Preparing to read your feedback report . . .

Your feedback report contains the Michigan Quality Council Examiners’ observations that are based on their understanding of your organization. They have provided comments on your organization’s strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to the Baldrige Criteria. The feedback is not intended to be comprehensive or prescriptive. It will tell you where Examiners think you have important strengths to celebrate and where they think key improvement opportunities exist. The feedback will not necessarily cover every requirement of the Criteria, nor will it say specifically how you should address these opportunities. You will decide what is the most important to your organization and the best way to address the opportunities.

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.

- Take a deep breath and approach your feedback with an open mind. You applied to get the feedback. Read it, take time to digest it, and read it again.

- Especially note comments in **boldface type**. These comments indicate particularly important observations – those that the Examiner Team felt had substantial impact on your organization’s practices, capabilities, or results (either a strength or opportunity for improvement) and, therefore, had more influence on the team’s scoring of that particular Item. In addition, the team placed comments in order of importance from most important to less important.

- You know your organization better than the Examiners know it. If Examiners had misread your application or misunderstood information contained in the application, don’t discount the whole feedback report. Consider the other comments and focus on the most important ones.

- 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 strengths comments as a foundation to improve the things you do well. Sharing those things you do well with the rest of your organization can speed organizational learning.

- Prioritize your opportunities for improvement. You can’t do everything at once. Think about what’s most important for your organization at this time and decide which things to work on first.

- 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.
KEY THEMES – PROCESS ITEMS

During the Consensus Review of the written application for the Michigan Quality Leadership Award, the Consensus Team found the descriptor for **scoring band 4** to be most accurate for the Process Items (Items 1.1 – 6.2). For an explanation of the process scoring bands, please refer to Process Scoring Band Descriptors in Table 3.

An organization in band 4 typically demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the overall requirements of the Items, 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.

a. The most important strengths or outstanding practices (of potential value to other organizations) identified in the response to Process Items are as follows:

- The Grand Rapids Community College (GRCC) Path to Success (GPS) provides the organization a framework to achieve performance excellence and aligns overall direction from the mission, vision, and values (MVV). The Strategic Planning System (SPS) with its environmental scanning, strategies, Indicators of Success, and College Action Projects (CAP) provide a systematic system for strategic plan development and implementation.

- GRCC demonstrates management by fact through use of the Indicators of Success (IOS), a system that creates a framework for a college dashboard organized by the Ends. The IOS is facilitated through the use of an 80-member Strategic Leadership Team (SLT) accountable to the President and his Cabinet. Throughout the year the organization uses the IOS measurement system to ensure that key performance requirements are on track and being met. The culmination of these activities is summarized into the highest reporting mechanism, the Board Monitoring Report (BMR).

- GRCC uses the Process Design and Improvement/Innovation Approach (PDIA) as a systematic approach to design and manage key processes. The PDIA uses multiple methods to communicate with and gather voice of the customer (VOC) inputs from students, workforce, stakeholders, partners, and suppliers. These inputs help the organization determine customer and stakeholder requirements, which in turn are used as inputs for the creation of College Action Plans (CAP) and Department Action Plans (DAP). The PDIA supports student learning and operational systems as it guides the design or re-design of work processes (Figure 6.2-1) by considering the scope of the project, goals, and impact to other departments, resource needs and measures of success. An example of an effective use of the PDIA process is the New Program Review Process, which has systematically been deployed to review academic programs in a way that is meaningful and useful to stakeholders with the goal of offering quality education to students.

b. The most significant opportunities, concerns, or vulnerabilities identified in responses to Process Items are as follows:

- An effective, systematic approach is not evident for a number of multiple criteria requirements. Examples of these missing approaches include senior leadership participation...
in succession planning and the development of future leaders, creating an environment that fosters innovation, evaluating core competencies and identifying new competencies, projecting competitor future performance, knowledge management, selecting and using comparative information, using performance review findings to share lessons learned and best practices across the organization, measuring the effectiveness of the learning and development system, and career progression and succession planning. Without systematic approaches that are well-ordered and repeatable in these areas, the organization may limit its ability to achieve its vision and Ends.

- In many key areas where systematic processes are shown, the organization lack systematic cycles of learning. For example, key processes such as leadership processes for Board and President assessment, GRCC Path to Success (GPS), the Strategic Planning System (SPS), Ethics Monitoring System (EMS), and the Work System Development all lack systematic cycles of improvement and learning. Without routinely evaluating key process, the organization may risk not learning and adapting as the needs of its various stakeholders change, resulting in an inability to sustain high performance.
KEY THEMES – RESULTS ITEMS

During the Consensus Review of the written application for the Michigan Quality Leadership Award, the Consensus Team found the descriptor for **scoring band 4** to be most accurate for the Results Items (Items 7.1 – 7.6). For an explanation of the results scoring bands, please refer to Results Scoring Band Descriptors in Table 4.

For an organization in band 4 for Results Items, results typically 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.

c. **Considering the organization’s key factors, the most significant strengths found in response to Results Items are as follows:**

- **GRCC's strong focus on students is demonstrated by student success in achieving personal goals** (Figure 7.1-3), their persistence (Figure 7.1-4), their performance (Figures 7.1-7 and -9), and their graduation (Figure 7.1-11). Students are also satisfied with their experience as demonstrated by Figures 7.2-1 through 7.2-7, which show favorable levels of performance. Figure 7.2-1 “Would Recommend” Satisfaction, for example, not only has favorable levels from 2009 to 2011 but also compares favorably to other CCSSE Peers in performance for 2011. This focus on the organization’s key customer, the student, shows its commitment to the GRCC Experience End in giving the student the “university experience.”

