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Executive Summary

Rochester and Community Technical College (RCTC) has sound, systematic methods (processes) that meet the overall purposes of the Performance Excellence Criteria. Some areas or work units are in the early stages of using these methods. The organization is beginning to systematically evaluate and improve processes.

Results are reported for many areas of importance to RCTC’s key business requirements, and the results demonstrate some improvements and good performance levels. Trends are beginning to develop, and the organization is in the early stages of obtaining comparative information.

Notable Strengths

Visionary Leadership – Senior leaders create and systematically deploy the College’s mission, vision, and values. The shared governance system builds strong partnerships to help create a focus on students. Senior leaders and many others in leadership positions are committed to performance improvement.

Focus on the Future – The College uses a systematic planning process that includes the Integrated Planning Process (annual) and the Strategic Planning Process (triennial). These processes are in place for all work areas, with measures and some targets identified. Dashboard information is fully transparent across the organization and available to other stakeholders.

Management by Fact – The College uses several information technology enhancements to facilitate more effective and efficient service to students. Specific examples include the recent image capture software and the tool to track student interactions as information is processed. Though using several different software types, faculty and staff generally feel the information is accurate and reliable.

Systems Perspective – The College uses a robust and well-designed work system consisting of Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 processes to discern differences in granularity of scope and responsibility. All work areas have such a work system design.

Potential Opportunities for Improvement

Focus on Results and Creating Value – Though RCTC has a robust, well-developed and systematic strategy development process, deployment is inconsistent and there are some gaps in alignment to RCTC’s performance management system. In addition, some work areas do not follow through by taking action on strategic action plans.
Valuing Workforce Members – Although the College has a favorable work environment with many education and training opportunities, many faculty and staff lack personal development plans that are aligned with identified strategic plan needs. Neither professional development plans nor performance management tools are consistently deployed throughout the organization.

Organizational and Personal Learning – Although some opportunities for organizational learning occur through the shared governance structure via various work committees and Staff Development Days, many faculty and staff are unable to consistently participate in learning opportunities. In addition, many departments do not effectively learn and share best practice information.

Results

Student Learning Outcomes – In 2007, licensure exam pass rates for an array of disciplines that included nursing, teaching, peace officer, and radiography averaged 93.4%, which was better than the MnSCU average of 85.8%. The exam pass rate for Licensed Practical Nurse has shown an increasing trend, sometimes reaching 100% and consistently exceeding the MNSCU average.

Customer-Focused Outcomes – Community Satisfaction has a positive trend, reaching 59% in 2009, which exceeds the MnSCU average of 46%. Retention Rates for Second Fall have remained fairly constant over the last four years and are above the MnSCU average. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Academic Challenge Benchmark, at 51.2, is better than the average of all colleges (50) and medium colleges (49.9). The Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark result (57.5) is better than the MN Consortium (54.8) and all colleges (50).

Financial and Market Outcomes – Online enrollment has increased from 12% in 2007 to 16% in 2009, which is significantly above the MnSCU average of 11%. STEM Credit Enrollment, at 51.4% is above the MnSCU average of 45%. The Composite Financial Index score has improved from 4.00 in 2006 to 1.90 in 2008.

Workforce-Focused Outcomes – The campus quality survey index of faculty and staff satisfaction and Workforce Engagement Benchmark Index show an unfavorable trend (however did show slight improvement in the last reported year, 2009). No comparative data were provided. Outcomes are not reported for key measures of workforce capability and capacity and measures of workforce climate.

Process Effectiveness Outcomes – Measures for Summer Bridge Conversion Rate; CQS: Strategic Quality Planning Benchmark; CQS: Quality Assurance Benchmark; and Inquiry Conversion Rate have no comparative data.
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.
# 2009 Education Criteria for Performance Excellence – Item Listing

P  Preface: Organizational Profile

P.1  Organizational Description
P.2  Organizational Challenges

## 2009 Categories and Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Point Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Senior</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Governance</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Strategy</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Strategy</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Customer</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Voice of</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Customer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Measurement,</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Measurement</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, Analysis, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Management</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Information,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 Workforce</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Workforce</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 Work Systems</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Work Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1 Student</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Customer</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focused Outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Budgetary,</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4 Workforce</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focused Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 Process</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6 Leadership</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POINTS</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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, how your organization fulfills its legal, ethical, and societal responsibilities, and how it supports its key communities.

1.1 Senior Leadership

Strengths

1.1a(1) Senior leaders set the College’s signature statements (Mission, Vision, Values) during the Strategic Planning (SPP) process. Senior leaders deploy signature statements through the use of the SPP, the College Performance Improvement System (CPIS), Organizational Leadership and Shared Governance System, Student Learning System (SLS), Integrated Planning Process (IPP), use of a Balanced Scorecard (BSC), and through diverse communication mechanisms. Signature statements are reviewed during the SPP; in 2004, a new vision statement was developed, the mission statement was modified, and six college values were adopted. In 2008, the College adopted student core outcomes and service attributes. Senior leaders demonstrate a commitment to the College’s values by discussing one of the values at the beginning of staff and committee meetings.

1.2a(2) Senior leaders consistently model expected behaviors related to legal and ethical behavior. Senior leaders proactively address ethical and legal behavior by reviewing College practices and policies for compliance to ethical standards and correcting or revising the practice or policy as necessary. The President leads orientation sessions for all faculty and staff and discusses the importance of legal and ethical behavior.

1.1a(3) Senior leaders use the Organizational Leadership and Shared Governance System to sustain the College. Sustainability is further reinforced through the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) which links self-assessment, continuous improvement planning, and resource alignment to signature statements. The IPP integrates a Balanced Scorecard (BSC) approach to managing and tracking college performance. Forty-one core measures are tracked and each aligns to a college goal. College goals are aligned with the MnSCU strategic plan and the Accountability Dashboard. There are six all-college committees chaired jointly by senior cabinet members and faculty/staff. The committees meet monthly to share updates on performance, make recommendations for changes, and ensure resources are aligned to strategy. This group adopted a five-step values-driven, outcomes-based meeting structure to ensure consistency between committees. The College fosters organizational learning through orientation sessions and focused Staff Development Days. Senior Leaders conduct mid-year IPP reviews and adjust plans if business and environmental factors change. An abbreviated IPP review may be conducted should sudden changes in the business or
academic environment occur. Senior leaders provide for professional development of leaders through the Luoma Leadership Academy, Leadership Greater Rochester, and Leadership RCTC.

1.1b(1) Senior leaders use multiple channels to communicate with the workforce. Communication on vision, performance, and updates occurs through the Baldrige Banterings newsletter, signature cards, strategic planning documents, presentations at staff meetings, and presence at student senate meetings. Other channels include the College’s website, all-college and student email, meet-and-confer and shared governance forums, and monthly dialogues with students at Student Senate/Leadership Cabinet meetings. Feedback is collected from online comment cards. In 2008, the President implemented a series entitled Chat with the President; the Vice President for Teaching and Learning holds a similar session entitled Open Mike. In addition, the President issues five personal recognition notes daily.

1.1b(2) Senior Leaders participate in the SPP, IPP, and BSC processes. Senior leaders review 41 core strategic goals found in the strategy maps, and balanced scorecard results indicate performance progress. Each Cabinet member establishes dashboards which are linked to the Student Learning System (SLS). As part of the IPP, departments submit mid-year and end-of-year reviews indicating progress achieved. The Collaborative process focuses the College on improvement, innovation, and problem-solving efforts and is deployed through the C3 committees. In addition, online comment cards, survey results, feedback from the OLSGS meetings, Chats with the President, and Open Mike sessions are reviewed and integrated into continuous improvement discussions.

Opportunities for Improvement

1.1a(1) Though Senior Leaders have an effective, systematic process in place to set and deploy organizational vision and values, Senior Leaders do not have an effective process to fully deploy signature statements to appropriate key suppliers, partners, and other stakeholders. Consequently, other key stakeholders may at times work at cross-purposes for the College and/or may not fully support the College’s vision and direction.

1.1a(3) Senior Leaders do not consistently develop and enhance their personal leadership skills. Consequently, Senior Leaders may not maintain and improve their leadership effectiveness. In addition, Senior Leaders do not participate in succession planning and do not consistently participate in the development of future organizational leaders. As a result, the College may not be able to sustain effective leadership should sudden changes in senior leadership occur.

1.1b(1) Although the President and one Vice President have established effective processes for two way communication, not all Senior Leaders have established
effective two-way communication mechanisms, and not all Senior Leaders are actively involved in reward or recognition programs. As a result, employees may perceive that they are not appreciated or that high performance standards are not important, ultimately impacting morale or performance.

1.2 Governance and Social Responsibilities

**Strengths**

1.2a(1) The College is governed by the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) Board of Trustees (BOT) and Chancellor. The BOT and Chancellor hold the College accountable for management actions and fiscal compliance to established spending plans. The BOT reviews performance through the BSC, which is available to the public on the College's website. The BOT ensures independent audits of the College are conducted. In addition, the College uses the “Shared Governance” system to provide governance of the College. The shared governance system includes input from students, faculty, staff, and other area stakeholders. The President of the College follows State statutes and policies and procedures established by the Chancellor and approved by the MnSCU BOT. Risk management assessments are conducted by Construction-Occupancy-Prevention-Exposure (COPE) in conjunction with the Finance and Facilities Office. Legal requirements are monitored and managed by the Office of the President. The MnSCU General Counsel assists the campus in interpreting policies, procedures, and matters of State law and provides legal and ethical training for the employees. The effectiveness of the BOT is reviewed by an independent organization biennially. Methods of providing oversight and governance were reorganized as a result of one of these reviews.

