



2011 Minnesota Quality Award
Feedback Report
for
Rochester Community and Technical College



1821 University Ave W, Suite S-256
St. Paul, MN 55104
Phone: 612-462-3577
E-mail: info@councilforquality.org

Executive Summary	2
Award Level Descriptions	3
2011 Education Criteria for Performance Excellence – Item Listing	5
1.0 Leadership	5
1.1 Senior Leadership	5
1.2 Governance and Societal Responsibilities	6
2.0 Strategic Planning	9
2.1 Strategy Development	9
2.2 Strategy Implementation	10
3.0 Customer Focus	12
3.1 Voice of the Customer	12
3.2 Customer Engagement	13
4.0 Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management	15
4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance	15
4.2 Management of Information, Knowledge, and Information Technology	16
5.0 Workforce Focus	18
5.1 Workforce Environment	18
5.2 Workforce Engagement	19
6.0 Operations Focus	24
6.1 Work Systems	24
6.2 Work Processes	26
7.0 Results	28
7.1 Student Learning and Process Outcomes	28
7.2 Customer-Focused Outcomes	28
7.3 Workforce-Focused Outcomes	28
7.4 Leadership and Governance Outcomes	29
7.5 Budgetary, Financial, and Market Outcomes	29
Scoring System	30
Process Scoring Guidelines – Categories 1-6	31
Results Scoring Guidelines – Category 7	33

Executive Summary

The assessment of your organization falls in the 500-699 point scoring range. This scoring range indicates that your organization has sound, systematic approaches to the overall purposes of the Performance Excellence Criteria. These approaches are in use throughout the organization although their use may vary in some areas or work units. Approaches are aligned with basic organizational needs. A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process is in place for basic processes.

Results address most key student, market and process requirements. Good performance levels are reported for some areas of importance to the organization's key business requirements. There is no pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels in areas of importance. Some current performance levels evaluated against relevant comparisons and benchmarks show areas of strength and good to very good relative performance levels.

Significant Strengths Related to Process Items (Categories 1-6)

- There is a commitment at all levels of RCTC to the development and education of students, as well as to strong partnerships in the community.
- Senior leaders have created an institutional culture of self-assessment in order to plan, innovate and improve. The College strategically participates in state and national assessments including the Minnesota Quality Award (MQA), Malcolm Baldrige Quality Award (MBNQA), and the Higher Learning Commission's Academic Quality Improvement Program (HLC/AQIP). The feedback reports from these assessments have been used to implement improvements at RCTC.
- Senior leadership developed and implemented the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) to create an environment for organizational performance improvement and the accomplishment of its mission and strategic goals. The IPP has been well deployed and is an innovative, best practice for the institution.
- RCTC has developed other innovative best practices including the implementation of over 90 dashboards beyond MnSCU's to promote effective decision-making across the institution and robust processes for Academic Program Review and Service Review.
- RCTC has benchmarked and implemented best practices from national Baldrige recipients and other organizations considered to be world-class including St. Luke's Hospital, Ritz Carlton, and Toyota. RCTC has created and implemented innovative practices including the Summer Bridge Program, Welcome Center, and the Idea Hive. Best Bee and Shining Star programs have been established to recognize and reward the workforce.
- RCTC uses a variety of methods to identify student and stakeholder needs and expectations and to further build relationships. Information regarding student and stakeholder needs is incorporated into the Strategic Planning Process (SPP). Indicators of the effectiveness of student and stakeholder relationships are built into the SPP and IPP process which are tracked through over 40 core measures.

Significant Opportunities for Improvement Related to Process Items (Categories 1-6)

- While RCTC is in the beginning stages of succession planning and is represented on the MnSCU sub-committee for succession planning, there is not a fully systematic succession planning process in place for all senior leaders. During a period of potential upcoming retirements, the College is currently vulnerable to unintended consequences and may create workforce stress through the unknown state of future leadership.
- The College does not have an effective, systematic process in place to use performance review findings and key comparative and competitive data to project future performance. As a result, it may be difficult for the institution to prioritize changes to strategic goals and associated targets to be competitive with other institutions, potentially impacting the College's competitive advantage.
- The College does not have a consistent, well understood process for identifying which of its work processes are key processes, those that are essential to mission, vision, and strategic success.

Significant Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement Related to Results Items (Category 7)

- The College has good performance against comparisons in Student Learning, Customer Focused Outcomes, and Budgetary/Financial Outcomes. Segmentation results appear in those areas plus Workforce Focused Outcomes.
- Comparison data are provided for about half of the reported strategic dashboard measures, with good to strong performance in half of those reported.
- No results are reported in many strategic dashboard measures, and there is variable or unfavorable performance in many strategic dashboard measures.

Award Level Descriptions

Commitment

Organizations recognized at this level have demonstrated their serious commitment to self-assessment as a catalyst for improvement and a means of promoting competitive and organizational excellence. They are in the early stages of developing and implementing approaches to address Criteria requirements.

Advancement

Organizations recognized at this level have demonstrated, through their commitment and implementation of quality management principles, progress in building systematic approaches responsive to the basic purposes of the Criteria. The “driver triad” is systematic and the organization is in early stages of obtaining results.

Achievement

Organizations recognized at this level have demonstrated sound and effective approaches responsive to the overall requirements of the criteria. They are generally aligned throughout the organization and demonstrate some evaluation and refinement. They demonstrate good trends for most areas important to their business requirements and have no major gaps.

Excellence

Organizations recognized at this highest level have demonstrated organizational excellence by the purposefulness with which they continue to improve and build upon results and systems. These organizations show refined approaches fully deployed with positive trends in key measures and results. They are well integrated, have no “show stoppers” and can be national and global role models.

2011 Education Criteria for Performance Excellence – Item Listing

P Preface: Organizational Profile

-
- P.1 Organizational Description
 - P.2 Organizational Situation

2011 Categories and Items Point Values

1	Leadership	120
	1.1 Senior Leadership	70
	1.2 Governance and Societal Responsibilities	50
2	Strategic Planning	85
	2.1 Strategy Development	40
	2.2 Strategy Implementation	45
3	Customer Focus	85
	3.1 Voice of the Customer	45
	3.2 Customer Engagement	40
4	Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management	90
	4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance	45
	4.2 Management of Information, Knowledge, and Information Technology	45
5	Workforce Focus	85
	5.1 Workforce Environment	40
	5.2 Workforce Engagement	45
6	Operations Focus	85
	6.1 Work Systems	45
	6.2 Work Processes	40
7	Results	450
	7.1 Student Learning and Process Outcomes	120
	7.2 Customer-Focused Outcomes	90
	7.3 Workforce-Focused Outcomes	80
	7.4 Leadership and Governance Outcomes	80
	7.5 Budgetary, Financial, and Market Outcomes	80
	TOTAL POINTS	1000

1.0 Leadership

The Leadership Category examines how your organization's senior leaders' personal actions guide and sustain your organization. Also examined are your organization's governance system and how your organization fulfills its legal, ethical, legal, and societal responsibilities and supports its key communities.

1.1 Senior Leadership

1.1 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
1.1a(1)	Senior leaders use a systematic Strategic Planning Process (SPP) to set its Signature Statements including its vision, mission and values. Senior leaders systematically deploy the vision and values to its workforce and students through the SPP, Student Learning System, Integrated Planning Process, Organizational Leadership and Shared Governance System, Balanced Scorecard and the "Expect the Unexpected" pamphlet. Senior leaders systematically deploy its vision and values to key partners by including Winona State University (WSU), the Rochester Area Chamber of Commerce, and Rochester Public Schools on the Strategic Planning Task Force. This is an innovative practice for RCTC. Senior leaders deploy the vision and values to suppliers by requesting that they provide "green" products. The College's cafeteria vendor is in the early stages of deploying "green" practices to its workers. Senior leaders demonstrate commitment to the College's values through monthly "C3" meetings of the Leadership Cabinet, Leadership Council, and College-wide Committee Co-Chairs, which provides a clearinghouse for committees, sub-committees, task forces and rapid response teams to share issues and focus on major topics affecting the College. In 2011, C3 committees improved their meeting process by establishing a common five-step, values-driven, and outcomes-based meeting structure to ensure continuity and consistency between committees and to create a focus on values and outcomes.
1.1a(2)	Senior leaders demonstrate commitment to legal and ethical behavior through discussion at Cabinet meetings, modeling fairness, and by systematically conducting an annual Campus Quality Survey (CQS), which asks faculty and staff to assess ethical behaviors in two questions: 1) Senior leaders foster and model an ethical work environment; and 2) Faculty and staff demonstrate ethical behavior in decisions, actions and stakeholder interactions. Senior leaders promote an environment for ethical behavior by providing legal and ethical training to employees through the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities' (MnSCU) General Counsel; by posting Minnesota Statute (M.S. 43A.38) Code of Ethics, policies and procedures on the College web site and in the online employee handbook; and through training at staff development days.
1.1a(3)	Senior leaders systematically use the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) to create an environment for organizational performance improvement and the accomplishment of its mission and strategic goals by linking academic and service area self-assessments with continuous improvement planning and resources and by integrating a Balanced Scorecard to track and measure 40-plus core metrics that are each aligned to a college goal and to MnSCU's Strategic Plan and Accountability Dashboard. The IPP is an innovative best practice for RCTC. Senior leaders used the CQS data to improve and expand the College's dashboards beyond MnSCU's to include measures for decision-making across the institution. The creation and use of over 90 RCTC specific dashboards is an innovative best practice for the College. Every six months, senior leaders create planned time to look at organizational agility and to review and revise the IPP. In 2009, the College established an innovative program called the Collaborative and provided learning sessions to teams comprised of College committees and invited guests. The teams used a best practice from Toyota to problem solve and implement strategies and actions to encourage innovation and improvement. A Collaborative project was designed to address a weakness revealed by CQS data – that the College lacked a means to receive, share, and act on ideas from faculty and staff. The project resulted in the creation of an idea management system known as the Idea Hive, which is an innovative practice for RCTC. The team benchmarked and used best practices from Starbuck's My Idea, Mayo Clinic and the Pepsi Refresh Project

for the project, which was placed in the IPP, tested and launched in February of 2011. The college-wide Best Bee and Shining Stars programs were also implemented to recognize and reward the workforce.

Senior leaders use a systematic Student Learning System to promote organizational learning that includes new faculty and staff orientation sessions each semester, and Staff Development Days. Senior leaders develop their leadership skills and future leader's skills by participating in Leadership Greater Rochester, Leadership RCTC, the Luoma Leadership Academy; and by annually sending a team including key partners to the Continuous Quality Improvement Network's (CQIN) Summer Institute and implementing projects based on the learning and best practices. Since 2009, projects that were implemented as a result of the CQIN Summer Institute combined with other improvement activities include the establishment of a Mission Vision Values wall and the Idea Hive.

