**Mission Fulfillment Committee**

Meeting Notes

March 6, 2018

8:00–9:00 a.m.

1. **Check-in and review commitments**

No previous commitments.

1. **Discuss recommendations to extend SP’s timeline**

David shared that he would like to recommend to the Board that we extend the current strategic priorities by two years. There are many different reasons for this, including the fact that we just adopted these core theme indicators and have been trying to align the core theme indicators to the strategic priority indicators. To change the strategic priority indicators in the next year would cause the whole process to start over. Another issue is that we are going to be getting feedback during mid-cycle report as well as during our ad hoc report. It doesn’t necessarily make sense to continue with the same process and re-up a new set of strategic priorities if there is some issue that comes from the feedback we get that tells us to do something different. Additionally, were we to do a new set of strategic priorities, there would be issues with capacity, as it is an institution-level, labor-intensive process. We have a new president coming and a lot of other initiatives that we’re trying to continue and close the loop on that require institution-wide involvement (assessment, guided pathways, etc.). Everyone agreed with this recommendation.

1. **Questions about draft**

Lisa Anh sent out a draft report on Friday so that everyone had a chance to review prior to the meeting. She said that she is still working in it as far as grammar and accuracy, but would like to receive feedback on layout, formatting, and whether the content is clear and makes sense. We are shifting away from the use of the word target, which are aspirational goals, to the word threshold. Lisa Anh has changed this language in the report.

There was some discussion around whether meeting mission fulfillment should be included in the summary sheet or presentation. Some of the thresholds we’re not able to report on or haven’t been set. We could say we’re not meeting mission fulfillment with a big asterisk or we could not mention it unless asked about it. It was shared that one of the reasons we’re not hitting the threshold is because we’re changing the basis for our use of data on several of our individual indicators. There is a good story to t ell about that that’s aligned with recommendations 4 and 5. Instead of using smaller baselines that are only internal, we’re looking at ways to use national and statewide data, changing what data we’re including in our measurements. This may be difficult to explain and will need to find words carefully. Our work as a committee is to report to the Board. It was decided that if we’re not meeting mission fulfillment, we should tell the Board.

The conclusion of the report was discussed. Bill shared that we need to outline bullet points on what we want the story to be, but he’s not sure how deep we want to go and to what extent we want to explain.

We don’t have to meet the threshold for all of the indicators to achieve mission fulfillment. David shared that if you look back at the year 1 report, we created a weighted system for each core theme to determine mission fulfillment, for guided pathways having met or exceeded was worth a certain number of points. Some of the indicators were worth more points. They receive a green, yellow, or red depending on the number of points. We don’t have to meet all of the indicators, we just have to meet enough indicators and the important indicators to get to that point. Lisa Anh said she can look at weighted scores for each of the core themes and add overall line item to indicate whether we’ve met or did not meet. David said that would make sense, but we have broken out some indicators, so we will need to look at those to see if they still align. Or we could put in the conclusion that we’re still comparing these indicators with our system for determining mission fulfillment. We are changing the basis of how we measure, moving from internal data to external data. The indicators are really new – we only adopted last spring and started working with them in the summer. So it would make sense that, 8 months later, we’re still determining what they mean. Lisa Anh pointed out that for core themes, we do still reply heavily on internal data – it’s the strategic priorities where we use external data.

Sue shared that she though the report read well and had good flow. David said that he received feedback from one Board member during the Board Agenda Review on Monday that they were impressed with it as a draft. Sue asked if the report will be distributed more widely after the Board meeting. David said that we need to be careful about what we communicate. This is information that is required for the Board, but we can certainly make it available more widely. We just need to be careful about how we describe progress to the college community.

Lisa Anh will incorporate feedback into the report, finalize, and send to Denice.

1. **Confirming structure of Board presentation**

The structure of the Board presentation was discussed. David expressed that we don’t just want to focus on the things that are we’re doing well. It is a good idea to choose one indicator that shows strength and one that shows weakness. We want the Board to understand and be used to the fact that we shouldn’t be presenting to them with all green. This is a continuous improvement process, so there should be areas where we have room to improve.

Each presenter should briefly provide an overview of their core theme and briefly discuss all of their indicators. Then they will focus on their two highlighted indicators. If the next steps are the same for both of their indicators, they can be merged into one on the slide. Bill said that anything each presenter can do to build a narrative that the Board can grab a hold of and understand is a positive thing. It helps the Board to understand the data. Logistically, it would be a good idea for each presenter to sit behind the table and then go individually to present.

Here is the order of progression for each presenter:

* Summary of core theme and overall what the indicators are getting at
* Highlight a couple of examples of indicators and results
* Discuss what the results mean
* Next steps

Lisa Anh will connect with presenters and schedule a meeting next week to do a run-through. Slides are due to Lisa Anh by the end of March 7.

1. **Review commitments**

Communication was mentioned as a future agenda item. The next meeting of the Mission Fulfillment Committee will be Wednesday, April 18, 1:30–3:00 p.m.