

Michigan Quality Council

Michigan Quality Leadership Award

Grand Rapids Community
College

Feedback Report
November 2003

Preparing to read your feedback report . . .

Your feedback report contains Michigan Quality Leadership Award Examiners' observations that are based on their understanding of your organization. They have provided comments on your organization's strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to the Baldrige Criteria. The feedback is non-prescriptive. It will tell you where Examiners think you have strengths to celebrate and where they think improvement opportunities exist. The feedback will not say specifically how you should address these opportunities. The specifics will depend on what you decide is most important to your organization.

Applicant organizations read and use feedback comments (both strengths and opportunities for improvement) in different ways. We've gathered some tips and practices from prior applicants for you to consider.

- Take a deep breath and prepare to benefit from the MQLA feedback process. You applied to get the feedback. Read it, take time to digest it, and read it again.
- Celebrate your strengths. You've worked hard and should congratulate yourselves.
- Use your strengths comments to understand what the Examiners observed you do well and build upon those things. Continue to evaluate and improve the things you do well.
- You know your organization better than the Examiners know it. There might be relevant information that was not communicated to them or that they did not fully understand. Therefore, not all of their comments may be equally accurate.
- Although we strive for "perfection," we do not achieve it in every comment. If Examiners have misread your application or misunderstood your organization on a particular point, don't discount the whole feedback report. Consider the other comments and focus on the most important ones.
- Prioritize your opportunities for improvement. You can't do everything all at once. Think about what's most important for your organization at this time and decide which things to work on first.
- You may decide to address all, some, or none of the opportunities in a particular Item. It depends on how important you think that Item or comment is to your organization.
- Use the feedback as input to your strategic planning process. Focus on the strengths and opportunities for improvement that have an impact on your strategic goals and objectives.

INTRODUCTION

By submitting an MQLA application, you have differentiated yourself from most Michigan organizations. We are eager to make your efforts achieve the maximum benefit possible. This feedback report was written for your consideration in accelerating your journey toward performance excellence.

The Board of Examiners has evaluated your application for the Michigan Quality Leadership Award. Strict confidentiality is observed at all times and in every aspect of the application review and feedback.

This feedback report contains the Examiners' findings, including a summary of key themes of the application evaluation, a detailed listing of strengths and opportunities for improvement, and scoring information. Background information on the examination process is also provided. We encourage you to use the feedback as input to your strategic planning process. As an MQLA applicant, you are already a winner in the journey toward performance improvement!

APPLICATION REVIEW

Stage 1, Independent Review

The application evaluation process begins with Stage 1, the independent review, in which members of the Board of Examiners are assigned to each of the applications.¹ Assignments are made according to the Examiners' areas of expertise and to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Each application is evaluated independently by Examiners who write comments relating to the applicant's strengths and opportunities for improvement and use a scoring system developed for the Award Program. All applicants in all categories (manufacturing, service, small business, education, and health care) go through the Stage 1 evaluation process.

Stage 2, Consensus Review

A team of Examiners, led by a Senior Examiner, conducts a meeting to reach consensus on comments that capture the team's collective view of the applicant's strengths and opportunities for improvement. Additionally, the team decides on a score for each Item and identifies the issues to clarify and verify if the applicant is selected for a site visit. The team documents its comments, scores, and site visit issues in a consensus scorebook. All applicants receive a consensus review.

Stage 3, Site Visit Review

After the consensus review process, the Panel of Judges verifies that the evaluation process was followed properly. Following their review, the Judges select applicants to receive a site visit based upon the scoring profiles of all consensus review applicants. If an applicant is not selected for site visit review, one of the Examiners on the Consensus Team edits the final consensus report that becomes the feedback report.

¹ There were 9 applications received in 2003; all 9 went through Stages 1 & 2 of the evaluation process.
Michigan Quality Leadership Award—Feedback Report

Site visits are conducted for the highest-scoring applicants to clarify any uncertainty or confusion the Examiners have regarding the written application, and to verify that the information in the application is correct. After the site visit is completed, the team of Examiners prepares a final site visit scorebook.

Application reports, consensus scorebooks, and site visit scorebooks for all applicants receiving a site visit are forwarded to the Panel of Judges, which makes final recommendations on which applicants should receive an Award. The Judges discuss and decide whether each of the applicants should be recommended as an Award recipient based on an “absolute” standard: the overall excellence and the appropriateness of the applicant as a state-wide role model. There is no limit on the number of possible recipients.

Judges do not participate in discussions or vote on applications in which they have a competing or conflicting interest or in which they have a private or special interest such as an employment or a client relationship, a financial interest, or a personal or family relationship. All conflicts are reviewed and discussed so that Judges are aware of their own and others’ limitations on access to information and participation in discussions and voting. Following the Judges’ review and recommendations of Award recipients, one of the Examiners on the Site Visit Team edits the final site visit scorebook that becomes the feedback report.

SCORING

The scoring system used to score each Item is designed to differentiate the applicants in the Stage 1 and Stage 2 reviews and to facilitate feedback. The Scoring Guidelines for Business, Education, or Health Care (shown in Table 1) are based on (1) evidence that a performance excellence system is in place, (2) the depth and breadth of its deployment, and (3) the results it is achieving.

In the feedback report, the applicant receives a percentage range. The percentage range is based on the Scoring Guidelines, which describe the characteristics typically associated with specific percentage ranges.

An applicant’s total scores fall into one of eight scoring bands. Each band corresponds to a descriptor associated with that scoring range. Table 2 provides scoring information on the percentage of applicants scoring in each band at Stage 1. Scoring adjustments resulting from the consensus review and site visit review stages are not reflected in the distribution. Site visit teams find that some applicants would have scored higher or lower than was indicated by their original score, while others would have remained the same.

TABLE 1--SCORING GUIDELINES**For Use With Categories 1-6**

SCORE	APPROACH/DEPLOYMENT
0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No SYSTEMATIC APPROACH is evident; information is ANECDOTAL.
10% to 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The beginning of a SYSTEMATIC APPROACH to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the Item is evident. Major gaps exist in DEPLOYMENT that would inhibit progress in achieving the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the Item. Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident.
30% to 40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the Item, is evident. The APPROACH is deployed, although some areas or work units are in early stages of DEPLOYMENT. The beginning of a SYSTEMATIC APPROACH to evaluation and improvement of KEY PROCESSES is evident.
50% to 60%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the Item and your KEY business requirements, is evident. The APPROACH is well deployed, although DEPLOYMENT may vary in some areas or work units. A fact-based, SYSTEMATIC evaluation and improvement PROCESS is in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of KEY PROCESSES. The APPROACH is aligned with your basic organizational needs identified in the other Criteria Categories.
70% to 80%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the Item and your current and changing business needs, is evident. The APPROACH is well deployed, with no significant gaps. A fact-based, SYSTEMATIC evaluation and improvement PROCESS and organizational learning/sharing are KEY management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement, INNOVATION, and improved INTEGRATION as a result of organizational-level ANALYSIS and sharing. The APPROACH is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in the other Criteria Categories.
90% to 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, fully responsive to all the requirements of the Item and all your current and changing business needs, is evident. The APPROACH is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units. A very strong, fact-based, SYSTEMATIC evaluation and improvement PROCESS and extensive organizational learning/sharing are KEY management tools; strong refinement, INNOVATION and INTEGRATION, backed by excellent organizational-level ANALYSIS and sharing, are evident. The APPROACH is fully integrated with your organizational needs identified in the other Criteria Categories.

