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History/Background

In November 2000, Grand Rapids Community College was officially accepted into North Central Association’s AQIP Program as one of the inaugural members. In spring 1999, members of the GRCC NCA Self-Study Team had begun to hear reports from other colleges who had shown great success in making system-wide transformational improvement by using a quality approach to re-accreditation. After careful research and study, it was determined that GRCC would be an excellent candidate for this new approach. In the late 1990s, GRCC faculty and staff participated in extensive training in total quality management tools and processes. The Self-Study team was eager to participate in a quality-based accreditation process hoping that it would result in a continuous focus on improvement rather than a major effort in the form of a self-study followed by several years of relative inactivity.

Our history as an AQIP college has been a positive one. We established our first set of action projects in 2001. We have attended Strategy Forums in 2002, 2005, and 2009. We submitted Systems Appraisals in 2005 and 2009. We were reaffirmed for accreditation in May of 2008, following a Checkup visit in 2007. A complete history of our Accreditation processes is found in Appendix A.

Oversight of Quality Implementation at GRCC

When GRCC first joined the AQIP process, the quality management journey was overseen by a new team entitled the Quality Leadership Team. This team, established to lead quality and AQIP efforts, was composed predominantly of former members of the 1999 NCA Self-Study Team. Within a few years it became apparent that the quality process had to become the “way we do business at GRCC” and thus the College Leadership Council was created. This new team was a merger of the President’s Cabinet and the Quality Leadership Team and was responsible for overall college leadership. Currently, the oversight of quality management at GRCC is done jointly by the Strategic Leadership Team and the President’s Cabinet. Our current model provides for college-wide representation on the Strategic Leadership Team as well as agility with a smaller President’s Cabinet. All members of the President’s Cabinet are also Strategic Leadership Team members. A timeline for the Quality Process for GRCC can be found in Appendix B.

AQIP Action Project Summary

GRCC has four AQIP Action Projects. In addition to these current projects, GRCC has successfully completed a number of other AQIP Action Projects. Since our acceptance into the AQIP Process, we have selected and managed AQIP Action Projects in a variety of ways, including oversight by the Quality Leadership Team, the Strategy Team, the team attending the Strategy Forum, etc. AQIP Action Projects are College Action Projects within the GRCC Strategic Plan that have been selected to be AQIP projects due to their potential for positive change for the greatest number of students. Monitoring of the implementation of the AQIP Action Projects is done through Deans Council.

Recently, we were accepted into the HLC Persistence and Completion Academy and attended our first data session in December 2013. The GRCC Street to Completion Team will attend the first workshop in March 2014. Our expectation is that we will identify and pursue new AQIP Action Projects through our participation as part of the workshop.
Current AQIP Action Projects

Pathways to Employment
AQIP Category: Helping Students Learn
Project Start: 2010

The goal of this project is to assess, develop and implement a new path-to-employment support system for GRCC students. The project will be a collaborative effort to integrate both on-campus and community resources into the system. This effort will lead to a comprehensive inventory and effectiveness assessment of services, methods and communications in our present services. We will use this information to determine gaps and plan for the future system. Finding and securing a job in a student’s chosen career is a very competitive process under the present economic times and job market. The new coordinated system will build and streamline pathways for students to be equipped with the skills and knowledge to meet this future challenge.

The College Success Program
AQIP Category: Helping Students Learn
Project Start: 2010

The goal of the College Success Program is to increase the rate of developmental students who complete a degree, transfer, or earn a certificate in five years. Based upon a “Targeted Intervention for Developmental Students” (TIDES) model (Boylan, 2009), the program will use multivariate cognitive, affective and personal assessments to strategically assign students to courses and learning assistance interventions. The CSP seeks to increase the rates at which students succeed and persist through achievement “milestones” along the path to completion: success in developmental coursework, success in gateway courses, along completion of 12 credits and 30 credits of college-level courses.

Strengthening the Infrastructure of Distance-Delivered Education to Promote Student Success
AQIP Category: Helping Students Learn
Project Start: 2012

This project will complete a thorough inventory of the purpose, goals, organizational structure, internal and external technology needs, professional development processes, impact on student learning and student success of distance-delivered education at GRCC. Activities could include: designing strategies for bringing greater consistency among online, hybrid, and face-to-face courses and student support services, especially as these modalities support or impede student success; consider and respond as necessary to the needs of faculty and staff who use instructional technologies to support student success; and create necessary processes and engage resources where necessary that strengthen the overall infrastructure of distance-delivered education.

SARS – Early Alert and Scheduling System
AQIP Category: Helping Students Learn
Project Start: 2014

The goal of this project is to implement a cross campus scheduling system that is fully integrated with the Early Alert System. The Early Alert System allows faculty to identify students exhibiting behaviors or patterns that may interfere with classroom success. Once an Early Alert flag is raised, the Office of
Student Success and Retention investigates, identifies, and recommends appropriate intervention strategies.

**College Generated Graduation**
AQIP Category: Helping Students Learn
Project Start: 2014 (TENTATIVE pending Deans Council Action in February 2014)

Students will automatically be awarded the degrees and certificates that they earn at GRCC. Students will have the opportunity to decline these credentials.

**Completed AQIP Action Projects (descriptions taken from the AQIP Project Directory)**

**Improving Student Learning through Course Development, Assessment, and Revision**
Project Start: 2001
Project Completion: 2009

Using the Course Approval and Review Process (Carp), faculty will revise courses, clearly identifying learner outcomes specific to the course and general learner outcomes that will be achieved in the course. The syllabus will be generated from this document and the learning activities will follow from the outcomes. These outcomes will later be assessed and the results used in improving the course. This represents an integrated system of course development from planning to carrying out the learning activities to assessing the effectiveness of the course back to planning course improvements.