The College creates a workforce culture, which fosters student and stakeholder engagement through the 2010 AQIP action project "Better Serving Stakeholders," that resulted in the opening of the University Center Rochester's innovative Welcome Center, the creation of a campus Mission Vision Values wall, the Idea Hive, and a cross-functional Rapid Response Team developing "Standards of Excellence." The 2009 MQA site visit and the 2010 AQIP action project resulted in over 200 staff completing Connections Now customer service training, which has led to significant improvement. A person on campus who was identified as providing the best customer service was invited to lead the effort.

The College is in the beginning stages of addressing succession planning for senior leaders. The Chief HR Officer sits on a MnSCU sub-committee working on a MnSCU succession planning model for the system.

1.1b(1)

Senior leaders use a systematic approach to communicate and engage the workforce through the Budget Buzz; the College Crossings; the Banterings strategic operations newsletter; the Beehive Notice; signature cards outlining the vision, mission and values; strategic planning documents; a blog; and personal thank you cards from the President. Senior leaders encourage two-way communication through various methods including a monthly Chat With the President; Open Mike with the Vice President; monthly Meet and Confer and Shared Governance forums; monthly dialogues at the Student Senate/Leadership Cabinet meetings; and presentations at staff and Labor Management meetings. The STAR Alert Emergency Notification System is used for immediate emergency communication. The Office of the President receives anonymous stakeholder compliments and concerns through Internet "Comment Cards," which are logged, categorized and shared with leaders, who in turn share it with the appropriate individual(s). The Comment Card logs are reviewed by the Leadership Cabinet on an annual basis. An improvement was made from forwarding incoming comment card information to Departments to providing an immediate response within 48 hours and then having leaders share the information directly with the appropriate individuals. The Chat with the President originated as a random drawing for Lunch with the President where information was presented without a feedback loop. Based on data from the Office of the President's bi-annual survey to all employees, the current Chat with the President was established as a two-way forum. Notes are now taken and the President follows up with the Leadership Team. The change has resulted in increased participation (up to 20 per session) and people are engaged in asking questions and having more effective dialogue with the President.

1.1b(2)

Senior leaders use a systematic approach to create a focus on action by having all Cabinet members create dashboards with measures that link to the College dashboard and to the processes of the Student Learning System; by having all academic and service departments engage in Academic Program Review or Service Review; and by linking all strategies for Continuous Improvement Plans with Level 3 departmental processes and related core measures which are used to track performance. Senior leaders use the IPP to identify initiatives, strategies and actions for academic and non-academic departments which support college and division goals. The IPP is self-assessed on an annual basis.

Senior leaders use self-assessment to plan, innovate and improve by participating in the Minnesota Quality Award program (MQA) 1996, 1999, 2000 and 2009, the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award program (MBNQA) 2004-2007, and the Higher Learning Commission's (HLC) Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) since 2002. RCTC participated in HLC's special emphasis Baldrige-like re-accreditation process in 2001 and has been invited by HLC to participate in a 2012 Baldrige/AQIP pilot in Minnesota.

RCTC's strategic decision to integrate the MQA assessment with HLC's AQIP accreditation is an innovative best practice within Minnesota higher education. The College has made significant changes based on AQIP feedback reports. During the last review cycle in 2007, HLC indicated that the absence of learner assessment may put the College's accreditation at risk. Senior leaders used the report to accelerate improvements including faculty participation in a Learning Assessment Academy; creating a Faculty Assessment Coordinator position; and placing the Academic Review Process at the top of the list for enhancements. Feedback reports from MBNQA, MQA and HLC/AQIP are used to identify strengths, opportunities for improvement and challenges; and Improvement Plans are integrated into the annual SPP and IPP. Since the 2009 MQA feedback report, the College has made significant and innovative improvements including the implementation of the Welcome Center, Connections Now customer service training, the Collaborative, Idea Hive, Best Bee, Shining Stars, use of CQS data, use of IPP, and rapid response teams.

Senior leaders have a systematic approach to identify AQIP action projects through institutional research; stakeholder survey findings; and strengths and opportunities from previous MBNQA, MQA and HLC/AQIP feedback reports. The College uses the Strategic Planning Process to conduct an Organizational Review and Program Analysis Process to examine findings and create focus. These efforts have resulted in the establishment of service attributes, design of a Welcome Center, the Collaborative, Idea Hive, a new committee meeting process, and the Buzz Box.

1.1 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
1.1a(3)	While the College is represented on the MnSCU sub-committee for succession planning, there is not a fully formed and functional succession planning process in place for senior leaders. Without a succession plan, especially during a time where a retirement from the senior leadership team recently occurred and more are forthcoming, the College is vulnerable to unintended consequences including additional gaps in senior leadership, loss of organizational agility, delays in decision-making, and increased workforce stress and decreased productivity due to the unknown state of future leadership. As a result, the College may overstretch its capacity to fill gaps, experience low morale and trust in both the short- and long-term and may shift focus from its core mission to distractions and activities that are not aligned with strategic objectives.

1.2 Governance and Social Responsibility

1.2 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
1.2a(1)	<p>The College is governed by state statutes, policies and procedures that are developed by the MnSCU System Office and approved by the Board of Trustees. The College achieves academic accountability through institutional and programmatic accreditation. The College's leadership and shared governance system is composed of integrated groups that include college leadership, shared governance and meet and confer groups, the Student Senate, and other key stakeholder organizations, all of which are designed to ensure accountability for management's actions.</p> <p>The College achieves fiscal accountability through its Budgeting and External Financial Reporting process and system audits. The College leaders protect the interests of the stakeholders by using the Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). The EOP was established to protect students, faculty, staff, stakeholders and the community at large by addressing campus emergencies including chemical/hazardous substance spills, civil protest, criminal or violent behavior, gas leaks, fire, flood, aircraft down on campus and death on campus. Key practices have been implemented through the parking/security process to address Workplace Safety, Right to Know, Campus Security and Critical Incident Planning.</p>

Senior leaders create transparency in operations through the use of public Dashboards, the Integrated Planning Process (IPP), Academic and Service reviews, the Collaborative, Idea Hive, Chat with the President; and through benchmarking and implementing best practices from world class organizations.

- 1.2a(2) The President's performance is assessed annually by the System Office through 1) a 360-degree multi-rater process including members of the student body, bargaining unions, subordinates, peers and community leaders; 2) submitting a list of achievements from the previous year and a work plan for the upcoming year; and 3) meeting with the Chancellor to review the assessment materials. The Leadership Cabinet and Council members are annually assessed through 1) a 360-degree multi-rater process which includes surveying 30-50 stakeholders; 2) submitting a self-assessment to the President including summaries of achievements related to College goals and goals for the next fiscal year; 3) addressing performance levels for measures on divisional dashboards; and 4) meeting with the President to discuss the findings, areas for improvement and mutually agreed upon goals for the next year.

Senior leaders create an environment for performance leadership by using the CQS data to evaluate the effectiveness of the Senior Leadership Team and to check actions that were determined in senior leader's 360-degree performance evaluations. In 2011, the Senior Leadership Team changed their standard weekly agenda to focus on strategic priorities, including the review of dashboards and budgets that have increased the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the team.

- 1.2b(1) The College addresses the impact on society of its programs, services and operations through 1) AQIP accreditation which is a Baldrige-like approach and requires participation in annual activities and reporting on a seven-year cycle; and, 2) programmatic accreditation by its accrediting agencies. The Office of the President uses the College Policy Development process to monitor and ensure legal compliance with State law. College Leadership seeks assistance from the MnSCU General Counsel and State Attorney General's Office on legal matters pertaining to operations, health and safety and for interpretation of policies and procedures related to State law. Risk management assessments are conducted by COPE in conjunction with the Finance and Facilities Office. Human Resources and the Finance and Facilities Office use the Affirmative Action/Diversity and American's With Disabilities Act Title IX processes to assure compliance with affirmative action and equity.

- 1.2b(2) The College ensures ethical behavior by requiring employees to adhere to ethical obligations and a code of conduct established by Minnesota Statute (M.S. 43A.38), which obligates reporting and investigating fraudulent or dishonest acts. The College Policy Development process is used by Human Resources to ensure an ethical environment.

- 1.2c(1) The College contributes to the social impact of its region by having approximately 55% of persons age 18-49 visit the campus each year for educational, cultural, recreational and social activity and is a place for area youth to participate in recreational sports. The College contributes to the region's economic system by 1) being a major employer; 2) making an approximate \$104M annual economic impact; and 3) nearly 80% of students attending the College, upon completion, will live and work in the area.

- 1.2c(2) The College supports its key communities by participating in community organizations, service organizations and in initiatives focused on supporting populations of people with identified needs. The innovative Summer Bridge Program was developed through the Collaboration Among Rochester Educators (CARE) to engage students in bridging the gap between high school and college-level courses and supports them in being successful students whether they choose to attend RCTC or another college/university. College leaders, faculty and staff serve in a number of local organizations and on local boards including the Rochester Area Chamber of Commerce, Workforce 2020 Coalition, Rochester Diversity Council, Leadership Greater Rochester, Rochester Rotary Clubs, RAQC, Rochester Arts Council, Boys and Girls Club, Intercultural Mutual Assistance Agency, Family Y, and RAMSP. Seventy-two percent of those volunteering do so at six or more hours per month. College faculty and staff participate in the United Way, Paws and Claws, Victim Services, American Red Cross, Salvation Army, Christmas Anonymous and Habitat for Humanity. The College annually collects Teddy Bears from faculty, staff and friends of the College and donates them to the Olmsted County Sheriff's Office and Rochester Police Department so they can be given to children in need of

a “friend” during a traumatic situation. The College fulfills its mandate of broadly meeting the diverse needs of the community by partnering with organizations whose purpose it is to serve targeted or under-served populations and to advance the economic vitality and quality of life in the greater Rochester area. The College is a founding member and active partner in the RAQC. The College partners with the Chamber of Commerce to provide support and co-sponsor community-wide planning programs including “Learn. Do. Earn,” and Workforce 2020.

1.2 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item	Comment
Reference 1.2c(2)	There is no systematic, fact-based process to determine the key communities to support and to assess the effectiveness of these relationships. As a result, the College may miss opportunities to focus on and further strengthen critical key communities that align with and support its strategic direction.

DRAFT

2.0 Strategic Planning

The Strategic Planning Category examines how your organization develops strategic objectives and action plans. Also examined are how your chosen strategic objectives and action plans are implemented and changed if circumstances require, and how progress is measured.

