

Organizational assessment



Organizations, whether for profit or otherwise, are sensitive to certain contingencies and disruptive events that somehow invariably alter the strategic character of its plans, intents and directions. Such events can be man-made or fortuitous or often legally called acts of God and can altogether bring both hopes or despair to an organization that only its people through time can ultimately define the character of the organization and where finally they would want the organization to go.

St. Thomas University, for instance, confronted contingencies and disruptive events during the last three years which significantly changed its organizational character and confronted an inevitable systemic shift in its strategy. Late in 2006, a Category 5 typhoon inundated the new university campus, destroying nearly its records kept for 60 years, two major buildings housing the Science-Oriented High School and the main administration building.

Rehabilitation work almost depleted its long-term development funds. As a result, quality accreditation for second level cannot be undertaken; thus, setting back its plans to qualify and avail of state funds for instructional and laboratory enhancements. Further, contingency plans at increasing the tuition and miscellaneous fees to further strengthen the strategic quality improvements could not be implemented considering the additional burden the fee increase will have on students victimized by the storm.

Consequently, the retirement of the Deans of the Graduate /School and the College of Business Administration in 2008 without qualified replacements sowed fears of administrative paralysis in those key areas of the university. These departments had the second biggest enrolment next only to the

College of Nursing. Further, fears of a significant drop in the Nursing enrolment are palpable due to the slackened demand for nurses abroad. Hopes then have been relayed to the school administration to amend its strategic plan, revise the same to confront the new realities and culture facing the university.

(Davis, 1984) Finally, an invitation was sent to the Dean of a competing school to head the College of Business Management and Accountancy of the university, for an immediate hiring at a negotiated compensation package. These changes, both disruptive and contingency in nature, somehow jarred the ranks of teachers and employees during 2009 exacerbating what could already be a serious lack of long-term focus additionally by the Planning Officer who has not documented properly the strategic directions of the university, hence resulting in management control skewed in favor of possible stagnation and lack of direction.

(Anthony & Govindarajan, 2004) (Kaplan & Norton, 2003) Reference list
Anthony R. & Govindarajan, V. (2004). Management control systems. International Edition, New York, McGraw Hill/Irwin Publications. Kaplan, R. & Norton, D (2003). Strategy maps. Converting intangible assets to tangible outcomes. Boston, Harvard Publications. Davis, S. M. (1984). Managing corporate culture. Cambridge, MA. Ballinger Publishing Company, A subsidiary of Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. , p. 7.