**Improving Student Support Systems from Street-to-Seat**
Project Start: 2001
Project Completion: 2004

The purpose of the Street-to-Seat project is to make the entire intake experience for students as smooth as possible while eliminating waste in the processes. The primary goal is to coordinate efforts across departments to streamline the intake processes from the time of first student contact with the college to the first day of class. Specific desired outcomes include: 1) process improvement for students; 2) improved efficiency and elimination of waste within our processes; 3) staff learning of quality principles and lean thinking; 4) empowerment of staff to make quality improvements; and 5) data for long-term planning.

**The Raider Learning System**
Project Start: 2001
Project Completion: 2006

This system will result in GRCC becoming a college completely focused on student learning. The focus of the learning system is to centralize coordination of a teaching and learning model that integrates employee learning by: identifying individual/unit/team and organizational learning and development gaps; examining learning college concepts/theories/practices; creating a centralized learning plan; developing curriculum and planning objectives; coordinating and planning space and resources; coordinating in-house trainers and facilitators as learners, teachers and planners; assessing the effectiveness of employee learning and using the data for continuous improvement; and developing supportive institutional policies, procedures and funding plans.
Design and Implement a First-Year Experience Program for New Students
Project Start: 2005
Project Completion: 2010

The goal of this project is to create a First-Year Experience program for students new to college and GRCC. There are seven objectives for this project: 1) engender GRCC’s commitment to new students; 2) establish community for new students; 3) introduce new students to support services; 4) help students deal with conflict; 5) help students manage complex lives; 6) provide new students with an advocate/mentor; and 7) provide new students with “basic training” for college. This project will culminate with the creation of a first-year experience course, FYE faculty training program, and an outcomes assessment for measuring student learning.

From the Street to the “Right” Seat
Project Start: 2004
Project Completion: 2009

This project will increase the College’s online teaching presence so that 25% of courses offered exist in an online or hybrid modality. This growth should take place over the next three to five years and include a comprehensive assessment of current resources, teaching practices, capacity, training needs, and other infrastructural components necessary to fully support accomplishment of the Project.

Student Success by Deliberate Design
Project Start: 2006
Project Completion: 2010

GRCC will achieve the following goals by implementing Student Success by Deliberate Design: 1) Establish and institutionalize collaboration and coordination between academic and student support services to increase the success of students at risk for academic failure; 2) Improve the pedagogical skills of developmental education faculty to increase the success of students at risk for academic failure; 3) Maximize student success through placement in appropriate learning environments; 4) Improve student support and intervention services for students at risk for academic failure; and 5) Implement and maintain the technology necessary to enhance academic and student support services for students at risk for academic failure.

Expanding the Distance Learning Program
Project Start: 2010
Project Completion: 2012

Increase the College’s online teaching presence so that 25% of courses offered exist in an online or hybrid modality. This growth should take place over the next 3-5 years and include a comprehensive assessment of current resources, teaching practices, capacity, training needs, and other infrastructural components necessary to fully support accomplishment of the Project.
Improving the Adjunct Experience
Project Start: 2010
Project Completion: 2014

The goals of this project are to develop consistent, discipline-appropriate, effective, and efficient ways to recruit, hire, and orient new adjunct faculty. In addition, a subsidiary goal related to hiring is to develop a phased-in, time-limited plan to achieve a 60%/40% ratio of contact hours taught by full-time vs. adjunct faculty.

Integrating GRCC’s Performance Management Systems with Employee Development Systems
Project Start: 2010
Project Completion: 2012

Our goal is to directly connect the Employee Performance Evaluations/Discussions and Employee Development. This would involve establishing common behavioral competencies for describing job performance and organizing employee learning opportunities. Data from a recent compensation study that involved analyzing jobs at the college will facilitate this process. By increasing the alignment of the performance and training systems, learning opportunities will be more relevant to the work of employees and performance discussions will be more constructive. Also, the connection of data on these systems will allow for more effective analysis of the impact of Employee Development on Employee Performance.

Michigan Quality Leadership Award Process

One of the hallmarks of the AQIP process is that participating colleges must receive external feedback regarding their quality journey on a regular basis. There are many ways to meet this requirement including state quality programs and the national Baldrige award process. Upon the recommendation of our HLC liaison, Dr. Steve Spanghel, we began the process of documenting our quality journey in 2001 through the pursuit of the Michigan Quality Leadership Award. The purpose of preparing the award applications is not to try to win the award. The value is the self-assessment against external criteria and the candid feedback received from the external review teams. It has forced us to look at ourselves in new ways and to ask hard questions regarding our performance. Our quality efforts paid off in April 2007 when we were notified that we had received the Michigan Quality Leadership award. Having won the state award, we applied for the national Baldrige award in May 2008 but did not receive a site visit.

AQIP – Baldrige Option

In 2010, NCA/HLC instituted a pilot AQIP program with a Baldrige Option. In July 2011, GRCC applied for acceptance into this pilot. As part of the Baldrige Option requirements, GRCC submitted an application for the Michigan Quality Leadership Award in February 2012. In May 2012, we were notified that we would receive a site visit. The site visit, including eight examiners plus one representative from the Michigan Quality Council, occurred Sept. 10 – 12, 2012. A Feedback Report listing areas of strength as well as opportunities for improvement was received in October 2012. The list of recommendations was prioritized by interested faculty and staff during a series of Dot Voting Fairs held in April 2013. The President’s Cabinet reviewed the prioritized opportunities and decided on further actions. In some cases, it was determined that existing College Action projects were already being implemented to address the issues. In other cases, we believed that the site visit team had not been provided appropriate documentation regarding a particular process and that no specific action was needed. For
some items, individuals or teams were assigned to put improvement plans in place. Cabinet has been monitoring the progress of these items regularly. A report entitled “GRCC Response to MQLA Opportunities for Improvements” is available as Appendix C.

