

Michigan Quality Council

Michigan Quality Leadership Award

Grand Rapids Community
College

Feedback Report
December 2004

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.

- 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. 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, health care, and non-profit) 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.

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 a scoring band. Each band corresponds to a descriptor associated with that scoring range.

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 organizational 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 educational service 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 educational service 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 organizational performance 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 key organizational 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 key organizational requirements. • Early stages of developing trends and obtaining comparative information are evident. • Results are reported for many to most areas of importance to your key organizational 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 key organizational requirements. • No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels are evident in areas of importance to your key organizational 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. • Organizational performance results address most key student, stakeholder, 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 key organizational 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. • Organizational performance results address most key student, stakeholder, 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 key organizational requirements. • Excellent improvement trends <i>and/or</i> sustained excellent performance levels are reported in most areas. • Evidence of education sector and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas. • Organizational performance results fully address key student, stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements.

KEY THEMES

Grand Rapids Community College (GRCC) demonstrates an effective, systematic approach responsive to the basic requirements of most Items. The Approach is deployed, although in the early stages in some areas. A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process is in place for some key processes. There are some improvements and/or early good performance levels in a few areas, although the organization is in the early stages of obtaining and using comparative information.

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

- Senior leadership is committed to total quality management. They work to ensure that all stakeholders have input into the strategic planning process. They communicate openly with students, staff and faculty and community. *GRCC Today* is a daily newsletter that all staff and faculty review to obtain organizational goals, action plans, performance indicators, and events.
- The college uses a robust and comprehensive strategic planning process. The mission, vision and values are driving forces for the applicant. Outcomes, Indicators of Progress, Strategic Priorities, Action Planning and Reporting are included. Employees at all levels of the organization understand their role in supporting the strategic planning process. A continuous improvement process is in place to keep the strategic planning process and action plans current with the stakeholder needs. Employees know how to make suggestions and get involved with the continuous improvement initiatives.
- GRCC seeks to identify community needs and enter new markets. Learning Corner @ Wealthy is an outreach initiative that has reported 82% success rate, increasing the applicant's enrollment, and benefiting the student and community stakeholders. This initiative supports Strategic Priorities 1, 2, and 6.
- GRCC has developed an approach to organization-wide performance metrics with the College Dashboard System. The Dashboard is used to track performance in the 4 Decision Drivers: Learner Success, Satisfaction, Stewardship, and Utilization. When Performance Indicators drop below acceptable levels, steps are taken to review and redesign the process. The organizational Dashboard is available throughout the organization, and made available to all stakeholders via the applicant's website.
- The college has an approach to benchmarking against other colleges seen as "best practice." Annually, Deans take a benchmarking trip to visit three community colleges in other states. Upon request department leaders are provided training in benchmarking techniques. Benchmarking data is maintained on an accessible database.
- GRCC has a well-developed approach to meeting the needs of faculty and staff. Processes are in place and many have gone through cycles of improvement.

Most significant opportunities, concerns, or vulnerabilities identified:

- The college has not deployed performance indicators (sub-sets of college dashboard indicators) to the classroom level, making difficult to evaluate learner success (including Student Satisfaction) at the classroom level. Further, although the Dashboard is a key initiative linking and aligning all departments and classrooms to the strategic plan, it is in the early stages of deployment and knowledge about the Dashboard and the experiences of departments with it is not widely shared and communicated.
- While GRCC collects extensive data from stakeholders, the primary collection methods (surveys, focus groups, meetings) are dependent upon voluntary participation. Without methods in place to gather additional feedback, the college is not assured of gaining feedback from representative groups of students and stakeholders.
- The Complaint Management Reporting Process is newly developed and is in the process of being deployed, as are a number of other key processes such as CARP and the Dashboard. While these approaches appear to be well-designed, deployment is at an early stage and employees below the leadership level are not as familiar with them.
- While the college collects perception data from many stakeholders (students, employees, etc.) to determine their satisfaction with processes and services, these are lagging metrics of performance. The approach to establishing and collecting objective metrics that may be used as leading indicators of performance is at an early stage of development. As a result, there are few objective metrics of performance in some areas.
- Data results are often not analyzed by segment. For example, student and staff satisfaction data are not segmented, making it difficult to assess performance against the diversity objective, which is a Strategic Outcome/End, as well as to identify improvement opportunities by segment. Likewise, the process for analyzing other student and stakeholder results and staff RAIDER results does not include analyses by segment. Without analyzing segmented data, GRCC may find it more difficult to ensure that the needs of important groups are being met as well as to design initiatives and improvements targeted to these groups.
- GRCC has identified the following three sources of competition: higher education, business and industry training, and distance learning providers. In discussions with leadership, faculty, and staff, comparative data on the performance of these competitors was not available or used in planning or target setting. Targets are widely used and are established based on internal performance. Without being based on external information and benchmarks, they may not be as useful in helping GRCC reach needed levels of performance. Further, while information is collected on the twelve Vanguard colleges and some benchmarking is conducted, the process for GRCC to use this information in its own improvement planning is not evident.