1.2a(2) The College effectively and systematically evaluates the President and the Leadership Cabinet. The President participates in an annual 360 evaluation; evaluators include representatives from the student body and bargaining units, peers, and community leaders. The President provides a list of achievements to the Chancellor and both review the results of the evaluation. The Leadership Cabinet also participates in 360 evaluations as well as self-assessments. In addition to the stakeholder assessment feedback, each Leadership Cabinet member submits to the President individual self-assessments, summaries of achievements related to College goals and goals for the next fiscal year. The process also requires cabinet members to address performance levels for measures on divisional dashboards. The President meets individually with each Leadership Cabinet member to share the findings, discuss areas for improvement and mutually agree upon the divisional goals.

1.2b(1) Adverse impacts on society are considered in the design of new programs and offerings. The College also considers adverse impacts on the environment when
considering capital improvements. The College established processes to ensure compliance with legal requirements, risk management, Equal Education and Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action, health and safety, critical incidents, accreditation, and fiscal accountability. These processes include training, the establishment of policies, and periodic independent audits. Goals and targets are established for each of the listed items. The College conducts training through the MnSCU attorney general’s office to ensure understanding of state laws and regulations and to maintain compliance with MN Statute 43A.38.

1.2b(2) The College promotes ethical behavior through training, policy deployment, and role modeling behaviors. Employees are required to adhere to ethical obligations and a code of conduct established by Minnesota State Statute 43A.38, which includes an obligation for reporting and investigating fraudulent or dishonest acts. Faculty and staff are required to complete a webinar every three years. The law and policies are communicated through the college website, the online employee handbook, and training at staff development days.

1.2c(1) The College selects key communities to support based on their focus on higher education and their complementarities with the College’s strategic direction and goals. The College also aligns with organizations whose purpose is to advance the economic vitality and quality of life in the greater Rochester area.

1.2c(2) The College actively supports and strengthens key communities and determines areas of emphasis for organizational involvement. Leaders, faculty, and staff serve on a number of local organizations and boards including the Rochester Area Chamber of Commerce, the Rochester Diversity Council, Leadership Greater Rochester, Rochester Rotary Clubs, Rochester Area Quality Council, Rochester Arts Council, Boys and Girls Club, Intercultural Mutual Assistance Agency, Family Y, and Rochester Area Math Science Partnership.

Opportunities for Improvement

1.2a(2) Though there are processes in place to assess senior leader performance, cycles of performance evaluation have not led to performance improvement. This may impact the College’s ability to sustain effective leadership and governance in the future. It may also create a perception in the organization with faulty and staff that performance improvement is not important, thus impacting workforce performance in general.

1.2b(2) Although the state requires that the College have a complaint/reporting process for unethical, fraudulent or dishonest acts, ethical behavior is not systematically monitored. Without measures to monitor ethical behavior, the College may not have the ability to detect early indicators of ethical compliance issues, and may also not be able to analyze and trend ethical behavior over time. In addition, although the College has a process to address ethical obligations with its workforce, the College does not have a systematic process to promote ethical
obligations with suppliers and partners. Failure to promote ethical practices to suppliers and partners may lead to improper supplier and partner actions, which could impact the College’s mission and reputation. Finally, the College does not have a systematic process to monitor and respond to breaches in ethical behavior. Failure to respond to ethical violations in a proper manner may create workforce perceptions that ethical violations do not carry adverse consequences and may also allow certain ethical breaches to recur.
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 deployed and changed if circumstances require, and how progress is measured.

2.1 Strategy Development

Strengths

2.1a(1) The College effectively and systematically conducts strategic planning through two planning processes. The strategic planning process (SPP) occurs every three years in conjunction with the MnSCU planning cycle, and the integrated planning process (IPP) occurs annually. In 2000, the multi-phase SPP was adopted, along with the College’s signature statements. Improvements to the process have evolved with selection of participants and cycle time to reflect five phases. The five phases are Landscape Phase, The Signature Review Phase, Organization Review and Program Analysis Phase, Systems and Processes Assessment Phase, and Identification of Strategic Directions and Key Performance Indicators Phase. The Landscape Analysis Phase includes a review of internal and external studies, known as Design Documents, which include a variety of feedback documents and other relevant information, including MnSCU directives and Signature Statements. Strategic challenges are identified, synthesized, and rated for impact. The Signature Review Phase focuses on review of the mission, vision, and values statements, which collectively are known as the College’s Signature Statements (Figure P.1-2). The Organization Review and Program Analysis Phase reviews, summarizes, and prioritizes findings from previous accreditation and quality site visit feedback reports (Figure 4.1-4). The Systems and Processes Assessment Phase is based on feedback reports from external quality reviews by the Minnesota Council for Quality (MQA), The Higher Learning Commission (HLC), and the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA).

The planning team includes 20 representatives from faculty, staff, administration, key partners, students, and other stakeholders. Internal representation includes collective bargaining representatives and/or their selected designees. In 2007, a series of internal and external Town Hall meetings were used to further capture stakeholder input. The process has been in use since 2000, and has been revised several times.

2.1a(2) The College uses the SPP and IPP to analyze information from its Listening and Learning Methods, external and internal review documents (Design Documents), audits and self-assessments, accreditation reports, Stakeholder Surveys, Town Hall meetings, and performance reviews. Organizational strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats are identified in the Landscape Analysis, the Organizational Review and Program Analysis, and the Systems and Processes Assessment Phases. Early indications of major shifts
are identified in the Landscape Analysis Phase. The College evaluates its ability to execute the strategic plan in the IPP by designating resource needs. Processes were revised in 2004, to include the Stakeholder Survey, and were further refined in 2007, with the addition of Town Hall meetings. The College uses an Economic Modeling Software, Inc. database product to pull updated data and information from over 70 sources to monitor demographic, occupational, and workforce trends. The software is a tool to aid in supporting organizational sustainability through program development, determination of market share, competitor analysis and marketplace changes. In addition, the College participates in accreditation site visits and self assessments to determine opportunities, strengths, threats, and weaknesses.

2.1b(1) The College defines key strategic objectives (known as College goals) to address challenges and advantages, as well as current and future core competencies; the timetable for accomplishing them is set via the IPP. College goals are linked to MnSCU goals, and division strategies align with College goals. Goals and strategies are revisited each year prior to the launch of the IPP. The strategic plan contains 13 goals organized around four strategic directions: access and opportunity, meeting state and regional economic needs, quality programs and services, and innovation and efficiency. Goals are aligned with four Balanced Scorecard perspectives: learning and growth, internal processes, students and stakeholders, and resources. The strategic plan is shown as a Strategy Map (Figure 2.1-3). The College tracks 41 core measures, each aligned to a goal and tracked on the BSC.

2.1b(2) The IPP is an annual process that generates development of action plans to facilitate program and department continuous improvement. The SPP, conducted every three years, guides long-term planning. The College has identified several strategic challenges in the organizational profile, which impact short- and long-term success. These challenges include: demonstrating accountability, funding and resource allocation, niche focus, and community understanding of RCTC. Many College goals directly align to the strategic challenges. The SPP, IPP, and strategy mapping process ensure that the College vision, mission, values, strategic advantages and challenges, and core competencies are considered, aligned, and linked. Input from internal and external students and stakeholders ensure some balance in the process.

Opportunities for Improvement

2.1a(1) Although the College effectively and systematically conducts strategy development, the College does not have a systematic process to set some planning time horizons. As a result, the College may not always effectively balance short- and long-term objectives and/or not always create the most appropriate sequence of actions that allows them to reach ultimate goals.
2.1a(2) Although the College has a systematic process to address many key factors, it lacks a systematic process to evaluate the competition, the regulatory environment, or identification of needed core competencies relative to long-term organizational sustainability through its SPP. As a result, the College may miss identifying some strategic actions to ensure its sustainability and its progress toward all strategic objectives.

2.1b(1) Although the College has identified strategic objectives and supporting measures, it has not identified specific timetables for completion of all its goals. In addition, there are not quantifiable targets for all goals. Consequently, the College may not be able to effectively monitor progress in fully achieving all goals, and/or may not take effective corrective action should progress lag targets. In addition, the College may sub-optimize resources in an effort to accomplish goals or may cause workforce frustration if accomplishment of goals is not fully (and timely) achieved.

