



## Feedback Report

Edison State Community College

**June 13, 2011**

## Preparing to read your Feedback Report . . .

*This feedback report contains OPE 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 celebrate 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 for you to consider.*

- You applied to OPE 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 an Ohio Partnership for Excellence (OPE) application, you have differentiated yourself from most Ohio organizations. The Board of Examiners has evaluated your application for the Ohio 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. OPE 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 *2009-10 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
<b>Consensus Planning:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assign Item Discussion Leaders</li><li>• Review Findings From the Independent Evaluations</li><li>• Develop Draft Item Consensus Comments</li></ul>	<b>Consensus Review:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discuss Key Factors</li><li>• Discuss Items and Key Themes</li><li>• Achieve Consensus on Comments, Scores, and Site Visit Issues</li></ul>	<b>Post-Consensus Review Activities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Document Findings</li><li>• Prepare Consensus Scorebook</li><li>• Prepare for Site Visit</li></ul>

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

**Stage 4, Judges’ Review**

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

Members of the Panel of Judges may be Ohio 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.

OPE 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 OPE 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 will become this Feedback Report. The Judges’ final recommendations are then sent to the OPE 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
<b>Panel of Judges' Review:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications</li> <li>• Key Factors</li> <li>• Key Themes</li> <li>• Consensus Scorebooks</li> <li>• Site Visit Scorebooks</li> <li>• Updated Results (Category 7)</li> </ul>	<b>Evaluation by Application Tier:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations made for Bronze, Silver, Gold, and Platinum Awards</li> </ul>	<b>Assessment of Organization:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall Strengths/ Opportunities for Improvement</li> <li>• Determination of Award Level</li> <li>• Identification of category Role Models</li> </ul>

## **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 7.1–7.6) 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.

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: 2009-2010 PROCESS SCORING GUIDELINES

For Use with Categories 1–6

SCORE	PROCESS
0% or 5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ No SYSTEMATIC APPROACH to Item requirements is evident; information is ANECDOTAL. (A)</li> <li>■ Little or no DEPLOYMENT of any SYSTEMATIC APPROACH is evident. (D)</li> <li>■ An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems. (L)</li> <li>■ No organizational ALIGNMENT is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently. (I)</li> </ul>
10%, 15%, 20%, or 25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The beginning of a SYSTEMATIC APPROACH to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the Item is evident. (A)</li> <li>■ 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)</li> <li>■ Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident. (L)</li> <li>■ The APPROACH is ALIGNED with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving. (I)</li> </ul>
30%, 35%, 40%, or 45%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the Item, is evident. (A)</li> <li>■ The APPROACH is DEPLOYED, although some areas or work units are in early stages of DEPLOYMENT. (D)</li> <li>■ The beginning of a SYSTEMATIC APPROACH to evaluation and improvement of KEY PROCESSES is evident. (L)</li> <li>■ The APPROACH is in the early stages of AUGMENT with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items. (I)</li> </ul>
50%, 55%, 60%, or 65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the Item, is evident. (A)</li> <li>■ The APPROACH is well DEPLOYED, although DEPLOYMENT may vary in some areas or work units. (D)</li> <li>■ 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)</li> <li>■ The APPROACH is ALIGNED with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items. (I)</li> </ul>
70%, 75%, 80%, or 85%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the Item, is evident. (A)</li> <li>■ The APPROACH is well DEPLOYED, with no significant gaps. (D)</li> <li>■ 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)</li> <li>■ The APPROACH is INTEGRATED with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items. (I)</li> </ul>
90%, 95%, or 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, fully responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the Item, is evident. (A)</li> <li>■ The APPROACH is fully DEPLOYED without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units. (D)</li> <li>■ 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)</li> <li>■ The APPROACH is well INTEGRATED with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items. (I)</li> </ul>

