



Feedback Report

Edison State Community College

June 14, 2013

Preparing to read your Feedback Report . . .

This feedback report contains TPE Examiners' observations based on their understanding of your organization. The examiner team has provided comments on your organization's strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence. It will tell you where the Examiners think your organization has important strengths to leverage and where they think key opportunities for improvement exist. The feedback is not intended to be prescriptive. The report will not necessarily cover every requirement of the Criteria nor will it say specifically how you should address the opportunities. You will decide what is most important to the organization and how best to respond.

Key Themes, which serves as an overview or executive summary of the entire report, is comprised of four sections: (a) Process Item strengths, (b) Process Item opportunities for improvement, (c) Results Item strengths, and (d) Results Item opportunities for improvement.

Applicant organizations understand and respond to feedback comments (both strengths and opportunities for improvement) in different ways. To make the feedback most useful to you, we've gathered some tips and practices from "*prior applicants*" listed below for you to consider.

- *"You applied to TPE to get non-biased, third-party feedback to improve your organization. Take time to read the report, digest it, and then read it again."*
- *"You know your organization better than the Examiners know it. Not all comments will appear equally relevant or important to you. If Examiners have misread your application or misunderstood information shared with them on a particular point, don't discount the whole feedback report. Consider the other comments and focus on the most important ones."*
- *"Especially note comments in **boldface type**. These comments indicate observations that the Examiner Team found particularly important – strengths or opportunities for improvement that the team felt had substantial impact on your organization's performance practices, capabilities, and/or results, and, therefore, had more influence on the team's scoring of that particular Item."*
- *"Celebrate your strengths and build on them to achieve world-class performance and a competitive advantage. You've worked hard and should congratulate yourselves."*
- *"Use your strength comments as a foundation to improve the things you do well. Share those strengths with the entire organization in order to speed cycles of learning among employees. Continue to evaluate and improve those things you do best."*
- *"Prioritize your opportunities for improvement. You can't - and shouldn't try to - do everything all at once. Think about what's most important for your organization at this time and decide where you can get the most "bang for your buck." Work on these opportunities first."*
- *"You may decide to address all, some, or none of the opportunities for improvement in a particular Item. It depends on how important you think that Item or comment is to your organization."*
- *"Use the feedback as input to your strategic planning process. Focus on the strengths and opportunities for improvement that have an impact on your strategic goals and objectives."*

INTRODUCTION

Congratulations! By submitting The Partnership for Excellence (TPE) application, your organization has differentiated itself from most other organizations. The Board of Examiners has evaluated your application for an Award for Excellence. Strict confidentiality was observed at all times and in every aspect of the application review and feedback.

This feedback report contains the Examiners' findings, including a summary of Key Themes of the evaluation, a detailed listing of strengths and opportunities for improvement by each Item of the Baldrige Criteria, and scoring information. Background information on the examination process is provided below.

APPLICATION REVIEW

Stage 1, Independent Review

The application evaluation process begins with a Stage 1 Independent Review. TPE assigns six to eight members of the Board of Examiners to each application. Assignments are made according to the Examiners' areas of expertise and to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Each Examiner notes key factors as they relate to the organization's profile, independently evaluates the application, writes observations relating to the applicant's strengths and opportunities for improvement, and suggests a score based on the Criteria for Performance Excellence scoring system (pages 68-69 of the *2011-12 Criteria for Performance Excellence* booklet). All applications in all sectors (government, business, education, health care, and nonprofit) receive a Stage 1 Independent Review evaluation.

Stage 2, Consensus Review

All applications proceed to the Stage 2 Consensus Review. The team of six to eight Examiners, led by a Team Leader, conducts a series of conference calls and/or face-to-face meetings reviewing all the Examiner observations. Their goal is to reach consensus on feedback comments that capture the team's collective view of the applicant's strengths and opportunities for improvement. In addition, the team assigns a numerical score for each Item and identifies any outstanding issues that the team will need to clarify and/or verify during Stage 3, Site Visit. The team documents comments, scores, and site visit issues in a Consensus Scorebook.

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Consensus Planning: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assign Item Discussion Leaders• Review Findings From the Independent Evaluations• Develop Draft Item Consensus Comments	Consensus Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss Key Factors• Discuss Items and Key Themes• Achieve Consensus on Comments, Scores, and Site Visit Issues	Post-Consensus Review Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Document Findings• Prepare Consensus Scorebook• Prepare for Site Visit

Stage 3, Site Visit Review

All applications proceed to Stage 3, Site Visit. The team of Examiners conducts the Site Visit to clarify any uncertainty or confusion regarding the written application and to verify that the information provided is an accurate reflection of the organization. The team clarifies the site visit issues by interviewing the applicant's

employees, by reviewing organizational documents on site, and by discussing their findings. After completing the site visit, the team of Examiners prepares a final Site Visit Scorebook.

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
<p>Team Preparation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Consensus Findings • Develop Site Visit Issues Worksheets • Plan Site Visit 	<p>Site Visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make/Receive Presentations • Conduct Interviews • Review Documents, Records, Updated Results • Record Observations • Provide Key Themes to Applicant 	<p>Post-Site Visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolve Issues • Summarize Findings • Finalize Comments • Prepare final Site Visit Scorebook

Stage 4, Judges’ Review

During Stage 4, TPE forwards the Application, Key Factors, Key Themes, Consensus Scorebook, and Site Visit Scorebook for each applicant to TPE’s Panel of Judges. The Panel of Judges makes the final recommendations on levels of Award to the TPE Board of Trustees.

Members of the Panel of Judges may be Ohio, Indiana, West Virginia residents or they may be from out-of-state. Judges generally have a long and varied history with their state and with the national-based Baldrige programs, having acted in several capacities at both levels.

A Lead Judge and a back-up judge are assigned to each application. The Lead Judge studies the application, the Consensus Scorebook and Site Visit Scorebook, and confers with the Team Leader as necessary. The Lead Judge presents the applicant to the Panel of Judges. A two-thirds majority vote by the Panel of Judges is required to award a level for an applicant. Judges do not participate in discussions or vote on applications in which they have a conflict of interest or a competing interest. The panel reviews and discusses all conflicts so that all Judges are aware of their own and others’ limitations on access to information and participation in discussions and voting.

TPE designs the judging process to provide for a balanced assessment of organizational quality. The Panel of Judges considers many factors in their decision-making: the breadth and relevance of competitive comparisons noted in the application; observations, verification, and clarification obtained by the examining team during the site visit; and the strengths, opportunities for improvement, and overall score identified by the examination team.

The TPE Panel of Judges seeks to apply consistent standards across all sectors for the final determination of Award levels. After the Judges’ review and recommend Award recipients, the lead judge works with the Team Leader to edit the Site Visit Scorebook, which becomes this Feedback Report. The Judges’ final recommendations are then sent to the TPE Board of Trustees for approval.

During its review, the Judges’ Panel also looks for role model organizations which can be used for recognition and sharing at the annual Quest for Success conference in September of each year.

