

Coyote Community College Scorebook



Coyote Community College Scorebook

The Coyote Community College Case Study was prepared for use in the 2000 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Examiner Preparation Course. This report provides a sample scorebook for that case study.



The Coyote Community College Case Study describes a fictitious college. There is no connection between the Coyote Community College Case Study and any college, either named Coyote Community College or otherwise. Other organizations cited in the case study are also fictitious. To learn about successful quality practices based on real organizations, you can attend *Quest for Excellence*, the official conference of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award.

RECOMMENDED SCORING RANGES FOR THE COYOTE COMMUNITY COLLEGE CASE STUDY

Item	Scoring Range (%)
-------------	--------------------------

1.1	60–70
-----------	-------

1.2	55–65
-----------	-------

2.1	55–65
-----------	-------

2.2	50–60
-----------	-------

3.1	50–60
-----------	-------

3.2	45–55
-----------	-------

4.1	50–60
-----------	-------

4.2	50–60
-----------	-------

5.1	55–65
-----------	-------

5.2	45–55
-----------	-------

5.3	40–50
-----------	-------

6.1	55–65
-----------	-------

6.2	50–60
-----------	-------

6.3	50–60
-----------	-------

7.1	50–60
-----------	-------

7.2	35–45
-----------	-------

7.3	45–55
-----------	-------

7.4	45–55
-----------	-------

7.5	35–45
-----------	-------

Scoring Range (points):	485–585
--------------------------------	----------------

KEY FACTORS WORKSHEET

Basic Description of the Organization

- Comprehensive two-year public college in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Largest community college (19,880 students) and second largest state-supported post-secondary school in the state, with tuition rates 60% lower than nearby colleges.
- Campuses:
 - Main campus in downtown Albuquerque consists of seven classroom/lab buildings on 55 acres (44% of enrollment).
 - Branch campus in Bernalillo, 20 miles north of Albuquerque serves the Native American population from nearby reservations (25% of enrollment).
 - Branch campus in Armijo (southeast of Albuquerque) houses labs for hospitality; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC); hydrology; and electronics manufacturing programs (31% of enrollment).
- Programs and offerings in three major areas:
 - General Education, University Transfer Education, and Developmental Education offer programs leading to Associate of Arts degrees and Associate of Science degrees, as well as GED; ESL (15% of students); and remedial math, reading, and writing programs (60% of students). There are 11,500 students (7,000 FTEs) enrolled in traditional college degree programs. Approximately 65% of these students have been out of school for more than four years, with 52% using the applicant as a bridge to four-year degree curricula. More than 75% of students work full- or part-time. Approximately 44% receive financial aid and 28% receive employer reimbursement.
 - Workforce Development, Certificate Programs, and Continuing Education provide custom-designed, on-site training courses and services to local businesses. These programs also provide short-term certification courses (by contract and to the general public) and continuing education. There are 8,380 students (93% employed) enrolled in these programs. Approximately 84% receive training at their employers' expense.
 - Community outreach programs offer noncredit programs and community services including multi-cultural, recreational, and community development activities for lifelong learners. These programs service more than 9% of the adult population in the two surrounding counties each academic year.
- Student demographics:
 - 54% White, 32% Hispanic, 10% Native American, 3% African American, and 1% Other
 - Average age of students is 28.
 - Women account for 58% of students.
 - Approximately 92% of students are residents of the applicant's two-county service area. Most non-resident students come from the contract training program.
- Faculty and staff demographics:
 - 280 full-time faculty, 830 adjunct faculty, 40 administrators, and 150 support staff.
 - Faculty are members of the National Education Association union.

- 50% have master's, 40% doctoral, and 10% bachelor's degrees. Adjunct faculty hold at least a bachelor's degree, and 75% of administrators have master's degrees.
- Average length of employment is ten years; average age is 46. Average tenure for administrators is eight years.
- 67% White, 21% Hispanic, 5% Native American, 4% African American, and 3% Other.
- Operates within guidelines of the state's Commission on Higher Education and is approved by the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC), which establishes standards, policies, and practices and assesses and coordinates education needs and services for the entire state. The SBCC also appropriates state funding and approves tuition rates, programs and offerings, and major construction.
- Funding comes from a property tax levy and annual appropriations by the state's legislature, with spending over \$50,000 approved by the applicant's Board of Governors (BOG), the oversight body; private, nonprofit foundation is increasing contributions every year.
- Accredited in 1998 by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS) with the next review scheduled for 2008; 12 individual programs accredited by other organizations.
- Other regulations include OSHA, EPA, ADA, and financial aid guidelines.

Student and Stakeholder Requirements

- Students require skill development, accessibility, flexibility in scheduling, affordability, increased capacity for self-directed learning, responsive services, and effective curricula.
- Faculty and staff require professional development, feedback, support, and recognition.
- Four-year colleges and universities require prepared students.
- Employers require competency development, cost-efficient learning, innovative problem solving and team skills, leadership skills, computer proficiency, and professional proficiency.
- The SBCC and BOG require return on investment.
- Taxpayers and the community require fulfillment of education needs, support to region, and efficient expenditure of funding.

Relationships to Other Organizations

- Ten public high schools and four private high schools provide students; college faculty serve on local curriculum advisory boards.
- Five public universities receive students; faculty members serve on the applicant's Curriculum Advisory Teams.
- Articulation agreements define requirements of applicant and partner schools. These include agreements with feeder high schools and with all four-year institutions in the region.
- Other community organizations also provide students, such as the Bureau of Immigration Services and the Indian Affairs Office.
- Area employers are suppliers of students and receive graduates; targeted certificate programs are developed to meet the needs of these partners.

- State funding is dispersed based on a formula defined by the SBCC.
- Several support processes are outsourced, including the bookstore and intercampus transportation. Six other key suppliers provide materials and services. Southwest Systems Solutions also provides funds and expertise related to the applicant's information systems.

Competitive Situation

- High-cost or sparsely attended programs are distributed among state colleges, so other community colleges are not direct competitors, although they compete for funding.
- Competition comes from local proprietary (private, for-profit) colleges that offer shortened degree/certificate achievement cycle times and out-of-state community colleges that offer on-line programs and convenience but do not target needs of local employers, which is identified as a key differentiator for the applicant.
- Targeting individualized, technology-based delivery of education programs for employed adult students with specific skill development needs.
- Competitive success determined by addressing the time to complete programs and the range of programs offered, in addition to meeting student requirements.
- Planning to expand the off-campus student population while maintaining current levels of on-campus students.

Organizational Directions

- Adopted LEARN in 1994, a three-point philosophy of education that emphasizes learner-centered education, ongoing assessment of learning, and recognition of stakeholder needs. The applicant's vision is to become one of the leading community colleges in the nation. LEARN is the foundation for leadership decisions.
- Identified new groups of students, including economically disadvantaged students, single parents, and physically disabled students, in addition to traditional and non-English speaking students.
- Three technology-based strategies are underway to improve student learning and meet learner requirements: (1) incorporate technology and multimedia into the traditional classroom; (2) use computer-based instruction to allow students to progress at their own pace; and (3) utilize distance-learning delivery methods.
- Reorganized in 1995 into discipline-related teams, rather than campus-based structure, and replaced Campus President positions with Campus Director positions responsible for facilities.

KEY THEMES WORKSHEET

a. What are the most important strengths or outstanding practices (of potential value to other organizations) identified?

- The Leadership Team developed and implemented the LEARN philosophy in order to achieve the applicant's vision of becoming one of the leading community colleges in the nation. The LEARN philosophy provides a focus for the organization that supports several core values, including Learning-Centered Education, Organizational and Personal Learning, and Focus on Results and Creating Value. The Leadership Team is involved in setting and communicating direction and developing strategies through its participation in strategic planning and the development of the LEARNing Board. The Leadership Team values organizational and personal learning and sharing and provides a number of forums and opportunities to gain knowledge and share improvements and lessons learned.
- The applicant's team structure facilitates the achievement of educational objectives and high performance. Teams are aligned to strategic processes and are responsible for organizing and managing work and jobs for both faculty and staff. There are numerous opportunities for stakeholders to participate in developing strategies, deploying action plans throughout the organization, and improving processes. The team structure supports the applicant's focus on organizational learning and demonstrates the high value the applicant places on partnerships among faculty, staff, students, employers, and the communities. These partnerships help create an environment that focuses on students and learning and encourages collaboration and creativity.
- The six-phase strategic planning process incorporates the needs of most stakeholders. The LEARNing Board balanced scorecard and deployment of critical outcomes to Operational Quality Measures (OQMs) at the operational level enable communication and the deployment of values and performance expectations throughout the organization. Key inputs and considerations used in the development of strategies and goals are built around external and internal stakeholder input.
- The applicant uses a variety of formal and informal mechanisms to identify student and stakeholder needs and expectations and to further build relationships. Information regarding stakeholder needs is fed into the strategic planning process. Indicators of the quality and effectiveness of stakeholder relationships are built into LEARNing Board measures and are tracked and monitored.
- The Wide Integrated Learning Excellence Environment (WILEE) computer information system supports the applicant's performance management and measurement system. Key organizational, process, work group, and individual data and information are collected, analyzed, and used to measure and manage performance and drive improvement. The Academic Coordinated Measurement Environment (ACME) analysis system is integrated with WILEE to systematically link LEARNing Board measures to actionable OQMs and to ensure alignment with the strategic plan. ACME also supports analyses that establish causal relationships between processes.
- A team-based Curriculum Design Process ensures that objectives, skills, course sequencing, emerging technology, and the needs and requirements of key stakeholders are incorporated into curriculum design. Outcomes are monitored to ensure that students and faculty achieve learning objectives.

b. What are the most significant concerns, weaknesses, or vulnerabilities identified?

- Despite the Leadership Team’s longer-term direction to leverage technology, faculty, staff, and operational capabilities to improve learning, reduce cost, and improve accessibility, there is a lack of alignment around these strategies and the measures currently in place. Although three technology-based strategies are identified in the Overview, measures of utilizing distance-learning delivery methods are rarely discussed. The focus on attracting new groups of students (economically disadvantaged, single parents, and physically disabled) is addressed in some places; however, current processes do not appear to identify the special needs of these student segments. This lack of alignment and information makes it difficult to understand how the applicant will effectively manage this expansion and achieve near- and long-term goals.
- While the applicant states that it uses best-in-class data from within and outside the academic community, comparative data analyses appear limited to state averages or state best. There are no comparisons to key competitors identified in the Overview, including proprietary colleges and out-of-state on-line offerings. The lack of competitive data and best-in-class comparisons makes it difficult to understand how the applicant will achieve its goal of being one of the leading community colleges in the nation.
- While the applicant promotes shared organizational and personal learning, it has not focused on identifying the key attributes that satisfy faculty and staff and contribute to their well-being and development, nor does it appear that improvement strategies are established around these issues. In addition, there appears to be little differentiation in staff and faculty needs by category or ethnicity of employee. This lack of attention to the diverse needs of its workforce carries over into the student population, as the applicant provides little differentiation in the approaches and results for the student groups it is determined to attract.
- Although the applicant has three campuses and a number of facilities that could pose potential health and safety risks, such as the science, manufacturing, and technology laboratories, there is little evidence of a systematic, prevention-based approach for ensuring a safe and healthful workplace for all. Key measures and targets appear to be compliance oriented, and it does not appear that the applicant takes into account its differing work environments and requirements.
- Although there are a variety of ways for students or stakeholders to register a complaint, there is no evidence of a systematic approach for tracking, aggregating, and analyzing complaints in order to identify root causes, resolve complaints, and prevent recurrences.
- There is little evidence of systematic approaches for evaluating and improving the processes described throughout the application. In some cases, evaluation processes are limited in scope (e.g., evaluation of training), while in others the process is missing or described in general terms. Few examples of improvements derived from these processes are provided. Without a systematic evaluation of its approaches, it is difficult to understand how the organization drives ongoing improvement and organizational learning.

c. Considering the applicant's key organization factors, what are the most significant strengths, vulnerabilities, and/or gaps (data, comparisons, linkages) found in its results?