## FIGURE 2: 2009-2010 RESULTS SCORING GUIDELINES

For Use with Category 7

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

**Figure 3 – 2010 Scoring Bands**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Band</b>	<b>PROCESS Descriptors</b>	<b>Band</b>	<b>Band</b>	<b>RESULTS Descriptors</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>Number</b>		<b>Score</b>	<b>Number</b>	
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	Results are reported for a few areas of importance to the accomplishment of the organization’s mission, but they generally lack trend and comparative data. Limited or no performance projections are reported
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 of importance to the 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. Limited performance projections are reported.
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 many areas of importance to the 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. Limited performance projections are reported.
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 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 Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission. Limited performance projections are reported, including those for a few high-priority areas.
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 Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission. Performance projections for some high-priority areas are reported.
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 organizational needs is evident.	301–345	6	Results address most key customer/stakeholder, market, and process requirements, as well as many action plan requirements, and some results include projections of future performance. 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 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 best practices as key management strategies.	346–390	7	Results address most key customer/stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements and include projections of future performance. Results demonstrate excellent organizational performance levels and some industry* leadership. Results demonstrate sustained beneficial trends in most areas of importance to the 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 Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission.



## Score Summaries for Edison State Community College

Process Items	Process Score Range
Item 1.1	30-45%
Item 1.2	30-45%
Item 2.1	30-45%
Item 2.2	30-45%
Item 3.1	30-45%
Item 3.2	30-45%
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	30-45%

Results Items	Results Score Range
Item 7.1	30-45%
Item 7.2	30-45%
Item 7.3	30-45%
Item 7.4	10-25%
Item 7.5	10-25%
Item 7.6	10-25%

**Your application scored in the the band 3 for process items.** 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.

**Your application scored in the band 1 for results items.** Results are reported for a few areas of importance to the accomplishment of the organization's mission, but they generally lack trend and comparative data. Limited or no performance projections are reported

## **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 Categories 1-6**

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

- Edison State Community College is committed to its mission and vision, which embrace core values arranged in clusters that support the learning outcomes. These student outcomes serve as a guide for the organization. The College's senior leaders communicate and deploy vision and core values using multiple communication mediums. Senior leaders encourage core values and promote communication throughout the organization by utilizing strategies that will give opportunities for multiple perspectives on issues throughout the decision-making process.
- The core value of valuing the workforce is a strength, as evidenced by the many recognition and reward opportunities including: employee recognition dinner, employee orientation process, the recognition of accomplishments, and supervisor acknowledgments with thank you's. The on-going analysis of employee satisfaction and the posting of these results on the dashboard indicate a key focus for the organization internally. This focus is reflected in cross-functional teams who do hiring and opportunities for staff to participate in "flex contracts."
- Edison State Community College listens to its customers using a variety of mechanisms to monitor the needs, expectations and attitudes of stakeholders. Surveys are collected regularly through Stakeholder Input Strategies. Systems are in place to gather this data through mechanisms such as focus groups, advisory committee feedback, internal feedback, and staff recommendations.
- Social responsibilities and focus on key communities represent an area of strength as evidenced through the availability of the Business and Industry Center, establishment of the business advisory board, the local police on-site academy, and contributions made to local businesses. Edison State Community College provides opportunities to all stakeholders for life-long learning.

Process Categories 1-6

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

- A systematic process used to determine and select Edison's core competencies, strategic challenges, and strategic advantages is not evident, nor are strategic objectives aligned with all of the identified challenges, (unemployment and funding), and advantages (size, agility, leading edge technology, quality of instruction/services, the brand, and cost effectiveness of instruction). A more robust approach toward addressing core competencies, strategic challenges, and advantages and ensuring that these are linked to strategy and action planning may help Edison realize innovation opportunities responding to present or future stakeholder needs.
- The scope and collection of data is uneven across the criteria categories. For example, key leadership metrics are missing, there is no evidence of a process for tracking deployment strategy to reinforce

organizational alignment, and it is not evident that Edison has a system in place for collecting and tracking ethical violations. The processes for setting target levels and determining the best comparative benchmarks for many key performance indicators are also not clearly defined.

- The use of fact-based data for improvement is not well deployed throughout Edison State. For example, a systematic process is not evident for using information to adjust processes, innovative offerings, and needed improvements in work systems and processes. Although the applicant examines stakeholder satisfaction and engagement through surveys, there is limited actionable information for use in meeting and exceeding expectations of stakeholders for organizational improvement. In addition, there is little evidence that marketing data are obtained from competitors and used to develop plans for innovation. While Edison assesses workforce engagement and satisfaction with a variety of formal and informal assessment methods, it is not evident how these methods are used to identify opportunities for both workforce engagement and organizational results.