2.1b(2) Although the College has determined its strategic challenges and advantages, it lacks strategies to meet all long-term challenges and opportunities and to determine how to balance the needs of all students and key stakeholders. This may result in missed opportunities, overlooking community needs, or failing to respond to abrupt changes in technological, cultural, or environmental factors. Without the ability to respond to the needs of all students/stakeholders, the College risks losing market share or impacting its overall sustainability.
2.2  Strategy Deployment

Strengths

2.2a(1)  The College has systematic processes in place to deploy its strategy through the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) and resulting action plans. The College has a longer-term planning system, the SPP, which operates on a three-year horizon, and is aligned with the MnSCU system, as well as the short-term action plans resulting from the IPP. The College converts its goals (strategies) to action plans through the use of the IPP, which is executed annually by all departments and consists of four steps: Step 1 – Academic Program Review or Nonacademic Self-Assessment; Step 2 – Continuous Improvement Planning; Step 3 – Annual Operating Budgets Request; and Step 4 – Determination of Priorities/Alignment of Resources. The output of the process is a set of approved department-level strategies (continuous improvement plans) that are linked with divisional strategies, which in turn are linked to the College’s strategies. The IPP system was recently improved to include an Academic Program Review (APR) or nonacademic self-assessment as applicable; the linking of Level 1, 2, and 3 processes to core measures; mid- and end-of-year reporting; leadership feedback; and enhanced reporting functions. The IPP is facilitated via a web-based portal so as to be transparent to stakeholders.

2.2a(3)  The College uses the “Determination of Priorities/Alignment of Resources” step of the IPP to systematically ensure that adequate financial and other resources are available to support the accomplishment of its action plans. In this step, the Leadership Council reviews continuous improvement plans and operating budget submissions. Targets are set for capital, personnel, non-personnel, repair and replacement, and other spending and revenue targets. Then, in a series of leadership retreats, all recommended projects and budgets are presented and discussed. During these retreats, final approvals are determined. Each year, the six divisions identify strategies that align with college goals. Strategies submitted by organizational units include general timelines and resource estimates with cost center allocation.

2.2a(4)  The College has mid-year and end-of-year checks on deployed IPP plans so that plans may be modified if circumstances change. In October and January, college leadership reviews plans and approves new initiatives or reallocates resources as warranted.

2.2a(5)  The College has identified human resource planning as one of its ‘vital few’ projects and has started to make some progress on its Strategic HR Plan, identifying short- and long-term strategies with a specific initial focus on Employee Selection. Strategies identified include Diversity, Selection, Development, Retention, Succession, and ongoing HR Management.
The College has identified 41 core measures organized around four perspectives (learning and growth, internal processes, student and stakeholder value, and resources) that make up the Balanced Scorecard (BSC). The BSC is a family of dashboards that includes the strategic dashboard, six divisional dashboards, and approximately 80 academic and nonacademic program and department dashboards. Of the 41 core measures on the College strategic dashboard, 10 align directly to the priority measures on MnSCU’s Accountability Dashboard. Department and program core measures include divisional measures and potentially other measures unique to the work performed by the division.

The College has identified short-term performance targets for most of its core measures. The measures are developed as part of the IPP and are aligned with the SPP’s three year planning horizon, which in turn is aligned with MnSCU’s planning horizon. Some performance projection targets are set for each year of the three-year planning horizon.

Opportunities For Improvement

Although the College has systematic processes to convert strategic objectives into action plans, the College does not effectively deploy its goals and action plans throughout the entire workforce and to key suppliers and partners. Failure to deploy needed action plans to the entire workforce, suppliers, partners, and collaborators may cause unintended confusion about priorities, improper action, and/or sub-optimized resources. Segments of the workforce may not fully understand the relative importance of expected actions, and may either take action that are at cross-purposes to that of the College’s objectives or may not take any action at all, resulting in an inability of the College to accomplish fully its goals. Furthermore, there is not a systematic process in place to ensure key outcomes can be sustained.

Although the College establishes and deploys action plans and reviews them in October and January, it may be difficult to quickly modify action plans if circumstances require a rapid shift in plans or adoption and execution of new plans. An inability to respond quickly could lead to decreased effectiveness and may impact the College’s ability to react in a rapidly changing environment.

Although the College has developed an integrated human resource plan that includes short- and long-term strategic objectives which are aligned with the College’s values, action plans are in the beginning stages with an initial focus on the Hiring/On-boarding process. Thus, current HR processes do not fully address potential strategic plan impact on the workforce and do not address potential needed changes to workforce capability and capacity. As a result, the College could miss opportunities to achieve its goals and may experience ineffective or sub-optimized execution of its strategic plan.
Although the College has a systematic process to convert strategic objectives into action plans, it lacks a systematic process for setting performance measures for all divisional action plans; in addition, the measurement system does not cover all areas, student segments, and stakeholders. As a result, individual divisions may not fully accomplish the desired level of performance against strategic goals.

Although the College has developed performance projections for most of its 41 key performance indicators, some performance indicators do not have performance projections. Furthermore, the College has not projected the performance of its competitors, and thus may not be aware when its performance is lagging behind the future projected performance of its competitors. As a result, the College may not detect performance problems early in the review cycle, leading to lagging corrective actions and resulting in a failure to fully meet strategic objectives.

Though the College has short-term performance projections, long-term measurable goals and performance projection targets are not identified. Without long-term measures or performance projections, the College may not have full awareness of how its short-term actions contribute to longer-term goals and projected performance (for example, acquiring resources, developing people, and designing programs often require time to make meaningful changes). The College may also find itself constantly reacting to changes if the future long-term path and performance projections are not fully understood.
3.0 Customer Focus

The Customer Focus category examines how your organization engages its students and stakeholders for long-term success. This engagement strategy includes how your organization builds a student- and stakeholder-focused culture. Also examined is how your organization listens to the voice of its customers and uses this information to improve and identify opportunities for innovation.

3.1 Customer Engagement

Strengths

3.1a(1) The College has multiple approaches to identify and innovate educational programs, offerings, and services to meet the requirements of stakeholders and market segments. These approaches include:

- Annual program advisory committee meetings. Members include subject matter experts as well as representatives from business and industry. Committees meet to assess programs, make recommendations for new programs and program changes based on industry and student needs. Feedback is incorporated into the Integrated Planning Process.
- Annual Survey of Stakeholders
- Market research (by SNG Research Group) and surveys (NCCBP, SENSE, PSOL, SNG, and SSI) are conducted to determine student needs.
- Organizational Leadership and Shared Governance meetings
- Participation and feedback from MQA and MBNQA
- Mystery Shopper Program

3.1a(2) There is a communication structure to allow students and potential students to seek information on programs. There are a variety of channels through which an individual can get information about the College (enhanced website, which is personalized once student identifies interest area, bulletin boards, social networking, phone calls, emails, face-to-face interaction, campus events, and newsletters). Communication strategies vary depending on market segment and Student Life Cycle phases. In addition, the College assigned a committee to analyze effectiveness of student communication processes using student focus groups and student surveys.

3.1b(1) The College identified a strategic focus on creating an organizational culture that fosters a positive student and stakeholder experience (AQIP "Better Serving Stakeholders"). Innovative changes resulting from student and stakeholder feedback include: The Collaborative, implementation of College Dashboards, outcome-based meetings (using PCDA), The Buzz Box, and the Student Senate structure. The College has established a Learner Life-Cycle (LLC), outlining the key phases of the students’ experience at the College (Figure 3.1-4). The College uses different approaches to engage and build relationships with prospective students, applicants, and current students. Student engagement is also encouraged
through the Web 2.0 portal and other web-based offerings.

3.1b(3) As a result of surveying students and stakeholders, the College takes steps to keep its engagement approaches current and relevant. For example, this past year it streamlined its STAR sessions by improving scheduling to create a more seamless set of intake processes for new students. The College created a new Expect Success Student Guide, implemented a New Student Welcome Day, and a new open house style event to target new students to help them access and find resources several days prior to the start of the fall term. Student Welcome Days include helping students locate classrooms, get ID cards, buy textbooks, meet other new students, establish email accounts, enjoy lunch, and generally get connected.

Opportunities for Improvement

3.1a(1) Although the College has processes in place to identify and innovate programs and services, it lacks a systematic process to identify opportunities for expanding current relationships with existing students and stakeholders. This could impact student/stakeholder – or at least certain segments of students/stakeholders – satisfaction and engagement, as well as other stakeholder-related outcomes such as retention and positive referral.

3.1a(2) There is not a process in place to identify student sector support requirements or communication strategies, nor evidence that needs are deployed to all people and processes involved in the student support role. As a result, branding, resource availability, and overall organizational performance may be negatively affected. Some student segments may be neglected, opportunities to satisfy new and emerging needs may be missed, and/or market share may be impacted.

3.1b(1) Although the College has designed several approaches for building student and stakeholder culture, some of these approaches have not been fully implemented. In addition, approaches like Web 2.0 portal and CRM software are not fully deployed, and there is not a process yet to gauge whether these approaches ensure a consistently positive student/stakeholder experience. The College is not yet fully realizing the benefit of these programs and, as a result, may not be realizing the benefits of building a positive student and stakeholder culture.