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Panel of Judges' Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications • Key Factors • Key Themes • Consensus Scorebooks • Site Visit Scorebooks • Updated Results (Category 7) 	Evaluation by Application Tier: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations made for Bronze, Silver, Gold, and Platinum Awards 	Assessment of Organization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall Strengths/ Opportunities for Improvement • Determination of Award Level • Identification of category Role Models

SCORING

The scoring system used to score each Item is designed to differentiate the Applicants in the various stages of review and to facilitate feedback. The scoring of responses to Criteria Items is based on two evaluation dimensions: Process and Results.

- The four factors used to evaluate Process Categories 1–6 are Approach (A), Deployment (D), Learning (L), and Integration (I). **Figure 1** shows Scoring Guidelines for Categories 1-6.
- The four factors used to evaluate Results (Items 7.1–7.5) are Levels (Le), Trends (T), Comparisons (C), and Integration (I). **Figure 2** shows Scoring Guidelines for Category 7.

The Applicant's overall scores for Process Items and Results Items each fall into one of eight scoring bands. **Figure 3** shows each band score with its corresponding descriptor of attributes associated with that band.

Note: Your scoring summaries are attached to the cover letter showing the percentage range score for each Item and the overall scoring bands for processes and results.

FIGURE 1: 2011-2012 BALDRIGE CRITERIA PROCESS SCORING GUIDELINES

For Use with Categories 1–6

PROCESS SCORING GUIDELINES

SCORE	PROCESS (for use with categories 1–6)
0% or 5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No SYSTEMATIC APPROACH to item requirements is evident; information is ANECDOTAL. (A) ■ Little or no DEPLOYMENT of any SYSTEMATIC APPROACH is evident. (D) ■ An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems. (L) ■ No organizational ALIGNMENT is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently. (I)
10%, 15%, 20%, or 25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The beginning of a SYSTEMATIC APPROACH to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item is evident. (A) ■ The APPROACH is in the early stages of DEPLOYMENT in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item. (D) ■ Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident. (L) ■ The APPROACH is ALIGNED with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving. (I)
30%, 35%, 40%, or 45%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item, is evident. (A) ■ The APPROACH is DEPLOYED, although some areas or work units are in early stages of DEPLOYMENT. (D) ■ The beginning of a SYSTEMATIC APPROACH to evaluation and improvement of KEY PROCESSES is evident. (L) ■ The APPROACH is in the early stages of ALIGNMENT with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other process items. (I)
50%, 55%, 60%, or 65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the item, is evident. (A) ■ The APPROACH is well DEPLOYED, although DEPLOYMENT may vary in some areas or work units. (D) ■ A fact-based, SYSTEMATIC evaluation and improvement PROCESS and some organizational LEARNING, including INNOVATION, are in place for improving the efficiency and EFFECTIVENESS of KEY PROCESSES. (L) ■ The APPROACH is ALIGNED with your overall organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other process items. (I)
70%, 75%, 80%, or 85%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item, is evident. (A) ■ The APPROACH is well DEPLOYED, with no significant gaps. (D) ■ Fact-based, SYSTEMATIC evaluation and improvement and organizational LEARNING, including INNOVATION, are KEY management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement as a result of organizational-level ANALYSIS and sharing. (L) ■ The APPROACH is INTEGRATED with your current and future organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other process items. (I)
90%, 95%, or 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, fully responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item, is evident. (A) ■ The APPROACH is fully DEPLOYED without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units. (D) ■ Fact-based, SYSTEMATIC evaluation and improvement and organizational LEARNING through INNOVATION are KEY organization-wide tools; refinement and INNOVATION, backed by ANALYSIS and sharing, are evident throughout the organization. (L) ■ The APPROACH is well INTEGRATED with your current and future organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other process items. (I)

FIGURE 2: 2011-2012 BALDRIGE CRITERIA RESULTS SCORING GUIDELINES

For Use with Category 7

RESULTS SCORING GUIDELINES

SCORE	RESULTS (for use with category 7)
0% or 5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ There are no organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS and/or poor RESULTS in areas reported. (Le) ■ TREND data either are not reported or show mainly adverse TRENDS. (I) ■ Comparative information is not reported. (C) ■ RESULTS are not reported for any areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's MISSION. (I)
10%, 15%, 20%, or 25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A few organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS are reported, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item, and early good PERFORMANCE LEVELS are evident. (Le) ■ Some TREND data are reported, with some adverse TRENDS evident. (I) ■ Little or no comparative information is reported. (C) ■ RESULTS are reported for a few areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's MISSION. (I)
30%, 35%, 40%, or 45%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Good organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le) ■ Some TREND data are reported, and a majority of the TRENDS presented are beneficial. (I) ■ Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident. (C) ■ RESULTS are reported for many areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's MISSION. (I)
50%, 55%, 60%, or 65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Good organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported, responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le) ■ Beneficial TRENDS are evident in areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's MISSION. (I) ■ Some CURRENT PERFORMANCE LEVELS have been evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or BENCHMARKS and show areas of good relative PERFORMANCE. (C) ■ Organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS are reported for most KEY CUSTOMER, market, and PROCESS requirements. (I)
70%, 75%, 80%, or 85%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Good to excellent organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le) ■ Beneficial TRENDS have been sustained over time in most areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's MISSION. (I) ■ Many to most TRENDS and current PERFORMANCE LEVELS have been evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or BENCHMARKS and show areas of leadership and very good relative PERFORMANCE. (C) ■ Organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS are reported for most KEY CUSTOMER, market, PROCESS, and ACTION PLAN requirements. (I)
90%, 95%, or 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Excellent organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported that are fully responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le) ■ Beneficial TRENDS have been sustained over time in all areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's MISSION. (I) ■ Evidence of industry and BENCHMARK leadership is demonstrated in many areas. (C) ■ Organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS and PROJECTIONS are reported for most KEY CUSTOMER, market, PROCESS, and ACTION PLAN requirements. (I)