For Use With Category 7

SCORE	RESULTS
0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are no business RESULTS or poor RESULTS in areas reported.
10% to 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are some improvements <i>and/or</i> early good PERFORMANCE LEVELS in a few areas. ▪ RESULTS are not reported for many to most areas of importance to your organization’s KEY business requirements.
30% to 40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements <i>and/or</i> good PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported in many areas of importance to your organization’s KEY business requirements. • Early stages of developing TRENDS and obtaining comparative information are evident. • RESULTS are reported for many to most areas of importance to your organization’s KEY business requirements.
50% to 60%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement TRENDS <i>and/or</i> good PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported for most areas of importance to your organization’s key business requirements. • No pattern of adverse TRENDS and no poor PERFORMANCE LEVELS are evident in areas of importance to your organization’s KEY business requirements. • Some TRENDS <i>and/or</i> current PERFORMANCE LEVELS—evaluated against relevant comparisons <i>and/or</i> BENCHMARKS—show areas of strength <i>and/or</i> good to very good relative PERFORMANCE LEVELS. • Business RESULTS address most KEY CUSTOMER, market, and PROCESS requirements.
70% to 80%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current PERFORMANCE is good to excellent in areas of importance to your organization’s KEY business requirements. • Most improvement TRENDS <i>and/or</i> current PERFORMANCE LEVELS are sustained. • Many to most TRENDS <i>and/or</i> current PERFORMANCE LEVELS—evaluated against relevant comparisons <i>and/or</i> BENCHMARKS—show areas of leadership and very good relative PERFORMANCE LEVELS. • Business RESULTS address most KEY CUSTOMER, market, PROCESS, and ACTION PLAN requirements.
90% to 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current PERFORMANCE is excellent in most areas of importance to your organization’s KEY business requirements. • Excellent improvement TRENDS <i>and/or</i> sustained excellent PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported in most areas. • Evidence of industry and BENCHMARK leadership is demonstrated in many areas. • Business RESULTS fully address KEY CUSTOMER, market, PROCESS, and ACTION PLAN requirements.

Table 2--2003 Scoring Band Descriptors

Band	Band Number	Percent Applicants in Band ²	Descriptors
0-250	1	67%	The organization demonstrates the early stages of developing and implementing approaches to Category requirements. However, important gaps exist in most Categories
251-350	2	11%	The organization demonstrates the beginning of a systematic approach responsive to the basic requirements of the Items, but major gaps exist in approach and deployment in some Categories. The organization is in the early stages of obtaining results stemming from approaches, with some improvements and good performance observed.
351-450	3	22%	The organization demonstrates an effective, systematic approach responsive to the basic requirements of most Items, but deployment in some key areas or work units is still too early to demonstrate results. Early improvement trends and comparative data in areas of importance to key organizational requirements are evident.
451-550	4		The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches to the overall requirements of the Items, but deployment may vary in some areas or work units. Fact-based evaluation and improvement address the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes. Results address key customer/stakeholder, market, and process requirements, and they demonstrate some areas of strength and/or good performance.
551-650	5		The organization demonstrates an effective, systematic approach responsive to the overall requirements of the Items and to key organizational needs, with a fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process resulting in overall organizational learning. There are no major gaps in deployment. Improvement trends and/or good performance are reported for most areas of importance. Results address most key customer/stakeholder, market, and process requirements and demonstrate areas of strength.
651-750	6		The organization demonstrates refined approaches, including key measures, good deployment, and very good results in most Areas. Organizational alignment, learning and sharing are key management tools. Some outstanding activities and results address key customer/stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements. The organization is an industry ³ and state-wide leader in some areas.
751-875	7		The organization demonstrates refined approaches, innovation, excellent deployment, and good to excellent performance improvement and levels in most Areas. Good to excellent integration and alignment are evident, with organizational analysis, learning and sharing of best practices as key management strategies. Industry leadership and some benchmark leadership are demonstrated in results that address most key customer/stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements.
876-1000	8		The organization demonstrates outstanding approaches, innovation, full deployment, and excellent and sustained performance results. Excellent integration and alignment are evident, and organizational analysis, learning, and sharing of best practices are pervasive. National and world leadership is demonstrated in results that fully address key customer/stakeholder, market, process and action plan requirements.

² Percentages are based on scores from the Stage 2 review.

³ Industry refers to other organizations performing substantially the same functions, thereby facilitating direct comparisons.

KEY THEMES

Grand Rapids Community College scored in band 3 in the consensus review of written applications for the Michigan Quality Leadership Award.

GRCC demonstrates an effective, systematic approach responsive to the basic requirements of most Items, but deployment in some key Areas to Address is still too early to demonstrate results. Early improvement trends and comparative data in areas of importance to key organizational requirements are evident.

Strengths or outstanding practices (of potential value to other organizations) identified:

- GRCC uses multiple ways of communicating with faculty, staff, students, stakeholders, and the community, including electronics, meetings, forums, reports, and televised meetings. As part of the strategy process, informal discussions and community forums are held. These sessions are used to survey stakeholders, helping to ensure that stakeholder needs are listened to and addressed.
- There is a well-organized leadership model with structures, accountabilities, technology, and systems of communication and learning that provides the framework and support for strategic planning and action plans to accomplish goals. The leadership model includes the Board of Trustees that empowers the President and encourages an atmosphere of cooperation, participation in decision-making, and process improvement through teamwork.
- A strategic plan with goals, objectives/ends, measures, and comparative organizations has been developed. It is fact-based and aligns with the institution's mission, goals, and values. The Strategic Guide for Planning and Resource Allocations guides the process. The strategic plan describes eight long-term outcomes (ends) and six short-term strategic priorities. Multiple opportunities to provide input and feedback on the results of organizational-level analysis are provided by a whole systems engagement process.
- GRCC's Information Management Department uses a current Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) technology tool as the anchor and paired it with a popular relational database system. The system currently has a 99.9% uptime and work is underway to identify efficiency improvements. GRCC is well protected against intrusion from viruses and hackers and at the same time, students, staff and workforce have easy access to the school's systems. Computers are available in rooms all over campus and even in the hallways. GRCC uses its technology capability to provide an infrastructure and foundation for strategic change, continuous improvement, and campus-wide communications.