**GRCC Response to AQIP Systems Appraisal- Baldrige Option Feedback Report**

The purpose of this section is to provide the AQIP Checkup Visit Team with an update regarding the issues raised in the AQIP Systems Appraisal – Baldrige Option Feedback Report (Report Dated: February 5, 2013).

The following table presents a summary of the evaluative comments from the Feedback report. We are very pleased that in all cases, the review’s believe we meeting the Accreditation Criteria and all associated core components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1: Mission</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 1A</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 1B</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 1C</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 1D</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 2A</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 2B</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 2C</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 2D</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 2E</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 3A</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 3B</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 3C</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 3D</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 3E</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 4A</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 4B</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 4C</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 5A</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 5B</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 5C</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 5D</td>
<td>“Meets”</td>
<td>Page 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in many cases suggestions for improvement were noted by the reviewers. The following section provides an update on our current status for each suggestion.
Core Component 1D: The institution’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good

*It is not always evident how GRCC assesses and monitors its support of key communities or the impact of such support.*

GRCC identifies its key community as those people who live and work within the boundaries of our primary service area, the Kent Intermediate School District. In November 2013 (as well as 2011 and 2009), GRCC contracted with a 3rd party vendor to conduct a survey of the residents of our attendance area on our behalf. Results are communicated to the Board of Trustees and the faculty and staff to be used for planning purposes and as an indicator of our success. The results of the survey are reported in the *GRCC Indicators of Success Report* (End: Community Outreach, Indicator: CO1) which is available on the GRCC website.

In addition, we monitor the support of key sub-communities within the larger community using a variety of methods. Some examples are provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Community</th>
<th>Description/Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development Advisory</td>
<td>Survey data collected as part of the regular program evaluation process</td>
<td>Results used for program planning and improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 educators</td>
<td>High school counselor sessions</td>
<td>Results used to improve quality of messaging/services provided to potential students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-12 Superintendents invited to Community Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school teachers work with GRCC staff to map curriculum paths from K-12 to college</td>
<td>Results used to improve course sequencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education administrators</td>
<td>Academic administrators from GRCC meet annually with academic administrators from those colleges/universities which have high transfer rates for former GRCC students</td>
<td>Results are used to plan joint program initiatives and provide seamless transfer paths for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCC Supplier Survey</td>
<td>Vendors who provide GRCC with goods and services are survey bi-annually</td>
<td>Results used to improve GRCC processes and relationships with vendors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td>In September 2013, GRCC President and Board of Trustees held a Community Summit inviting leaders from the economic, education, and governmental sectors. This event is planned to be repeated annually.</td>
<td>Results used by the Strategic Leadership Team in identifying key issues that GRCC must address in the next Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Component 2D: The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning

*At Grand Rapids, the academic freedom policy is embedded in a BOT policy on Executive Limitations for the President, hence the complexity to an outside viewer. The College is encouraged to review the content of its policy to determine that its wording accurately reflects institutional intent.*

Beginning in January 2013, the Board began to have a conversation around the need to review all Board policies to ensure that the wording of each policy accurately reflected the Board’s institutional intent.
At the January 2013 regular Board meeting, the President presented the Academic Freedom Monitoring Report (Academic Freedom Monitoring Reports for January 2013 and February 2014 are attached in Appendix D). There was Board conversation around the clarity of the wording of the Academic Freedom executive limitation, and the Board agreed that this is a policy they should pay close attention to as they begin their individual policy review process.

Over the next couple of months, each Board member spent time outside of regular meetings and retreats reviewing all Board policies and then providing feedback to the Board liaison on those policies that they felt the Board should take a closer look at as there may be a need for updates. At the end of March, this feedback was compiled by the Board liaison and presented to the Board. The Board determined that the policy review work that needed to be done would be best accomplished in the Board retreat setting; beginning in September 2013, the Board began the policy review work at its monthly Board retreats.

The Board received a copy of the AQIP Feedback Report in February 2013 and Donna Kragt (GRCC HLC liaison) presented the overall findings of that report at the February 2013 regular Board meeting. After reviewing the findings, the Board agreed that there may be a gap between the wording and the actual intent of the Academic Freedom policy. Again the Board agreed one of the first policies that the Board needed to review was the Academic Freedom policy.

**September 2013 Board Retreat:** The first conversation that took place regarding the Academic Freedom Policy involved reviewing the individual Board member’s suggested verbiage changes, and the rationale for these changes, as they related to the current executive limitation policy. As a result of the discussion, the Board determined that they needed faculty input regarding an academic freedom policy and requested that Provost Gely solicit this feedback from faculty and bring that feedback to the next retreat.

**October 2013 Board Retreat:** Continued Board discussion around the Academic Freedom policy. This thorough and thoughtful discussion included:

- An extensive review of the AAUP’s statements on:
  - Academic Freedom & Artistic Expression
  - Freedom of Expression and Campus Speech Codes
  - Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications
- The Board’s review of a memo from Provost Gely discussing her observations regarding the current policy, a proposed verbiage change for the current policy, and her review of faculty feedback received. (Note: the Board received feedback from 50 faculty members representing various academic departments.)
- The Board was made aware of an academic freedom statement in the faculty contract (Item I, page 8) that addresses academic freedom as it relates to work of the faculty member.

