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## Key Factors Worksheet

#### P.1a Organizational Environment

**Educational Program and Service Offerings** 50 associate; 25 certificate/workforce training badge; workforce development/continuing education—personal development, badges/skill-building courses. All associate programs require internship, apprenticeship, or other applied experience.

**Enrollment** 10,000 students/year, 75% face-to-face courses; 25% courses online/alternate location. Weekend, compressed, evening courses, dual-credit academies, prior learning credit.

**Context** Founded 1970; focused on open access, affordability, career-readiness, social responsibility; part of 12-college separately accredited state system; 5th largest enrollment of system. Manages own operations with central administrative support system office.

**Mission, Vision, Values** Mission—Empowering students to be successful in the workforce and their communities; Vision—Will be the best in the nation in providing students with accessibility, affordability, career-readiness, social responsibility. Values—Students First; Community-Engaged; Collaboration; Partnership Excellence.

**Core Competencies** CC1: Provide exceptional student support services; CC2: Partner with local community to achieve excellence/graduate job readiness; CC3: Maintain expert, up-to-date workforce.

**Workforce Profile** Tenured/tenure-track faculty (250); Adjunct/non-tenure-track faculty, FT & PT (200); management (60); professional support (250); support (400); temp. (50).

**Workforce Engagement Drivers** Open communication (supervisor relationships); high-performance work (valued as team member); focus on continuous improvement/innovation (training/resource availability/relevance); engaged/empowered workforce (satisfied with sense of contribution to mission); diverse ideas, cultures, thinking (satisfied with sense mission and college future); inclusion/equity.

**Assets and Locations** 125 acres: 25 major academic/admin. buildings; 238 labs; 12 research labs. Dining, athletic facilities, art galleries, theaters, rehearsal/studio space. 3X more labs than classrooms.

**Technology** STAR-Point app; Internal mobile app; college wireless network; online instructional resources/ support services; BOYD, interactive tv, virtual classrooms/podcasting, virtual anatomy table, collaboration technology/virtual discussion rooms, CAD systems.

**Regulatory Requirements** State coordinating board (Central Polk Board of Trustees); regional accred. (HLC); specialized accred. (7 academic programs w/discipline-specific); local (Board of County Commissioners); federal regs (DoE, Veterans Affairs, OCR, OSHA).

#### P.1b Organizational Relationships

**Organizational Structure** CPBT is governing/policy-setting body; President is CEO, reports to Chancellor, who reports to CPBT; President’s Team (senior leaders): president, VPs of academic & student services; finance; administration; community engagement, outreach, communications; human resources. Elected faculty governance w/board & committee structure.

**Key Market Segments and Key Requirements** Recent high school graduates inside/outside service area; non-traditional, transfer, former students—focused recruitment, information about institution, easy access to services. Primary customers: credit students, over 70% in 3-county service area.

**Key Student and Other Customers and Requirements** Career-seeking students—degree completion info, academic support services. Transfer—transfer articulation, degree completion info, academic challenges. Non-degree-seeking—workforce skills, adult learner needs. Dual Credit—college credit courses, collaboration with high school schedule.

**Key Partners and Collaborators** Transfer schools/sister colleges, feeder high schools, Foundation, donors, alumni association, alumni, employers/advisory committees, technology partners, local community including chamber of commerce.

**Key Suppliers** Technology providers, laboratory support providers, service providers (bookstore, dining), admin. support.

#### P.2a Competitive Environment

**Competitive Position** 66% of students from 3-county service area w/300,000 population. Declining high school graduates, primary competition is sister colleges. Other competitors: private technical colleges in service area, online higher ed. providers.

**Competitiveness Changes** National/regional estimates: declines in high school graduates over next decade; some peers/competitors lowering admissions standards; dual-credit academies, articulation agreements, collaboration with local employers to increase entry pathways; more attention to instructor qualifications due to increase in high school enrollment.

**Comparative Data** peers, competitors, national averages, best-in-class—IPEEx2, CCSSE, CollUnivPA-HR; Nome Zevil DASHER; other Baldrige winners; NCCBP, Cost and Productivity Project, NSC.

#### P.2b Strategic Context

**Strategic Advantages** Student success outcomes, societal responsibility outcomes, partnerships, affordability.

**Strategic Challenges** Decreased state funding, influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students, demands to close achievement gap, ensuring qualifications of incoming FT/PT faculty; Covid-19 pandemic, related disruptions.

**Strategic Objectives** student access, student success, career readiness, social responsibility.

#### P.2c Performance Improvement System

**Performance Improvement System** Baldrige-based PDCA. External requirements (accreditation, accountability, system requirement) inform internal strategy/measurement (strategic plan, KPIs), leading to process improvement (program review process, educational support review process validated by input mechanisms (VOC, workforce drivers/engagement).

## Key Themes Worksheet

### a. What are the most important strengths or outstanding practices (of potential value to other organizations) identified in the applicant’s response to process items?

1. Demonstrating a systems perspective, the applicant uses its Strategic Planning Process (SPP) to integrate organizational components into an interconnected ecosystem that delivers results. Built around a Plan, Do, Check, Act (PDCA) continuous-improvement framework, the five steps of the SPP include engaging with key stakeholders, partners, suppliers, collaborators, and workforce members. For example, voice-of-the-customer (VOC) and market data are used to determine program and service offerings, with key performance metrics set and fully deployed throughout the applicant, and several cycles of improvement of the Performance Management System are completed during the SPP. Workforce skills, competencies, certifications, and staffing levels necessary to achieve organizational results are also considered and systematically determined through the SPP. In addition, senior leaders create an environment for success by integrating communication approaches and addressing innovation opportunities that may arise as part of the SPP.
2. The applicant embeds PDCA methodology into many process implementation loops, thus using it as a key improvement tool and creating opportunities for innovation. The PDCA-based Performance Management System (Figure 4.1.1) and Operational Performance Review (Figure 4.1-6) support the performance review framework. The applicant’s Organizational Knowledge Management Process (COKMP, Figure 4.2-2) allows it to build and manage organizational knowledge gleaned from the PDCA reviews, as well as transfer knowledge among workforce members. Many key organizational processes undergo PDCA cycles, including those for determination of programs and services, legal and ethical compliance, learning and development, and workforce capacity and capability. In addition, the President’s Team and unit leaders use PDCA in step 5 of the SPP to make improvements in strategies and key processes. Further, the Northwest Innovation Process (Figure 1.1-3) uses PDCA to conduct intelligent risk analyses and manage innovation opportunities that may arise from PDCA-based reviews of processes.
3. The applicant supports its vision to be the best in the nation by systematically monitoring organizational performance to drive fact-based decision making. Using strategic key performance indicators (S-KPIs) for longer-term action plans and unit-level, operational KPIs (O-KPIs), the applicant tracks its performance through its Performance Measurement System (PMS, Figure 4.1-1) to reinforce organizational alignment. The applicant uses the Operational Performance Review (Figure 4.1-6) structure to determine teams, areas, and frequencies for reviews and uses the four-step B2P process to select comparative data and information. Additionally, the applicant’s Model of Data Quality and Availability (Figure 4.2-1) includes multiple approaches to systematically verify and ensure the quality of organizational data and information.
4. In support of its core competency of maintaining an expert, up-to-date workforce, the applicant uses systematic approaches to engage its workforce members, provide for their development, and address changing capacity and capability needs. For example, the applicant identifies key drivers of workforce engagement through annual environmental scans and assesses engagement levels using multiple methods, including three national surveys that allow for benchmarking to top-performing organizations. Additionally, the applicant systematically evaluates and improves its learning and development process, which includes professional development seminars and classes open to all faculty and staff levels. The applicant also requires employees to participate in an annual review of Culture Walk and successfully complete a competency test to ensure their currency on expected ethical and legal behavior. Further, the applicant addresses key changes and impacts to the workforce through workforce plans developed using Cap2 analysis during the SPP, and these are aligned to budget and action plans and reviewed throughout the year.

### b. What are the most significant opportunities, concerns, or vulnerabilities identified in the applicant’s response to process items?

1. Some gaps are apparent in the applicant’s use of its PDCA improvement approach to evaluation and improvement and in how it makes information available for improvement and innovation. For example, it is unclear how the processes used to evaluate Board and senior leader performance are evaluated for effectiveness. It is also not evident that the institution regularly evaluates and improves its overall approach to listening to potential students and other customers, as well as its processes for determining student/customer groups and market segments and determining educational program and service offerings. It is not clear how the applicant transfers relevant knowledge for use in strategic planning and innovation processes. Several aspects of how the applicant manages best practices are unclear, such as how best practices are identified for sharing at the annual Day of Sharing or for inclusion in The Northwest Way (TNW) portal. Further, the applicant does not appear to systematically analyze the success of or identify opportunities for improvement for its diversity-related processes for recruiting, hiring, and onboarding new workforce members.
2. It is unclear how the applicant’s approaches consider the different needs and expectations of its various student and workforce segments. For example, it is unclear that the applicant’s partnership with RBM reflects a well-ordered and repeatable approach to identifying future student and market segments, including identifying which groups and segments to pursue for future growth. It is also not evident how listening methods vary for different student groups, or that the applicant deploys its Relationship Management Process (RMP, Figure 3.1-2) to effectively understand varying student requirements. t is also unclear how key means of student support vary for different student groups or segments through the RMP or other approaches. Additionally, it is not clear how the applicant considers various workforce segments (e.g., professional support staff vs. faculty members, full-time vs. part-time, those working at various locations such as labs) in determining drivers of workforce engagement, as well as in its approaches for managing workplace capability and capacity, the workplace environment, and benefits/policies.
3. Processes to sustain and grow a culture that inspires the workforce and students and treats them fairly are not apparent. Beyond the Culture Walk program, a systematic method for senior leaders to create a culture that fosters inclusion and develops future students and leaders to ensure inclusion of those of diverse backgrounds is not evident. Nor is it evident how senior leaders’ personal actions demonstrate a commitment to organizational values and accountability. Additionally, it is not clear how senior leaders effectively communicate with and engage the entire workforce, students, partners, and other stakeholders using the communications methods listed in Figure 1.1-2. A systematic approach to effectively respond to ethical breaches, such as potential Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) or Title IX complaints and/or student harassment at remote worksites, also is not evident. In addition, in the applicant’s efforts to ensure fair treatment for different students and student groups, it is unclear how approaches for compliance with federal/state equal opportunity and antidiscrimination laws align with Just Culture guidelines and the institution’s Walk-It-Right ethics program. Further, a systematic approach is not evident for promoting equity and inclusion in processes for workforce performance management, performance development, and career development.
4. Addressing an apparent lack of systematic approaches to engage suppliers, partners, and the community may help the applicant create more value for them. For example, a process to balance the needs of all stakeholders in the SPP is not evident; nor is it clear that a systematic approach is in place to deploy action plans to key suppliers, partners, and collaborators. In addition, a systematic leadership approach is not evident for identifying key communities and determining areas for organizational involvement. Further, in the collection and analysis of data, it is unclear how the applicant engages its technological partners to assess changes and innovations in technology, including in planning to anticipate and prepare for disruptions of a technological nature. It is also not clear how the applicant deploys priorities from its performance reviews to its key suppliers, partners, and collaborators. Specifically, it is unclear how the leader of each priority captured in the Action Plan Management System (APMS) deploys the priority to suppliers of student support services, such as providers of technology, laboratory support, the bookstore, and dining services. Moreover, it is unclear whether the applicant’s Central Administrative Support (CAS) processes for managing the supply network include approaches to communicating performance expectations, measuring suppliers’ performance, providing feedback, or addressing suppliers’ poor performance.

### c. Considering the applicant’s key business/organization factors, what are the most significant strengths found in its response to results items?

1. The applicant demonstrates good levels, trends, and comparisons in many results related to its strategic objectives of student access and success, reflecting its value of Students First. For example, supporting the strategic objectives of student access and success, results for enrollment, graduation rate, credit hours delivered, and number of students transferred (Figures 7.1-1, 7.1-3, 7.1-4, and 7.1-6) show a pre-pandemic beneficial trend and outperform key comparatives. In many instances, the applicant has continued to outperform comparisons even in the midst of pandemic downturns in others’ performance, such as in results for degrees awarded (Figure 7.1-2) and continuing education hours (Figure 7.1-5). In support of the applicant’s value of Students First, RBM Overall Satisfaction (Figure 7.2-1) levels have continuously improved and outperform three peer institutions and equal the performance of a Baldrige Award winner in 2020. Similarly, the applicant’s results for RBM College Met Expectations (Figure 7.2-2) outperform those of all peers and meet the RBM top decile in 2020. Additionally, results for Satisfaction with Student Focus (Figure 7.2-4) have improved steadily from 2014 to 2019 in four key measures; and results for Customer Satisfaction with Student Services (Figure 7.2-14) have increased for four student segments from 2017 to 2020. Further, results for Level of Student Engagement (Figure 7.2-20) exceed the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) top decile for all four dimensions measured. These performance levels may significantly contribute to the applicant’s market share penetration in its three-county service area, which outperforms the best service-area competitor (Figure 7.5-12).
2. Favorable financial results may assist the applicant in maintaining its strategic advantage of affordability and addressing its strategic challenge of decreased state funding. For example, cost containment results indicate the applicant is performing at or above the level of DASHER (Data Sharing Consortium for Higher Education Research) top peer (Figure 7.5-8), and the applicant also outperforms the DASHER top peer for percentage of expenditures for instruction and academic support (Figure 7.5-9), while maintaining a lower cost per enrollment than all three of its comparators (Figure 7.5-10). The applicant’s shift to online textbooks has decreased the average cost and increased student savings (Figure 7.1-22), and its integration of systems has resulted in support savings for food service and the bookstore (Figure 7.1-21). In addition, financial results for revenue and margin have remained stable or better than comparative benchmarks. For example, the Net Asset position (Figure 7.5-4) is better than the NCCBP comparison; revenue and expenditures outperform the IPEEx2 top quartile (Figure 7.2a), and the net margin has continued to improve from 2016 through 2019. Further, the applicant’s bond credit rating (Figure 7.5-6) continues to be strong.
3. The applicant’s leadership and workforce results demonstrate a focus on the future by creating an environment for success and ethical behavior. Senior leader (SL) results for communication, engagement, and support of organizational values (Figure 7.4-1), as well as scores for SL reinforcement of each of those values (Figure 7.4-2) demonstrate beneficial trends and outperform top-decile levels of comparisons. Results for stakeholder trust in the President’s Team demonstrate beneficial trends for the past three years and outperform the top decile in fiscal year (FY) 2020 for all four stakeholder groups. Additionally, the applicant invests more in workforce development than its peers and that investment garners favorable satisfaction ratings for effectiveness of leadership development programs; for example, applicant results for Workforce Learning and Development Investment (Figure 7.3-13) exceed the DASHER comparison for all three workforce segments. In addition, participation rates of eligible employees and perceptions of effectiveness (Figure 7.3-15) and satisfaction with peer mentoring (Figure 7.3-14) demonstrate general beneficial trends and good performance levels for faculty members and administrators. Further, most compliance and regulatory measures are at or near 100% for the last one to two years; and employee participation in ethics training has outperformed the top sister college in the system for four of the last five years. Results for workplace climate also are favorable; for example, perceived safety results related to service and professionalism (Figure 7.3-5) show beneficial trends, with all areas exceeding the national top decile. In addition, results of the Canter Q12 survey (Figure 7.3-6) show consistently good levels that exceed top-decile scores for overall workplace climate.

### d. Considering the applicant’s key business/organization factors, what are the most significant opportunities, vulnerabilities, and/or gaps (related to data, comparisons, linkages) found in its response to results items?

1. Missing results may prevent the applicant from fully understanding its progress in relation to its vision to be the best in the nation. For example, the applicant does not present results for its efforts to close the student achievement gap, a strategic challenge, including results on student use of support services or interventions to promote equitable access. Also missing are results for the satisfaction and engagement of some suppliers and partners, including those for engagement of employers and advisory committee members, technology companies, the community (including the local chamber of commerce), and engagement of lab support providers. Additionally, some key workforce-related results are missing, such as workforce capability results related to academic credentials or appropriate skills, accessibility results (which may impact inclusion), and participation in and satisfaction with wellness programs (the applicant’s indicator of workplace health). Further, a number of expected leadership and governance results are missing, including measures of legal and regulatory compliance and accreditation performance. Other examples are missing measures of SL communications and engagement with students, Board self-assessments, and grievances and complaints, as well as measures addressing risk with educational programs. The applicant also has not provided many expected performance results for societal well-being and key community support, including measures related to students (graduate placements in programs of need, faculty and student events for community benefit), businesses (certification, advisory groups, and dual-credit programs), and community learning events. Results are also not reported for the socially important indicators of career-placement and readiness, retaining students in higher-income positions, and keeping students local.
2. Addressing missing segmentation in some key results may help the applicant in understanding its performance in relation to all key groups or areas. For example, no data are presented for student learning by different student population segments. Indicators of student success, such as annual (fall-to-fall) student persistence rates (Figure 7.1-9), graduation rates (Figure 7.1-3,3b), and number of students transferring to four-year institutions (Figure 7.1-6) are not segmented to provide results for the applicant’s certificate programs, workforce badges, or career preparation courses. Segmentation of results by student sub-groups is missing for measures of satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and engagement, such as RBM Overall Satisfaction (Figure 7.2-1), Satisfaction with Academic Services (Figure 7.2-3), Level of Student Engagement (Figure 7.2-20), and Percent Students Achieving Goals (Figure 7.2-23). Additionally, workforce-focused results do not show data for non-tenure-track, full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty members, particularly key indicators such as workforce capacity and capability, climate, engagement, and development. Most key leadership, governance, and societal well-being results also lack segmentation. For example, segmentation of results by student groups (career seeking vs. non-career seeking) and faculty groups (PT vs. FT) is lacking in Leadership Reinforcement of Values (Figure 7.4-2), Stakeholder Trust in Senior Leaders (Figure 7.4-10), Ethical Environment (Figure 7.4-11), and Perception of Walk It Right Ethics Program (Figure 7.4-12). Further, no results are provided on the net revenue related to credit/degree students who make up 70% of the student population or on affordability by market, educational offering, or student group (career seeking, transfer, non-degree, and dual-credit students).
3. Several key results highlight areas where unfavorable levels, trends, or comparisons may limit the applicant’s ability to achieve its vision of being the best. For example, the applicant’s clock hours have consistently been below the DASHER top peer, the National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP) 90th percentile, and the IPEEx2 top quartile (Figure 7.5-13), and its market share for credit students has been flat over the last five years and below the Dasher and NCCBP benchmarks (Figure 7.5-11). Even during a move to remote operations precipitated by the pandemic, safety drop-box inputs have remained higher than pre-pandemic levels in 2018 (Figure 7.1-19). In addition, both the Canter and CEE surveys indicate that engagement results for the staff segment are lower for all workforce engagement factors (Figures 7.3-9 and 7.3-10) than for other workforce segments. Lower results for the staff segment relative to faculty and administrator segments are also reflected in the measures showing lower investment in staff learning and development (Figure 7.3-13), lower satisfaction for this work group with Bright Star peer mentoring (Figure 7.3-14), lower participation in leadership development (Figure 7.3-15), and an uneven trend for attrition. Further demonstrating performance that may limit the applicant’s advancement, seven of the applicant’s 15 strategic goals have a red status, indicating that they have not been met, and many action plans (Figure 7.5-18) have a red or yellow status.

