Performance Budget 2017
Initial Meeting
Summary of Discussion
Thursday, July 9, 2015

Present: VPIA (Karen), VPSS (Joey), VPAS (Joe), VPCRE (acting Sonny), VPIEQA (acting Gordon)
IRPO Director (Jimmy) and support staff (Francis)
Location and Date/Time: Board Conference Room, 2015.07.09 (Friday) 9:30 AM to 12 Noon

Key Issues:

- Pickup on dialogue over challenges and what can be addressed as part of performance budget development
- Brief training on generating institution level reports in TracDat
- Review of major plans
    ◦ Strategic Plan
    ◦ Mini-work Plan for Student Success
    ◦ IEMP

The budget dialogue and discussion picked up the concussion of the June 19, 2015 meeting to address of issues raised on assessment/evaluation and issues with TracDat and what could be addressed in the context of the performance budget development for FY 2017. Comments are induced under the appropriate section.

From mind-mapping exercises

Challenges

I.   Budget based on previous expenditures

II.   Use of academic assessment

> *For clarification, one of the major issues addressed in this round of performance budgeting is to ensure that assessment from both academic and non-academic programs are used in decision-making for setting priorities and for allocation of resources.*

III.   Enrollment decline

> *The following chart provides the trends for fall, spring and summer semesters for the past 5 years.*

IV. **FSM funding not included in many allocation decisions**

V. **Allocation of resources not based on student needs**

A specific concern of these performance budget development is to tie allocation to achieving greater student learning and achievement.

VI. **Outreach**

VII. **Monitoring**

A. **Need to monitor performance improvement**

Goals (and related strategies for achieving the goals) for FY 2017 will be written in SMARTER formats to allow ease in tracking of performance.

VIII. **Assessment**

A. **Problem with coordinating system wide assessment**

B. **Setup of TracDat by organizational structure**

A key issue here is where responsibilities overlap across departments. The recommendation was to address this in cabinet to see if perhaps a more matrix type organizational system might be appropriate.

A brief training was provided to Vice Presidents on generating institution wide reports for knowing what is happening in other program areas.

C. **TracDat not updated**

Based on discussion this is perhaps a number of concerns for this issue. One, is the benefit of TracDat is not being seen. Some solutions are to make review of TracDat materials as part of motioning and review processes in committees and at office and division levels. Second is related to issue one, but takes the track of how the material in TracDat is related to decision-making. Taking TracDat materials into consideration in decision-making would be a strong force to drive frequent

updating. A third areas is duplication of reporting and use in such items as program reviews and assessment write-ups. TracDat can and perhaps should be the major source for both program reviews and assessment with no additional (or only limited) additional information required. It needs to be noted these issues are for academic and non-academic programs.

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**

There is a recognized need for training not just in use of TracDat but writing quality SMARTER goals and related strategies. The premise is that a well written goal with related strategies makes assessment and evaluation easier. A poorly written and non-measurable goal is difficult to assess and evaluate.

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?**

(United IX and X) A discussion centered role of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) as statements of what the college considers student success. It was noted that the current ISLOs are primarily related to the academic side of the college and the ISLOs likely need to be expanded to includes issues such as graduation and job placement, civic duty, etc.

Planning

An initial overview was conducted of the colleges strategic plan and mini-work plan on **student success** and how those plans cold be used in conjunction with the IEMP to determine priorities for FY 2017. Process was discussed, each possible priority needs to be reviewed from multiple angles: is the priority SMARTER, if the priority is addressed with quality will it have a "ripple" effect and impact improvement beyond its immediate domain. An additional area covered was the importance of use of tools such as pro and cons to help evaluate the relative importance of different potential priorities as well as determining if the recommended implementation strategies are appropriate.

Used as examples to help understand the process were improvement of writing and the downward nature of enrollment trends.

Next Meeting Preparation

- Each Vice President is requested to summarize the departments strengths and weaknesses based on assessment and data.

- Each Vice President is requested to summarize what they see as potential priorities based on review of assessment and data. Also, why this item is proposed as a priority as opposed another potential priority.

- Consider how the proposed proprieties would be written to be SMARTER.

Documents:

Strategic Plan 2013 – 2017

Mini-work plan for Student Success

Trend Data reformat for Accreditation