Figure 3: 2011-2012 Baldrige Criteria Scoring Band Descriptors

Band Score	Band Number	PROCESS Descriptors	Band Score	Band Number	RESULTS Descriptors
0–150	1	The organization demonstrates early stages of developing and implementing approaches to the basic Criteria requirements, with deployment lagging and inhibiting progress. Improvement efforts are a combination of problem solving and an early general improvement orientation.	0–125	1	A few results are reported responsive to the basic Criteria requirements, but they generally lack trend and comparative data.
151–200	2	The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the basic requirements of the Criteria, but some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment. The organization has developed a general improvement orientation that is forward-looking.	126–170	2	Results are reported for several areas responsive to the basic Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission. Some of these results demonstrate good performance levels. The use of comparative and trend data is in the early stages.
201–260	3	The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the basic requirements of most Criteria items, although there are still areas or work units in the early stages of deployment. Key processes are beginning to be systematically evaluated and improved.	171–210	3	Results address areas of importance to the basic Criteria requirements and accomplishment of the organization’s mission, with good performance being achieved. Comparative and trend data are available for some of these important results areas, and some beneficial trends are evident.
261–320	4	The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the overall requirements of the Criteria, but deployment may vary in some areas or work units. Key processes benefit from fact-based evaluation and improvement, and approaches are being aligned with overall organizational needs.	211–255	4	Results address some key customer/stakeholder, market, and process requirements, and they demonstrate good relative performance against relevant comparisons. There are no patterns of adverse trends or poor performance in areas of importance to the overall Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission.
321–370	5	The organization demonstrates effective, systematic, well-deployed approaches responsive to the overall requirements of most Criteria items. The organization demonstrates a fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and organizational learning, including innovation, that result in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of key processes.	256–300	5	Results address most key customer/stakeholder, market, and process requirements, and they demonstrate areas of strength against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks. Improvement trends and/or good performance are reported for most areas of importance to the overall Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission.
371–430	6	The organization demonstrates refined approaches responsive to the multiple requirements of the Criteria. These approaches are characterized by the use of key measures, good deployment, and evidence of innovation in most areas. Organizational learning, including innovation and sharing of best practices, is a key management tool, and integration of approaches with current and future organizational needs is evident.	301–345	6	Results address most key customer/stakeholder, market, and process requirements, as well as many action plan requirements. Results demonstrate beneficial trends in most areas of importance to the Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission, and the organization is an industry* leader in some results areas.
431–480	7	The organization demonstrates refined approaches responsive to the multiple requirements of the Criteria items. It also demonstrates innovation, excellent	346–390	7	Results address most key customer/stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements. Results demonstrate excellent organizational

		deployment, and good-to-excellent use of measures in most areas. Good-to-excellent integration is evident, with organizational analysis, learning through innovation, and sharing of 8best practices as key management strategies.				performance levels and some industry* leadership. Results demonstrate sustained beneficial trends in most areas of importance to the multiple Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization's mission.
481–550	8	The organization demonstrates outstanding approaches focused on innovation. Approaches are fully deployed and demonstrate excellent, sustained use of measures. There is excellent integration of approaches with organizational needs. Organizational analysis, learning through innovation, and sharing of best practices are pervasive.		391–450	8	Results fully address key customer/stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements and include projections of future performance. Results demonstrate excellent organizational performance levels, as well as national and world leadership. Results demonstrate sustained beneficial trends in all areas of importance to the multiple Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization's mission.

Your application scored in the band 3 for PROCESS items. The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the overall requirements of the Criteria, but deployment may vary in some areas or work units. Key processes benefit from fact-based evaluation and improvement, and approaches are being aligned with overall organizational needs.

Your application scored in the band 1 for RESULTS items. A few results are reported responsive to the basic Criteria requirements, but they generally lack trend and comparative data.

Score Summaries for Edison State Community College

Process Items	Process Score Range
Item 1.1	30-45%
Item 1.2	50-65%
Item 2.1	50-65%
Item 2.2	30-45%
Item 3.1	30-45%
Item 3.2	50-65%
Item 4.1	30-45%
Item 4.2	30-45%
Item 5.1	30-45%
Item 5.2	30-45%
Item 6.1	30-45%
Item 6.2	50-65%

Results Items	Results Score Range
Item 7.1	30-45%
Item 7.2	10-25%
Item 7.3	10-25%
Item 7.4	10-25%
Item 7.5	10-25%

KEY THEMES

A Key Theme is a strength or opportunity for improvement that addresses a central requirement of the Criteria is common to more than one Item or Category (is cross-cutting), is especially significant in terms of the applicant's Key Factors, and/or addresses a Core Value of the Criteria.

Process Item Strengths: *What are the most important strengths or outstanding practices (of potential value to other organizations) identified?*

- Edison State Community College (Edison) demonstrates a strong commitment to Student-Centered Excellence as evidenced by their systematic approaches to develop, deploy, and monitor action plans, and for obtaining student feedback. Also, employees at Edison measure their success by the success of Edison's students. Every student who graduates is a personal indicator to each Edison employee that they are doing their jobs well. This ties to Edison's Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), the employee working core values and overall Mission, Vision and Values of the organization.
- Edison's leadership training approaches represent a key strength of the organization. Edison initiated a Life Skills leadership-training program in the fall of 2011 and has trained 90+ employees to-date. The trainees included administration, faculty, staff, students, and community members. Partners in Leadership training was initiated in the fall of 2012; thirty college leaders received a full day of training and all college employees were offered a half day of training. These extensive leadership programs aid Edison with its sustainability and provide training desired and required by its employees.
- Established advisory boards, created on a per program basis, keep the community involved, engaged and committed to Edison. For example, as a result of the board for nursing, a new hospital simulation lab has been established in the new wing of the college dedicated to the nursing program. The members of Edison's boards remain engaged due to a genuine interest in the future of Edison and its programs.
- Edison is positively impacting the environment with a plan for the "greening" of Edison. All major initiatives outlined in the plan have been implemented throughout the organization. Edison has exceeded state of Ohio targets in energy usage, emissions, and use of water, demonstrating its commitment to the environment and its continued support of the community.

Process Item Opportunities for Improvement: *What are the most significant opportunities, concerns, or vulnerabilities identified?*

- **Edison lacks systematic processes in several key areas. These include, for example, identifying future leaders, monitoring and ensuring ethical behavior, determining the effectiveness of Edison's efforts to support its communities, evaluating the strategic planning process, managing complaints and using them to support decision making, sharing lessons learned and transferring knowledge across the organization, managing workforce engagement, and ensuring stakeholder, partner, and collaborators' needs are fully met. Lack of systematic and integrated processes may result in missed opportunities and adversely affect sustainability.**
- The Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations, Responsibilities (SOAR) process for strategic planning is a relatively new process and will help Edison in the years to come; however, it is in the very early stages of deployment. In the meantime, Edison uses an outdated CARE process and its associated artifacts, resulting in confusion around the current strategic objectives from their inception through inclusion in individual action plans and resulting measures of progress.
- At the senior level, Edison understands and lives its Mission, Vision, and Values. However, the lack of a systematic process for deployment of Edison's Mission, Vision, and Values explains why most employees questioned could not explain what they are. Improving this approach could assist Edison to assure that its employees understand these key cultural components.

Results Item Strengths: *Considering the applicant's key organizational factors, what are the most significant strengths (related to data, comparisons, and linkages) found in its response to Results Items?*

- Edison consistently provides registered-nursing graduates in the Associate of Applied Business degree program with the skills to pass the nursing certification. Employers of those graduates indicate that they will continue to hire from that pool. The near 100% pass rate for nursing graduates helps Edison assure sustainability of the nursing program.
- Edison collects data from employee surveys, customer surveys, stakeholder focus groups, transfer students, new graduates, alumni, and many other sources. These data are rich and help Edison to assure that its processes are data-focused and that measurement can be used to drive continuous improvement. Several metrics, such as nursing licensing success, student satisfaction and engagement, financial indicators, and senior leadership effectiveness, show positive levels and/or trends.