- Virtually all student performance results, including those related to attainment of skills and competencies, course and program completion, student persistence, and success of transfer students and graduates, are improving steadily. Levels for completion of occupational degree and certificate programs are approaching the national best, while other indicators compare favorably to the state average or local comparison, when provided.
- The focus on individualized learning and learner-centered education has resulted in increases since 1995 in the percentage of faculty and courses using technology, faculty mentoring, student use of individualized learning, and faculty and staff self-assessments. The number of organizations providing internships has also increased since 1997, providing students additional learning methods.
- Results demonstrate that the applicant is meeting or exceeding its financial performance goals and has made significant improvements in budgetary and revenue performance, even as education funding and spending have been constrained in recent years and the performance of other state institutions has been erratic. The organization is strengthening its budget and financial position and performance capabilities to better meet the competitive challenges and risks associated with functioning in a restricted state economy.
- Results data are missing in a number of significant areas, including effectiveness in increasing access to programs, achievement of human resource plans, cost control and fiscal effectiveness, supplier performance, organizational effectiveness, and the satisfaction levels of the SBCC, BOG, taxpayers, and community. The absence of results makes it difficult to understand how the applicant is evaluating its performance in these key areas.
- Results are reported in the aggregate and are not segmented to better understand the workforce and the student population or to address the strategic priorities of the applicant. The absence of segmented data makes it difficult to understand how the applicant evaluates relative performance in these areas and makes adjustments accordingly to better meet its strategic objectives.
- The lack of relevant comparative and competitive data makes it difficult to understand how the applicant evaluates its relative performance and sets aggressive improvement targets to achieve its goal of becoming one of the leading community colleges in the nation.
- Student satisfaction ratings are at or below the community college average for several key attributes listed in Figure 7.2-2 (e.g., financial aid, registration effectiveness, responsiveness to a diverse population, and schedule flexibility), all of which relate to key student requirements listed in the Overview.

CATEGORY WORKSHEETS

Category 1 Leadership (125 points)

STRENGTHS

- The President and the Leadership Team provide direction for the organization through the LEARN philosophy and leverage leadership through Process Teams. The Leadership Team and the Process Teams use the strategic planning process to set priorities and identify plans, goals, and measures that are aligned throughout the organization. The LEARN philosophy facilitates a focus on learning, an understanding of stakeholder needs and expectations, and measures to assess performance.
- The team operating structure provides an infrastructure for effective communication to set direction, obtain information needed for strategic planning, drive strategic plans into action plans, and review performance. Through their participation on Process Teams and subteams, students and key stakeholders are an integral part of the decision making process for strategic planning, performance review, and continuous improvement. The Leadership Team and the Process Teams are essential links to the entire organization for all leadership approaches and public responsibility.
- The Leadership Team participates in a variety of weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annual performance reviews, which are open to faculty, staff, and students. These reviews use a common format and incorporate a variety of inputs, including results of LEARNing Board measures (Figure 1.1-4) and data from the WILEE system. The Leadership Team derives key measures from a variety of internal sources and combines them with external data and information, such as stakeholder surveys, feedback from the state quality award process, and input from participation in community activities, to develop priorities for improvement. The Leadership Team's use of these measures and information in the strategic planning and periodic performance review processes demonstrate management by fact and using data to drive strategic decisions that will impact the applicant's future success.
- The wide variety of approaches used in setting, communicating, and deploying direction, reviewing performance, and addressing public responsibility all reflect a strong focus on students and stakeholders. A strong emphasis on two-way communication between the members of the Leadership Team and all stakeholders and reliance on a wide variety of communication vehicles provide an effective system for ensuring that plans and performance results are disseminated to all campuses, students, faculty, and staff.
- The applicant maintains an active relationship with its key communities, a factor of particular note because the applicant serves three service areas through its main campus and its two branch campuses. Through a strategic selection process, the applicant identifies opportunities for organizational involvement that will bring value to itself and its communities.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Individual involvement of the Leadership Team members in various leadership approaches and the breadth and depth of involvement by leaders, faculty, and staff in public responsibility activities are not apparent. Although a wide variety of approaches to leadership and community involvement provide ample opportunity for leaders to act as role models and for faculty and staff to practice good citizenship, lack of information concerning the extent of their involvement makes it difficult to understand whether the applicant's approaches reflect all aspects of the core values of visionary leadership and citizenship.

- Although the LEARNing Board provides an extensive set of measures for reviewing performance, it is not clear to what extent a number of factors are addressed in these reviews. These factors include: comparative and benchmark information; measures and targets related to state and local laws, rules, and regulations; accreditation measures and targets; and health and safety of students and other key stakeholders. Without this information, it is difficult to assess the extent to which the Leadership Team understands and addresses these factors in its leadership approaches.
- While results of the Leadership Team’s reviews are communicated and resultant plans are deployed internally to appropriate teams, there is no evidence of similar communications or deployment to other stakeholder groups, namely feeder high schools, receiving colleges and universities, employers, and the community. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant ensures adequate communication with these key stakeholders to build the partnerships described in the Overview.
- The measures and targets for Key Public Responsibilities (Figure 1.2-1) only address basic federal requirements. Other areas of public responsibility, such as state and local laws, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS) accreditation requirements, and health and safety of students and stakeholders, are not addressed. It is also not clear how targets are established for the existing measures. Without this information, it is difficult to determine if the applicant’s measures are driving continuous improvement rather than mere compliance.

Category 2 Strategic Planning (85 points)

STRENGTHS

- The applicant's formal, six-phase strategic planning process gathers stakeholder input and identifies LEARNing Board critical outcomes and measures to focus on areas of critical importance to stakeholders and fulfill the mission for each stakeholder to achieve lifelong learning opportunities to succeed in a global society. Action plans are developed that link to the strategy, and all Process Team action plans are integrated into the organizational Operating Plan. Opportunity ratings for LEARNing Board outcomes are determined through a process that considers the importance of the outcomes and current stakeholder satisfaction.
- Students and most essential stakeholders are involved in the strategy development and deployment process to ensure that their requirements are reflected in the strategic initiatives and action plans. Participation in Process Teams ensures that stakeholders understand performance expectations and are involved in performance reviews, which ensures alignment of students and stakeholders with strategic direction throughout the organization.
- Based on the vision and mission and stakeholder inputs, the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) develops critical outcomes for each of four LEARNing Board views (Figure 2.1-3). LEARNing Board measures are based on these outcomes, and, at the operational level, Operational Quality Measures (OQMs) are linked to the LEARNing Board measures and action plans. This approach links strategic direction and priorities to day-to-day operations and individual work and supports the applicant's drive toward its vision by aligning effort and focus.
- Near- and long-term strategic objectives (Figures 2.1-4 and 2.1-5) and action plans (Figure 2.2-1) reflect the LEARN philosophy and demonstrate the strategic alignment of the organization. The team operating structure provides the necessary linkage to ensure that this alignment is extended through subteams, academic divisions, and support offices.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- While the applicant compares its projected performance to the expected performance of other state community colleges, it does not appear to use performance data for key competitors (e.g., private colleges, distance-learning institutions, and national best performers) in the strategic planning process. The absence of comparative data for key competitors and best-in-class performance makes it difficult to understand how the applicant determines whether its plans are sufficient to achieve its vision of becoming one of the leading community colleges in the nation.
- Although the balanced scorecard approach (Figure 1.1-4) represents key measures used to monitor performance, only a small segment of these measures are addressed in the planning process. It is not clear how the 15 LEARNing Board outcomes (Figure 2.1-3) not selected as strategic objectives are considered in the planning process, nor is it clear whether performance projections, comparisons, and/or OQMs are developed for LEARNing Board measures not tied directly to strategic objectives (Figure 2.2-1). This makes it difficult to understand whether the applicant's approach for plan development and deployment is effective and to assess its rate of progress in key areas, including student outcomes, student success, and curriculum.
- It is not clear how resource allocation decisions are made across strategic objectives and/or Process Teams. Also, it appears that each Process Team develops its own action plans to support the strategic objectives, although ownership of four of the five strategic objectives is shared by two teams (Figures 2.1-4 and 2.1-5). This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant ensures alignment of action plans.

Category 3 Student and Stakeholder Focus (85 points)

STRENGTHS

- The applicant uses a variety of formal and informal methods to identify the needs and expectations of its students and to monitor student utilization of offerings, facilities, and services. These data are aggregated in WILEE and used by the Leadership Team, Process Teams, divisions, and offices to drive strategic initiatives and ongoing improvement activities.
- The applicant uses a variety of approaches to build and maintain relationships with students and key stakeholder groups. Twenty LEARNing Board measures related specifically to student and stakeholder needs enable the Leadership Team to assess relationships with each of these groups.
- The applicant uses a systematic Student Satisfaction Survey for determining student satisfaction, which allows for a comprehensive assessment of key areas throughout the college. Results are segmented in a variety of ways and can be compared to national averages and scores from 300 other community colleges. This approach enables the applicant to fully determine satisfaction levels of students and drive future improvements.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although the applicant provides a variety of methods for registering a complaint, there is little evidence of a systematic approach for collecting, aggregating, and analyzing complaint information in order to identify root causes and prevent their recurrence. This makes it difficult to understand how this information is used for planning purposes or for improving the applicant's educational services, programs, and offerings.
- It is not clear how the applicant segments results from the Student Satisfaction Survey in order to determine satisfaction levels for all of its key student segments. There is little evidence of systematic approaches for determining and using satisfaction results for stakeholders other than students. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant effectively monitors student and stakeholder satisfaction in order to obtain actionable information that drives improvements.
- There is little evidence of a systematic approach for following up on interactions with students and key stakeholders that allows the applicant to address the issue, record the interaction, or track the results. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant determines the overall effectiveness of follow-up processes and how they affect overall performance.
- Although the applicant's approaches for determining student needs and expectations, building and maintaining student and stakeholder relationships, and determining student and stakeholder satisfaction are evaluated annually, it is not clear how these evaluations are carried out. There are also limited examples of improvements resulting from these evaluations. This makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the approaches in driving improvement and organizational learning.

Category 4 Information and Analysis (85 points)

STRENGTHS

- The Data Management Team (DMT), the applicant's Research Center (CRC), and the Leadership Team all ensure that data and information are aligned with the LEARN environment. Since 1997, the applicant has used a balanced scorecard approach, the LEARNing Board, to monitor performance across all stakeholder groups. During the annual planning process, the Leadership Team reviews the LEARNing Board measures to ensure that they support the organization's strategic objectives and systematically links lower-level Operational Quality Measures (OQMs) to the LEARNing Board measures.
- The applicant uses WILEE and ACME to perform a variety of analyses of LEARNing Board measures and OQMs in support of organizational performance reviews and planning. These include ongoing and ad hoc analyses by Process Teams and subteams, trend and correlation analyses by the CRC and IS Office, and organization-level analyses by the Leadership Team. The linkages within this measurement system, as well as its alignment with the organization's strategic objectives and stakeholder needs, ensure that data analyses address the overall health of the organization and support the LEARN philosophy.
- The applicant uses several approaches to ensure that analyses address faculty/staff or educational program processes, thereby supporting effective decision making. The CRC develops relationship maps between key results measures and learning and educational program processes which it uses to perform quarterly correlation analyses, to predict success or demonstrate outcomes of educational programs and student performance, and to develop reports for external stakeholders and grants. The Learning Team also contributes by investigating new approaches for measuring student performance and organization-level learning.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although WILEE and ACME provide the capability to perform analyses to support daily operations, it is not clear if this capability is deployed beyond Process Teams and subteams. For example, it is not clear what analyses are performed or used by individual faculty members or administrative staff to improve student performance or support processes, respectively.
- There is no evidence that the LEARNing Board process addresses cost/benefit options and the impact on financial and budgetary outcomes. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant effectively allocates limited resources.
- Although the applicant provides comparisons for state academic, financial, and faculty performance results, it is not clear how these comparative data or other competitive comparisons are considered as part of the organization's various analyses. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant monitors its progress and evaluates current performance levels in order to develop strategies to achieve the vision of becoming one of the nation's leading community colleges.
- Although measures are reviewed annually and plans are in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the LEARNing Board in the future, there is little evidence of a systematic approach for ensuring that the overall measurement systems stay current with changing educational needs. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant ensures that its measurement systems and resulting analyses continue to support the needs of the organization and its students and stakeholders.