#### Results Category 7

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

- Some results show positive levels and trends. These include graduation rates; stakeholder satisfaction with the organization, its programming, and its support services; success rates in passing the National Council for Licensing exam for nursing, and the National Council for Licensing and percent of Police Academy graduates for Ohio Peace Officer State Certification exam; and market penetration rates.

#### Results Category 7

***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, linkages) found in its response to Results Items?***

- Negative trends have been identified in some key results areas, including written communication, inquiry, and critical thinking. Results for the employee satisfaction data indicate areas that are rated below 50%. Although direct trend data is not available, Edison's explanation of workforce results levels indicated inconsistent or declining data/trends in many areas.
- Performance results and comparative data are not available for leadership trends, ethics, stakeholder trust, and fiscal accountability. The applicant shows no current data for results of key measures or indicators for fulfillment of societal responsibilities and the College's support of key communities. Levels and trends in key measures, capability, and capacity are not evident across the organization, including staffing levels and projections.
- Edison State Community College lacks key comparative data and segmentation for many results. For example, appropriate comparative data do not exist for recruitment and diversity hires, and ethical behavior reports. No segmented information is provided on the budgetary or financial performance of the applicant's various (Arts & Humanities, Business Education, Social Sciences, Science & Technologies, Engineering, Mathematics, and Medicine) programs.
- While Edison shows current levels and trends in such measures as evidenced in student learning results, there is a lack of consistent analysis and reporting of these results. Five-year trends exist, but there is no consistent analysis of the effectiveness of these measures. There is also no clear benchmarking of the measures with similar organizations.

## **DETAILS of STRENGTHS and OPPORTUNITIES for IMPROVEMENT**

### **Category 1 Leadership**

#### **Item 1.1 Senior Leadership 30-45%**

##### **STRENGTHS**

- Senior leaders communicate and deploy vision and core values using multiple communication mediums listed in 1.1b1. The mechanisms are used to communicate with key stakeholders, students, and employees.
- Leadership growth and enhancement at Edison are developed and strengthened as evidenced by professional growth activities such as attendance at state and national professional development conferences. Support for professional growth and development is further evidenced by the use of cross training and flex contracts. Edison reports many references to performance evaluation and accountability systems and processes to measure, monitor, and improve leader and workforce performance. The 360-degree process is used for selected organizational leaders. Professional membership, in-house programming, and conference attendance are all mechanisms that Edison uses to help assure workforce competence and continued development. These leadership opportunities are integrated with core working values of excellence and accountability.

##### **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- A process used to determine succession plans is not in place. Although there is a succession plan for the president, there is no process in place for succession of other key players.
- Senior leaders personally promote an environment that results in legal and ethical behavior and are held to high standards in both personal and professional activities. It is not evident, however, that a system is in place for collecting and tracking ethical violations. Collecting, tracking, and analyzing data on ethical violations may provide insight on the effectiveness of the senior leader's ability to promote a highly functioning legal and ethical environment.
- Edison cites performance evaluation and accountability systems and processes to measure, monitor, and improve leader and workforce performance. However, the organization lacks key metrics for leaders with respect to professional memberships, in-house programming, and conference attendance.

#### **Item 1.2 Governance and Societal Responsibilities 30-45%**

##### **STRENGTHS**

- Support of key communities is evidenced by the availability of the Business and Industry Center and industry business training programs such as SKILLS TRAC offered by Edison. The local police academy is also located on Edison's site. Key communities are recognized as important stakeholders through Edison's practice of including local business leaders on the community advisory committees that provide input to programs of study and curriculum. Edison has contributed to the stability of the local community with \$240 million in business sales and \$91 million in labor income through 2005.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- The applicant does not have a process in place to systematically determine areas for organizational involvement including areas related to core competencies. Systems are not in place to determine activities. Collecting, tracking, and analyzing information on key communities and societal responsibilities may increase Edison's ability to accomplish organizational goals.

### Category 2 Strategic Planning

#### Item 2.1 Strategy Development 30-45%

#### STRENGTHS

- The organization's 2010 Strategic Initiatives (Figure 2.1-2) are aligned with the USO's Strategic Plan and drive increased student learning, student access, market share, revenue availability, and student/stakeholder satisfaction. An Institutional Assessment Measurement Grid (Figure 6.2-1) exists for Master Plans & Initiatives, which documents each AQIP and Process Improvement team. Progress reviews occur monthly during Dean Council meetings.