## Item Worksheet—Item 1.1

## Senior Leadership

### Relevant Key Factors

1. Mission—Empowering students to be successful in the workforce and their communities; Vision—Will be the best in the nation in providing students with accessibility, affordability, career-readiness, and social responsibility. Values—Students First; Community-Engaged; Collaboration; Partnership Excellence
2. Tenured/tenure-track faculty (250); Adjunct/non-tenure-track faculty, FT & PT (200); management (60); professional support (250); support (400); temp. (50).
3. CPBT is governing/policy-setting body; President is CEO, reports to the Chancellor, who reports to CPBT; President’s Team (senior leaders) includes president, vice presidents of academic/student services; finance; administration; community engagement, outreach, communications; human resources. Elected faculty governance w/board/committee structure.
4. Transfer schools/sister colleges, feeder high schools, Foundation, donors, alumni association, alumni, employers/advisory committees, technology partners, local community including chamber of commerce
5. Decreased state funding, influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students, demands to close achievement gap, ensuring qualifications of incoming FT/PT faculty.
6. Baldrige-based PDCA.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Based on nationally recognized best practices, senior leaders (SLs) implemented a Culture Walk program in 2016 to demonstrate their commitment to ethical and legal behavior. President’s Team (PT) members serve as resources for workforce questions and guidance. The applicant logs Culture Walk issues, takes action, and records outcomes; SLs conduct an annual Culture Walk review. Employees are required to participate in an annual review and pass a test on their Culture Walk competency; new employees receive Culture Walk information during new employee orientation (NEO). | 5 examiners (Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex2, Ex6) identified as a strength with some variations to the specifics approaches and if this was rooted in best practices.  NOTE: Leaving this comment in (but have undoubled) based on discussions as this is focused on specifically the Culture Walk for legal/ethical behavior and not necessarily on senior leaders’ personal actions ... would expect a lot more to support personal actions as a strength; and it is differentiated from the OFI for a(1)/c(2) about personal actions. But have undoubled to ensure that it is not in conflict with the a(1)/c(2) OFI.  More evidence: Students learn about the Culture Walk program upon enrollment and access a confidential online portal to report issues, concerns, events. | a(2) |
|  | The applicant’s vision and values are established by SLs within the Strategic Planning Process (SPP) and are communicated and reinforced to employees through various communications methods (Figure 1.1-2). For example, SLs introduce the vision and values at the NEO, and they are discussed at department meetings. SLs receive feedback on how they reflect the applicant’s values in their annual performance reviews, providing some opportunities for learning. This approach helps reinforce the applicant’s Students First value. | 4 examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex5, Ex6) identified as a strength at the overall for setting and at multiple level for specifically addressing employees. (There is an optional OFI for other stakeholders—but at multiple level, currently choosing not to use it.)  Triennially in the SPP (Fig 2.1-1); Leadership Communications Process and NEO; annual performance reviews. Leaders deploy them in departmental meetings. SLs explain in person in NEO. SLs set expectations for demonstration of values in everyday action, and employees are evaluated annually and provided feedback. | a(1) |
|  | SLs create an environment for success by integrating communications approaches to drive the achievement of the applicant’s mission. SLs help ensure cultural alignment through feedback and integration with change management approaches, NEO, and employee surveys. In SPP, step 5, the PT and unit leaders address innovation and change management, and they use PDCA to continually evaluate and improve these processes. Short- and longer-term systematic succession plans are in place for the President and PT to ensure continuity and smooth transitions, as needed. These approaches may help the applicant achieve organizational sustainability. | 6 examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7) identified as a strength at the overall/multiple levels, with some differences in the examples, and incorporate learning.  A change management process creates and reinforces the organizational culture and fosters employee engagement, which is measured by the employee engagement survey.  The 4-step innovation process has helped with agility, with the example of being able to quickly include workforce and student communication during the start of the pandemic.  The applicant has a short term 8-week success plan so that someone can step in quickly to SL positions and has a longer-term succession plan for the president and the president’s team.  Strong evidence of integration via the Listening, communications, strategic planning, NWIP, and Leadership system; as well as succession planning and culture alignment efforts. also deployed through communications methods and NEO and STAR. PDCA used to evaluate opportunities. | c(1) |
|  |  |  |  |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Note: did not use a c(1) STR about innovation and intelligent risk (1 examiner); there is an OFI at the multiple level that would conflict with it, and there is some innovation addressed in the current c(1) strength.  Did not use a, b, and c(2) strengths as they were weaker strengths (even though ID’d by multiple examiners) as there are OFIs for the same areas that were more relevant and pertinent for the applicant; but gave a little credit for communications in a c(1) STR comment. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X** | It is not evident how SLs’ personal actions reflect a commitment to the applicant’s values or how SLs demonstrate personal accountability for the applicant’s actions. For example, the Culture Walk appears to be limited to promoting ethical and legal behavior, inclusion, and equity, rather than addressing values and personal accountability more broadly. In addition, it is not clear how SLs demonstrate their commitment to the values of being community-engaged and of partnership excellence. Systematic approaches in these areas may enable SLs to enhance the mission of empowering students. | 5 examiners (Ex1, Ex3, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7) had some overall elements of a and/or c(2) as an OFI. Based on the issues, I merged into 1 OFI to address the gap with SL personal actions and personal accountability. The applicant gives general examples of things it does … but actual personal actions are absent.  I have doubled the OFI based on its relevance to what SL should be “doing” to lead the org at the overall level.  Evidence includes:  It is introduced in NEO but not sure how “first do no harm” relates to actual commitment or examples.  SLs serve as resources but what makes employees go to SL for a challenging situation.  Self-serve reporting mechanisms, but how most stakeholders are aware of legal or ethical situations is not clear. Information is visible and reviewed by leaders, but little to no evidence of their specific actions. | a(1),c(2) |
|  | Beyond the Culture Walk program, systematic processes for SLs to create a culture that fosters inclusion and cultivates organizational agility and resilience is not evident. For example, it is not evident how the applicant ensures inclusion of individuals with diverse backgrounds in efforts to develop future leaders; nor is it evident how innovation processes contribute to cultivating agility or resilience. Approaches in these areas may enhance the applicant’s ability to empower students in a diverse society and diverse communities. | Multiple-level comment supported by 3 examiners (Ex1, Ex3, Ex5) in various fashions—2 addressing equity and inclusion and one focused on agility and reliance; I merged into one comment to capture 3 aspects, based on suggestions for refinement and discussion with SME.  Evidence —-It is unclear that the applicant’s approach to workforce selection helps ensure inclusion of diverse backgrounds by participation representing broad cross-sections of the institution.  Northwest Innovation Process seems to be a self-initiated program for idea gathering.  Change management process describes ad hoc application to a particular initiative but does not describe organizational capacity for agility or resilience.  Weekly PT meetings track progress on objectives, but these are driven by monthly meetings of workgroups performing the actions—seems incongruous. | c(1) |
|  | It is not evident how SLs effectively encourage two-way communication with the workforce, students, and key partners using the applicant’s communications methods (Figure 1.1-2). For example, it is not evident how STAR-Point achieves frank, two-way communication or how such communication is achieved in department meetings. Fully engaging the workforce and students may advance the applicant’s performance excellence journey. | Supported by 4 examiners (Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex6) in some fashion based on the gaps in the communications approaches and/or effectively engaging aspect at the overall level.  Example: it is not evident how STAR-Point achieves frank two-way communication. Nor is it clear how frank two-way communication is achieved in department meetings where staff may be uncomfortable speaking. | b |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| 3 OFIs not used:  1. c(2), multiple level—"unclear how the applicant’s system of review of achievement of strategy and priority action plans helps to create a focus on action.” (Ex1, Ex2)  2. a(1), multiple level—“It is not evident that SLs use a systematic process to deploy MVV to key suppliers, partners, students, and other customers and stakeholders.” (Ex3, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7). Choose to hold this one out as there were more relevant OFIs ... but open to moving it back in the mix. There was a suggestion to add this as an additional OFI by Ex4—but have chosen not to do so at this point as think the other OFIs are more relevant. IF this would support a KT ... may need to add as a 4th OFI.  3. a(2), c(1) OFI for L—"It is not clear how the applicant evaluates several senior leadership processes such as the SL communication, innovation and intelligent risk taking, and succession planning. While processes are described, evaluation of the processes and learnings are not clear. Example is given of changing a survey from Laney Mess to Canter but no information about whether this resulted from an evaluative process. No information was provided as to how the data may be analyzed or about evaluating the effectiveness of the processes for SL communication beyond satisfaction data.” (Ex4, Ex5) |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 60**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Score should not be below this range as the applicant has answered most of the overall questions, rather than the basic; processes appear to be well deployed, there is some evidence of evaluation, and the approach is well aligned with the Org. Profile factors, rather than in the early stages. It is not in the higher range of 70–85% in part because the applicant does not respond to several key elements of the overall questions, with some responses in the multiple questions for approach and also because the other descriptors of 50-65% also seem most descriptive.**  **Recommend a score of 60, with one OFI doubled.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 1.2

## Governance and Societal Contributions

### Relevant Key Factors

1. Vision—Will be the best in the nation in providing students with accessibility, affordability, career-readiness, and social responsibility. Values— Students First; Community-Engaged.
2. The work I do contributes to the mission of the college; I am confident about the future of the institution.
3. State coordinating board (Central Polk Board of Trustees); regional accred. (HLC); specialized accred. (7 academic programs w/discipline-specific); local (Board of County Commissioners); federal regs (DoE, Veterans Affairs, OCR, OSHA).
4. CPBT is governing/policy-setting body; President is CEO, reports to Chancellor, who reports to CPBT; President’s Team (senior leaders) includes president, VPs of academic/student services; finance; administration; community engagement, outreach, communications; human resources. Elected faculty governance w/board/committee structure.
5. Transfer schools/sister colleges, feeder high schools, foundation, donors, alumni association, alumni, employers/advisory committees, technology partners, local community including chamber of commerce
6. Baldrige-based PDCA. External requirements (accreditation, accountability, system requirement) inform internal strategy/measurement (strategic plan, KPIs), leading to process improvement (program review process, educational support review process validated by input mechanisms (VOC, workforce drivers/engagement).

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The applicant promotes and ensures ethical behavior in all of its interactions through the well-deployed and integratedCulture Walks and Walk It Right programs, with the latter integrated into stakeholder surveys and added to SL reviews in cycles of improvement. Deployment occurs through NEO, leader meetings, the classroom, and stakeholder surveys. These approaches support leaders’ effectiveness in addressing the applicant’s key drivers of workforce engagement, especially inclusion and equity (Figure 5.2-1). | 5 examiners (Ex1, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7) called this out as a STR, with 1 indicating it as a double STR. This may be significant in linking inclusion in education.  Other examples include:  Key ethics processes: Culture Walk and Walk It Right. [A]  Deployed through: NEO, Leader meetings, classroom. [D]  Improvements: Walk it Right started in 2016. [L]  Integration and learning: Walk it Right added to stakeholder surveys in 2017; added to SL Reviews in 2018. Measures: cases raised, comfort/ease of reporting, number of cases successfully resolved. | b(2) |
|  | The applicant evaluates the performance of SLs and governance board members through a systematic, multilevel process. Annually, the CPBT conducts a self-evaluation to determine learning needs. The President is evaluated using an ACCT-endorsed review instrument, as well as the measures of the strategic dashboard and Culture Walk. Performance review results lead to an annual development plan for SLs and Bright Star graduates. Providing accountability for performance and development opportunities supports the applicant in maintaining expert, up-to-date leadership. | Overall STR—All examiners called this out as STR.  Examples include:  40% of compensation tied to overall applicant performance and 60% on individual, strategic, and AP annual development plan mentoring provided to Bright Star candidates.  A comprehensive approach is presented using a 360-degree evaluation for faculty, workforce, the president, and PT.  The president and each PT member are also reviewed by the Culture Walk rating to assure living the Culture Walk, highly valued by the CPBT.  The CPBT uses an annual self-evaluation to determine its strategic, financial, advocacy for student success, learning needs for development. | a(2) |
|  | The applicant’s governance approaches support its ability to deliver on its value of being community engaged. The applicant ensures responsible governance through the board’s fiduciary and leadership oversight; transparency is accomplished through regular open meetings, the board committee structure and meetings, performance reviews, regional events, and community engagement. Annual performance outcomes are aligned with strategic objectives. | All examiners had this as a STR at the overall level, with some examples of multiple questions.  Examples include:  System’s 11-member board ensures responsible fiduciary and leadership oversight via open meetings, committee meetings, perf. reviews, participation in regional events for advocacy, community engagement, and support; Committee of the Whole meets monthly; standard agenda and public notices enable citizens to participate.  Various board committees are in place including Financial Committee, Policy Committee.  Also, selection of governance member guided by state statute ensuring county representation, employment relationship, ethnicity, gender, representation of key programs, areas of needed knowledge.  Annual perf. outcomes aligned with SObjs; chancellor facilitates annual board evaluation and 360 of president. System board has lead role in succession planning for chancellor. | a(1) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Had originally considered 2 additional STR; 1 for c(1) and 1 for b(1)—but to try to cut down to 3 key STR, chose to not include these in R2 as the OFIs for these areas are more relevant to helping the applicant. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A systematic approach is not evident to effectively respond to ethical breaches, such as potential FERPA violations, Title IX complaints, and students being harassed at remote worksites. For example, Compliance Services would respond to ethical breaches, but it is not clear what specific process would be used to address breaches, as none have yet to occur. Given the applicant’s regulatory requirements and commitment to societal responsibility, being unable to systematically address ethical breaches may have a negative impact on the applicant’s reputation. | 1 examiner (Ex4)—but support this multiple-level Criteria question issue for this OFI and have confirmed with another SME the criticality of this. Thus kept in there because of its relevance to reputation.  Examples include: Information is provided about monitoring for ethical breaches and none have happened.  The applicant says the Compliance Services would respond to ethical breaches but not what processes would be used to address them.  Have included references to potential FERPA and Title IX complaints as well as addressing if students are harassed by internship collaborators while on remote work sites to have effective approaches to address. | b(2) |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant identifies its key communities (identified as feeder and transfer schools, local business and community advisory committees, and industry partners) and determines areas for organizational involvement. For example, the electric company, which is identified as a key community, does not appear to be a target for organizational involvement. Given that the applicant’s key partner/collaborator is the local community, a systematic approach may allow the applicant to better anticipate and evaluate any changes in its key communities or their needs. | 4 examiners (Ex1, Ex3, Ex4, Ex7 as SME identified) had this as A-multiple-level comment.  Based on discussion with SME and Ex6—have refined but have left the OFI for identifying key communities.  Evidence: While the applicant has listed its key communities, it has not given the process by which key communities are identified. | c(2) |
|  | Systematic evaluation and improvement, as well as use of best practices and innovations, are not evident for the applicant’s governance and societal contributions approaches. For example, it is not evident how the applicant evaluates the effectiveness of its processes to ensure responsible governance or to assess the performance of its SLs and Board; it is not clear how the applicant arrived at the decision to expand the CPBT in 2018. Applying its PDCA system to these approaches may help the applicant move toward its vision to be the best. | 4 examiners (Ex3, Ex4, Ex6, Ex5) had some form of learning OFI identified—3 for leadership/governance, 2 specifically for societal—thus merged into 1 OFI.  Per discussion with SME to support this OFI additional support is ... In a learning organization, would expect to see more specific evidence of actual learning/improvements made.  For example ... Multiple evaluative processes within the governance system and performance evaluation, but it is not clear the applicant evaluates the processes themselves. The applicant talks about doing a number of evals., but no actual improvements noted; and not clear that they are utilizing their own PDCA approach other than reviewing in the SPP. | a,c |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant systematically addresses current and anticipates future concerns with the college’s educational programs, services, and operations. For example, it is unclear that the applicant’s Complaint Management Process (Figure 3.2-1) includes systematic approaches to effectively manage escalation, resolution, and follow-up; nor is it clear how complaints are validated prior to filing with the state. The lack of a systematic approach in this area may limit the applicant’s ability to demonstrate its value of Students First. | As a community college … this OFI warrants staying (per SME discussion).  2 examiners had this at the overall, 1 had it more at the multiple level (risk) (Ex3, Ex4, Ex7). (OFI from 1 about lack of specific measures put "below the line.”)  This OFI splits the overall question into elements so that it clearly calls out the gap. Kept the comment more at the overall level.  Examples include: Evaluation and response to complaints are provide per CMP (Figure 3.2-1) do not provide a process that describes steps for escalation, resolution, follow up. Validated complaints are filed with state board of ed. How community stakeholder concerns, complaints are addressed and resolved. | b(1) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Did not include an original OFI consideration for b(2) for deployment to various stakeholders as there is a STR for that area of b(2) with its Walk it Right approach; and opted to keep a b(2) OFI specifically around not addressing breaches as saw this as more critical for the applicant.  There were 3 additional OFIs not used:  b(1) concerning lack of compliance measures to address specifics of legal/regulatory and regional accrediting (felt getting to specific);  b(2) about ensuring ethical behaviors are aligned with assuring equity and inclusion with its students—saw this as going beyond the Criteria; and  c(1) about making determinations of what constitutes societal well-being for each constituent—also saw this as going beyond the Criteria.  May use elsewhere in c: It is not evident how community stakeholder concerns shared at open meetings are addressed and resolved. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 60**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Score should not be below as the applicant has answered the majority of overall questions, rather than the basic; processes appeared to be well deployed but with variation in some areas; with some evaluation/learning evident. Overall the approach is well aligned with overall needs in the Org. Profile. It is not in the higher range of 70–85% as the applicant does not respond to several key elements for many of the multiple questions for approach, deployment is not clear among all areas (e.g. suppliers, partners with its community approaches), and learning/evaluation would not support this level.**  **Recommend a score of 60 based on the 3 strengths and 4 OFIs, with no comment doubled.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 2.1

