannot be tasked with such a thing.
3. Over the next 3 weeks, CAC is reviewing program reviews submitted by program coordinators last summer/fall.  That group has a simplified feedback form and will provide feedback to authors.  The group will also be looking for important trends that need attention and making recommendations to Karen/Mariana for incorporation into the educational master plan.  Those recommendations should also pass along to you all.
4. It seems at this point is where PRC comes in.  You need the feedback/recommendations from CAC and you need to look at the ranking of the programs completed by the working group to review the process.  You can make recommendations about the process and you can make comments on the ranking and any recommendations.  Each time we complete process, we need a plan for improvement.  That is where your recommendations for such things are valuable.  Perhaps you don’t agree with some of the rankings.  Perhaps a program is vital, but based on the criterion selected the program came out 35 out of 40...and though it is low in the ranking....common sense might tell you the program must go on.  You might then deem a flaw in our criterion or realize had certain data been included that program would have instead come out number 2 out of 40...etc....
5. Finally, I realize that until steps 1 – 3 are completed...you can’t do your portion.  I also agree with Womack, we don’t want to rush this part.  The budget can always be re-adjusted to fit the education plan...but the education plan needs good data/good processes for its direction.  At the same time, I need everyone involved in steps 1 – 3 working day and night...as this process can’t run weeks on end.  We need data within the week.  Then we need the working group focused a full week as their highest priority to get the ranking done...even if that means help and a working Saturday at this point.  I feel we are walking the fine line between show cause and termination otherwise.  Plans must be in place by the time the visiting team arrives, and these are simply the foundations for the plans.
6. I would recommend the strategic plan work come after the integrated educational plan is completed and the program prioritization process will also be adding much direction towards the strategic plan.  I recommend focus on emergency, running out of time, accreditation issues, as without accreditation, a strategic plan will need changed drastically.

**Governance Policy:**Some questions were about this:  
The committee structure, number of committees, how committees are chaired, etc...has been changed, which is excellent. However, we are now in conflict with our governance policy. That is not terrible, policies always need to be reviewed, evaluated, and changed for improvement.    
  
But, we now need to adjust this policy to reflect what we are currently doing, and also evaluate it for any other necessary changes.  And, yes, the grammar/syntax and other blatant errors do need corrected (yeah for the English instructors on the committee).  As this is on our website, and presented as evidence of our operations, and accreditation evidence in the March Report, it would be nice if it was a professionally done document with all the updated changes (already approved) reflected.  And, you all can make any other recommendations to Cabinet for consideration.  All new committee TORs will replace the old committee TORs and all committees have been asked, if theirs have not yet been approved, to finalize their TORs and pass them along to the President for approval.  
  
This task shouldn’t be too onerous and can be completed while you are all waiting to receive the results from CAC and the program prioritization working group.    
  
**Effectiveness of Restructuring**

**I have asked the following of the HR Committee:**

While visiting all COM-FSM sites across the states, there were many complaints regarding the inefficiency of the streamlining process.  People outside national campus seem to be spending a large amount of their time following up on emails, POs, etc... with minimal response from certain offices at National, upon whom state site folks are depending. There is also difficulty in communicating between National to the other sites.  
  
As a college, we need to identify the problems/flaws in this system.  And, as this is an issue for personnel, and because each campus has its own HR committee...this seems best tasked to HR, initially.

1. Ask each site to list the problems in this restructuring system/streamlined system.
2. Propose recommendations for improving efficiency.
3. Offer any relevant evidence of the flaws for support of recommendations.
4. Send all these to the larger committee to look for common trends across the college.
5. **And, from the larger committee, put a final list of issues, evidence, and recommendations for change forward to PRC**.
6. As PRC does planning, they should be aware of necessary changes during the planning process that might alleviate inefficiency/ improve effectiveness.
7. Then, these things can go to the President (you can submit HR recommendations via council of chairs) and Ross can submit (also via council of chairs) and these things can go to the cabinet also as necessary through the President.

As we are getting a new President who wasn’t part of restructuring/streamlining, it can help him understand some of the issues more readily.  
  
Do you feel you can ask your other HR committee to review these items?  
Do you feel 02MAR12 is a reasonable deadline for completing items 1 – 5?  
  
I believe giving all a chance to have a say on this, and to also be part of offering viable solutions is necessary.  You’ll also want to be sure you local HR committee does a good job of soliciting input from all at their sites to have an excellent, larger picture of the full extent of the issues.

**Integrated Plan/Educational Master Plan (This thing needs one consistent name)**

1. **PRC can only prepare presently by doing some background research. Review the existing plans on the website in preparation.**
2. **Carefully review and consider trends/recommendations/feedback put forward from CAC as they complete their review of program reviews.**
3. **Carefully consider all that is put forward in the ranking of programs during the program prioritization process.**
4. **But, you will have to wait for the program prioritization working group to complete their ranking. And, you have to wait for the administration to complete their integrated plan, before you can do any more here. You can consider close dialogue of concerns on issues as seen in 1 – 3 to present to Karen and Mariana as they develop the educational plan….and you might ask for invitations to their work sessions.**

**Mission Statement**

**For now, this isn’t as urgent, but it is an accreditation issue.**

A visiting team suggested the college review its Mission statement, as, *“the college mission statement does not clearly define its students.  In fact references to “uniquely Micronesian” and the “Federated States of Micronesia” imply the institution serves the entire population.”* (WASC Visiting Team Report, March 2010).  
*“In its planning agenda for this standard, the college recognizes the need to revise the mission as needed and further, to develop goals and objectives to address better the “uniquely Micronesian” component of the mission.”* (WASC Visiting Team Report, March 2010).  
  
For the Mission statement, under the accreditation standard it states:  
  
*“Mission:  The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.”* (WASC Visiting Team Report, March 2010).  
  
I am sure, as programs must be scaled back...this becomes more relevant.  So, as program reviews and planning are occurring, it seems good to have this mission statement of ours in the front of our minds, and this seems an issue that needs good college-wide dialogue to begin.  Though we were asked 2 years ago to look at revising the statement.  
  
Input from your larger groups would be great, and would be evidenced in minutes and any recommendations for change you make in the minutes.  
  
Asking folks to think about this now...for more detailed discussions and recommendations in a few months would be great.

I have also asked CAC to think about this. As programs are prioritized and our integrated educational plan is in place, our mission might become easier to define as required.

**Communications Plan**

**You will only be reviewing this if changes are made to the existing communications plan. Such changes would be based on evidence. The evidence and the plan would need to go before PRC.**

**You would need to consult with the President and IRPO for the status of this in a few weeks.**

**Emergency Preparedness Plan**

*“None of the COM-FSM campuses, including the National Campus, has an Emergency Preparedness Plan.  Although the team was informed that that national government has a comprehensive emergency plan, this plan is not available on any campus nor is staff or faculty trained in emergency procedures.”* (WASC Visiting Team Report, March 2010).

The ALO has recommended VPSS, VPAS, Campus Directors, Director of Maintenance, and Director of Security be involved in the development of this plan.

Would PRC like to review this plan?

HR has been solicited for utilizing professional development day to train people on this plan, should it be in place before April 2012. They cannot do so if the plan is not in place (it REALLY should be). And, I need their approval for this time and coordination from all sites.