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- **The process used to determine and select Edison's core competencies, strategic challenges, and strategic advantages is unclear. Strategic objectives do not address all of the identified challenges (unemployment/funding) and advantages (size, agility, leading edge technology, quality of instruction/services, the brand, and cost effectiveness of instruction). Addressing core competencies, strategic challenges, and advantages and ensuring that these are linked to strategy and action planning may help the organization realize innovation opportunities responding to present or future stakeholder needs.**
- Edison has an action plan, but there is no evidence of a process for tracking achievement that reinforces organizational alignment. Short-term goal targets are set, but how those targets are analyzed and improved is not evident.

#### Item 2.2 Strategy Deployment 30-45%

#### STRENGTHS

- Edison provides multiple opportunities for training and development of its employee base to ensure its ability to accomplish the action plans and initiatives and its readiness to address changing needs and expectations of student and stakeholder base.
- Edison State Community College has a Communication Repository accessible to all staff which provides a means for all internal stake-holders to review and monitor strategy mapping and action plans in terms of responsibility, timeline, and budget needs as well as the status of these initiatives.

## **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- While Edison exhibits a Master Plan tied to the AQIP Categories for the collection of data, it does not show evidence as to what processes exist for departmental analysis of the assessment data for organizational improvement. Examining an analysis process used by similar organizations may give Edison more knowledge on this.
- Edison has an action plan but has no process for tracking achievement that reinforces organizational alignment. Short term goals targets are set, but a process for how those targets are analyzed and improved does not exist. It may be helpful for Edison to determine long-term goals/targets with shorter-term goal improvement targets on a quarterly basis.

### **Category 3 Customer Focus**

#### **Item 3.1 Customer Engagement / 30-45%**

#### **STRENGTHS**

- Edison uses multiple sources of satisfaction and engagement information, including the Noel-Levitz Satisfaction Inventory. Graduation survey and CCSSE student engagement surveys help to obtain information on customer satisfaction and engagement. Labor statistics, career services data, advisory committee feedback, internship feedback and new program proposal processes provide data that reflects student and stakeholder perceptions and actions. In addition, focus groups, staff recommendations, and discussions provide the organization valuable feedback relative to key educational programming and services.
- Edison utilizes area partners to assist with the identification and innovation of educational programs, offerings, and services. Partnering is facilitated to attract new students and stakeholders, to provide feedback to Edison, and to expand relationships.
- Area employers are in partnership with Edison in identifying emerging needs and assisting in the development of new programs that in turn increase the potential for new students.

#### **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- While Edison uses surveys to gather information from and about students, a systematic process is not evident for using this information to adjust processes, innovative offerings, and expectations for needed improvements in work systems and processes.
- The process for determining all stakeholder requirements is not fully deployed. This may be important since four distinct groups of stakeholders have been identified: educational/community, board of trustees, college foundation, and accrediting agencies.
- Although Edison uses survey questions as identified in the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, it does not have clarifying types of questions and outcomes for each survey group. Such segmentation can help Edison better understand its customer groups and customize its approaches to meet their specific needs.

## **Item 3.2 Voice of the Customer / 30-45%**

### **STRENGTHS**

- Edison provides for monitoring student and stakeholder needs, expectations, and attitudes through a variety of listening and learning strategies such as surveys and market analysis.
- Edison utilizes a national survey to assess student engagement and a less formal process to assess alumni satisfaction as a means of collecting stakeholder input to determine stakeholder needs.

### **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Although Edison examines stakeholder satisfaction and engagement through surveys, it captures limited actionable information for use in meeting and exceeding expectations of stakeholders for organizational improvement.
- Although marketing decisions are based on evidence from stakeholder groups, how marketing data is obtained from competitors and how this data is used to develop plans for innovation is not available.

## **Category 4 Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management**

### **Item 4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance 30-45%**

#### **STRENGTHS**

- Edison participates in and obtains key comparative academic data from its Ohio community college cohort made up of five higher education organizations similar in size, resource availability, and program offerings. Other sources of comparative data include such organizations as those sponsoring the licensing examinations in nursing or certification examinations for Microsoft or Cisco. Some state and national data are available through required reporting sites and through data received from CCSSE. Retention and completion are compared to the federal cohort. Data is analyzed using the Ohio community college cohort, USO expectations, USO Success Points, and the review of benchmarks available through networking with AQIP- and CQIN-member organizations. These sources provide the applicant with useful benchmarks and opportunities for performance comparisons.
- The applicant has identified strategic drivers of increased student learning, student success, market share, revenue availability and student and stakeholder satisfaction. A number of selected performance indicators for these drivers are tracked on the dashboard. A significant portion of this dashboard is publicly accessible on Edison's web site allowing customers and stakeholders open access to key information.