- **GRCC shows favorable results for some workforce and process outcomes.** Positive workforce outcome examples include OSHA lost time injury rates favorably declining (Figure 7.3-7) and workers compensation costs also declining favorably (Figure 7.3-8), both of which can affect insurance and other medical costs and ultimately financial performance. In addition, several results for operational process effectiveness show beneficial levels and trends. For example, the number of days in accounts payable (Figure 7.1-21) has decreased from 2007 to 2011 and the IT help desk (Figure 7.1-23) has increased the number of issues solved at first contact from 2006 to 2010.

d. **Considering the organization’s key factors, the most significant opportunities, vulnerabilities, and/or gaps (related to data, comparisons, linkages) found in its response to Results Items are as follows:**

- **For a number of results the organization has not analyzed the data nor taken action to address declining trends.** For example, Figure 7.5-14 GRCC Market Share shows a favorable trend in workforce share but an unfavorable trend in college bound share from 2010-2011. There was no analysis of these trends to re-direct strategy deployment through CAP/DAP modification to address this result. Similarly, Figure 7.1-24 EPAS Success Rate has an unfavorable trend as reported from 2008 when results showed 100% Success Rate, but no efforts are underway to understand either the decline or effect a reversal of the unfavorable trend using updated procedures, practices, or policies for the emergency phone system. Without evaluating results and taking corrective action as appropriate the organization may be missing opportunities to respond quickly to adverse trends.
• Although overall data are readily available for important results areas, there is a lack of segmented data that would assist the organization in meeting organizational goals. For instance, Figure 7.2-11 show an unstable trend in student engagement factors such as active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student faculty interaction, and support for learners, but the data are not segmented by market segment or educational programs or service. Additionally, Figure 7.3-11 is lacking in segmented data for turnover by race, gender, or job type. Figure 7.3-14 is also lacking in segmented data for staff engagement and satisfaction indicators. Segmented and disaggregated data frequently reveal opportunities that are masked by the aggregated data. By not analyzing segmented data GRCC may be missing opportunities to target improvement efforts and improve results, compromising the organization’s ability to focus on workforce engagement and customer engagement to meet its Ends.

• While GRCC has identified several sources of competitive and comparative, results are often to the industry mean and not to geographic best competitor or best in sector performance. For example, Figure 2.2-3 Performance Projections does not include many of the comparison data results for geographic competitors. Many performance results are not compared against industry benchmarks. Alignment with these benchmarks and identifying appropriate institutions to compare with would help GRCC set targets and goals that may help in its continuous improvement journey. For an organization seeking high performance, “regression toward the mean” will not be sufficient to set stretch goals to improve performance.
DETAILS OF STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Category 1 – Leadership

1.1 Senior Leadership

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(1) Senior leaders and the Board set and review the mission, vision, and values (MVV) annually as part of the Strategic Planning System (SPS), which is a key element of the GRCC Path to Success (GPS). The MVV are then deployed and communicated at regular intervals to faculty/staff, students, and other stakeholders through methods such as orientation, GRCC Today, performance evaluations, and reward/recognition (Figure 1.1-2 and Figure 1.1-3). The MVV are also deployed through a variety of printed material distributed on-campus to students and stakeholders and off-campus to suppliers and others. The systematic deployment of MVV allows senior leaders to align the work of the organization and promote organizational sustainability.

- b(1) Senior leaders encourage two-way communication and dissemination of key decisions through a variety of methods listed in Figure 1.1-3. Examples include Coffee and Conversation with the President, email, and committee and department meetings. Key leadership decisions are cascaded down through the organization to the entire workforce/community as appropriate. This framework of varying methods allows senior leaders to engage the entire workforce through the sharing of goals and other key decisions that allow the organization to create value for students and other stakeholders.

- b(2) Senior leaders create a focus on action to accomplish objectives and improve performance by implementing a system of College Action Projects (CAPs), and associated Indicators of Success (IOS). Senior leaders are personally involved in the system by acting as champions for some CAPs, reviewing the associated Indicators of Success (IOS), and tracking progress with other CAP champions.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(2) While the organization has implemented an Ethics Monitoring System (EMS), there is no systematic approach for senior leaders to demonstrate by their actions their commitment to legal and ethical behavior. Senior leaders’ demonstration of ethical behavior could help them build transparency and a culture where ethical behavior is valued and fostered by all stakeholders, achieving the values of respect and integrity.

- a(3) Senior leaders have not addressed several areas important to creating a sustainable organization. They do not have a systematic approach for participating in succession planning and the development of future organizational leaders. They do not have a systematic approach to creating an environment for innovation. The involvement of senior leaders in succession planning and creating an environment for innovation may
help build a sustainable organization as well as achieve their mission and strategic objectives.

- a/b Key senior leadership processes are not refined through cycles of evaluation and improvement to encourage significant change or innovation. Building in the opportunity for evaluation and improvement to these processes may assist GRCC to build a more effective leadership system.
1.2 Governance and Social Responsibility

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- **a(1)** GRCC has a well-deployed and systematic approach to address several areas of its governance system including accountability for management actions, transparency in operations, independence of internal and external audits, and protection of stakeholder interests. Examples include the Policy Review and Development Process, monthly review of financial and purchasing reports, and the use of external audits. Meeting agendas are published in advance, open to the public, and broadcast on television. These approaches promote transparency and help the organization achieve its mission and Ends.

- **c(1)** The organization has multiple initiatives to address its contribution to environmental sustainability. Examples include the installation of a living/green roof that has reduced rainwater run-off and increased heating/cooling efficiency and a partnership with the energy education department to reduce energy consumption. The Sustainability Council has implemented mini-grants to faculty and staff seeking to implement various instructional and operational initiatives. As acknowledged in the Board’s assessment of the President, the College saved $3.5 million in 2011-12 and targets to save $7.2 million in 2012-13 through its green initiatives.

- **b(1)** GRCC addresses adverse impacts on society of its educational programs and services, and anticipates public concerns by listening to the community through the deployment of several two-way communication methods such as community conversation and coffee meetings. It additionally uses its Environmental Scan and Strategic Planning System (SPS) to prepare for the impacts and concerns in a proactive manner. It manages accreditation requirements through the AQIP accreditation process. It addresses risks through the Risk Management Team. These systematic approaches may help GRCC to remain 100% compliant with regulatory requirements and achieve or surpass accreditation requirements and achieve its mission and Ends.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- **a(2)** Senior leaders and the Board do not use their performance reviews to improve both their personal leadership effectiveness and that of the leadership system. While performance reviews are used to set goals for the subsequent year, the information is not used to improve leadership effectiveness through follow-up actions. Systematic use of performance review data may help the organization improve the governance and leadership systems while fulfilling the values of excellence and accountability.

- **b(2)** The Ethics Monitoring System (EMS), developed to promote and ensure ethical behavior in all interactions, is not fully deployed and has not undergone any cycles of improvement. Staff members are generally unaware of the policies or what they would do in a situation that violated the policy. While the organization monitors and resolves breaches of ethical behavior through policy making, it does not cover the entire scope of ethical behavior of students, management, leadership, staff, other stakeholders, partners,
and suppliers. Effective deployment of the Ethics Monitoring System with cycles of learning may help the organization adhere to the values of accountability, sustainability, and integrity.