Category 5 Faculty and Staff Focus (85 points)

STRENGTHS

- The applicant's team-based operating structure fosters cross-functional communication and collaboration throughout the organization, which in turn drives innovation and individual initiative. The Leadership Team and the five key Process Teams create an environment with a strong focus on students and learning, and support the development of faculty and staff, enabling them to adapt to change. Because the teams are aligned with the organization's key processes and are responsible for developing and managing related action plans, they encourage high performance, process improvement, and innovation. The involvement of faculty, staff, and students on these teams promotes cooperation and collaboration among these groups.
- The applicant's approach to performance management ensures the basic alignment of human resource management with the organization's overall mission and strategy. All faculty and staff are encouraged to develop their full potential through Individual Development Plans (IDPs) and the multi-tiered compensation system, which emphasizes the development of skills and capabilities in support of the applicant's strategic objectives and the LEARN philosophy. A formal orientation program, mentoring process, and Master Learning Facilitators are instrumental in the development of new faculty.
- The approach for faculty and staff education and training is integrated with the performance management system and aligned with the organization's mission and strategy. Faculty and staff use Guidebooks published by the Learning Team to identify their individual training needs. These needs are aggregated at the organization level and by each division and office to align individual needs with goals and to develop training plans. Approaches for identifying and prioritizing training needs ensure that education and training take into account both organizational and individual needs.
- Multiple formal and informal evaluation methods and measures (Figure 5.3-2) are used to determine faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation. In addition to an annual formal faculty and staff satisfaction survey, other approaches such as internal focus groups, Brown Bag Lunches, and measures of turnover and workers compensation are used to help determine satisfaction. These approaches are linked to the team-based operating structure through the Leadership Team and the Human Resource subteam for inclusion in process reviews and for strategic planning purposes.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- It is unclear whether the performance management system completely supports the organization's team-based operating structure. For example, it is not clear how team skills and team performance are addressed in the IDP, performance evaluation, and compensation processes. It appears that some of these performance management components are more reflective of individual achievement than team-based achievement.
- Although several approaches are used to facilitate workplace health and safety, there appears to be little emphasis given to the health and safety exposures inherent in the applicant's differing work environments. For example, the applicant does not appear to address the unique health and safety risks associated with the science, manufacturing, or technology laboratories at the various campuses. Without specific approaches and health and safety measures, it is not clear how the applicant can effectively address health and safety concerns in its differing work environments.

- It is not clear how the applicant identifies the key factors contributing to faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation or how it tailors its satisfaction determination approaches to the needs of its various categories and types of faculty and staff. While the Leadership Team considers several sources of input when evaluating faculty and staff satisfaction, it is not clear how these data are aggregated and analyzed, or how opportunities for improvement are identified and addressed. This makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the applicant's approaches to satisfaction determination and evaluation.

Category 6 Educational and Support Process Management (85 points)

STRENGTHS

- The applicant uses a systematic Curriculum Design Process to develop new educational programs and course offerings. This process defines specific roles for the Leadership Team, Learning Team, and Curriculum Teams and ensures the development of courses, curricula, delivery methods, and assessment strategies that are based on student and stakeholder needs, are aligned with strategic and operating plans, and which satisfy BOG, SBCC, and accreditation and certification requirements.
- The applicant demonstrates its commitment to learner-centered education through the LEARN philosophy that is pervasive across all aspects and levels of the organization. The attention to individual learning styles and preferences in course and program design demonstrates that instruction is learner-centered with in-process and outcome measures of student performance linked directly back to LEARNing Board measures. The Curriculum Design Process integrates input from key stakeholders to ensure that their needs are addressed and expectations are met. The applicant is also using technology in its program design to support the differing levels of interactivity, learning styles, and self-paced learning required by its students.
- Performance indicators on three instructional objectives established by the Learning Team are developed for each course by faculty during the annual planning process. These indicators, which are linked to LEARNing Board indicators (e.g., student performance, employability, enrollment trends, satisfaction, and persistence), are included in the faculty IDPs and used by the Learning and Leadership Teams to monitor student achievement of divisional and organization-wide objectives.
- The applicant uses a variety of approaches to develop partnerships that facilitate student transitions into and from the college. These include articulation agreements with both feeder and receiving schools, a High School Joint Council, and inclusion of colleges and universities, as well as employers, on its advisory boards and teams. The applicant has also formed strong partnerships with the organizations to which it has outsourced the bookstore and on-campus transportation, thus ensuring their ability to support the applicant's strategies and action plans.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- While the Curriculum Design Process is used to design and revise full degree programs, the design process for developing individual courses, contract training, or community development programs is not as clear. This makes it difficult to determine how the applicant incorporates all key aspects of learner-centered education design and delivery, as well as key performance requirements, into these program offerings so that the organization is systematically aligned with its LEARNing Board critical outcomes.
- Although the applicant identifies requirements and measures for its educational programs and offerings, it does not appear to be as systematic for support processes. A lack of definition of the requirements for key support processes makes it difficult to determine how these processes combine to support overall organizational performance.
- While the applicant describes a number of improvements in its design and delivery processes, and there are measures for various partnering processes, it is not clear that these are linked to a systematic evaluation and improvement process. Approaches for sharing improvements across the organization are not sufficiently described to understand how they ensure that improvements are deployed to all relevant areas.

Category 7 Organizational Performance Results (450 points)

STRENGTHS

- Most student performance results, including those related to attainment of skills and competencies, course and program completion, student persistence, and success of transfer students and graduates, are improving steadily. Levels for completion of occupational degree and certificate programs (Figure 7.1-2) are approaching the national best, while other indicators compare favorably to the state average or local comparison, when provided.
- Trends in student satisfaction are generally positive and compare favorably to the community college average, both overall and at the attribute and segment levels. Stakeholder satisfaction results are also improving. These results demonstrate that the applicant has been successful in identifying and addressing student and stakeholder needs.
- Indicators of financial performance improved steadily over the past five years, reflecting the applicant's focus on fiscal efficiency. In particular, overall revenues increased significantly, due primarily to increased enrollments, and resource utilization and budget management also improved.
- Trends for most human resource indicators, including those for satisfaction, turnover, and faculty and staff development and involvement, are positive or remain at relatively high levels. These results reflect the applicant's ongoing focus on the needs and expectations of its faculty and staff.
- Organizational effectiveness results demonstrate steady improvement in several areas of importance to the applicant's strategic objectives, including curriculum development cycle time, enrollment of disadvantaged students, implementation of individualized learning and approaches to increase learner involvement in active learning, and availability and use of technology.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Most student performance results are not segmented by student type, which makes it difficult to assess performance at the segment level. Trends for student persistence are relatively flat for the economically disadvantaged and single parent segments. Few student satisfaction attribute ratings improved for non-degree and contract segments, and overall satisfaction for the credit segment is also lagging. These results indicate that the applicant may not be meeting some needs for specific student segments.
- Student satisfaction ratings are at or below the community college average for several key attributes listed in Figure 7.2-2 (e.g., financial aid, registration effectiveness, responsiveness to a diverse population, and schedule flexibility), all of which relate to key student requirements identified in the Overview. Performance levels for student satisfaction with transportation and food service are significantly lower than for other attributes, which makes it difficult to assess the applicant's approaches for managing its outsourcing partners.
- Results are not provided for many key performance indicators discussed throughout the application. There are no results reported on the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the SBCC, BOG, taxpayers, and the community. Results are also lacking for most of the key measures related to the long-term action plan to increase access to programs and related human resource plans identified in Figure 2.2-1 and key organizational effectiveness goals identified in Figure 6.2-1. Comprehensive results related to faculty and staff well-being are lacking, specifically technology use, work environment, and well-being results, which are either not shown in sufficient detail to fully understand the significance of the applicant's performance

levels or are omitted altogether. Without comprehensive performance results, it is difficult to evaluate the applicant's performance in these areas, which are important for it to achieve its strategic goals.

- The applicant does not provide meaningful comparative data for most results. While state average or state best comparisons are sometimes provided, there are few comparisons to national leaders and none to direct competitors identified in the Overview, such as local proprietary schools and out-of-state community colleges offering on-line programs. Without comparisons to best-in-class and direct competitors, it is difficult to understand how the applicant evaluates its relative performance and develops performance targets that address its core value of promoting innovation and discovery. The lack of these comparisons also makes it difficult to understand how the applicant assesses whether its rate of improvement is adequate to achieve its vision of becoming one of the leading community colleges in the nation.

ITEM WORKSHEETS

Item 1.1 Organizational Leadership (85 points)

	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+	a	The team operating structure (Figure 1.1-1) provides the President and Leadership Team with an infrastructure for guiding the organization. This infrastructure facilitates setting direction; communicating vision, mission, values, and performance expectations; and deploying the LEARN philosophy throughout the organization. Through involvement of faculty, staff, students, and other stakeholders in Process Teams and ad hoc subteams, this infrastructure, coupled with the strategic planning process, enables the Leadership Team to create and balance value for students and stakeholders.
++	a	A key component of the applicant's vision of shifting from an internally focused teaching organization to an externally focused "learning center" has been the LEARN philosophy, which provides the structure for performance measurement and review and which drives daily decision making. LEARN also provides direction for the strategic planning process and structure for communicating accomplishments and results. The LEARN philosophy provides a focus for the organization that supports several core values, including Learning-Centered Education, Organizational and Personal Learning, and Focus on Results and Creating Value.
+	a	The Leadership Team and Process Teams use a wide variety of approaches to communicate values, strategic direction, LEARN, and performance results. All stakeholder groups participate in the communication process, either through their involvement in Process Teams or subteams, or through attendance at events such as the monthly Board of Governors (BOG) meeting. The variety of approaches to communication helps the applicant ensure that "listening" and "talking" posts address all key stakeholders.
+	a	Using a wide range of information from both internal and external stakeholder sources, the Leadership Team and the Process Teams implement a strategic planning process to set direction and address opportunities for the organization. The planning process includes the use of an annual assessment by Thinkers Nearing Tomorrow (TNT), which considers the future role of the applicant in light of changing trends and potential developments in the community college and technological environments. This approach has led to the development of three technology-based strategies that address current and future student learning needs.
++	b	The Leadership Team participates in a variety of weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annual performance reviews (Figure 1.1-3), which are open to faculty, staff, and students. These reviews focus on a balanced scorecard of performance measures, the LEARNing Board (Figure 1.1-4), which demonstrates how well the organization is operating and where improvement is needed. These reviews provide a comprehensive approach for translating performance findings into priorities for improvement and a mechanism for deploying findings and opportunities throughout the organization.

-- / --	Area to Address	(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
–	a,b	It is not clear to what extent all members of the Leadership Team actually participate in creating and maintaining a learning environment, communicating the mission/vision/ core values, and reinforcing ethical behavior. There is also little evidence of a systematic approach for evaluating and improving the effectiveness of the Leadership Team. This makes it difficult to understand the extent to which each member of the Leadership Team serves as a role model, reinforces the LEARN philosophy, and improves their leadership effectiveness.
–	b	Although the Leadership Team conducts periodic performance reviews and assessments to improve the organization’s effectiveness, there is no evidence that comparative data or benchmarks are used in these reviews. It is also not clear how these reviews are translated into key opportunities for improvement or how they are used to develop opportunities for innovation. This makes it difficult to understand how the Leadership Team ensures that performance goals are appropriate, and how it uses performance reviews to drive towards the vision of becoming one of the nation’s leading community colleges.
–	b	Although the Leadership Team communicates review findings and deploys resultant plans internally to appropriate teams, there is no evidence of similar communications or deployment to other stakeholder groups, including feeder high schools, receiving colleges and universities, employers, and the community. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant ensures adequate communication with these key stakeholders, other than inclusion on process subteams, in order to develop the partnerships described in the Overview.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the extent of involvement of all members of the Leadership Team in the team operating structure, promoting and supporting the LEARN philosophy, various communication activities, the strategic planning process, weekly LEARNing Board reviews, and other periodic reviews.
- Clarify the use of comparative data and benchmarks in periodic performance reviews. Clarify how the Leadership Team translates review findings into priorities for improvement and opportunities for innovation.
- Clarify communication and plan deployment to feeder high schools, receiving colleges and universities, employers, and the community.