Some the most significant strengths, opportunities, vulnerabilities, and/or gaps (related to

data, comparisons, and linkages) found in its response to Results Items:

- The college has been successful in winning 30% of its market despite competing with larger private and public colleges and universities.
- GRCC has demonstrated success in student learning outcomes as reflected in several results in Item 7.1, such as course success rates and graduation rates, some of which meet or exceed relevant comparisons and best performers.
- Results are lacking in areas of importance to GRCC, including objective measures for learning-entered processes, support processes, workplace effectiveness, well-being and satisfaction, organizational effectiveness, and social responsibility, among other areas.
- Results are not segmented by categories of importance to the institution. For example, major student segments have been defined as 1) workforce degree, 2) transfer students, 3) early college, 4) job training, 5) apprentices, 6) guests, 7) international, 8) developmental, 9) personal interest, 10) older learner, and 11) special population. However, learner success is not analyzed and reported by these segments. Faculty and staff satisfaction results and student and stakeholder satisfaction results are likewise not segmented. Without analyzing segmented and disaggregated data, it is not evident how the college is able to ensure that the needs of all sub-groups are met and targeted interventions designed in the event that they are not.
- Very little comparative data are provided for results, other than a few student learning results. Results generally do not contain data with which to compare to direct competitors as identified in the organizational profile or to the twelve Vanguard Colleges. Without comparing its own performance to the performance of competitors and other selected best practice organizations, it is not clear how GRCC identifies best performance and sets stretch targets to improve. Meeting targets that are set internally without regard to competitive and best in class performance may not ensure that the organization is positioned to accomplish its strategic objectives.

Category 1 – Leadership

1.1 Organizational Leadership

Strengths:

- Senior leaders demonstrate an ongoing commitment to creating an environment that promotes ethical values, equity for all students, empowerment, innovation, safety, organizational agility, and organizational and faculty/staff learning in three ways. First, they identify and commit to their RAIDERS values. Second, they demonstrate commitment to empowerment and learning of staff through the use of whole-systems engagement processes. This process enables large number of staff to come together as a microcosm to study data, discover root causes of problems, develop innovations solutions, and identify indicators of progress. Third, senior leaders consider open communication to be critical to encourage empowerment, participation, and innovation.
- Senior and department level leaders use the College Dashboard System to review key performance indicators. The dashboard reports include benchmark data, long- and short-term targets, and student achievement results. Results are monitored at quarterly strategic planning meetings and action plans are developed and implemented when performance falls below acceptable levels.
- The Board of Trustees commissioned a community committee to review the financial position, forecasts, and relevant student and program-related data for the purpose of an external “stakeholder” perspective. Employees and students have input into the budget development process.
- GRCC makes extensive use of teaming and matrix management to involve the staff in the leadership process and to communicate goals, values and plans throughout the organization. The three leadership teams (President’s Executive Team, College Leadership Council (CLC) and the Deans Council) are responsible for deployment and communication of organizational values, directions, and expectations. The CLC has commissioned a number of cross-functional teams designed to increase communication, better organize to accomplish organizational goals, create and implement action plans, and evaluate accomplishments. Each team creates a charter and has appropriate policy and decision-making authority.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Student participation at budget development forums is low, inhibiting the organization in achieving Strategic Priority #6: Actively Engage Community Stakeholders. There are no clear plans in place to address this.
- A number of approaches for major initiatives are not understood below the leadership level, indicating opportunities to further communicate the direction and approaches the college is taking.

1.2 - Social Responsibility

Strengths:

- To address accountability within its governance system, GRCC has established and utilizes four specific executive limitation polices that serve as parameters for financial controls, budgeting and forecasting, asset protection, and compensation and benefits. In addition, the college relies on external audits such as financial audits by certified public accounts and governmental audits of selected programs. Internal audit committees are used for review and improvement opportunities. Financial information is available for review by staff and students at a web site and in publications.
- At new employee orientation, recent hires are shown the values video followed by a dialogue with selected full time staff about living the values in day-to-day interactions.
- The college is meeting its goal and demonstrating social responsibility by exceeding all regulated areas of safety, health, law, and academia as reported in Governance and Social Responsibility (Fig. 7.6-1).