Most significant opportunities, concerns, or vulnerabilities identified:

- While GRCC's MQC application says that they have three direct sources of competition (P2.a.1), other than the Institute of Business and Technology, extensive site visit interviews consistently reported that GRCC does not believe that it has any competitors. If GRCC is not aware of how its potential competition is performing, over the long-term it may become difficult for GRCC to remain competitive and to continue to maintain full enrollment.
- While GRCC has developed or implemented a number of effective approaches, deployment to all key areas of the organization is not yet complete. Examples include CARP and Lean thinking.
- The organization does not have a systematic approach to evaluating and improving its approaches or specific problem areas. For example, complaint data are normally expected to

be handled at the lowest level of the organization and are not aggregated. Also, until the dashboard metric indicates a red light status, no analyses of adverse or negative trends are conducted to provide information on how teams and individuals can continuously improve their work processes.

- GRCC does not have a clear process to measure and evaluate how to improve educational programs and offerings to better student learning. There is no systematic and fully deployed process for one area of the organization to share improvement with other organizational units, programs, and stakeholders.
- Although numerous key supplier/partner relationships are evident, consistent processes do not exist for selecting, chartering, identifying outcomes, and measuring results from those partnerships. This, in turn, limits opportunities for continuous improvement including the sharing of best practices.
- Although programs exist for individual performance appraisal and training, there is no systemic process to align such effort with GRCC's strategic direction or to support continuous improvement (e.g. strategic human resource planning).

Some the most significant strengths, opportunities, vulnerabilities, and/or gaps (related to data, comparisons, and linkages) found in its response to Results Items:

Significant Strengths

- GRCC's current market share is 31% of the county's college bound seniors despite the fact that three private and one major state university are located in the same county.
- GRCC has applied for and won a number of awards that demonstrate its ability to establish value, obtain positive referrals, and build relationships with students and stakeholders.
- For the past three years, GRCC has a graduate placement rate above 95% in finding employment or continuing education one year after graduation.

Opportunities, Vulnerabilities and/or Gaps

- GRCC does not use a consistent approach to determine which organizations to compare against for many of its benchmarks. Additionally, benchmarks are lacking for some of the data reported.
- There is a lack of results in Category 7 that report the goals, objectives, or targets/measures identified by GRCC. For example, there are many activities listed in Category 5 that are not reflected in the results in Item 7.4 and there is a lack data on Organizational Effectiveness and Support Processes, Category 6, in Item 7.5.

1.1 Organizational Leadership

STRENGTHS

- Vision, mission, values, and strategic outcomes guide improvement initiatives. The Board of Trustees (BOT) provides the vision and policies, while the President oversees day-to-day college operations. The BOT uses data to monitor strategic ends, evaluate, and take action.
- The College Leadership Council (CLC) is a 19-member team comprised of senior college administrators and key faculty leaders. It guides the strategic vision and day-to-day direction by meeting bi-weekly to review activities, discuss progress, and address organizational issues and concerns. Quarterly the CLC holds work-sessions to analyze key sets of data and establish strategic objectives. Annually it participates in a self-evaluation process.
- Senior leaders communicate values, directions, and expectations through all major college publications including the college catalog, annual report card, daily electronic newsletter, monthly newsletter, and website. Other communications vehicles and opportunities exist, such as staff in-service training, meetings, and television.
- There are cross-functional teams to carry out daily operations and improvement strategies organized around significant college processes, championed by a CLC member. Each CLC member communicates regularly with these operations teams to monitor team activities and provide opportunities to exchange information vital to GRCC's operation.
- Senior leaders create an environment that promotes ethical values, equity, empowerment, innovation, safety, and organizational agility in three specific ways; modeling of RAIDER values, use of whole- systems engagement, and deployment of a variety of communication vehicles.
- There are various performance review methods including student and non-student surveys, employer satisfaction, academic program review, customized training satisfaction surveys, student success studies, and BOT monitoring report. GRCC uses a variety of surveys to assess organizational performance by studying key data sets. In some cases external programs are used and compared to external data such as is the case with the PACE program done with North Carolina State University. Deficiencies are indicated by a decline compared to prior periods, when data are significantly below a benchmark group, or when data fall below targets set to meet community needs. Cross-functional teams are then appointed to address areas needing improvement.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although there are processes for leading the college in the direction of the vision, mission, and values and employing teams to assure that all groups are included in the process of setting direction for the college, this effort is more fully deployed in top administration than with positions lower on the organization chart. While many of the people interviewed indicated that they felt included and listened to, many others indicated that decisions were made higher up, or that they were not included in decisions that impacted their work.
- The deployment of vision, mission, and values is not separately measured or tracked for improvement strategies. This makes it difficult to understand how the leadership can ensure that the entire organization is moving in the desired direction, beyond performance to strategic objectives.
- There is a lack of a formal leadership review process to facilitate deployment of action plans and agendas based on reviews throughout GRCC and to stakeholders, partners, and students.
- An assessment process to evaluate the effectiveness of communications with specific measures to track and drive improvement and innovation throughout GRCC is not evident.
- There is a lack of a systematic review process for leadership's role in finding ways to detect problems early and to be able to quickly redirect resources to meet unanticipated needs.

Item 1.2 Public Responsibility and Citizenship

STRENGTHS

- The BOT established executive limitations for the President to guarantee long-term health, safety, security, and ethical standards for students and employees. Executive Limitations provide clear standards on treatment of people, fiscal management, compensation & benefits, emergency executive succession, communication and counsel to the board and accreditation. (See Figure 1.4, GRCC Executive Limitations). The governance structure is now considered best in class and is being benchmarked accordingly.
- In addition to accreditation by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), other programs on campus are seeking specific accreditations. They were selected early for AQIP accreditation, for which the focus is on continuing improvement processes, considered the cutting edge for education. (See Figure P-1, Accreditation Agencies)
- Multiple opportunities for public input and constituent feedback exist. These include organized community conversations, advisory committees for all occupational areas, and Strategy Team members visiting business, non-profit, and educational organizations. Most recently the President appointed a community committee to study future funding needs, address revenue resource strategy, study areas for cost containment, and identify mission and program strategies.
- GRCC targets partnership initiatives to address community efforts, provide community leadership, and offer innovative programming and services for the community. The belief is that "what people see is what they believe" so ethical behavior is valued across the college, and action is taken when unethical behavior is identified. Accountability for Public Responsibility and Citizenship is supported through the Service Learning Center. Administration is expected to "walk the talk" and it is done very well.
- The CLC uses the term "The Community's College" and has the belief that all the college is expected to be connected to the community. Examples of this include, but are not limited to, things like: The Learning Corner, M-Tech (two facilities), the use of the Learning Center for anyone in the tax base free of charge, and FACTS – a project of Grand Rapids Public Schools – involving the encouragement of employees to Tutor/Mentor a child one hour per week during their work time. Reinforcing what people are doing by "pats on the back" and leadership at all levels models other forms of formal and informal recognition.
- Senior leaders, faculty, and staff support a variety of outreach activities. Examples include collaboration with area K-12 schools in both academic and occupational arenas and collaboration with the Workforce Development Board. They also partner with local, regional, and state organizations, professional entities, business and industry, area K-12 schools, and higher education institutions. Outreach activities include United Way, community conversations, tutoring at Central High School, MLK activities, service learning through habitat to humanity, Walk for a Cure and Earth Day, employee leadership participation on community/state boards, "Green by Design" Conference, and service learning.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Most of the data collected to drive decision-making are qualitative, lacking of quantifiable data that supports analysis for trends and relationships.
- There is a lack of specific mechanisms to evaluate and anticipate future market demands that can be met with innovative offerings from GRCC.