## Strategy Development

### Relevant Key Factors

1. Vision—Will be the best in the nation in providing students with accessibility, affordability, career-readiness, social responsibility.
2. STAR-Point app; internal mobile app; college wireless network; online instructional resources/support services; BOYD, interactive tv, virtual classrooms/podcasting, virtual anatomy table, collaboration technology and virtual discussion rooms, CAD systems.
3. Recent high school graduates inside/outside service area; nontraditional, transfer, former students—focused recruitment, information about institution, easy access to services.
4. Transfer schools/sister colleges, feeder high schools, foundation, donors, alumni association, alumni, employers/advisory committees, technology partners, local community including chamber of commerce.
5. National/regional estimates: declines in high school graduates over next decade; lowering of admissions standards of some peers/competitors; development of dual-credit academies, articulation agreements, collaboration with local employers to increase entry pathways; increase attention on instructor qualifications due to increase in high school enrollment.
6. Student success outcomes, societal responsibility outcomes, partnerships, affordability.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X** | The applicant’s systematic Strategic Planning Process (SPP; Figure 2.2-1) includes five steps built around PDCA and engages key stakeholders, partners, suppliers, and collaborators, as well as the workforce. Monitoring of short- and long-term goals quarterly for agility and annually for improvement allows the applicant to strengthen its core competencies and support its values. The process cascades organizational goals to the workforce through the online Action Plan Management system, with action plan performance posted on the web for transparency. | All examiners. This is addressed at the multiple level. I doubled this based on the strength of the various comments.  The key process steps are clearly articulated, along with all of the key stakeholders, including suppliers, collaborators, community, etc. The ST and LT planning horizons are clearly explained. Agility and resilience are included through review and PDCA processes. The plan can be reviewed and modified quarterly as part of the response to drastic environmental changes or emergencies.  ADLI | a(1) |
|  | The applicant’s strategic objectives are aligned with its strategic advantages, strategic challenges, and core competencies (Figure 2.2-1). Each objective has associated strategic goals, KPIs, and corresponding action plans or strategic initiatives. The action plans incorporate key changes in educational programs and services that may help the applicant succeed in its changing competitive environment. | This was noted by 5 examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6). The SObjs are clearly described in the figure, along with related goals. What is not included are key changes it plans in services, programs, customers, markets, suppliers etc. It does indicate more focus on rural area, which is part of the multiple questions.  ADI | b(1) |
|  | The applicant systematically stimulates and incorporates innovation through SPP step 1 (Visioning) and step 5 (Strategy/Process and Innovation). Through the Intelligent Risk Analysis, the applicant prioritizes strategic opportunities. The strategic opportunities for online and competency-based education, transfer articulation, and on-site educational and training among rural communities were results of this process. This approach may help the applicant address the strategic challenge of closing the achievement gap. | Strength noted by 5 examiners (Ex1, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7). Ex2 noted this as an OFI. Most examiners noted that it fit the overall question with a few areas of the multiple questions addressed. This was doubled by one examiner (Ex5).  ADLI | a(2) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| There was a large amount of commonality in the strengths noted by the team. One exception is that one examiner listed innovation as an OFI (Ex2).  Comments not included in the strengths were on the collection and analysis of data used in the SPP, especially regarding technological changes, and blind spots.  (a3) This was noted by 3 examiners as a strength and 3 examiners as an OFI.  Work systems (a[4]) was noted as a strength by 3 examiners (Ex4, Ex6, Ex7) but conflicts with an OFI in the same area. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X** | A systematic process is not evident for balancing the needs of all key stakeholders while addressing the applicant’s strategic challenges and leveraging its core competencies and strategic advantages. In particular, the applicant’s strategic objectives do not appear to address the key changes planned for educational programs and competitive changes, or to address strategic challenges such as decreased state funding and differentiation of multiple student segments’ learning needs. Without addressing these key areas, the applicant may limit its ability to achieve its vision of being the best in the nation in a highly competitive and changing environment. | Stakeholders are involved in the SPP retreat, but it is not clear how their needs are balanced and become part of the goals and action plans.  Strategic objectives relate to the design and assessment of the curriculum as goals, action plans, and initiatives did not include measurable learning outcomes. There were no financial measures indicated in the objectives (Fig. 2.1-2). It is hard to determine which are ST and which are LT needs unless you assume O-KPIs are for short term.  This comment was noted by 4 examiners (Ex2, Ex3, Ex5, Ex7).  AI | b(2) |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant determines what core competencies it will need in the future or how it includes the core competencies of suppliers and partners in this determination. Considering the applicant’s need for the core competencies of technology partners, the need to understand and meet the needs of rural students, and the changing demographics of students in a more diverse learning environment, a systematic approach in this area may help the applicant sustain its strategic advantage of student success outcomes. | OFI was noted by three examiners (Ex3, Ex5, Ex6). This OFI addresses AI at the multiple level. Needs include the involvement of core competencies of technology partners, understanding and meeting the needs of rural students and changing demographics of students in a more diverse learning environment. Some of these areas are mentioned briefly in the strategic goals without specific timelines other than improvements in results annually.  One concern of the consensus team regards RBM—the relationship management firm used extensively in item 3.1. A great deal of important work is done by this supplier with no evidence of what would happen if this supplier changed and where the supplier backup information might be available. | a(4) |
|  | In the applicant’s collection and analysis of data, it is unclear how it engages its technology partners to assess changes and innovations in technology. For example, it is unclear how the applicant engages these partners to anticipate and prepare for technological disruptions and in the use of the IRA tool to minimize risk. Given changes such as the increased use of technology in STEM programs and the decrease in state funding, an approach in this area may help the applicant address the risk of not having adequate resources to execute its strategic plan. | This approach OFI was noted by 5 examiners relative to the multiple Criteria questions (Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7). Different multiple areas were noted by different examiners.  Especially noted was lack of comments on potential changes in regulatory and the external environment; technological changes and innovations that may come from partners, collaborators, and suppliers; the ability to address potential blind spots; and the ability to execute the plan. | a(3) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Examiners were really varied on OFIs, with not a lot in any one area.  a(1): Two examiners (Ex4, Ex6) noted in a(1) the need for change, prioritization of change initiatives, and resilience, but a(1) was left as a strength. No comments were doubled. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 60**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Score should not be below as the applicant has answered the overall questions, rather than the basic; processes appeared to be well deployed with benefit of doubt; fact-based PDCA improvement is noted and innovation was listed as a strength; and the approach is well aligned with overall needs in the Org. Profile.**  **It is not in the higher range of 70–85% as the applicant does not respond to several key elements for many of the multiple questions for approach, deployment is not clear among all areas (e.g., suppliers, partners), and it is not clear if the approach is integrated for future needs.**  **The score is at the higher end of the range based on the strength of the Strategic Planning Process itself and use of PDCA for improvement.**  **Recommend a score of 60 based on the balance of strengths and OFIs, with one strength doubled.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 2.2

## Strategy Implementation

### Relevant Key Factors

1. CC3: Maintain expert, up-to-date workforce.
2. Transfer schools/sister colleges, feeder high schools, foundation, donors, alumni association, alumni, employers/advisory committees, technology partners, local community including chamber of commerce.
3. Technology providers, laboratory support providers, service providers (bookstore, dining), administrative support.
4. National/regional estimates: declines in high school graduates over next decade; lowering of admissions standards of some peers/competitors; development of dual-credit academies, articulation agreements, collaboration with local employers to increase entry pathways; increase attention on instructor qualifications due to increase in high school enrollment.
5. Decreased state funding, influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students, demands to close achievement gap, ensuring qualifications of incoming FT/PT faculty
6. Baldrige-based PDCA. External requirements (accreditation, accountability, system. requirement) inform internal strategy/measurement (strategic plan, KPIs).

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Workforce plans are systematically developed to address key changes and their impact on the applicant’s workforce, supporting the applicant’s core competency of maintaining an expert, up-to-date workforce. The Cap2 Analysis Process, a part of step 2 of the SPP, is integrated with the strategic objectives (SObjs) and action plans (APs). Four workforce plans (Figure 2.2-1) are aligned to specific SObjs, deployed to the applicant’s leaders and workforce through the Action Plan Management System (APMS), and reviewed semiannually. | This is noted by 5 examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6).  ADI  The HR team executes the Cap2 Analysis Process involving the review/alignment and creation of new SObjs in step 2 of the SPP to assure appropriate capability and capacity needs.  WF plans are deployed to the PT, unit leaders, and WF using the APMS, and are integrated with steps 2 & 3 of the SPP.  This addresses the core competency of an expert, up-to-date workforce and also addresses the strategic challenge of ensuring qualifications of incoming full-and part-time faculty. | a(4) |
|  | Through its systematic Strategic Resource Allocations (SRA) process, the applicant ensures that workforce, financial, and other resources are available to support the achievement of action plans at a time of declining state funding. Step 5 of the SPP includes a review of the budgeting process used by the Finance Committee (CPBT-FC), which ensures that financial resources are available to support current or modified action plans. A review of the Workforce Process (Cap2) ensures that workforce resources are available to execute the plans. | Noted by two examiners as a strength (Ex6, Ex7). ADI  The CPBT allocates to each of the colleges based on the number of contact hours and strategic expansion. The PT then distributes funds for AP implementation, taking into account Intelligent Risk Analysis (RA).  This is a somewhat weak strength. Relevance, decline in state funding makes this even more important. | a(3) |
|  | Through its use of S-KPIs for longer-term action plans and O-KPIs, the applicant tracks its performance through its Performance Measurement System (PMS). During step 3 of the SPP (Figure 2.1-1), the PT and unit leaders deploy the action plans through the Action Plan Management System (APMS), which cascades SObjs and S-KPIs down to strategic initiatives/priorities, unit goals, strategies, and O-KPIs. This approach supports the applicant’s ability to execute on its strategic objectives. | This was noted by four examiners (Ex2, Ex3, Ex7, Ex4).  ADI  This strength is written at the overall level as it is not clear how the measurement system reinforces organizational alignment, which is a multiple area to address and also ties to a(2) AP implementation, which is noted as an OFI.  Note: PDCA is used annually on the process, but no improvements were mentioned, so no learning was noted. | a(5) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Comments that were not used include a strength in a(1) by 3 examiners (Ex3, Ex5, Ex6) with a double by Ex6. a(1) is noted as an OFI due to lack of differentiation of ST and LT objectives/goals. They do not tie clearly to the SObjs. Also there is very little on learning/education outcomes.  4 examiners noted AP implementation a(2) as a strength, and 4 indicated this as an OFI. The OFI portion was at the multiple level (a[2]: AP Implementation deploy/track 4 examiners; Ex1, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6). It is listed as an OFI.  2 examiners (Ex5, Ex7) noted a(6) as a strength on performance projections, but it was not included as it is a weaker strength.  1 examiner (Ex3) listed b as a strength relative to action plan modification, but it is noted by 4 examiners as an OFI, as it is not clear that there is a systematic process for how the applicant recognizes when circumstances require a shift in action plans for rapid execution. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X** | A systematic approach is not evident for deploying action plans to key suppliers, partners, and collaborators. For example, the Action Plan Development and Deployment Process does not indicate who is involved in the supplier and partnership plans or how the relationship process takes place. Deployment of action plans to these and other stakeholders may help the applicant achieve its strategic objectives related to student access and readiness. | Six examiners noted this OFI in A and D (Ex1, Ex2, Ex3, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7).  The applicant mentions the APMS, but this process is never explained, so it is not clear if this is a systematic process.  In addition, there is no information on how this is deployed to its partners, collaborators, and suppliers which are critical to accomplishment of the applicant’s goals and SObjs. E.g., do they have access to the system? For example, feeder high schools may impact SObj #1, and technology companies may be critical to SObj #2.  The applicant mentions step 5 of the SPP as process improvement but no learning or bet practices are indicated | a(2) |
|  | In its review of projected performance against that of competitors or comparable organizations, it is not clear how the applicant addresses performance gaps. For example, the processes used to address these gaps during the strategy evaluation and process improvement phases of the SPP are not evident. Addressing such gaps may help the applicant attain its vision of being the best in the nation. | Potential double.  4 examiners noted this OFI for ADI (Ex1, Ex3, Ex5, Ex6) with Ex5 noting it as a double.  For example, it is not evident which are short-term vs. long-term projections to track action plans. The measures appear to be measures for the SObj rather than the action plans.  There is no evidence of how the applicant’s strategic projects are aligned or are integrated with its Future Star Strategic Performance projections (SP3), as there appears to be a difference in the approach in determining its strategic and organization performance projects as indicated in the Performance Measurement System (PMS) Figure 4.1-1 and SP3 Figure 4.1-7.  After discussion, not doubled, focused on addressing performance gaps, and dropped to 2nd position. | a(6) |
|  | It is unclear which action plans (Figure 2.1-2) are short term and which are long term; nor is it clear how the action plans align with the short-term and long-term SObjs. Clear time frames and alignment may help the applicant more effectively address the competitiveness changes of a decline in projected high school graduates, lowering of some peers’ admission standards, and increasing dual-credit academies. | 3 examiners note this as an OFI for approach and deployment in a(1) (Ex3, Ex4, Ex5), and 5 examiners (Ex2, Ex3, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7) for a(4), specifically for WF plans.  a(4) is listed as a strength on the overall approach, but not relative to ST and LT plans.  It is unclear that the applicant differentiates between ST and LT initiatives and action plans overall. S-KPIs are indicated in Figure 2.1-2, and O-KPIs, both long term and short term, are indicated in 4.1-2. It is not clear how these align.  The applicant indicates it has made improvements but does not indicate any improvements or learning.  With an influx of high school students in the Early College HS Development Program, capacity of qualified PT and FT faculty is a challenge. A change in learning modalities from in-person to hybrid and online classes, along with a STEM focus may impact the capability of the faculty. There do not seem to be any SOs ties to student learning outcomes, which may be important to an educational organization  Comment focused on alignment issue. | a(1) |
|  | In the APMS, it is not clear how the applicant recognizes when circumstances (e.g., the pandemic or changing economic conditions) require a shift in action plans and rapid execution of new plans. A systematic approach may enable the applicant to be positioned for success in a rapidly changing environment. | Four examiners noted this (Ex1, Ex3, Ex4, Ex7). While the applicant does have a process for shifting action plans as part of the APMS and provides annual SPOT training to enable leaders to create/modify APS for rapid execution, there is no evidence of a process to determine when action plans need to be changed.  One examiner has the SPOT training as a strength. This OFI is at the overall level. | b |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| There was variance in the OFIs noted. Those not used in the comments include one on resource allocation and managing risks (a3) as noted by Ex4 and Ex5.  Four examiners noted a(4) WF plans as an OFI. It was included as a strength. The OFI was around how WF plans are not segmented by type of workforce while the strength was relative to capability and capacity planning using the Cap2 analysis process.  Learning was noted in many of the areas, e.g., learning was noted in a(1) by Ex3, Ex5, and Ex6; and in a(2) by Ex1 and Ex4; in a(5) by Ex2 and Ex4; and in a(6) by Ex7. Ex5 felt a learning OFI would be helpful to get the applicant to the next level, as it was felt there was limited learning. While PDCA is used throughout for improvements, not many examples of improvements were noted in the application. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 55**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? The score is not in the lower range as the applicant has answered the key aspects of the overall questions, the approach is deployed, and some learning is indicated. The score is not in the upper range of 70–85% in part because the applicant does not respond to several key elements for the overall and many of the multiple questions. Also, while learning is indicated, no examples of what has been improved or instances of innovation or refinements are indicated to improve key processes. In addition, the approach appears to be aligned, but it is not clear that it is integrated for current and future changing needs. There are no double strengths, but there is one double OFI noted. Based on the strengths and OFIs, the score is at the lower end of the range. Recommend a score of 55.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 3.1