3.1b(2) Although the College has established a Student Life Cycle process, not all phases of the life cycle have related indicators for organizational progress, and some of the approaches for managing relationships are not fully deployed (“Retain,” Facebook site, You Tube channel, and Twitter). As a result, the College may be acquiring new students only to lose them later in the life cycle, or the College may have success with one sector in a specific phase of the life cycle, but not with other sectors.
3.2 Voice of the Customer

Strengths

3.2a(1) There are multiple opportunities for students and stakeholders to provide the College with feedback. The College distributes the following surveys to varying areas of the student life cycle and captures both qualitative and quantitative results:

- SENSE – Survey of New Entering Student Engagement
- CCSSE – Community College Survey of Student Engagement
- SSI – Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey Inventory
- CQS – Campus Quality Survey
- PSOL – Priority Survey of Online Learners
- SNG – Knowledge and Awareness Survey
- Student Course Evaluations
- SNG Research Group Mystery Shopper
- Annual Survey of Stakeholders
- Comment Cards
- Chats with the President
- Open Mike sessions

3.2a(3) Student comment cards (launched in August 2006) are available to resolve informal issues or provide the College with student or stakeholder feedback. Comments are submitted through the website. Printed cards are available throughout the campus informing students of the process. The Executive Assistant to the College President logs all comments, distributes comments to the owner of issue, and follows-up for resolution and closure. Student complaints are also communicated through monthly Student Senate and Leadership Cabinet meetings.

For more formal or complex issues, there is a formal grievance process.

- Step 1 – student files a written grievance to an employee’s supervisor. Responses guaranteed in five days.
- Step 2 – If no agreement is reached, student can file with the Vice President.
- Step 3 – If no agreement is reached, student can present the grievance to the College President (this decision is binding).
- Step 4 – If the grievance involves a board policy or the President the grievance can be filed with the Chancellor/Board of Trustees.

3.2b(1) The College uses a variety of mechanisms to determine student and stakeholder satisfaction and engagement and obtain actionable information including: Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI); Community College Survey of Student
Engagement (CCSSE); Survey of Entering New Student Engagement (SENSE); Client Satisfaction Surveys; Participant Satisfaction Surveys; and Survey of Stakeholders. Data can be presented as item-level results, or items may be grouped to create a benchmark. Some segmentation is available.

3.2b(2) The College uses data from the National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP), the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), and MnSCU dashboards to compare its student and stakeholder satisfaction to that of its competitors. The College identifies gaps to indicate opportunities for improvement.

3.2b(3) The College uses a variety of mechanisms to determine student and stakeholder dissatisfaction, including the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI); Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE); Survey of Entering New Student Engagement (SENSE); Client Satisfaction Surveys; Participant Satisfaction Surveys; and Survey of Stakeholders. As a result of gathering dissatisfaction data, changes were made in the student orientation: the College added a more simplified student feedback process to complement the existing formal feedback process, and two Student Success Days were added to support students in academic success.

3.2c(1) The College does internal and external research, has access to demographic data, collects feedback from industry and business leaders, leverages partnerships with other organizations, and accesses information from Economic Modeling Software, Inc. to determine market trends, shifts in population, labor shortages, gaps in outputs of graduates for growing occupations, etc. that could require additional programs, changes in curriculum, or the addition of support services. This information is used during the Strategic Planning and Integrated Planning Processes.

3.2c(2) Through the use of the College’s SPP and Performance Improvement System, the College has identified key requirements for each of the eight student market segments and 12 stakeholder segments.

**Opportunities for Improvement**

3.2a(1) Although the College has systematic, effective processes in place to listen to students and stakeholders, these methods do not vary for different students and stakeholders, groups, or market segments, nor do they vary across the stages of the relationship with the College. In addition, there are no systematic follow-up processes with students and stakeholders. Consequently, the College may miss opportunities to gain immediate feedback and/or may miss opportunities to make adjustments in their offerings to satisfy emerging student needs or needs across different student/stakeholder segments.
3.2b(1) Although the College has effective, systematic processes in place to determine student satisfaction and engagement, the methods do not differ across all student/stakeholder groups and market segments, and information is not used to meet all student/stakeholder expectations or to secure engagement. As a result, the College may miss opportunities to serve specific populations of students or stakeholders, potentially impacting satisfaction, retention, and persistence rates.

3.2b(3) The College does not systematically determine student dissatisfaction using information available from other sources (for example, dropout rates, absenteeism, and student conflict data). As a result, the College may miss important opportunities to identify actionable information that could facilitate its taking important corrective action.

3.2c(2) Although there are a variety of current listening approaches, information on students, stakeholders, and markets (relative to programs, offerings, and services) is not systematically used to anticipate requirements and changing expectations. In addition, data are not systematically used to pursue future programs, offerings, and services. As a result, the College may not be able to identify bottlenecks or issues during the awareness or inquiry stage, which could impact movement to the application stage. In addition, the College may be losing students later in the Student Life Cycle to a competitor because of gaps in student support services.

3.2c(4) The College does not systematically evaluate and improve approaches for student and stakeholder listening; determination of student and stakeholder satisfaction, dissatisfaction, engagement, and use of student and stakeholder data. Consequently, the College may not be able to ensure that its methods are kept current with changing organizational needs and directions, and may miss opportunities to ensure future student/stakeholder satisfaction and marketplace success.
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 reviews and uses reviews to improve its performance.

4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance

Strengths

4.1a(1) The College uses a Balanced Scorecard (BSC) approach, which consists of four perspectives: learning and growth, internal processes, students and stakeholders, and resources. The College selects data and information based on measures appearing on the MnSCU accountability dashboard, measures used by the Office of Chancellor to evaluate the College’s president, and measures of performance that align with its strategic goals. Additionally, the College uses 41 core measures that are aligned to its 13 strategic goals. The BSC originated from an AQIP project, is used by divisions and departments, and includes unique measures as well as measures that align with the Colleges priorities. Most measures are evaluated from three angles: performance trends, performance compared to a benchmark, and performance compared to a set target. The College addresses underperforming measures via PDCA-based approaches (see Figure 4.1-4 for frequency of Performance Reviews). The measures included on the dashboards are reaffirmed every year as part of the IPP, ensuring their continued relevance. Division and departments track overall performance within their organization using a variety of technology support systems. MnSCU Integrated Records Management System is one of seven systems used by Admission/Enrollment, one of 12 systems used by Finance and Facilities, and one of three systems used by Financial Aid, which enables them to perform daily functions.

4.1a(2) The College has a systematic method in place for selecting key comparative data and information to support strategic decision-making, and for some measures, the dashboard contains comparison and target goals. Source of comparative data include: comparisons to the MnSCU system, National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP), national averages, defined cohorts, and Minnesota consortia data. The College also uses comparative data from the Integrated Post Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS), from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), Priorities Survey of Online Learners (PSOL), the Student Satisfaction Survey (SSI), and through other nationally normed surveys.

4.1a(3) The College keeps its performance management system current with educational service needs and directions by reaffirming its measures annually (during the IPP process). If changes are required, dashboards are edited. The Office of the Chancellor and MnSCU Board of Trustees influence changes to core measures. Changes in system-level dashboards and Presidential evaluation measures also
influence the College's dashboard.

4.1b The College reviews performance during the SPP and IPP processes. The BSC was implemented as an improvement to the SPP in 2007. The College also uses feedback from MQA; Malcolm Baldrige Applications; Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) annual updates; Academic Program Development and Review; continuous BSC reviews; Leadership Cabinet/Council Shared Governance meetings; Level 1, 2, and 3 Process Reviews; The Collaborative; MnSCU review of the College’s president; and Senior Leader 360 reviews. These reviews are performed at various levels of the College as appropriate. To respond to changing needs, the College uses “Solve and Dissolve” committees. The “Collaborative” process was adopted in 2009, to incorporate stakeholders into performance planning processes. The College has also developed a Continuous Improvement Website on which pertinent information, including quality assessment, feedback reports, and research studies are made available to internal and external stakeholders.

4.1c The College uses its IPP as the primary means of translating review findings into action, integrating planning, and fostering continuous improvement and innovation. The IPP process considers all data and information used in the establishment of division strategies, which in turn guide the setting of department strategies. The College uses a Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) process for performance improvement. Performance review findings are shared with faculty and staff through the College Crossings features, “Weekly Market Facts” and “Supalla’s Scribblings,” and two-page executive summaries or “Data Briefs”; college research studies are included as attachments. Data and information are also available through the College intranet site. Data and information are currently made available through content embedded in the IPP, the MnSCU ITS Data Management site, and the Balanced Scorecard and dashboards.

Opportunities for Improvement

4.1a(3) Although the College has effective and systematic processes in place to assess performance measurement against current College needs/directions, it does not have a systematic process that is sensitive and fully responsive to rapid or unexpected changes. As a result, the College may not be able to fully (and quickly) respond to unanticipated events, potentially impacting performance and sustainability.

4.1b Although the College reviews performance through the SPP and IPP at higher levels, there is not a consistent process for performance review at all staff levels throughout the organization. As a result, staff efforts to identify and communicate improvement needs and opportunities may be limited, resulting in missed improvement opportunities.
4.1c Although the College effectively uses performance review findings to identify priorities for improvement and utilizes the IPP process to translate these findings into action, there is not a systematic process to communicate and deploy improvement priorities to all staff, stakeholders (e.g. feeder and/or receiving schools), suppliers, partners, or collaborators to ensure alignment. Consequently, staff, stakeholders, partners, and collaborators may not be able to fully contribute to improvement efforts, potentially sub-optimizing resources or impacting overall results.