2.1 Strategy Development

STRENGTHS

- GRCC utilizes a systematic annual strategic planning process (Figure 2.1) and involves a number of campus teams, units, and workgroups including the BOT, the CLC, the Quality Leadership Team, and the Deans Council. GRCC's mission, values, and ends guide the strategic planning process. This process follows a whole-systems engagement process using microcosm teams to allow for campus-wide input and participation.
- Data about student/stakeholder and market needs are collected through surveys and studies. Surveys are available on the college website. External factor data are collected through various means including environmental scanning, advisory groups, Michigan community college associations, and community networks and associations. Data used include current and future student/stakeholder and market needs; key external factors; ethical, social, budgetary, and other potential risks, strengths and weaknesses.
- Eight key long-term and six short-term goals are clearly identified in Figure 2.3 along with Strategic Objectives/Actions, Strategic Indicators, Targets, and some Benchmark data. In the planning process, key long-term and short-term objectives that are responsive to student/stakeholder needs are developed annually and monitored by the CLC quarterly.
- GRCC identifies technology as a strategic priority (#4), and the CTLT, departments, and CLC use an interactive budgetary planning and review process to insure that technology is aligned with and prioritized to strategic ends.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although there are goals of increasing student ratings regarding the quality of instruction in their major field and student rating of overall quality of instruction, there is a lack of quantifiable goals and measures related to improving student learning, with the exception of developmental students.
- There is an opinion among many members of the organization that there is a lack of competition. Thus, there is a lack of a mechanism for tracking GRCC's rate of improvement and change relative to that of its competitors and other types of organizations that could be used for benchmarking and as input to the strategic planning process.

Item 2.2 Strategy Deployment

STRENGTHS

- The *Strategic Guide for Planning and/Resource Allocations* provides a model for developing and deploying strategic plans. The process entails the CLC using key data sets to select strategic priorities designed to maximize progress towards their ends. These priorities are introduced to college staff at a Learning Day session held in late August of each year. Department- and college-wide planning and budgeting are based on this information. Individual areas determine how they will meet these objectives by allocating resources accordingly.
- Both support and academic departments' planning processes are defined and include an ongoing monitoring step.
- Professional development plans are linked to the faculty and staff requirements as identified to support the strategic plan.
- There are documented performance measures/indicators for tracking progress relative to the action plan. Actions and measurements are aligned through benchmark data from national averages, national "best-in-class", Michigan averages, previous quality award winners, and Vanguard colleges.
- An academic program review and planning process assesses and monitors academic objectives (Figure 2.5, Academic Program Review and Planning Process).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although there is evidence of benchmark processes resulting in data collection, there is a lack of information related to how the benchmarking data support GRCC's plans to become one of the nation's leading community colleges, and how targets are specifically derived to achieve that objective.
- Projections against a competitive and changing market (e.g. distance learning) are not readily available or clearly understood across the college. GRCC does not view itself in a competitive market despite fluctuations in the (national, state and local) economy; changes in industry, community, and technology; and the availability of funding.

Category 3 Student, Stakeholder, and Market Focus

3.1 Knowledge of Student, Stakeholder, and Market Needs and Expectations

STRENGTHS

- GRCC gathers information regarding students' needs and expectations through a variety of methods during entry, attendance, and after graduation including: surveys, forums, focus groups, etc. The student demographic and enrollment information is segmented by various student groups: gender groups, new students, "academic-at-risk" students, English as a Second Language, athletes, minority students, and in-district, out-of-district international, and out of-of-state students. This information is used to anticipate enrollment and required services.
- GRCC uses a variety of listening and learning methods to determine the students' general and special needs and expectations along with their importance to the students. For example there is a web based scoreboard updated weekly to post enrollment, applications by student segments, number of students tested, orientation attendance, number of students paid and additional key information. This is used to monitor class utilization and implications for programs, services, and policies. All graduates are surveyed 6-12 months after graduation.
- Data collected from the students have implemented such changes as: 1) a call system to remind students of counseling appointments, 2) increased implementation of Internet-based registration and services, 3) the hiring of an ESL Coordinator and the redesigning of the ESL curriculum, 4) creation of the Center for Teaching and Learning to address diverse teaching strategies and the addition of new distance learning opportunities, and 5) improved information about financial aid and deferred tuition payment.
- The Deans Council regularly reviews demographic information, high school graduation projects, and employment trends. Admissions recruiters, counselors, and unit/department leaders obtain direct information on students and potential student needs through high school visits, established partnerships, career pathways programs, campus open-houses and meetings with students and their parents during new student orientation programs. These data are used to anticipate change and keep methods current and has resulted in the addition of recording technologies, vocal music, and pastry arts; as well as consideration of future courses in child development.
- GRCC collects data regarding needed curricular and program changes as well as additional programs from employers and former program students using advisory teams and graduate surveys. Responsiveness to stakeholders has resulted in community improvements. For example, the Learning Corner as well as the Mi-tech Center will influence the prosperity of individuals as well as the city.
- GRCC uses a scanning process to assist in monitoring trends in demographics, occupations, and workforce needs. These processes help anticipate changing stakeholder needs and requirements. Staff membership in state and national associations provides information about current and future directions of disciplines and environmental changes that may have an impact on education and societal expectations. GRCC pursued information about students who started or completed the enrollment process but did not attend.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Major gaps exist in the collection and utilization of complaints and other critical incidents to determine changing needs, direction or expectations of stakeholders. This may hinder the understanding key education and support service needs and expectations from students, faculty, staff and stakeholders.