#### **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- While it is clear that Edison's organizational decisions are data-driven and that a good deal of effort is invested in collecting and reviewing data, the applicant has not effectively defined processes to determine what "yardsticks" should be used to measure each key performance indicator and why. The processes for setting target levels and determining the best comparative benchmarks for these key performance indicators are also not clearly defined. It is important for organizations to be able to demonstrate the validity of their choice of measures and understand the rationale for what levels of these measures are acceptable and

exceptional. This may ultimately help Edison understand how successful it is in performing its core competencies, which leads to new levels of organizational confidence.

## **Item 4.2 Management of Information, Knowledge, and Information Technology 30-45%**

### **STRENGTHS**

- The organization data and information accuracy, integrity and reliability, timeliness and security and confidentiality are ensured through LAN policy agreement, restricted data entry, data verification, planned system updates and IT security (physical, firewalls, security levels, password protection). Students, faculty and community can assess organizational data and information through an online dashboard application, use of Public Folders, and a Communication Repository.
- A technology recovery plan exists with automatic backup every 24 hours and a full-system backup weekly to ensure continuity of operations. Backups defend against emergency loss of power or data within the organization protecting internal stakeholders from information loss

### **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Edison does not have systems in place for ensuring software/hardware reliability, security, and user-friendliness. Edison has a 5-year replacement practice budget consideration for software and hardware versions to ensure their systems stay current with service and technological changes. However, a proactive plan does not exist indicating steps to ensure hardware and software systems availability during an emergency event. The applicant may benefit from examining processes used by a like organization for emergency events.
- Best practices are shared through the Academic Senate and faculty professional development sessions, but there is no process for rapid identification and implementation of best practices across the organization. Nor is there evidence that a process for collecting and transferring workforce knowledge exists.

## **Category 5 Workforce Focus**

### **Item 5.1 Workforce Engagement 30-45%**

#### **STRENGTHS**

- Edison State Community College builds and maintains working and social relationships among college employees. It fosters an engaged workforce and an open communication system through employee forums held to define Employee Working Core Values.
- To carryout workforce enrichment, Edison determines key factors that affect workforce engagement and workforce satisfaction by surveys (Zoomerang, etc.) and discussion opportunities. A cross-functional “valuing people” team led by the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness provides continuing analysis and recommendations of strategies for the enhancement of the workforce environment. Edison monitors employee satisfaction and engages, compensates, and rewards its workforce for achievement by providing a variety of recognition opportunities.



## **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- While Edison employs a variety of data gathering methods and appears to solicit open communication, a systematic approach at an organizational level is not evident for fostering a culture that supports high performance work and benefits from diverse ideas, cultures, and the thinking of its workforce. Investigating systematic approaches by other organizations may provide additional knowledge to the applicant.
- Although Edison assesses workforce engagement and satisfaction with a variety of formal and informal methods, it is not evident how these methods are used to identify opportunities for improving workforce engagement and organizational results. Benchmarking and analyzing assessment methods and how opportunities for improvement are used by other organizations may provide unexpected opportunities. Identifying these opportunities may provide increased workforce performance and may decrease gaps in operational processes.

### **Item 5.2 Workforce Environment 30-45%**

#### **STRENGTHS**

- All employees, including student workers, must participate in an eight-module orientation process. The HR Department monitors individual progress in completing the orientation modules.
- Edison's hiring process for employees requires that the area supervisor and the Human Resources Department determine the characteristics and skills necessary to fulfill the needs of an open position. A review of the current position is made to determine if changes in the job description would increase organizational effectiveness or could support expanded service to their stakeholders.

#### **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Although the Employee Satisfaction survey is a means to gain valuable information from the entire staff and leadership team, systematic processes do not exist for translating the data into improvement of workforce engagement.
- While Edison provides information about employee performance evaluation, the lack of information about how the process reflects employee competence assessment and assurance may limit the College's ability to achieve its mission. Because individual competence is a significant component of organizational core competencies, aggregate information about employee competence may be helpful.