2.1 Strategy Development

2.1 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
2.1a(1)	<p>The College conducts strategic planning through the five-phase Strategic Planning Process (SPP) on a three-year cycle. The five phases are: Landscape Analysis, Signature Review, Organization Review and Program Analysis, Systems and Processes Assessment, and Identify Goals and Core Measures. The process is conducted by a 23-person group of College leaders, faculty, staff, and students, as well as community and MnSCU stakeholders. The Signature Review Phase of the SPP is used to review and recommend refinements to the vision, mission and values (known as Signature Statements). The College conducts systematic evaluation of the SPP through benchmarking and process review by the Strategic Operations Committee. Improvements to the SPP include incorporating the concept of an Education (Business) Model into the planning process which resulted in adopting the values proposition, “improving student lives;” and strengthening the SWOT analysis through improved prioritization and translation of findings to strategic advantages, challenges and strengths. The planning time horizon of three years aligns with organizational agility needs and responsiveness to the MnSCU planning horizon. The 2009 MQA feedback report was used to create a crosswalk of Opportunities for Improvement to determine the new 2-3 year targets in the Strategic Plan, which is visually displayed in a one-page strategy map.</p>
2.1a(2)	<p>The Landscape Analysis Phase of the Strategic Planning Process includes a SWOT analysis and other inputs including college research, listening and learning information, external reports, quality award and accreditation feedback and dashboard performance to identify and define strategic advantages, challenges and core competencies (identified as “distinctive competencies”). The College uses the Economic Modeling Software, Inc. tool to monitor demographic, workforce and economic trend data, and to determine market share, conduct competitor analysis, and identify marketplace changes. The College reviews results from the Stakeholder Survey to gather information from elected officials, business and community leaders, representatives of local boards, and other key populations. The Organization Review and Program Analysis Phase of the Strategic Planning Process is used to review, summarize and prioritize findings from previous accreditation and quality site visit feedback, which is validated through listening and learning methods. The Systems and Processes Assessment Phase is used to review external quality Feedback Reports including MQA, HLC and MBNQA and uses the SLS to integrate the feedback into improvement efforts of key systems and processes. The Identify Goals and Core Measures Phase of the SPP is used to set goals and measures based on the prior steps in the planning process including SWOT, research findings, strengths and opportunities in feedback reports, and priorities aligned to MnSCU strategic directions . The College annually reviews targets for its core measures on the Balanced Scorecard and Strategic Dashboard.</p>
2.1b(1)	<p>The College has identified ten strategic goals (Strategic Objectives) and adopted MnSCU’s five strategic directions. The most important goals have been identified as 1) Goal 4.2 (People): Strengthen the capability of the workforce; 2) Goal 2.2 (Continuous Improvement): Achieve learning and performance excellence through continuous improvement, service, engagement, and innovation with accountability for results; and 3) Goal 2.3 (Student Success): Create value by improving student lives and meeting the needs of all stakeholders. The Goals are depicted on the Strategy Map and reflect thematic priorities for the College. Specific annual performance targets for more than 40 supporting measures are present on the Strategic Dashboard.</p>

- 2.1b(2) The Strategic Planning Process, Integrated Planning Process and strategy mapping processes are used to align goals with College vision, mission, values, value proposition, strategic advantages and challenges and strategic strengths. The Leadership Council annually reviews and refines strategic directions and goals to ensure alignment with MnSCU strategic goals and the annual work plan. The three “vital few” AQIP action projects, “Strengthening the Capability of the Workforce, Better Serving Stakeholders and First Year Experience,” are aligned with four of the ten College goals.

2.1 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
----------------	---------

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 2.1a(2) | The College does not consider projections of future performance and projections of competitors’ or comparable organizations’ future performance within the strategic planning process. By not considering its own or competitors’ future performance, it may be difficult to prioritize strategic changes, anticipate necessary adjustments to the strategic plan and assess the impact of the plan. This may lead to incomplete or inaccurate conclusions about organizational priorities and strategy effectiveness. |
|---------|--|

2.2 Strategy Implementation

2.2 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
----------------	---------

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 2.2a(1) | The College uses an annual, systematic Integrated Planning Process (IPP) to implement and deploy action plans that support the College’s three-year strategic plan. The IPP is a key innovation for RCTC. The process ultimately results in multiple improvement action plans aligned with organizational strategy for each work unit. The five-step process is used to develop annual division strategies aligned with the College’s strategic goals and academic and service department goals. The Self-Assessment Step One of the process is used to complete Annual Program Reviews (APR) for all academic programs and departments and Service Reviews (SR) for all service departments. RCTC’s application of APRs and SRs is an innovative best practice. The Service Review process was improved in 2010 to be more similar to the Annual Program Review. Department leaders use the Self-Assessment Step to provide background information; to respond to a series of questions regarding efficiency, effectiveness and satisfaction of students; to self-rate their performance against a rubric based on the review of dashboards and Annual Performance Review core measures; and to provide a qualitative response based upon evidence in the data regarding their program’s or department’s performance. Academic Deans use the Self-Assessment Step to review the Annual Program Reviews for their academic programs and departments and to provide feedback. Service areas use the Self-Assessment Step to self-rate their performance and identify strengths and opportunities for improvement on the three dimensions of efficiency, effectiveness and satisfaction; and to provide comments on their performance measures based on the dashboard. The Leadership Cabinet and Leadership Council annually review and modify strategic goals and divisional strategies as a kick-off to the IPP. |
| 2.2a(2) | The Continuous Improvement Planning Step Two of the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) is used by all 90 academic and non-academic programs and departments through a web-based interface to write strategies and actions that align with their divisional plan; to request new resources; to reprioritize current funds; and to leverage external resources. Step Two of the IPP is used to ensure that each strategy includes an author, planned completion date, cost center, and linkage to a work unit-specific process within the Student Learning System. The Leadership Council conducts the annual budget retreat to discuss and make determinations on all Continuous Improvement Plans requiring new resources; and to identify potential budget scenarios based on legislative appropriations, enrollment projections and tuition revenue. |
| 2.2a(3) | The Annual Operating Budget Request Step Three of the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) is used by academic and non-academic programs and departments to develop and submit annual operating funding requests for communications, supplies, travel and other areas that are required to deliver and support teaching |

and learning. The Leadership Council uses the IPP web interface to review Continuous Improvement Plans and operating budget submissions and to make recommendations over a 30-day period. Leadership sets strategic targets for capital, personnel, non-personnel, repair and replacement, and other spending and revenue targets, and uses a series of leadership retreats to discuss all recommended projects and budgets and to make final approvals that are communicated to the college community through the IPP web interface.

- 2.2a(4) The College uses its AQIP Vital Few Action Project, “Strengthening the Capability of the Workforce,” to address the strategic challenge of having nearly 50% of college personnel reaching retirement age in the next 10 years by 1) developing measurable performance standards for individual employees; 2) establishing management development and training; 3) strengthening the capability of the workforce through a focus on professional development plans; and 4) aligning work outcomes with strategy.
- 2.2a(5) The College uses a Balanced Scorecard, which is aligned with the Strategic Dashboard, divisional dashboards and approximately 90 academic program and service department dashboards to collect, and report performance linked to the Student Learning System work processes.
- 2.2a(6) To modify action plans, programs and departments complete mid-year and end-of-year Continuous Improvement Plan updates, which are reviewed in October and January in order to make adjustments and consider new approvals for initiatives or to reallocate resources. The Leadership Council reviews significant, time-sensitive mid-cycle action plan adjustments and approves them as appropriate.
- 2.2b Performance measures have been established for most core measures on the Strategic, Division and Department Dashboards. The College sets targets, using a variety of methods including the external reference standard, specific goal or target method, expected values and performance-based or gap closure method.

2.2 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
2.2a(4)	There is not a systematic, fact-based approach to create organization-level workforce plans to address capability and capacity needs required to support changes brought forth by the strategic plan itself. Without the appropriate plans to develop, acquire, or motivate the human resources necessary to carry out desired actions, the organization may not be able to achieve fully its strategic objectives, and employees may not have the skills, knowledge, or abilities to carry out the actions required for success in the future.
2.2b	The College does not project future performance relative to key performance measures and key comparisons for these measures. As a result, it may be difficult to select and set appropriate targets to make progress toward achieving the College’s strategic goals, and the strategic goals and associated targets may themselves not be adequate to remain competitive with other institutions, putting the College at a competitive disadvantage.

3.0 Customer Focus

The Customer Focus Category examines how your organization engages its students and stakeholders for long-term market success. This engagement strategy includes how your organization listens to the voice of its customers (your students and stakeholders), builds customer relationships, and uses customer information to improve and identify opportunities for innovation.

3.1 Voice of the Customer

3.1 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
3.1a(1)	<p>The College gathers data from student and stakeholders to obtain actionable information through national and local surveys such as Student Satisfaction Inventory, Community College of Engagement, Entering New Student Engagement, Client Satisfaction, Participant Satisfaction, Priorities for Online Learners, Graduate Follow-Up, and Key Stakeholders and uses this information to determine current and future needs and expectations. Listening methods are stratified to the College's students based on the eight segments, including online and face-to-face. Results are compared against those of other similar educational organizations. The College also gains data from potential students through the Welcome Center, while using a Web 2.0 strategy with social media and Web-based technologies to manage their brand awareness. These processes are tailored to the different student and stakeholder-groups and vary across the Learner Life Cycle (LLC) with its five stages of awareness, inquiry, application, enrollment, and advancement. Evaluation of these processes is completed through a continuous improvement step, which is embedded in their strategic planning process. The data from these systems are placed in the College's continuous improvement website for review. The Welcome Center, student comment card system, The Idea Hive, and Standards of Excellence Team were formed in response to student and stakeholder feedback. The comment card system also serves as a way to gather information from current students and stakeholders.</p>
3.1a(2)	<p>The College gathers information from former students and stakeholders; potential students and stakeholders; and students and stakeholders of competitors using a Knowledge and Awareness Study, a Survey of Lost Inquiries, a Survey of Lost Applicants, and a Graduate Follow-Up Survey</p> <p>The College uses an innovative mystery shopper program that tracks the experiences of prospective students prior to enrolling using 40 shopping scenarios, including experience with at least one competitive institution. In 2010, the Rapid Response Team process was used and the team addressed an opportunity uncovered in the mystery shopper program that prospective students were not receiving the planned theme-based communication from the College. The team made improvements to increase the number of prospects whose information gets entered into the organization's customer relationship management software which then resulted in a higher percentage of students receiving the planned communication.</p>
3.1b(1)	<p>The College utilizes a variety of tools to measure multiple aspects of student/stakeholder engagement that differ across different student and stakeholder groups. These sources of information include the Student Satisfaction Inventory, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, the Survey of Entering New Student Engagement, Client Satisfaction Surveys, Participant Satisfaction Surveys, Priorities Survey for Online Learners, and the Graduate Follow-Up Survey. Each student survey includes the Big Three questions: "Did we meet expectations?", "What is your level of satisfaction?", and "Would you do it again?"</p>
3.1b(2)	<p>The College obtains information on its students' and stakeholders' satisfaction relative to data against both Minnesota two-year colleges and national percentiles for diverse cohort groups. Tools include Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), Survey of Entering New Student Engagement (SENSE), and Priorities Survey for Online Learners (PSOL).</p>

- 3.1b(3) The College captures dissatisfaction information for use in meeting students' and stakeholders' requirements in the future. The organization uses gap analysis of difference in importance rating of attributes versus dissatisfaction ratings to determine areas with the largest gaps that need improvement. Gaps have informed the formation of the Welcome Center and the creation of the Standards of Excellence.