Results Item Opportunities for Improvement: *Considering the applicant's key organizational factors, what are the most significant opportunities, vulnerabilities, and/or gaps (related to data, comparisons, and linkages) found in its response to Results Items?*

- Edison demonstrates unfavorable levels, beginnings of declining trends, or mixed results in areas of student learning and process outcomes i.e., Figures 7.1-18, 7.1-19, 7.1-21a, 7.1-22, 7.1-23, and 7.1-26 ; some satisfaction and engagement results; as well as areas of workforce focus outcomes, i.e., Figure 7.3-5 with employee satisfaction. Identifying and addressing these areas may be critical in maintaining key performance indicators and overall organizational effectiveness.
- Edison lacks appropriate segmentation of data in many areas, such as student satisfaction and engagement, leadership effectiveness, Business and Industry Center data, and remedial math and English programs. Lack of segmentation may make it difficult for Edison to determine effective and/or efficient deployment, engagement, and cycles of learning to reach their short- and long-term goals.
- Edison lacks key results in some areas such as employee absenteeism and employee safety, deferring instead to using an employee survey to measure engagement. Edison also does not provide measures or trends for workforce capability, societal responsibility, or ethical behavior compliance. Missing results in these areas may make it difficult for Edison to identify strategic challenges and advantages that may influence future success.
- Comparative data are missing for several key measures, such as workforce capability measures, effectiveness of leadership development activities, workforce health/safety processes, societal responsibility and ethical behavior compliance, and comparisons for overall budget, financial, and market results. Without comparisons, Edison cannot evaluate its performance relative to other leading organizations over time, and it may be difficult for Edison to attain its Mission and Vision.

Category 1 - Leadership
1.1 Senior Leadership

Scoring Range: 30-45%

Strengths

1.1a(3), 1.1b(2) Leadership training, including a full day course given to 30 leaders and a half day course offered to all employees are among a wealth of leadership development courses taught to leaders and potential leaders at Edison. One recent leadership course emphasized Edison's core value of accountability. These courses help Edison assure its sustainability.

1.1a(3) An emergency succession plan for the President is reviewed annually by the Board of Trustees. Succession plans for other areas of the college are in development and include a mentoring component to ensure smooth transitions. Several internal candidates have been promoted to leadership positions. Succession planning will help Edison remain sustainable.

1.1b(1), 1.1b(2) Edison uses multiple methods for communicating information, key decisions and initiatives to all employees in an effort to engage the workforce and create a sustainable organization. Some of the many ways they communicate across campus include specific communications from senior leadership, a communication repository and regular campus wide mass communication vehicles (daily e-newsletters, SharePoint, intranet, web pages, public folders, email, distribution lists, area specific web pages, and an open forum) and face-to-face meetings at many levels. The Edison Communication Repository (CQIN) further encourages information sharing. The many communication mechanisms encourage one-way and two-way conversations and the ability to communicate key decisions thus reinforcing organizational performance expectations and engaging the workforce.

1.1b(2) Edison demonstrates a focus on action by creating a strategy map of initiatives and utilizing a data dashboard to make data informed decisions leading to organizational performance optimization and continuous improvement.

Opportunities for Improvement

1.1a(1) **There is no evidence of a systematic approach for deploying and integrating the Mission, Vision and Values to employees. While senior leaders are well aware of the Mission, Vision and Values, that awareness is not demonstrated at other levels of the organization. This lack of consistency may impact Edison's ability to achieve its Mission.**

1.1a(2) There is no systematic process for promoting ethical behavior. While Edison provides ethics training for new hires and search committees, there is no evidence of a systematic process. Without a well-defined and systematic approach, Edison may not be able to sustain an ethical environment.

1.1a(3) Edison lacks a systematic approach for identifying and developing future leaders. Edison enhances leadership skills by providing leadership training such as Life Skills and Partners in Leadership, but without a systematic process for identifying and developing future leaders, Edison may be undermining its ability to create a sustainable organization.

1.2 Governance and Societal Responsibilities

Scoring Range: 50-65%

Strengths

1.2a(2) Edison uses a performance management system including a 360 degree review process to evaluate the performance of senior leadership, including the President. The Board of Trustees (BOT) participates in self-evaluations. These processes help to advance Edison to improve leadership effectiveness.

1.2c(1) Edison is positively impacting the environment with a (BOT) approved plan for the “greening” of their college. All major initiatives outlined in the plan have been implemented throughout the organization. Since 2004, Edison has reduced energy usage by 52% and CO2 emission by 41.7%, exceeding state of Ohio targets of 40%, and use of water is reduced by 40% exceeding state requirements of 20%. In addition, Edison’s most recent building is an Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) certified building. These examples show Edison’s commitment to the well-being of its environment and social responsibilities.

Opportunities for Improvement

1.2b(2) There is no systematic process for the monitoring of ethical behavior or reporting and responding to ethical breaches. In addition, there are no measurements for the effectiveness of the required ethics training offered by Edison’s HR department. Without a systematic process and deployment of a process to promote and monitor ethical behavior throughout the organization, Edison may be at risk.

1.2c(2) There is no process to determine the effectiveness of Edison’s efforts to support and strengthen its key communities. While Edison does provide community support and programs, there is no defined goals, process or desired results. Without a well-deployed process, Edison may miss opportunities to better meet community needs.

Strengths

2.1a(1), 2.1b(2) The Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations, Results (SOAR) process adopted in 2011, following a cycle of learning is used to guide strategic planning. The SOAR process ensures that the input and perspective of all stakeholders is considered during the strategic planning process. Use of a systematic and integrated approach to strategic planning, inclusive of all stakeholders, ensures that plans are developed and executed and ensures the high-level performance necessary to sustain the organization.

2.1a(2) The annual action planning through use of the Completion, Access, Retention, Engagement (CARE) process identifies annual strategies. Action plans are deployed to the departmental level for goal setting and execution to achieve the overarching goal of student success. Deployment of a systematic and integrated process to the identification of annual key strategies ensures action plans are aligned with key performance indicators.

2.1b(2) A systematic and deployed approach to sharing and monitoring data and results allows senior leaders to notice early indicators of change or shifts that are pending and that might have an effect on the achievement of goals. An example is the placement of college-wide initiatives on a strategy map and subsequent storage in SharePoint allows for immediate updates. The ability to identify sudden shifts in market conditions allows Edison to respond quickly to maintain its strategic advantage.

Opportunities for Improvement

2.1a Edison's current strategic planning process lacks a systematic approach to deploy and integrate strategic goals, objectives, and action plans across the organization. Lack of a systematic and integrated deployment process may result in missed opportunities and adversely affect sustainability.

2.1a(2) There is neither systematic approach to the evaluation of the strategic planning process nor any evidence of cycles of learning. Without evaluation and resultant cycles of learning, Edison may have difficulty determining the effectiveness of its strategic planning process. With the implementation of SOAR, Edison has the opportunity to build evaluation into the strategic planning system.

Strengths

2.2a(3) A systematic process is used to allocate resources, including capital funds allocation, during the budget process. Appropriate allocation of resources contributes to financial stability, core competencies, and ultimately, achievement of Edison's Mission.

2.2a(1), 2.2a(2) A systematic approach is used to develop, deploy, and monitor action plans ensuring alignment of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). For example, to ensure sustainability and continuance of education delivery and services, all areas of the college undergo assessment of function, activity, and strategic initiatives in the master plan. Alignment of action plans to KPIs establishes a solid foundation for setting and communicating organizational priorities for ongoing improvement activities.