## Customer Expectations

### Relevant Key Factors

1. 50 associate; 25 certificates/workforce training badge; workforce development/continuing education—personal development, badges, skill-building courses.
2. 10,000 students/year, 75% courses face-to-face; 25% online/alternate location. Weekend, compressed, evening courses, dual-credit academies, prior learning credit.
3. Recent high school graduates inside/outside service area; nontraditional, transfer, former students.
4. Career-seeking students. Transfer. Non-degree-seeking. Dual credit.
5. Transfer schools/sister colleges, feeder high schools, foundation, donors, alumni association, alumni, employers/advisory committees, technology partners, local community including chamber of commerce.
6. Decreased state funding, influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students, demands to close achievement gap, ensuring qualifications of incoming FT/PT faculty.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The applicant uses a systematic approach (Figure 3.1-1) to listen to, interact with, and observe students and other customers, such as feeder and transfer schools, to obtain actionable data and information. Formal and informal VOC methods include a variety of modalities at varying frequencies. The VOC data flow to the RMP (Figure 3.1-2) to provide actionable information in support of operational and strategic discussions. | Noted by 6 examiners in IR. This is an overall-level STR that focuses on approaches to obtaining actionable information from students and other customers. Does not conflict with proposed a(1) OFI about deployment.  R2: Moved to first position. Some examiners indicated that a(1) should be doubled. I do not find sufficient evidence that VOC listening processes are exemplary, and the use of/relationship with RBM is unexplained and unclear.  R2: Revised to avoid sloshing over into b(2) questions. | a(1) |
|  | During step 1 of the SPP, the applicant uses multiple methods to determine program and service offerings. These methods incorporate data and information from the applicant’s VOC (Figure 3.1-1) and RMP (Figure 3.1-2). Other data, including environmental scans, competitor information, and stakeholder feedback, are incorporated during SPP step 1 to analyze opportunities. Some additional services and programs have resulted from the VOC and RMP analyses, including the STAR program and pandemic-related initiatives, and these expand the applicant’s reach into new markets based on community and local needs. | Four examiners noted an overall-level b(2) strength; all comments are represented in this drafted b(2) STR comment.  R2: Added STAR example to relevance statement. | b(2) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| The applicant’s unexplained use of a 3rd-party vendor/partner to manage customer relationships is cause for some confusion and concerns in category 3 and elsewhere. The applicant introduces RBM in 3.1a(1) as "a relationship-based management firm . . . [that] manages VOC data collection and analysis with teams from PROD, CEOC, and the Foundation to differentiate needs from student, community, employer, and stakeholder groups." Is this a shared-services agreement? Do sister colleges also use RBM? If so, HLC guidelines state that when an institution forms a relationship with an entity that has no corporate or financial relationship with the institution to perform services—or pools/consolidates services with a related entity or derives services from a parent or affiliated corporation—the agreement may require HLC approval. The applicant does not describe its relationship with RMB as HLC approved.  R2—Deleted a(2) STR to avoid confusion with a(2) OFI (Ex1, Ex7). One examiner agreed with keeping a(2) STR in last position (Ex4): “The applicant uses formal and informal methods to listen to potential students and other customers to obtain actionable information as evidenced in the VOC system (Figure 3.1-1). Methods include information gathered via conferences, websites, journals, and job and high school fairs, and from national databases. The SPP Step 1 (Figure 2.1-1) includes analysis and impact of these data in strategy development to design, improve, and innovate community involvement, business partner development, fundraising strategies, and legislative outlook.” (Noted by six examiners: Ex1, Ex2, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7.)  Ex6 proposed new a(1) STR (copied below). I did not add this second a(1) STR because evidence of integration of VOC and SPP was not compelling: “Voice-of-the-customer information is aligned with other organizational processes to drive change and improvement. The Office of Planning, Research, and Organizational Development aggregates, analyses and distributes VOC data, which is then used in step 1 of the SPP to identify needs for new programs and services. VOC data is also used in the Innovation Process to design, improve and innovate educational programs. Further, customer involvement in the PI Analytic Process helps to identify improvement opportunities.” |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The applicant’s partnership with RBM does not appear to be a systematic approach for identifying future student and other customer groups and market segments, including which groups and segments to pursue for future growth. The approach does not appear to be well ordered or repeatable by the applicant, as it is not clear which processes the applicant has outsourced to its RBM partner. A systematic approach may help the applicant address its strategic objectives for student access and success. | Multiple-level OFIs for b(1) were noted by 4 examiners; a single examiner noted a b(1) strength for use of RBM to compare system data with competitor colleges in the service area and best practices. The proposed b(1) STR comment initially did not appear to be as generally useful to the applicant as the more all-encompassing b(1) OFI.  R2: Embracing feedback from two examiners (Ex1, Ex4) that the partnership with RMB does not represent a process, I revised language in Sentence 2 to reflect the concern that the institution might be unable to replicate the RMB approach (i.e., it is unclear that the process used by RMB is well ordered and repeatable—from the Baldrige definition of systematic).  Moved this b(1) OFI to top rank based on feedback from 3 examiners (Ex1, Ex4, Ex7). | b(1) |
|  | Beyond evaluating specific VOC methods, the applicant does not appear to use its Baldrige-based PDCA performance improvement system to evaluate and improve its overall approach to student and other customer listening. Nor are cycles of improvement evident for the applicant’s processes to determine student/customer groups and market segments and to determine educational program and service offerings. Systematic use of PDCA in these areas may help the applicant address its student-related strategic challenges. | 3.1a(1) VOC methods go thru annual PDCA cycles of learning—ex=moving classes online during COVID.  3.1a(2) Leadership development identified as opportunity to improve student recruitment in 2016 SPP [not review of approach to listen to potential students/other customers].  3.1b(1) No cycles of improvement described for process to determine student/customer groups and market segments.  3.1b(2). No cycles of improvement described for process to determine educational program and service offerings. | a,b |
|  | Approaches for listening to potential students and other customers to obtain actionable information do not appear to be systematic. For example, it is not clear how frequently the applicant gathers information about competitors’ students via discussions, conferences, websites, and job/high school fairs; nor is it clear who gathers this information. Additionally, approaches to listening to former, competitors’, and other potential customers do not appear to focus on the applicant’s tri-county service area. Systematic processes may help the applicant address the strategic challenge of increased competition in its service area. | Mentioned by two examiners. This overall comment based on the nugget with a further multiple-level example.  The a(2) OFI addresses a strategic challenge and might be more useful to the applicant in moving to the next level of organizational maturity than the a(2) overall-level STR noted by two examiners. The drafted a(2) STR comment is included here for consideration,  R1: a(2) STR added as lowest-ranking STR comment, and a(2) OFI augmented to focus on the SC of increased competition for students, with emphasis on tri-county service area.  R2: One examiner (Ex6) questioned focus on tri-county service area. I kept this focus in the comment in reference to SC3 and applicant’s competitive position.  Comment is lowered to second rank. | a(2) |
|  | It is not evident how the applicant varies its listening methods for different student groups and across the stages of students’ relationships with the applicant, or how the applicant deploys its RMP (Figure 3.1-2) to understand varying student and other customer requirements. This may limit the applicant’s ability to address the requirements of key market segments. | This is a multiple-level approach OFI mentioned by all examiners. Does not conflict with proposed a(1) overall approach strength; the approach is systematic overall but does not vary for student groups/stages.  R2: Moved Sentence 2 to nugget position and truncated second sentence to avoid confusion with a(2). | a(1) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Based on consensus conversation, moved a, b OFI to second position. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 45**  **Score Range: 30–45%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Not above 30–45% because, in part, there is little evidence of systematic improvement to approaches, examples of use of best practices, or instances of innovation or of sharing refinements (though that alone doesn’t keep score from rising since L is just one evaluation factor; 30-45% range seems best fit for ADI too). Not below 30–45% because the approaches are deployed and are aligned with elements of the applicant’s strategic planning process. Note that score might need to be adjusted if STR and OFI comments are added/removed.**  **R1: Score adjusted downward to address balance/gravity of STR/OFI comments.**  **R2: Score adjusted upward to reflect new balance of STR/OFI comments**. |

## Item Worksheet—Item 3.2

## Customer Engagement

### Relevant Key Factors

1. 50 associate; 25 certificates/workforce training badge programs; workforce development/continuing education—personal development, badges, skill-building courses.
2. Values—Students First
3. CC1: Provide exceptional student support services
4. Recent high school graduates inside/outside service area; nontraditional, transfer, former students—focused recruitment, information about institution, easy access to services
5. Career-seeking students—degree completion info, academic support services. Transfer—transfer articulation, degree completion info, academic challenges. Non-degree-seeking—workforce skills, adult learner needs. Dual Credit—college credit courses, collaboration with high school schedule
6. Primary competition is sister colleges. Other competitors: private technical colleges in service area, online higher ed. providers

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | In support of achieving its strategic objectives for student access and success, the applicant systematically uses VOC and market data and information to make decisions on students-first initiatives. Specifically, RMP, CEOC, and PROD teams review S-KPIs presented by the RBM team and derived from VOC, enrollment reports/market data, daily reports, campaign data, and web traffic. Based on analysis and integration of these data, changes are vetted through RMP and reviewed through PI and SPP to determine programs/services focused on students first. | Mentioned by 5 examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex6).  One examiner (Ex5) proposed a 3.2c OFI, noting that it is not evident that VOC and market data are used to create a student-focused culture and support operational decision making. I believe that using VOC and market data to determine new programs/services is a form of decision making and related to the students-first value. | c |
|  | The applicant’s six-step complaint management process (Figure 3.2-1) reinforces its value of putting students first. The applicant relies on RBM to screen, assign, and prioritize complaints. Red-flag complaints related to security, safety, legal, or ethical issues are brought to the immediate attention of the President’s Team and to the Crisis Communication Team, if necessary. Complaint data are aggregated, analyzed, tracked, and trended to determine if patterns exist and to support cycles of evaluation and improvement. | 5 examiners noted the proposed a(3) STR (Ex1, Ex4, Ex3, Ex6, Ex7). Three examiners (Ex2, Ex3, Ex5) mentioned a(3) OFIs related to (a) lack of clarity about segmenting complaint data by student or program type or market, (b) alignment of 6-step complaint management process with TNW/PDCA model, and (c) lack of evidence that complaints are managed to enable recovery of students’ and others’ confidence, satisfaction, and engagement.  I propose the a(3) STR, which reflects benefit of the doubt that tracking and trending complaint data includes segmentation by RBM such as that described in 3.1b(1) related to first-year student experience. | a(3) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| R2: Deleted a(1) STR to avoid conflict with more actionable/insightful a(1) OFI. Initially, 4 examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex5, Ex6) supported the a(1) STR; in R2, 3 examiners (Ex1, Ex4, Ex7) recommended deleting the a(1) STR to heighten the importance of the a(1) OFI. Agreed.  The deleted a(1) STR: “The applicant manages relationships with students and other customer groups using a partnership between RBM and internal communications and research units to develop advertising campaigns, manage social media, and maintain a ‘students-first’ focus on its website, which provides a variety of marketing, social media, and advertising avenues to build and expand the institution’s image. A cycle of refinement resulted in RBM’s development of a Spanish social media platform to enhance STAR students’ communication with HS students. The RBM partnership might help the applicant address the strategic challenge of increased competition for students.” |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The applicant’s processes for determining student and other customer satisfaction and engagement do not appear to be systematic. For example, the provision of inputs via the VOC methods and RMP and the disaggregation of data by RBM do not appear to constitute a systematic approach. Furthermore, the outsourcing of key elements to RBM may make it difficult for the applicant to ensure the repeatability of this approach if the college chooses to conduct these activities internally or to use another partner/vendor. | 4 examiners (Ex1, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5) noted OFIs for b, b(1), and b(2).  This OFI augments the a(1) OFI by explicating further the opportunities to improve systematic processes that are key to customer engagement that the institution has delegated to a 3rd-party provider. It is not evident if the relationship with RBM is a shared service agreement with the system as the source or an independent agreement of the applicant, alone, or why the applicant decided to engage in the partnership to manage customer relationships. See 2.1a(4) OFI. | b |
|  | In the applicant’s efforts to ensure fair treatment for different students and student groups, alignment of the Walk-It-Right ethics program to the Just Culture guidelines is not evident; that is, compliance with federal/state equal opportunity and antidiscrimination laws does not appear to align with Just Culture and Walk-It-Right. Such alignment may help ensure that the applicant can provide exceptional support services for all students. | Five examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5) noted this a(4) OFI. There were no proposed a(4) strength comments. As drafted, the focus is on lack of alignment with the applicant’s Walk-It-Right approach to Just Culture described in 1.2b(2), with results reported in 7.4-12.  R1: Backup noted opportunity to incorporate one examiner’s (Ex1) relevance statement related to the core competency of ensuring the institution’s ability to provide exceptional support services for all students. Great idea! | a(4) |
|  | It is unclear how the RMP (Figure 3.1-2) systematically ensures that key means of student support vary for different student groups or segments; nor are cycles of learning and improvement evident for this process. A systematic process, along with evaluation and improvement, may reinforce the applicant’s core competency in providing exceptional student support services. | 5 examiners (Ex1, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7) noted multiple-level OFIs, which I tried to integrate into this proposed a(2) OFI. 4 examiners (Ex2, Ex3, Ex5, Ex6) mentioned a(2) overall-level STR comments.  Here is an overall a(2) STR, if preferred to the OFI. I do not recommend including an overall a(2) STR and a multiple a(2) OFI—the OFI adds more value to the applicant’s opportunities to improve:  “The applicant uses multiple methods to enable students and other customers to seek information and support and access services and programs. These methods include the website; information sessions; face-to-face and virtual advising; social media; radio/tv, campus flyers, and other publications; self-service registration, bill payment, and financial aid processing; online access to LMS via the STAR program; Smyle poll reports; and more. These methods may enable the applicant to enhance its core competency of providing exceptional student support services.” | a(2) |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant builds and manages student and other customer relationships through its RBM partner; the processes managed by RBM are not described, and it is unclear how the applicant evaluates and improves them. Without well-ordered, repeatable processes that are accessible to the applicant, the applicant’s ability to acquire students and other customers and meet their expectations may be at risk. | Mentioned by 5 examiners (Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7).  The essential concern is that it is not evident how the institution manages its RBM partner to build/manage student and other customer relationships. RBM’s processes for relationship management are unclear; for example, RBM builds/manages student relationships for acquisition and managing needs of differing market segments/stages, but the processes for doing so are not described. Does the applicant know how RBM does it? If not, what happens if RBM goes away and the applicant needs to assume these processes? | a(1) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| R2: Three examiners (Ex1, Ex4, Ex7) recommended demoting/deleting a(1) STR in favor of a(1) OFI. I deleted the a(1) STR comment and support the a(1) OFI as I believe that the applicant’s ability to manage RBM processes is not evident. If the relationship with RBM were to cease, could the applicant manage student and other customer relationships effectively?  “It is unclear that the applicant’s approach to relationship management represents a systematic process to acquire students and meet their requirements. It is evident that RBM builds and manages student relationships, including the acquisition of students and managing the needs of market segments and stages, but it is unclear how the applicant manages RBM to ensure that market share and new students are acquired effectively. The applicant may benefit from collaboration with RBM to identify deliverables and expectations to ensure that market share and student groups are acquired effectively and retained to meet and exceed expectations.”  Based on consensus conversation, added learning to OFIs a(2) and a(1). |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 45**  **Score Range: 30–45%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Not below: Evidence of alignment and problem solving. Not above: Weight of OFIs, as well as lack of evidence of fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and some examples of use of best practices, instances of innovation, or sharing of refinements for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 4.1

## Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance

### Relevant Key Factors

1. Vision—Will be the best in the nation in providing students with accessibility, affordability, career-readiness, and social responsibility.
2. CC1: Provide exceptional student support services; CC2: Partner with local community to achieve excellence/graduate job readiness.
3. Transfer schools/sister colleges, feeder high schools, foundation, donors, alumni association, alumni, employers/advisory committees, technology partners, local community including chamber of commerce
4. Technology providers, laboratory support providers, service providers (bookstore, dining), administrative support.
5. National/regional estimates: declines in high school graduates over next decade.
6. Peers, competitors, national averages, best-in-class—IPEEx2, CCSSE, CollUnivPA-HR; Nome Zevil DASHER; Other Baldrige winners; NCCBP, Cost and Productivity Project, NSC.
7. Decreased state funding, influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The applicant systematically reviews organizational performance across the college. Through the Operational Performance Review structure (Figure 4.1-6), the applicant identifies the teams (including the governance board), areas, and frequencies for reviews. The applicant uses the Strategic and Operational Performance Review Process (Figure 4.1-5) to review S-KPIs and O-KPIs. Opportunities are recorded in the Action Plan Management System, which is integrated with the SPP. Two cycles of improvement have led to the current SOPRP. These systems help the applicant identify improvement opportunities to support its vision to be the best. | Which STR should be put in the #1 spot wasn’t a slam dunk for the team. But we ended up with this one because it addresses a broad and basic function (reviewing performance) and worked in elements of L and I in addition to A. Reviews of org performance support the vision to be the best, plus this helps to identify opportunities for improvement and innovation.  This comment has elements of A, D, L, and I, with A at the overall level (with a slight dip into the multiples by working "governance" into the comment). | b |
|  | The applicant’s PMS (Figure 4.1-1) is supported by the four-step B2P process to select comparative data and information to support fact-based decision making (Figure 4.1-3). The PROD selects benchmarks for each S-KPI and most O-KPIs through the B2P process. The B2P has undergone two cycles of improvement through semiannual reviews by PROD and key stakeholders. These systematic processes may help the applicant address the strategic challenge of increased competition. | This is proposed as the #2 STR due to its clear, compelling relevance (the vision of being #1 in the nation), but it’s narrower focus than the "b" STR moves it to #2.    This comment has pretty strong A, L, and I. And others see some D (which I usually don’t see clearly until the site visit). | a(2) |
|  | Key performance measures, including strategic and operational, are systematically selected, collected, and aligned using the four-phase Performance Management System (PMS; Figure 4.1-1). The resulting key data and information are used to monitor daily operations and overall performance. Key metrics and the PMS are fully deployed, through a number of key methods, down to the various departments and operational units. Several cycles of improvement have occurred as part of the SPP, step 4. This approach may enable the applicant to effectively manage and track its strategic and operational KPIs, leading to achieving its strategic objectives. | Another highly relevant comment: very foundational; pulling the data together to allow tracking, review, etc. to be the best in the nation and identify opportunities. Three examiners (Ex1, Ex4, Ex7) listed this as #1 in 4.1 STRs (Ex4 blended her comment with a[3). Ex5 and Ex6 also listed it as a STR.  It strongly shows A, D, L, and I. The approach is covered at an overall level and reaching into the multiples. | a(1) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| c(2) (continuous improvement) was noted as a lower-ranked STR by Ex4 and Ex6. I think other points are more compelling.  We could fold this into the "b" comment with just a word tweak if we chose to. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant deploys priorities from its performance reviews to its key suppliers, partners, and collaborators. For example, it is unclear how the leader of each priority captured in the APMS deploys those priorities to suppliers of student support services such as providers of technology, laboratory support, the bookstore, and dining. Ensuring deployment of improvement priorities to key suppliers may help in reinforcing the applicant’s first core competency—providing exceptional student support services. | I’m going to lead with this OFI because the relevance was so clear and specific to this applicant: reinforcement of one of its three core competencies. After team discussion, we left the nugget broad, but focused the example on suppliers.  This OFI is at the multiple level and focuses on D. | c(2) |
|  | It is unclear how the applicant considers competitive performance and data as it reviews organizational performance and projects future performance. For example, it is unclear how this occurs in the SOPRP, the SP3, or other related processes. Inclusion of competitive performance and data in these processes may assist the applicant in understanding the impact of increased competition for students and qualified staff members. | We’re focusing on a narrow part of the multiple questions here (thinking about competitors), but this is incredibly important given the forces in higher education: a shrinking student base and funding cuts.  Competitors are mentioned in the "b" and c(1) questions in 4.1.  And note that this comment acknowledges the existing use of the SOPRP (for reviewing org performance) and the SP3 (for projecting performance). This comment points not to a complete gap but to an opportunity to improve existing systematic processes. | b,c(1) |
|  | Key short- and longer-term financial measures are not evident among the applicant’s S-KPIs. For example, no financial measures are listed with S-KPIs (Figure 2.1-1); nor are any listed in the short-term O-KPIs (Figure 4.1-2). The lack of broad, strategically focused financial measures among the S-KPIs may limit leaders’ ability to manage county funds and to successfully navigate an environment with reduced state funding. | The team had two diametrically opposing thoughts about this multiple-level OFI: First, this certainly exists within the applicant and would be discovered 5 minutes into the site visit when talking to the CFO. On the other hand, it’s a big omission. We decided to cut the baby in half: we’ll move it to the bottom, so if the applicant doesn’t get a site visit, it will know about this omission.  This OFI is at the multiple level and is largely integration focused. Note: Two narrow financial O-KPIs for the finance department were mentioned in Figure 6.1-1, but those are not S-KPIs. | a(1) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Ex3 specifically noted tech partners in her "b" OFI. Since we went in a different direction in that "b" OFI, should we consider including tech partners in our c(2) OFI (I excluded it because the core competency was an ideal match)? Or, is there some cross-cutting OFI in 4.1 that applies to tech partners? So, subject matter experts: think about the relevance of something like that. It would be an out-of-the-box approach, for sure. But, perhaps, of value if accurate and relevant.  "b" OFIs from Ex2 and Ex7. Lack of clarity about how performance reviews are done. They are right. It is blurry. But we’re giving benefit of the doubt and a STR for "b." A site visit will help us sort it out.  a(2) OFIs from Ex7 and Ex5. Lack of clarity about how comparative data is selected, etc. They are right. It is blurry. But we’re giving benefit of the doubt and a STR. A site visit will help us sort it out.  a(3) OFIs from Ex1 and Ex6. Lack of performance measurement system responsive to agility. Decided that this isn’t important enough to include as either a STR or an OFI. Letting it fall to the cutting room floor.  Overall learning OFI for 4.1 from Ex5. She wanted to see some actual examples of improvements, etc. They pretty specifically said that they had numerous cycles of improvement (with no other detail, which is unnerving, I know), so I think we have to give them benefit of the doubt here and be ready to explore it at site. And if they were embellishing their application, that’s on them. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value:** **65**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one?** **Two of the three STRs are reaching into the multiples. My teammates tell me that deployment exists for them** (although I usually punt on deployment until the site visit unless it’s screaming at me)**. Although the applicant doesn’t tell us how they go about learning, they emphatically say, "we’ve put X through Y cycles of improvement" and we’re giving benefit of the doubt. Integration is well-documented for the STRs. And all the STRs relate to something relevant to the applicant.** None of the STRs are technical or academic (no pun intended) for them. They are meaty.  Some of you might be having indigestion because some of the responses were blurry. They often said that X happens within a big process Y, but it’s not totally clear how it happens in there. When applicants do this, it makes it hard for us examiners. In this case, we’re giving benefit of the doubt. If we get to a site visit, we’ll get to inspect for ourselves. If we don’t get to a site visit, we won’t have irritated the applicant with OFIs they find unactionable in case they just didn’t have enough room to include a more thorough response in their application.  **Regarding our OFIs, they are all at the multiple level. The first OFI is a deployment OFI, but at the multiple level (no other OFI on deployment). The 2nd OFI is focused around 2 words in the multiples. It’s very narrow. The 3rd OFI is narrowly focused on financial measures (a multiple).**  **I’m falling in the north side of the 65/70 range boundary, but I know I’m a high scorer. A 60 or 65 could also be justified. I’ll propose a 65 because we did give them lots of benefit of the doubt.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 4.2