Opportunities for Improvement:

- While community involvement is strong at the leadership level, it is not fully deployed to all the faculty and staff. This is a gap in the alignment to the Strategic Outcome #6, Community Outreach, and Strategic Outcome #7, Community Partnerships.

Category 2 – Strategic Planning

2.1 Strategy Development

Strengths:

- The strategic planning system combines the mission, vision, and values with benchmarking to identify the long and short term strategic priorities and allocate resources. The college cascades the strategic planning process down to the department level by requiring each department to identify two to three action projects that directly support the strategic priorities/strategic outcomes. These include goals and timelines for each project. Leadership monitors the progress and translates the priorities into department and team level action plans. Progress toward the action plans is available on the dashboard in real-time to all stakeholders.
- The planning process utilizes information from a variety of inputs. Data about current and future students/stakeholders and market needs are gathered through an ongoing series of data surveys and studies (Survey Schedule: Figure 1.1). Survey results are available on the college web site and studied as key data sets during the annual planning process. In addition, the Board of Trustees and CLC members listen to stakeholder and market needs from key constituency groups during the Community Conversations sessions. Ethical, social, budgetary and other potential risks are addressed by using the Strategic Guide for Planning and Resources Allocations to align the budgeting and planning processes. Strengths and weaknesses are determined during the situational analysis phase of the planning process at both the college and department levels as part of the Academic Program Review or the Annual Department Level planning process.
- Senior Leadership and the Board of Trustees hold a strategic planning retreat to begin the planning process of the planning cycle. Once consensus has been achieved regarding strategic and organizational development priorities, various models are used (see Long and Short Term Objectives by Strategic Priority: Figure 2.5) to assist in choosing the final plan. Once the final plan is chosen, strategic planning participants begin the process of developing team and process strategies. Follow-up meetings are held to review action plans, staff feedback, assumptions, goals, and metrics. Once approved, the plan is shared with the entire school and the process of continuously evaluating results against strategic priorities begins.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- The applicant has identified the three sources of competition: higher education, business and industry training, and distance learning providers, yet comparative data for these competitors is not available or used in the planning process.

2.2 Strategy Deployment

Strengths:

- The Academic Department Planning Process uses twelve critical indicators to evaluate student success and has identified a continuous improvement process for use within a defined time period (three years). When the critical indicators are not achieved, corrective action is required and measured where performance indicators are deemed below requirements. Key long-term and short-term action projects are those directly related to the teaching and learning process and are identified in Long and Short Term Objectives by Strategic Priority (Figure 2.5).
- Action plans are developed and deployed according to processes outlined in the Strategic Guide for Planning and Resource Allocations (Figure 2.2). Each year, after consideration of key data sets (Figure 1.1), the CLC updates and validates the set of strategic priorities. These priorities describe the core strategies used to focus resources (people, tools, financial) to maximize progress toward the achievement of long and short-term goals (ends). This multiple action plan approach to plan ensures alignment between organizational and process strategies.
- Key performance indicators are provided in Strategic Planning System (Figure 2.1) for the Strategic Outcomes. The College Dashboard allows for monitoring of the Four Decision Drivers at all levels of the institution. The college seeks benchmark data from a number of sources including national averages, national “best in class”, Michigan averages, previous quality award winners (Baldrige and Pacesetter), and Vanguard Colleges.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- GRCC has identified three sources of competition: higher education, business and industry training, and distance learning providers. Comparative data for these competitors is not available or is not used to set stretch goals and develop breakthrough improvement initiatives. Targets are determined by projecting current performance, but without some reflection of competitors’ and best practice colleges’ performance, there is no basis to evaluate whether these targets will help GRCC achieve the desired level performance.
- The College Dashboard is deployed at all levels of the organization. Although some departments have been collecting and analyzing data for departmental planning purposes, departmental Dashboards are still in the early stages of deployment.

Category 3 – Student, Stakeholder, and Market Focus

3.1 Student, Stakeholder, and Market Knowledge

Strengths:

- The college has developed several joint ventures with other education providers. Collaboration enhances the ability of GRCC and its stakeholders to provide services to various student segments using various providers.
- The college regularly collects, monitors and analyzes data from surveys, focus groups, student demographics, placement testing, course evaluations, attendance at state and national conferences, Academic Foundations Programs, graduates, Five Year Program Reviews, Enrollment Scorecard, Community Conversations, Student Information Forum, Student Congress, New Student Orientation, Hispanic Student Organizations, Service Learning Advisory Board and Strategic Conversations. These are used to listen and learn regarding student and stakeholder needs and expectations.
- GRCC uses a variety of methods to keep current with educational service needs and directions, including admissions recruiters, school visits, Deans Council, environmental scanning processes, Street to Seat enrollment project, counselors, established partnerships, career pathways programs, early college programs unit/department leaders and enhanced technology.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- The newly development complaint management system is not yet deployed. Once deployed, it will be a source of information to analyze programs and to keep listening and learning methods current.