• c(2) GRCC does not measure the effectiveness of activities targeted at supporting and strengthening its key communities. Although it has identified key communities, it does not systematically determine areas for organizational involvement. Participation in the various community outreach events is not systematically aligned with core competencies. For example, while senior leaders participate and contribute to improving the KISD, systematic determination of areas for organizational involvement could help GRCC make a more meaningful impact and communicate the benefit derived from its involvement.
Category 2 – Strategic Planning

2.1 Strategy Development

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(1) GRCC use the Strategic Planning System (SPS), a well-deployed, systematic approach to strategic planning (Figure 2.1-1) that includes environmental scanning and student inputs. The Strategic Leadership Team (SLT), which consists of 80 members representing all areas of the organization, reviews the mission, vision, values (MVV), and Ends annually. The SLT then uses a Visioning Exercise, an IOS exercise, and a Mix-Max Session to formulate strategies based on the group’s analysis of inputs. College Action Plans (CAPs) are created to address short- and longer-term horizons (1-3 years). The SPS includes goals and approaches that are aligned with the organization’s Ends.

- a(2) The organization continuously gathers and analyzes information from a variety of key sources (Figure 2.1-2), which allows for informed decisions to be made when developing strategies and action plans. For example, inputs related to technology shifts, market/demographic shifts, student preferences, and regulatory requirements are collected and analyzed through Institutional Research and Planning (IRP).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(1)(2) A systematic approach to evaluate existing core competencies and identify needed core competencies is not in place. For example, the core competencies relate to the Ends, but there is no process in place to ensure that these are challenging for competitors to imitate. Without a systematic approach to identify core competencies, the organization may not be able to address strategic challenges efficiently.

- a(1) While the Strategic Planning System underwent cycles of improvement for more than ten years and was redesigned in 2009, the current SPS with its supporting sub-processes does not have built in opportunities for evaluation and improvement. Without cycles of learning, the organization may have blind spots in future strategic objective development.

- a(2) Although input from nonstudent stakeholders (key suppliers/partners/collaborators) is collected, there is not a systematic process to include the feedback in the strategic planning process. Nonstudent stakeholder feedback was collected in 2010, but there was not a process to disseminate and incorporate the information into the Strategic Leadership Team analysis. Nonstudent stakeholders are critical to the delivery of student services; including their input may provide the opportunity to enhance strategy development through a systematic process.
2.2 Strategy Deployment

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(1)(2) GRCC has a systematic approach to develop and implement action plans to achieve key strategic objectives. College Action Projects (CAP) and their alignment to strategies are shown in Figure 2-2.1. When the strategies and CAP have been determined, Champions complete CAP Worksheets. Strategy action plans are developed in collaboration with the teams and departments impacted. The teams later align the Indicators of Success (IOS) and develop their plans, goals, resource requirements, etc., to support the CAP. CAP Champions then work with department and team leaders to ensure this work is accomplished effectively.

- a(3) Financial resources are available to support and accomplish College Action Projects (CAPs) through the budgeting process. CAP resource requests are prioritized and balanced against funding needs for current obligations and the impact on students. If a CAP cannot be funded during the initial budgeting cycle, it is either placed in a long-term status and funded when additional funds become available (e.g., additional tuition revenue or cost savings), or is piloted using up to $20,000 awarded from the Strategic Leadership Team to evaluate the expected impact on meeting the Ends and strategic objectives.

- a(5) The approach to action plan measurement includes the development of Indicators of Success (IOS). These are deployed through several dashboards at college and department levels. For example, IOS measures listed in Figures 2.1-3 reflect sample IOS relation to the Ends, Strategies, and College Action Plans (CAPs). The plan development step of the Strategic Planning System cascades the Indicators of Success to the department level ensuring further alignment.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(6) GRCC does not have a systematic process to evaluate action plan modification effectiveness to ensure that key outcomes meet target or sustain performance. For example, the organization designed the CAP process to promote agility and empowerment over systematic refinement of underperforming action plans. The process lacks an objective means to evaluate an action plan’s success. Using a systematic process to evaluate and refine action plans, and potential subsequent modifications, could enhance the organization’s ability to successfully adapt if circumstances require a shift in plans.

- b GRCC lacks a systematic process to project competitors’ future performance and compare to GRCC performance. Without projecting competitor performance, it may be challenging for the organization to evaluate how it is performing in relation to competitors. This is important as the organization seeks to distinguish itself from competitors and identify and prioritize opportunities for improvement.
Category 3 – Customer and Market Focus

3.1 Customer and Market Knowledge

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(1) GRCC uses many listening methods to gather Voice of the Customer Data for student and stakeholder groups, both formal and informal, across student life cycle, both current and alumni (Figure 3.1-1). The organization also gathers feedback from feeder schools through meetings with counselors, employers, the community, and from transfer schools through the articulation agreement process. Student data is reviewed at the department level and committee level. This approach supports the organization’s efforts in achieving the End of student success.

- b(1) The organization uses multiple methodologies to obtain actionable student satisfaction and engagement information. Examples include the CCSSE, SENSE, and Noel-Levitz surveys. These methods will assist the organization in accomplishing the mission and vision.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- b(1) Satisfaction and engagement metrics are not deployed for each market segment. For example, engagement and satisfaction measurements for credit program students are deployed throughout the organization through mediums such as The Indicators of Success Report. However, engagement and satisfaction measurements for workforce training students or non-credit program students are not deployed. Satisfaction and engagement measures for all market segments will assist the organization in providing quality learning opportunities for the community.

- b(2) Although GRCC has an approach to collect student and stakeholder satisfaction data relative to competitors, the level of current students’ satisfaction with a competitor of GRCC is not collected. As an example, the organization administers an alumni survey that asks respondents which institution they most recently attended and whether they transferred from another 2-year or 4-year institution. But respondents are not asked to provide any information regarding their experience at their current or former institution. Taking advantage of this survey opportunity may assist GRCC in meeting its Ends of student success.

- b(3) The process of using actionable information to meet the needs of stakeholders is not as deployed as it is for students. For instance, credit program student dissatisfaction results are aggregated and analyzed by IRP, communicated to ASAD, reported to Dean’s Council, and ultimately deployed throughout the organization. But the same reporting structure is not routinely applied to workforce training customers or non-credit program students. Recognizing this opportunity will support the organization’s value of responsiveness.
3.2 Customer Relationship and Satisfaction

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

• b(2) GRCC has an approach to complaint management that involves suggestion boxes, Facebook, call center tracking, and community listening events. Frontline staff members who receive complaints are empowered to resolve them immediately. If there is a trend in the type of complaints being serviced, or if a complaint cannot be resolved at the frontline or department level, then it is referred to the Student Conduct office for a final resolution. This process supports the organization’s values of responsiveness and accountability.