4.2 Management of Information, Information Technology and Knowledge

Strengths

4.2a(1) The College uses its intranet site as the primary method of information dissemination. Standard reports are available through the intranet and are available for multiple fiscal years. Faculty and staff have access to workstations. Timeliness is ensured through the use of uploads to ISRS and regional computing centers; data are available nearly real-time. Reliability and accuracy are managed via adherence to data integrity standards. For security, employees have network passwords, workstation security, virus protection, and SPAM protection software.

4.2a(2) Data and information from the intranet are available to faculty and staff through individual workstations. Workstation standards are in operation to ensure that hardware/software are reliable and current. Workstation occupants are provided network passwords, workstation security, virus protection, SPAM protection, remote network availability, and user support. Faculty and staff use MnSCU Information Technology Services (ITS) websites to generate reports. The College’s BSC and survey data are available on the Continuous Improvement web site.

4.2b(1) The College ensures that data are reliable, secure, and timely by uploads to ISRS and the data warehouse in regional computing centers. The ITS test and approve software installation to ensure network compatibility and security. Data, information, and College knowledge properties are ensured through a combination of approaches. Integrity is maintained by controlling the level of access privileges for faculty and staff. Access is given to those individuals with functional responsibilities for managing key systems and processes or for data entry. Accepted procedures and standards are adhered to in the entry and use of data and information systems. The Technology Support Center provides faculty and staff with a support mechanism to report and fix errors. Faculty and staff are surveyed each year in the Campus Quality Survey and are asked to rate hardware and software user-friendliness.
4.2b(2) To ensure the continued availability of hardware and software systems and the continued availability of data and information, each workstation is equipped with virus protection. Users are expected to back up files stored on the local computer themselves. All users have a home directory on the network that will not be deleted during upgrades or transfers. The files in the home directory are backed up weekly to an off-site location. Redundant equipment for key network components, servers, and data storage are maintained at a secondary campus location (Heintz Center). All components are active and available for immediate use if there is a failure of the primary equipment.

4.2b(3) The College has adopted workstation and software standards for keeping the technology infrastructure current with educational service needs and directions. Common software packages are updated on cycles linked to software releases (i.e., Microsoft Office, Windows, Outlook, etc.). Faculty make recommendations and requests for software upgrades as warranted by their academic needs. The College has an established procedure for the installation of new software; only software tested and approved by ITS is installed to ensure network compatibility and security.

**Opportunities for Improvement**

4.2a(3) Although the College has adopted standard workstation and software standards for keeping the technology infrastructure current with educational service needs and directions, the College lacks systematic processes to transfer workforce knowledge; transfer knowledge from/to students/stakeholders; facilitate rapid identification, sharing, and implementation of best practices; or assemble and transfer relevant knowledge for use in the College’s strategic planning process. Lack of systematic processes to manage the College’s knowledge may hinder the flow of information that people need to do their work; improve processes, programs, offerings, and services; keep current with changing educational service needs and directions; and develop innovative solutions that add value for students, stakeholders, and the College.
5.0 Workforce Focus

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

5.1 Workforce Engagement

Strengths

5.1a(1) The College-established Workforce Engagement Benchmark resulted from changes to the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Performance Excellence Criteria in 2007. The benchmark was patterned after the Gallup Q12 National Engagement Benchmark to determine factors affecting workforce engagement and satisfaction. The College identified existing items from the Campus Quality Survey and then added several items to establish a similar measure for engagement. Item scores from the survey were recalculated and applied to data prior to 2008. Data from the 2008 and 2009 surveys include the full set of items composing the benchmark. The Workforce Engagement Benchmark results can be viewed as an aggregate score or viewed at item level to determine factors most impacting overall engagement.

5.1a(2) The College uses several approaches to foster open communication, high performance, and an engaged workforce. The Shared Governance System, the Collaborative, and Solve and Dissolve Committees provide opportunities for employees to offer feedback and suggestions to resolve organizational issues or share ideas for improvement. This system provides opportunities for faculty and staff to interact regarding important issues facing the College. The College uses its shared governance system, all-College committees and sub-committees, and The Collaborative to create a high performance culture. The Collaborative, begun in October 2009, represents approximately 10% of the workforce and is composed of six teams that reinforce the College values, with an emphasis on learner-centered teamwork and innovation. The College has established a Core Competency Model – a collection of behaviors that are linked to organizational values and are incorporated into the performance management system. College values include: Learner-centered, Excellence, Innovation, Teamwork, Respect, and Fun.

5.1a(3) The College has performance management systems for administrators, evaluation processes for some faculty, and periodic performance reviews for some staff. These performance review processes have been developed to support high-performance work and workforce engagement. The systems include goal setting, completion of self-appraisals, and – for some employees – development plans. For administrators and certain professional employees, annual “360 degree” feedback surveys are used. These surveys focus on student and stakeholder needs with input from students, direct reports, faculty,
staff, and external stakeholders. The resultant information provides administrators with feedback regarding perceptions of their performance that can be used to improve future performance. Other employees are engaged in an annual performance review conducted by their supervisor and endorsed by the supervisor’s manager. Many employees complete a self-evaluation. The performance review may serve as a basis for pay increases for administrators, and for supervisory recommendations for granting progression/step increases for staff. Faculty on probationary status are evaluated annually by their academic dean (supervisor) and, thereafter, evaluated every three years.

5.1b(1) The College uses a variety of venues to provide for the professional development of its workforce. These include tuition waivers 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; interpersonal/human relations/conflict management training; quality/innovation training addressed through ongoing participation in CQIN Summer Institutes; and RAQC events. Use of dashboards and self-assessments to review progress reinforces a culture of high performance expectations.

5.1b(2) The College has dedicated annual Staff Development Days and has established funding for professional development opportunities. Performance management and learning systems are in place to address individual and organizational performance and improvement. The College Learning and Development System addresses workforce learning and development needs. A satisfaction survey is conducted after each event to assess employee perception of the learning sessions. The College has a Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) for faculty development. The College participates in Leadership RCTC, Leadership Greater Rochester, the MnSCU-sponsored Luoma Academy, and Core Training Program for Supervisors. There is an on-boarding process to integrate new employees, which includes orientation programs, possible mentor assignments, welcoming activities, on-the-job training, and probationary evaluation.

5.1c(1) The College uses established assessment tools to determine workforce engagement, such as the Workforce Engagement Benchmark and annual Campus Quality Survey, which includes more than 50 items aggregated into 10 benchmarks that measure various dimensions of workforce satisfaction and has also established internal benchmarks against which future assessments can be compared. The College established the Workforce Innovation Benchmark in 2008, as part of its measurement of workforce engagement. The College tracks all workforce grievances using the data as an indicator of workforce engagement and satisfaction; the College consistently experiences a low number of grievances.
Opportunities for Improvement

5.1a(1) The College does not systematically determine those factors that affect workforce engagement and satisfaction for the various workgroups and workgroup segments. As a result, the College may miss key factors for some segments of its workforce, possibly impacting workforce satisfaction, engagement, and productivity.

5.1a(3) The College workforce Performance Management System does not reinforce a focus on students, stakeholders, and the achievement of action plans. As a result, workforce may not give these areas appropriate focus, which could impact the College’s ability to achieve certain goals and strategic objectives.

5.1b(1) Although the College provides a variety of professional development opportunities for its workforce, these opportunities are not fully aligned with the core competencies, strategic challenges, and goals of the College. Learning and development needs are not systematically assessed, and the effectiveness and efficiency of the College Learning and Development System is not systematically evaluated. As a result, the College may not be fully leveraging its professional development resources, and professional development may not be fully advancing College goals.

5.1b(2) Although the College provides for learning and development opportunities for its workforce, the College does not address the transfer of knowledge from departing or retiring workers. As a result, valuable organizational knowledge may be lost as workers transition out of the College, potentially impacting the College’s productivity and/or long-term sustainability.

5.2 Workforce Environment

Strengths

5.2a(1) Staff additions are requested through the Integrated Planning Process. Through this process, requests for changes in capacity are linked to the institutional, divisional, and departmental strategic initiatives. The leadership team reviews all requests and approves funding if appropriate. MnSCU governs faculty credentialing to ensure faculty meet the appropriate minimum qualifications. Qualifications for non-faculty positions are determined by the State of Minnesota position classification system and the College.

5.2a(2) The College uses various strategies to recruit new employees, which include newspapers, workforce centers, higher education publications, several internet recruiting sites, and the RCTC website. For specific vacancies, recruiting is tailored using professional organizations, trade journals, and list-servs. The
College uses teams of three to eight people representing internal and external stakeholders to screen candidates for each search. Search teams develop interview questions, conduct interviews, and recommend finalists. They also ensure that appropriate attention is given to a diverse pool of candidates reflective of the College and surrounding community. Behavior-based interview questions are used to align potential candidates with organizational values.

5.2a(3) Workforce resources are managed and assessed through the Strategic and Integrated Planning Processes. This allows the College to: (1) organize its workforce to accomplish the work, (2) capitalize on core competencies, (3) reinforce a focus on students and stakeholders, and (4) address strategic challenges and action plans in alignment with its Work System Processes.

