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Presented proposed target frameworks

- **Peer Comparison**
  - Sets targets based upon a comparison with peer colleges

- **Targeted Performance Improvement**
  - Sets targets against our current year while taking into consideration Harper trends, peer trends, and other national data

Applied frameworks to sample IEMs

Discussed pros and cons
## Peer Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages of peer comparison:</th>
<th>Disadvantages of peer comparison:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Benchmarking against peers provides a context (reality check)</td>
<td>• Lack of peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical trends</td>
<td>• Demographics / not similar entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Herd model”</td>
<td>• Local economic effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Go learn” about our peers</td>
<td>• “Best of bad lot”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Advantages of peer comparison:**
- Benchmarking against peers provides a context (reality check)
- Historical trends
- “Herd model”
- “Go learn” about our peers

**Disadvantages of peer comparison:**
- Lack of peers
- Demographics / not similar entities
- Local economic effect
- “Best of bad lot”
# Targeted Performance Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages of targeted performance:</th>
<th>Disadvantages of targeted performance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Room for continuous improvement</td>
<td>• Setting targets close to threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer comparison may not be enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Targets don’t change quickly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More relevancy than peer alone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Builds on peer and additional data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Framework Recommendation

Developed recommendation based on:
- Review of comments from Planning Workshop
- Review of common/best practices for setting targets
  - Benchmarking
  - Historical data

The recommended framework is
**Targeted Performance Improvement**
Process Timeline

- All campus constituents surveyed – Late October/November
- Survey results shared with Board of Trustees and Executive Council for input – December
- Create recommendation and solicit feedback – January/February
- Presentation to College Assembly for approval - March
- Initial recommended targets to the Board of Trustees – April
- Follow-up presentations to Board of Trustees – as needed
- Board of Trustees approve IEM targets
Questions???
Using a Framework to Select Targets

A “target framework” defines the process for establishing performance targets which helps ensure consistency and relevancy.

When using a defined framework, stakeholders understand the process for setting targets and the direct role they play in that process.

An effective framework is:
- Easily understood
- Results in challenging, yet achievable targets
- Applicable to all 24 IEMs
Peer Comparison Framework

This framework sets Harper’s target based upon a comparison with peer colleges.

Framework categories:
- Leading the peer group.
- Top 25% of peer group.
- At the peer average.
- Remain in the same position in relation to peers.
This framework aims to set Harper’s target against our current year (2010 in most cases) while taking into consideration Harper trends, peer trends and other national data. Targets are long-term and achieved over a specified period of time.

Framework categories:

- Increase/decrease by x% over a specified period of time.
  - 0-1% increase/decrease
  - 1.1-2% increase/decrease
  - 2.1-3% increase/decrease
  - 3.1-4% increase/decrease
  - 4.1-5% increase/decrease