3.2 Student and Stakeholder Relationship and Satisfaction

Strengths:

- Several programs are in place to build relationships and attract and retain students and stakeholders. These programs include off site Learning Corner@Wealthy, Service Learning, volunteering projects, the Family Matters event, concurrent enrollment agreements with two local universities, running a joint program with another local community college, and a joint grant for Science Bridges program. Relationships are built with future students through outreach efforts including Early College, Tech Prep, Career Pathways, and Upward Bound. Cross-college teams, activities and collective off campus travel are used to build relationships among staff.
- GRCC determines student and stakeholder satisfaction through a regular schedule of surveys (Fig 1.1) and focus groups. Surveys include rating scales and open-ended questions and are beneficial in providing qualitative and quantitative results and actionable information. Data are tracked using the Dashboard system and are decision drivers.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- The newly developed complaint management is in the early stages of implementation; thus, the organization has been unable to gather and analyze information for planning educational programs, offerings, and services. This makes it difficult to determine the effectiveness of the listening and learning and other student and stakeholder focus processes.
- The key mechanisms for collecting feedback (survey, focus groups, forums) from students and stakeholders are dependent upon voluntary participation, thus making it difficult for the college to determine whether these volunteers represent the entire population. Without a representative group of respondents, the college may not be collecting feedback from a sample of the entire population of students and stakeholders, who may have different perspectives than the volunteers.
- The process for analyzing student and stakeholder results does not include segmenting the data, making it difficult to assess the organization's performance around diversity, for example, which has been identified as a Strategic Outcome/End.

Category 4 – Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management

4.1 Measurement and Analysis of Organizational Performance

Strengths:

- The primary tool for tracking overall organizational performance is the College Dashboard system (Figure 4.1). Each dashboard is organized around Four Decision Drivers: Learner Success, Satisfaction, Stewardship, and Utilization.
- GRCC gathers comparative information through ongoing environmental scanning, benchmarking, state and federal reports, national and professional organizations, credentialing entities, and business and industry best practices. The most-often used source of benchmark data is data from one or more of the twelve Vanguard colleges, identified by The League for Innovation in the Community College to provide evidence of best practice among community colleges.
- Senior leadership prepares organization progress reports to the Board of Trustees (BOT) though out the year. The BOT reviews these reports and prepares an official response to the President to guide future planning. Additionally, these reports serve as the basis for the President’s annual evaluation.
- The College Dashboard system is linked into the annual planning process. The process identifies short-term strategic priorities, aligns these with long-term goals (ends), and allocates annual resources. Utilizing whole systems engagement, the college develops action plans and defines the most appropriate indicators and measures to monitor daily operations and departmental performance. Organizational progress is tracked through the College Dashboard process to allow departments and units to monitor their most appropriate success indicators through a common dashboard template.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Departmental level Dashboards are in the early stages of deployment throughout the organization. Department level Dashboards have not been deployed to the classroom level, making it difficult to assess staff and student satisfaction with program offerings.
- While some initiatives such as the Dashboard process are in various stages of deployment; there is little evidence of refinement to other, more established processes as the result of organizational-level analysis and sharing of priorities for decision making and improvement.

4.2 Information and Knowledge Management

Strengths:

- Data and information needed to support daily operations and decision making are accessible from anywhere on campus via the college network, college web pages, and the Campus Wide Information System (CWIS). Employees have real time access to essential data through online inquiry and reporting templates. Students and faculty have access 24/7 to appropriate information.
- GRCC has identified that knowledge management consists of two components: (1) the availability of data and (2) the appropriate management structures and processes to turn data into information. Knowledge management is accomplished by having regular avenues for sharing information using teams, departments, and all staff meetings (Figure 4.3). The knowledge management system has been improved as a result of benchmarking and adopting best practices from outside the organization.
- The College Technology Leadership Team (CTLT) has been created to integrate leadership and strategic direction with IT and to ensure that the appropriate data are available to meet the stakeholders' needs. The Information Technology (IT) staff continually monitors all network and centralized computer infrastructure components to ensure that they are running properly and efficiently to guarantee the highest reliability and responsiveness. State of the art tools are used for tuning and safeguarding the college's system, providing immediate notification to appropriate IT staff when measured indicators are out of the norm and approaching critical ranges.
- Employees' access to institutional data is defined by job function and the related user profile, which provides the appropriate access to data and functions. To ensure the integrity and quality of institutional data and information, departments responsible for student, employee, and constituent data share common data entry standards and a shared decision-making model.
- Best practices are documented in a database that includes analysis of the GRCC's performance relative to the Vanguard Colleges. The CLC and Deans Council have systematically studied key practices at each college and analyzed how the GRCC compares to the benchmark. In addition, the Provost and Deans make an annual benchmarking trip to visit best practice institutions.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- While several continuous improvement teams are in place, there is no formalized process for organizational-level analysis and for sharing of knowledge and lessons learned among faculty and staff. For example, departmental Dashboards, a key initiative, are in the early stages of deployment and there has been limited communication between the various departments to share knowledge and lessons learned.

- Although there is a best practices database and some benchmarking is conducted, there is little knowledge of this below the leadership level of the organization.

Category 5 – Human Resource Focus

5.1 Work Systems

Strengths:

- Evolving work systems complement the traditional structure by incorporating an approach of integrated project teams. Staff and faculty have the opportunity to participate in cross-college teams and assist in setting the organizational direction, serving to motivate staff to develop to their full potential. Ninety percent (90%) of the members of the Strategy Team surveyed in April 2004 rated the team experience as valuable to them personally and to the organization. The Strategy Team has a revolving membership of 70 to 85 employees.
- The faculty evaluation process focuses on a faculty member's performance in five key areas: teaching, college service, student services, professional development, and community service. A leadership team of faculty and administrators provides ongoing support to the process. Adjunct faculty members are evaluated each semester. All other college staff members are evaluated using a variety of tools depending on employee function and group. The guiding principles behind the performance review and evaluation processes are the alignment of an individual's work goals and development plans to the college's mission, vision, values and ends, alignment to the department's strategic plans, and alignment to the individual's job requirement.
- A variety of formal and informal recognition processes are in place to encourage and recognize high-performance work, including formal recognition such as The Excellence in Education Award, The Salute to Women Award, and The Raider Spirit Award; and informal recognition such as: The Raider Salute (a peer-to-peer thank you card), and a toolkit provided to all supervisors with suggestions and ideas for informal recognition.
- The formal hiring process governing the recruitment, hiring, and retention of faculty and staff requires justification of hiring based upon an analysis of the position requirements along with anticipated growth and new program needs. This process includes proactive recruitment strategies aimed at attracting qualified minorities, women, and candidates with disabilities. Incentives are closely linked to the achievement of strategic processes and personal growth goals.
- New and changing skill set needs are monitored by supervisors and employees and tracked by the new Learning Management System. General technology skills that each faculty candidate, as well as all other job applicants, should possess have been established. Skill standards for non-union employees are defined by related job descriptions and updated annually based on changing job needs. A Faculty Profile has been created to guide the recruitment and hiring of new faculty and to assure the quality of instructional personnel.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- There are few processes in place to directly address capitalizing on the diverse ideas and culture of the hiring community.

5.2 Employee Learning and Motivation

Strengths:

- Faculty and staff education needs are linked to the strategic “ends” of the college, and two of the four annual “Learning Days” are allocated to address these needs. The President aligns training needs of individuals with the school’s objectives and prioritizes the most effective balance of course offerings and schedules. All staff members are required to participate in professional and/or staff development days each year. Learning Days are used to train employees and collect feedback on the training process and material. The feedback is used to ensure that future training will meet the needs of employees and will be useful on the job.
- Training on the mission, vision, values, campus safety, and other safety training is integrated into new employee orientation, which is held monthly. New employee orientation includes the use of mentors who have received additional training to communicate messages consistent with the applicant’s values.
- Data on faculty needs and wants are gathered in several ways. The CLT reports to the Provost Office and Dean Council. Through formal monthly meetings with the Dean of Instructional Design and Learning Technology, the CTL is made aware of learning needs and institutional changes being implemented by the academic area of the college. Data are collected from staff through surveys administered directly to faculty and through data collection at college-wide events. Performance evaluation systems are designed to identify the training and education needs of the faculty and staff. GRCC is currently systemizing the approach to individual employee learning to tie employee learning to the expectations of leadership while encouraging individual growth.
- Training through is delivered through a variety of methods, including traditional classroom settings, audio conferences, distance learning methods, self-paced tutorial computer training, and employee-to-employee mentoring. The Raider Learning Center, New Employee Orientation, College Connections, Diversity Learning Center, and the Strategy Teams are used to address key organizational needs.
- The effectiveness of education and training is evaluated by using the faculty and staff’s professional development plan, the unit/department plans, and the strategic ends report. Follow-up is conducted with department/unit supervisors for program evaluations. The college is in the process of devising a method to evaluate the effectiveness of training its impact of on job performance.
- A Talent Cultivation process is tied to core competencies, performance development discussions, and career planning. Succession planning for different levels is tracked by software and web-based portal systems. As work systems evolve and skill sets and job expectations change, succession planning involves the analysis of job expectations and key performance requirements. There are opportunities within the college for employees to assume various leadership positions for specific projects or temporary assignments, such as committee work and special assignments.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- There is no approach in place to motivate the faculty to implement Strategic Priority # 1, Improve the Learning Process, and Strategic Priority #2 Redesign Services to Increase Learner Success at the classroom level.
- Some process are in various stages of deployment. Evidence of refinement and innovation as the result of organizational-level analysis and sharing is not fully deployed to all areas of the organization