3.1 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
3.1a(2)	While satisfaction and dissatisfaction information from current and former students and stakeholders of MNSCU organizations and national benchmarks is gathered, the organization does not gather satisfaction and dissatisfaction specifically for key competitors including Riverland Community College and the Minnesota School of Business. As a result, the organization may have incomplete information that could impact its ability to acquire students who are dissatisfied with other institutions.
3.1b(1,3)	While dissatisfaction information is gathered from students and stakeholders, the information is not segmented across identified student and stakeholder groups. As a result, the College may miss an early indication that there is an issue with a particular group and be unable to take appropriate, timely action in order to satisfy and/or retain the dissatisfied students or stakeholders.

3.2 Customer Engagement

3.2 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
3.2a(1)	The College has business and industry representation on program advisory committees to provide feedback on health sciences programs of study to meet market requirements. The College meets with community leaders from area stakeholders, including the Mayo School of Health Sciences, to develop new programs identified by new emerging technologies in health sciences. The College uses the feedback from these committees to evaluate and improve health sciences educational programs and services to meet the requirements, exceed expectations, and expand relationships of student and stakeholder groups and market segments.
3.2a(2)	The College has support programs for both new and returning students such as intrusive advising, supplemental instruction and learning communities. The College surveys community stakeholders on an every other year basis and has surveyed citizens aged 18-49 with a thirty-mile radius of campus in 2010. It has determined that its website is the key mechanism for supporting students' and stakeholders' use of its programs and services and to enable them to seek information and conduct business with the organization. Google analytics is used to measure website visits and return visits. The College has three options for prospective students to visit campus. The College used feedback from surveys to ensure their engagement approach, and Student Testing Advising and Registration (STAR) is current. Diverse methods are used at all five points of the Learner Life Cycle (LLC) including customized/personalized VIP web pages for students using Connect customer relationship management system for prospective students.
3.2a(3)	The College has identified eight key market segments that represent both historical and emerging groups. It has also identified key requirements for each of the student and stakeholder market segments. These segments include High School Graduate and Young Adults, Workforce Learners, Prior College and Adult Learners, Pre-College Learners, Lifelong Learners, Employers/Organizational Learners, Online Learners, and Under-represented Groups. RCTC has also identified a number of stakeholder segments which include business leaders and civic leaders, economic and community development organizations, program advisory committee members, Winona State University, UCR Advisory Council, RCTC Foundation Board of Directors, Alumni, Donors, Citizens, Employers, and MNSCU Board of Trustees and System Office Staff.

- 3.2a(4) The College uses information from students, stakeholders, and educational programs and services to improve marketing, to build a more student- and stakeholder-focused culture, and to identify opportunities for innovation. Examples include the creation of Rapid Response Teams, which recommend improvements, and the AQIP vital few action projects “Better Serving Stakeholders” and “First Year Experience,” which were created in response to student and stakeholder dissatisfaction information.
- 3.2b(1) The College uses a variety of marketing strategies, including college fairs, trade shows, and social media to attract potential students. Measures are in place for each stage of the Learner Life Cycle (LLC). The College uses different approaches to engage and build relationships with prospective students, applicants, current students and graduates. The College uses many approaches to engage students including intrusive advising, supplemental instruction, learning communities, First Year Experience, developmental education, Summer Bridge programming, Student Success days, WOW Weekend, the Comprehensive Learning Center (CLC), tutoring support in the Academic Support Center, Welcome Day/Orientation events, Hobson’s “Retain” that supports targeted communications to enrolled students, Student Life program, Survey of Stakeholders, Knowledge and Awareness Survey of citizens aged 18-49 within a 30 mile radius of campus, and Better Serving Stakeholders project. The Summer Bridge program is an innovative practice, which engages an identified potential growth segment of Rochester students. Examples of improvements to the retention and satisfaction of students include the creation of The Welcome Center, streamlined STAR sessions to make the intake process for new students more seamless, the creation of the “Expected Success Student Guide,” and implementation of a Student Welcome Day.
- 3.2b(2) The College manages student complaints through a comment card program, which responds to students within 48 hours. Comments from the cards are logged into a database and shared with the Leadership Cabinet. The organization has a clearly outlined Student Grievance Process.

3.2 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
3.2a(3)	The College does not have a systematic process to anticipate future student and stakeholder groups and market segments. As a result, the organization is vulnerable to losing potential partners, stakeholders, and students to competitors who are better able to identify these emerging markets.
3.2b(2)	The College does not have a systematic, fact-based process to evaluate the effectiveness of the Comment Card system. Without evaluation of the complaint management process, the process itself might not fully capture student and stakeholder concerns, leading to lost enrollment, retention and relationships.

4.0 Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management

The Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management Category examines how your organization selects, gathers, analyzes, manages, and improves its data, information, and knowledge assets and how it manages its information technology. The Category also examines how your organization uses review findings to improve its performance.

4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance

4.1 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
4.1a(1)	The College has effective, systematic processes in place to select, collect, align, and integrate data and information to track daily operations and overall organizational performance through the Integrated Planning Process (IPP), which includes a regularly scheduled (annual) process to track the measures. The College collects and reviews performance measures from divisions and departments annually, which allows the College to define organizational performance measures. By requiring all departments to submit requests through the IPP, the organization is able to track short- and longer-term budgetary and financial measures. The data and information are used consistently to support decision-making by the organization's Cabinet. Additionally, this same information is also used by many Academic Deans for their Divisions and by some Departments and Programs for their individual strategic planning and goal setting. In the past two years, the organization has made improvement to the IPP by tracking both Facilities and Technology requests allowing these two work areas to coordinate requests and plan for work.
4.1a(2)	The College selects and uses comparative data and information to support operational and strategic decisions. Sources of such data and information include the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), the Survey of New Entering Student Engagement (SENSE), and the Priorities Survey of Online Learners (PSOL). Comparative information is also available through the National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP).
4.1a(3)	The College selects and uses voice-of-the-student and stakeholder data and information (including complaints) to support operational and strategic decision making. In addition to the tools mentioned above, the College uses the Knowledge and Awareness Study, a Survey of Lost Inquiries, a Survey of Lost Applicants, a comment card system, and a Graduate Follow-Up Survey to gather such data. The College also uses a mystery shopper program that tracks the experiences of prospective students prior to enrolling. The planned administration cycles keeps data and information current, and the College reviews the statistical significance of changes in attributes rated most important so as to ascertain shifts in the needs and requirements of market segments. Surveying capabilities of the Hobson's Connect software also provide for additional, flexible options to engage student segments.
4.1a(4)	The College has an effective, systematic process in place to ensure that its performance measurement system is responsive to changes. The Dashboard data are submitted by process owners to a central, in-house location allowing for immediate updates and changes as needed. The plans submitted through the annual IPP are reviewed by the submitter and the Vice Presidents and Cabinet at six month intervals.
4.1b	The College has effective, systematic processes in place to analyze and review performance data and information found in the Dashboard for all major operating divisions. The organization uses listening and learning techniques, annual quality review assessments (MQA and MBNQA), and Continuous Improvement Plans as part of the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) to ensure a systematic, fact-based process to evaluate the effectiveness of the Dashboard and have made changes and improvements to the system based on this evaluation. RCTC ensures that the performance analyses are aligned with Program and Division action plan development in the CIP and information and knowledge management in the IPP through the review and

update to plans through the yearly IPP process with a check on performance every six months. The performance measures are generally aligned with organizational needs as outlined in the strategy map (figure 2.1-4) and work process design of the Student Learning System (SLS) and IPP.

- 4.1c(3) The College has an effective and systematic process in place to use organizational performance review findings (through the IPP process and through weekly and monthly performance reviews by leadership) to develop priorities for continuous improvement. Strategic dashboard measures are reviewed on a bi-annual basis through the IPP process. These performance review findings are deployed to students, staff, and faculty through various means including online postings on the College website, Staff Development Days, The Crossing monthly newsletter that includes "Scribbblings" where the president shares strategic plans, priorities and continuous improvement. The College uses listening and learning techniques, regular quality review assessments (MQA and MBNQA), and Continuous Improvement Plans used at the annual Integrated Planning Process (IPP) to ensure a systematic, fact-based process to evaluate the effectiveness of the Dashboard and IPP. The improvement processes are generally aligned with the organizations Strategy Map and processes listed in the Student Learning System. The College ensures that the improvement processes are aligned with Program and Division performance measure development in the CIP and information and knowledge management in the IPP through the review and update to plans through the yearly IPP process with a check on performance every six months.

4.1 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
4.1a(3)	While the College measures student and stakeholder data via comprehensive listening and learning approaches, there is no standard, repeatable process to guide the use of this information across the organization in support of operational and strategic decision making and innovation. Without a consistent approach to using data gleaned from listening and learning tools to implement organizational improvements, opportunities to meet stakeholder and workforce expectations could be missed, potentially impacting satisfaction levels and/or opportunities for innovation.
4.1c(2)	The College does not have an effective, systematic process in place to use performance review findings and key comparative and competitive data to project future performance. As a result, it may be difficult to prioritize changes to strategic goals and associated targets to be competitive with other institutions, potentially impacting the College's competitive advantage.

4.2 Management of Information, Knowledge, Information Technology

4.2 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
4.2a(1)	The College has effective, systematic process in place to manage organizational data, information and knowledge captured in the Student Learning System (SLS), Integrated Planning Process (IPP), and College Dashboards to ensure they maintain system integrity through standard database security and additional coding by RCTC Information Technology processor coding. RCTC ensures that organizational data and information are secure, and maintain confidentiality via enforced network security. Data reliability is ensured through a systematic process that limits the access to the administration of the Dashboard to the Director of Institutional Research and her approved support, with review of all data by the Director of Institutional Research.
4.2a(2)	The College has an effective systematic process in place to make needed data and information available to the workforce, students, stakeholders, suppliers, partners, and collaborators via the Dashboard where measures and processes are accessible to all. This Dashboard ties into the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) dashboard metrics as well as multiple other metrics the organization and individual departments have determined as important for the organization and individual departments for the year.