Item 1.2 Public Responsibility and Citizenship (40 points)

	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+ / + +		
+	a	Through the strategic planning process, the Leadership Team assesses the organization's regulatory and legal environment, evaluates associated risks, and develops priorities, measures, goals, and plans related to laws, rules, regulations, and community involvement. Key measures associated with health and safety, environmental protection, and equal opportunity employment are shown in Figure 1.2-1. The strategic planning process and related performance measures help ensure that public responsibility is a key component of organizational action plans and reviews.
+	a	The applicant interacts with a variety of community groups and representatives to gather information relating to current and emerging community needs. These interactions include participating in a network of community agencies with a shared mission of community improvement, regular meetings with the Chamber of Commerce and the mayor, and faculty participation on local school boards. Information gathered from these sources is factored into the annual planning process and used to address public concerns with the applicant's operations.
+	a	The Code of Ethics for students, faculty, and staff was developed by a cross-functional team representing each of these stakeholders. The Code of Ethics is communicated in six hours of training for new faculty and administrative staff, three hours of training for new support staff, and a presentation at orientation for new students. Ethical practices are reinforced quarterly with professional, administrative, and support staff, and with students through Town Hall Meetings and case studies in the school newspaper. This continuous dialogue reinforces the importance of ethical practices in all student and stakeholder interactions.
+	b	The Leadership Team uses selection criteria to target community activities as part of the strategic planning process. The criteria ensure that community activities are consistent with the applicant's values, supported by the community, and result in a positive impact. Involvement in the National Technology Literacy Challenge and the applicant's support of various local health organizations demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach.
+	b	The applicant implements service learning programs to involve students in organized community service. These programs address community needs while developing the students' academic skills, sense of civic responsibility, and commitment to community. With 92% of the applicant's students coming from the surrounding two-county area, these community service programs demonstrate the applicant's active involvement in strengthening its key communities.

Area to Address	(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
--	a Although the applicant provides several measures and targets for key public responsibilities (Figure 1.2-1), these measures only address basic federal requirements. There are no measures and targets for other key areas of public responsibility, including state and local laws, rules, and regulations; accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS) and other appropriate organizations; and the health and safety of students and other key stakeholders. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant adequately anticipates and reacts to all public concerns with current and future operations in order to proactively address key public responsibilities.
--	a Although the applicant uses a comprehensive approach for communicating the Code of Ethics, it is not clear how it ensures that the Code of Ethics is followed. It is also not clear how faculty are trained in the Code of Ethics. Without faculty training or practices, measures, and targets reflecting student and faculty behavior as it relates to the Code of Ethics, it is difficult to understand how the applicant determines whether the Code of Ethics is being followed.
--	b Although the breadth of community involvement and activities indicates that senior leaders, faculty, and staff are involved in community support, there is little evidence of the level and depth of that support. Without more information regarding who is involved with the various programs described in the application, it is difficult to assess the extent to which the faculty and staff support the applicant's key communities.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the Leadership Team's ability to develop appropriate priorities, measures, goals, and plans that address public responsibilities using the strategic planning process. Verify the information flowing into the strategic planning process from public stakeholders as well as the effectiveness of the applicant's criteria for targeting community activities.
- Verify the effectiveness of the applicant's approaches supporting ethical practices, and clarify how the applicant trains faculty in the Code of Ethics and ensures that the Code of Ethics is followed by faculty and staff.
- Clarify the extent to which the applicant addresses practices, measures, and targets related to public responsibility beyond the scope of federal rules and regulations.
- Clarify the level and depth to which leaders, faculty, and staff are involved in community support and clarify the extent to which the applicant refines and improves its approaches to public responsibility and community support.

Item 2.1 Strategy Development (40 points)

	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
++	a	The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) spearheads the strategic planning process using a comprehensive, six-phase process that has been adopted by the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) as a model for strategic planning throughout the state. The process leads the SPC through identifying critical outcomes (Figure 2.1-3), developing appropriate measures, and prioritizing essential near- and long-term goals and objectives (Figures 2.1-4 and 2.1-5). Refinement of the process since its inception in 1994 has enabled the applicant to deploy strategic initiatives more effectively.
+	a	The SPC uses a variety of approaches to collect input from multiple stakeholders including the BOG, SBCC, accreditation agencies, students, employers, four-year colleges, high schools, faculty, and staff (Figures 2.1-1 and 2.1-2). Additional information used in the strategic planning process includes LEARNing Board performance outcomes (Figure 1.1-4), student/stakeholder needs (Figures 2.1-1 and 2.1-2), expectations and future requirements, curricula information, college and university data, current capabilities, emerging learning technologies, and assessments. This array of input enables the applicant to develop objectives based upon relevant and essential data from stakeholders, and ensures that the planning process is fact based and future oriented.
+	b	The organization presents three key near-term and two key long-term strategic objectives, along with four major program/delivery changes required to support the strategic objectives. LEARNing Board measures and owners are identified for each strategic objective. Associated action plans incorporate the concerns of key stakeholders and are focused on the near- and long-term strategic objectives of cost effectiveness, skilled and productive faculty and staff, increased value of programs, and program accessibility.
+	b	The strategic objectives are identified using a prioritization process in which the SPC calculates an opportunity rating that is based on the importance of the outcome and key stakeholder satisfaction levels. Long-term objectives reflect information related to demographics, employment, and business trends, emerging technologies, and long-term success factors, and both near- and long-term objectives are developed from strengths and opportunities identified during Phases I and II of the planning process. This data-driven prioritization process allows the SPC, along with process owners and subteam leaders, to select the strategies that are most beneficial to stakeholders and the organization.

– / – –	Area to Address	(–) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
–	a	Although the applicant uses an extensive array of data in the planning process, inputs related to its competitive environment, operational capabilities, budgetary risks, and resource needs and availability appear to be limited in scope. For example, it is unclear how competitive implications associated with school growth, individualized learning, technology-based delivery of educational programs, and costs are linked to the critical strategic objectives. This makes it difficult to understand how the organization identifies strategic objectives that effectively address the challenges from local proprietary colleges and out-of-state community colleges offering on-line programs, which may impact the applicant’s ability to achieve its vision of becoming one of the leading community colleges in the nation.
–	a	There is little evidence that the applicant systematically considers either supplier capabilities or its own ability to meet student learning and development needs during the planning process. Other than having two suppliers represented on the Business Support Services Team, it is not clear how key suppliers participate in the planning process, nor is it clear whether input from potential students is related to existing programs and course offerings or to new courses and programs. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant’s planning process effectively considers information related to emerging practices in order to effectively plan for future directions such as distance learning and increased use of technology.
–	b	Although the Overview describes three critical strategies for technology investment designed to improve student learning and meet learner requirements, this emphasis does not appear to be reflected in the strategic objectives listed in Figures 2.1-4 and 2.1-5. This makes it difficult to understand how these three key technology strategies are translated into key objectives and action plans in order to ensure alignment of actions and strategic intent.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the SPC’s use of the strategic planning process, and clarify how the process considers key competitive implications. Clarify how the process considers supplier capabilities and the applicant’s own ability to meet student learning and development needs.
- Clarify alignment between key technology strategies and the applicant’s key objectives and action plans.
- Clarify how the applicant ensures the collection of information it has identified as critical, and verify the types of information used in the planning process.

Item 2.2 Strategy Deployment (45 points)

+ / + +	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+	a	The applicant's team operating structure ensures that strategic objectives identified by the SPC and Leadership Team are used by responsible Process Teams to develop action plans and goals through the involvement of subteams, academic divisions, and support offices. The SPC integrates all of the Process Team action plans into an overall Operating Plan. Action plans are linked with LEARNing Board measures, targets, resource requirements, budgetary needs, and key milestones (Figure 2.2-1). This approach ensures alignment of action plans with strategic objectives and provides an opportunity for widespread involvement in the planning process by faculty, staff, and students.
+	a	Human resource plans (Figure 2.2-2) addressing faculty and staff requirements in terms of recruitment needs, changes in work design, and preparation and development needs are identified for each of the five strategic objectives. This facilitates development of the work designs and human resource capabilities required to achieve the strategic objectives. These plans also reflect the applicant's value of faculty and staff and the LEARN philosophy.
+	b	LEARNing Board measures (Figure 1.1-4) are defined based on LEARNing Board outcomes during the planning process, and all operational action plans are linked to at least one of these measures. Each Process Team also develops lower-level Operational Quality Measures (OQMs) that are linked to or support the LEARNing Board. This allows the Leadership Team to track progress and maintain alignment of strategic objectives.
+	b	Strategic objectives and LEARNing Board measures are communicated at campus all-hands meetings, by posting on the Intranet, and through chat room discussions. Operational action plans are also posted on the Intranet, and progress reports are provided on a monthly basis. These approaches enable key internal stakeholders to have access to the plans and monitor performance against them.
+	b	The applicant presents three-year projections for near- and long-term action plans (Figure 2.2-1), along with comparative performance data for other community colleges in the state. These projections allow the applicant to assess the impact of key plans on its leadership position among community colleges in the state.
- / - -	Area to Address	(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
-	a	While Process Teams work with subteams to determine budget requirements to support their plans, it is not clear how decisions for resource allocations are made and priorities are established among the different Process Teams. There is little evidence that the applicant uses a systematic process or criteria to prioritize needs or make decisions regarding use of its limited resources. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant allocates resources effectively in order to support the strategic plan.

- a It is not clear if the applicant develops performance projections, comparisons, and/or OQMs for LEARNing Board measures not directly linked to strategic objectives (Figure 2.2-1), since projections are only provided for five measures directly linked to the LEARNing Board. In addition, it appears that the applicant has already reached several of the key performance targets presented in Figure 2.2-1 such as for direct costs as a percent of total budget. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant assesses its rate of progress in key areas, including student outcomes, student success, and curriculum in order to set stretch targets as a basis for continuous improvement.
- b Although performance projections are compared to the expected performance of other state community colleges, there are no comparative data for key competitors such as proprietary colleges, on-line programs, and national best performers. Without more complete comparisons reflecting the best-performing community colleges in the nation, it is difficult to understand how the applicant determines if its plans are sufficient to achieve its vision of becoming one of the nation’s leading community colleges.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify deployment of action plans throughout the various Process Teams, subteams, and divisions. Verify linkages between performance measures, OQMs, and action plans throughout the organization.
- Clarify extent to which comparisons are developed for measures included on the LEARNing Board. Clarify targets relative to current performance levels. Clarify the process for using comparisons to set stretch targets or as a basis for continuous improvement.
- Verify the existence of a Human Resource planning strategy, and clarify how the plan is being deployed.
- Clarify how the applicant makes resource allocation decisions as part of the planning process and how spending decisions are linked to strategic objectives.

Item 3.1 Knowledge of Student Needs and Expectations (40 points)

+ / + +	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
++	a	The Learning, Entry, and Exit Teams have each developed and implemented formal and informal mechanisms to determine student needs and expectations in support of the Recognizing Needs aspect of the LEARN philosophy. Data obtained through these mechanisms reflect input from incoming and current students, recent graduates, transfer students, and contract students and are aggregated and analyzed by the Process Teams. Findings are deployed through biannual reports to all divisions and offices and through an annual report to the Leadership Team, thereby ensuring that the applicant is maintaining an awareness of the general needs and expectations of current students.

- + a As part of a structured approach for obtaining information regarding nonacademic offerings and the services they provide, divisions and offices use multiple data sources, including Town Hall Meetings, Brown Bag Lunches, focus groups, divisional performance indicators, and face-to-face meetings with students. This information is aggregated and analyzed by the offices or divisions to identify improvement recommendations for the appropriate Process Team or the Leadership Team. Analysis of results from these data sources has led to several recent initiatives that address the learning needs of specific student segments, including the new Native American Campus Center, Internet-based courses, interactive video, and the Day Care Center.
- + a The applicant uses multiple sources to determine and anticipate students' changing needs, including an annual District Needs Survey, high school senior surveys, feedback from Curriculum Advisory Teams and Business Council meetings, and demographic projections. Data are input into WILEE, analyzed, linked to the appropriate strategies or operational plans, and organized into reports that are used by Process Teams and the Learning Team for planning.