• a(1) The organization has an effective process for innovation in program development as demonstrated by programs that assist students through the student life cycle. Some of these programs are: The Pathways to Employment Innovation project, 3+1 agreements, financial aid lab, and incorporating 4 year colleges into the ease of the transfer process. These approaches may help GRCC build strong relationships with students and stakeholders and support its core competencies.

• b(1) GRCC has a mature approach to building relationships with new and retained students by using processes such as the Customer Relationship Management System, college fairs, active and collaborative learning, and orientation programs.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

• a(3) The organization does not have a systematic process for using student and stakeholder, market, and educational programs and services information to identify and anticipate future student and stakeholder groups and market segments. For example, the organization began to receive a high volume of applications for admissions from students who were veterans. A staff member recognized this trend and GRCC responded and began a campaign to market to and recruit veterans. Without a system to proactively anticipate student groups and market segments the organization may not identify opportunities and may not be in a position to assist some student groups in achieving their educational goals.

• a(1) The organization does not have a systematic process for proactively identifying programs and services for its students. For instance, the UJIMA program was established as a result of voluntary feedback from male African-American students who wanted to feel “a part of.” Without a data-driven process for identifying programs and services to support the student body and stakeholders, GRCC may be challenged to provide quality programs and high level support to their students.
Category 4 – Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management

4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(1) There is a systematic approach to the selection, collection, and alignment of performance measures through the Indicators of Success. For example, Indicators are specifically chosen to track performance toward a goal that supports achieving an End, which integrates them into the strategic plan as demonstrated by Figure 2.1-3. This alignment of organizational performance measurement allows GRCC the means to track organizational performance.

- c(2) GRCC projects its own future performance using historical trends, an environmental scan, limited competitor and comparative performance data, and anticipated impact of College Action Projects. Figure 2.2-3 states short- and long-term projections along with competitor data where available. Projecting future performance aligns with the organization’s value of sustainability.

- b The organization has a well deployed process for performance review through the Indicators of Success and the Board Monitoring Report. The Indicators of Success are tracked on a regular basis and cascaded through multiple levels of the organization. The Board Monitoring Report is used to review organizational performance in respect to achieving the Ends. The report is inclusive of the End it is to achieve, associated strategies, Indicators of Success with performance data, and the supporting College Action Plans. This deployment allows GRCC the means to monitor organizational performance and level of progress towards achievement of Department Action Plans, College Action Plans, strategies, and Ends.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(2) GRCC does not have a systematic process to select and effectively use comparative information for the purpose of strategic and operational decision making. Where comparative data are utilized it is often a like-peer average, with lack of consideration of geographic competitors or sector leaders or best practice. There are different comparisons used at different times, which may impact the ability to identify gaps. The effective use of comparative data may assist the organization in ensuring that it is performing at desired levels in relation to others in higher education and that it is achieving the vision of being a college of distinction.

- c(1)(3) The organization lacks a systematic approach to using performance review findings to share lessons learned and best practices across the organization. For example, communication regarding results of performance reviews and subsequent improvements to those impacted is the responsibility of the CAP champion, but each may not share consistently. This may limit GRCC’s ability to continuously improve, innovate, and progress to End achievement.
4.2 Management of Information, Information Technology, and Knowledge Management

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- b(1) GRCC ensures hardware and software are reliable, secure, and user-friendly by a variety of approaches that consider faculty, staff, and student needs in a prioritized fashion. For example, requests for upgrades are made regularly and applied to the instructional environment first to ensure student and instructor access to the latest technology. The organization also utilizes multiple servers, load balancing, swappable components, and regular maintenance, which provide the resources to assist in achieving student success.

- b(2) A variety of tools, backup, and redundant systems assure continuity of service and continued availability of systems. This is provided through a secondary data center, Storage Area Network, and the ability to perform backups without shutting down databases or interrupting service. These backups provide the ability to roll back data to a secure point in time. Practices such as these allow for the organization to serve students, staff, and stakeholders effectively.

- a(2) Information is made accessible to multiple stakeholder groups through a variety of methods. Throughout the main campus GRCC provides 100% wireless network coverage and a process to provide the same service to off-campus sites with a primary and secondary provider. Students, faculty, employees, and partners have off site access 24/7 via portals, the Campus Wide Information System, and the college website all of which house a vast array of information on numerous aspects of the college and community. This aligns with the End of student success.

- a(1) GRCC has a systematic approach to managing organizational data and information in respect to integrity and reliability, timeliness, security, and confidentiality. For example, the organization controls access to sensitive and confidential information in compliance with FERPA. Cycles of learning are evident with the addition of a Project Management Office and use of change management. This well deployed process provides dependable data for student service, workforce effectiveness, and operational success.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(3) Although GRCC has instances of knowledge transfer through Learning Days, presentations, and archived PDIA project information, there is not a systemic process for knowledge management. For example, a large workforce departure occurred through retirement and there was not a process to capture the institutional knowledge held by these departing employees. Utilizing a well-ordered and repeatable process for knowledge management may increase the organization’s ability to leverage its diverse knowledge base to enhance continuous improvement through best practice sharing and innovation.

- a(1) The organization lacks a systematic approach to the management of organizational data in respect to accuracy. For example, there are multiple systems that house data and
do not interface; as such there is no method to assure data are consistent and correct from application to application. A systematic approach to ensuring data are accurate is important to student service, performance measurement, and organizational success.
Category 5 – Workforce Focus

5.1 Workforce Engagement

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- **a(1)** GRCC uses a systematic approach to assess workforce needs and capacity. Prior to job postings, a job description is developed and staff members are involved in assessing the need for the position and gaining authorization from the Cabinet. Workforce levels are assessed at a department level through the Budget Review Process that the human resource department piloted in 2012.

- **a(3)** In accordance with the mission, vision and values, management and organization of the workforce reinforces a student focus. Student success is focused on in performance evaluations. Faculty portfolios include personal statements of teaching and learning philosophy, evidence of effective teaching, and evidence of student service.

- **b(2)** The organization supports its workforce through a number of services and benefits. GRCC provides a competitive compensation and benefits package. All employee groups are offered cafeteria options for health care plans and reimbursement for vision and dental. Paid time off may be ‘donated’ to employees in need. In addition, a number of professional development opportunities exist both internally and externally.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- **b(1)** There is not a systematic approach to workforce safety, health, and wellness although there are Wellness & Enrichment and Risk Management Teams. While the Wellness & Enrichment Team sponsors a number of wellness events and initiatives, these are not measured to demonstrate the impact of the programs. The Risk Management Team promotes safety in a variety of ways, but the team itself meets as needed and has not met in one year. Systematic efforts in these areas may allow the organization to increase wellness and safety and to reduce risk.