- 4.2a(3) The College has a systematic processes in place to manage organizational knowledge through the Integrated Planning Process (IPP), the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP), the Student Learning Assessment, and the Academic Program Review (APR) and other work unit-specific processes to accomplish the collection and transfer of workforce knowledge. This knowledge is collected at the department level and subsequently used within work units. The IPP is available to all members of the workforce to review all reported department metrics.
- There is evidence of a cycle of improvement to the IPP over the past five years of existence, resulting in changes to what is measured, linkage to MNSCU core outcomes, and addition of Facilities and Technology requests submitted prior to budget approval.
- 4.2b(1) The College has effective, systematic processes in place to ensure that hardware and software are reliable and secure through multiple ways including: network passwords, workstation security (timed login with password after inactivity), virus protection, SPAM protection, network availability restrictions, file/document management protocols, redundancy of systems equipment, and user support as needed (fig 4.2-2). Standards for maintaining current technology infrastructure are consistent with educational service needs and MnSCU directions. Common work productivity software packages are updated on established cycles and are linked to software releases.
- 4.2b(2) The College has effective, systematic processes in place to ensure the continued availability of hardware and software systems, as well as the continued availability of data and information to effectively serve customers and business needs in the event of an emergency through well documented Information Technology emergency preparedness plans, and replication/server backup in two sites located 1.25 miles apart.

4.2 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
4.2a(1)	While there are a number of ways that the College ensures data reliability, integrity, and security for its various information sources, there is not a systematic process to evaluate and improve these processes. This could result in gaps in information reliability and accuracy, potentially allowing room for data corruption or not having the correct information available when needed to make strategic decisions for the organization.
4.2b(1)	The College has taken steps to ensure that hardware and software are available and secure; however, it does not have a systematic process to ensure that hardware and software are user-friendly for all faculty, staff, or students. This could impact user satisfaction with technology and/or the effectiveness of technology to support user needs.

5.0 Workforce Focus

The Workforce Focus Category examines your ability to assess workforce capability and capacity needs and build a workforce environment conducive to high performance. The category also examines how your organization engages, manages, and develop your workforce to utilize its full potential in alignment with your organization's overall mission, strategy, and action plans.

5.1 Workforce Environment

5.1 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
5.1a(1)	The College uses its IPP process to manage its workforce capacity through annual self-assessments and empowering departments to identify initiatives, strategies, and actions that support college goals and division strategies. Leaders at all levels have the ability to request staff additions and the leadership team reviews and approve requests for staffing levels. The MnSCU system governs faculty credentialing to make sure faculty are qualified.
5.1a(2)	The College uses an open and inclusive search process to recruit, hire, and place new members of their workforce through the use of Workforce Centers, newspapers, higher education publications, and the internet. In addition, the College has a variety of recognition and retention programs in place including the "Best Bee" or "Team Bee" of the month, faculty member of the year, "Shining Star" on staff development days, length of service awards given annually, President awards given on an ongoing basis, recognition by supervisors at team meetings, and regular verbal and written praise and acknowledgement from leaders, including the President's hand-written notes.
5.1a(3)	<p>The College is divided into five distinct divisions, which each have Level 1, 2 and 3 processes. This drives how the workforce is organized and managed to accomplish the work of the organization, which aligns the work with the goals of the organization. At the time of each vacancy, opportunities for improvement and position/organizational restructuring are assessed to determine if changes should be made for more effective staffing. Employment in full-time, part-time, permanent, seasonal, temporary, and intermittent staffing ensures the workforce is flexible and responsive to changing needs. The organization continually reviews how positions evolve to assess opportunities for further development, promotion and reassignments, to address changing needs and trends.</p> <p>The College manages its workforce to reinforce a student and stakeholder focus in several ways. The Core Competency Model is aligned with the organization's values and outlines expectations for all employees in terms of desired characteristics and competencies. The selection process focuses on values and competencies and emphasizes "right fit" of the new hire in the specific position, and includes a behavioral-based assessment/interview tool to support selection of employees for fit with this model.</p>
5.1a(4)	The College has minimized budget-related workforce reductions by not filling positions vacated due to retirement or other movement, reallocating funds to support needed capacity in other areas of the College, and offering a Board Early Separation Incentive (BESI) program that was accepted by eight employees. When workforce reductions become inevitable, the College communicates early and openly, and discussions with union representatives occur during planning and implementation phases. Several processes and benefits are outlined in collective bargaining agreements when layoffs cannot be avoided, including the use of retraining, reassignment at other institutions or state agencies, as well as the ability to recall staff.
5.1b(1)	The College addresses workplace environmental factors in a variety of ways related to workplace health, safety, and security and to support its workforce. The College has a safety committee and a Safety Officer position with responsibility for developing critical incident plans and procedures, providing a safe education/work place, ergonomics, safety training, and pandemic planning. There is a Campus Security

Director position that is supported by a student security force of 8-10 students. A Student Health Service Nurse position administers health and wellness programs for both students and employees including an annual health fair, employee use of the college fitness center, stress management/reduction, relaxation, walking/exercise programs, work/life balance, weight reduction, smoking cessation, flu vaccinations, and a regular health/wellness newsletter. Health/wellness topics are also included in staff development events and staff is encouraged to use health and wellness services available through their health insurance providers. A confidential Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is offered, and the College has a unique program called the Fund for the Family, providing financial assistance or services to employees in need.

- 5.1b(2) The College supports the workforce via policies, services, and benefits tailored to its various workforce groups. It has seven collective bargaining agreements that spell out the terms and conditions of employment, benefits, job classification, and compensation structures specific to the needs of those employee groups. All agreements have paid leave and unpaid leave provisions, and there is a comprehensive insurance package with optional coverage's to meet individual needs. The parent system and the state also have comprehensive mandatory and voluntary retirement plans in place that recognize the differing needs of various employee segments while the state also has vacation donation programs that allow employees to donate their vacation or personal leave to employees who have exhausted all forms of paid leave, or to pay unreimbursed medical expenses in excess of \$10,000.

5.1 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
5.1a(1)	The College does not have a systematic process to assess its current and future workforce capability needs, including the knowledge, skills, abilities, and competencies necessary to accomplish all of its work processes. As a result, its workforce may not be fully prepared to develop new educational programs and services, innovate and transition to new technologies, or meet changing education, market, and regulatory demands.
5.1a(2)	While the College has a process in place to recruit new members of its workforce, it does not have a systematic approach designed to ensure its workforce represents the diverse ideas, cultures and thinking of the hiring and student/stakeholder communities. This could make it difficult to capitalize on diverse ideas and approaches, which may in turn limit the ability of the workforce to be engaged, innovative, and empowered.
5.1b(1)	While the College has a dashboard measure called "Safe Work Environment," which tracks annual total worker's compensation costs, it does not have a well developed process to identify and track performance measures or improvement goals for workplace health, safety, and security for its different workplace environments. The failure to define such measures and targets for each key environmental factor and each distinct employee group increases the likelihood the problems will go unnoticed and unresolved, potentially impacting worker satisfaction and effectiveness.

5.2 Workforce Engagement

5.2 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
5.2a(1)	In 2007, the College determined key elements affecting workforce engagement using the Gallup Q12 national engagement benchmark and Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence as guides. It identified existing items from the Campus Quality Survey and added several items to establish a Q12-like measure for engagement, calling it the Workforce Engagement Benchmark. The Workforce Engagement Benchmark was then applied to data prior to 2008, and the results were used to determine the factors contributing to overall engagement. The results can be viewed as a composite or aggregate score or viewed at item level to determine factors most contributing or impacting overall engagement. Questions are occasionally added to the survey based on survey results and information obtained from various sources.

- 5.2a(2) The College uses a variety of approaches to foster an organizational culture characterized by open communication, high performance work and an engaged workforce.
- * The Organizational Leadership Shared Governance System provides faculty and staff opportunities to be engaged in conversations regarding important issues facing the College and to be part of groups making recommendations for improvement, innovative ideas, and positive change;
 - * College-wide committees, sub-committees and other task forces or ad-hoc groups provide opportunities for employees to be involved;
 - * In 2009, using an improvement idea borrowed from the Mayo Clinic, the College launched a new process called “The Collaborative” with approximately 10% of the workforce and all parts of the College participating across six teams tasked with various org-wide improvement projects;
 - * Standards of Excellence were adopted which defines service standards and expectations with guidelines, and which align to the six core values;
 - * An outcome driven, values-based agenda structure for its all-college committees was adopted in 2011, which includes every meeting beginning with three minutes of good news and a conversation on a college value;
 - * Over 200 staff participated in Connections Now customer service training in the fall of 2010;
 - * All new and revised college policies and procedures go through shared governance in a spirit of open exchange with multiple readings before final action is taken; and
 - * The Core Competency Model aligns with the college’s values and outlines expectations of all employees in terms of characteristics and competencies that the college wants to develop in order to engage the workforce and foster the desired organizational culture and climate.

- 5.2a(3) The College’s workforce performance management system supports high performance work and employee engagement. Separate processes exist for administrators, faculty, and staff, which include goal setting, completion of self-appraisals and development plans, and the use of 360 degree feedback surveys to gather feedback from students, direct reports, faculty, staff and external stakeholders. The 360 degree surveys focus efforts on student and stakeholder needs and provide the employee with information regarding perceptions of their performance across the college community that they can use to assess/adjust their actions and approaches to improve performance.

For faculty, probationary and adjunct instructors are evaluated every year, and non-probationary instructors are formally evaluated every three years and required to submit an annual report to administration. Student evaluations are an integral component to focus faculty efforts on meeting their needs. Annually, faculty is able to choose several methods of self-evaluation and outside evaluation as part of the professional development plan. Options available in this “Toolbox” include peer observation, observation of other teaching, self-evaluation, outside observation, evaluative surveys, document collection and professional development portfolios.

The performance review serves as the basis for pay for performance increases for administrators, and for supervisory recommendations on granting progression/step increases for staff. Lump-sum monetary rewards for staff in certain bargaining units are based on performance reviews that reflect superior or outstanding work on specific projects or in overall performance.

- 5.2b(1) The College assesses workforce engagement using its Campus Quality Survey (CQS), which is conducted annually and includes fifty-plus items that are aggregated into 10 benchmarks measuring various dimensions of workforce satisfaction. These results are segmented by type of position, employment status and years of service. The questions that make up the CQS have changed over time in response to prior survey results and improvement ideas gleaned from organizational assessments. A Workforce Innovation Benchmark is also used that includes items that assess participation in the College’s continuous improvement and innovation efforts. Satisfaction surveys are conducted after each Staff Development Day to gather data on the learning success of the event. The number of employee grievances is also monitored as another indicator of engagement.

5.2c(1) The learning and development system at the College provides faculty and staff with diverse professional and personal development opportunities that support their learning and development needs and organizational innovation. Some of these opportunities include the following:

- Tuition waiver at MnSCU institutions;
- Reimbursement for tuition at other providers;
- Sabbatical leaves and external development opportunities such as Fulbright Scholarships and educational leaves for faculty and staff;
- MnSCU, regional or national conferences or workshops available within disciplines/functions;
- Computer/technology training offered regularly by Educational Technology Services;
- Health and wellness programming offered regularly;
- Safety and regulatory training such as Right to Know, ergonomics, safe-lifting;
- Interpersonal/human relations/conflict management training offered as needed or incorporated into staff development day programming;
- Quality/innovation training addressed through ongoing participation in CQIN Summer Institutes, RAQC events, and other focused staff development sessions;
- On-the-job training; and
- Subscriptions to a significant number of professional journals, higher education and other publications.