5.3 Faculty and Staff Well-Being and Satisfaction

Strengths:

- Several approaches are in place to maintain a work climate that supports the well-being of employees. The physical health of faculty and staff is encouraged by funding the Employee Wellness Team. The field house offers a fully equipped fitness center, free to all staff. The risk management team has developed an ergonomics assessment process. The Campus Police Department staff is certified in CPR and First Aid, and are “first responders” for any campus medical emergency.
- Safety in the Classroom training is offered for faculty members to learn techniques to de-escalate a potentially hostile or hazardous situation. A crisis communication plan has been developed and deployed to protect employees, students, and stakeholders in case of emergency or disaster.
- The Job Satisfaction Survey segments data between teaching and support staff members. The results are used as input into the strategic planning process and are reviewed at the annual staff retreat with action plans formed to address needed improvements. This assists the school toward becoming a management by fact organization.
- Faculty and staff surveys are used and findings are related to key organizational performance results to improve work environment and climate. Results are used to direct and inform changes in institutional processes and practices concerning employee issues.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Key factors that affect faculty and staff well being are determined using survey and focus groups that are dependent upon voluntary participation, which may bias the data without the college necessarily being aware of this.
- Metrics of well being and satisfaction other than the employee survey are lacking or do not appear to be used to develop improvements, such as absenteeism, turnover, safety, or other similar indicators.

Category 6 – Process Management

6.1 Learning Centered Processes

Strengths:

- The new Course Approval and Revised Course (CARP) includes a process for designing and revising key course requirements. This process addresses all coursework toward consistent outcomes, the use of diverse teaching strategies to meet students' needs, curriculum development, documented external needs, and documented system needs.
- A new program process is in place that is used to determine community needs. The program uses an environmental scan, advice from advisory boards on changing requirements from transfer institutions, and needs from student groups. The process includes a value-added review and input through analysis by departments, schools, and deans.
- Faculty and staff are prepared to deliver learning centered programs through (1) the Faculty Learning and Development of diverse teaching strategies, (2) Multimedia and Blackboard technology support, and (3) Customized Training as needed. Each program has its own unique key performance measures.
- GRCC has processes in place to maximize student success, to improve services, and to keep the process current with educational needs, such as counseling, tutoring, student technology, student activities, and academic support activities.
- Key process requirements are determined by using several methods, including environmental scanning, benchmarking data, analysis, listening, formal surveys, and 'anecdotal data collection'. Key requirements are centered on the values and are grounded in policies. The review, redesign, and feedback process includes cross-college teams, student feedback, and data analysis. The college uses techniques such as Kaizen and process mapping to improve processes.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- The fourteen key learning centered processes identified are in the early stages of deployment. Some of these processes are being developed to include measures on the Dashboard and are linked to the college's strategic planning process. Action plans are in place to develop the metrics. Once all metrics are developed and deployed, consistency with the mission, vision, and strategic outcomes is more likely to be achieved.
- The General Learning Outcomes Assessment (critical learning, technology skills, interpersonal skills, communication skills, information literacy, computational skills, diversity and community skills, and personal skills) identified by the League for Innovation of the Twenty-first Century has not been deployed throughout all classes.
- The CARP process, an important recent initiative, is not linked to the Dashboard or rolled up to the organizational strategic planning process. There is a lack of objective metrics for some processes, making it difficult for GRCC to ensure that these processes are executed as planned and designed.