## Information and Knowledge Management

### Relevant Key Factors

1. CC3: Maintain expert, up-to-date workforce.
2. I have the necessary training and resources to do my work.
3. STAR-Point app; internal mobile app; college wireless network; online instructional resources/support services; BOYD, interactive tv, virtual classrooms/podcasting, virtual anatomy table, collaboration technology/virtual discussion rooms, CAD systems.
4. Career-seeking students—degree completion info, academic support services. Transfer—transfer articulation, degree completion info, academic challenges. Non-degree-seeking—workforce skills, adult learner needs. Dual Credit—college credit courses, collaboration with high school schedule.
5. Transfer schools/sister colleges, feeder high schools, foundation, donors, alumni association, alumni, employers/advisory committees, technology partners, local community including chamber of commerce
6. Technology providers, laboratory support providers, service providers (bookstore, dining), administrative support.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | In support of the workforce engagement driver of training and resource availability, the four-step COKMP (Figure 4.2-2) allows the applicant to build and manage organizational knowledge as well as conduct workforce knowledge transfer. This process resulted from two improvement cycles and a subsequent innovation project, with the current version being improved to include search technology and data entry automations. | The team had a hard time ranking both the STRs and OFIs in this item. In the end, we felt that workforce knowledge management is the most important part of this item for this applicant.  Since we had both a STR and an OFI for workforce knowledge (b[1]), we moved both to the top to make the following point: You’ve got some good stuff going on in workforce knowledge, but you’ve still got a way to go. | b(1) |
|  | The applicant uses multiple approaches through its MDQA (Figure 4.2-1) to systematically verify and ensure data and information quality as well as attributes including accuracy, validity, integrity, reliability, and currency. The MDQA has undergone two cycles of improvement and is currently subject to two improvement projects regarding quality of data and information. The MDQA is integrated with several other key processes such as the SPP, PMS, BwP, PMM, and SP3. These approaches allow users to get accurate and timely information from the applicant’s many information technology platforms. | Massive editing after R-2 feedback.  The relevance is that the applicant has many, many sources of information and many platforms/applications.  Note that I’m going with the broader "a" reference instead of the a(1) reference that half of our team chose. The two sections are very close and only differ by adding a few words to the nugget sentence. The applicant’s responses were basically the same for a(1) and a(2). Including all the terms in the nugget was necessary to indicate that they responded to both a(1) and a(2) at the multiple levels.  This STR covers A, L, and I. (And others note D as well, but I often have a hard time sorting out D until the site visit.) Approach is covered at the multiple levels for both a(1) and a(2). | a |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| All proposed STRs from IR are addressed in the comments proposed or in the ghost comment. No extra loose ends for STRs in this item. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant transfers relevant knowledge to and from students and other groups; nor is it clear how it transfers relevant knowledge for use in strategic planning and innovation processes. For example, it is not evident how students and other stakeholders are made aware of knowledge available in the TNW portals, and it is unclear what process triggers other departments to use TNW portal information in innovation and strategic planning processes. Systematically transferring knowledge may help the applicant’s various stakeholder groups more fully engage to create an environment of organizational success. | The team had a hard time ranking both the STRs and the OFIs in this item. In the end, we felt that workforce knowledge management is the most important part of this item for this applicant. Since we had both a STR and an OFI for workforce knowledge (b(1)), we moved both to the top to make the following point: You’ve got some good stuff going on in workforce knowledge, but you’ve still got a way to go. | b(1) |
|  | Several aspects of how the applicant manages best practices are not evident, potentially limiting its efforts to become one of the best in the nation. For example, it is unclear how the applicant identifies best practices to be shared at its annual Day of Sharing or for inclusion in the TNW portal, or whether any best practices come from the highest-performing role models. Further, it is not evident how best practices are implemented once they are identified and shared. | Best practice management is an important part of a performance excellence journey (so says I) and a vision to be the best. So, this comment makes the cut.  Edited the comment to point out that the applicant might consider best practices of role-model organizations if it wants to achieve the vision of being the best. | b(2) |
|  | The applicant’s approach to making needed data and information available in a user-friendly format and timely manner to students and the workforce does not appear to be systematic. For example, it is not evident how or when PROD reviews user satisfaction data to determine whether students and the workforce perceive that information is user-friendly and timely. A more systematic approach may be important given the centrality of the STAR-Point app (introduced in 2019) and the Students-First value. | Lots of editing after R-2.  Good relevance for this comment: this applicant lives on data, so making it available to key stakeholders is really important.  This approach OFI is at the multiple level, while the STR for a is at the overall and (a little bit at the) multiple level. | a(2) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| CONFLICT ALERT!!!!! The b(1) STR focuses on the overall question and the first 2 bullets of the multiples. The OFI focuses on the last 2 bullets from the multiples.  Ex1’s OFI on a(2) had a nugget that was focused on learning (then his example focused on stakeholders). It would be nice if we could polish our a(2) OFI so it had an element of learning. My brainstorm was to include that somehow in the relevance, but Ex3’s relevance was so damn nice that I didn’t want to muck it up. Open to clever ideas on how to work in some learning to the a(2) OFI, but we don’t want to mess with its current effectiveness.  Ex1 and Ex6 both noted that it’s unclear what prompts anyone to make use of the best practices in the TNW portals. I worked this into the b(1) comment as an example.  Several of us (I’m recalling Ex4 and Ex6, and I think some others) wrote a few OFIs as follow-ups to some of the STRs where details were left out. (And this applicant did this a lot.) We often gave benefit of the doubt for the STRs, but I sensed a desire to include some OFIs that would say to the applicant: "OK, we gave you some STRs with some benefit of the doubt, but we’re still not sure these processes are really fully functional. There was some stuff missing." I’ve not included those specific comments as OFIs, but I have included some OFIs as counterweights to some STRs where we gave some significant benefit of the doubt. If you had one of those OFIs in your IR, I just wanted to acknowledge that. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value:** **55**  **Score Range:** **50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one?** **The two STRs cover some important turf. They address important multiple-level Criteria questions, they strongly assert they’ve done cycles of improvement, and they are integrated. (As you know by now, I have a hard time seeing deployment in applications, but others noted deployment.) This pushes us maybe into the 70–85% range.**  **The OFIs are all at the multiple level, but they are important omissions. This brings us back to 50–65%.**  **I initially proposed a 60 (and we gave quite a bit of benefit of the doubt). The feedback was that a little lower might be preferred. Coming back after R-2 with 55.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 5.1

## Workforce Environment

### Relevant Key Factors

1. 50 associate; 25 certificates/workforce training badge; workforce development/continuing education—personal development, badges, skill-building courses. All associate programs require internship, apprenticeship, or other applied experience.
2. Vision—Will be the best in the nation in providing students with accessibility, affordability, career-readiness, and social responsibility.
3. CC3: Maintain expert, up-to-date workforce.
4. Tenured/tenure-track faculty (250); adjunct and non-tenure-track, FT & PT (200); management (60); professional support (250); support (400); temp. (50).
5. Decreased state funding, Influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students, demands to close achievement gap, ensuring qualifications of incoming FT/PT faculty.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The JPC team systematically assesses workforce capability and capacity needs through the annual Capability Review Process, which is part of the SPP and undergoes annual reviews. Skills, competencies, certifications, and staffing levels are considered and aligned to the SPP, budget, and the NWPMP processes to evaluate performance and future development needs. Capacity analysis for academics includes projected enrollment, contact hours with consideration for FT/PT faculty ratios, average class size, and advising and student services ratios. Achieving appropriate workforce capability and capacity supports the applicant’s Students First value. | All examiners had a strength for a(1).  ALI | a(1) |
|  | Changes to addressing workforce capacity and capability needs are systematically determined through the SPP and are reviewed twice a year for degree instruction and quarterly for workforce development. Changes in capacity are addressed through the Center for Faculty Development, the Emergency Innovation Response Team, and the three-year systematic change management strategy. Improvements over the last three years include established outplacement, revised training opportunities, and more just-in-time hiring. These improved processes may help the applicant strengthen its core competency of an expert, up-to-date workforce. | Ex1, Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex7 all have a + for a(3).  ALI  One examiner included a(3) as an OFI based on how the applicant uses teams as part of its ability to manage changing capacity. I did not include this as the Criteria do not include questions specific to teams. | a(3) |
|  | The applicant systematically addresses work accomplishment through a defined structure focused on aligning the organization to achieve goals/action plans with a focus on continuous improvement. Committees and teams promote collaboration and continuous improvement across the organization. Unit-level teams focus on achieving SPP goals and establish action plans for the coming year. Cross-functional teams work on issues affecting the larger organization, and ad hoc teams address specific issues. Departments are aligned by function. Both faculty and staff members participate on teams and committees. | Three examiners identified this as a strength, and three identified that this process does not address the applicant’s core competencies, so see corresponding OFI.  ADI | a(4) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| a(1): Two examiners had OFIs around segmentation. One examiner expressed concern over lack of systematic process to assess skills, competencies, certifications, and staffing levels needed to ensure qualifications of incoming full- and part-time staff. The other examiner expressed concern over lack of description for addressing all segments of the workforce, such as all faculty, but also management, professional support, temporary, and how full-time versus part-time decisions are made. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X** | It is not clear how the applicant considers its various workforce segments in managing workplace capability and capacity, workplace environment, and benefits/policies. For example, for workplace health, security, and accessibility processes, it is unclear how the applicant takes into account potential differences between professional staff vs. faculty members, full-time vs. part-time employees, or employees in labs vs. those in other locations. Considering workforce segments in these approaches may strengthen the applicant’s core competency of maintaining an expert, up-to-date workforce. | There were 3 OFIs for b(2) around benefits and segmentation of benefits for a diverse and segmented workforce. Based on other areas to address also having a concern over the lack of segmentation, I opted to address segmentation across the item. At one point I changed the focus to be on deployment but after consideration and coaching from BPEP, I opted to focus on actual segmentation as the applicant will benefit from segmentation of the stated processes.  I | a,b |
|  | The applicant’s team-based structure to accomplish work does not appear to capitalize on the college’s three core competencies, reinforce resilience and a student focus, or manage the workforce to exceed performance expectations. Systematically addressing these components of its work accomplishment approach may help the applicant meet or exceed its stated performance expectations. | 3 examiners identified the lack of addressing the core competencies and reinforcing student focus.  A | a(4) |
|  | A systematic process is not evident for improving the effectiveness of the applicant’s diversity-related processes for recruiting, hiring, and onboarding new workforce members. Specifically, it is unclear how processes such as using community agencies, diversity websites, behavioral interviewing, and the Works System ensure that its workforce represents the ideas, cultures, and thinking of its student community. Such an evaluation process may help the applicant succeed in an environment of increased competition for students. | Lack of systematic processes for considering community demographics, diversity of student population in hiring process, and ensuring the workforce represents the local community, etc.  L  The applicant lists the following:  Figure 5.2-1 and Figure 5.1-1 indicate meeting EEOC requirements, but meeting EEOC requirements does not necessarily mean meeting the needs of the local community or student population.  The applicant lists several processes aimed toward improving the diversity of the applicant pool, such as using community agencies, diversity websites, behavioral interviewing, and the Works System. But there is a lack of a description as to HOW these processes actually help the applicant represent their student population in the processes to recruit, hire and onboard their workforce.  3 examiners listed a(2) as an OFI, and 3 had this as a strength. The strengths are all around the approach. The learning OFI appears to have more value to the applicant for learning purposes. | a(2) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| On first comment: One examiner cautioned segmentation since it is not explicitly called for in the Criteria, and I thought he was right. So, I switched the focus to be on deployment, not segmentation. But the learning for the applicant is around segmentation so I reverted back to my original thought around segmentation. (This is now an integration OFI highlighting a lack of alignment with the workforce groups listed in the Org. Profile.) |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 60**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? It should not be in the 30–45% range due in part to addressing Criteria questions beyond the basic requirements. It should not be in the 70–85% range due in part to the applicant not addressing many multiple questions and also due to lack of segmentation by the workforce segments in the OP, as well as a lack of some examples of adopting best practices, which may be a major issue since its vision is to be the BEST. There is no evidence that the applicant studies "best" which may inhibit the accomplishment of the vision (KT?).** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 5.2

## Workforce Engagement

### Relevant Key Factors

1. CC3: Maintain expert, up-to-date workforce.
2. Tenured/tenure-track faculty (250); adjunct and non-tenure-track, FT & PT (200); management (60); professional support (250); support (400); temp. (50).
3. Open communication (supervisor relationships); high-performance work (valued as team member); focus on continuous improvement/innovation (training/resource availability/relevance); engaged/empowered workforce (satisfied with sense of contribution to mission); diverse ideas, cultures, thinking (satisfied with sense mission and college future); inclusion/equity.
4. 125 acres: 25 major academic/admin. buildings; 238 labs; 12 research labs. Dining, athletic facilities, art galleries, theaters, rehearsal/studio space. 3X more labs than classrooms.
5. Service providers (bookstore, dining), administrative support.
6. Ensuring qualifications of incoming FT/PT faculty.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The applicant systematically identifies the key drivers of workforce engagement through an annual environmental scan including data from Baldrige Award recipients and surveys from CCSSE, Dasher, and Great Higher Ed Employers. Further, focus groups, performance evaluations, training feedback, and exit interviews help identify potential improvements. Examples of improvement include enhancements to the surveys in 2017 and the addition of exit interviews in 2019. These actions support the applicant’s core competency of maintaining an expert, up-to-date work force. | Six examiners list a(1) as a strength, but four examiners identified this as an OFI (including me) for lack of segmentation, hence, there is a corresponding OFI.  AL | a(1) |
|  | Through analysis of surveys, focus groups, and departmental performance review summaries, the applicant systematically assesses workforce engagement. Three surveys (CEE Climate, Canter 12Q and the Great Higher Ed Employers surveys) include benchmarks of top-performing organizations outside education as well as data to evaluate and understand the key workforce drivers. Further, focus groups and departmental performance review summaries are combined with the survey results for analysis, with findings used as an input into the SPP. | AI  While there is an OFI around segmentation and also the listing of three different sets of key engagement drivers, three examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex6) wrote a strength around the current process. This item was a discussion point between team members. Some felt that the applicant describes three differing sets of drivers of engagement as presented in P.1a(3), 5.2.a(1) and Figure 5.2-1.  After closer examination, it is now seen that P.1a(3) is actually presenting the questions from the survey that determine the engagement factors. Figure 5.2-1 lists the key drivers, and 5.2a(1) describes factors that impact the key drivers. Figures 7.3-9 (CEE Survey) and 7.3-10 (Canter Q12 Survey) and 7.3-6 include results for the key drivers. Yet, there are gaps between what is presented in the OP, category 5, and outcomes. There is enough evidence to apply benefit of the doubt and address on site. | a(2) |
|  | The applicant systematically evaluates and improves its LDC process, which includes Kirkpatrick for benchmarking against best-performing organizations. A multidisciplinary team began a biennial learning and development assessment, which led improvements such as the development of professional development seminars and classes open to all levels of faculty and staff. This approach responds to the workforce engagement driver of training and resource availability and relevance. | Three examiners saw a strength for 5.2c(3). If I end up with too many comments, this one may not be as important to the applicant as others so consider removing, if needed.  AL | c(3) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The applicant’s approach to performance management does not appear to support high performance. For example, the NWPMP defines how performance is tracked, but not how the process supports high performance or how it reinforces intelligent risk taking and the achievement of action plans. In addition, goal setting considers innovative ideas and intelligent risk, but it is not clear how this is actually accomplished. Supporting high performance through the NWPMP may help the applicant respond to the engagement factor of high-performance work. | Several parts of the multiple questions were not addressed, such as high performance and intelligent risks.  A  Two examiners listed OFIs and two examiners found strengths around the WORKS system and how it aligns to goal setting and its 360 structure.  One examiner provided feedback that caused me to alter the sentence to be more tightly aligned to the Criteria at the multiple level. However, the OFI is addressing the lack of an approach at the overall level, so I will consider this an OFI at the overall level. | c(1) |
|  | The applicant’s approach for determining drivers of workforce engagement does not appear to differentiate these drivers for the college’s various workforce segments, such as faculty vs. staff members. Determining these drivers for each workforce segment may assist the applicant in responding to the needs of its workforce. | I  4 examiners identified an OFI for segmentation, so there is a + for approach and learning and a - for integration due to the lack of segmentation.  There was a lot of concern over how many sets of engagement factors the applicant presented but after carefully reviewing the details, P.1a(3) is actually questions used to determine the drivers in 5.2-1. The list presented in 5.2a(1) are factors that affect the 5.2-1 drivers. So they use the questions in P.1a(3) to determine drivers in 5.2-1. So, I did not include any comments from examiners about multiple sets of engagement factors. | a(1) |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant’s approaches to performance management, performance development, and career development systematically promote equity and inclusion. Such an approach may help the applicant achieve its strategic objectives and enhance its ability to recruit diverse workforce members, which may support its Students First value. | I originally used Ex3’s comment to write a “b” OFI around the organizational culture promoting equity and inclusion, but after seeing that there are 5 examiners (including Ex3) that have concerns about equity and inclusion for 5.2c(5), I decided to change out the OFI to a combined one referencing b and also c(5).  Subsequently, I changed the OFI to a c(5) OFI only, as the opportunity lies not with organizational culture (b) but with the applicant’s approaches to performance management and development (c[5]). | c(5) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Several examiners had OFIs around 5.2b, and 2 listed strengths. The strengths were around communication, but in the spirit of "around" 6, I did not select this as a strength as I found the other strengths to be more important for the applicant. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 50**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one?** The 50-65% range seems the most descriptive for all ADLI descriptors. For example, for A, **the applicant addresses the overall questions, but many aspects of the multiple questions are not addressed. That is,** t**he applicant has three strengths at the overall level; two OFIs are at the overall, and one is at the multiple level, which reflects the 50–65% range.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 6.1