3.2 Student and Stakeholders Relationships and Satisfaction

STRENGTHS

- GRCC builds relationships with current students through a variety of activities such as academic advising, career exploration and counseling, Service Learning, and college volunteer projects. It builds relationships with future students through outreach efforts such as Early College, Tech Prep, Career Pathways, and Upward Bound. It builds community and family relationships through activities such as hosting informational booths at festivals and local conferences and supporting other community endeavors with finances and resources. Staff relationships are facilitated through cross-college teams and activities, including both problems-solving and staff development activities.
- The students build relationships with the community through service learning.
- Advisory boards, community conversations, focus groups, and surveys are used to determine contact requirements. Relationships with current students (considered the most important stakeholder) are maintained through Budget Forums, Student Congress Forums, activities, honors, recognition, and staff interaction. Electronic means have been and are being developed to maintain relationships with alumni and donors.
- GRCC employs numerous methods of obtaining student and stakeholder information through surveys, face-to-face meetings and “point-of-contact” or immediate feedback from services such as the library. GRCC determines key student and stakeholders contact requirements with a system that is fact-based both quantitatively and qualitatively, and well deployed. The evaluation process is in place regarding students but in the early stages in regards to other stakeholders. Student satisfaction/dissatisfaction is determined by surveys. When areas on the survey score less than a 4 on a 5 point scale, comments are read for actionable information
- Teams strategize to improve areas of weaknesses identified by students, former students, advisory committee members, and program staff. A recent example would be when the Student Congress held forums to solve a weak area identified by a Student Satisfaction Survey. The resulting data and ideas were used in the improvement planning process.
- Techniques such as asking student services staff to suggest survey changes, benchmarking, and asking for student feedback on the data collection instruments are used to keep data collection methods current.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- A variety of complaint procedures for students were described, but there is a lack of an associated evaluation process. For example, while a student suggestion or complaint process was described, it was stated that complaints were expected to be dealt with at the lowest level. However, a well deployed, systematic, and timely approach was not found to be in place in order to obtain, analyze, and use complaints in the decision making process.
 - The Business and Technology Institute uses a systematic process to gather quantitative information on the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of stakeholders including comparisons with competitors and/or comparable organizations delivering similar educational services. However, this process is not well deployed across GRCC. There is little evidence of a systematic and timely approach in the remainder of the college. Areas of stakeholder satisfaction that are evaluated using qualitative methods are the Community conversations and informal discussions.
 - There is a lack of a systematic process for effective communications of complaint information throughout GRCC.
-

4.1 Measurement and Analysis of Organizational Performance

STRENGTHS

- PeopleSoft, a relational data base system, is based on the college's business model. Required data are selected and collected by functional area and/or chartered cross-functional teams. Institutional data are shared across the school. Data to support daily operations and decision-making are accessible from anywhere on campus. Reporting templates allow users to access real time and/or trend data as needed. The owner of the data is responsible for its quality.
- A web-based scoreboard is available across the college and is used in the Academic Planning Process and Enrollment Management. Analysis of this data is used to evaluate which students (by segment) and which fields of study to market to. Tracking is done online and is accessible institution-wide. Reports are provided to the Board of Trustees (BOT) annually.
- The CLC selects and measures progress of GRCC's eight strategic outcomes. An annual planning process identifies short-term strategy. Teams and departments develop action plans and monitor daily operation and performance. Leadership can track which department level projects support each long- and short-term goal.
- GRCC uses a variety of comparative and benchmark data during the planning process and when defining goals. Vanguard colleges provide evidence of best practice among community colleges. There are a variety of organizations that are used as the source of benchmark data by GRCC to provide evidence of best practices among community colleges.
- Performance measurements are aligned with changing educational service needs through monitoring of trend data, customer satisfaction surveys, employment and economic indicators, employee and student forums, and external stakeholder feedback. This information and feedback is utilized in the annual planning and resource allocation process.
- The BOT prepares the outcomes and limitations for the President and monitors the results. The Board of Trustees' Monitoring Report involves all of the CLC. The CLC meets weekly to monitor organizational progress, identify priorities, allocate and prioritize resources, define indicators, and provide leadership for college departments and teams. A Dashboard gives strategic focus and prioritization to specific areas and is used to monitor the data elements that drive performance and in 2003 will be electronically linked to an integrated system of reports.
- GRCC uses a whole systems engagement, where employee collaboration, involvement, and cross-communication provide multiple opportunities to provide input and feedback on the results of organizational-level analysis. Key data sets are communicated to all employees through electronic means, meetings, discussions, and web posting.
- The Academic Program Review has identified twelve key indicators used across all departments to assess performance. In the case of unsatisfactory performance, departments have three years to avoid negative consequences including program elimination.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Decision-making utilizes on-going environmental scanning, routine state and federal reports, national and professional organizations, credentialing entities, business and industry best practices, and data from one or more of the twelve Vanguard colleges; however, there is a lack of a systematic process for selecting benchmarks.
- Twelve key indicators have been established to assess department performance. While the Dashboard reports are under development to highlight department performance, it has not been fully implemented in all areas.
- Although GRCC has enormous amounts and varieties of data readily available, there is limited capability for transforming it into useful information. While there are significant challenges to utilizing and prioritizing these data into more useful information it can facilitate better planning and decision-making.
- There is a lack of a process for continuing to evaluate the appropriateness of the data being tracked and further deployment of the use of the key data sets and dashboards to support decision making and evaluation of the colleges' performance in all areas.
- There is no systemic, institution-wide approach to using quantifiable data to track progress and to support decision-making across the college. There are no clear guidelines for measuring student satisfaction with instructional and support processes. Comparisons to relevant benchmarks and other comparative data are not used to improve student instructional and support processes.
- Trended data do not exist for measuring the effectiveness of the College Report Card, nor is there a data integrity process to evaluate the redundancy of data being collected and its appropriateness.

4.2 Information Management

STRENGTHS

- GRCC aligns leading edge technology planning (a strategic priority) with college-wide strategic planning and resource allocation in order to keep data and information available current with educational service needs and directions.
- The Dashboard is used to prioritize the analysis of available data and information. It is also used as a visual reminder of areas of the College that need improvement.
- Institutional data are available on line to the extent possible. Access is defined by the user profile. There is real time access through query and reporting templates. Students have access 24/7 for their personal, academic and account information. Employees utilize the distribution of electronic report copies, presentations at college-wide meetings, discussion and review at Strategy Team sessions, and web postings.
- Performance measurements are aligned with changing educational service needs through continuing monitoring of trend data, customer satisfaction surveys, employment and economic indicators, employee and student forums, and external stakeholder feedback. This information and feedback are utilized in the annual planning process.
- The college has implemented a Dashboard System that tracks key data. This system is structured around five measures: Student Success; Student Satisfaction; Staff Satisfaction; Financial; Strategies. Progress has been made in the top five student issues which are: Parking; Instruction; Bookstore; Course Availability/Scheduling; Customer Service. The College Leadership Team (CLC) is responsible for data sets and meets in retreat to report findings and to develop plans to drive improvement and evaluate the appropriateness of measures.
- Security and confidentiality access to GRCC's institutional data is defined by user profile.
- GRCC utilizes the College Technology Leadership Team (CTLT) to integrate leadership and strategic direction, priorities and funding for technology, infrastructure, and services needed.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although GRCC provides the capability to perform analyses to support daily operations, it is not deployed beyond the various teams or integrated to support daily operations and decision-making. For example, there are no systematic analyses performed or used by individual faculty members or administrative staff to improve student performance, maintain the currency of performance measurement systems, or manage support processes.
- Although there is a large amount of data available through PeopleSoft and other means, it is sometimes collected in various departments, reviewed and filed/maintained in the department and therefore, may not be available throughout the college.
- There is a lack of defined methods to be used as an institution wide approach for data analysis or use of common tools and methods for improvement and decision-making. There is also a lack of a systematic method for tracking data that is being used for fact-based decision making based on information derived from statistical and trend analysis. Most of the data collected is qualitative rather than quantitative data. Without a process to analyze key results, it is difficult to understand how improvements in education design and delivery can be achieved.