- **a(4)** The organization is in the early stages of developing an approach to manage workforce change. While memorandums to staff address workforce level changes, discussions indicate that some groups were not notified when nine open positions were frozen this past year. A well-defined approach that is used systematically will promote transparency and shared decision making during periods of both reduction and growth.

- **a(2)** GRCC does not have a strategic approach to recruiting a diverse workforce. Various approaches are used to attract and retain the workforce in general, but there is no intentional approach to ensure that the workforce represents the diversity of the student population and the community. A strategic approach in this area will allow the organization to meet its strategic challenge of recruiting diverse candidates.
5.2 Workforce Environment

Your score in this Item is in the 30% - 45% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(1)b(1) The Personal Assessment of the College Environment survey (PACE), supplemented with the Staff Opinion Survey, provides GRCC with data to identify and assess key drivers that are most important to the workforce, such as Empowerment and Trust, Teamwork and Cooperation, Student Focus, and Committed Employees. These surveys assess workforce satisfaction and engagement. Other methods additionally used to assess these areas include exit interviews, focus groups, and informal conversations with the workforce. Awareness and assessment of key drivers will allow GRCC to focus on improvement in these areas.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- c(1) There is no systematic process to ensure that employees continue to train and develop. Meet and Confer employees are encouraged to complete a 20-hour training requirement annually through their performance evaluation system. Employee covered by collective bargaining agreements (the majority of employees) generally complete only their compliance training although they are also encouraged to complete the 20 hours of training. A systematic approach to promote workforce development for all employees may enhance the level of skill and competency and reinforce continuity during retirements and departures.

- c(2) There is no systematic process to measure the effectiveness of the learning and development system to determine whether offerings are meeting the needs of participants and employees are gaining overall skills. While dollars are tracked, no measures of effectiveness are in place for trainings such as new employee orientation, adjunct faculty orientation, the Leadership Institute, and the Professional Development System. A full understanding of the effectiveness of these offerings will allow the organization to identify improvements and meet the End of workforce development.

- a(3) GRCC’s performance management system is not systematic in approach to support high performance and workforce engagement and reinforce a student focus. Within the Meet and Confer group, the Performance Evaluation System (PES) is a systematic, fully-deployed and aligned tool used to focus on action plan achievement. For union groups, performance improvement goals are set, but goal measurement does not occur. Adjunct faculty members, who make up half of the workforce, are evaluated by student evaluations and initial teaching observations and do not set goals. A fully deployed performance management system may better align the organization to achieve action plans and meet the Ends.

- c(3) GRCC does not have a systematic approach to career progression and succession planning. The Leadership Institute is used for emerging leaders; however, these individuals are not prioritized when promotion opportunities arise. By policy, the
President is required to have two successors, but outside of this, leaders choose their own successors at the time of retirement or departure. A systematic approach to career progression and succession planning may help to promote high performing employees and support sustainability.
Category 6 – Process Management

6.1 Work Systems Design

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- b(1) GRCC manages and improves work systems by utilizing its team structure and considering various customer inputs. Lower tier work systems are reviewed for improvement needs through the regular collection of student and other stakeholder feedback, which leads to the formation of teams around College Action Plans or Department Action Plans. For example, based on student complaints and feedback, the Financial Aid department was moved from the Operational work system to the Student Learning work system to better align with other services provided to students. This change was made with careful consideration by Cabinet and other leadership to ensure a seamless transition for students and employees.

- c The organization has a systematic approach for workplace preparedness for disasters and emergencies that includes assurances for continuity of services in case of an emergency. The Crisis Response team developed the Crisis Response and Communication plan that is consulted in an emergency situation to determine the necessary internal and external response. Learnings from regularly performed drills or past events are analyzed to evaluate the emergency response process and make improvements. In addition, plans are in place to provide continuity of service in case of an emergency, such as agreements with GVSU and Ferris State to utilize classroom space in the event of an emergency. Having such a well-developed system provides a safe and secure working and learning environment.

- a1) GRCC has a systematic approach to determining which processes and services offered by the college will remain internal and which will use external resources. The Budget Review Process allows leadership to review expenses and consider areas where savings could be captured by using external resources while also considering the capabilities of the organization. For example, parking services and food services are not considered a core competency of the organization and are therefore provided by external companies. Consistently utilizing this process will allow the organization to monitor and control the costs of providing services while balancing the impact on employees and stakeholders.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(2) There is no evidence of cycles of learning related to the Work System Development Model (WSDM, Figure 6.1-1). The model is used to implement or modify GRCC’s first- or second-tier work systems, but systematic review of the model to ensure the relevance and usefulness would support GRCC in capitalizing on its core competencies and better serving internal and external customers.

- b(2) While GRCC uses the Budget Review Process to monitor and control costs related to work systems, there is no systematic approach in place to prevent errors and rework
when designing and improving work systems. For example, GRCC identified technology solutions and training as ways to prevent errors but there is no evidence of routine training for specific processes nor does this ensure these steps are built into a system design or improvement. Focusing efforts to minimize errors and rework may allow the organization to perform more effectively and efficiently and better serve its students.
6.2 Work Process Management and Improvement

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- **a(1)b(1)c(1)** GRCC has a systematic, well-deployed approach to ensuring academic programs are designed, managed, and reviewed for improvement on a consistent and frequent basis across the portfolio of offerings. The New Program Development Process is used to determine the need for additional programs based on stakeholder requirements and to ensure the design of the program to meet learner needs. Also, a modified Program Review Process has been developed in response to internal and external feedback/requirements providing a more relevant and meaningful review of academic programs. Having systematic approaches to curricular improvement will enhance the organization’s ability to provide quality and relevant programs.

- **a(1)** GRCC uses a systematic and deployed Process Design and Improvement/Innovation Approach (PDIA, Figure 6.2-1), which guides the design and management of work processes. For example, the process considers inputs from multiple sources to determine the process requirements and teams are used to complete the work. The identification of design or improvement opportunities are generated at different levels including from review of the IOS performance measures, from strategic planning activities or from regular review of operational processes. After implementation, outcomes are monitored to determine if student and stakeholder needs are met.