**November 2013 Board Retreat:** The Board continued the thoughtful and thorough discussion regarding faculty feedback as it relates to the Board’s consideration of adopting the language in the faculty contract as the Board’s academic freedom policy. The conversation around adopting this language included:

- Discussion around eliminating any ambiguity around the academic freedom policy if the Board did simply adopt the statement in the faculty contract.
- Discussion around, “Is there a need for a student academic freedom policy?”
• Discussion around an academic freedom policy that addresses “diversity of thought.”

December 2013 Board Retreat: Board continued its work on the academic freedom policy and based on their review of faculty feedback and reflection on several Board conversations, it was determined:
• That there was no need for a specific student academic freedom policy.
• The Board agreed that the academic freedom statement in the faculty contract suffices for both faculty and student academic freedom.

The following statement will serve as the new academic freedom policy under executive limitations:

“Faculty members are entitled to freedom in the discussion of their subject, but they should not introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Faculty members must also recognize that students are free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion. The presence of any communication device during the meeting of a class shall be subject to the faculty member’s permission. The only exception is for students who need reasonable accommodations in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and similar laws. The exception is granted if the College and the student sign a statement acknowledging the faculty member’s ownership of the classroom presentations/materials, and the student agrees to limit the use of communication devices to satisfy his/her learning needs.”

• The new academic freedom policy will come before the Board at a regular meeting for a first reading in April 2014 and a second reading in May 2014 as part of the entire Board policy packet.

• The Board will officially vote on the adoption of the policy at the regular May Board meeting.

The thoughtful conversation around the need to address “diversity of thought” continued.

After much discussion it was proposed that the Board could address “diversity of thought” or “intellectual diversity” in the existing Diversity value.

January 2014 Board Retreat: The Board Chair recommended that “intellectual diversity” be reflected in the existing diversity value. The proposed new definition for this value is:

“We create an inclusive learning and working environment that values free and open dialogue and the dignity of each person.”

The Board agreed that they liked this new definition but asked this definition be provided to the Strategic Leadership Team for their input before adopting. The Strategic Leadership team will review this revised definition at their February 2014 meeting and feedback will be provided to the Board in time for the March Board retreat.

The entire process around the revision of the academic freedom policy has been extremely thoughtful, thorough, and transparent. The Board researched academic freedom policies at other community colleges, researched AAUP statements, and solicited feedback from faculty and administration as they worked to solidify the intent of the words in a new academic freedom policy. As a result, the Board identified the need to revamp the academic freedom policy and identified a gap in the current definition of our diversity value and is now working to add “diversity of thought” to our organizational definition of diversity.
Overall Comments on Criterion 2:

It appears that Grand Rapids has a highly developed governance structure that embraces a complex system of policies. These policies allow the institution an avenue of response to procedural questions, but having these policies does not ensure that their content has been fully implemented......the College is encouraged to examine possible gaps between simply distributing printed material to new students and employees about the EMS and actually providing effective ethical and responsible conduct education for its students and employees.

At GRCC we understand that developing, implementing, monitoring and revising policies is a shared responsibility. The following figure represents the general policy structure of the college:

At the highest level, the Board of Trustees, using the policy governance structure, sets the direction of the college through the ends and executive limitations. The BOT also determines its own governance process and its relation with the Chief Executive Officer. The direction given by the Board through the ends and executive limitations serves as the framework that the academic and administrative leadership uses to establish academic and operational policies for the day-to-day work.

Academic Policies are managed by the Provost’s Office through the Academic Governing Council (AGC) following HLC Criteria for Accreditation: “Governance of a quality institution of higher education will include a significant role for faculty, in particular with regard to sufficiency of the curriculum, expectations for student performance, qualifications of the instructional staff, and adequacy of resources for instructional support.” The Academic Governing Council is a body of 69 voting members comprising 52 faculty members representing every department (including adjunct instructors) and 17 academic administrators. The development of policies process is as follows:

1. AGC members discuss new policies seeking input from their respective departments and recommends policies to Provost.
2. Provost approves or sends back proposed policies to AGC.
3. Provost reports approved academic policies to Cabinet.
4. Approved policies are disseminated to staff via GRCC Today.
5. Approved policies are posted on GRCC’s website at http://cms.grcc.edu/policies.
6. Policies are reviewed according to schedule.
Administrative/Operational policies are managed by the General Counsel’s Office through the Policy Advisory Group that includes the General Counsel, a Dean appointed by the Provost, the Executive Deputy and Board Liaison, the Executive VP for Business and Financial Services, the Executive Director of Human Resources, and a representative from each of the four bargaining units (Support Staff, Faculty, Custodial Staff and Police). The development of policies process is as follows:

1. Policy “owner” prepares draft of new or updated policy, involving relevant stakeholders.
2. Policy Advisory Group reviews new or updated policy and provides feedback.
3. Policies approved by advisory group go to Cabinet for discussion and approval.
4. Approved policies are disseminated to staff via GRCC Today.
5. Approved policies are posted on GRCC’s website at http://cms.grcc.edu/policies.
6. Policies are reviewed according to schedule.

Once policies are approved, the respective “owners” are responsible for implementation, monitoring and eventually to review the policy and propose changes. The Board of Trustees has a system to review and discuss its policies periodically. The Provost Office manages the implementation and monitoring of academic policies, and the administrative/operational policies have owners in different areas of the institution. Academic and operational policies have a schedule of revision (Appendix E). However, it is possible that revisions take place out of schedule if particular issues need to be addressed. Anyone can bring up the need for an out-of-schedule revision through the Provost or General Counsel’s offices. In the same way, anyone can bring up the need for the creation of a new policy. We have several examples of policies created or revised because faculty and staff have identified a need (e.g., College Generated Graduation), have learned of a new trend (e.g., e-cigarettes) or regulation (e.g., records management state law) or have identified a best practice (e.g., Mandatory First Year Experience). Through scheduled review and the opportunity to propose new policies, we feel we are well positioned to identify gaps and address them in a systematic and collaborative way.