5.1 Work Systems

STRENGTHS

- The guiding principle for all performance evaluations is to align individuals' work with the strategic mission, goals, and values.
- The BOT Executive Limitations of the President includes that "the President shall not fail to provide opportunities for personal and professional development of Trustees, students or employees".
- Job descriptions exist for all positions and are linked to performance development, succession planning, and recruitment. A Faculty Profile has been developed to guide recruitment and hiring of new faculty and assure quality of instructional personnel.
- The faculty evaluation process focuses on a faculty member's performance in five key areas: teaching, college service, student service, professional development, and community service. Evaluation for all faculty groups includes student evaluation and self-assessment, and setting of goals through the Faculty Goals and Improvement Process (FGIP).
- GRCC uses a Performance Development Discussion System for all non-union staff. Evaluation aligns work goals with the college's mission, vision, values, and ends.
- There are multiple support structures designed to motivate professional development and involvement including four all-employee learning days, competitions, funds, awards and public recognition given for innovations, and department level learning including IIPD's. In addition, evolving work systems incorporate integrated team projects (e.g. College-Wide Recruitment Team).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although there exists opportunities for professional development, there is a lack of follow-up with targets and measures to track training or its impact of performance.
- There is limited evidence of a succession planning system. Specific information is not given of how job descriptions and training are linked to college's vision/mission or placement decisions. At the present, the succession planning is "mostly a vision rather than a plan."

5.2 Faculty and Staff Education, Training, and Development

STRENGTHS

- Projects are often completed in teams around improvements in the student learning experience and other areas related to institution wide issues. In addition, employees participate on strategy teams as a way to involve employees in addressing issues as well as teaching employees about strategy development and teamwork.
- Leadership and supervision development is taking place in such efforts as the Deans Academy where leaders learn together about the evaluation system, the curriculum development process, changes in the faculty contract, personnel and human resources issues, and the annual strategic priorities. A Leadership Training program will be offered in 2003-2004.
- A variety of communication systems are in place to inform faculty and staff of key organizational needs such as, media technologies and distant learning technologies, the Dean's Academy, college connections, Employee Orientation and the Diversity Learning Center.
- Performance evaluation identifies faculty and staff training/education needs. As part of their personal evaluation, improvement goals are set with appropriate learning methods.
- Adjunct focus groups and surveys were used to gather input for the pre-semester Adjunct Meetings and to plan the Adjunct Institute. Although adjunct faculty training is challenging, an adjunct email group was implemented to provide support and the CTL developed an Adjunct Faculty Institute plan.
- The CTL Director meets with groups including leaders of interdisciplinary faculty teams around campus to get input on the Center's work and offerings.
- New learning is reinforced through training course completion, teaching on-line classes, and attending ongoing institutes. Four Learning Days are dedicated to institution-wide issues organized around ends, action plans, and employee training and development. The student support team members working on Street-to-Seat learned "lean manufacturing" strategies to help them design more efficient and effective systems.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Input from staff concerning specific training needs is solicited. The requests are analyzed and prioritized for future delivery. However, there is a lack of a systematic follow-up plan for using input from faculty, staff, or senior leaders on training needs or delivery options.
- Although there is orientation training for adjunct faculty, professional development is not systematic or well developed for either new or continuing adjunct faculty. This makes it difficult to understand how the College can assure consistent course delivery or focus on student learning.
- There is no systematic formal follow-up plan to check with employees as to whether their training expectations, requirements, and needs were met. Also, there is no analysis done post-training to determine the impact of training and new learning on department or individual performance.

5.3 Faculty and Staff Well-Being and Satisfaction

STRENGTHS

- GRCC encourages staff well-being in a variety of ways. Examples include encouraging fitness through free facilities, providing incentives, having a wellness team and offering individual health risk appraisals. The Wellness Team seeks grants to provide all interested staff with an individual health risk appraisal conducted by the local health department.
- There is an ergonomics assessment process. When ergonomic needs are not resolved internally a consultant is brought in.
- A security team conducts patrols and provides escort services when requested. The security police are constantly alert for problem areas.
- On-going efforts exist to comply with The American Disabilities Act, OSHA, and MIOSHA standards, and the Right to Know.
- The PACE survey is used to evaluate the campus environment and focus groups were held to develop solutions to problems identified.
- There are many services and benefits offered to support GRCC faculty and staff such as, dental and vision reimbursement, paid sick and vacation time, tuition reimbursement, compensatory time, flex scheduling, local outings, discounted tickets, free lectures, and an Institute on Diversity Training.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although programs are in place for employees relative to health and fitness, limited tracking is done to assess participation and satisfaction with these programs. Performance measures and/or key targets are not included for well-being, safety, or ergonomics.
- There is not a systematic approach for how faculty and staff, including specific segments or work environments, take part in improving workplace health, safety, and ergonomics, or how performance measures or targets are set.
- There is a lack of information regarding indicators of employee satisfaction, with the exception of the PACE survey (which is reported in Category 7, Item 7.4). There is not a systematic way for how information such as faculty and staff retention, absenteeism, grievances, safety, and productivity are assessed and used to improve faculty and staff well being, satisfaction and motivation.
- There is a lack of information regarding employee satisfaction targets in long- and short-term plans making it difficult to understand how target areas for improvement are set or at what level optimum satisfaction is achieved.