## Work Processes

### Relevant Key Factors

1. 50 associate; 25 certificates/workforce training badge; workforce development/continuing education—personal development, badges, skill-building courses. All associate programs require internship, apprenticeship, or other applied experience.
2. CC1: Provide exceptional student support services.
3. Career-seeking students—degree completion info, academic support services. Transfer—transfer articulation, degree completion info, academic challenges. Non-degree-seeking—workforce skills, adult learner needs. Dual Credit—college credit courses, collaboration with high school schedule.
4. Technology providers, laboratory support providers, service providers (bookstore, dining), administrative support.
5. Increased competition for students.
6. Baldrige-based PDCA.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The applicant uses best practices such as NIST IDEF0 (Figure 6.1-2) and PMI’s Project Management Body of Knowledge to systematically design its educational programs and services and work processes. PDCA has been added as a learning on the Baldrige journey and is embedded into process implementation loops. These processes include a WBS for all required activities and deliverables. This approach integrates with the KPIs and Tracking Star PMS and supports the applicant’s core competency of providing exceptional student support services. | (Ex1, Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7 FBR)  Integration and best practices present with PDCA learning loops. Examples are Tracking Star PMS; NIST IDEF0 methodology, Project Management Institute design products and processes, agility.  No OFIs for a(3). (Ex5 asks where PMI came from.) | a(3) |
|  | The applicant implements and improves its work processes using approaches that have been updated through its Baldrige journey. For example, processes are implemented through monitoring O-KPIs on the dashboard. PDCA has been embedded into process implementation loops and is triggered when O-KPIs cross predetermined thresholds. These approaches support the applicant’s vision of being the best in the nation in providing students with accessibility, affordability, and career-readiness. | Process implementation includes PDCA loops and operational measures (Ex1, Ex2, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6). Combined key elements of Ex1 and Ex6 feedback ready comments. Ex2 and Ex6 brought in b(2) and b(3) respectively. Ex6 notes that "there are a lot of ways to take this one.”  Combined b(1,3) because only one multiple of a multiple proposed as an OFI for b(3) and we have an OFI around b(2). | b(1,3) |
|  | The PDCA-based innovation process (Figure 6.1-4) helps the applicant manage opportunities for innovation. Innovation initiatives are accompanied by a business case including cost, schedule, and scope and monitored with stoplight reviews for budget, schedule, and meeting of objectives. These processes support the applicant in pursuing innovation opportunities that are likely to be successful. | Ex1, Ex2 (double), Ex3, Ex6. Melded feedback-ready comments from Ex2 and Ex3. Some noted necessity of giving benefit of doubt.  Ex5 cited this as an OFI because there was a lack of clarity, no cycles of evaluation and improvement and not clear how resources are made available. Propose giving benefit of doubt to allow for verification on-site given the detail that has been presented. | d |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| STR a(3) was cited in some way by 7 examiners. Though Ex6 combined a(3) with a(1) into a STR, he noted the a(3) portion was strongest. Support for a(1) was split between STR and OFI and given key factors, proposing it as OFI (please see a(1,2) rationale).  Ex6 had combined b(1,3) into a STR and this allowed a merged draft of b(1) and b(3) strength comments from 6 examiners. The t3 examiners who had listed c as a STR all had made notes about it being a weak strength or an OFI as well, so it appears as an OFI.  While Ex5 cited a lack of clarity and some noted benefit of doubt for the d STR, 4 examiners cited a STR with Ex2 giving it a double. Proposing a single strength and listing it as the third strength given the mixed certainty and benefit of doubt. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | It is unclear how the applicant systematically determines key educational program, service, and process requirements; work processes and requirements (Figure 6.1-1) do not appear to align with strategic objectives, goals, action plans, and KPIs (Figure 2.1-1). Operational units and departments sort inputs, but the frequency, criteria, and decision makers are unclear. In addition, no work processes align with learning, graduation, or work readiness of students. Systematically determining requirements that are aligned with strategic elements may assist the applicant in addressing its strategic challenge of increased competition for students. | R3: Used Ex5’s suggestion of combining a(1) and a(2) OFIs. Moved a(1) OFI content back up from GHOST comment into feedback report given importance relative to applicant’s key factors and melded it with the a(2) OFI.  R2: Proposed eliminating both STR and OFI for a(1). There’s rationale for giving benefit of doubt and while some proposed OFIs (Ex5, Ex3, Ex4). Those who gave strengths were Ex7 weak strength, Ex6 strength based on benefit of doubt, and Ex1 focused on inputs.  Though we were mixed on this, with the key factors of increased competition and decreased state funding, it could be a vulnerability if the applicant doesn’t systematically determine its work process requirements. Although inputs were listed, it was fuzzy as to whether systematic processes are used.  This comment focuses on "key educational program, service, and process requirements" because they were not specifically addressed.  Drafted using Ex3’s feedback-ready comment. | a(1,2) |
|  | The applicant’s CAS processes for managing the supply network do not appear to include approaches for communicating performance expectations, measuring suppliers’ performance, providing feedback, or addressing suppliers’ poor performance. Considering suppliers’ role in providing information technology, the bookstore, and dining services (Figure 6.1-1), supplier management may be critical to meeting students’ requirements. | R3: worked on broadening the "so what" while giving specific example of students’ requirements.  Unclear how applicant’s management of supply network enhances performance or satisfaction (Ex1, Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6). Ex6 asked whether RFP is responsive to changes in student preferences.  All three examiners who proposed strengths (Ex3, Ex5, aEx6) either questioned the process or proposed OFIs.  Given the importance of the supply network for the applicant in delivering services to its stakeholders, particularly students, rather than an overall STR I am proposing a multiple OFI as better helping the applicant on its quality journey.  Ex4: The procurement process allows the applicant to engage with suppliers, but it is not clear how the process allows the applicant to enhance performance, support strategic objectives or enhance student and customer satisfaction. | c |
|  | It is unclear how the applicant systematically determines its key support processes and their requirements and determines whether these processes meet key business requirements during daily operations; nor is full deployment to the key assets and locations (P.1a[4]) or other support functions (Figure P.1-1a) evident. Without a systematic approach and full deployment, the applicant may not meet its students’ or other customers’ requirements or maintain its core competency in providing exceptional student support services. | R3: Broadened the relevance statement to include other customers’ per Ex5 suggestion.  R2: Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7 cited unclear how support processes are determined or how day-to-day operations meet organizational requirements.  Ex5 questions deployment to key assets and locations across the applicant including labs and research lab as wells as athletics and other support functions as addressed in P.1a(4) and Figure P.1-1a (administrative and support services such as tutoring, SL, internships, financial aid).  Based on R1 feedback, moved to third position based on importance of this comment versus other with regard to key factors. | b(2) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| In R2 there was consensus around OFIs for b(2) (3 examiners) and c (6 examiners). In IR, 6 examiners identified a(2) as an OFI but the draft comment wasn’t clearly Criteria-based. Therefore, a(1) comment is retained and a(2) portion is narrowed to the multiple question on key requirements for key work processes; proposing a combined a(1,2) OFI as suggested by Ex5. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 55**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? R3: Proposing the middle of 50–65% with a score of 55. It isn’t in 70–85% because we saw areas where there were some deployment issues and integration issues.**  **It isn’t in the 30–45% range in part because the applicant has gone beyond addressing the basic question and most deployment goes beyond early stages. By embedding PDCA into key work processes, the applicant addresses Learning beyond the 30–45% level. Many OFIs at the multiple or multiple of multiple levels, but a(1,2) at the overall/multiple therefore proposing 55.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 6.2

## Operational Effectiveness

### Relevant Key Factors

1. Tenured/tenure-track faculty (250); adjunct and non-tenure-track, FT & PT (200); management (60); professional support (250); support (400); temp. (50).
2. Career-seeking students—degree completion info, academic support services. Transfer—transfer articulation, degree completion info, academic challenges. Non-degree-seeking—workforce skills, adult learner needs. Dual Credit—college credit courses, collaboration with high school schedule.
3. Transfer schools/sister colleges, feeder high schools, foundation, donors, alumni association, alumni, employers/advisory committees, technology partners, local community including chamber of commerce.
4. Technology providers, laboratory support providers, service providers (bookstore, dining), administrative support.
5. Decreased state funding, influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students, demands to close achievement gap, ensuring qualifications of incoming FT/PT faculty.
6. Baldrige-based PDCA. External requirements (accreditation, accountability, system requirement) inform internal strategy/measurement (strategic plan, KPIs), leading to process improvement (program review process, educational support review process validated by input mechanisms (VOC, workforce drivers/engagement).

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The applicant systematically protects its systems from and detects cybersecurity events through the *Baldrige Cybersecurity Excellence Builder*, the NIST Cybersecurity Framework, and US-CERT; PDCA processes are used to improve these approaches. By using students to both attack and defend the applicant’s cyber systems, the applicant identifies and acts on opportunities for improvement, as well as providing a learning opportunity for students. Such improvements may help the applicant maintain cybersecurity, which has become increasingly important given the reliance on online instruction and use of technology platforms during the pandemic. | R3: Used feedback to weave in more Criteria language in first sentence. This is focused on the multiple level and does not address security of assets which had been raised in IR as an OFI.  R2: Ex2, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7. Overall level strength. Multiple tools in place with some question about how systematic this is and how they fit together. Giving benefit of doubt at overall level but OFI for multiple questions.  Focused on learning. Need help in making sure that the b STR and OFI do not conflict. We may need to narrow them both further because the overall approaches are valid as a strength and the gap is an OFI.  Moved up after R1 feedback given importance of cybersecurity relative to other strengths in the applicant’s ability to operate. | b |
|  | The applicant systematically provides a safe operating environment for its workforce, students, and others in the workplace through its Emergency and Safety Process (Figure 6.2-1). The applicant regularly performs safety audits and inspections, provides for multi-platform reporting of safety issues, and it customizes safety training for all faculty and staff members for their respective roles. | Ex1, Ex3, Ex5, Ex6 (but with questions). Overall strength.  We were nearly equally split on whether this was a strength or OFI for the applicant. The OFIs focused more on multiples so proposing an overall strength. | c(1) |
|  | The applicant’s stoplight reviews provide an emphasis on budget/cost control and schedules in order to manage process efficiency and effectiveness. As an improvement made through the PDCA process, the applicant integrated the registration and scheduling system with food services and the bookstore, which resulted in cost savings. This approach may help the applicant manage its strategic challenge of decreased state funding. | Strength focuses on overall and some multiple questions. (Ex1, Ex2, Ex7) | a |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Strengths are mostly at the overall level, and there were some questions and benefit of doubt. Must make sure that the b OFI and STR do not conflict. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant manages physical and digital data, information, and key operational systems to ensure confidentiality and only appropriate physical and digital access by employees, partners, and suppliers. Ensuring that these stakeholders understand their roles may help the applicant mitigate the risk of inappropriate access inherent in moving operations online. | R3: Included partners and suppliers as suggested by Ex7. This focuses on "ensure confidentiality and appropriate physical and digital access." While there was some discussion about the mention of cybersecurity potentially conflicting with the b strength, that comment focuses on the last bullet of the multiple. We eliminated "cybersecurity" from this comment to avoid potentially conflicting comments, but the two comments focus on different aspects of the item.  For discussion: Ex7 raises whether the Cybersecurity Excellence Builder and US-CERT include training processes for confidentiality. Ex1, Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6  R1 feedback streamlined comment to lessen the STROFI nature of the original draft.  Ex6: They didn’t address how they secured assets other than cyber assets. Focuses on multiple questions. | b |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant’s emergency process allows it to anticipate disasters, emergencies, and other disruptions, or how the process is deployed to suppliers, other people in the workplace, and locations such as the bookstore, athletics, art galleries, or dining areas. For example, when the pandemic struck, plans were put into place as needed rather than according to a continuity-of-operations plan. Without a fully deployed process that includes the ability to anticipate disruptions, the applicant’s business continuity may be at risk. | Ex1, Ex2, Ex4, Ex5, Ex7 identified this OFI. How emergency plan helps applicant anticipate, plans, and recover ... saw reactive response to the pandemic.  Ex5 advocates for an overall OFI.  Ex2 focuses on deployment.  Ex7: For example, when the pandemic struck, there was no systematic process for continuity of operations and plans were put into place as needed.  Ex2 focused on deployment to suppliers. | c(2) |
|  | It is not clear how the applicant systematically balances the need for cost control and efficiency with students’ and customers’ needs. For example, the applicant has a strategic challenge of reduced state funding while also facing the increasing need to develop dual-credit options and meet employers’ needs. By addressing process efficiency and effectiveness, the applicant may better mitigate the effects of declining state funding and still meet student and stakeholder requirements. | Identified by Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, and Ex6. Multiple-level OFI, whereas the strength for a is overall and different multiple.  NOTE: need help with the "so what" for the for the counterpart strength because they both cite decreased state funding. Another option is to focus this just on balancing the need for cost control and efficiency with students’ and stakeholders’ needs which is probably this most important given the applicant’s key factors and vision.  R1 feedback suggested focusing on one nugget, so the following was removed from the comment, "It is not clear how the applicant prevents errors and rework or how it minimizes the costs of inspections, tests or audits, including accreditation." While this is true, there is a strategic need for the applicant to balance the declining funding with meeting student and stakeholder requirements. | a |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| These are big OFIs as they all could represent vulnerabilities ... especially confidentiality of student data (think of all the nationally newsworthy student data breaches), being reactive in the pandemic, and balancing cost control with meeting students’ needs. Focused the OFI for 6.2a on multiples not contained in the STR a. c(2) OFI is at the overall level. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 50**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Proposing a score of 50% at the lower end of its range. Not proposing higher range (70–85%) because of deployment gaps, some overall approach gaps, and learning gaps with significant strategic OFIs. Not proposing lower range of 30–45% because the applicant has gone beyond addressing the basic questions and has provided evidence of refinement through cycles of learning with its PDCA approach.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 7.1