- **b2** GRCC has a systematic approach to selecting, managing, and monitoring relationships with suppliers to ensure they meet the needs of customers. The bidding process is open and the selection process uses a matrix to evaluate potential suppliers objectively. There is routine communication from GRCC to suppliers and reviews of performance are conducted regularly based on student and stakeholder feedback to ensure that suppliers’ performance is meeting or exceeding expectations. This systematic approach to supplier management benefits the organization by controlling costs while being able to meet the needs of stakeholders.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- **a(1)** There is no systematic process to consider innovation or cycle time when designing or redesigning a work process. Innovation workshops and facilitators were mentioned by some involved in process improvements, but the workforce does not have a consistent knowledge of such tools existing nor were the innovation tools used consistently in process design or improvement efforts. Also, there is no evidence of steps taken to consistently consider cycle time in process design/redesign. Systematically utilizing the available resources related to innovation in process design/redesign and consistent consideration of cycle time may be beneficial to the organization in light of funding constraints.

- **a(2)** While the organization uses various inputs to determine key requirements related to work processes, there is no systematic evaluation and improvement of this approach for
possible opportunities or to make modifications to the list of key requirements. For example, many key requirements presented in Figure 6.2-2 are determined by budget considerations, compliance requirements, and customer input, but the inputs used to establish this list are not routinely reviewed nor new ones considered to update and improve the key requirements of the organization’s stakeholders. Continually monitoring the process key requirements will better help GRCC meet student and stakeholder needs.
Category 7 – Results

7.1 Student Learning and Process Outcomes

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- **a** Student-focused outcomes demonstrate beneficial levels, trends, and comparisons. GRCC students achieve the personal educational goals they desire (Figure 7.1-3). They enroll, stay (Figure 7.1-4), perform well (Figures 7.1-7 and 9), graduate (Figure 7.1-11) or transfer and perform well at transfer schools (Figures 7.1-1 and 8) or pass licensure tests (Figure 7.1-10). These results demonstrate achievement of the GRCC mission.

- **b(1)** Operational process effectiveness results show beneficial levels and trends for key work processes. Work order completion (Figure 7.1-22) and IT help desk tickets solved on first contact (Figure 7.1-23) demonstrate good levels and trends. GRCC owns multiple facilities and uses many software systems to provide services to students so these beneficial process results are important. The number of days in accounts payable (Figure 7.1-20) has decreased from 33 days in 2007 to 15 days in 2012 and days in accounts receivable (Figure 7.1-21) has decreased from 25 to 20 over the same period. These results indicate improved financial processes.

- **c** GRCC tracks performance relative to the strategic plan through the Indicator of Success Report. The following indicators demonstrate beneficial trends toward achievement of its Ends and strategy: articulation agreements (Academic Alignment), minority representation (Access), students in clubs/teams/service learning (GRCC Experience), community penetration Community Outreach), fall to next term persistence (Student Success), and licensure pass rate (Workforce Development).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- **c** Many Indicators of Success in the IOS Report lack comparative/competitive data, including articulation agreements, satisfaction with preparation to transfer, minority representation, non-traditional classes, community satisfaction, tuition costs vs. Pell Grant dollars provided, percent of students in clubs/organizations/athletics, courses with co-curricular activities, community collaborative partnerships, and number of accredited programs. Determining and using comparative and competitive information will help GRCC to strengthen its core competencies, address strategic advantages and challenges, and meet the Ends, all upon which the Indicators of Success are built.

- **a** Results for developmental education students (AFP) for Math and English show GRCC performance behind the national NCCPB benchmark over three cohorts. The most recent results are provided for the 2008 cohort and show Math performance behind the benchmark by 10.8 percentage points, and English behind the benchmark by 9 percentage points. Figures 7.1-12 and 7.1-13 for AFP course retention and course success have declined by 12.9 and 9.7 percentage points, respectively, since 2009. GRCC
performance relative to the NCCBP demonstrates opportunities for improvement in AFP. GRCC has identified one of its core competencies as minimizing barriers to a college education including the barrier of under-preparedness for college level work. Fully 52% of new students require developmental education. These results do not indicate a strengthening of this core competency.

- **a** While the organization monitors student outcomes data for credit and non-credit students (Figures 7.1-1 and 9-11), other segmented results are not routinely used to drive continuous improvement for other student groups (e.g. first generation, non-traditional etc.) relative to other indicators. Segmentation is often available for other indicators, but not systematically reviewed. For instance, the Early Alert Flag system data (Figure 7.1-18) is not reviewed by student segments to determine trends or opportunities for continuous improvement when students are at risk, which does not support the End of student success.

- **b(2)** The Emergency Phone Alert System (EPAS) success rate has declined from 100% in 2008 to 94.4% in 2011. This primary mechanism for emergency communication is relied upon by the staff. A fully effective emergency communication mechanism will help to ensure a safe learning environment for students to achieve their goals and a safe work environment for the workforce to effectively serve students and stakeholders.
7.2 Customer-Focused Outcomes

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(1) Results indicate strong student satisfaction in service areas considered key to the organization. Figure 7.2-3 and 7.2-4 show complementary levels of student service satisfaction on the 2011 administration of the CCSSE and the 2010 administration of Noel-Levitz when compared to peers nationwide. For instance, on the CCSSE, the organization scored 7 percentage points higher than the CCSSE peer group on the financial aid benchmark and 0.6 percentage points higher on the advising benchmark. Additionally, Student Dissatisfaction (Figure 7.2-10) as measured by not recommending GRCC and poor experience at the organization on the CCSSE, illustrates, overall, that student satisfaction with their experience at the organization is positive.

- a(2) Figure 7.2-16 illustrates a steady growth in articulation agreements from 2008 to 2012. In 2012, articulation agreements increased to 42 agreements from 36 agreements in 2011, a 16% increase. Continued growth in this area will help GRCC sustain its core competency of close collaboration with K-12 and transfer schools to provide a seamless transition.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(1) The CCSSE survey report: Race/Ethnicity details areas in which GRCC scores best and worst with respect to CCSSE benchmarks. Regarding student effort and support for student learners benchmarks, Caucasian students scored the lowest when compared to the other six race/ethnicity groups. And, with respect to student faculty interaction, Caucasian students scored second to last on this benchmark as well. When reviewing the CCSSE report from 2012 by race/ethnicity, Caucasian students score the lowest on all of the satisfaction with student services indicators that are reported. These results may not support the core competency of providing quality programs and high level support to assist students in achieving their educational goals. Routinely and systematically analyzing segmented data may reveal opportunities for improvement such as these.