5.2a(4) To prepare the workforce for changes in capability and capacity, the College holds regular team and union meetings. Also, “Meet and Confer” sessions are scheduled to communicate changing needs/plans and to listen to and prepare the workforce. To minimize the impact of workforce reductions, the College communicates with employees and carefully approaches potential workforce reductions. Discussions with union representatives occur during the planning and implementation phases to solicit employee/union input and determine ways to eliminate or limit layoffs. Collective bargaining agreements address process issues when a layoff cannot be avoided.

5.2b(1) To address workplace environmental factors, the College has a Safety Officer, who develops critical incident plans and procedures, promotes legal compliance, and provides safety training, pandemic planning, and Safety Committee leadership. Two full-time campus security officers support a security force of eight to 10 student workers from the College Law Enforcement training program. The Student Health Service Nurse administers health and wellness programs for both students and employees. These programs include employee use of the college fitness center, stress management/reduction, relaxation, walking/exercise programs, etc. In addition, there is an Employee Assistance Program, a vacation donation program, and a Fund for the Family, which provides financial assistance or services to employees in need.

Opportunities for Improvement

5.2a(1) The College does not systematically assess its workforce capability needs. As a result, the College may not be able to detect all gaps in workforce capability, which could impact the College’s ability to meet all of its strategic objectives and goals.

5.2a(3) Though the College has made inroads into building an effective and supportive workforce environment, it does not have systems in place to ensure that the workforce has the capability to adapt to changing organizational needs or to reinforce a focus on students, stakeholders, and on exceeding performance
expectations. This may result in an inability to provide the organizational agility required to meet abruptly changing needs. It may also impact the College’s desire to focus on students.

5.2a(4) Though the College has processes in place to communicate to its workforce and prevent/minimize workforce reductions, it lacks a systematic method for effectively preparing its workforce for changing needs related to capability. This may result in capability gaps workforce that could ultimately affect stakeholder satisfaction and organizational sustainability.

5.2b(1) The College has not established performance measures or improvement goals for workforce health, safety, and security for its various workplace environments and workforce segments. As a result, the College may not be able to fully gauge risks or respond to changing workforce health, safety needs, which could result in incidents that affect the safety and well-being of its workforce.
6.0 Process Management

The Process Management category examines how your organization designs its work systems and how it designs, manages, and improves its key processes for implementing those work systems to deliver value to students and stakeholders and to achieve organizational success and sustainability. Also examined is your readiness for emergencies.

6.1 Work Systems

Strengths

6.1a(1) The College designs its work systems (e.g., the Student Learning System) around the requirements of collective bargaining processes and agreements, partner arrangements, and state laws, as well as the policies and procedures of the State of Minnesota and the MnSCU system. The College uses a systematic, fact-based process to refine and innovate its work system design process to more effectively respond to student, stakeholder, and marketplace needs through review during the IPP (every year) and the SPP (every three years). An example of this innovation is the introduction of Level 1, 2, and 3 work processes; these were introduced after being identified as a best practice from a Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award winner. The College systematically determines which processes will use external resources and which will use internal resources through cost-benefit analyses, retaining only those systems in which it has expertise in-house.

6.1a(2) The College’s four core competencies (partnerships, innovation, comprehensive learning opportunities, and delivery of health science/allied health curricular focus) are related to its key work processes. An example of the linkage of work systems to partnerships involves the 75 partnership agreements that are used in the design and delivery of its work systems; external partnerships are leveraged to manage the bookstore, media, library, food services, and child care services. The linkage to comprehensive learning opportunities is exemplified in the College’s relationship with the Collaboration Among Rochester Educators (CARE) Committee, as well as by its relationship with Rochester Public Schools and other area school districts to offer Post Secondary Enrollment Option (PSEO) programs. To support its delivery of Health Science/Allied Health Curricular Focus core competency, the College collaborates with the Mayo School of Health Sciences to offer affiliate programs.

6.1b(1) One of the College’s major work systems is the Student Learning System (SLS). The SLS is focused on achieving student success and learning. To this end, the remaining College divisions (Student Development and Services, Strategic Operations; Finance and Facilities; Human Resources; and Information Technology) align to support Teaching and Learning. Each department aligns its planned strategies, actions, resources, and measures to college goals via divisional strategies and the IPP.
6.1b(2) The College determines key work process requirements by incorporating input gained via its Listening and Learning approaches, as well as through program advisory committees, Survey of Stakeholders, and other formal and informal mechanisms. Input gleaned through subsequent iterations of these approaches is consequently incorporated into refinements of the requirements.

6.1c The College utilizes an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) to address campus emergencies, such as chemical/hazardous substance spills, civil protest, criminal or violent behavior, gas leaks, fire, flood, bomb threats, earthquakes, aircraft down on campus, and death on campus. The EOP considers all phases of an emergency, including initial response, creation of a command structure, incident stabilization, continuity of operations, and the resumption of normal operations. The EOP is available on the College website, and key response actions are posted in each classroom. In addition, the College has in place a STARS alert system to quickly deliver emergency messages to students and stakeholders. The College participates in community planning for response to H1N1 and tests its response capabilities through the use of table-top drills.

Opportunities for Improvement

6.1b(2) The College does not have a systematic process to refine and innovate the way its work systems are designed. As a result, the College could sub-optimize its resources and its workforce and may fail to fully achieve its goal of increasing student learning and success.

6.1b(2) Although the College has multiple listening processes in place to identify the requirements of students and staff, there is not a systematic communication or feedback mechanism between the College and its other key stakeholders (e.g., suppliers, vendors, or partners), especially in the non-academic divisions. As a result, the requirements of suppliers and partners may not be adequately represented in the College’s work systems and key work processes, which may undermine the ability of the College to form and maintain strong partnerships, a current core competency. Though the College has effective, systematic key work processes in place, it does not integrate information on student segments and individual students in the design of key work processes in order to engage all students in active learning. Consequently, not all students may be engaged and supported, which could result in higher attrition, lower graduation rates, and lower enrollment.

6.2 Work Processes

Strengths

6.2a The College effectively and systematically designs work processes to meet key requirements. Process requirements are determined by listening and learning
approaches, program advisory committees, survey of stakeholders and other informal/formal mechanisms. The Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) has students rate the importance and level of satisfaction for 80 items, which aids the college in determining students’ most important requirements. In addition, the College effectively and systematically tracks effectiveness, evaluates processes, and refines/innovates some of its work processes through the IPP.

6.2b(1) The College works toward meeting work process requirements by having established process measures for all Level 1, 2, and 3 processes; Level 3 processes measures are aligned with higher Level 1 and 2 process measures. The established process measures are in place for all departments, both academic and non-academic programs. Dashboards are used to assess current performance and to ensure progress toward meeting strategic goals, a view that serves as a mechanism to drive improvement.

6.2c The College uses several methods to improve work processes, which include the Integrated Planning Process; academic and non-academic program reviews; continuous improvement planning; the College Performance Improvement System, characterized by use of a balanced scorecard; institutional self-assessments; college, division, and department dashboards; continuous quality improvement network (CQIN) initiatives; all-College committee improvement efforts; the Collaborative; assessment of student learning initiatives including the Power of One; piloting; and focus on a ‘vital few’ AQIP initiatives.

Opportunities for Improvement

6.2a While the College has a systematic approach to determine the design of key work processes, it does not have systematic methods to: (a) incorporate organizational learning and best practices, or to (b) account for the potential need for agility into the design of its work processes. As a result, the College may waste time and resources ‘reinventing the wheel’ or using suboptimal processes. Further, the College may decrease its ability to consistently meet student and stakeholder requirements, making it less competitive in the market.

6.2b(1) Although the College has in place work processes and work process measures, not all of the processes are fully deployed, managed day-to-day, and systematically evaluated. As a result, the College may miss opportunities to improve how it delivers services and curriculum to students and stakeholders, impacting student/stakeholder satisfaction and/or strategic goals.

6.2b(2) The College does not have fully deployed, systematic processes in place to prevent variability in its work processes, reduce defects and service errors, or prevent rework. Consequently, the College may find it difficult to ensure consistent outcomes, may sub-optimize resources, and/or may impact student value. In addition, this may prevent the College from maintaining its desired service levels, impacting student/stakeholder satisfaction.
6.2c The College does not incorporate a measurement plan that makes use of both formative and summative assessments, nor does it incorporate the results of performance reviews into the review and improvement of all processes. Consequently, the College may overlook issues hidden in the data, resulting in an inability to fully meet or exceed student and stakeholder expectations.
7.0 Results

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

7.1 Student Learning Outcomes

Strengths

7.1a In 2007, licensure exam pass rates for an array of disciplines that included nursing, teaching, peace officer, and radiography averaged 93.4%, which was better than the MnSCU average of 85.8% [Figure 7.1-1].

7.1a The Persistence and Completion rates for Students of Color showed a three year average of 62%, comparing favorably to the MnSCU average of 59% [Figure 7.1-5].

7.1a The exam pass rate for Licensed Practical Nurse has shown an increasing trend, sometimes reaching 100%, and consistently exceeding the MNSCU average [updated documents at site visit].