In addition, the College has four all-staff development days to enhance learning and development. Separate college-wide, faculty, and leadership development budgets are in place and individual departments provide additional funding for staff to attend seminars, conferences and workshops.

5.2c(3) Career progression is managed in a variety of ways. For staff, it is included in the annual performance management process for staff, which includes discussion and recognition of growth that has occurred and provides an opportunity to identify plans for future changes in duties.

For managers, supervisors and leaders, a leadership program was created in 2004 to develop leaders at all levels, and close to 150 faculty, staff and administrators have participated in seven cohorts. External leadership development programs are available, such as “Leadership Greater Rochester,” which is sponsored by the local Chamber of Commerce and designed to develop future community leaders. The organization has had 1-3 participants per year since the program’s inception in the early 1990s. Additionally, all new RCTC administrators and supervisors participate in the “Core Training Program for Supervisors” that covers both the art and science of leadership. A mentor program exists where mentors can be assigned to all new college leaders and there are opportunities for interim, acting and mobility assignments. The MnSCU system also provides training as new collective bargaining agreements are negotiated and sponsors Labor Relations Institutes on topics such as mediation, performance evaluation, grievance handling, and progressive discipline. Individual administrators and supervisors may also incorporate any leadership development opportunity into their individual development plan.

The College is in the beginning stages of creating a process for succession planning. The Chief HR Officer sits on a MnSCU sub-committee working on a MnSCU succession planning model for the system.

5.2 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference

Comment

5.2b(1) While the College uses engagement scores to assess and improve workforce engagement, it does not consistently use other indicators such as retention, absenteeism, safety, and productivity measures to assess and improve engagement. Failing to consider data from other such indicators may prevent the College from learning about and correcting problems that may adversely affect performance and productivity. Also, a one-size fits all method of assessing engagement such as an annual climate survey may fail to take into account parts of the organization that may be undergoing change and facing more stress or turmoil than other parts of the organization.

- 5.2b(2) The College does not relate engagement assessment findings to key organizational results to identify opportunities for improvement in both workforce engagement and organizational results. The College risks sub-optimizing resources if it fails to understand the likely impact on business results of the improvement priorities they set in response to those findings.
- 5.2c(2) The College does not have a consistent, repeatable process to evaluate the effectiveness of its learning and development systems, which could make it difficult to optimize individual and organizational performance and may sub-optimize resources directly (the cost of the training) and indirectly (lost opportunity and productivity while employee is receiving training).
- 5.2c(3) The College does not have an established process for succession planning for leadership, management, and other key positions. Failure to conduct effective succession planning for senior leaders and key positions throughout the College could threaten organizational stability in the long term, and the College may lack the talent it needs to fulfill its mission and attain its strategies and growth objectives.

DRAFT

6.0 Operations Focus

The Operations Focus Category examines how your organization designs, manages, and improves its work systems and work processes to deliver student and stakeholder value and achieve organizational success and sustainability. Also examined is your readiness for emergencies.

6.1 Work Systems

6.1 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
----------------	---------

The College uses a systematic process to design and manage its work system, known as the Student Learning System (SLS), which is essential to student success. The SLS design includes Level 1, 2 and 3 processes and is based on a best practice from Saint Luke's Health System, a Baldrige recipient. The SLS capitalizes on one of the College's strategic strengths, Partnerships, as evidenced through the Learning Alliance; by operating sports and fitness facilities in partnership with local city government; through the Collaboration Among Rochester Educators (CARE) Committee partnership with local public schools (including the innovative Summer Bridge Program); through the Post Secondary Enrollment Options (PSEO) program; through sponsoring the ROC Charter High School; through its partnership with Mayo on several affiliate programs; and by focusing on the College's strategic advantage of being able to deliver health science/allied health curricular which is reflected in 20% of credits being sold in that area of focus.

The College's leadership decides which processes are internal, external or a combination of both. HR, Finance and IT have internal and external processes. The College has a contractual agreement with its Learning Alliance partners to jointly provide services, which include the library, bookstore, duplicating, media, facilities, maintenance, security, and IT. The MnSCU System Office provides services for HR, legal, government relations, auditing, IT, finance, facilities and also manages system-wide processes including union negotiations and grievances, retirement program, state appropriations to the College, planning capital projects, and developing system-wide IT security standards and policies. The College externally contracts for food service, vending and child care services delivered on campus and operates the UCR Regional Sports Center, Rochester Regional Stadium and sports field complex in partnership with the City of Rochester.

The College determines work system requirements through multiple approaches, including the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI). The SSI asks students to rate the importance and level of satisfaction on 80 items, which aids the College in determining students' key requirements. The Survey of Stakeholders and the Knowledge and Awareness Survey perform the same role with respect to the stakeholder groups, and some individual organizational units do their own user surveys related to their services. The work system key requirements are as follows for each of the five main divisions:

Academic Affairs:

- * Teaching Excellence key requirements are: Quality Instruction, Knowledgeable Faculty, Convenient Class Scheduling; Fair and Unbiased Faculty, Faculty Availability, and Value for Investment

- * Student Learning key requirements are: Experience Intellectual Growth; Quality Instruction and Timely Faculty Feedback

- * Academic Program Development and Review key requirements are: Ease of Transfer, Course Availability, Clear/Reasonable Program Requirements

- * Partnership Development key requirements are: Ease of Transfer, Satisfied Business and Workforce Education Needs

- * Advising and Counseling key requirement is Knowledgeable Academic Advisor

Finance and Facilities:

*Facilities key requirements are: Safe and Secure Campus, Welcoming Campus, and Sufficient Campus Study Areas

Student Affairs and Strategic Operations:

* Inquiry Management key requirement is Responsiveness to Requests for Information

Human Resources:

* Development key requirement is Satisfaction with Staff Development Days

Information Technology:

* Information Technology Services key requirements are: Easy Access to Computers and Technology, and Adequate Library Resources

- 6.1b(1) The College's has named its work system the "Student Learning System" (SLS), which is built on three levels of work processes: Level 1 (the five major operating divisions), Level 2 (the major work processes of the divisions), and Level 3 (key daily processes for all academic and service departments). This structure was borrowed from a health care Baldrige recipient, St. Luke's Health System and adapted for use at the College. Internal work systems are managed through use of the IPP, which provides for ongoing review, goal setting, identification of improvement opportunities, and measurement of those processes. Elements of the work system also align with the Learner Life-Cycle, which goes from awareness, to inquiry, to application, to enrollment and to advancement. (Fig 3.1-1)

The College reviews and can make adjustments in its work system design each time a vacancy occurs. At those times, College leadership assesses the ongoing need for the position and whether changes in processes should be made in the design of work. Additionally, the planning process includes conversations about the flow of service and how people and space can interact to better serve stakeholders and to create a more seamless experience for prospective students, guests, and enrolled students.

- 6.1b(2) The College has a systematic process in place to control the overall costs of work systems. All departments have Continuous Improvement Plans aligned to work processes and corresponding measures. The corresponding measures make-up departmental dashboards and every dashboard has a budgetary efficiency measure that compares budgeted to actual expenditures and an Instructional Cost measure. The Instructional Cost measure identifies program costs relative to other similar programs at other MnSCU system institutions. The measure indicates whether programs are in, below, or above the targeted performance band. Resource allocations are conducted in a Fall Review in October and a mid-year review in January.

- 6.1c The College has an Emergency Operations Plans (EOP) to address campus emergencies and ensure work system and workplace preparedness for such situations. The EOP includes the initial response, creation of a command structure, incident stabilization, continuity of operations, and the resumption of normal operations as well as chemical/hazardous substance spills, civil protest, criminal or violent behavior, gas leaks, fire, flood, bomb threats, earthquakes, aircraft down on campus, death on campus. The plan protects students, faculty and staff, stakeholders, and the general community from adverse impacts on College operations. Classrooms have posted emergency response guidelines for various types of incidents. The College participated in planning efforts for a community response to H1N1, in planning an on campus emergency Flu Center, and in table top drills. They are piloting a program called the STARS Alert System to provide for the delivery of emergency response messaging via phone, cell phone, email and instant messaging

Departments in the Technology Division have developed and maintain both Disaster Plans and Business Continuity Plans, and they have ongoing discussions of critical services and operations. IT has a secondary server farm/system administration center at the Heintz Center campus. The primary server farm is located at the UCR campus, in environmentally controlled, secure rooms, which are monitored to ensure a minimum availability of 99%. Data from the principal server farm is continuously replicated to a Data Recovery Site (DRS) at the Heintz Center, which automatically goes live if the primary server farm fails.

6.1 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
6.1a(1)	While the College has designed and defined its work system, the SLS, it does not have a consistent, repeatable approach to evaluate and improve that design or the work system itself. This could prevent the College from knowing when work systems changes may be most beneficial and/or could result in systems that do not maximize value to the students and stakeholders.
6.1c	There is no consistent, repeatable process to evaluate the effectiveness of and improve the Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). As a result, the College may be missing opportunities to ensure the EOP is meeting the changing needs of the campus and external environment.