– / – – **Area to Address**

(–) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a There is little information regarding the specific offerings, facilities, and services for which the applicant collects utilization data or the types of data collected. This makes it difficult to understand how utilization data are used to assess the impact of key services on active learning, satisfaction, and development.
- a With the exception of enrollment data and surveys, it is not clear how the applicant ensures that its data collection methods regarding current student needs and expectations yield data that are representative of the overall student population. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant identifies priorities and action plans that reflect the needs and expectations of key student groups as well as the overall student population.
- a Although the applicant collects a variety of data in order to determine the changing needs and expectations of students, it is not clear how the Learning Team aggregates and analyzes these data to identify significant issues and trends or how they prioritize their findings for action by the Leadership Team, divisions, or offices. This makes it difficult to understand how the changing needs and expectations of students are effectively incorporated into action plans and used to drive decisions that impact student learning.
- a Although the applicant states that the Learning Team conducts an annual review of its approaches to listening and learning, the process used for this review is not clear. There is also little evidence that the review has improved the applicant's overall methods for anticipating students needs and expectations in order to stay current with changing educational needs and directions.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the use by the Leadership Team and the Process Team of the mechanisms listed (e.g., demographic data, SGA information, surveys, and town meetings) to determine student needs and expectations.
- Verify the sources of information for student utilization of facilities, offerings, and services and how these data sources are used to affect active learning, satisfaction, and development and lead to action. Verify that these sources ensure a representative sample of student needs and expectations.
- Clarify how the annual review process is conducted and how the process has improved the applicant's overall methods for anticipating student needs and expectations.
- Clarify how information on key issues is summarized, analyzed, and made actionable.

Item 3.2 Student and Stakeholder Satisfaction and Relationships (45 points)

	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
++	a	The applicant uses a variety of approaches to build relationships with students and other key stakeholders, including chat rooms, Curriculum Advisory Teams, and satisfaction surveys (Figure 3.2-1). LEARNing Board measures are used to monitor the effectiveness and progress of the applicant's key relationships, and 20 of these key measures relate directly to specific stakeholders (Figure 3.2-1). This allows the Leadership Team to effectively assess relationships with each of the applicant's student and stakeholder groups.
+	a	The applicant evaluates its relationships with key stakeholders by analyzing data from various stakeholder satisfaction measurement methods and feedback from each stakeholder group (Figure 3.2-2). Annually, the Leadership Team develops a matrix that links each stakeholder to its key contact area within the college. This helps identify "weak" relationships and provides an approach for sharing learnings between divisions and offices.
+	b	The applicant conducts an independently administered Student Satisfaction Survey (CSSS) annually, which provides student satisfaction and importance ratings in 12 key areas, including academic advising, instructional effectiveness, schedule flexibility, and the learning environment. The CSSS measures how satisfied students are, as well as what is important to them, and provides comparative data from 300 community colleges across the nation. Results of the survey are used for divisional goal-setting and action planning, development of annual assessment plans, and assessment of institutional effectiveness.

Area to Address	(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
- / - -	
-	a Although there are a variety of forums to register a complaint (e.g., SGA, roundtables, and Town Hall Meetings), there is little evidence of a systematic approach for gathering, aggregating, analyzing, and using information obtained through these forums to resolve complaints or to identify improvement opportunities. Without a consistent and proactive complaint management process, it is difficult to understand how the applicant ensures that educational services continue to meet the needs of students and stakeholders.
-	b It is not clear how the applicant’s approaches for determining satisfaction address the differing needs of its various student segments. For example, it is not clear if contract students are included in the CSSS or if the survey is modified to address their unique requirements. This makes it difficult to understand whether the current approaches to satisfaction determination provide relevant, actionable data for each student segment.
-	b There is little evidence of a systematic approach to follow up on interactions with students and key stakeholders. While the responsibility for follow-up is placed at the individual faculty and staff levels, it is not clear how or when this follow-up occurs, how information from these follow-ups is recorded and tracked, and how the results are used to improve performance.
-	b Although Figure 3.2-2 lists various formal and informal methods for determining stakeholder satisfaction and dissatisfaction, it is not clear which of these approaches is deployed to each stakeholder group, what types of information are collected, or how the information is used in improvement. It is also not clear how the applicant ensures the validity and reliability of the data obtained through these methods. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant assesses the satisfaction of its nonstudent stakeholders in order to build relationships, enhance student performance, or develop new educational services.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the stated methods used to build relationships with students and stakeholders. Clarify approaches to follow up on interactions with students and key stakeholders.
- Verify the validity and reliability of the CSSS. Clarify whether results are segmented and used to understand differing student segments.
- Clarify how complaint data are gathered, analyzed, and used for improvement purposes.
- Clarify satisfaction and dissatisfaction determination approaches, including data validity and reliability, for all key stakeholders.

Item 4.1 Measurement of Organizational Performance (40 points)

	Area to Address	
+ / + +		(+) STRENGTHS
++	a	The applicant has been using a balanced scorecard, the LEARNing Board, since 1997 to monitor performance in key areas for each stakeholder. Measures tracked through the LEARNing Board are integrated with the strategic planning process and the annual metrics review process, and lower-level OQMs are systematically linked to the LEARNing Board measures and action plans. Deployment of the LEARNing Board through the Wide Integrated Learning Excellence Environment (WILEE) computer system helps ensure that the applicant's measures are actionable and aligned with strategic objectives at all levels.
++	a	A cross-organizational Data Management Team (DMT) is responsible for selecting and coordinating data and information to support the learning environment using specific criteria. The team is co-led by managers from the applicant's Research Center (CRC) and the Information Systems (IS) Office and includes representatives from the student body, faculty, and administration. This approach ensures input from key stakeholders, as well as coordination between the two key functional organizations involved in data management and technology use.
+	a	The applicant uses a six-step Strategic Benchmarking Process (Figure 4.1-1) to select comparative data and to identify best practices across the state. Current trends in measures and practices are identified through the American Legion for Education Excellence (ALEE). One year after completion, benchmarked processes are evaluated in an effort to assess their impact on the organization.
+	a	The Academic Coordinated Measurement Environment (ACME) is a data analysis system that resides in WILEE. ACME ensures data reliability and validity, provides rapid access to information, and links LEARNing Board measures to OQMs, enabling users to see related higher- and lower-level measures through a relationship map. ACME is also used to identify correlations and projections to support forecasting and planning.
- / - -		(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
-	a	It is not clear how the applicant's measurement system supports a cost/financial and budgetary understanding of improvement options. Without this capability, it is not clear how the applicant prioritizes improvement activities and allocates resources to them.
- -	a	Although the applicant has access to comparative data through ALEE, these data are not described in sufficient detail to enable an understanding of their scope or relevance for the applicant. For example, it is not clear if the comparisons available represent benchmark performance or if they include performance data for nonacademic processes. Without more information concerning this data source and/or other national and competitive comparisons, it is difficult to understand whether the applicant has

sufficient comparative data to gauge its progress toward its vision of becoming one of the leading community colleges in the nation.

- a It is not clear how the DMT, CRC, and IS Office systematically evaluate the effectiveness of the applicant’s overall measurement system. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant ensures that its overall measurement systems stay current with changing educational needs in order to support the needs of its leadership, students, and stakeholders.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the deployment of the LEARNing Board balanced scorecard system to ensure alignment of measures with the strategic plan and to ensure its use throughout the organization. Clarify how the effectiveness of the measurement system is evaluated and improved by the DMT, CRC, and IS Office to ensure that it meets the changing information needs of the stakeholders.
- Clarify how the applicant’s measurement system supports a cost/financial and budgetary understanding of improvement options.
- Verify the process used by the DMT, CRC and IS Office to select data. Clarify how the current LEARNing Board measures were selected.
- Verify the extent to which the Strategic Benchmarking Process for selecting comparative data is deployed, and clarify how it is currently being used to select measures. Specifically, clarify which measures, other than state and academic performance measures, have been selected based on this process. Clarify the process for evaluating and improving the Strategic Benchmarking Process.
- Verify the data reliability and validity systems to ensure information is accurate and actionable. Clarify how the ACME system ensures confidentiality.

Item 4.2 Analysis of Organizational Performance (45 points)

Area to		
+ / + +	Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+	a	The applicant uses WILEE and ACME to perform a variety of analyses of LEARNing Board measures and OQMs in support of organizational performance reviews and planning. These include ongoing and ad hoc analyses by Process Teams and subteams, trend and correlation analyses by the CRC and IS Office, and organization-level analyses by the Leadership Team. The linkages within the applicant’s measurement system, as well as its alignment with the organization’s strategic objectives and stakeholder needs, ensure that data analyses address the overall health of the organization and support the LEARN philosophy.
+	a	The CRC and Learning Team use several methods to ensure that information and data analyses address faculty/staff or educational program processes, thereby supporting effective decision making through LEARN. These include relationship mapping

between results measures and learning and educational program processes. The results are used to perform quarterly correlation analyses, to predict success or demonstrate outcomes of educational programs and student performance, and to develop reports for external stakeholders and grants.

– / – –	Area to Address	(–) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
–	a	Although the applicant provides comparisons for state academic, financial, and faculty performance results, it is not clear how these comparative data or other competitive comparisons are considered as part of the organization’s various analyses. This makes it difficult to understand how the applicant monitors its progress and evaluates current performance levels in order to develop strategies to achieve its vision of becoming one of the nation’s leading community colleges.
–	a	Although WILEE and ACME provide the capability to perform analyses to support daily operations, it is not clear if this capability is deployed beyond Process Teams and subteams. For example, it is not clear what analyses are performed or used by individual faculty members or administrative staff to improve student performance or support processes, respectively.
–	a	There is not enough information concerning the relationship maps to understand the scope and effectiveness of the correlations performed. For example, it is not clear if correlations are performed across types of measures, e.g., the impact of faculty development on student performance or of process improvement on financial performance. Without an understanding of whether such student outcomes are measured and analyzed, it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of the organization’s approach to analyzing overall performance.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the process for analyzing data using ACME. Determine what types of analyses are conducted on what types of data, how ACME presents analyzed information, and how this information is made available to support daily operations.
- Verify the use of analytic methods, including relationship mapping between measures, learning and education processes, and correlation analyses.
- Verify the process for aligning LEARNing Board measures and OQMs with strategic action plans. Verify the process for analyzing non-LEARNing Board and other OQM measures.
- Verify the process for analyzing the health of the organization through the four LEARNing Board balanced perspectives, and clarify how competitive data and student outcome information are analyzed.
- Clarify the role of the CRC and Learning Teams in ensuring that information and data analyses address the needs of the applicant.

Item 5.1 Work Systems (35 points)

+ / + +	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
++	a	The applicant uses a team-based structure (Figures 1.1-1 and 5.1-1) to design, organize, and manage work and jobs for faculty and staff. Process Teams coordinate subteams responsible for day-to-day operations in support of action plans aligned with key strategies. Involvement of faculty, staff, and students on these teams promotes individual initiative and innovation, cross-functional cooperation and collaboration, and an increased understanding of how work and jobs are connected.
+	a	The Industry-Team Knowledge Building (ITKB) process promotes cooperation, collaboration, and innovation. This process, which pairs full-time faculty with adjunct faculty in the same discipline, enriches student learning by providing both theory and industry experience in a given subject area. The ITKB approach also allows instructors to learn from each other and to keep current with educational service and student development needs.
+	a	The applicant uses several approaches for encouraging and motivating faculty and staff to develop and utilize their full potential. These include Individual Development Plans (IDPs), whereby faculty and staff members develop competency goals and skills aligned with the applicant's strategic plan, and multiple formal and informal assessments that provide feedback to faculty and staff and support high performance. Faculty are formally evaluated annually by Division Chairs and twice each semester by students. Formal staff evaluations are conducted by supervisors.
+	a	The applicant's approach for faculty and staff compensation supports achievement of the overall objectives for high performance and student learning reflected in its LEARN philosophy. This approach includes defining performance expectations and capabilities for each of four tiers that are aligned with LEARN objectives: learning, team performance, administrative skills, and the use of technological skills.
+	a	The applicant uses a Behavior Quality Index (BQI) to guide the process for hiring new faculty and staff. The BQI, which is maintained in WILEE, assesses candidates' abilities against 30 desired attributes (e.g., team orientation, leadership, and continuous improvement) that are aligned with the values of the organization. Use of the BQI helps to ensure new faculty and staff have the characteristics required for maximum contribution to organizational performance.
- / - -	Area to Address	(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
-	a	More information is needed in order to understand clearly how feedback to faculty and staff on their performance as team members is addressed in the performance evaluation process. It is also not clear how reward and recognition programs directly support teams and the team-based operating structure as opposed to individuals. Without this information, it is difficult to understand how the performance management and compensation and recognition practices systematically reinforce the applicant's team-

based approach to work and job design or fully support high performance throughout the organization.