## Student Learning and Process Results

### Relevant Key Factors

1. 50 associate; 25 certificates/workforce training badge; workforce development/continuing education—personal development, badges, skill-building courses. All associate programs require internship, apprenticeship, or other applied experience.
2. CC1: Provide exceptional student support services.
3. Recent high school graduates inside/outside service area; non-traditional, transfer, former students—focused recruitment, information about institution, easy access to services. Primary customers: credit students, over 70% reside in 3-county service area.
4. Technology providers, laboratory support providers, service providers (bookstore, dining), administrative support.
5. National/regional estimates: declines in high school graduates over next decade; lowering of admissions standards of some peers/competitors; development of dual-credit academies, articulation agreements, collaboration with local employers to increase entry pathways.
6. Decreased state funding, Influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students, demands to close achievement gap.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X** | Student access and success results demonstrate good levels and favorable performance against comparisons. Enrollment, four-year graduation rate, credit hours delivered, and number of students transferred (Figures 7.1-1, 7.1-3, 7.1-4, and 7.1-6), among other results, were improving pre-pandemic and showed better performance than the IPEEx2 peer group, the NCCBP top decile, and Baldrige Award recipient comparisons. In many instances (e.g., degrees awarded and continuing education hours, Figures 7.1-2 and 7.1-5), the applicant outperforms comparisons even during the pandemic downturn in performance. | All examiners cited a strength for pre-pandemic performance. Good comparisons and sustained trends are recognized despite downturn in performance. The downturn is from a known cause and there is slight recovery even while still in the midst of the pandemic. Performance continues to best comparators even with lower performance. For all these reasons, a double is warranted.  R-1 provided more examples of where they continued to outperform comparisons. | a |
|  | Supply-network results demonstrate good levels and beneficial trends pre-pandemic. A change in the procurement system has resulted in a tripling of participation by and procurement dollars from small, woman, and minority suppliers (Figure 7.1-20) and a decrease in cycle times (Figure 7.1-23). A shift to online textbooks has decreased the average cost and increased student savings (Figure 7.1-22); integrating systems resulted in support savings in food service and the bookstore (Figure 7.1-21). These results are evidence of the applicant’s core competency in providing exceptional student support services, many of which are delivered by suppliers. | One examiner (Ex5) has as an OFI for other suppliers such as for laboratory, but others (Ex6, Ex3, Ex7) have this as strength and the examiner (Ex5) also had this strength. I think good results from improvements warrant a strength as opposed to picking out missing suppliers or missing indicators of supplier performance processes.  R1: changed relevance (last sentence) to more directly tie into students and supply network management per feedback. | c |
|  | The applicant’s indicators for innovation performance (Figure 7.1-18) demonstrate good pre-pandemic trends and comparisons. Both the number of innovations submitted and the percentage of innovations completed doubled prior to the pandemic and exceeded the DASHER top decile for 2019 and 2020. Continuing to effectively manage innovation processes may help the applicant manage its strategic challenges around funding, competition, and the achievement gap. | Very narrow strength to give credit for innovation process management as it supports the applicant’s ability to manage strategic challenges. | b(1) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| I am choosing to remain silent on the work process effectiveness strengths. Admission and registration times have decreased due to online systems, but enrollment is also in decline, so have they decreased cycle time because there was a corresponding decrease in customers? The applicant does not segment enrollment results so is the move to online admission and registration proportionately hurting diverse students? The applicant cites the move to online for decrease performance in degrees awarded, graduation, transfer, persistence so is the savings due to online education worth it?  I am giving them instead an OFI that safety drop box inputs are still above 2018 levels even in a pandemic with remote operations. Education plan results show a curious decrease due to pandemic. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X** | Results for the applicant’s efforts to close the student achievement gap—such as student learning by different population segments, utilization of services, or interventions to promote equitable access—are missing. Such results may help the applicant identify areas of progress or opportunities for improvement in addressing its strategic challenge of demands to close the student achievement gap. | One examiner (Ex6) cited not addressing the strategic challenge of closing the achievement gap as an OFI. This OFI points to linkages with categories 1, 3, and 5 for diversity, equity, and inclusion and is highly relevant given the current social and political climate. This is more than a missing segmentation OFI, and there are no results for key processes towards closing the gap, which the applicant indicates is a strategic challenge.  Rises to the top as it is an unaddressed strategic challenge despite all the work on workforce diversity, equity, and inclusion and warrants a double to bring the attention of the applicant to this critical area.  R1: changed relevance to more directly tie into student learning. | a |
|  | The applicant does not provide segmented results for its educational program and service offerings (P.1-1). For example, fall-to-fall student persistence rates (Figure 7.1-9), graduation rates (Figure 7.1-3, 7.1-3b), and the number of students transferring to four-year institutions (Figure 7.1-6) are not segmented by certificate programs, workforce badges, or career preparation courses. Results for the applicant’s various programs may reveal progress toward meeting the requirements of its key market segments. | The applicant does provide results for persistence, graduation, and transfer—traditional summative indicators of student learning, but they are not segmented by programs.  There may be an OFI for missing formative assessments of student learning, but the Criteria does not prescribe what type of student learning outcomes results are to be presented, and OFI for how applicant gauges student learning should be in process categories.  R1: adjusted for Ex4 feedback, keeping positive relevance, and citing results figures as hint for improvement for applicant. | a |
|  | Some of the applicant’s results for work process effectiveness demonstrate poor levels. Even during a pandemic move to remote operations, safety drop box inputs remain higher than pre-pandemic levels in 2018 (Figure 7.1-19). In addition, the percentage of students with a required education plan has declined by more than 10 percentage points (Figure 7.1-13). Probing and improving these pandemic-era results may help the applicant improve its resilience. | High safety drop box inputs when there are fewer people on campus during remote operations would indicate poor effectiveness. The pandemic may have disrupted enrollment, but of the students who are with the college, a decline in mandatory education plans would seem to indicate ineffective advising processes.  R1: probably needs to be reconstituted as my points weren’t understood but going to wait until R-2 comments. I put Ex6 OFI about placement in OFI4 for downturn of performance but don’t feel its necessarily a process issue per se.  Ex5’s comment about 7.3-7 I’m chalking up to a typo, and Ex4’s IT availability comment seems minor and explained by applicant due to sudden transition.  The "good" arrow for 7.1-17 and 7.1-19 clearly doesn’t apply to all the metrics, and my point was that it’s puzzling you’d have increased safety inputs and emergency drills when hardly anybody is on campus. | b |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| If we eliminate the (a) OFI surrounding pandemic-related performance, I see the score being 55 or higher, but if we keep the OFI4(a) whether as is or adjusting to call out only lower performance pre- or post-pandemic, I think the score goes lower to 50. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 55**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? The applicant addresses the overall questions, and pre-pandemic performance demonstrates good levels in most areas, so the applicant is beyond the basic. But there’s very little to no segmentation for student learning and very little for performance of services, which keeps the responses out of the multiples.**  **Pre-pandemic beneficial trends were sustained over time, so this might help put the score into the next range. Many results show comparisons and those comparisons show areas of leadership, even with current pandemic performance so this is relatively high. Organizational performance results are reported for a few areas of importance, making determination of performance, trends, and comparisons less clear.**  **So holistically, the applicant has provided enough to determine good organizational performance with beneficial trends, but segmented performance is lacking to be able to accurately determine comparative performance for areas of importance.**  **Keeping score at 55.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 7.2

## Customer Results

### Relevant Key Factors

1. 50 associate; 25 certificates/workforce training badge; workforce development/continuing education—personal development, badges, skill-building courses.
2. 10,000 students/year, 75% courses face-to-face; 25% online/alternate location. Weekend, compressed, evening courses, dual-credit academies, prior learning credit.
3. Vision—Will be the best in the nation in providing students with accessibility, affordability, career-readiness, and social responsibility. Values—Students First.
4. CC2: Partner with local community to achieve excellence/graduate job readiness.
5. Recent high school graduates inside/outside service area; nontraditional, transfer, former students—focused recruitment, information about institution, easy access to services.
6. Career-seeking students—degree completion info, academic support services. Transfer—transfer articulation, degree completion info, academic challenges. Non-degree-seeking—workforce skills, adult learner needs. Dual Credit—college credit courses, collaboration with high school schedule.
7. Peers, competitors, national averages, best-in-class—IPEEx2, CCSSE, CollUnivPA-HR; Nome Zevil DASHER; other Baldrige winners; NCCBP, Cost and Productivity Project, NSC.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X** | In support of the Students First value, student satisfaction results show beneficial trends and good performance against comparisons. RBM Overall Satisfaction (Figure 7.2-1) levels continuously improved and outperformed peer institutions in 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020, and were equal to the Baldrige Award recipient’s levels in 2020. For RBM College Met Expectations (Figure 7.2-2), the applicant outperformed peers and was at the RBM top decile in 2020. In addition, results for Satisfaction with Student Focus (Figure 7.2-4) improved steadily from 2014 to 2019 for four key measures, and Customer Satisfaction with Student Services (Figure 7.2-14) increased from 2017 to 2020 for four student segments. | R2: New a(1) strength comment combining previous first and third a(1) comments per advice of three examiners (Ex4, Ex5, Ex7). Examiners suggested that this should be a double strength. | a(1) |
|  | The applicant demonstrates beneficial trends and favorable comparisons for some measures of stakeholder and student engagement. For example, results for Stakeholder Engagement (Figure 7.2-24) from 2017 through 2020 show charitable giving trending beneficially overall for annual giving, the STAR scholarship fund, and the alumni association. Customer Engagement Response Times (Figure 7.2-25) have generally improved, and response times have been cut in half during the pandemic. In addition, Level of Student Engagement (Figure 7.2-20) exceeds the CCSSE top decile for all four dimensions reported. | Four examiners (Ex7, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6) noted a(2) strengths. In 1.1c(2), the applicant says that S-KPIs address student engagement and results; nonetheless, engagement is minimally described in item 3.2. Dashboard and KPI measures are listed below. I tried to include most in the proposed a(2) S comment.  7.2-20 Level of Student Engagement  7.2-5 Student Participation and Engagement Plan (Figure 7.22-5 has different title in Results where it is Student Satisfaction with [applicant] Programs)  7.2-24 Stakeholder Engagement  7.2-25 Customer Engagement Response Time  R1: In response to backup’s good advice, changed "upward" and "downward" language describing trends to "beneficially" and "improved."  R2: Suggestion to change "some" to "many." I left the wording at "some" because evidence is not strong. The reduction in response time during the pandemic (Figure 7.2-25), for example, might be because of lower census/volume. [See Considerations for COVID-era Assessments.] | a(2) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Previous first a(1) strength: “The applicant demonstrates beneficial trends and comparisons for its student satisfaction results, demonstrating progress toward achieving the institution’s vision to be best in the nation. For example, for RBM Overall Satisfaction (Figure 7.2-1), levels continuously improve and outperform Peer 2, 3, and 4 institutions in 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020, equal to level of Baldrige winner in 2020. RBM College Met Expectations (Figure 7.2-2) outperforms all peers and meets RBM top decile in 2020, and beneficial comparative performance for Satisfaction with Academic Services (Figure 7.2-3) in 2020 is equal to or exceeds RBM top decile.”  Previous third a(1) strength: “In support of the value of students first, results demonstrate beneficial trends for student satisfaction related to specific services and segments. For example, results for Satisfaction with Student Focus (Figure 7.2-4) have improved steadily since 2014 for Students First, instructional effectiveness, concern for individual, and service excellence. Scores for Nome Zevil Educational Experience (Figure 7.2-7) have increased from 2012 through 2018. Customer Satisfaction with Student Services (Figure 7.2-14) has increased from 2017 to 2020 for transfer, DC, career, and nondegree student segments.”  R2: First and third a(1) strength comments combined into the first, doubled a(1) strength comment per the advice of three examiners (Ex4, Ex7, Ex5). |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Results for most measures of student satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and engagement lack segmentation by key student groups (Figure P.1-5). Examples are Figures 7.2-1 through 7.2-3 as well as Figures 7.5, 7.8, and 7.9 for satisfaction; Figure 7.2-19 for dissatisfaction; and Figures 7.2-20 and 7.2-23 for engagement. Such segmentation may help the applicant uncover opportunities for improving the satisfaction and engagement of key student groups. | Four examiners (Ex3, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7) noted lack of segmentation for customer-focused performance outcomes.  QUESTION FOR BACKUP: Shall we shift the emphasis from student groups, especially, to customer groups, generally, and include examples of results for lack of segmentation of other customers?  R2: Segmentation may be rising to level of a key theme (OFI); therefore, this OFI remains to support the emerging key theme. Added Dissatisfaction (Figure 7.2-19). | a |
|  | Some customer results lack comparisons that may help the applicant determine its progress toward its goal of being best in the nation. For example, results for Financial Aid Student Satisfaction (Figure 7.2-15), Community Satisfaction (Figure 7.2-16), Percent of Student Achieving Goals (Figure 7.2-23), Stakeholder Engagement (Figure 7.2-24), and Customer Engagement Response Times (Figure 7.2-25) lack comparisons. | Lack of comparisons mentioned by two examiners (Ex4, Ex5).  R2: One examiner (Ex6) suggested demoting this OFI as potentially unactionable. I disagree; comparisons for annual giving, graduation rates, response times, and more, are available—very likely among sister schools if not elsewhere. Given the applicant’s aspiration to be the best, this OFI might be useful and motivating. | a |
|  | Results are missing for the satisfaction and engagement of most of the customers listed in Figure 3.1-1. For example, no results are provided for engagement of employers and advisory committee members, technology companies, the community including the local chamber of commerce, and lab support providers. Such results may help the applicant strengthen its core competency of partnering with the local community to achieve excellence and graduate job readiness. | Mentioned by one examiner (Ex3). What about satisfaction and engagement of RBM, clearly a key partner/vendor!  R1: Backup and I discussed her observation that the proposed third “a” OFI might be prescriptive because the applicant lists only feeder schools and the local community as key stakeholders (P.1-5); no other customers besides students (career-seeking, transfer, nondegree-seeking, and DC high school students) are listed in P.1-5. In Figure 3.1-1, however, the applicant includes feeder schools transfer schools, employers, local community, service providers, and donors as customers.  R2: One examiner (Ex6) suggested deleting, one (Ex2) asked if this is prescriptive, one (Ex5) suggested "customers" (as defined in Figure 3.1-1) for clarity and alignment with Criteria. Employers and advisory committee members, tech partners, and the local community, including chamber, are key partners/collaborators whose satisfaction/engagement is essential to the sustainability and growth of programs/services. | a |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| R2: Ranking OFIs is challenging. If segmentation is a key theme, it might be useful to list the segmentation OFI among top-ranking comments. Also, segmentation is especially relevant given the applicant’s strategic advantage of student success outcomes (SA1) and strategic challenges related to student segments and levels (e.g., SC 2, SC3, SC4, SC5). The lack of comparisons is meaningful in relation to the applicant’s vision to become the best in the nation and, therefore, could be the top-ranking OFI. The third OFI addresses community engagement, which is essential to the applicant’s sustainability as an institution serving the community.  Lowest-ranking a(1) OFI DELETED in R2 due to challenges with examples: “The applicant demonstrates some results that lack beneficial trends such as Overall Satisfaction (Figure 7.2-9), which declined from 2012 through 2018 and was below the Nome Zevil top decile, and Community Perception (Figure 7.2-17), which declined between 2017 and 2020 and lagged the peer comparisons. The declining community perception and satisfaction results indicate that the applicant may not be achieving its value of being community engaged.” |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 50**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Not below, in part, because of some beneficial trend data (noted in double a[1] strength). Not above: Segmented data are missing according to student and customer groups, as are comparative data. Initially, proposed score was in the 30–45% range. Moving to the low end of the 50–65% range is supported by evidence of good performance levels, beneficial trends in areas of importance to the applicant’s mission, comparisons of performance to relevant comparisons/benchmarks, and reporting of performance results for most process requirements.**  **R2: Increased score to 50–65% range and score of 50% due to doubled a(1) STR and deleted a(1) OFI. A score higher than 50% is not recommended in part because of the lack of segmentation by key student and customer groups.** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 7.3

## Workforce Results

### Relevant Key Factors

1. CC3: Maintain expert, up-to-date workforce.
2. Tenured/tenure-track faculty (250); adjunct/non-tenure-track, FT & PT (200); management (60); professional support (250); support (400); temp. (50).
3. Open communication (supervisor relationships); high-performance work (valued as team member); focus on continuous improvement/innovation (training/resource availability/relevance); engaged/empowered workforce (satisfied with sense of contribution to mission); diverse ideas, cultures, thinking (satisfied with sense mission and college future); inclusion/equity.
4. Peers, competitors, national averages, best-in-class—IPEEx2, CCSSE, CollUnivPA-HR; Nome Zevil DASHER; Other Baldrige winners; NCCBP, Cost and Productivity Project, NSC.
5. Decreased state funding, influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students, demands to close achievement gap, ensuring qualifications of incoming FT/PT faculty.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Workforce capacity results show good levels and good performance relative to comparisons. For example, Vacancy Rates (Figure 7.3-3) and Faculty-Student Ratio (Figure 7.3-4) both demonstrate consistent good levels and exceed the comparisons shown. In addition, Workforce Attrition (Figure 7.3-2) for faculty members and administrators has been consistently better than that of the top-decile comparators. Such results may help the applicant achieve its strategic objectives during a period of decreased state funding. | Vacancy rates show good levels as indicated by exceeding comparison group, same with faculty-student ratio. Attrition rates show uneven trend for staff, but levels are relatively stable at above top-decile performance. | a(1) |
|  | The applicant invests more in workforce development than its peers do, which garners good satisfaction ratings for the effectiveness of leadership development programs. Workforce Learning and Development Investment (Figure 7.3-13) exceeds that of the DASHER comparison for all three workforce segments. Satisfaction with peer mentoring and participation in leadership development (Figures 7.3-14 and 7.3-15) also demonstrate generally beneficial trends. These results evidence progress in responding to the workforce engagement driver of training and resource availability and relevance. | Although it is impossible to determine a “good” level of development investment by itself, coupled with a benchmark comparison we can determine the levels exceed those of peers but not so far above that it brings into questions about efficiency.  Bright Star peer mentoring and Leadership Development Effectiveness results do not have comparisons and would not be expected to have them for such internal measures, but strengths are noted for beneficial trends and levels above 90%.  R1: Ex3 feedback is fine—just thought I’d write it with less Baldrigese for variety but will gladly switch if team prefers. | a(4) |
|  | The applicant’s results for workplace climate demonstrate good levels and favorable comparisons. Perceived safety results for service and professionalism (Figure 7.3-5) show beneficial trends and exceed the national top decile in all areas. Results for workers’ compensation injuries compare favorably to the National Safety Council average. These results support the applicant in meeting the workforce engagement factors it has identified. | Results are good to excellent as indicated by far exceeding national top-decile comparisons. Trends are difficult to pinpoint as the levels are high enough on overall climate that variations on a five-point scale at that level are not meaningful.  R1 edits to placement of figure citation per feedback. | a(2) |
|  | The applicant’s results for the engagement of faculty members and administrators demonstrate good levels, beneficial trends, and good performance relative to comparisons. Performance on the Great Higher Education Employers Survey exceeds the two-year college top decile for all factors. Overall Workplace Climate (Figure 7.3-6) and Workforce Engagement Factors (Figure 7.3-10) show good relative levels, trends, and comparisons for faculty members and administrators. This good performance evidences the applicant’s success in responding to the workforce engagement driver of feeling valued as a team member. | Narrow strength to give credit for good engagement levels but still provide room to call out lagging relative performance for staff engagement. | a(3) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| All the strengths seemed comparable to me with none rising above or falling below others in the ordering. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Some key workforce-related results are missing. For example, workforce capability results do not address academic credentials or appropriate skills. In addition, accessibility results, which may impact inclusion, are missing, as are results for participation in and satisfaction with wellness programs, the applicant’s indicator of workplace health. Tracking these results may assist the applicant in strengthening its core competency of maintaining an expert, up-to-date workforce and in responding to the increased attention on instructor quality. | The comment is taken from Ex6 as a good summary of key missing results. Most examiners had an OFI around capability and, while applicant presents a table for capability, it does not address credentials and instructor quality.  R1: Moved to top per feedback. | A(1,2,3) |
|  | Engagement results for staff members, the largest segment of the workforce, lag behind those for other workforce segments. This is reflected in results for all workforce engagement factors (Figures 7.3-9 and 7.3-10), lower investment in staff learning and development (Figure 7.3-13), lower satisfaction with peer mentoring (Figure 7.3-14), lower participation in leadership development (Figure 7.3-15), and a mixed attrition trend. Improvement in these areas may help the applicant meet students’ needs as it works to increase entry pathways to the college. | Staff results traditionally are lower, but this is across the board and, with efforts to recover from the pandemic and an influx of high school enrollment that may need more services, the applicant may need to address this workforce segment sooner rather than later. | a(3) |
|  | The applicant’s results for workforce capacity and capability, climate, engagement, and development are not segmented by non-tenure-track, adjunct, full-time, and part-time faculty members, a significant portion of the faculty ranks. Segmented results may help the applicant ensure that it is fulfilling the engagement drivers for all employees. | Unlike segmentation of workforce capacity by programs, which would require display far more data by the program, the applicant simply needed to add another line for adjuncts and non-tenure-track faculty, FT, and PT. So while segmentation by programs may have warranted benefit of the doubt, leaving off a significant segment of the most important work population—faculty members—does not warrant benefit of the doubt.  R1: minor edits per Ex3 feedback | a |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Benefit of the doubt that the applicant has segmented results for capacity for programs in 7.3-2 Workforce Attrition, 7.3-3 Vacancy Rates, and 7.3-4 Faculty-Student Ratio. There is a possible OFI here, but for now there are other more critical areas for feedback and overall results are relatively good. Would be an issue to clarify should applicant make it to a site visit.  Benefit of the doubt that Worker’s Compensation Injuries is a result of charting error; that the applicant does not have thousands of falls, sprains, and burns each year or that “other” injuries don’t number in the five figures. This might be clarified in an applicant call if it is caught early enough, but benefit of the doubt is warranted to reserve comments for more realistic feedback. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 55**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? The applicant addresses more than the basic Criteria questions and in some cases goes into the multiples but is missing responses to questions in key areas for capacity, capability, and climate. There are enough beneficial trends to say that they are evident in areas of importance but not sustained over time in most areas, but there is weakness in the staff segment results. Results are reported for many areas but missing for key areas of adjunct and non-tenure-track faculty members; key missing results also help put this in the 50–65% range, with a score of 55, give or take 5%.**  **R1: Holding on score for further team feedback.**  The team reached consensus on a score of 55. |