Opportunities for Improvement

2.2a(4) There is no evidence of a systematic process for the development and deployment of workforce plans to address capability and capacity needs. Without appropriate workforce development plans, Edison may not be able to achieve strategic objectives. The SOAR strategic planning process provides an opportunity to identify workforce capability and capacity and develop workforce plans.

2.2a(2) There is no evidence that the strategic planning process includes deployment of action plans to all key stakeholders. Without deployment of action plans to all stakeholders, Edison may miss opportunities to achieve its key strategic objectives.

2.2a(5) Edison lacks a systematic process to establish the effectiveness of SOAR action plans and strategies. Without an evaluation of Strategic Planning process, it may be difficult to determine if desired progress is being made and to reinforce overall organizational alignment.

2.2b There is no systematic process for setting performance projections. Performance projections for both short and long-term planning are missing. Without established performance projections it may be difficult for Edison to identify strategic challenges and areas of innovation to retain its competitive advantage.

Strengths

3.1a(1), 3.1b(1) Edison maintains a systematic approach to obtaining student and stakeholder feedback through a variety of listening and learning strategies. The annual student survey along with individual class evaluations and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and Noel-Levitz surveys provide listening opportunities from various stakeholder segments. This feedback helps to guide and focus Edison on its KPIs, particularly student satisfaction. Further, Edison uses input from stakeholder groups (such as advisory committees, alumni and special interest groups, the BOT, and the Edison Foundation Board) through periodic meetings and work sessions addressing needed modifications to programs and curriculum. Input and review of programs and curriculum aid in market success, accomplishing general education outcomes, and maintaining agility.

3.1a(1) Edison uses cycles of learning to ensure that high quality of student listening data are collected. Changes such as the addition of an importance rating to the survey, better and more challenging timing of survey delivery, and modifications for a more tailored Noel-Levitz survey have been implemented. Continuous improvement to voice-of-the-customer processes helps support Edison's brand as well as their focus on creating stakeholder value.

3.1a(2) Edison is obtaining potential student feedback. Approaches include: (1) Enrollment managers allow potential students to inquire and compare; (2) Connect to College workshops are offered and taught in local high schools; and (3) the Discover Edison program draws potential students to interface with faculty. All of these approaches generate significant feedback data. Maintaining a primary focus on listening to potential students leads to Edison's future engagement as well as feedback to address their KPIs.

Opportunities for Improvement

3.1a(1), 3.1a(2), 3.1b Edison lacks satisfaction strategies and data for student segments. In addition, a more formal effort to obtain actionable feedback from other stakeholders such as students of competitor schools and parents of traditional students is also missing. Further segmenting stakeholder data may result in more accurate and meaningful analysis of Edison's performance.

3.1a(1) Edison has no process for reviewing and utilizing non-program related data as actionable feedback. Without an effective and well-defined process in place to obtain and then transform such feedback into action, Edison may miss opportunities to set improvement goals and priorities to meet ever-changing student needs.

3.1a(1), 3.1(b) Effective listening methods that will obtain actionable feedback via social media are missing. The use of Facebook and Twitter is evident, but primarily to push-out and distribute information, rather than to obtain and listen to customers. Without using social media, Edison may miss opportunities to collect relevant, timely and low-cost data from students and stakeholders.

3.2 Customer Engagement

Scoring Range: 50-65%

Strengths

3.2a(1), 3.2a(2) Through Edison's feedback reviews from students, themes of need are identified and categorized into well-defined key processes and support operations. These are exploited to determine and meet changing and innovative support needs of the students. A continued focus on transforming determined needs into met needs through systematic processes allows Edison to capitalize on their innovation process and support key performance indicators of improvement.

3.2a(2), 3.2a(3) With a focus on strengthening engagement, Edison uses extensive communication avenues to fulfill information needs of students and other stakeholders. A variety of traditional and new marketing communication vehicles allows for thorough and tailored data distribution. This focus on communication translates into a more engaged stakeholder group and heightens awareness of Edison's program and service offerings to potential customers.

3.2b(2) Edison maintains a defined and systematic student complaint process. A clear step-by-step process is provided to all students online and in the student handbook. Supporting an easy and clear process for students to submit complaints allows for rich data collection and may subsequently lead to a more acknowledged and satisfied stakeholder group.

3.2a(1), 3.2a(3), 3.2a(4) A systematic approach is in place for utilizing data to identify future student and stakeholder groups and markets. Valuable data such as labor trends, economic and census data, competitor information, high school enrollment and graduation rates, etc. are reviewed (along with other current trends, programs, and services) by staff, faculty, Deans' Council, marketing and community relations, and the President's Cabinet. Maintaining a focus on continuous review and identification of new market segments allows Edison to properly focus its programs and services, supporting its Mission, Vision and Values.

Opportunities for Improvement

3.2b(2) Edison does not use a process to manage customer complaints. The missing components to the complaint process include tracking, reporting, resolution, and follow-up of the complaints. Without a process to manage student and stakeholder complaints, Edison may experience dissatisfaction or a loss of community confidence.

3.2a(2) Edison lacks a process of stakeholder support for Business and Industry Center customers. Identification of specific stakeholder needs, along with a systematic approach to design and tailor support services to meet those needs is critical to satisfying and engaging Business and Industry Center customers and stakeholders.

3.2b(1) Edison lacks a systematic process for acquiring and building relationships with advisory committee members. Specifically, there is no process for member solicitation and selection. Without a clearly defined process for marketing and building advisory relationships, Edison may miss new opportunities and may negatively affect sustainability of this stakeholder segment.

Category 4 - Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management

4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance

Scoring Range: 30-45%

Strengths

4.1a(1) Edison uses an integrated system for the collection and distribution of data and information necessary for strategic planning and for tracking daily operations. The data repository is accessed using the Colleague software to run reports and create dashboards. This process ensures the availability of data to maintain and improve Edison's overall organizational performance.

4.1a(1) Edison uses performance measures to inform and support operations, for example: (1) a demonstrated increase in enrollment activity necessitates increased hours for registration and advising; (2) a decline in enrolled credit hours necessitates the need to reduce expenses through the curtailment of an expense such as not purchasing planned software; (3) declining student success drives revised course scheduling or curriculum; or, (4) increased student success from a trial initiative moves the initiative forward to become operational. By managing by fact, Edison is leveraging their core competency of a data-rich environment and demonstrates agility.

4.1a(2) Edison incorporates comparative data, current performance measures and in-house projections, and benchmark information from national sources to determine future performance and continuous improvement aligned with its KPIs, strategic planning, and its Mission and Vision.

Opportunities for Improvement

4.1c(1) There is no evidence of a systematic process for sharing lessons learned or overall organizational knowledge. Although Edison shares successes found during data analysis through college-wide email announcements, departmental and/or college-wide meetings; there is no evidence as to how the data are used to gain organizational knowledge and improve overall performance. Without a process that systematically uses the data for improvement, it may be difficult for Edison to thoroughly leverage these experiences throughout the organization

4.1a(3) There is no evidence that complaints are compiled and used to help support strategic decision-making and innovation. Without customer complaint input into strategic decision-making and innovation, Edison may not be supporting the KPI of student satisfaction or considering all factors of student data. Therefore, Edison may miss opportunities for improvement and/or innovation.