- a Although the team-based operating structure brings together faculty and staff from various parts of the organization to improve processes and accomplish specific tasks, there is little evidence of a systematic approach for communicating and sharing knowledge and skill across work units, functions, or the applicant’s three locations. Without such an approach, it is difficult to understand how the applicant ensures an organization-wide focus on student and stakeholder needs and requirements, as well as an environment of encouragement, trust, and mutual commitment.
- a Although the applicant has a Diversity Subteam and a Strategic Diversity Plan in place, there is little evidence of a systematic approach for taking into account the diversity of its communities in the recruitment and hiring of new faculty and staff. Given that the applicant’s goal, as stated in the Overview, is to increase both Native American and Hispanic representation on the faculty (currently 5% and 21%, respectively), it does not appear that there are specific plans in place to increase the percentage of diverse hires.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Clarify the extent and deployment of the team operating structure and the ITKB approach and the extent of involvement of students, faculty, and staff on the team, as well as the extent to which teams assist in communication and knowledge sharing across campuses.
- Verify the extent to which administrators and supervisors are involved in the IDP approach and determine how goals and objectives are developed in support of the applicant’s strategic plan.
- Clarify how the applicant’s performance management system addresses team activities, including how team activities are factored into performance evaluations, work structures, compensation, and reward and recognition approaches.
- Clarify whether the applicant has an approach in place to increase Hispanic and Native American faculty and whether the Strategic Diversity Plan and Diversity Subteam have established action plans for increasing this representation.

Item 5.2 Faculty and Staff Education, Training, and Development (25 points)

Area to	
+ / + +	Address
(+) STRENGTHS	
+	a The Learning Team compares the capabilities and performance of current faculty and staff with a list of the 30 most important skills and behaviors to develop a prioritized list of development needs. Prioritization is accomplished using a decision matrix that reflects the applicant’s strategic goals, and priorities are published on-line in guidebooks that faculty and staff use in conjunction with the IDP process to identify their individual education and training needs. This approach supports the achievement of

the applicant's overall objectives for education and development; builds faculty and staff knowledge, skills, and capabilities; and contributes to improved faculty and staff performance.

- + a The applicant uses a variety of formal and informal approaches to deliver faculty and staff education and training. Delivery methods include mentoring, interactive video classes, shadowing Master Learning Facilitators, on-line training, conferences, and traditional classroom training. Additionally, an Employee Education Program (EEP) provides an 80% waiver of course fees for faculty and staff to take up to six hours of course work each semester during work hours.
- + a New faculty and staff members participate in a comprehensive one-week orientation that addresses performance excellence factors as well as the LEARN philosophy and culture and the importance of teamwork and process improvement. Process Team leaders and members of the Leadership Team attend these orientations, and new faculty and staff members are assigned Master Learning Facilitators as mentors during the sessions. This approach appears to be systematically deployed to familiarize new faculty and staff with the organization's vision, mission, and values.
- + a The applicant uses several approaches to enable on-the-job skill and knowledge reinforcement. Supervisors are notified upon completion of education and training events and update the WILEE system with performance changes attributable to that education and training. Recognition letters and the fulfillment of supervisory requirements for developing faculty and staff members also contribute to reinforcing skills and knowledge while on the job.

**Area to
Address**

– / – – **(–) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- a Although the Learning Team and the Human Resource Subteam use a decision matrix to prioritize those development needs that best support the applicant's strategic goals, it is not clear how this process balances long-term and short-term organizational needs, nor is it clear how the process accounts for faculty and staff needs. Without a systematic approach for balancing the short- and longer-term needs of the organization, it is difficult to understand how the applicant achieves its overall performance and personnel objectives.
- a Although the applicant states that the Human Resource Subteam continually evaluates classes and instructors and implements improvements based on their assessments, there is no evidence of a systematic approach for ensuring that the education of faculty and staff meets the organization's strategic goals or individual learning or development goals.
- a While the applicant indicates that the Leadership Team identifies college-wide training needs, there is not enough information provided to understand if and how key faculty and staff developmental and training needs, such as diversity training, leadership development, and safety training, are considered. Without this information, it is difficult to understand if the applicant is addressing these needs.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Determine how the Learning Team and Human Resource Subteam compare faculty and staff capabilities and performance against the 30 desired attributes and prioritize them, using the decision matrix.
- Verify that IDPs are linked to overall training and education needs, and determine to what extent short- and longer-term organizational and faculty and staff needs are balanced in the process. Clarify how or whether the applicant addresses key faculty and staff developmental and training needs in the areas of diversity training, leadership development, and safety.
- Verify the approaches for delivering faculty and staff education and training, including new faculty and staff orientation. Confirm the multiple delivery methods (interactive, on-line, self-paced, and classroom) and whether they are evaluated for effectiveness in promoting faculty and staff performance.
- Verify the applicant’s approach for reinforcing education and training, including notification to supervisors and mentors, entering performance changes into WILEE, and using this information in performance evaluations.

Item 5.3 Faculty and Staff Well-Being and Satisfaction (25 points)

	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+ / + +		
+	a	The applicant uses a variety of approaches to address and improve workplace health, safety, and ergonomic factors. Internal safety inspections are conducted by the Business Support Services Team and Division Chairs using safety checklists, with nonconformities logged into WILEE with an associated corrective action plan. Additionally, students, faculty, staff, and key stakeholders are surveyed on their satisfaction with workplace conditions at the college. Survey responses are compiled and analyzed by the Business Support Services Team and used to develop action plans.
+	b	The applicant uses a wide variety of services and benefits to enhance the work climate for faculty and staff, including a Wellness Center staffed with nurses and counselors, a fully equipped gymnasium, a complete benefits package, day care programs, and a tax deferred annuity program.
+	b	The applicant has established a Diversity Subteam, which reports directly to the Leadership Team, and an ombudsperson to consider and support the needs of its diverse work force. Additionally, a Strategic Diversity Plan provides a roadmap for future actions designed to meet the diverse needs of all constituents. These actions directly support the applicant’s LEARN philosophy, which recognizes the diversity in learning styles and rates of learning.
+	c	Multiple formal and informal evaluation methods and measures are used to determine faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation (Figure 5.3-2). Focus groups, Brown Bag Lunches, and exit interviews provide qualitative information, and a written satisfaction survey is conducted each year to provide quantitative information on

faculty and staff satisfaction in a multitude of areas. Key measures for turnover, workers compensation, and IDP performance are also used in the satisfaction determination process.

Area to Address	(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT	
- / - -	a	There is little evidence of a systematic approach for addressing and improving workplace health and safety factors on any of the three campuses. For example, although facilities such as science, manufacturing, and technology laboratories present special health and safety exposures, there is no mention of any consideration of health and safety standards associated with those environments.
- -	b	There is no evidence of a systematic approach for tailoring the applicant’s satisfaction determination methods and measures to its diverse work force and to different categories and types of faculty and staff. The lack of a systematic approach for selecting and tailoring enhancements in services, benefits, and policies or for differentiating the needs of each category and type of faculty and staff makes it difficult to understand how the applicant maintains a climate that contributes to the well-being, satisfaction, and motivation of all faculty and staff.
-	c	It is not clear how the applicant determines the key factors that affect faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation. Although the applicant states that employees have individualized plans and that factors differ by employee, there is little evidence of a systematic approach for determining these key factors. Without this information, it is difficult to understand how the applicant identifies and addresses factors that are reliable indicators of faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation.
-	c	Although the Leadership Team and Process Teams review and use employee satisfaction data to identify and address potential problems relating to the work environment and support climate, it is not clear how the applicant relates evaluation findings to key organizational performance results. Without such information, it is difficult to understand how the applicant identifies priorities for improving the work environment and the faculty and staff support climate. It is also difficult to understand how the applicant makes decisions that will have the greatest impact on overall organizational performance without this linkage.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the deployment of the workplace health, safety, and ergonomic approach at all three campuses and various facilities such as laboratories.
- Verify the faculty and staff climate approaches, particularly the deployment of services (e.g., Wellness Center, benefits, and day care programs) at all campuses. Clarify where and how the applicant tailors services, benefits, and policies to the needs of individuals and of different categories and types of faculty and staff.

- Verify the effectiveness of the formal and informal evaluation methods and measures used to determine faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation, and clarify the basis for determining and selecting key factors that affect faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation. Clarify whether methods and measures for determining faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation are tailored to different categories and types of faculty and staff (e.g., adjunct professors and administrative staff).

Item 6.1 Education Design and Delivery (55 points)

+ / + +	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
++	a	The applicant uses a systematic Curriculum Design Process (Figure 6.1-1) to develop new educational programs and course offerings. This process defines specific roles for the Leadership Team, Learning Team, and Curriculum Teams and ensures the development of courses, curricula, delivery methods, and assessment strategies that are based on student and stakeholder needs; aligned with strategic and operating plans; and satisfy BOG, SBCC, and accreditation and certification requirements.
+	a	The Learning/Education Preferences for Everyone Workshop (LEPEW) enables students to understand their individual learning styles and preferences and to manage their own learning more effectively. LEPEW has resulted in improved performance as measured by Graduation Grade Point Average (GPA) and Student Persistence. In a related pilot program, faculty are provided with a composite profile of student learning styles and suggested teaching strategies for each profile, facilitating the alignment of instructional strategies with student learning needs.
+	a	The Learning Team and Curriculum Design Teams are responsible for ensuring that new technologies are incorporated into new and revised course offerings. Curriculum Design Teams use a structured approach to ensure that appropriate technologies are selected to support different levels of interactivity, learning styles, and self-paced learning. This effort supports the applicant’s goal to develop distance learning and web-based instruction capabilities.
+	a	In order to sequence the appropriate information for enhancing the probability of student success, Division Curriculum Teams construct a matrix of learning objectives and skills to be introduced, mastered, and reinforced in each course. The Learning Team then coordinates these matrices throughout the college to ensure that all key learning objectives and skills are mastered in an integrated fashion by the time students have completed the coursework required for their degrees or certificates. This coordination guards against duplication and unintentional gaps in student learning.

- + b Indicators of performance on three instructional objectives established by the Learning Team are developed for each course by faculty during the annual planning process. These indicators, which are linked to LEARNing Board indicators (e.g., student performance, employability, enrollment trends, satisfaction, and persistence), are included in the IDPs for faculty and are used by the Learning and Leadership Teams to monitor student achievement of divisional and college-wide objectives.
- + b The applicant has developed several approaches to facilitate sharing of research and learning among faculty, including faculty development workshops, the CRC Research Seminar, Brown Bag Lunches, and an Intranet page called “What’s New!” In addition, information from Curriculum Advisory Team meetings is used to improve educational programs. These approaches enable faculty to be more responsive to student learning preferences and changing educational requirements.

– / – – **Area to Address** **(–) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- a The extent to which the Curriculum Design Process is used to develop and revise individual courses, contract training, and community development programs is not clear. This makes it difficult to understand the extent to which this design process is deployed.
- a/b Although the applicant states that student needs drive instructional delivery practices and that the faculty incorporates those needs into instructional designs, there is no discussion of key delivery processes or how they are designed. Without a systematic approach for designing key delivery processes, it is not clear how the applicant ensures that delivery of educational programs is consistent with curriculum design and delivery requirements.
- b Although the applicant lists several measures of educational programs and offerings, they appear to be selected annually based on three broad objectives established by the Learning Team. It is not clear exactly how these measures are selected or whether they are linked to specific curriculum design and delivery requirements.
- b It is not clear how the applicant evaluates and improves its educational design and delivery processes. For example, it does not appear that feedback from the various formative and summative assessments is aggregated and analyzed to identify improvement opportunities, nor does it appear that the approaches for sharing improvements across the organization are systematic. Without structured, systematic approaches for evaluating, improving, and sharing, it is difficult to understand how the organization increases the effectiveness of its programs in support of the LEARN philosophy.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify and clarify the extent to which the Curriculum Design Process is applied to areas of development in full degree programs, and clarify its use for individual courses, contract training, and community development programs.

