## Institutional Effectiveness Measures Framework Recommendation

Committee of the Whole Meeting October 10, 2011



# **Recap of Planning Workshop**

- 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**

	Advantages of peer		Disadvantages of peer
	comparison:		comparison:
•	Benchmarking against	•	Lack of peers
	peers provides a context	•	Demographics / not
	(reality check)		similar entities
•	Historical trends	•	Local economic effect
•	"Herd model"	•	"Best of bad lot"
•	"Go learn" about our		
	peers		



<b>Targeted Performance Improvement</b>				
Advantages of targeted	Disadvantages of			
performance:	targeted performance:			
Room for continuous	<ul> <li>Setting targets close to</li> </ul>			
improvement	threshold			
Peer comparison may not				
be enough				
• Targets don't change				
quickly				
More relevancy than peer				
alone				
Builds on peer and				
additional data				



#### **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 <u>Targeted Performance Improvement</u>



#### **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.

### **Targeted Performance Improvement Framework**

- 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