4.2 Management of Information, Knowledge and Information Technology

Scoring Range: 30-45%

Strengths

4.2a(1) Edison uses a systematic approach to ensure that data are accurate, reliable and timely. This approach is in direct alignment with its core competencies of technology and a data-rich environment.

4.2b(2) Edison ensures technology is available 24/7/365, aligning with its core competency of technology and key process of reliability and integrity of records. The continued availability of hardware systems, software systems and data information is of increasing importance and may be critical in the event of an emergency.

Opportunities for Improvement

4.2a(3) There is no evidence as to how Edison collects and transfers relevant workforce knowledge and how this is incorporated into their innovation and strategic planning processes. Specifically, there is no process for what knowledge needs to be captured, how to collect and categorize data, and what learning can be obtained. Without a clear and defined process for managing organizational knowledge, Edison's ability to maintain its core competency of educational and professional teaching and development may be adversely impacted.

4.2b(1) There is no systematic approach for selection of hardware and software that ensures the technology is user-friendly. Without such a process to ensure that the systems are easy to use may make it difficult for Edison's workforce to use the systems effectively. Therefore, Edison may miss opportunities that impact information management.

Strengths

5.1a(1), 5.1a(2) A systematic, deployed, and integrated approach is used to hire new staff. The approach was developed by a cross-functional team and is reviewed and updated on a periodic basis. The approach is segmented by employee type (faculty; non-faculty), is aligned with the organizational values, and requires candidates to validate their stated qualifications for a given position. A systematic approach to hiring helps ensure a qualified and capable workforce, thus providing a strategic advantage.

5.1a(2) Edison uses a well-developed approach to orient new employees. Edison requires participation of all new full-time faculty and staff in a year-long, eight-module procedure. The modules are intended to increase the understanding of each employee's work, how the work links with Edison's initiatives, and how it aligns with the organization's Mission and Vision. This process helps Edison to build a capable and engaged workforce.

Opportunities for Improvement

5.1a(2) Edison does not have a systematic approach to ensure that its workforce represents the diverse ideas, cultures and thinking of its communities. Advertising position openings in higher education publications and Hispanic newspapers and consulting with other HR personnel in the area to explore best practices does not represent a robust, systematic process. Without a process, Edison may miss opportunities to build a more effective and engaging workforce.

5.1b(1) There are no processes or goals in place that address workplace environmental factors nor any evidence of improvement efforts in this area. Creating a systematic process that promotes workforce health, safety, and security and measures to determine performance may help Edison increase their core competency of value-centeredness.

5.1a(4) Edison does not demonstrate a systematic approach to change management in relation to its workforce. Further, there is no systematic process in place to add needed capacity to the workforce. For example, Edison evaluates the need for new hires through its yearly budget process, but there is no process for requesting changes in the workforce mid-year. Without an effective change management process, Edison may not fully realize its strategic advantage of "operational responsiveness, adaptability and nimbleness" and its value of agility.

5.1a(1) Edison does not have an approach to determine non-supervisory employee capability needs. Specifically, there is no systematic process to determine appropriate training/knowledge needs. While non-supervisory employees are able to recommend professional development opportunities and are supported through annual allocation of funds, there is no process to determine educational offerings based on employee segments or on their capabilities. Lack of education/training to meet non-supervisory employee needs may have an adverse effect on Edison's core competencies: educational & professional teaching and value-centeredness.

5.2 Workforce Engagement

Scoring Range: 30-45%

Strengths

5.2a(1) Edison uses a survey annually to assist in determining employee satisfaction developed by the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) . Employees may submit anonymous comments through the Continuous Quality Improvement Network (CQIN) where information is obtained through employee suggestions and concerns to further define employee satisfaction and its opinion of leadership. In addition, Edison uses a variety of relationship-building activities such as new associate orientation, employee holiday luncheon, annual recognition dinner for years of service, etc. Several approaches are well deployed and show cycles of learning. These approaches demonstrate a systematic approach to evaluating employee satisfaction and engagement.

5.2a(3) Edison uses several approaches to performance management including the 360-degree performance review process and individual performance plans for supervisory employees. Each of these approaches have been deployed and reviewed for improvement opportunities. Those reviews have resulted in cycles of learning and enhancements to the approaches to make them more effective. Edison's performance management system aligns with the Mission and Vision and demonstrates fact-based decision-making.

5.2a(2) Employee Working Core Values were developed from eight employee forums in 2001-02. The employee resources page on Edison's website highlights one of the working core values each week and includes pictures of employees at work exemplifying the value. These actions foster an organization that values communication from its workforce and likely result in enhanced employee engagement.

Opportunities for Improvement

5.2a(1) While Edison surveys its workforce on employee satisfaction through various means such as the employee satisfaction survey and CQIN anonymous comments, the employee satisfaction survey does not segment the data across all the departments and levels of the organization. Without appropriate segmentation, the survey results cannot identify how differing faculty types have responded or that only one member of a particular department responded. Thus, Edison may miss opportunities to capitalize on employee segment-specific data, which may result in decreased employee engagement.

5.2a(3) While Edison uses a well-defined approach and process to evaluate supervisors; it lacks a performance review process that assesses non-supervisory . Without a process to evaluate all employees, Edison may miss opportunities to identify and respond to workforce capability – skill and competency – needs.

5.2b(1) Edison has no systematic approach to address the scope of workforce engagement. For example, overall absenteeism numbers are not collected and retention numbers are not tracked nor are there goals set for these measures. Establishing a comprehensive and systematic approach that supports workforce engagement, may increase employee commitment, both emotional and intellectual, to accomplish the work, Mission, and Vision of Edison.

Strengths

6.1a(2), 6.1b(2) During Edison's budgeting process, the President's Cabinet assures alignment of Mission, Vision and Values with all proposed initiatives. Financial oversight includes monitoring monthly financial statements from the top down for cost control, revenue and departmental effectiveness. This assists in ensuring alignment throughout the resulting approved action plans at the departmental and unit level.

6.1a, 6.1a(2) Edison identifies themes of stakeholder needs and creates a key process around them. Edison addresses the needs with a series of support operations aligned with key processes (Figure 6.1-1). For example, business operations links to stakeholder needs of fiscal stability, integrity of records, etc. and is supported by accounting, payroll, purchasing, etc. This process demonstrates Edison's administrative support services are designed to address stakeholder needs.

6.1a(1) Edison uses a systematic and integrated process to design, improve, and innovate their cross-functional work systems. The Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process is supported from the top down where cross-functional teams are assigned to projects. More than 80 CQI projects have addressed work process improvements. Inclusion of all stakeholders ensures that work systems are designed to support the needs of the entire organization. One example is the organizational/institutional services that Edison provides, such as professional development, professional /public service, economic/workforce development, and enhancement of culture, which meet the needs of the students as well as Edison's service area.

Opportunities for Improvement

6.1c There is no process to evaluate the effectiveness of emergency preparedness programs. Without a process to evaluate workplace preparedness for disaster or emergencies, Edison is unable to determine the effectiveness of these procedures and to make any necessary adjustments in order to ensure the safety of its students and staff in the event of a real emergency.