- Verify how student needs are used to guide instructional delivery practices, and clarify how meetings between faculty members, Curriculum Team members, and the Learning Team are used to identify teaching methodologies that effectively ensure that all programs, offerings, and courses address individual student needs and differences.
- Verify that the applicant adapts instruction to prepare students to participate in active learning. Identify those mechanisms that are used to facilitate active learning and clarify the extent to which active learning is included in the curriculum.
- Clarify how the applicant consistently evaluates and improves its educational programs and how this evaluation and improvement fit into an overall, systematic measurement process. Clarify the approaches used for sharing improvements with other organizational units and programs, including the Intranet.

Item 6.2 Education Support Processes (15 points)

+ / + +	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+	a	Key education support processes are identified in Figure 6.2-1, along with their respective principal requirements and key measures. Driven by student and stakeholder needs, the performance of these processes is tracked using measures that evaluate performance against key requirements and track their efficiency and effectiveness. Several teams, including the Entry Team, Exit Team, and Business Support Services Team, share the responsibility for ensuring that these key processes meet expectations.
+	a	The Entry, Exit, and Business Support Services teams and related subteams share responsibility for monitoring performance of support processes. Both in-process and outcome measures are stored in WILEE and used to evaluate process performance. Subteams are empowered to make immediate process corrections or to establish problem-solving teams, if necessary. Problem-solving teams use root cause and “what if” analyses to correct and improve process performance.
+	a	The applicant ensures integration of outsourced processes by including partner representatives on the Business Support Services Team. This allows partners to provide input into the day-to-day management of the applicant’s processes, as well as input into the strategic planning process. The successful outsourcing of the bookstore and intercampus transportation (BEEP) demonstrates a commitment to developing long-term partnerships to meet student and other stakeholder requirements.
+	a	The applicant uses benchmarking, process mapping, and an annual “Lessons Learned” symposium to improve support processes and to share improvements across the organization. Benchmarking is conducted with external and internal sources based on “best-in-class” performance levels and practices to identify and develop improvement solutions. These approaches have resulted in cost, cycle time, and customer satisfaction improvements for most support processes.

Area to Address	(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
- / - -	<p>a While the applicant indicates that it uses a process similar to the one described in Figure 6.1-1 to design its support processes, it is not clear how this process is adapted to support process design. There is also no indication of how key requirements and measures are determined for support processes. Without more information concerning how the performance requirements for support processes are identified and managed, it is difficult to understand how these support processes effectively contribute to overall organizational performance.</p>
-	<p>a Although the applicant states in the Overview that it has eight key suppliers, several of which manage support processes, there is no evidence of a systematic approach for selecting and measuring these supplier relationships. For example, cafeteria services, intercampus transportation, and the bookstore have been outsourced, but it is not clear how the performance of these critical suppliers or of the suppliers of information technology is monitored to ensure that they are meeting the applicant's requirements in support of strategic objectives.</p>
-	<p>a There is little evidence of a systematic approach for sharing support process improvements throughout the organization on an ongoing basis. The lack of proactive approaches for sharing information makes it difficult to understand how the applicant rapidly deploys improvements across the organization.</p>

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify how support process performance is monitored at the subteam level and how ACME and WILEE are used to support this monitoring and analysis.
- Clarify how key performance requirements at the student, faculty, and staff levels influence the identification and design of support processes and how support process performance requirements are developed in order to understand the linkage among all processes that impact overall performance.
- Clarify the process used to design and improve support processes, the extent to which it is used, and how it incorporates the key requirements of stakeholders and operations. Verify and clarify how the applicant uses benchmarking, process mapping, and its annual symposium to share improvements and lessons learned from one organizational unit to another.
- Clarify whether a process exists to select and measure supplier relationships. If such a process exists, determine the extent to which it is used and how it incorporates the applicant's requirements in support of its strategic objectives.

Item 6.3 Partnering Processes (15 points)

	Area to Address	
+ / + +		(+) STRENGTHS
+	a	The Entry Team is responsible for developing meaningful relationships with area high schools, which represent nearly half of the applicant’s entering students. Articulation agreements between the applicant and these feeder schools facilitate both the communication of expectations and the sharing of resources to support student achievement. The applicant’s High School Joint Council provides a mechanism through which alignment of curriculum and expectations can be accomplished. The combination of these approaches ensures that student needs are addressed through a continuum of appropriate programs and offerings.
+	a	The Exit Team uses articulation agreements to understand the requirements of schools that receive the applicant’s students. The Exit Team has developed agreements with all colleges and universities in its state and surrounding states, as well as 27 other out-of-state institutions. These agreements provide an opportunity to communicate and develop relationships to promote ongoing success for transitioning students.
+	a	Through their participation on various Curriculum Advisory Teams, area employers provide input on the curriculum and learn about the applicant’s requirements for the students they provide. One result of this approach, the “Re-Entry for Success” workshop, has increased the GPAs of participating students. Based on a successful partnership with Telecom Unlimited (TU), the applicant is also developing bilateral needs and fosters direct support from local employers.
- / - -		(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
-	a	It is not clear how employers are selected for Curriculum Advisory Teams or if they are representative of all area employees. This makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of this approach in identifying employer requirements. It is also not clear if the applicant proactively seeks out potential employers for its students and builds positive relationships with them.
-	a	The organization appears to be in the early stages of developing a process for managing partnering relationships with feeder schools, colleges and universities, and employers. Although three teams appear to be working on in-process measures that will predict LEARNing Board outcome measures, none of these measures are presented, nor is any information presented on when the process will be implemented. Without additional information, it is not possible to fully assess how the organization is improving partnering processes with other schools and employers.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the use of articulation agreements among area high schools, the applicant, and the identified four-year colleges to determine the effectiveness of communicating student needs and the translation of such to program development.

- Verify the effectiveness of employer participation in Curriculum Advisory Teams and the resultant partnerships. Clarify how the organization identifies area employers to participate in partnerships and the degree to which these participants represent the entire employer base.
- Clarify the approaches used to develop partnerships with community organizations and to seek out potential employers for the applicant’s students.
- Investigate the work of the teams in developing in-process measures for managing partnerships. Clarify when and how the process will be implemented in order to ascertain how the applicant is improving partnering processes with schools and employers.

Item 7.1 Student Performance Results (200 points)

+ / ++	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+	a	Results for course completion rates (Figure 7.1-4) are at the national best, and results for students who complete occupational degree and certificate programs (Figure 7.1-2) are significantly better than the state average; both are improving steadily. These results, along with improving levels of full-time, part-time, and physically disabled student persistence, demonstrate the applicant’s success in its efforts to become more flexible and accessible to its students.
++	a	Results for student success at transfer institutions (Figure 7.1-5) demonstrate steady improvement and are significantly better than the state average. Graduates’ hourly wages (Figure 7.1-7) have also been improving at a faster rate than the area median, while improvements in graduate placement rates (Figure 7.1-6) have resulted in performance levels approaching the national best. These results are evidence of the alignment of the applicant’s programs with the requirements of receiving schools and area employers.
++	a	All indicators of the applicant’s success in developing basic student skills and competencies reflect steady improvement. The applicant is performing at levels better than the state best for basic skills improvement (Figure 7.1-8) and attainment of program competencies (Figure 7.1-10). State competency examination pass rates (Figure 7.1-9) and first-time pass rates on ESL and remedial courses (Figure 7.1-11) are significantly better than the state average.
- / --	Area to Address	(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
-	a	Although student persistence results are improving for full-time, part-time, and physically disabled students, results for economically disadvantaged students and single parents appear to be relatively flat (Figure 7.1-1). While the applicant has a long-term plan to increase enrollment of these student segments, the data indicate little progress against the key objective of increasing access to programs for these groups.

- a There are no comparisons provided for Student Persistence (Figure 7.1-1) and Passing Rates on Licensure and Certification Exams (Figure 7.1-3). Although the applicant’s results are significantly better than the state average for a number of indicators (Figures 7.1-2, 7.1-5, and 7.1-11), comparisons to state or national best are not provided. There are also no results provided for key competitors such as proprietary colleges and out-of-state community colleges that offer on-line programs. The lack of relevant comparative data makes it difficult to assess the applicant’s actual performance in these areas.
- a Although the applicant identifies its ethnically diverse student population, three types of programs (degree granting, certificate, and community outreach), and three strategically focused student groups (physically disabled, single parents, and economically disadvantaged), few results data are segmented along any of these dimensions. Without analysis and use of segmented results, it is not clear how the applicant is able to assess student performance across population segments and use results to drive decisions regarding various student populations.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the results presented, and review the current levels and trends for Figures 7.1-1 through 7.1-11.
- Clarify whether the applicant has comparative data for key competitors and national best.
- Clarify segment data for student performance measures.

Item 7.2 Student and Stakeholder Focused Results (70 points)

+ / ++	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+	a	Overall student satisfaction (Figure 7.2-1) has steadily improved over the last five years for three student segments, with current performance above the community college average. Segmented results for student satisfaction with goal attainment (Figures 7.2-3 and 7.2-4) and student satisfaction with programs (Figure 7.2-6) reflect similar rates of improvement. These results demonstrate success in implementing the LEARN philosophy.
+	a	Results presented in Figure 7.2-2 demonstrate that 1999 satisfaction levels improved for more than half of the attributes within the degree segment, as well as for several attributes within the non-degree segment. Attribute ratings across all segments are also generally better than the community college average. These results provide evidence of the positive impact of the applicant’s approaches for improving performance in areas of importance to its students.

- + a Satisfaction with the capabilities of the applicant’s graduates has improved steadily for both four-year colleges and universities and for employers (Figure 7.2-7). The level of citizen participation in community programs and events has also improved, widening the lead relative to the state average (Figure 7.2-8). These results reflect the applicant’s focus on the needs and requirements of these key stakeholder groups.

**Area to
Address**

– / – – **(–) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- a Results for student goal attainment are lower for disadvantaged segments (Figure 7.2-4) than for any of the student segments presented in Figure 7.2-3. Few attribute ratings improved for non-degree and contract segments in 1999, and in particular, these segments rated two key attributes, acquiring useful skills and campus support services, significantly lower than did degree students (Figure 7.2-2). These results may indicate that the applicant is not adequately addressing the unique needs of all student segments.
- – a Results do not reflect student satisfaction with several requirements identified in the Overview, including learning skill development, affordability, and increased capacity for self-directed learning. Results are not provided for student satisfaction with course delivery methods, which would reflect performance in the key strategic goal of incorporating technology into the traditional classroom, nor are results for measures and/or indicators of student dissatisfaction provided. There are also no results that demonstrate the loyalty of students, positive referral, perceived value, or relationship building. Finally, no graduate or former student results are presented, which makes it difficult to understand whether or not the applicant includes the opinions of these key stakeholders in its performance assessment.
- a Results do not reflect employer satisfaction relative to key requirements of cost-efficient learning and specific student skills (e.g., innovative problem-solving and team skills, leadership skills, computer proficiency, and professional proficiency). Results also do not reflect satisfaction/dissatisfaction levels for the SBCC, BOG, taxpayers, and community. There are no results for measures and/or indicators of stakeholder dissatisfaction. Without this information, it is difficult to evaluate the extent to which the applicant is satisfying stakeholders in these key areas or how the applicant understands the effectiveness of its efforts to improve stakeholder satisfaction.
- a Comparisons are not provided for student goal attainment (Figures 7.2-3 and 7.2-4), student satisfaction with programs (Figure 7.2-6), and satisfaction with capabilities of graduates (Figure 7.2-7). Although all of the satisfaction measures provided are compared to the national average for community colleges, there are no comparisons to key competitors identified in the Overview. Without more meaningful and complete comparative data, it is difficult to understand how the applicant can fully assess the strength of its student and stakeholder satisfaction results.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the results presented, and review the current levels and trends for student and stakeholder focused data since the application was written.
- Clarify the existence of results and comparisons where they are not provided in the application.
- Clarify the significance of the difference between 1998 and 1999 results in Figure 7.2-2.
- Clarify the comparability and consistency of data used in Figures 7.2-1, 7.2-3, 7.2-4, and 7.2-6.