### **Category 6 Process Management**

#### **Item 6.1 Work Systems 30-45%**

#### **STRENGTHS**

- Edison supports its key performance indicators by deploying a work process designed to include and involve key stakeholders. Edison utilizes processes such as CQIN, AQIP, work process improvements, cross-functional teams, and academic advisory committees to provide innovative and responsive learning opportunities.
- The organization has clear, well-developed key processes based on key work process drivers. These key process categories include: business operations, information management, institutional support and personal

support. The drivers are listed as increased student learning, student success, market share, revenue availability, and student and stakeholder satisfaction. Based on information provided in the application as well as during the site visit, the key work processes provide adequate and appropriate support to ensure achievement of identified organizational priorities and goals.

## **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Although Edison makes numerous references to the commitment that it has made to performance and process improvement and innovation, process details focusing on innovation and defined cycles of improvement are not available. Neither the application nor the on-site interviews provided this necessary evidence: at least one cycle of improvement and innovation within work system design. Edison may benefit from benchmarking and analyzing innovation and cycles of improvement processes of similar organizations.
- Although Edison has well-written, clear information regarding key work processes, more detail is needed as to how work systems are defined and how they align with organizational core competencies. Once clearly defined, understanding the relationships between the critical organizational factors will assist the leadership of the organization to more effectively and efficiently achieve its goals.
- Although a basic emergency/disaster process is in place and deployed, it is primarily focused on internal and weather related situations and does not address other critical safety situations. Benchmarking similar organizations for risk management processes to identify target areas may assist Edison's integrity, visibility, security, and reputation.

### **Item 6.2 Work Processes 30-45%**

## **STRENGTHS**

- System planning exists and is incorporated through the PDCA methodology with mapped processes, planning improvements and recommendations, pilots, data collection and analysis, and final implementation. The applicant prevents variability in the implementation of their educational work processes that may lead to variations in student learning and success through a variety of processes and tools. The applicant has initiated a robust multi-tiered training and assessment program for the use of on-line education systems, classroom learning assessment, continuity, and feedback.

## **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- While Edison presents some evidence of student and/or stakeholder involvement in planning work processes, full stakeholder involvement throughout the entire planning and improvement cycle may ensure that processes are focused, effective, and valuable to stakeholders and organizational performance.
- Linkage between process and student success is not well documented. While it indicates that student success was improved and that educational programs and offerings are the primary focus for work improvements, Edison may gain insight from the application and analysis of a measurement plan that advances organizational learning and sustains improved educational outcomes.

## **Category 7 Results**

### **Item 7.1 30-45%**

## **STRENGTHS**

- Seventy-five percent of Edison's Police Academy graduates have completed an on-campus program, have passed the Ohio Peace Officer State Certification Examination needed for employment, and have been employed as police officers. This indicates that Edison is providing a successful preparatory experience for those students seeking to be employed as law enforcement officers.
- Figure 7.1-13 shows nursing success rates in terms of passing National Council for Licensing exam. Since 2007, only 3 of Edison's 189 nursing graduates have not passed their licensing exam. In 2010, 100% passed, although 5 did not pass on the 1st attempt. This demonstrates Edison's success in preparing students for a career in nursing.
- Figure 7.1-17 shows Edison at the top of its cohort for graduation rates in 2007, 2008 and 2009 and Figure 7.1-14 shows Edison second only to Ohio Private Non-profit 2-year institutions. These are favorable levels, trends and comparisons showing successful completions of educational experiences.
- Ohio Community Portrait Data (Figure 7.1-19) exists for a six year period with cohorts and comparisons which emphasizes an increase in students from Edison graduating from a four year institution with 12% above the state average.

## **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Appropriate comparative data do not exist for recruitment and diversity hires, and ethical behavior reports.

### **Item 7.2            30-45%**

## **STRENGTHS**

- Data gathered from Edison indicates positive stakeholder satisfaction with programming, and with support services with an increase in percentages over the previous year. Students' satisfaction is above 75% in all areas with areas in the 90% for the following: internship experiences, financial aid, advising, and convenience in paying fees. Results in selected areas relative to customer focus outcomes such as High School Penetration Rates Figure 7.2-4 and Business and Industry Enrollment Figure 7.2-6 are segmented. Various other measures of customer focus include critical comparative data and are targeted on strengths, opportunities, weaknesses, and threats.