6.2 Support Processes

Strengths:

- Key support processes are determined based on the needs of internal and external stakeholders with the goal of leveraging the relationship between school, its vendors, and service partners. Analyzing student learning assessments assists the organization in determining what support processes are needed. Support requirements are linked to the values and Dashboard performance measures, which are grounded in the strategic planning process.
- The College Dashboard System is the key performance measurement system used for day-to-day operations. Each department is expected to select key indicators. Department heads and directors monitor the performance results on a daily basis.
- Process or performance costs are minimized through three methods; staff management, clearly defined policies and procedures, and a continuous improvement program.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- For the key support processes identified in Figure 6.2 and in the organizational profile, several student requirements are identified such as advising, admissions, financial aid, counseling, facilities, and career planning; however, metrics for these key support processes are not consistently evaluated or deployed throughout Dashboard. The Dashboard itself is in the early stages of being cascaded down to all departments.

Category 7 – Results

7.1 Student Learning Results

Strengths:

- Fall to Fall Retention Rates (Fig. 7.1-1) indicates steady retention and rates approaching target levels overall. The Full-Time segment exceeds the target of 60% for the 02-03 year. Several segments exceed the Michigan average of 49%.
- Course Success Rates (Fig. 7.1-2) indicates steady performance over the five-year reporting period. Results for several segments exceed the target of 70% and Vanguard College benchmarks. Those segments meeting or exceeding the target are Female, Asian, White, Fulltime, Interactive TV, Modules, Off Campus, and Work Force Development.
- Transfer Student Success at 4-Year Colleges (Figure 7.1-3) results, which compares GRCC's students to native students at four year colleges, shows that students are matching or exceeding the native students' GPAs.
- The Graduation Rate (Fig. 7.1-4) reports improvement trends with performance approaching the target of 20%. Workforce Development graduation rates exceeds the target and the Vanguard Colleges benchmarks.
- Graduate Placement Success (Figures 7.1-6) indicates the percent of students employed or continuing at a four year college meets the state average.
- Preparation for Employment and Transfer (Figure 7.1-7) shows a positive trend for the percentage of students, indicating that GRCC prepares students to continue their education.
- State Licensing Exam Passing Rates (Figure 7.1.5) are tracked for several of the occupational programs. The percent of students passing these exams is an indicator of student performance results. Figure 7.1-5 shows the exam passing rates for RN's, LPN's, Dental Hygienists, Radiologic Technicians, and Occupational Therapy Assistants that are at or above target for four of the five professions measured.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Course Success Rates (Figure 7.1-2) indicates that the results segmented by student groups for five of the identified groups (Male, African American, American Indian, Hispanics, and Age 18-21 students) are below the school average percentage for Course Success Rates, and plans to address this are not evident.
- The Fall to Fall Retention Rates (Figure 7.1-1), for African American and other segments are lagging the overall college averages, which does not support the college's RAIDER values of Responsiveness and Diversity.

- Section 3.1a, Knowledge of Student Needs and Expectations, identifies key market segments as those seeking workforce degrees, transfer students, high school students pursuing dual enrollment/early college, adults seeking job training or retraining, apprentices, guest students, international students, development students, students pursuing personal interest, older learners, and members of special population. The results data are not segmented according to these important key markets. This lack of segmented data may make it difficult for GRCC to identify how effectively it is meeting the needs of these groups as well as how to target improvement strategies.

7.2 Student- and Stakeholder-Focused Results

Strengths:

- New Student Rating of Applicant Intake Experience, (Figure 7.2-1), demonstrates improvement over the past three years, with the fall 2003 rating of 46% approaching the target of 50%.
- Student Rating of Key Student Services (Figure 7.2-3) provides results of the Student Satisfaction Survey administered in 2002 and 2004. There are nine indicators tracked, with college above target for five of the indicators.
- Results for Graduate Ratings of Key Services (Figure 7.2-5) demonstrate a general positive trend in 11 out of 13 key service areas, over the reported five-year period. Three areas exceed the stated target of 40%.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Results are not segmented by key student and stakeholder demographic data important to the institution. The absence of segmentation makes it difficult for the college to prioritize improvements in specific demographic segments and ensure that targeted groups are having their needs met.
- Figure 7.2-3 Student Rating of Key Student Services provides data for two years; longer trends are not available. The performance is below targets and comparative data are not available.
- Figure 7.2-5 Student Ratings of Key Services shows that with the exception of the Library, Academic Support and Computer Labs, performance is below targets. Comparisons are not provided to evaluate relative performance.
- Comparative data are not reported for results in this Item. Without comparisons and benchmarks it is difficult to understand how the college evaluates its own performance and how meaningful targets are set to plan for improvements in areas most important to the long-term success of GRCC.