Overall Comments on Criterion Two:

The GRCC policy governance model is equally impressive but also has possible gaps. Having and even following such a model does not in itself ensure that the Board will follow fair and ethical policies and processes. It certainly provides a structure, and the College is encouraged to monitor adherence to that structure as a means of closing any possible performance gaps.

Beginning in 2011-12, the Board established a calendar outlining the timing of each monitoring report to ensure that the Board was successfully monitoring all ends statements and executive limitation policies. This was a completely new process for the Board and as the year of monitoring reports wrapped up, the Board determined that there were gaps in the monitoring report process.

In 2012-13, the Board addressed the gaps they had identified during the previous year. The Board found that the monitoring reports were often too long and operational in focus – they wanted the reports to focus more on data; they also felt that the Board needed monthly updates on student success indicators. As a result the following improvements were made to the monitoring report process:
• Creation of a monthly Student Success Indicator Report
• A change in the report format that the Board receives
• A long detailed report is no longer required; instead the Board requested a single-page executive summary report that outlines progress on indicator measures along with a Power Point presentation summarizing the work on the end as it relates to the strategic plan.

The Board developed a new monitoring report calendar (Appendix F attached) that includes the additional student success indicators reports. The Board also held its first organizational retreat in August 2013 to outline goals and review the year-long schedule of work to accomplish those goals. This organizational retreat was an improvement made to the Board’s governing process to address gaps in the Board’s performance as it related to ensuring that the Board maintained its primary focus on monitoring of the ends policies and the executive limitations.

Both changes outlined above have been found to be extremely effective in assisting the Board to focus their monitoring efforts on performance indicators that are directly linked to the college’s strategic plan; and the strategic leadership team and departmental work is directly aligned with the strategic plan and Board monitoring process. The Board and faculty/staff are now speaking the same language when it comes to monitoring success indicators as part of our total strategic planning process.

In addition to the Board monitoring report process, the Board also has been working this academic year to review all Board policies and revise or update those policies as they see fit. This policy review process has given the Board the opportunity to determine:
• if there is a need for new policies,
• if current Board policies are still relevant,
• if the language in current policies accurately represents the intent of the policy and the actual work that is being done by the Board.

Through this iterative process, Board members have made minor verbiage changes in some policies, determined that policies are accurate as currently written, and have proposed adding new policies. This policy work is all done in a Board retreat session that is open to the public. The process allows for open dialogue along proposed changes to policies as well as proposal of new policies that may be added to the Board policy listing. The Board members have thoughtful and thorough conversations around the proposed changes and additions to policies. To date, no new policies have been added to the Board policy listing; instead, the conversation has been so thoughtful and thorough that the proposed policy additions were withdrawn by the Board member(s) that presented them.

Core Component 3A: The institution’s degree programs are appropriate to higher education

....the MQC Feedback Report considers the need for a fully deployed performance management system, particularly for adjunct faculty, as an Opportunity.

All employee groups, in addition to Meet and Confer, now have specific, contractual requirements for merit increases. These groups include Campus Police, Educational Support Professionals, CEBA, and faculty, both full-time and adjunct.
Specifically regarding faculty, on March 18, 2013, the Board of Trustees ratified a new Faculty Contract (in effect through 2015-16) which includes dramatically different evaluation systems for both full-time and adjunct faculty.

Below the major differences between our previous full-time faculty system and the new one, which is in its first year of implementation in 2013-14, are delineated.

**Previous System**

1. Evaluation is based on five major categories – Teaching, College Service, Student Service, Professional Development, and Community Service (optional)
2. Depending on status as probationary, temporary, or tenured, faculty complete a Faculty Goals and Improvement Plan (FGIP)
3. FGIP’s are reviewed by the Associate Dean
4. FGIP’s play no role in salary increases
5. Depending on status as probationary, temporary, or tenured, faculty complete a Portfolio
6. Portfolios are reviewed by the Associate Dean
7. Portfolios play no role in salary increases
8. Tenure is determined by administration; rank is determined by longevity
9. Classroom observations are required only for probationary and temporary faculty
10. Depending on the status of the faculty member, student evaluations of instruction are required for selected classes
11. Students’ written comments are viewed only by the faculty member
12. Peer input into evaluation is not permitted
13. Standards for achieving tenure and maintaining ongoing employment are not delineated
14. No minimum standards to maintain ongoing employment are delineated

**New System**

1. Evaluation is based on five major categories – Teaching, College Service, Student Service, Professional Development, and Community Service (optional)
2. All faculty complete a Faculty Performance Evaluation (FPE) every year
3. FPE’s are reviewed by Department Heads/Program Directors and the Associate Dean
4. FPE’s are the means by which merit midpoint and merit increases after achievement of Full Professor are determined
5. For tenure, Associate Professor, and Professor, faculty complete a Portfolio
6. Portfolios are reviewed by a committee of two peers, the Department Head/Program Director, and the Associate Dean
7. Portfolios are the means by which salary increases associated with tenure and rank are determined

8. Tenure and rank are determined by the committee referenced above – the committee recommends to the Dean and Provost

9. Periodic observations are required of all faculty

10. Student evaluations of instruction are required for all classes every semester

11. Students’ written comments are viewed by the faculty member, Department Head/Program Director, and Associate Dean

12. Peer input into evaluation is encouraged and required

13. Standards for achieving merit, tenure and rank are delineated

14. Minimum standards to maintain ongoing employment are delineated, even for tenured faculty not seeking promotion or merit

The adjunct faculty evaluation system used to include student evaluations of every course, but it now also includes mandatory observation by a peer or administrator every three years, with required feedback to the faculty member.