6.1 Education Design and Delivery Processes

STRENGTHS

- GRCC describes four key design processes for creating and maintaining educational products that meet customers needs; New Program Development Process, Program/Curriculum Modification Process, Internet Development/Delivery, and Course Approval and Review Process, CARP (Figures 6.1 Design Processes and Related Delivery Systems/Processes and 6.2 GRCC Curriculum Model).
- The college is in its third full year of AQIP (Academic Quality Improvement Program) that is sponsored by the NCA Higher Learning Commission. At this time the college has participated in the Strategy Forum and is scheduled for Systems Appraisal in November 2004. Most of the data systems are focused around three vital few projects have are being implemented: Improving Student Learning through course development, assessment, and revision; Street to Seat; and Raider Pride.
- Academic and Student Affairs is assigned responsibility for published processes to ensure programs address education, developmental and well being needs, meet high standards and focus on active learning (Figure 6.2).
- The CARP process is being used to design and redesign all courses. It addresses, among other things, learning objectives and teaching methodology to support consistency in course content and provides guidelines to assess learning. The CARP process also addresses how each course is aligned with programs and other courses.
- Students are given a variety of options as alternatives to traditional classes to address their personal learning needs, for example, on-line courses. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) provides opportunities for the faculty to learn ways to accommodate for individual learning differences.
- Technology is a strategic priority in course design and multiple venues of delivery are considered. Technology is incorporated throughout the education design and delivery process through the CARP. CARP requires a definition of resources including technology. There is a Distance Learning Technology plan with indicators and targets with a cross campus team, the Campus Technology Leadership Team, providing leadership and direction for the college on the use of technology.
- GRCC has an institutional license for Worldwide Instructional Design System (WIDS) and several certified trainers on staff. WIDS is used for the design of new internet courses.
- The Provost and Academic Deans are responsible to ensure that programs and offerings meet design/delivery requirements. A support staff team assists with the development and documentation. A Curriculum Approval and Review Process reviews each course on a three-year cycle.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although GRCC has identified processes that focus on increasing learner success, the processes listed, such as CARP, CTL, do not address, nor do they ensure, that student learning is a process outcome.
- Although the CTL provides a variety of opportunities for faculty to learn ways to engage students in the learning process, there is a lack of information to determine to what extent faculty actually have these skills or participate in the workshops provided by CTL.
- Although the activities in the CARP process associated with course assessment are documented in the CARP process, assessments are not measurable and there is a lack of consistent measurable course objectives and explicit formative assessments to measure learning early in the learning process. Also lacking are summative assessments to measure progress against key, relevant external standards and norms regarding what students should know and be able to do upon completion of courses. Consistent and accurate use will support strategic planning, action plans, and continuous improvement
- The categories listed, such as age, gender, working/not working, part time/full time, etc., are not systematically used for determining active learning.
- Although GRCC has identified processes that focus on increasing learner success, for the processes listed, such as CARP, CTL, assessment, and hiring and evaluating faculty, there is a lack of information for how these processes focus on student learning and ensure active learning.
- Despite the implementation of the CARP process, there is a lack of key observations and measures/indicators used to monitor and improve the delivery of key educational programs. There is also a lack of a process linking student assessments or other in process measures of programs and offerings that lead to improvement.

6.2 Student Services

STRENGTHS

- Key student services have been identified with key performance requirements for those services (Figure 6.5 Key Educational Support Services). Information is gathered from several sources including students, faculty, and high schools and receiving schools, business, and the community.
- Key student service requirements are determined through surveys, focus groups, and best practice information from other colleges, student congress feedback, student complaint process, and legal compliance issues. These requirements are then aligned with GRCC's Raider values.
- Teams work on identified problems in student services. An example is the Street-to-Seat process improvement effort. A variety of information, including a survey on the time spent waiting for service, lead to the assignment of the issue to a team.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although the users of student services are asked to fill out a survey indicating their satisfaction with the services received, the information is not systematically organized, analyzed, and entered into the database that is available to all units of the College.

6.3 Support Processes

STRENGTHS

- Key operational process requirements are determined from input from a variety of stakeholders, Deans Council, Academic Leadership Team, Space Planning Team, Academic Senate, student forums, community conversations, and various state and federal regulatory agencies (Figure 6.6).
- Key support processes, requirements, and measures (Figure 6.6 Key Support Processes) are tied to the annual planning process and are documented in the Strategic Guide for Planning and Resource Allocation.
- Costs saving procedures have resulted in a reduction of personnel, costs in purchasing, and managing risk. For example, the Purchasing Director, who has a goal of maximizing value, has reduced cost through better relations with suppliers and purchasing on-line to reduce cycle time.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- There is a lack of information regarding some key support processes such as human resources, marketing, recruiting, public relations, legal, secretarial and other administrative services. Key support processes for support daily operations are not considered in the application nor were they recognized in interviews held with staff. Although it is indicated that there is input from internal and external stakeholders, there is a lack of information as to how stakeholder input is used the determination of process requirements.
- There is a lack of information regarding performance measures/indicators for support processes as well as a lack of information for how in-process measures and feedback are used to manage support processes. For example, the Facilities Department refers to the Key Operational Requirements in the long range Master Plan. The associated measure is the existence of Plan, adherence to Plan, alignment with academic needs, annual update and revision of Master Plan, and State approval of Plan. There is no evidence of how the day-to-day operation of key support processes ensures meeting key performance requirements.
- There is no process for how support processes are improved to achieve better performance and to keep them current with organizational needs and directions. For example, while there is an approach to cost saving that includes a variety of activities such as experienced staff, a Risk Management Team, and the use of the State of Michigan pro bono consultants, GRCC is just beginning to pilot an on-line requisition process and has started to implement a Procurement Card allowing direct purchase. However, there is a lack of goals, objectives, and measures tied to these activities, making it difficult to understand how it will be evaluated as a cost improvement. It is also unclear how the improvements are shared with other organizational units and processes.

7.1 Student Learning Results

STRENGTHS

- Student retention results from the fall semester to the winter semester show steady improvement over the past four years. In addition, current results (81% overall retention) are better than the Vanguard College (61%) benchmark but slightly below the Pacesetter winner (84%). In addition, the retention rates are increasing in each of the years. In addition to overall rates, GRCC segments the data based on sex, race, full/part-time, and AFP students (Figure 7.1-1).
- Retention for its fall-to-fall semesters indicates rates better than the Vanguard College benchmark and overall better than the Michigan average of 49% (male 52% and female 61%).
- Course success rate (Grade C or Better) has stayed the same 69% from Fall 2000 to Fall 2002 (Figure 7.1-3). This is a better percentage than the Vanguard College benchmark of 64% although it is below the National averages of 75%.
- Course success rates, Grade C or better, (Figure 7.1-3) indicate higher rates (male 67% and female 72%) than Vanguard College for all courses 64% and higher rates for all distant learning methods (Vanguard College 33%).
- GRCC's transfer students' compare favorably with native students in eight colleges and universities. Figure 7.1-4 shows the success of students transferring to a four-year college based on the grade point of their junior year. It shows a 3.0 average grade point with a slight increase in the most recent year.
- Percent of students attaining a degree within three years shows steady improvement (Figure 7.1-5) and higher than Vanguard College # 1.
- Licensing Exam Passing Rates exceed national or state averages for all available data for nurses, dental assistants, radiologist assistants, and occupational therapy assistants (Figure 7.1-6).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although there are positive results shown in many of the data presented, there is a lack of information that explains negative results or trends that do not meet or exceed comparative data, making it difficult to understand how the data are used for continuous improvement. For example, Figure 7.1-1 shows a decline in retention of American Indians from Fall '02 to Winter '03; Figure 7.1-3 shows mixed results for African American and American Indian, part-time students, and AFP courses, and at risk students (AFP) in English Figure 7.1-9 also shows mixed results. Another example includes the lack of explanation for why the percent answering “adequately” or higher when asked, “How well did the college prepare you...” is declining (Figure 7.1-8).
- There is a lack of information regarding the number of individuals represented in the tables or segments of data, making it difficult to determine whether changes in percentages are significant or an artifact of sample size. There is also a lack of evidence on how data are segmented in ways that will facilitate continuous improvement.
- Year-to-year retention rates increased from Fall '97 to Fall '99 from 53% to 58% and then declined to 55% and then 56% for the most recent two years. Although the current year results beats the Vanguard and Michigan average of 44% and 49%, it is below the Top State of 64% and the Baldrige Winner (4-year college) of 77%. Although GRCC has a goal to improve these rates, the data indicate little progress against the key objective.
- Although the percent of graduates for employed or continuing education is high (Figure 7.1-7), there is a lack of information concerning Hispanic students as indicated in the strategic plan.
- There is a lack of data for 2000-2002 in Figure 7.1-5. Progress is shown for graduation rates from 1997-1999; however, the Vanguard College benchmarks are conflicting and seem to indicate that progress is needed.