7.3 Budget, Financial, and Market Results

Strengths:

- Results for Unrestricted Net Assets as a Percent of Revenue (7.3-1) shows that the institution has consistently exceeded its target of 10% of the budget set aside for emergency purposes, demonstrating social responsibility.
- “Other Revenue” as a Percent of Total Revenue (Figure 7.3-3) shows that the college has been successful in generating income outside of the three traditional sources of funding.
- High School Market Share (Figure 7.3-4) demonstrates that GRCC has achieved a positive trend, with 30% high school seniors selecting the institution.
- General Fund Expenses/Instruction (Figure 7.3-5) shows that the college has exceeded the stated target of 47% (which is based upon the Michigan aggregate percentage) in each of the last three fiscal years.
- Tuition/Fees (Figure 7.3-6), reports that tuition/fees as a percentage of Michigan Public 4-Year Average shows a positive trend over the last three years with the 2002-03 fiscal year results meeting their target of 35%. Affordability is a key student requirement.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Figures 7.3.1, 7.3-2, 7.3-3, 7.3-4, 7.3-5 do not contain data to compare to direct competitors identified in the Organizational Profile or to the twelve Vanguard Colleges. Without comparisons with competitors, relevant peer colleges, or best practice colleges, it is difficult for GRCC to evaluate its own performance. For example, while the college has met its target for financial set-asides of 10%, without comparative data it is not clear why 10% is considered adequate or how it was derived.

7.4 Faculty and Staff Results

Strengths:

- PACE Climate Survey Trends (Figure 7.4-2) shows the entire staff rated the institution of each of the organization's values at a rate higher than the Pacesetter award winner in all the areas surveyed. While the college has not achieved its target, it performs at the national benchmark in each area.
- Faculty Survey Results-Center for Teaching and Learning (Figure 7.4-5) show a positive trend of faculty participation in the Center for Teaching and Learning.
- GRCC has placed strong emphasis on the strategic planning process and has used survey items from PACE to assess staff perceptions on items related to the process. Staff Ratings of Priority Items (Fig 7.4-6) reports that four measures indicate a positive/steady trend and three new items have been added for the most recent assessment year.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Raider Values are stated as important to the college. Results for the Staff Evaluation of GRCC Values /RAIDER Values (Figure 7.4-3) are not segmented by staff functions. Without segmenting results, GRCC may not be able to develop strategies to address the concerns of different segments or classifications of faculty and staff.
- No metrics of work system effectiveness and performance are available.

7.5 Organizational Effectiveness Results

Strengths:

- Figure 7.5-1 indicates that students are satisfied with instruction, including design and delivery (5-point scale).

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Student Satisfaction/Instructional Process (Figure 7.5-1) and data on Student Satisfaction/Campus Support Processes (Figure 7.5-2) indicates declining performance. The target is 4.0 or above and GRCC has only met the target in five of the thirteen areas. The information contains gaps and there are not enough data to establish trends. Furthermore, these data are not segmented by student demographics, preventing GRCC from developing targeted improvements in these student satisfaction measures in accordance with strategic priority # 2: To Increase Learning Success.
- Although Student Satisfaction/Campus Support Processes (Figure 7.5-2) identifies some of the student requirements and expectations, the student satisfaction survey does not measure many of the student requirements, such as financial aid, tuition, advising, career services, childcare, and registration.
- Objective measures of the performance of instructional design and delivery and key support processes are lacking. Student satisfaction with process performance is important, but these results are lagging indicators of how well the college is meeting the needs of its customers. Absent objective metrics of performance, GRCC is less prepared to be proactive and initiate improvements that may result in lower satisfaction levels in the future if not addressed.
- Data are not available for productivity, cycle time, supplier and partner performance, and other metrics of efficiency and effectiveness.
- There is a lack of comparative data for results in of organizational effectiveness. Without comparative data, it is difficult to determine how GRCC is able to evaluate its relative performance.

7.6 Governance and Social Responsibility Results

Strengths:

- GRCC is meeting its goal for social responsibility by exceeding all regulated areas of safety, health, law, and academia as reported in Governance and Social, Figure 7.6-1. The college uses the Executive Limitations for the President as a means of ensuring compliance with social responsibilities. Divisions or teams are responsible for ensuring that assigned requirements are met.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Trend data are not available in the area of governance and social responsibility.
- Comparative data are not available for the results provided.