Core Component 3B: the institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

However, it also notes that results from developmental education students (AFP) are an Opportunity, particularly because one of their Core Competencies is minimizing barriers for underprepared learners.

GRCC has created several initiatives to improve developmental education results. Two of these projects are the Title III funded College Success Center and Achieving the Dream projects. Through these efforts, GRCC has lowered the incidence of developmental education to 48.3%, compared with the State of Michigan rate of 62%. GRCC continues to fall behind NCCPB benchmarks for English and Math; however, the Math performance is 6.5 percentage points behind (from 10.8 points) and English is 6 percentage points behind (from 9.7 points) for students in Fall 2011. This improvement can be seen as a result of the Achieving the Dream work to improve developmental outcomes in Math and English, as well as the Title III projects.

Specifically:

- **On Track and Fast Track** minimize barriers and accelerate student completion of developmental education or help them to bypass the developmental course. Barriers we remove from these interventions include: less developmental placement, time saved, tuition saved, financial aid eligibility extended. There is also greater success in gateway classes.
- **Connect.** The goal is to connect PY 097 (Strategies for College and Life Success) students with coaches and provide a series of activities along with PY 097 faculty with the goal of increasing retention. Coaches play a role in removing barriers.

- **Accuplacer Preparation:** This is a proactive strategy to remove barriers such as eliminate false positives, and avoid under placement/over placement issues and proper intervention placement as well.

- **Diagnostics for lower level AFP students.** The same goal as the Accuplacer Prep, except that it is only for students who place in the lower level of AFP (MA 095, EN 097, RD 095/097). The idea here is to offer more diagnostics to assess those who have potential and those who should be taking their original placement and talk about career goals.

- **Proactive Interventions and support services at High Schools.**

- **Reading 095** – new course for the lowest level reader

- **A-COMP** – using the Accelerated Learning Program concept of enrolling students in gateway English and developmental English in the same term

Core Component 3B: the institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

...the need to employ a systematic process to ensure that employees continue to train and develop and to ensure training meets the needs of the participants is an Opportunity.

Each employee group has expectations for professional development. The processes include individual professional development plans which are approved by supervisors and the achievement of these plans are monitored in the evaluation systems.

On the staff side, these plans are entered into a database that includes both offerings from Staff Development and other training individual employees need. Staff Development has access to the database. If an employee selects a Staff Development offering, s/he is notified when the offering is scheduled. If training is requested that cannot be met by an internal offering, Staff Development might develop a new offering or will identify an external source for the training.

Staff Development periodically does surveys asking about needs. Last summer, surveys were sent out asking people what training in Word, Excel, and Powerpoint they needed. These more specific surveys help define needs across the organization.

Staff Development does an evaluation survey after every training session and uses that information to inform future sessions.

For the Faculty, one of the five roles of faculty members is Professional Development. Each Faculty member identifies their professional development plan for the year in their Faculty Performance Evaluation plan. These need to be a mix of Disciplinary and Pedagogical learning experiences.

The Center for Teaching and Learning organizes its offering to meet institutional obligations, to meet the need of institutional policies and contract agreements, to respond to requests from faculty, to disseminate knowledge from institutional experts, and to respond to issues noted by the instructional
support staff who do individual consultations with faculty. An example of offerings meeting institutional obligations are the series of learning opportunities related to accessibility of classroom materials. The series of sessions offered to support the new Faculty Performance Evaluation system is an example of meeting institutional contract agreements. Faculty requests are solicited through the evaluation survey that follows every session. Institutional Experts, such as our student conduct office, provide training on handling disruptive students. Finally, as instructional support staff work with faculty, they identified a need for an online version of Blackboard Basics.

The CTE also does an evaluation survey after every session and uses that information to make improvements. Every year, they hold a Faculty Learning Day for all full-time faculty. The evaluation survey after that session gives every full-time faculty member an opportunity to identify learning opportunities they would like to see offered.

Core Component 3C: The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high quality programs and student services

...the organization is in the early stages of developing an approach to manage workforce change, and it does not have a strategic approach to recruiting a diverse workforce.

GRCC has an established process for workforce personnel changes. These changes are developed and reviewed with the Executive Budget Control Officers and approved by the President prior to implementation. Cabinet members are then notified of personnel changes. The College would not establish processes for “shared decision making” in personnel matters.

GRCC is still in the early stages of developing a comprehensive approach to manage workforce change more broadly defined. Academic and Student Affairs is now taking a more assertive approach to documenting the processes by which division and departmental reorganization and realignment decisions are made and, subsequently, the processes which are then undertaken to communicate, implement, and assess those changes.

For the past two and a half years, as part of its Strategic Plan, GRCC has been working on a College Action Project (CAP 5.2.1) to strengthen the recruitment and hiring process to attract highly qualified, highly diverse full time and adjunct faculty. Our cross college team has completed the following work:

- We are advertising more broadly to diverse applicants.
- Our recruitment efforts indicate that we have diversified applicant pools.
- We have developed new training that is required for anyone serving on a screening committee. The training is focused on identifying unintentional bias.
- Adjunct recruitment events are held once each semester to diversify applicant pools, provide realistic job previews of adjunct work, and allow for pre-screening of candidates by program directors and department heads.
- Our data reflect improvement: 20.6% of our employees are represented by minority populations. This is within 5% of our student minority population.