7.2 Student- and Stakeholder-Focused Results

STRENGTHS

- The long-term goals for Diversity satisfaction are an example of continuous improvement. The 95% (page 10 of application) satisfaction level increases 1% per year until it has achieved GRCC's objective. Figure 7.2-4 shows the results improving from 94% in 1998-99 to 97% in 2000-01, thus meeting or exceeding GRCC's long-term goal.
- Figure 7.2 lists the key measures of student and stakeholder satisfaction results and is composed of 9 figures (Figure 7.2-1 through Figure 7.2-9). Graduate ratings of key college experiences indicate slight improvements in satisfaction levels from the school years 1998-9 through 2000-1 (see Figure 7.2-4). Similarly graduate ratings of key student services shows increasing improvements since school years 1997-8 through 2000-1 (Figure 7.2-5).
- The applicant has applied for and won a number of awards establishing perceived value, positive referrals, and stronger relationships with students and stakeholders. The current number of 30.3 people per 1000 indicates the highest workforce enrolled for the past three years from the surrounding county; giving possible evidence of community satisfaction (Figure 7.2-8 and Figure 7.2-9).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Student ratings of critical components of the college experience are done using the Student Satisfaction Survey. The results from 1999 and 2002 are shown in Figure 7.2-2 and establish an "overall satisfaction rating" based on a benchmark. However, the results have declined from prior years. When benchmark data is given, results are worse than the benchmarks except for that one "Overall Satisfaction Rate".
- Relative comparisons such as benchmarks, trends, and student segments/numbers are missing from several key factors. This makes it difficult to understand how progress is tracked relative to other organizations offering similar educational services or how meaningful targets and projections in these areas are set (Figure 7.2, Figure 7.2-1, Figure 7.2-4, Figure 7.2-5, Figure 7.2-6, Figure 7.2-7, and Figure 7.2-8).
- While GRCC indicates workforce penetration has remained nearly constant at approximately 30% (Figure 7.2-8) and lists several awards in Figure 7.2-9, data are missing regarding the current levels and trends in stakeholder perceived value, persistence, and positive referrals. There is also a lack of information regarding the satisfaction of other stakeholders as identified in the Preface.

7.3 Budgetary, Financial, and Market Results

STRENGTHS

- As a measure of good financial management, the average class size has remained stable for the past three Fall semesters and has increased for the Winter semesters (Figure 7.3-2).
- Data show continued growth in Foundation assets from 1996-2002. The financial strength of the Foundation is enabling scholarships to increase and thereby afford more minority students into the workforce development programs (Figure 7.3-3).
- The fund balance is exceeding its goal of a 10% fund balance as a percentage of Operating Revenues in each of the past three years (Figure 7.3-1).
- The market share of college-bound students has increased from 25% in 1999-00 to 31% in 2001-02 (Figure 7.3).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Other key financial measures noted on page 13 of the application such as increasing non-financial aid grant revenue by 5% for 2003 are new measures. Since only fund balance is reported and other financial goals are in the early stages of development and reporting; it is difficult to understand how targets are set for improvements in budgetary and financial performance.
- Market share data are not tied to long- or short-term strategic goals and are not benchmarked.

7.4 Faculty and Staff Resource Results

STRENGTHS

- The PACE climate survey trends shows an increase in all areas when comparing 2001 scores to 1999 (Figure 7.4-3).
- The staff rated the college on its application of the RAIDER Values an average of 3.6. This compares favorably with the benchmark 3.5 of the Pacesetter Award winner (Figure 7.4-4).
- The college opened a Center for Teaching and Learning in 1999-2000. A survey of faculty indicated that 80% of the respondents rated the CTL as meeting or exceeding their expectations (Figure 7.4-5).
- The staff rating of technology and training has remained the same or improved (Figure 7.4-6).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Faculty and staff work system performance and effectiveness is not quantified across the campus.
- Although Figure 7.4-6 shows a climate survey indicating improvement between 1999 and 2001, there are no data on current levels, trends, or effectiveness of staff development and well-being.
- Two learning centers for the faculty are described, the CTL and the RLC. A faculty survey shows that 80% feel that the CTL meets their expectations but only 48% finds it to be an asset (Figure 7.4-6).
- Although there are data reflecting serious crime (Figure 7.4-7), there are no data concerning perceptions of a safe work environment or reported incidents that are less than serious crime that can reflect a safe work environment.

7.5 Organizational Effectiveness Results

STRENGTHS

- A student satisfaction survey was conducted in 2002 with satisfactory ratings in all categories of the instructional process and the campus support processes except parking. There are baseline data concerning student satisfaction with the instructional process (Figure 7.5-1) and the campus support processes (Figure 7.5-2).
- In the table reporting student satisfaction (Figure 7.5-1), benchmark data are offered for some instructional process items (class size, overall quality, attitude and availability of instructors and lab facilities).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- There are a lack of some measures and results for the support processes Item 6.3 (e.g., risk management or with safety on campus). For example, while measures are indicated for areas such as work-related injuries and numbers of employees trained in safety, the data are not tracked.
- There is a lack of information or data for measures of public responsibility and citizenship, safety; regulatory and legal; and support of key communities.
- There is a lack of information or data for measures or indicators of performance of key education design as well as for the effectiveness and efficiency of the design.
- Student satisfaction with instructional process shows an overall rating below the Pacesetter and National Benchmarks where they are provided (Figure 7.5-1). It is not clear what the student satisfaction ratings in campus support processes (Figure 7.5-2) or key student services (Figure 7.2-5) mean since there are no trends or benchmarks provided, such as the Vanguard college, Pacesetter, or National standards.
- While numerous targets are identified in Figure 2.3, organizational performance results are not indicated with historical and trend data on many characteristics. For example, the long-term goal of transfer and articulation indicates a target is to "increase number of articulation agreements by 1 per year for next 5 years." Another example of the lack of historical and trend data involves the longer-term goal of flexible learning in which the target is to have "66% of courses in CARP format by July 2003".
- There is a lack of benchmark or comparative data for Figure 7.5-2, Student Satisfaction with Campus Support Processes and half of the items in Figure 7.5-1 Student Satisfaction with Instructional Process. The surveys indicate only one year of data with no explanation as to whether it is baseline data or part of other surveys cited in Item 7.2.
- There is no data set to monitor the college's key areas of risk such as: Compliance areas; Employee Safety & Health; Student and Visitor Safety; and Asset Protection.
- While there is abundant qualitative and quantifiable attribute data, there is a lack of specific quantifiable variable data to monitor improvement in educational design and delivery across the college.