- a(2) The trend in student engagement has not been beneficial from 2005 to 2011. For instance, Figure 7.2-11 illustrates an unstable trend in active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners, benchmarks measured by CCSSE. Similarly, in comparison to the CCSSE peer group, Figure 7.2-12, the organization scores consistently lower on all of the benchmarks. This result does not support the Ends of Student Success and Academic Alignment.
7.3 Worforce-Focused Outcomes

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(2) Workforce safety (Figure 7.3-8) results show beneficial trends and OSHA Lost Time Injury Rates (Figure 7.3-7), dropped from 0.83 to 0.12 from 2008 to 2011 and is outperforming the US comparison. Workers Compensation Costs have declined over that same period from $140,100 to $128,500. These results correspond with outcomes from the Staff Opinion Survey that show beneficial trends in the employee perception of safety on the questions of strong emphasis on safety, safe equipment, and feeling safe (Figure 7.3-6).

- a(4) GRCC shows favorable trends in areas for professional development and tuition reimbursement. Staff development investments have grown from $372,300 to $429,900 from 2008 to 2011 (Figure 7.3-19). Tuition reimbursement grew from $162,200 to $255,100 2008-2012 (Figure 7.3-20). These results support the focus on developing the workforce despite financial challenges.

- a(2) The organization has favorable results for workforce climate indicators. Results for the bi-annual PACE survey demonstrate that GRCC is outperforming the US norm for the cultural climate indicators of Institutional Structure, Supervisory Relationships, Teamwork and Student Focus (Figure 7.3-12). GRCC’s goal is to have a “collaborative” workplace on the PACE climate scale, which is a score between 4 and 5. The most recent overall results show GRCC scoring at 3.73, above the US norm of 3.66. Results from the Staff Opinion Survey show increases in results for the key elements of workforce engagement of teamwork, cooperation, staff commitment and student focus satisfaction have improved from 2007 to 2011 for most employee groups (Figure 7.3-14). Turnover is outperforming the state and peer average (Figure 7.3-11). A positive workplace environment benefits students and support their success.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(3) Empowerment and Trust satisfaction indicators from the 2011 Staff Opinion Survey have declined for the employee groups Meet and Confer, Executive Support Staff, CEBA maintenance staff, and Faculty, dropping since 2009 and below 2007 levels (Figure 7.3-17). Additionally, satisfaction indicators of positive point of life, pride in work, loyalty to employer, and job satisfaction demonstrate the same pattern of performance declines from 2009 (Figure 7.3-14). Empowerment and trust are identified as key factors of workforce engagement that drive workforce satisfaction.

- a(4) Leadership Institute participant feedback shows that respondents strongly disagreed, disagreed, or were neutral on the following survey questions: “The content of the program met my expectations” (48%), “My participation in the LI/LCI increased my knowledge regarding leadership/coaching” (48%), “I have changed some of my practices at work as a result of my LI/LCI experience” (52%). During interviews, staff gave similar feedback on the program. An effective leader development system will help to ensure that staff are prepared to advance their careers at GRCC and assume leadership positions and may benefit students as well.
7.4 Leadership and Governance Outcomes

Your score in this Item is in the 30% - 45% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(2) GRCC has maintained positive results for governance. There have been zero management comments for external audits (Figure 7.4-9) from 2007 to 2011. In addition, a favorable trend is seen in Percent Work Centers Overspent from 44.1% in 2009 to 16.1% in 2011 (Figure 7.4-10). This demonstrates its commitment to accountability and sustainability.

- a(5) GRCC shows favorable results for key measures of sustainability. It saved $3.5 million in the year 2011-12 from several sustainability initiatives and is targeting to save $7.2 million in the year 2012-13. Trends available for 2008 to 2011 (Fig 7.4-15) show significant total cost savings of $1.7 million from reduced energy consumption during this period. The organization has reduced its use of electricity, natural gas, water, and water and sewer (Figure 7.4-14).

- a(3) GRCC has been 100% compliant for regulatory and accreditation requirements from 2007 to 2011 in ADA, OSHA/MIOSHA, EPA, and Workforce certification/licenses.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(1) SOS survey results for “Leadership puts our values into action by their behavior” has decreased from 3.75 in 2009 to 3.26 in 2011. Results on the question “Leadership provides clear communication on the direction this organization is headed” has also decreased from 3.48 in 2009 to 3.23 in 2011. There are no results measuring the effectiveness of leadership’s communication or engagement with the workforce, including two-way communications to deploy the mission and values.

- a(4) Although the number of ethics breaches have declined in 2012, the Pace Survey results for “the extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution” has decreased from 3.41 in 2007 to 3.22 in 2011. GRCC does not track results for Ethical Behavior and Stakeholder Trust in the organization’s senior leaders and governance.

- a(5) GRCC does not track results for support of key communities. Figure 7.4-13 shows beneficial trends in curriculum ASL, Event ASL, and Partner participation, but these results do not effectively measure support of key communities, nor the impact of such support. Assessing the impact the organization’s support of key communities will help GRCC determine areas of organizational involvement and communicate the benefits of its involvement.
7.5 Budgetary, Financial, and Market Outcomes

Your score in this Item is in the 50% - 65% range.

STRENGTHS

- a(1) GRCC has achieved strong financial and budgetary results in difficult economic times. For example, general fund net assets increased from $9.9M in 2007 to $11M in 2011 (Figure 7.5-8), while costs have been controlled in the past three years (Figure 7.5-12). GRCC has managed operations within budget since 2007 while facing declines in revenue sources (Figure 7.5-1). These results demonstrate the ability to contain costs to remain financially viable.

- a(1) The organization demonstrates its commitment to supporting student learning by focusing resources. For example, Figure 7.5-6 Expenditures for Instruction shows 53% of the revenue is dedicated to instruction. This level of performance is just behind the best performing peer by 0.1% and reinforces the commitment to the End of Student Success.

- a(1) GRCC has maintained an S&P bond rating of AA since 2008 (Figure 7.4-8), which indicates strong budgetary and financial performance in challenging financial times. This rating exceeds that of four-year competitor Ferris State. This high rating may allow the organization opportunities to secure funds for future growth.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a(2) The percentage of high school students entering GRCC following high school graduation has declined from 30.3% in 2010 to 28.5% in 2011 (Figure 7.5-14). Capturing enrollment from other markets will be important to consider as the available high school pipeline continues to decline and 56% of revenue is generated by tuition (Figure 7.5-1). Further, the organization does not currently track competitor data for this metric to allow it to identify which competitor and programs are attracting students.

