

**Performance Budget 2017
Initial Meeting
Summary of Discussion
Friday, June 19, 2015**

Present: VPIA (Karen), VPSS (Joey), VPAS (Joe), VPCRE (Jim), VPIEQA (acting Gordon) IRPO Director (Jimmy) and support staff (Francis)

Location and Date/Time: Board Conference Room, 2015.06.19 (Friday) 9:30 AM to 12 Noon

Key issues:

- Overview of performance budgeting process
- 5 year data trends review
- Overview of assessment and evaluation status
- What does student success mean at COM-FSM?
- Performance budgeting and linking of planning and assessment to resource allocations
- Mind-mapping of 1) key issues for FY 2017 performance budget and 2) expected challenges

An overview of the performance budgeting process was conducted with review of highlights of the proposed IRPO role in the performance development budget process (see attachment) followed by review of data and current issues with assessment.

- 1) A review was conducted of key data and information from the Student Information System (SIS) for five-years for fall, spring and summer semesters (tables can be found at accreditation data). Some key issues:
 1. Enrollment
 1. Enrollment in decline over the past five-years at all campuses and major categories (fall 2014 down 19.5% from high in fall 2011)
 1. Generally ratios of gender, campus, etc remain similar
 2. Exception is for Chuuk campus and students from Chuuk (significant decline) with increases in students from Pohnpei (Chuuk campus enrollment fall 2014 down 47% from fall 2011)
 2. Slight upturn at Kosrae and Pohnpei campuses in spring and summer 2015
 2. Retention and persistence
 1. Persistence and retention generally high (College ~ 60% for fall 13 to fall 4 full time students compared to ACT 2010 report of 56% average for community colleges), but
 1. 30 to 40% of new students on academic probation at end of first semester
 2. Drop off in fourth semester
 3. Student achievement
 1. Slight increase over 5-years seen in overall course completion (fall 2014 at ~73% up from high 68-69% in previous 5-year period)
 2. Ratios (gender, etc.) generally stable over 5-years
 3. Key courses such as general education MS 100, EN 110, EN 120A & B as well as lab courses course completion lower than average course completion – barrier or gate-keeper courses
 4. Significant variation seen in course completion by instructor (some instructors always 90/95% or above for ABCor P grades while some below 50%)
 4. Student Learning
 1. Review by VPIA of status of assessment of SLOs

1. Embedded assessment being use in MS100 and CA100
 2. To be expanded to all courses over a projected 4+ year time line
 3. Some modification of ISLOs currently under consideration
- 2) Assessment (initial review)
 1. Focus on challenges facing assessment at the college (see below)
 2. General concern by all Vice Presidents that assessment is not functioning as indented.
 3. Future sessions to focus on what assessment is revealing about students learning
 - 3) Student success
 1. Initial discussion over definition of student success for the college
 2. Comment was that Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) are a definition of the college definition of student success
 3. Concern from administrative and student services that ISLOs currently focus on academics and may need to be expanded to more broadly address what the college fully intends for a student to know, do and think at the end of their schooling
 - 4) Revenue and resource allocation initial discussion
 1. Concern that previous allocations based largely on previous expenditures
 2. Issue of access raised (open or via entrance testing) in the context of how this would affect revenue and ability of the college to meet increased numbers of student needs
 - 5) Planning and assessment cycles
 1. Concern was raised that while the college has planning and assessment cycles they are not aligned and appear to cause some confusion

From mind-mapping exercises

Budget 2017

- I. Retention**
- II. Recruitment**
 - A. Access**
 - 1. Open**
 - 2. Entrance**
- III. ISLOs achievement**
- IV. Alignment of planning cycles**
- V. Academic innovation**
- VI. Assessment**

Challenges

- I. Budget based on previous expenditures**
- II. Use of academic assessment**
- III. Enrollment decline**
- IV. FSM funding not included in many allocation decisions**
- V. Allocation of resources not based on student needs**
- VI. Outreach**

VII. Monitoring

- A. Need to monitor performance improvement**

VIII. Assessment

- A. Problem with coordinating system wide assessment**
- B. Setup of TracDat by organizational structure**
- C. TracDat not updated**
- D. More problem with non academic side of assessment**
- E. Academic assessment ongoing and improving**
- F. Not used for monitoring**
- G. Need developing of instruments**
- H. Systems not understood or not used**
 - 1. Problems with input**
 - 2. Clear approaches to data entry**

IX. How to address ISLOs from nonacademic side

X. Understanding of what is student success?

IRPO to assist with **facilitation** of performance budget 2017 development

- Working sessions with Vice Presidents, Departments, offices and divisions (programs). Generate **options for performance outcomes** based on review of data, assessment and planning (use of formal process (tools to determine basis of option – primarily what is the evidence to support this as a priority)). Documentation as each step. Review of internal and external factors affecting revenue generation and develop projections.
- Develop **decision-making criteria** for institutional priorities and resource allocations.
- Develop **institutional** performance outcomes in a SMARTER format using prioritization techniques. Use institutional performance outcomes to set department, office, division and (program) performance outcomes. Departments, offices, and divisions are also recommended to have at least one outcome related to their direct improvement. For instructional programs, have at least one program review outcome in addition to SLO outcomes. Use of the SMARTER format is to ensure that the outcomes are measurable and can be assessed and that strategies and activities to accomplish the outcome are identified. Strategic plan goals can be **used** to assist in setting institutional outcomes but in general are not appropriate for operational/budget plans that need measurable outcome for a specific academic or fiscal year.
- Vice Presidents **recommend** allocations of resources based on institutional performance outcomes and decision-making criteria. Decisions based on increasing, maintaining and reducing resources in line with performance outcomes.
- Assist with development of department, office, division and program **operational/tactical** (implementation) plans. This is of special importance when activities cross department, office or divisional lines.
- Conduct working sessions with **Campus Deans** and Vice Presidents to coordinate campus outcomes and services areas before or after the BOR meeting in August 2015.
- MIP modification to track finances in line with performance outcomes, strategic plans and IEMP.
- Approved performance outcomes at all levels inputted into TracDat for ongoing evaluation of planning, assessment and resource allocation and monitoring of implementation. Assessment becomes a primary factor in development of FY 2018 and future budgets.