Item 7.3 Budgetary and Financial Results (40 points)

	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+ / + +		
+	a	The applicant's overall revenue increased steadily over the last four years (Figure 7.3-1), while tuition costs held steady, despite the fact that the reimbursement rate per FTE per semester in the state has decreased since 1995 (Figure 7.3-2). The improvement is the result of significant increases in both credit and noncredit student enrollments (Figure 7.3-3), which drive both tuition and reimbursement revenues, and a slight increase in grant and foundation funding (Figure 7.3-4). These results demonstrate the success of the LEARN philosophy in attracting more students and its impact on the applicant's financial performance.
+	a	Segmented results for grant and foundation funding levels (Figure 7.3-4) demonstrate the applicant's success in attracting funding in areas that are aligned with its strategic objectives. Its success in attracting capital funding relative to the state average (Figure 7.3-5) also enables upgrades in facilities and infrastructure required to support the applicant's plans (e.g., to improve access for the physically disabled and to develop the Three Nations Reservation Campus Center [Figure 2.2-1]).
+	a	Over the past five years, the applicant improved resource utilization and budget management, as demonstrated by steady increases in the percentage of funds devoted to direct costs and significant reductions in budget variances, respectively. Current levels represent the best performance in the state, reflecting the applicant's ongoing efforts to improve its fiscal efficiency (Figures 7.3-6 and 7.3-7).
+	a	Investment in technology resources is helping to build the infrastructure needed to deliver instructional services at an overall lower cost in the future (Figure 7.3-8). The applicant has improved technology investment dollars per FTE from \$63 in 1995 to over \$70 in 1999, and has performed better than the state best of \$65 each year during that cycle. This sustained investment demonstrates the applicant's commitment to developing its technology infrastructure in support of state-of-the-art teaching and learning (Figure 7.3-8).

– / – –	Area to Address	(–) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
–	a	Comparative data are included for only five of the eight indicators presented. There is only one national comparison (Figure 7.3-2), and there are no comparisons to direct competitors identified in the Overview. Without a clearer understanding of performance relative to comparable organizations and competing institutions, it is difficult to assess the overall performance of the applicant outside the state academic community, particularly in areas such as providing value and containing costs.
–	a	Financial results are not segmented by division, office, and/or program. Without this segmentation, it is difficult to understand how the applicant ensures that improvement initiatives are consistently deployed across the organization and how it identifies segment-specific opportunities for improvement.
–	a	Results for cost containment (e.g., savings or reduction in costs as a result of process improvement, outsourcing, or technology improvements) are not presented. Without these results, it is difficult to assess the applicant’s progress in improving fiscal efficiency, a key strategic objective.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify the results of the budgetary and financial information presented, review current levels and trends, and determine types of comparative data used.
- Clarify how the applicant measures the entire spectrum of fiscal health and budgetary performance. Determine how it correlates the effectiveness of financial health to student/stakeholder and organizational effectiveness results.
- Verify whether other measures of budgetary and financial results exist (e.g., market share with competitors, tax rate, program expenditures as a percentage of budget, scholarship growth, and percent of budget on research).
- Verify whether outsourcing of various organizational services has led to direct cost reduction and has impacted the budget variance results.

Item 7.4 Faculty and Staff Results (70 points)

+ / + +	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+	a	Overall staff satisfaction, as shown in Figure 7.4-1, has increased since 1996. It is at 83% in 1999 and exceeds the state average of 79% for community colleges. Current staff are also more satisfied than the state average with the work environment, maintenance and cleanliness, food services, grounds, benefits, and compensation. Faculty satisfaction in 1999 compares favorably to the state average in nine of eleven satisfaction measures presented (Figure 7.4-1).

- + a The percentage of faculty and staff trained since 1996 is increasing in the areas of process improvement methods, team dynamics, technology use, and budget management, addressing a key near-term objective to increase the percentage of faculty and staff who have the tools to increase productivity. Most notable is that nearly 100% of faculty and staff have been trained in technology use, because a key direction for the applicant is in the area of technology expansion into both the traditional and virtual classroom learning environments. Other results showing consistently favorable trends include faculty training for individualized learning and mentoring (Figure 7.4-2), faculty and staff participation on teams (Figure 7.4-4), and faculty ESL expertise (Figure 7.4-6), reflecting accomplishments that support the applicant's key strategic directions and priorities.
- + a Results for full-time faculty turnover (Figure 7.4-5) have consistently improved over the past four years, dropping from approximately 12% in 1996 to approximately 7% in 1999. Adjunct turnover has improved in the last two years, dropping from a three-year average of over 20% to less than 10%. These results reflect a focus on the needs and expectations of both segments of the faculty.
- + a The applicant has experienced a reduction in the number of incidents of carpal tunnel syndrome (Figure 7.4-7) from a high in 1995 of approximately 42 to the current level of approximately 12, and in corresponding associated costs from approximately \$147,000 to \$50,000. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of the applicant's carpal tunnel awareness program, furniture replacement program, and purchase of ergonomic devices. Additionally, the safety inspection index has averaged 99.8% or better over the past three years, and absenteeism continues to be at least 20% better than the Bureau of Labor Statistics average for colleges and universities in the Southwest.

Area to Address

(-) OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a The applicant appears to be in the early stages of developing comparative information in the area of faculty and staff results. The only comparative data used are the average of the state's community college satisfaction results. The lack of best-in-class comparative data makes it difficult to understand how the applicant will realize its vision of becoming one of the nation's leading community colleges.
- a Results for numerous key measures relating to faculty and staff are not provided. Key work environment factors (Figure 5.3-1) include safety and physical health and measures for number of accidents per month and percent sick days, but results are not provided other than a reference to one reportable accident in three years and a better than average absenteeism rate. Although Figure 5.3-2 lists Worker's Compensation Rate as a key measure for determining well-being, there are no results provided beyond costs associated with carpal tunnel syndrome. Without these results, it is difficult to understand how the applicant can fully assess its performance in maintaining and improving employee well-being.

- a The applicant does not provide measures of reward/recognition, work system performance, results of the IDP, improvement in the compensation tiered classification approach, and job rotation. Without these results, it is not clear how the applicant can fully assess how well it is creating and maintaining a positive, productive, learning, and supportive work environment.
- a The percentage of staff turnover (Figure 7.4-5) is higher in both 1998 and 1999 than in 1996 and 1997, and staff satisfaction results (Figure 7.4-1) indicate lower levels of overall satisfaction and satisfaction with professional development for staff compared with that of faculty. Thus, it appears that the applicant may not be addressing the needs and expectations of staff as completely as those of faculty. Furthermore, the results presented for faculty training for individualized learning and mentoring (Figure 7.4-2), faculty and staff training (Figure 7.4-3), and faculty ESL expertise (Figure 7.4-6) lack segmentation of various faculty and staff groups. Without segmented data, it is difficult to understand how the applicant can target and set priorities for improvement for meeting the needs of its diverse workforce.

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify current levels and trend data for all measures.
- Verify and clarify how the training results shown in Figure 7.4-3 are linked to the near-term objective of increasing the percentage of faculty and staff who have the tools to increase productivity.
- Clarify the availability of comparative data, especially comparisons other than state averages, and, if available, what they show.
- Clarify if there are additional results demonstrating faculty and staff satisfaction levels. Clarify the satisfaction results provided relative to faculty and staff segments to determine the overall effectiveness of selected approaches for each employee group.

Item 7.5 Organizational Effectiveness Results (70 points)

+ / + +	Area to Address	(+) STRENGTHS
+	a	Cycle times for new program development, credit courses, business workshops, and outreach demonstrate sustained improvements since 1995 (Figure 7.5-1). This demonstrates improvements in the applicant’s ability to respond quickly to changing student and stakeholder requirements.
+	a	Results for all factors related to implementing individualized learning and for approaches to increasing learner involvement in active learning improved steadily since 1995 (Figures 7.5-2 and 7.5-3). Opportunities for internships increased significantly in the past two years (Figure 7.5-7), and more technology delivered course offerings have been made available (Figure 7.5-6). These results demonstrate the applicant’s commitment to the LEARN philosophy.

- + a Results related to the key objective to increase the enrollment of single parents and economically disadvantaged students are favorable. Sustained improvement is evident for disadvantaged student enrollment over the past five years (Figure 7.5-4).
- + a Favorable results are demonstrated for the key objective of increasing the ability of faculty to use technology to enhance learning and productivity. Computer lab utilization increased from 48% in 1995 to 83% in 1999; Internet utilization is up 100%, use of multimedia is up 85%, and participation in telecourses is up 8%. Participation in an internship program increased from 20% to 40% in two years (Figures 7.5-5 through 7.5-7).
- + a Results for technology delivered offerings as a percentage of courses show steady increases in implementing the three strategically targeted learning technologies (Figure 7.5-6).
- + a The organization disposes of hazardous waste each month, and 65% of waste is recycled. Results for the loan default rate are favorable over the past five years and are better than the national average for all higher education institutions (Figure 7.5-9).

Area to Address
 - / - - (-) **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- - a Results are not presented for a variety of key indicators described throughout the application. These include results for key education support processes (Figure 6.2-1), partnering processes (Item 6.3), and several key action plans (Figure 2.2-1). Results are also not provided for key human resource measures, including compensation costs per worker, average sick days per person, and percentage of facilities that are accessible. This makes it difficult to assess the applicant's progress in key areas.
- a With the exception of comparative results for the national loan default rate, comparative or competitive results are not provided for key measures of organizational effectiveness identified in Figures 7.5-1 through 7.5-8. The lack of comparative data makes it difficult to assess the performance of the applicant relative to other organizations.
- a Although improving, the current level of technology delivered offerings (Figure 7.5-6) is relatively low. This is a key issue relative to meeting student needs and to competing with out-of-state community colleges that offer on-line programs. Similarly, the availability of business/industry mentors, a key means of expanding student learning opportunities, is low (Figure 7.5-7).

SITE VISIT ISSUES (For Stage 2, Consensus Review, Only):

- Verify up-to-date current and trend results for all measures, including in-process measures for efficiency and effectiveness of partnering processes with feeder schools, four-year colleges, universities, and employers.
- Determine if there are results for compensation costs per worker, average sick days per person, accessibility, measures related to goals in Figure 2.2-1, organizational effectiveness measures identified in Figure 6.2-1, and in-process measures for efficiency/effectiveness of partnering processes.
- Determine if there are comparative results for measures identified in Figures 7.5-1 through 7.5-8.

Baldrige National Quality Program

United States Department of Commerce
Technology Administration
National Institute of Standards and Technology
Baldrige National Quality Program
Administration Building, Room A600
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 1020
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-1020

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) is a non-regulatory federal agency within the Commerce Department's Technology Administration. NIST's primary mission is to strengthen the U.S. economy and improve the quality of life by working with industry to develop and apply technology, measurements, and standards. The Baldrige National Quality Program at NIST manages the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award.

Call the Baldrige National Quality Program for:

- information on applying for the Baldrige Award
- information on the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award process and eligibility requirements
- information on becoming a Baldrige Examiner
- information on the Baldrige Award recipients
- individual copies of the Criteria for Business, Education, and Health Care (no cost)
- information on other Baldrige National Quality Program materials

Telephone: (301) 975-2036; Fax: (301) 948-3716; E-mail: nqp@nist.gov
Web Address: <http://www.quality.nist.gov>

American Society for Quality

611 East Wisconsin Avenue
P.O. Box 3005
Milwaukee, WI 53201-3005

The American Society for Quality (ASQ) advances individual and organizational performance excellence worldwide by providing opportunities for learning, quality improvement, and knowledge exchange. ASQ administers the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award under contract to NIST.

Call ASQ to order:

- bulk copies of the Criteria
- case studies
- Award recipients' videos

Telephone: (800) 248-1946; Fax: (414) 272-1734; E-mail: asq@asq.org
Web Address: <http://www.asq.org>

Design: RCW Communication Design Inc.