6.1a(2), 6.1b(1) There is no systematic approach to ensure stakeholder, partner, and collaborators' needs are being met. Some processes do take into account teaching and/or learning; however, work systems are more reactive than proactive. One example is the recent improvements to turnaround times in their financial aid system. Without a clear systematic process to regularly improve work systems, Edison risks not meeting student and stakeholder needs which may impact Edison's brand of *A Personal Experience, A Rewarding Education*.

Strengths

6.2a Edison uses a systematic approach to review and design work processes. Edison joined CQIN and AQIP in 2001 and the CQIN Steering Committee reviews and designs work processes as part of the ongoing CQI process. Identified projects are assigned to AQIP Action Project Teams and the CQIN project teams. More than 80 work processes have been addressed with CQI teams. These approaches support the management and improvement of organizational performance and key work processes that nurture success and sustain the organization.

6.2b(3) Edison addresses innovation by encouraging faculty and staff to pursue professional development. New ideas are considered and supported if they align with Mission, Vision, and Values. Edison embarked on a redesign of its Student Affairs department that ultimately improved customer service. This approach enhances Edison's ability to meet and deliver student and stakeholder value and advance as a sustainable organization.

6.2a, 6.2b Edison uses an approach to designing, innovating, and improving work processes. The SOAR initiative is strength-based and is a positive focus for developing a strategic plan. It aligns the strategic planning process with the CQI Teams and incorporates PDCA. Implementing PDCA tracks and trends results for CQI processes. The implementation of process-strengthening approaches aligning with organizational goals delivers value to students and stakeholders and aligns with Edison's KPIs.

Opportunities for Improvement

6.2a(2) There is no evidence of what the requirements for each of the 80 CQI work process are. Without well-defined requirements, Edison may not accomplish the desired results.

6.2b(2) There is no process to ensure that suppliers are qualified and enhance student performance and stakeholder satisfaction. For example, since purchasing at Edison is decentralized and there is no common theme except "best price," Edison may consider a process of supplier management that involves assessing qualification, selection, and performance evaluation. Evaluating suppliers may be critical to enhancing supplier performance and satisfaction of stakeholders. Without a well deployed process to evaluate supplier performance and how Edison deals with poorly performing suppliers, Edison may create rework and may be unable to ensure high performance.

Category 7 - Results

7.1 Student Learning and Process Outcomes

Scoring Range: 30-45%

Strengths

7.1b(1) Edison consistently prepares registered nursing graduates - Associate of Applied Business (AAB) with the skills to pass the nursing certification. The near 100% pass rate for nursing graduates helps assure sustainability of the nursing program for Edison. Further, it demonstrates Edison's value clusters of Excellence, Competence, and Accountability.

7.1a, 7.1b Trending and segmentation data are evident. For example, Enrollment by Time of Day (Both Campuses (Figure 7.1-7) determine instructor needs by peak times thus resulting in better teacher to student ratios. Using results from the enrollment by time of day helps support Edison's Mission and Vision.

7.1a Edison demonstrates a positive trends and favorable levels for the delivery of On-line courses. For example, Enrollment by Online and Web-flex Delivery (Figure 7.1-3) shows that since 2002 online enrollment has increased 150%. NCLEX Data for Registered Nurse AAB (Figure 7.1-25) indicate a positive trend over the last three semesters of nursing students passing their licensing examination on the first attempt. In December 2011, 100% (38 students) passed on their first attempt, surpassing all cohorts in number of associate degrees awarded as evidenced by Cohort Comparison - Completion of Associate Degrees (Figure 7.1-28). These examples support the delivery of Edison's brand, *A Personal Experience, A Rewarding Education*.

Opportunities for Improvement

7.1a Post-Developmental Success - ENG 121S (Figure 7.1-18) and Post-Developmental Success – MTH 122S (Figure 7.1-19) show mixed or unfavorable results. For example, Figure 7.1-18 results show that the success rate of students taking developmental English have been at 72% or lower since 2009. This is below those not taking developmental English prior to college level. Although reasons are given for the students taking developmental English, it is critical for Edison to address underperforming results to assist in achieving their Mission and student's overall success.

7.1a Retention Comparisons 2008-2010 (Figure 7.1-26) shows that Edison consistently 55% of its full-time students, however they only retained 32% of students in 2010. Part-time retention is lower than 5 of its 6 cohort community colleges in 2010. Benchmarking with competitors or similar organizations outside the cohort may enable Edison to determine best practices and improve its retention of part-time students, the largest segment of its student population as evidenced in Gender and Enrollment Status (Figure 7.1-1).

7.1a Student learning and process outcomes performance is declining over the last two years. For example, Assessment of Mathematics (Figure 7.1-21a) shows the average has declined 12.47% in the last four AYs (2007-2011), and Annual Assessment Recap (Figure 7.1-22) indicates mixed results for 5 years with a decline from 2009-10 to 2010-11. In addition, Program Review Outcomes Assessment Recap (Figure 7.1-23) indicates declines from 2008-09 to 2010-11 for Business Management, 7%; Criminal Justice, 6%; Early childhood Education, 7%; Automation & Robotics, 4%; Marketing, 25%; and Medical Laboratory Technician, 8%. Focusing in these areas may assist Edison to increase performance and attain its Mission.

7.1a Segmentation and comparative data are missing for remedial Mathematics and English programs. For example, segmenting performance data by student and or enrollment type, would provide greater insight in determining the effectiveness of developmental courses. Further, the use of segmentation and comparative data will allow Edison the opportunity to measure their performance relative to other leading community colleges and its competitors.

7.2 Customer-Focused Outcomes

Scoring Range: 10-25%

Strengths

7.2a(2) Edison's measurement of student engagement shows favorable results as compared to the national cohort. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Aspects of High Engagement (Figure 7.2-5) indicates that in areas of highest student engagement shown, Edison outscored the 2011 benchmarks. CCSSEE and Edison segment results data into aspects of high and low engagement to allow for better assessment and improvement plans. Continuing to score favorably in this area shows positive steps toward student engagement and toward creating a sustainable organization.

7.2a(1) Student Satisfaction by Year and Campus (Figure 7.2-1) survey data from 2008 through 2012 show Edison's performance generally similar to national cohort targets. These student satisfaction results support the Mission of Edison and create sustainability.

7.2a(1) Employer Satisfaction/Nursing RN Program (Figure 7.2-4) show 100% of employers will continue to hire Edison graduates' and "100% of employers believe nurses from Edison act as effective providers of care. These high employer satisfaction results indicate Edison is providing quality Nursing students and support learning outcomes.

Opportunities for Improvement

7.2a(1) The Noel-Levitz 2010 Scale Report (Figure 7.2-3a), Noel-Levitz 2010 Institutional Summary (Figure 7.2-3b) and Noel-Levitz 2010 Identified Benchmarks (Figure 7.2-3c) do not include trend data. Showing a minimum of three historical data (not projected) points constitute a trend. Trends are important to illustrate the direction of change, the rate of change, or the consistency of performance over time. Using trend data may indicate where performance is lacking or has plateaued or where breakthrough performance has occurred. Using trend data may also increase Edison's understanding of the effectiveness of processes designed to improve and/or sustain results.