The work of this action project is reported regularly to the Strategic Leadership Team and to the Board of Trustees via the President’s Monitoring system (Executive Limitation, Treatment of People).
Core Component 3C: The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high quality programs and student services

...MQA Feedback Report points to unstable trends in active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners, benchmarks measures by CCSSE, as Opportunities.

CCSSE results over the past several years are of particular concern at GRCC. The results and what we are doing to improve student engagement are the focus of a specialized Student Success Indicator report presented to the Board of Trustees annually (most recently, August 2013). Up until 2009 GRCC’s numbers for most of the five categories were increasing; however, the results from 2011 show decrease in all five areas. The results from 2013 show further decrease in three areas, a slight increase in one area (student faculty interaction) and no change in the last one (support for students). However, a further analysis shows some interesting trends. When you compare the data for fulltime vs. part time students to the benchmarks, our fulltime students are above benchmark in two areas (active and collaborative learning, academic challenge), and at benchmark in two additional areas (student effort and student faculty interaction).

It is a research-supported fact that fulltime students are more likely to be engaged and ultimately to achieve their goals than part time students. Our enrollment trend shows that in the past ten years the percent of our students attending part time has increased 10% points from 58% in 2005 to 69% in Winter 2014. Part time students divide their time; they are more likely not to have time to visit computer labs or tutoring services because they are working. We believe the services we have implemented have been effective for fulltime students. We continue to search to find ways to provide effective services to those students attending part time.

A number of College Action Projects (CAPS) from the GRCC Strategic Plan (2011-2014) are focused on increasing student engagement including:

1.1.1 Implement strategies to increase the number of students who graduate
1.1.2 Promote faculty leadership in academic advising
1.1.3 Create and revise transfer agreements
2.1.1 Implement the College Success Program
2.1.2 Implement Achieving the Dream initiatives
2.1.3 Create an accessible campus for all
2.2.2. ABO Leadership Program
5.1.1 Mandate the student success course (CLS100)
5.1.2 Integrate the Starfish Early Alert program
5.1.4 Strengthen infrastructure of distance-delivered education
5.2.1 Strengthen the recruitment and hiring process to attract highly qualified, highly diverse fulltime and adjunct faculty
5.2.2 Improve the adjunct faculty experience
6.2.1 Develop a college-wide Career Pathways system

In fall of 2013, a new team was created called the Street to Completion Team. The purpose of this team is to increase student successes as measured by retention, transfer and completion through the creation of discrete teams that will develop and implement targeted activities for pre-defined populations using
baseline data, tasks, developing an action plan, monitor and evaluate and identify strategies to influence next strategic plan. We expect that this effort will result in increased CCSSE outcomes as well.

The predefined populations include:

- African American males
- Foundation scholarship students
- Student employees
- Latino students
- Off campus students

In addition, other subteams will concentrate on a whole systems approach to improve the following outcomes:

- Access
- Retention
- Completion
- Transfer

Core Component 3D: The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching

The Report (MQC) also suggests that segmentation of student data in these areas (student services such as tutoring, counseling, advising, disability support, occupational support and service learning) could provide more accurate information for improvement planning...The Early Alert Flag System is not reviewed by student segments to determine trends or opportunities for continuous improvement when students are at risk; therefore, this is considered an Opportunity. The lack of a systematic process for proactively identifying programs and services for its students also presents the institution with an Opportunity.

GRCC has begun to proactively identify programs and services for students. As we began to increase online course offerings, our Academic Tutorial Services office surveys students for their need of online tutorial services. As a result, GRCC offers students access to online tutoring during the times most requested by the students. GRCC also identified a new program for students on academic probation. By reviewing the data and identifying trends, GRCC created a new outreach program for students on academic probation to reduce the number of students suspended from GRCC. This program received the National Council of Instructional Administrators Honorable Mention Award for Exemplary Initiatives. Based on data that was reviewed by both Dean’s Council and the Academic Governing Council, it was determined that the First-Year Experience course, CLS 100, would be made mandatory for all entering students with less than a 3.0 high school GPA. The data were very clear, that this course promotes student learning and integration into post-secondary education. Students taking this course perform better academically and are retained at a higher level. In response to the current inability to review Early Alert flags by segments, GRCC has chosen a new Early Alert software that will allow us to segment by student groups to determine patterns of risk.

Another example of being proactive in identifying programs for student segments is the creation of the P.L.A.C.E.: Providing Learning Atmosphere through Coaching and Encouragement. This service provides students enrolled in developmental courses a place to connect with fellow students, tutors and staff to
help them focus on being successful. After reviewing the data on African American male student success, GRCC launched the mentoring and leadership development program Alpha Beta Omega. This program is in its second year, but preliminary data from participants is promising.

Core Component 3E: The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

...the MQC Feedback Report notes that Indicators of Success lack comparative/competitive data in percent of students in clubs/organizations/athletics, courses with co-curricular activities, and community collaborative partnerships, making this an area for Opportunity.

We continue to search out comparative/competitive data in the area of clubs/organizations/athletics. A wide variance in how community colleges approach student participation in these types of activities makes comparisons difficult. For example, comparative data for this area is not available as part of the National Community College Benchmarking Project.

Core Component 4B: the institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

...the MQA Feedback Report points to the results for developmental education students (AFP) for Math and English, which show GRCC performance behind the national NCCBP benchmark, as an Opportunity.

GRCC has created several initiatives to improve the developmental education results. Two of these projects are the Title III funded College Success Center and Achieving the Dream projects. Through these efforts, GRCC has lowered the incidence of developmental education to 48.3%, compared with the State of Michigan rate of 62%. GRCC continues to fall behind NCCPB benchmarks for English and Math; however, the Math performance is 6.5 percentage points behind (from 10.8 points) and English is 6 percentage points behind (from 9.7 points) for students in Fall 2011. This improvement can be seen as a result of the Achieving the Dream work to improve developmental outcomes in Math and English, as well as the Title III projects.