- a(1) The organization shows unfavorable levels when considering tuition rates (Figure 7.5-3) compared to state community colleges with GRCC’s rate $9 per credit higher than the comparison group. This, along with the recent addition of student fees, could impact stakeholders’ ability to afford a college education, conflicting with the organization’s End of Access and the core competency of minimizing barriers.
APPENDIX

By submitting a Michigan Quality Leadership award application, you have differentiated yourself from most Michigan organizations. The Board of Examiners has evaluated your application for the Michigan Quality Leadership Award. Strict confidentiality is observed at all times and in every aspect of the application review and feedback.

The report contains the Examiners’ findings, including a summary of key themes of the application evaluation, a detailed listing of strengths and opportunities for improvement, and scoring information. Background information about the examination process is provided below.

APPLICATION REVIEW

Stage 1, Independent Review

The application evaluation process begins with Stage 1, the independent review, in which members of the Board of Examiners are assigned to each of the applications. Assignments are made according to the Examiners’ areas of expertise and to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Each application is evaluated independently by Examiners who write observations relating to the Scoring System described on p. 70-71 of the Criteria for Performance Excellence.

Stage 2, Consensus Review

A team of Examiners, led by a Senior Examiner, conducts a series of reviews, first virtually and eventually concluded through a focused conference call. The purpose of the consensus review is for the team to reach agreement on comments and scores that capture the team’s collective view of the strengths and opportunities for improvement. All applicants receive a consensus review.

Stage 3, Site Visit Review

After the consensus review process, the independent Panel of Judges selects applicants to receive a site visit based upon the scoring profile. If an applicant is not selected for site visit review, one of the Examiners on the Consensus Team works with one Judge to edit the final consensus report that becomes the feedback report.

Site visits are conducted for the highest-scoring applicants to clarify any uncertainty or confusion the Examiners have regarding the written application and to verify that the information in the application is correct. After the site visit is completed, the team of Examiners prepares a final site visit scorebook.

Application reports, consensus scorebooks, and site visit scorebooks for all applicants receiving a site visit are forwarded to the Panel of Judges, which selects the applicants to receive an Award based on the overall excellence and the appropriateness of the applicant as a state-wide role model. There is no limit on the number of possible recipients.
Judges do not participate in discussions or vote on applications in which they have a competing or conflicting interest or in which they have a private or special interest such as an employment or a client relationship, a financial interest, or a personal or family relationship. All conflicts are reviewed and discussed so that Judges are aware of their own and others’ limitations on access to information and participation in discussions and voting. Following the Judges’ review and recommendations of Award recipients, one of the Examiners on the Site Visit Team edits the final site visit scorebook that becomes the feedback report.

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. As seen in the Scoring Guidelines, the scoring of responses is based on two evaluation dimensions: Process and Results. The four factors used to evaluate process (Categories 1 – 6) are Approach, Deployment, Learning, and Integration (Table 1). The scoring factors used to evaluate results (Items 7.1 – 7.5) are Levels, Trends, Comparisons, and Integration (Table 2).

In the feedback report, the applicant receives a percentage range for each Item. The percentage range is based on the Scoring Guidelines, which describe the characteristics typically associated with specific percentage ranges.

An applicant’s overall score for Process Items and its overall score for Results Items fall into one of eight scoring bands. Each band has a corresponding descriptor of attributes associated with that band.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>PROCESS (For use with Categories 1 – 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0% or 5%   | • No systematic approach is evident; information is anecdotal.  
• Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident.  
• An improvement orientation is not evident improvement is achieved through reacting to problems.  
• No organization alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 10%, 15%,  | • The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item is evident.  
• The approach is in the early stages of deployment most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item.  
• Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident.  
• The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving.                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 20%, or 25%| • An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident.  
• The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in early stages of deployment.  
• The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident.  
• The approach is aligned with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items.                                                                                                                                                            |
| 30%, 35%,  | • An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the overall requirements of the Item and your key organizational requirements, is evident.  
• The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units.  
• A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning, including innovation, is in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes.  
• The approach is aligned with your overall organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items.                                                                                                                                 |
| 40%, or 45%| • An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item is evident.  
• The approach is well deployed, with no significant gaps.  
• A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning, including innovation, are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement, innovation, and improved integration as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing.  
• The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items.                                                                                                                                                  |
| 50%, 55%,  | • An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item is evident.  
• The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units.  
• Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization.  
• The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items.                                                                                                                                 |
| 60%, or 65%|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 70%, 75%,  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 80%, or 85%|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 90%, 95%,  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 100%       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
Table 2 – Scoring Guidelines for Results Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>RESULTS (For Use with Category 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% or 5%</td>
<td>• There are no organizational performance results or poor results in areas reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trend data are either not reported or show mainly adverse trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comparative information is not reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Results are not reported for any areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organizational mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%, 15%, 20%, or 25%</td>
<td>• A few organizational performance results are reported; there are some improvements and/or early good performance levels in a few areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Little or no trend data are reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Little or no comparative information is reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Results are reported for a few areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organizational mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%, 35%, 40%, or 45%</td>
<td>• Good organizational performance levels are reported, responsive to the basic requirements of Items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some trend data are reported, and a majority of the trend data are beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Results are reported for many areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organizational mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%, 55%, 60%, or 65%</td>
<td>• Good organizational performance levels are reported, responsive to the overall requirements of the Items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beneficial trends are evident in areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some current performance levels have been evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks and show areas of good relative performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizational performance results are reported for most key customer and stakeholder, market, and process requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%, 75%, 80%, or 85%</td>
<td>• Good to excellent organizational performance levels are reported, responsive to the multiple requirements of the item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beneficial trends have been sustained over time in most areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizational performance results are reported for most key customer and stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%, 95%, or 100%</td>
<td>• Excellent organizational performance levels are reported for most areas of importance to the Item requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beneficial trends have been sustained over time in all areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of industry and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizational performance results and projections are reported for most key customer and stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Score</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 - 200</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 260</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261 - 320</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 - 370</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371 - 430</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431 - 480</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481 - 550</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Score</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 - 170</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 - 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 - 255</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 - 300</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 - 345</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346 - 390</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391 - 450</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITE VISIT SCORING SUMMARY

Applicant GRCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>5.2</th>
<th>6.1</th>
<th>6.2</th>
<th>7.1</th>
<th>7.2</th>
<th>7.3</th>
<th>7.4</th>
<th>7.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCORING RANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS BAND %</th>
<th>BAND NUMBER</th>
<th>RESULTS BAND %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88 – 100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88 – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 – 87%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78 – 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 – 77%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68 – 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 – 67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58 – 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 – 57%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48 – 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 – 47%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38 – 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – 37%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28 – 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 27%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 – 27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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