## **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Segmentation does not exist for several key outcomes in this Item. The Noel-Levitz survey has been used to measure levels of student satisfaction; however, evidence of specific targets is not reported. The identification of key outcomes may assist Edison in more fully understanding its success relative to customer-focused outcomes.
- Negative trends have been identified in academic areas such as written communication, inquiry, and critical thinking (Figures 7.1-7, 7.1-8, and 7.1-9 respectively). Comparisons with similar programs and organizations are not evident, leaving undetermined whether the results are comparable to current academic trends or indicators of program shortfalls.

**Item 7.3                    30-45%**

**STRENGTHS**

- Edison’s reported financial results suggest budgetary compliance FY2009 93.81% within budget and FY2010 96.87% within budget.
- Edison’s reported market penetration rate (Figure 7.2-4) is 18.84%, exceeding the 10% benchmark metric. Edison has increased enrollment headcount/credit hours (Figure 7.2-3) since 2007 FR, has increased business & industry enrollment (Figure 7.2-6), and nearly doubled online enrollment from 1931 to 3692 credit hours. Dual enrollment programs have also increased from 4544 to 5444 since 2007.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- No segmented information is provided on the budgetary or financial performance of Edison’s various (Arts & Humanities, Business Education, Social Sciences, Science & Technologies, Engineering, Mathematics, and Medicine) programs.
- Edison’s Cost per Student Credit Hour (Figure 7.3-1) has been greater than comparative institutes (since 2007) and the Cost per FTE (Figure 7.3-2) has fluctuated/increased since 2007.

**Item 7.4                    10-25%**

**STRENGTHS**

- Results for employee satisfaction data indicates achievement of employee knowledge of Edison’s mission and job expectations.
- Edison reports a rising trend in Student Credit hours for SOC and is making staff hiring decisions based on these trends

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Results for the employee satisfaction data indicate areas that are rated below 50%. The organization could investigate similar survey results from other organizations and examine methods used to improve data in those areas.
- Applicant’s explanation of workforce result levels indicated although direct trend data is not available, inconsistent or declining data/trends in many areas are suggested. (fig.7.4-1) Additionally, low participating rates in some critical areas (less than 10% of faculty responded) although they teach 60% of all classes may mean that the data is skewed or incomplete. The applicant would benefit from more analysis of results and trends as reported in Employee Satisfaction results for 2006-2008 as well as summary of the 2009-2010 results.

**Item 7.5                    10-25%**

**STRENGTHS**

- Key business processes are cited in Figure 6.1-1 The Strategy Map for the college-wide initiatives is available to the public through the CQI web page and is reviewed monthly by the Board of Trustees.

## **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Although many initiatives do exist, there is no routine process for analyzing performance and process improvement initiatives. Formalization of these efforts may facilitate better use of information in areas such as readiness emergencies performance measure that ensure student learning, and stakeholder satisfaction
- Key measures or indicators of importance to Edison State to verify process initiatives and deployment are not evident, including productivity, cycle time and other measures of process efficiency and innovation. Such measures can assist the leadership in documenting performance improvement.

### **Item 7.6**                    *10-25%*

## **STRENGTHS**

- Edison has a monthly budgeting review process with the Board of Trustees in a public session on budget status and monthly statements. The percentage of actual expenditures to the budgeted amount is shown in Figure 7.1-1. At last reporting, November 2010, income showed only a 3.14% difference from their budget, demonstrating responsible fiscal management.
- Edison received accreditation in 2007-2008 from the Higher Learning Commission, indicating that they are moving in a positive direction.

## **OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Performance results and comparative data are not available for leadership trends, ethics, stakeholder trust, and fiscal accountability.
- Cost per Credit hour increased in Figure 7.3-1 for 2008. Although it decreased, it is still higher than competitors in 2009.
- Although it reports support of community through many avenues, Edison shows no current data for results of key measures or indicators for fulfillment of such societal responsibilities and support of key communities.

## **END OF FEEDBACK REPORT**

It is OPE's goal that this feedback report provides your organization with actionable data and becomes a valuable tool in moving your organization forward. Please contact the Ohio Partnership for Excellence at (614) 441-8337 if you have questions regarding this report.

Thank you.