7.1a The exam pass rates for EMT Technician, Registered Nurse, and Building Utilities Mechanic have exceeded the MNSCU average [updated documents at site visit].

7.1a Employment of graduates is generally increasing from 85% in 2005 to 89% in 2008 [Figure 7.1-3].

7.1a In the interval from 2006 to 2009, RCTC graduates who transferred to WSU consistently achieved a higher GPA as compared to the overall WSU GPA and the GPA of non-RCTC graduates [updated documents at site visit].

Opportunities for Improvement

7.1a Dental Assistant, Dental Hygiene, EMT ICP Paramedic, Health Information Technology, Surgical Technologist, and Veterinary Technician/Assistant pass rates have no comparison data [updated documents at site visit].

7.1a Pass rates for EMT ICP Technician (high of 81%, low of 50%), Registered Nurses (high of 99%, low of 89%), and Surgical Technologists (high of 100%, low of 87%) have declining trends from 2005 to 2009 [updated documents at site visit].

7.1a Persistence and Completion rate (for overall student population), at 66.6%, was
less than the MnSCU average of 69.2% in 2007, the last year reported [Figure 7.1-4].

7.1a There are no substantiated projections for any of the External Exam Pass Rates.

7.2 Customer-Focused Outcomes

Strengths

7.2a(1) Community Satisfaction has a positive trend, reaching 59% in 2009, which exceeds the MnSCU average of 46% [Figure 7.2-4].

7.2a(1) New Students Likely to Recommend Result for stakeholder population of community residents (between 18-49 years of age) shows a general improvement trend [Figure 7.2-6].

7.2a(1) Retention Rates for Second Fall have remained fairly constant over the last four years and are above the MnSCU average [Figure 7.3-6].

7.2a(2) The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Academic Challenge Benchmark, at 51.2, is better than the average of all colleges (50) and medium colleges (49.9) [Figure 7.2-4].

7.2a(2) The Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark result (57.5) is better than the MN Consortium (54.8) and all colleges (50). This is a steady improvement from 50.7 in 2005 and 52.7 in 2007 [Figure 7.1-7].

7.2a(2) The Support for Learners Benchmark shows an improving trend from 46.5 to 49.1 in the interval from 2005 to 2009, which approaches the all-colleges and medium-size colleges benchmark [Figure 7.2-5]. The data are segmented by Online Learners, Graduates, New Entering students, and All Students in the categories of Overall satisfaction, Expectations Met, All in all, If you had it to do it over again, Would you enroll here, and Word of mouth [Figures 7.2-5 and data provided on site].

7.2a(2) Student Effort Benchmark data has improved slightly (51.7 from 51.6) and is comparable to MN Consortium rates (51.3) and better than all colleges (50) [Figure 7.1-8].

7.2a(2) Stakeholder satisfaction remained high for FY2007 (4.05 on a 5 point scale) and FY2009 (4.34 on a 5 point scale) [updated documents at site visit]; however, data are not yet sufficient to determine a sustainable trend.
Opportunities for Improvement

7.2a(2) The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Academic Challenge Benchmark, at 51.2, is slightly less than the MN Consortium at 52.1, and this measure has declined from 52.1 in 2007 [Figure 7.2-4].

7.2a(2) Although the Support for Learners Benchmark shows an improving trend, the 2009 benchmark score of 49.1 is slightly lower than the Minnesota Consortium score of 51.5.

7.3 Financial and Market Outcomes

Strengths

7.3a(1) In 2009, the College’s measure of Percent of Budget Spent on Direct Instruction (44.3%) was higher than the MNSCU average of 41.2% [Figure 7.3-16].

7.3a(1) The Composite Financial Index score has improved from 4.00 in 2006 to 1.90 in 2008 [Figure 7.3-17].

7.3a(1) Private Annual Gift and Grants have increased over the last few years from $802K in 2005 to $1.1 M in 2007 [Figure 7.3-21].

7.3a(2) The College has a recent increasing trend for continuing education enrollment for the 25-44 population [Figure 7.3-1]. Online enrollment has increased from 12% in 2007 to 16% in 2009, which is significantly above the MnSCU average of 11% [Figure 7.3-4]. STEM Credit Enrollment, at 51.4% is above the MnSCU average of 45% [Figure 7.3-5].

7.3a(2) The College’s fall enrollment has increased from 5812 in 2006 to 6192 in 2010 [Figure 7.3-7].

7.3a(2) The Top-of-Mind (when you think of higher education in this area, which institutions come to mind) measure has maintained a 30 percentage point advantage over RCTC’s area competitor (WSU) during the interval from 2005 to 2009 [Figure 7.3-10].

7.3a(2) Brand Recall has improved from 57% in 2006 to nearly 65% in 2009 [Figure 7.3-12].
Opportunities for Improvement

7.3a(1) While tuition and fees have steadily increased from FY2005 to FY2010, no comparative data reported. [Figure 7.3-3]

7.3a(1) Although the percent of budget spent on direct instruction is better than the MnSCU average, the percentage has declined from 47.7% in 2006 to 44.3% in 2009 [Figure 7.3-16].

7.3a(1) The percent of budget spent on direct instruction has declined and is less than the MnSCU average [Figure 7.3-16].

7.3a(1) The Debt Burden ratio has increased over the last couple of years and there is no comparative data noted. The Fund Balance as a Percent of Revenue declined between 2007 and 2008, and is significantly less (2%) than MnSCU (5%). Targets for 2009 and 2010 are set at less than MnSCU (3% and 4% respectively) [Figure 7.3-18].

7.3a(1) Alumni support has declined from 2005 to 2007, and is now less than the MnSCU average [Figure 7.3-20].

7.3a(2) The College’s spring enrollment has shown a steady decline from 2005-2007, although showed a slight increase in 2008, [Figure 7.3-8].

7.3a(2) The College’s enrollment has shown a steady decline from 2005-2007 (although showing a slight increase in 2008), while the MnSCU system has seen steady increases. Targets for 2009 and 2010 are below the current MnSCU enrollment measure [Figure 7.3-7].

7.3a(2) STEM Credit Enrollment shows a negative trend over the last four years: currently at 51.4% from a high of 55.6% in 2006 [Figure 7.3-5].

7.3a(2) Rochester High School market share, at 25.65% in 2009, has declined from 2005-2007 [Figure 7.3-13].

7.4 Workforce-Focused Outcomes

Strengths

7.4a(1) Some (five of 17) measures of workforce engagement show positive trends over the past three years [CQS Workforce Engagement Survey].

7.4a(1) Some (four of 18) measures of workforce satisfaction show positive trends over the past three years [CQS Faculty and Staff Satisfaction Survey].
Opportunities for Improvement

7.4a(1) The Campus Quality Survey index of faculty and staff satisfaction [Fig. 7.4-1] and Workforce Engagement Benchmark Index [Fig. 7.4-3] show a generally negative trend (however, there is a slight improvement in the last reported year of 2009). No comparative data were provided.

7.4a(2) The Employee Training and Development Benchmark [Fig. 7.4-5] shows a flat trend, with no comparative data provided.

7.4a(3) No results were shown for trends and key measures of workforce capability and capacity.

7.4a(4) No results were shown for trends and key measures of workforce climate (health, safety, security, workforce services and benefits).

7.5 Process Effectiveness Outcomes

Strengths

7.5 Summer Bridge Conversion scores were approximately 95% in 2008, down from 100% in 2007, but above rates in 2005 and 2006. The trend score was within the ‘meeting expectations’ range [Figure 7.5-1].

7.5 The College’s conversion scores were above the MnSCU averages for 2006, 2007, and 2008 [Figure 7.5-2].

7.5 First time visitors to the College’s website significantly increased from 2007 to 2008, reversing a three-year trend [Figure 7.3-9].

7.5 The Facilities Condition Index has remained stable and more recently improved over the last four years (from 13 to 6%) and is better than the MnSCU average (12-13%) for the last reported year [Figure 7.3-14 and site visit update].

Opportunities for Improvement

7.5 The following measures have no comparative data:

- Summer Bridge Conversion Rate [Fig 7.5-1]
- CQS: Strategic Quality Planning Benchmark [Fig 7.4-9]
- CQS: Quality Assurance Benchmark [Fig 7.4-10]
- Inquiry Conversion Rate [Fig 7.5-5]
7.5 Percent of programs below Instructional Cost limits are trending down since 2006, with 2008 levels at 56.4% of programs in or below the cost band. No comparative or target data are available [Fig 7.5-4].

7.6 **Leadership Outcomes**

**Strengths**

7.6a(1) The Strategic Aggregate Results Scorecard shows nine measures meeting expectations and one measure exceeding expectations [Fig 7.6-1]. The Increase Access and Opportunity Strategic Direction Scorecard shows four measures meeting expectations and one measure exceeding expectations [Fig. 7.6-2]. Quality Programs and Services Strategic Direction Scorecard shows 11 measures meeting expectations and two measures exceeding expectations [Fig. 7.6-3]. The Meet State and Regional Economic Needs Scorecard shows one measure meeting expectations and one measure exceeding expectations [Fig. 7.6-4]. The Innovation and Efficiency Strategic Direction Scorecard shows 15 measures meeting expectations and three measures exceeding expectations [Fig. 7.6-5].