6.2 Work Processes

6.2 Strengths

Item Reference	Comment
6.2a(1)	<p>RCTC has systematic methods in place to design organizational work processes using input from the listening and learning approaches, advice from program advisory committees, organizational knowledge, and process mapping. The potential use of new technology is also considered. Process flowcharts have been created for many Level 2 (major work processes of the divisions) and Level 3 (the daily processes for all academic and service departments) processes to create consistency and reduce variability across the organization, and to educate and inform department workers of process steps and work flow. Each academic program and service department aligns core measures to their work processes, which are then identified on their dashboard.</p> <p>The Academic Program Review and Service Review in the annual IPP includes assessment of efficiency, effectiveness and satisfaction factors by each functional department and academic discipline using identified rubrics to support consistency across the organization. Based on those assessments and reviews of budgetary and other program data, improvement plans are crafted and implemented for the coming fiscal year.</p>
6.2a(2)	RCTC determines work process requirements through multiple approaches, including the Landscape Analysis phase of the Strategic Planning Process, input from the listening and learning approaches for academic and student-focused processes (e.g. brand management and inquiry management), Program Advisory Committees, and the Campus Quality Survey for internally-focused processes. Process requirements have been identified for many Level 3 processes.
6.2b(1)	RCTC's Level 3 processes are derived from the Level 2 processes, which are derived from the Level 1 processes that form the SLS work system. Data feed into dashboard measures in many departments that are correlated to each work process, which helps ensure the operation of these processes meet key process requirements. For example, the Level 2 brand management process contains the Level 3 advertising process for which progress is tracked with eight measures contained in the dashboard for the College Relations department (Fig 6.2-1). The IPP contains an annual self-assessment (Annual Program Review and/or Service Review) and a Continuous Improvement Plan which filters to budget allocations.
6.2b(3)	RCTC has an effective, systematic process in place to improve work processes to achieve better performance, to reduce variability, and to improve educational programs and services. The IPP has embedded in its process an annual step that evaluates the effectiveness of the overall process and makes improvements. The IPP also requires faculty and staff to assess performance, submit continuous improvement plans, link those plans to resources, and measure performance using dashboards. The

Academic Program Review (APR) is a key approach to assessment planning, documentation and improvement in Academic Affairs, and is conducted annually which is an innovation when compared to most other higher educational institutions who do such reviews on a 3-5 year cycle. All service departments also conduct a Service Review, akin to APR, to improve their core processes. Additional examples include:

- * institutional self-assessments using Baldrige, Minnesota Quality Award and Higher Learning Commission evaluations
- * Power of One is a key process for engaging faculty across the campus in assessment of student learning, and it is faculty driven and creates one assessment activity implemented in one upcoming semester, and results are used to suggest one improvement and are summarized in one report. The creation of this process was part of the accelerated improvement made as a result of the 2007 AQIP feedback report.
- * The Assessment of Student Learning Committee has provided mentoring and assistance to create rubrics, competencies, check lists, shared exams and other tools for measuring student learning.
- * Rapid Response and Solve-and-Dissolve teams have been used in several areas to drive short- and longer-term improvements, for example Student Success Day, Mystery Shopper and Standards of Service.

6.2 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

Item Reference	Comment
6.2a(2)	The College does not have a consistent, well understood process for identifying which of its work processes are key processes – those that are essential to mission, vision, strategic objectives, core competencies, and/or are related to student learning or non-educational business processes that are important to organizational success and growth. As a result, the efforts of its leaders, faculty and staff may not be collectively focused on the things that are most critical to organizational success, and resources may not be optimized.
6.2b(1)	Dashboard measures and indicators are not fully deployed to all departments and work processes. As a result, senior leaders and department management may not be aware of all processes that are not performing to expectations and/or may not respond quickly in making needed changes.
6.2b(3)	While the College has the Power of One process in place to assist faculty in developing assessments of student learning, it is not fully deployed to and used by all faculty. As a result, the College may be missing an opportunity to maintain and strengthen the “Outstanding Faculty” strategic strength, especially within programs that do not participate in the Power of One initiative, and may ultimately not be performing as effectively as desired on its mission of delivering quality learning opportunities to the community.

7.0 Results

The Results Category examines your organization's performance and improvement in all key areas – student learning and process outcomes, customer-focused outcomes, workforce-focused outcomes, leadership and governance outcomes, and budgetary, financial, and market outcomes. Performance levels are examined relative to those of competitors and other organizations with similar programs and services.

7.1 – Student Learning and Process Outcomes

Overview

The College's results for student learning and process outcomes indicate good performance and positive trends for a few areas, one of which is identified as an area of importance to the organization. Most comparisons show good to strong performance. Most results important to the organization are reported (8 of 14 strategic dashboard measures applicable to this category). Most trends show uneven or adverse performance and two results lack sufficient data points to demonstrate a trend at this time.

7.1 Strengths

The College reports results that include data called for by the *basic* requirements of the item. These include data showing good performance for student learning measures.

- MnSCU Transfer (percent credits accepted in transfer) increased from 72.5%-76.6% between FY 2007-2009. (Dashboard data from site)

The College reports results regarding the *overall* requirements of the item: key student learning results. As required at the overall level, the organization compares its performance to relevant external benchmarks.

- External Exam Pass Rates increased from 91.63% in FY 2007 to 93.58% in FY 2010 which was strong performance compared to the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.1a-2)
- Bridge student Fall-to-Fall Retention increased from 61% in FY 2006 to 78% in FY 2009. (Fig. 7.1a-11)
- Bridge student course success (Math) increased from 63.2% in FY 2006 to 90.5% in FY 2009. (Fig. 7.1a-11)
- MnSCU: Related Employment of Graduates was uneven between FY 2007- 2010, varying between 76.9% and 81.5% in that time, but was still good performance relative to MnSCU 2-year college averages. (Fig. 7.1a-3)
- MnSCU: Persistence and Completion Rate was uneven between FY 2006-07 and FY 2009-10, varying between 67.2% and 67.4% in that time, but was still good performance relative to MnSCU 2-year college averages. (Fig. 7.1a-4)
- Transfer Success RCTC Students at WSU was uneven between FY 2006-2009, varying between 3.24 and 3.38 in that time, but was strong in comparison to the non-RCTC grads. (Fig. 7.1a-6)

7.1 Opportunities for Improvement

The College reports results that include data called for by the *basic* requirements of the item. These include data showing one measure of uneven performance and one measure of unfavorable performance for student learning and process effectiveness measures

- CQS: Workforce Innovation was uneven between FY 2007 – FY 2011, varying between 3.14-3.24 on a 5.0 scale. (Fig. 7.3-4)

- Instructional Cost Study results were unfavorable going from 70.4% in FY 2007 to 22.45% in FY 2010. (Fig. 7.1b-1)

As required at the *overall* level, the College reports two uneven results for a segment of its student population, and one result that shows good performance against comparisons but unfavorable results.

- Bridge student course success (English) was uneven between FY 2006-2010, varying between 65.2% and 100% in that time. (Fig. 7.1a-11)
- Retention Rates for RCTC Students Attending WSU was uneven between Fall 2005 - 2009, varying between 86.7% and 95.1% during that time for one semester retention, and between 82.1% and 87.8% during that time for one year retention. (Fig. 7.1a-7)
- MnSCU: Licensure Exams Pass Rates were unfavorable between FY 2007-2009, dropping from 93.4% in FY 2007 to 87.9% in FY 2009. That was still good compared to the MnSCU 2-year college average. (Fig. 7.1a-1)

The following results show uneven or unfavorable overall performance and also lagging performance relative to comparisons:

- Fund Balance as Percent of Revenue was uneven between FY 2007-2010, moving from 5% in FY 2007, to 2% in FY 2008-9, and back to 5% in FY 2010, and also lags the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.5-17)
- Resources for Facilities Renewal fell from \$1.08/sq ft in FY 2007 to \$0.88/sq ft in FY 2010 and lagged the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.5-14)
- Composite Financial Index decreased from 3.5 in FY 2007 to 1.3 in FY 2010 and lagged the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.5-15)

As required at the *multiple* level, no data are reported for the following strategic measures:

- Advisory Committee Survey Measure
- Employer Satisfaction
- Key Stakeholder Satisfaction Mix
- Innovation Index
- MNSCU Innovation and Efficiency
- Transfer Student Success

Four results lack sufficient data points to demonstrate a trend.

- MnSCU: Student Opinion of Learning in FY 2009 was 24.81 on a 100 point scale. (Dashboard data from site)
- Customized Training: Number of Clients Served moved from 91 in FY 2008 to 129 in FY 2009. (Dashboard data from site)
- NOCTI Results - Law Enforcement in FY 2010 was 77.2% which outperformed that national average of 69.7%. (Fig. 7.1a-5)
- CCSSE: Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark was 52.7% in FY 2007 and 57.3% in FY 2009 which was better than the MN Consortium, All Colleges and Medium-Size Colleges numbers in those 2 years. (Surveys done every 2 years)(Fig. 7.1b-3)

7.2 – Customer-Focused Outcomes

Overview

The College’s results for customer-focused outcomes indicate good performance and positive trends for some areas, three of which are identified as areas of importance to the organization. Most comparisons show good to strong performance. All results important to the organization in this category are reported (3 of 35 strategic dashboard measures). Several results lack sufficient data points to demonstrate a trend at this time.

7.2 Strengths

The College reports results that include data called for by the basic requirements of the item. These include data showing good performance for student learning measures.

- Brand Recall of “Get There” increased from 58% in FY 2007 to 63.3% in FY 2010. (Fig. 7.5-11)
- Students Who Would Recommend RCTC was essentially flat but good between 87% and 91% for the period of FY 2003-2009 (with survey done every 2 years). (Fig. 7.2-6)

The College reports results regarding the overall requirements of the item: student and stakeholder satisfaction and engagement results. As required at the overall level, the organization compares its performance to relevant external benchmarks and segments its data.

- Top-of-Mind Awareness (TOMA) was relatively flat and fluctuated between 77.5% and 81.6% between FY 2007 and FY 2011, but was strong compared to key competitors MN School of Business, U of M Rochester, and Winona State University. (Fig. 7.5-8)
- Applicant Conversion Rates was uneven between FY 2007-2011, varying between 63% and 69.20% during that time, but was good compared to the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.1b-5)
- Community Satisfaction was uneven between FY 2007-2010, moving between 58.5% in 2007 and 51.3% in 2010, but was good compared to an All Colleges comparison. (Fig. 7.2-3)
- Expectations Met – Graduates increased from 4.5/7.0 in FY 2006 to 4.75/7.0 in FY 2010. (Fig. 7.2-4)
- Would You Do It All Over Again - Graduates increased from 5.05/7.0 in FY 2006 to 5.75/7.0 in FY 2010. (Fig. 7.2-5)
- Would You Do It All Over Again - New Entering Students increased from 3.71 in FY 2008 to 3.82/7.0 scale in FY 2010. (Fig. 7.2-5)
- Stakeholder Populations Likelihood to Recommend - Community Residents 18-49 increased from 67% in 2006 to 74% in FY 2009. (Fig. 7.2-7)
- First Time Visitors to College Website increased 272419 in FY 2007 to 604968 in FY 2011. (Fig. 7.5-9)

7.2 Opportunities for Improvement

As required at the overall level, the College reports six uneven results for segments of its student and stakeholder populations.

- Overall Satisfaction Segments - Online Learners was uneven between FY 2006-2009, varying between 5.32 and 5.58/7.0 scale. (Fig. 7.2-2)
- Overall Satisfaction Segments – Graduates was uneven between FY 2006-2010, moving between 5.69 and 5.78/7.0 scale. (Fig. 7.2-2)
- Overall Satisfaction Segments - New Entering Students was uneven between FY 2008-2010, varying between 3.44 and 3.65/7.0 scale. (Fig. 7.2-2)

- Expectations Met - Online Learners was uneven between FY 2006-2009, moving between 4.60 and 4.75/7.0 scale. (Fig. 7.2-4)
- Expectations Met - New Entering Students was uneven between FY 2008-2010, varying between 3.30 and 3.46/7.0 scale. (Fig. 7.2-4)
- Would You Do It All Over Again - Online Learners was uneven between FY 2006-2009, varying from 5.84/7.0 in FY 2006 to 5.58/7.0 in FY 2009. (Fig. 7.2-5)

The following results show lagging performance relative to comparisons:

- SSI: Overall Student Satisfaction was 5.04 in FY 2008 and 5.05 in FY 2010 (done every 2 years) which was lower than the National Colleges and NCCBP comparisons. (Fig. 7.2-1)

Six results lack sufficient data points to demonstrate a trend.