## Item Worksheet—Item 7.4

## Leadership and Governance Results

### Relevant Key Factors

1. Vision—Will be the best in the nation in providing students with accessibility, affordability, career-readiness, and social responsibility. Values—Students First; Community-Engaged; Collaboration; Partnership Excellence.
2. CC2: Partner with local community to achieve excellence/graduate job readiness.
3. Open communication (supervisor relationships); high-performance work (valued as team member); focus on continuous improvement/innovation (training/resource availability/relevance); engaged/empowered workforce (satisfied with sense of contribution to mission); diverse ideas, cultures, thinking (satisfied with sense mission and college future); inclusion/equity.
4. State coordinating board (Central Polk Board of Trustees); regional accred. (HLC); specialized accred. (7 academic programs w/discipline-specific); local (Board of County Commissioners); federal regs (DoE, Veterans Affairs, OCR, OSHA).
5. Recent high school graduates inside/outside service area; nontraditional, transfer, former students—focused recruitment, information about institution, easy access to services.
6. Peers, competitors, national averages, best-in-class—IPEEx2, CCSSE, CollUnivPA-HR; Nome Zevil DASHER; Other Baldrige winners; NCCBP, Cost and Productivity Project, NSC;
7. SO: Social responsibility.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X** | The applicant’s key ethics and legal/regulatory results show good levels, beneficial trends, and good relative performance against comparisons (Figures 7.4-4 through 7.4-7 and Figures 7.4-9 through 7.4-12). Most compliance and regulatory measures have been at or near 100% for the most recent one or two years reported, and employee participation in ethics training has outperformed that of the top sister college in the system for four of the last five years. In addition, stakeholders’ trust in the President’s Team demonstrates beneficial trends for the past three years and outperforms the top-decile comparison in FY2020 for all stakeholder groups (overall, faculty, staff, and students). | 6 examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex7) had ID’d ethics and legal results as strengths (with some elements of an OFI also in the mix for specifics of levels, missing, and segmentation).  Based on an SME’s comments that these results are extremely strong, have carried the doubling forward.  Examples include—Good levels shown: 7.4-4 On-Time/Accurate Compliance with Required State/Fed Reports.  7.4-5 Internal Financial Audit Finding Results: Consistently good-excellent levels from FY2016 to FY2020.  7.4-6 Accreditation and Legal Compliance: consistently good-excellent levels in FY2014, FY2017, and FY2020 [accreditation would not be reported according to a FY calendar].  7.4-7 Compliance with Key Measures and [internal] Requirements: consistently good-excellent levels from FY2018 to FY2020. Similarly, these results have been at 97% or higher for all areas reported since FY 2018, with 100% compliance in FY2019 for all but one area. | a(3,4) |
|  | For senior leaders’ communication, engagement, and support of organizational values (Figure 7.4-1), the applicant reports good-to-excellent results levels, sustained improvement, and good relative performance against comparisons among several key student and stakeholder groups. For example, leadership scores for reinforcement of each of the applicant’s values demonstrate overall consistent beneficial trends for administrators, faculty members, staff members, and overall for the past three years (Figure 7.4-2). Results for both measures outperform top-decile comparisons. These results demonstrate that the workforce and key stakeholders perceive that senior leaders support the applicant’s values. | 5 examiners had many to most of these figures ID as strengths.  Examples include: 7.4-1 Satisfaction with Communication from SL Levels at/near Canter top decile for administrators, faculty, staff, partners, and business/industry from 2017 to 2020  7.4-1a Satisfaction with SL Cultivating Innovation and Intelligent Risk-Taking Levels at/near Canter top decile for administrators, faculty, staff, partners, and business/industry from 2017 to 2020  7.4-2 CEE Leadership Reinforcement of Values Good levels, generally positive trends, and favorable comparison to CEE top decile for administrators, faculty, and staff from 2018 to 2020 for each of APEx5’s values  7.4-3 PT Focus on Action [align with Figure 1.1-3] Good results and positive trend for workforce perception of SLs’ focus on action (related to number of innovation plans that have been funded and successfully implemented, overall organizational performance improvement rate of change, and favorable workforce perception of SLS’ focus on action) | a(1) |
|  | Some results for societal well-being and support of key communities demonstrate good levels, beneficial trends, and good relative performance against comparisons. For example, dual-credit enrollment has saved students over $1.7 million, and enrollment of rural students increased to 31% in the latest fall term, achieving the best-in-the-state level in fall 2019-2020 (Figure 7.4-13). Other examples of such results are the increased percentage of employees giving back and a reduction in consumption of resources (Figures 7.4-14 and 7.4-15). These results demonstrate the applicant’s value of being community-engaged. | 4 examiners (Ex1, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6) provided some elements of a(5) as strengths and provided specifics. This a(5) will have a companion OFI comment about other aspects that are missing.  STR evidence includes: Dual-credit enrollment has saved students over $1.7 million dollars and increased enrollment of rural students to 31% in the latest fall term. Employees’ participation rate in the giving program has more than doubled in the last five years and has made significant reductions in consumption of resources.  Figure 7.4-13 dual-credit enrollment  Figure 7.4-14 employees giving back  Figure 7.4-15 reduction in consumption of resources | a(5) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Results are missing for a number of measures related to the applicant’s leadership; governance; and legal and regulatory, compliance, and accreditation performance. For example, no results are reported for senior leaders’ communication and engagement with students, for the Board self-assessment, for grievances and complaints, and for measures addressing risk with educational programs. Tracking such results may enable the applicant to more effectively demonstrate being the best in the nation. | 6 examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6) called out missing results. I chose to create 2 OFIs, one for a(1, 2, 3, 4) and one for a(5) results.  Doubled based on significance. Examples include board self-assessment (1.2a2); grievances and complaints (1.b1); measures address risk with ed. programs (student completion, satisfaction, and transfer rates by program (see bottom of 1.2b1).  External audit findings weren’t reported. Missing results based on text provided in cat. 1.  Now that there are 2 OFIs for missing results, removed the double. | a(1,2,3,4) |
|  | Performance results are missing for several expected measures of societal well-being and key community support. These results relate to students (graduate placements in programs of need); faculty and student events for community benefit; businesses (certification, advisory groups, and dual-credit programs); and community learning events. In addition, results are not reported for career placement and readiness, for retaining students in higher-income positions, or for keeping students local. Tracking these results may help the applicant asses its performance relative to the social responsibility aspect of its vision. | Broke up the issue of missing results into 2 comments to give more examples of specific missing areas. This was supported by a number of examples. | a(5) |
|  | Most of the applicant’s key leadership, governance, and societal well-being results are not segmented by student segments, faculty segments, or programs. For example, in Figures 7.4-2, 7.4-3, and 7.4-10 through 7.4-12, results for career-seeking vs. non-career-seeking students or for part-time vs. full-time faculty segments are not reported. Tracking results by these key segments may enable leaders to ensure that they are effectively meeting each group’s requirements and expectations (Figure P.1-5). | Several examiners specifically called out the lack of segmentation. Student segmentation not reported in 7.4-1, -1a, -2, and -3 while all other segments were included. And no segmentation for part-time vs. full-time staff/faculty, which is significant based on numbers. No specific program segmentation other than dual-credit is shown, such as areas including health education or other STEM programs. | a(1,2,5) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Have separated out the missing results comments from 1 OFI to 2 to help differentiate the issues (based on recommendations); thus removing the double OFI 1 for missing. And refined the segmentation comment. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 65**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? The score is not in the range below as results are reported for all areas, beneficial levels and trend data are provided for most results at the overall level, and some results are reported for multiple questions. The score is not in the above range because of missing results and lack of segmentation by key groups/programs noted for several key expected results.**  **Thus, based on the 3 STR, with one doubled strength for ethics/legal results, and the 3 OFIs with 2 specifically addressing missing expected key results (at multiple level), the 50–65% range is the most descriptive, and a score of 65 .** |

## Item Worksheet—Item 7.5

## Budgetary, Financial, Market, and Strategy Results

### Relevant Key Factors

1. Recent high school graduates inside/outside service area; nontraditional, transfer, former students—focused recruitment, information about institution, easy access to services. Primary customers: credit students, over 70% in 3-county service area.
2. Career-seeking students. Transfer. Non-degree-seeking. Dual credit.
3. National/regional estimates: declines in high school graduates over next decade; Lowering of admissions standards of some peers/competitors; development of dual-credit academies, articulation agreements, collaboration with local employers to increase entry pathways.
4. Peers, competitors, national averages, best-in-class—IPEEx2, CCSSE, CollUnivPA-HR; Nome Zevil DASHER; other Baldrige winners; NCCBP, Cost and Productivity Project, NSC.
5. Affordability.
6. Decreased state funding, Influx of dual-credit high school students, increased competition for students.

### Strengths

| **++** | **Strength** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Some financial performance results demonstrate sustained top-decile or top-quartile levels. For example, the bond credit report (Figure 7.5-6) is positive, and for cost containment, the applicant’s results are equal to or better than those of the DASHER top peer (Figure 7.5-8). The percentage of expenditures for instruction and academic support (Figure 7.5-9) outperforms the DASHER top peer, while cost per enrollment is lower than all three comparators (Figure 7.5-10). These results may help the applicant maintain its strategic advantage of affordability. | Noted by six examiners (Ex1, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7). Ex6 had a double for some figures (2b, 6, 9, 10).  Ex6 also had an OFI for 2b, 6. Ex7 had an OFI and Ex4 had a strength for figure 7 Conflicts occurred for Figs. 2b, 6, 7, 10 with these being noted as adverse trends due to the pandemic by some examiners.  Those figures at or above the top decile include 7.5-3, -6 -7 -8, -9, -10 with -8 and -9 listed as a double strength.  Figures with dips in FY2020—e.g., Net Revenue (Figure 7.5-2) were not included here, such as net margin (Figure 7.5-2b).  The bond credit report is positive (Figure 7.5-6) with the highest level for Moody’s. | a(1) |
|  | The applicant reports beneficial trends for market performance and growth, with some results comparing favorably to in-state competitors and the top decile. For example, there is consistent growth in dual-credit enrollment (Figure 7.5-11), which is now above the best in the state; for total number of customers (Figure 7.5-14), the applicant outperforms the best competitor and equals the DASHER top peer. In addition, market share penetration in the three-county service area is better than that of the best service-area competitor (Figure 7.5-12). | Strength was noted by four examiners (Ex1, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7).  While the applicant has compared favorably in DC High School as compared to the state, it is below the DASHER measure in the noncredit credit market penetration. The strength was noted for the DC High School growth. Cost per enrollment has continued to be low and is much better than the three national benchmarks of IPED, Dasher, and NCCBP. | a(2) |
|  | Revenue and margin results have remained stable or are better than benchmarks. For example, net asset position (Figure 7.5-4) is better than the NCCBP comparison, revenue and expenditures outperform the IPEEx2 top quartile (Figure 7.5-2a), and net margin continued to improve from 2016 to 2019 (Figure 7.5-2b). These results may enable the applicant to use its resources to address its challenge of decreased state funding. | Noted by six examiners (Ex1, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7). Originally there was just one strength on financial results, but due to the number of good results, two comments were generated, with the strongest comment rising to the top.  Conflicts did exist where some examiners saw the decline in 2020 as an adverse trend, but due to the pandemic and the fact that performance is still at or above its benchmarks at the top decile or top quartile, these comments were not included.  Results for grants and scholarship increased in FY20 to assist students with affordability. | a(1) |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| Many of the areas indicated beneficial trends through 2019, with a dip in 2020 due to the pandemic. While comparators also saw a dip, the applicant did not do as well as its benchmarks.  While the applicant indicates it benchmarks against Baldrige performers, no measures indicated Baldrige institutions in the comparators. Some of the same organizations, e.g., NCCBP, were used by both Baldrige Award recipients and the applicant. |

### Opportunities for Improvement

| **—** | **Opportunity for Improvement** | **Rationale** | **Item Ref.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Some key financial and marketplace measures demonstrate unfavorable performance relative to comparisons. For example, the applicant’s clock hours have consistently been below the DASHER top peer, the NCCBP 90th percentile, and the IPEEx2 top quartile (Figure 7.5-13). Market share for credit students, who compose 70% of the student population, has been flat over the last five years and is below the DASHER and NCCBP benchmarks (Figure 7.5-11). Closing these gaps may assist the applicant in meeting the strategic challenge of increased competition for students. | Noted by five examiners with one double (Ex1, Ex3, Ex5-double, Ex6, Ex7).  Market penetration (Figure 7.5-11) levels for credit and noncredit compare unfavorably to Dasher, NCCBP, and best in state benchmarks from AY2018-AY2020. The market share level for the percentage of undergrads in the tri-county service area underperforms the DASHER top peer from AY2015-AY2020. The clock hour or contact hours (Figure 7-5-13) for the applicant, a measure of engagement in student learning, is below all benchmarks, with little growth in hours.  Left as a double due especially to student contact hours (clock hours). These may have an impact on the increased competition for students, may also impact the demand to close the achievement gap and meeting the visions of being the best in the nation.  Removed the double after the consensus call. | a |
|  | The applicant reports performance below expectations for achieving its organizational strategy (Figure 7.5-17). Seven of the applicant’s 15 strategic goals have a red status, indicating that they have not been met. Among these are goals for enrollment, academic/technical program completion, pathways, and transfer. Many action plans (Figure 7.5-18) show a red or yellow status. Without progress on achievement of its strategic goals and action plans, the applicant may not be able to meet its strategic challenges in its competitive environment. | Four examiners (Ex1, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7) provided comments on strategy. Achievement of strategic goals (Figure 7.5-17) shows performance below expectation in AY2018 with many improving in AY2019, returning to worse levels in AY2020.  Programs of importance to the applicant such as student support services pathways and transfer, STEM and preparation of students were all reported in the red area (do not meet). It is not clear which are strategic initiatives and which are action plans in Figure 7.5-18. Results are shown beginning in fourth quarter AY2020, which is not a full year of results. In addition to the goals in the red area, four are in the yellow area.  No results were provided for intelligent risk taking. | b |
|  | Results in some areas of financial and market performance are not segmented by student groups, other customer groups, or programs. For example, net revenue results are not segmented to show results for credit/degree students, who are 70% of the student population. Nor are results for affordability segmented by market, educational offerings, student groups (such as career seeking, transfer, nondegree, and dual-credit students), or relative to the local community. Segmented results in these areas may help the applicant eliminate any blind spots and focus on which student groups persist and which need assistance. | Two examiners comment on missing segmentation (Ex3, Ex5 double). Some segmentation is shown, but the OFI is written as missing data for the remaining segments.  There does not appear to be much focus on students in the various programs and market segments overall. With CC2 of partnering with the local community, results may indicate financial or market results for this partnering.  Other areas with limited data are Figure 7.5-1, which groups certificate, workforce and continuing ed into one group and does not provide information on the large student group of credit students. As the applicant does show revenue for one group of students, there may be more data available on-site, but the applicant does not indicate this.  Total revenue and expenditures (Figures 7.5-2a, 2b) have no segmentation by program. It is not clear if expenditures are for staff, or other budgetary areas. | a |

#### Notes

|  |
| --- |
| While there was a decline in many of the areas in FY2020 due to the pandemic, there were a large number of results that did not have beneficial trends or did not reach the desired top decile, related to the vision of being the best in the nation for accessibility, affordability, career-readiness, and social responsibility. |

### Scoring

|  |
| --- |
| **Score Value: 50**  **Score Range: 50–65%**  **Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? The score is not in the range below as results are reported for all areas above the basic level for financial and market data, and include strategy implementation data. Trend data are provided with some adverse trends, and results are compared to best-in-state and national benchmarks. The applicant reports performance levels for most of the overall questions with some beneficial trends. Relative to comparisons and/or benchmarks, the applicant’s results do not show good performance in a few areas. In the area of strategy, it was difficult to determine trends as strategic initiatives and action plans are only reported starting in late FY2020.**  **The score is not in the next higher range in part because some trends have fluctuated, and segmentation is missing at the multiple level for some budgetary and market performance results. Based in part on the level of OFIs, a score of 50 is recommended.** |

### Consensus Review—2021TST

| **Summary of Criteria Items** | **Total Pts. Possible** | **% Score** | **Score** | **Scoring**  **Band** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category 1—Leadership |
| 1.1 Senior Leadership | 70 | 60% | 42 |  |
| 1.2 Governance and Societal Contributions | 50 | 60% | 30 |  |
| Category Totals | 120 |  | 72 |  |
| Category 2—Strategy |
| 2.1 Strategy Development | 45 | 60% | 27 |  |
| 2.2 Strategy Implementation | 40 | 55% | 22 |  |
| Category Totals | 85 |  | 49 |  |
| Category 3—Customers |
| 3.1 Customer Expectations | 40 | 45% | 18 |  |
| 3.2 Customer Engagement | 45 | 45% | 20 |  |
| Category Totals | 85 |  | 38 |  |
| Category 4—Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management |
| 4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance | 45 | 65% | 29 |  |
| 4.2 Information and Knowledge Management | 45 | 55% | 25 |  |
| Category Totals | 90 |  | 54 |  |
| Category 5—Workforce |
| 5.1 Workforce Environment | 40 | 60% | 24 |  |
| 5.2 Workforce Engagement | 45 | 50% | 23 |  |
| Category Totals | 85 |  | 47 |  |
| Category 6—Operations |
| 6.1 Work Processes | 45 | 55% | 25 |  |
| 6.2 Operational Effectiveness | 40 | 50% | 20 |  |
| Category Totals | 85 |  | 45 |  |
| SUBTOTAL Cat. 1-6 | 550 |  | 305 | 4 (261–320 pts.) |
| Category 7—Results |
| 7.1 Student Learning and Process Results | 120 | 55% | 66 |  |
| 7.2 Customer Results | 80 | 50% | 40 |  |
| 7.3 Workforce Results | 80 | 55% | 44 |  |
| 7.4 Leadership and Governance Results | 80 | 65% | 52 |  |
| 7.5 Budgetary, Financial, Market, and Strategy Results | 90 | 50% | 45 |  |
| SUBTOTAL Cat. 7 | 450 |  | 247 | 4 (211–255 pts.) |
| GRAND TOTAL | 1000 | TOTAL SCORE | 552 |  |