7.2a(1), 7.2a(2) Some satisfaction and engagement results show declining trends, particularly after 2010. Employer Satisfaction/Nursing RN Program (Figure 7.2-4) show two areas of the declining results and Business & Industry Enrollment (Figure 7.2-7) shows the lowest number of customers engaged since 2006-07, Library and Internet Café Usage (Figure 7.2-9) shows declines, and Learning Center Usage (Figure 7.2-10), show recent decline. Examining these results may assist Edison in improving customer satisfaction, engagement and loyalty of its different customer groups.

7.2a(1) Student satisfaction and engagement data results lack segmentation, such as segmentation by program area or student type. With a focus on student satisfaction as a key performance indicator, segmentation of results is important in providing specific indication of organizational effectiveness and improvement.

7.2a(1), 7.2a(2) Edison lacks sufficient satisfaction and engagement results data for stakeholder groups such as potential students, alumni and the community. Without results data geared to these specific groups, Edison may miss opportunities to determine effectiveness of their efforts. In addition, areas of dissatisfaction may be missed.

7.3 Workforce-Focused Outcome

Scoring Range: 10-25%

Strengths

7.3a(3) Edison provides satisfaction results for different segments of its workforce. Employee Satisfaction Survey Results, 3-Year Period (Figure 7.3-5) show a positive increase from 2010 – 2012 for only one segment - the Classified Employees. Segmenting these data may help Edison to focus process improvement efforts toward achieving higher employee satisfaction for FT Faculty, Admin/Tech, Admin/Prof and Adjunct segments and may help in reinforcing its core competencies.

7.3a(2), 7.3a(3) Employee Satisfaction Survey Participation (Figure 7.3-4) shows response percentages for four segments of its workforce. Although Edison began employee satisfaction surveys in 2006, they are in the early stages of tracking percentage participation in employee satisfaction surveys which started in 2012. Tracking employee survey participation data is allowing Edison to better assess satisfaction levels of all its employees to attain its Mission.

Opportunities for Improvement

7.3a(1) Edison does not provide trends or comparative data for workforce capability. The 2012 Employees (Figure 7.3-1) for capability are limited to only the number of employees in position types with degrees earned. Without appropriate measures, trends and comparative data in this area, Edison may not be able to evaluate and understand its performance relative to other organizations.

7.3a(4) While Edison provides a list of and participation in leadership and development opportunities, it does not provide measures, trends or comparative data for the effectiveness of these activities. For example, Leadership and Develop Opportunities (Figure 7.3-9) show only the number of participants. The impact of the various initiatives and how it helps to develop leaders is not presented. Without such measures, it may be difficult for Edison to determine the effectiveness of its professional development offerings and achieve its goals.

7.3a(2), 7.3a(3) Edison began employee satisfaction surveys in 2006, but only began tracking the participation percentage in 2012 (Figure 7.3-4). Tracking participation and trend data are needed to assure validity of results.

7.3a(2) Edison does not provide measures, trends or comparative data for workforce health or safety. Limited measures, trends and comparative data may hinder Edison's ability to ensure a safe and secure environment.

7.3a(3) Employee Satisfaction Survey Results, 3-Year Period (Figure 7.3-5) shows mixed results. The data indicates a decline over 10% from 2010-2012 in Full-Time Faculty and mixed results for Admin/Tech, Admin/Prof and Adjuncts. Identifying and addressing the reasons for these unfavorable results may assist Edison in improving engagement and improving KPIs.

7.4 Leadership and Governance Outcomes

Scoring Range: 10- 25%

Strengths

7.4a(1) Employee Satisfaction – Leadership Responsiveness (Figure 7.4-1) shows favorable results from 2001 to 2012. In addition, Employee Satisfaction Results (Figure 7.3-7) shows that in 2012, 83% of employees were satisfied with leadership (Edison’s President). These recent results are indicative of leadership’s effort to communicate with and engage its workforce and support Edison’s Mission, Vision, and Values.

7.4a(3) Edison's performance meets accreditation requirements by the Higher Learning Commission in 2007-08. The next reaffirmation of accreditation is 2014-2015. Continued accreditation is key to Edison's sustainability.

Opportunities for Improvement

7.4a(1) Leadership effectiveness results are not segmented. Without segmenting results of all leaders, Edison may be missing opportunities to reach goals and to develop a culture of accountability.

7.4a(4) Edison does not provide results, trends or comparative data for key measures of ethical behavior. Without measures to monitor ethical behavior or breaches thereof, Edison may jeopardize relationships with stakeholders.

7.4a(5) There are no results for fulfillment of its society responsibilities. Without measures of the societal impact, for example of employee participation in local events, hosting cultural events, volunteerism, and local memberships, Edison may miss opportunities to support key communities and improve organizational effectiveness.

7.5 Budgetary, Financial, and Market Outcomes

Scoring Range: 10-25%

Strengths

7.5a(1), 7.5a(2) Edison's overall financial data and market indicators (Figures 7.5-1, 7.5-3, 7.5-4) show favorable results. These results contribute to Edison’s financial stability and support their KPIs.

7.5a(2) Market Penetration Rates (Figure 7.1-16) show results segmented by high schools/districts within each county service area and by enrollment as a percentage of the service area as a whole. These results show leadership’s commitment to management by fact by analyzing the segmented data to better understand market share position and growth.

7.5a(2) Percentage of Enrollment to Service Area Population (Figure 7.5-4) shows increases from 2006 – 2010. These results demonstrate market strength and long-term sustainability.

Opportunities for Improvement

7.5a(1), No comparative data are shown for budget, financial, and market results. For example, Percentage of Enrollment to Service Area Population (Figure 7.5-4) lacks comparisons. Without performance in relationship to external competitors, Edison may miss opportunities to identify underperforming areas which could affect their budgetary, financial or market performance and hinder achievement of goals.

7.5a(1) The Budget FY 2012 (Figure 7.5-1) show operating revenue is 11.1% below projected budget. Although enrollment decreased by 7% and the percentage of students receiving federal grants increased, it is difficult to evaluate performance without trend data. Trends generally require a minimum of three historical (not projected) data points. If this trend continues, it may impact Edison’s sustainability.

7.5a(2) Although Edison shows Market Penetration Rates (Figure 7.1-16), these data are for only one year (2011) and also do show comparative data. Market Penetration Trends Overall (Figure 7.1-17 show mixed results over time. Without comparisons, Edison is not able to assess its performance relative to other organizations and may miss opportunities to increase market share.

7.5a(1), 7.5a(2) Budgetary and market results do not address significant performance segmentation levels and trends. For example, the updated 2012 NCCBP Report provided at site visit includes total number of companies but not segmented by type of company (large, small, privately-owned, etc.) Lack of segmentation and trending may prevent Edison from identifying and responding to key stakeholder needs and requirements.

END OF FEEDBACK REPORT

It is TPE’s goal that this feedback report provides your organization with actionable data and becomes a valuable tool in moving your organization forward.

Please contact Al Faber at The Partnership for Excellence at (614) 425-7157 if you have questions regarding this report.

Thank you for your support of The Partnership for Excellence.