- CCSSE Student Engagement was 52.8% in FY 2009 which was better than the 52.1% MnSCU 2-year colleges and 50% from the “All Colleges” comparisons. (Fig. 7.1b-2)
- Expectations Met - All Students was 4.45 on a 7.0 scale in both FY 2006 and FY 2008 (done every 2 years). (Fig. 7.2-4)
- Would You Do It All Over Again - All Students was 5.3/7.0 scale in FY 2006 and 5.22 in FY 2008 (done every 2 years). (Fig. 7.2-5)
- New Students Likelihood to Recommend was 3.73/4.0 scale in FY 2008. (Fig. 7.2-5)
- Stakeholder Populations Likelihood to Recommend - Key Community Stakeholders was 97% in FY 2006. (Fig. 7.2-7)
- Fig. 7.2-2 Overall Satisfaction Segments - Key Community Stakeholders in FY 2006 was 4.05/7.0 scale

7.3 – Workforce-Focused Outcomes

Overview

The organization's results for workforce-focused outcomes indicate a few measures of good performance. Results are reported for most areas of importance to the organization (4 of 6 strategic measures associated with this category). This includes good performance for the basic requirements of the item as well as most of the overall requirements and a few of the multiple requirements. There are no reported comparisons.

7.3 Strengths

The College reports results that include data called for by the basic requirements of the item. Three measures showing good performance for workforce-focused outcomes.

- CQS: Employee Empowerment and Teamwork Benchmark increased from 3.07 on a 5.0 scale in FY 2007 to 3.29 in FY 2011. (Fig. 7.3-2)
- CQS: Workforce Engagement Benchmark improved from 3.24 on a 5.0 scale in FY 2007 to 3.33 in FY 2011. (Fig. 7.3-3)
- CQS: Quality Assurance Benchmark increased from 3.41 on a 5.0 scale in FY 2007 to 3.52 in FY 2011. (Fig. 7.3-10)

The College reports a result regarding the multiple requirements of the item: security.

- On-campus crime statistics for FY 2008 there were zero crimes reported. (p. 48 text)

7.3 Opportunities for Improvement

The College reports results that include data called for by the basic requirements of the item. These include data showing five measures of uneven performance for workforce-focused outcomes.

- CQS: Faculty and Staff Satisfaction was uneven between FY 2007-2011, varying between 66-63%. (Fig. 7.3-1)
- CQS: Measurement and Analysis Benchmark was uneven between FY 2007-2011, moving between 3.25-3.32 on a 5.0 scale. (Fig. 7.3-7)
- CQS: Quality and Productivity Benchmark was uneven between FY 2007-2011, varying between 3.13-3.18 on a 5.0 scale. (Fig. 7.3-8)
- CQS: Strategic Quality Planning Benchmark was uneven between FY 2007-2011, moving between 3.18-3.36 on a 5.0 scale. (Fig. 7.3-9)
- CQS: Employee Training and Recognition Benchmark was uneven between FY 2007-2011, varying between 2.87-3.01 on a 5.0 scale. (Fig. 7.3-5)

The College reports uneven results regarding the overall requirements of the item: workforce satisfaction. As required at the overall level, the College segments its data.

CQS: % would recommend as a place to work by tenure (agree and strongly agree)

- Fewer than 5 years varied between 62% and 85% from 2007-2011
- Between 5 and 15 years varied between 52% and 59% from 2007-2011
- More than 15 years varied between 59% and 73% from 2007-2011 (Data from site)

CQS: % would recommend as a place to work by position (agree and strongly agree)

- Support/Classified varied between 49% and 60% from 2007-2011
- Faculty varied between 56% and 74% from 2007-2011
- Admin/Professional Staff varied between 61% and 73% from 2007-2011 (Data from site)

CQS: Impression of quality by tenure (% good or excellent)

- Fewer than 5 years varied between 56% and 82% from 2007-2011
- Between 5 and 15 years varied between 51% and 72% from 2007-2011
- More than 15 years varied between 45% and 71% from 2007-2011 (Data from site)

CQS: Impression of quality by position (% good or excellent)

- Support/Classified varied between 45% and 55% from 2007-2011
- Faculty varied between 57% and 72% from 2007-2011
- Admin/Professional Staff varied between 56% and 70% from 2007-2011 (Data from site)

CQS: % Satisfied or Very Satisfied by tenure

- Fewer than 5 years varied between 67% and 82% from 2007-2011
- Between 5 and 15 years varied between 51% and 72% from 2007-2011
- More than 15 years varied between 45% and 78% from 2007-2011 (Data from site)

CQS: % Satisfied or Very Satisfied by position

- Support/Classified varied between 49% and 51% from 2007-2011
- Faculty varied between 57% and 75% from 2007-2011
- Admin/Professional Staff varied between 56% and 73% from 2007-2011 (Data from site)

The College reports results regarding the multiple requirements of the item: workforce health and safety

- Worker's Comp Dollars Spent was uneven between FY 2007-2011, varying between \$95,110 and \$152,986, with FY 2011 at \$135,899.00. (Dashboard data from site)

No data are reported for the following measures identified as important to the organization:

- Turnover
- Percent of staff with professional development plans
- Percent of employees completing mandatory training
- Percent of employees with annual evaluations
- Percent of successful hires
- Time to fill vacancies

One result lacks sufficient data points to demonstrate a trend.

- CQS 2011: I would recommend RCTC as a school to attend (definitely yes, most likely yes, and probably yes) showed support staff at 61%, faculty at 86%, and admin at 98%. (Data from site)

7.4 – Leadership and Governance Outcomes

Overview

The organization’s results for leadership and governance indicate some good performance for areas of importance to the organization. This includes good performance for the basic requirements of the item as well as a few of the overall requirements. One result important to the organization is not reported and there are no reported comparisons.

7.4 Strengths

The College reports results regarding the *overall* requirements of the item: fiscal accountability, legal compliance, ethical behavior and support of key communities.

- Percentage of Residents Visiting Campus increased from 52% in FY 2007 to 56.7% in FY 2010. (Fig. 7.5-10)
- CQS Top Management Leadership support benchmark improved slightly from 3.07 on a 5.0 scale in FY 2007 to 3.16 in FY 2011. (Fig. 7.3-6)

7.4 Opportunities for Improvement

One measure lacks sufficient data points to demonstrate a trend:

- Economic impact on the region

Four results lack sufficient data points to demonstrate a trend.

- The CQS question “Senior leaders foster and model an ethical work environment” was 3.16 on a 5.0 scale in FY 2010 and 3.08 in FY 2011. (p. 48 text)
- Audit and financial statement findings showed 2 management findings in FY 2009 and 0 management findings in FY 2010. (p. 48 text)
- The college currently has full institutional and programmatic accreditation with no findings. (p.44 text)
- The CQS question “Faculty and staff demonstrate ethical behavior in decisions, actions and stakeholder interactions” was 3.4 on a 5.0 scale in FY 2010 and 3.42 in FY 2011. (p. 48 text)

7.5 – Budgetary, Financial, and Market Outcomes

Overview

The College's results for budgetary, financial, and market outcomes indicate good performance and positive trends for many areas of importance to the organization. This includes good performance for all of the basic requirements of the item as well as most of the overall requirements and a few of the multiple requirements. All results important to the organization are reported (11 of the 35 strategic dashboard measures are reported in this category) and a few comparisons show lagging performance. Most trends show adverse or uneven performance.

7.5 Strengths

The College reports results that include data called for by the *basic* requirements of the item. These include data showing good performance for budgetary, financial and market share measures.

- Debt Burden Ratio moved from 1.35% in FY 2007 to 1.31% in FY 2010 (Fig. 7.5-16)
- Fiscal Year Student FYE went from 4273 in FY 2007 to 4648 in FY 2011 (Fig. 7.5-1)
- Enrollment Day 10 Fall increased from 5852 in FY 2007 to 6226 in FY 2011 (Fig. 7.5-6)
- Enrollment Day 10 Spring increased 5427 in FY 2007 to 5908 in FY 2010 (Fig. 7.5-7)
- Market Share of High School Students from targeted high schools moved 13.89% in FY 2007 to 14.50% in FY 2010. (Fig. 7.5-12)

The College reports good results regarding the *overall* and *multiple* requirements of the item: budgetary, financial, and market performance results by market segments and student and stakeholder groups. As required at the overall level, the organization compares its performance to relevant external benchmarks.

- Facilities Condition Index moved from 0.13 in 2006 to 0.11 in FY 2008 which is strong performance comparatively against the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.5-13)
- MNSCU % Change Enrollment increased from a -2.9% in FY 2007 to 8.1% in FY 2010, a positive trend but lagging against other MnSCU two-year colleges. (Fig. 7.5-2)
- Online Enrollment (% of total FYE) increased from 11.8% in FY 2007 to 24.3% in FY 2012 which is strong performance against the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.5-4)
- While Percent of Budget Spent on Direct Instruction was uneven between FY 2007-2009, varying between 46.5% and 44%, it was better than the MnSCU average. (Dashboard data from site)

7.5 Opportunities for Improvement

The College reports results that include data called for by the *basic* requirements of the item. These include data showing some uneven performance and one measure of unfavorable performance for budgetary, financial and market share measures.

- Retention Rates: Second Fall was uneven between FY 2007- FY 2009, varying between 47.5% and 48.6% in that time (Fig. 7.5-5)
- Market Share of High School Students - Rochester HS was uneven between FY 2007-FY 2011 varying between 31.32% in FY 2007 to 30.94% in FY 2011. (Fig. 7.5-12)
- MNSCU Tuition/Fees trended unfavorably from \$4497 in FY 2007 to \$4944 in FY 2010. (Fig. 7.5-3)

As required at the *overall* level, the College reports no results for the following market segments and student groups identified by the College as key student market segments: young adult learners, workforce learners, prior college and adult learners, pre-college learners, lifelong learners, employers/organizational learners, and under-represented groups.

The following results show uneven or unfavorable overall performance and also lagging performance relative to comparisons:

- Fund Balance as Percent of Revenue was uneven between FY 2007 - FY 2010, moving from 5% in FY 2007, to 2% in FY 2008-9, and back to 5% in FY 2010, and also lags the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.5-17)
- Resources for Facilities Renewal fell from \$1.08/sq ft in FY 2007 to \$0.87/sq ft in FY 2010 and lagged the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.5-14)
- Composite Financial Index decreased from 3.5 in FY 2007 to 1.3 in FY 2010 and lagged the MnSCU average. (Fig. 7.5-15)

DRAFT

8.0 SCORING

Forthcoming

DRAFT