7.6a(2) For the period of 2005 through 2007 (last report), negative management findings from financial audits did not exceed an annual count of two [Fig. 7.6-6].


7.6a(5) Between 2007 - 2009, the percentage of faculty and staff participating in service clubs ranged from 25% to 34%, community boards from 23% to 27%, youth groups 27% to 24%, religious organizations 61% to 58%, athletic organizations 20% to 21%, political organizations 16% to 21%, membership on community committees from 27% to 30%, and other volunteer activities from 45% to 53%.

7.6a(5) Between 2007 - 2009, the percentage of faculty and staff engaging in volunteer activities for five or fewer hours per month ranged from 28% to 32%, six to 10 hours per month ranged from 32% to 37%, 11 to 15 hours per month ranged from 13% to 18%, 16 to 20 hours per month ranged from 7% to 13%, and more than 20 hours per month ranged from 9% to 12%.

**Opportunities for Improvement**

7.6a(1) The Strategic Aggregate Results Scorecard shows three measures with no data [Fig 7.6-1]. The Increase Access and Opportunity Strategic Direction Scorecard shows one measure not meeting expectations and three measures with no data [Fig. 7.6-2]. Quality Programs and Services Strategic Direction Scorecard shows one measure not meeting expectations and six measures show no data [Fig. 7.6-3]. The Meet State and Regional Economic Needs Scorecard shows three
The Innovation and Efficiency Strategic Direction Scorecard shows four measures with no data [Fig. 7.6-5]. No comparative data are provided for the Scorecard, and data are provided for one year only.

7.6a(2) No comparative data for results of financial audits are reported.

7.6a(4) No results for measures of ethical behavior are reported.

7.6a(5) No comparative data for faculty and staff engaging in volunteer activities are reported.
8.0 Scoring

(revised 4/28/10)
## Scoring Guidelines – Categories 1-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Deployment</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No systematic approach evident; anecdotal information</td>
<td>Anecdotal, undocumented.</td>
<td>Anecdotal</td>
<td>No alignment is evident, work units operate separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Early beginning of a systematic approach consistent with the basic purposes of the Item is somewhat evident. Mostly reactive approach to problems. Some <strong>basic</strong> requirements of the Item not addressed.</td>
<td>Many major gaps exist in deployment. Progress in achieving basic purposes of Item is significantly inhibited.</td>
<td>In the earliest stages of transitioning from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation.</td>
<td>Beginning to align the approach with other areas/work units through joint problem solving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A partially systematic but beginning approach consistent with the <strong>basic</strong> purposes of the Item is evident. Generally reactive to problems. A few basic requirements of the Item not addressed.</td>
<td>Some major gaps exist in deployment. Progress in achieving basic purposes of Item is noticeably inhibited.</td>
<td>In the early stages of transitioning from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation.</td>
<td>The approach is aligned with other areas/work units through joint problem solving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>An effective, systematic approach is in place responsive to the <strong>basic</strong> purposes of the Item.</td>
<td>The approach is generally deployed although several units are in the earliest stages of deployment. Progress in achieving basic purposes of Item is minimally inhibited.</td>
<td>No systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of basic Item processes is evident. Random improvements may have been made.</td>
<td>The approach is in the earliest stages of alignment with basic organizational needs identified in response to other Criteria Categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>An effective, systematic approach responsive to the <strong>basic</strong> purposes of the Item is in place. Several minor requirements of the Item are not addressed.</td>
<td>The approach is deployed although several units are in the early stages of deployment. Progress in achieving basic purposes of Item is not inhibited.</td>
<td>Beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of basic Item processes is evident. Random improvements may have been made.</td>
<td>The approach is in the early stages of alignment with basic organizational needs identified in response to other Criteria Categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>An effective, systematic approach is in place that is responsive to the <strong>overall</strong> purposes of the Item and business needs.</td>
<td>No major gaps in deployment exist that inhibit progress in achieving overall purposes of Item, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units. Some work units still in the early stages of deployment.</td>
<td>Fact-based evaluation system is in place to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of basic Item processes (but no refinements based on this evaluation are in place). Random improvements may have been made.</td>
<td>The approach is aligned with some basic organization needs identified in the Organizational Profile and other Criteria Categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>An effective, systematic approach is in place that is responsive to the <strong>overall</strong> purposes of the Item and business needs.</td>
<td>No major gaps in deployment exist that inhibit progress in achieving overall purposes of Item, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units. A few work units still are in the early stages of deployment.</td>
<td>Fact-based evaluation system is in place to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of basic Item processes, including some systematic refinement based on the evaluation.</td>
<td>The approach is aligned with the most basic organization needs identified in the Organizational Profile and other Criteria Categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>An effective, systematic approach is in place that is responsive to <strong>many to most of the multiple</strong> purposes of the Item and current and changing business needs.</td>
<td>Approach is well deployed with some work units in the middle to advanced stages. No significant gaps exist that inhibit progress in achieving many of the multiple purposes of Item.</td>
<td>Organizational learning and sharing are frequently used management tools at many levels. Some cycles of systematic fact-based evaluation with evidence of refinements, improved integration, and organization-level analysis and learning.</td>
<td>The approach is aligned and integrated with many overall organization needs identified in the Organizational Profile and other Criteria Categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>An effective, systematic approach is in place that is responsive to <strong>most to nearly all of the multiple</strong> purposes of the Item and current and changing business needs. Organizational learning and sharing are frequently used management tools at most levels.</td>
<td>Approach is well deployed with many work units in the advanced stages. No gaps exist that inhibit progress in achieving most of the multiple purposes of Item.</td>
<td>Many cycles of systematic fact-based evaluation with evidence of refinements, improved integration, and organization-level analysis and learning.</td>
<td>The approach is aligned and integrated with most overall and many multiple organization needs identified in the Organizational Profile and other Criteria Categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>An effective, systematic approach is in place that is responsive to <strong>nearly all of the multiple</strong> purposes of the Item and current and changing business needs.</td>
<td>Approach is fully deployed with most work units in the advanced stages. No significant gaps or weaknesses exist in any areas or work units that inhibit progress in achieving nearly all of the multiple purposes of Item.</td>
<td>Extensive organizational innovation learning and sharing are key management tools at all levels. Considerable systematic evaluation and extensive refinements; and improved organizational sharing and learning are key management tools at all levels. Some innovative processes are evident with strong refinement and integration supported by substantial organization-level analysis and sharing.</td>
<td>The approach is aligned and well-integrated with many multiple organization needs identified in the Organizational Profile and other Criteria Categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>An effective, systematic approach is in place that is responsive to <strong>all of the multiple</strong> purposes of the Item and all current and changing business needs, is clearly in place.</td>
<td>Approach is fully deployed with nearly all to all work units in the advanced stages. No significant gaps or weaknesses exist in any areas or work units that inhibit progress in achieving all of the multiple purposes of Item.</td>
<td>Extensive organizational innovation, learning and sharing are key management tools at all levels. Considerable systematic evaluation; clear evidence of strong refinements; and improved organizational sharing and learning are key management tools at all levels.</td>
<td>The approach is aligned and well-integrated with most multiple organization needs identified in the Organizational Profile and other Criteria Categories. Components operate as fully interconnected units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scoring Guidelines – Category 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scoring Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Results are not reported for any areas of importance to key organizational requirements. Trend data are either not reported or show mainly adverse trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Results not reported for most areas of importance to the organization’s key requirements. Limited positive results and/or limited good performance levels are evident for a few areas. Most results are lacking trend and/or comparative information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Results not reported for many areas of importance to the organization’s key requirements. Some positive results and/or early good performance levels are evident for a few of these areas. Many results are lacking trends and/or comparative information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Results are reported for many areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Improvements or good performance levels are evident for many areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Early stages of developing trends but little or no has been obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Results are reported for most key areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Improvements and good performance levels are evident for many areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Early stages of developing trends and obtaining comparative information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Results are reported for most key areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Some positive trends or good performance levels — evaluated against relevant comparisons or benchmarks — show a few areas of strength or good relative performance levels. No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels in areas of importance to key organization requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Results are reported for most key areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Many positive trends and good performance levels — evaluated against relevant comparisons and benchmarks — show some areas of strength and good relative performance levels. No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels in areas of importance to key organizational requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Results are reported for most key areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Current performance is good in many areas important to key organizational requirements. Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels are sustained or—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show some areas of leadership and very good relative performance levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Results are reported for most key areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Current performance is excellent in many areas important to key organizational requirements. Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels are sustained and—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show areas of industry leadership and very good relative performance levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Results fully address areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Current performance is excellent in most areas important to key organizational requirements. Most improvement trends or current performance levels are sustained or—evaluated against relevant comparisons or benchmarks—show areas of industry or benchmark leadership in many areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Results fully address areas of importance to the organization's key requirements. Current performance is excellent in most areas important to key organizational requirements. Excellent improvement trends and current performance levels are sustained and—evaluated against relevant comparisons and benchmarks—show industry and benchmark leadership in many areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>