Specifically:

- **On Track and Fast Track** minimize barriers and accelerate student completion of developmental education or help them to bypass the developmental course. Barriers we remove from these interventions include: less developmental placement, time saved, tuition saved, financial aid eligibility extended. There is also greater success in gateway classes.
- **Connect.** The goal is to connect PY 097 students with a coach and provide a series of activities along with PY 097 faculty with the goal of increasing retention. Coaches play a role in removing barriers.
- **Accuplacer Prep:** This is a proactive strategy to remove barriers such as eliminating false positives, and avoiding under placement/over placement issues and proper intervention placement as well.
- **Diagnostics for lower level AFP students.** The same goal as the Accuplacer Prep, except that it is only for students who place in the lower level of AFP (MA 095, EN 097, RD 095/097). The idea here is to offer more diagnostics to assess those who have potential and those who should be taking their original placement and talk about career goals.
- **Proactive Interventions and support services at High Schools.**
- **Reading 095** – new course for the lowest level reader
• **A-COMP** – using the Accelerated Learning Program concept of enrolling students in gateway English and developmental English in the same term

Core Component 4C: The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

...the MQA Feedback Report credit GRCC for monitoring student outcomes data for credit and non-credit students, yet it notes the lack of segmented results for other student groups as an Opportunity.

In 2010, GRCC joined the *Achieving the Dream* national project. Our goal for participating in that effort was to identify and close achievement gaps for at-risk students. In August 2010, we established a Faculty Data Team who identified those courses that had the largest achievement gaps for different segments of students. They then identified five focus areas for future efforts including achievement gaps for African American students, achievement gaps for Hispanic students, low course success rates in math, low course success rates in English/reading, and achievement gaps for older, first time students. A team was created for each of these areas to establish and implement projects that would lead to more successful student outcomes. In 2012, these efforts were combined under a single College Action Project in the GRCC Strategic Plan.

Grand Rapids Community College has made significant progress in improving infrastructure to support student success and completion. Along with participating in *Achieving the Dream*, academic leadership has committed to the Completion Agenda, and the GRCC Board of Trustees has made student success an End of the institution. To further improve our efforts in this area, GRCC applied to and was accepted into the inaugural cohort of the HLC Academy on Persistence and Completion.

Currently, the following student outcome data is available:

a. Persistence: “percentage of students who persist from one semester to the next”
   
   1) Persistence rate (fall to next term), State of Michigan DashBoard data for 2007-08 to 2011-12 (all students), GRCC Dashboard/Indicator report, National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP). All data available disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and Pell status.

b. Retention: “percentage of first time students who return for subsequent semesters”
   
   1) Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE) data for first time students by full time/part time status, ethnicity, and gender for each cohort group 2000-01 to 2011-12
   
   2) Fall to winter retention for beginning, degree seeking students by gender, ethnicity, age, fulltime/part time status, Arts and Sciences program students, Workforce Development students, and Developmental program students
   
   3) Retention rate – Fall to fall for first time, degree-seeking students (IPEDS and GRCC DashBoard/Indicator Report). All data available disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and Pell status.

c. Completion: “percentage of students who earn a certificate or degree within an allotted amount of time”
1) Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE) data for first time students by fulltime/part time status, ethnicity and gender for each cohort group from 2000-01 to 2011-12.

2) State of Michigan DashBoard data for 6-year completion/transfer rates from 2007-08 to 2011-12 (also on GRCC DashBoard/Indicator Report).

3) Completion (150% graduation rate) for first time, full time students (IPEDS report, GRCC DashBoard/Indicator Report, National Community College Benchmarking Project). All data available disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and Pell status.

Core Component 5B: The institution’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

There is an opportunity for GRCC to use performance data to improve its governance and leadership systems while fulfilling the values of excellence and accountability.

...the team respectfully submits that College leaders fully assess the value of its policy structure."

In 2012-13, the Board began the process of Board self-assessment as a way to determine the effectiveness of the Board’s governance structure. This was the first time that the Board had officially assessed its own effectiveness. The Board self-assessment process consists of each Board member taking an electronic survey that comprises several questions aimed at gauging the effectiveness of the Board in the following areas:

- Student Success
- System Finance
- Future/Vision
- Policy Role
- Board/President Relationship
- General Board Effectiveness
- Board Education & Advocacy
- Qualitative responses to the questions:
  - “What are the Board’s greatest strengths?”
  - “What are the areas in which the Board must improve?”

The self-assessment process is designed to evaluate the value of the policy governance structure.

As a direct result of this self-assessment process, the Board identified Future/Vision as a gap that needed to be filled in our governance and leadership systems. To address this gap the Board created a new executive limitation policy – Vision/Future. As an executive limitation, the President is evaluated for effectiveness in this area and the Board has added environmental scanning to their retreat agendas as an item that is discussed on a regularly scheduled basis and is also part of the strategic planning conversations that take place in retreats. This process mirrors the environmental scanning work and discussions that takes place as part of the work at regular Strategic Leadership Team meetings; ensuring that the Board and the college are speaking the same language when it comes to monitoring the ends that are directly linked to the strategic plan. It is through this retreat work and Board monitoring process that the Board adds value to the strategic planning process. The Board is now in the process of working
through its second self-assessment process for the 13-14 academic year and preliminary results indicate that progress has been made with regard to the work of the Board this academic year.

The Board of Trustees adopted policy governance because it is a governance structure that emphasizes:

- vision,
- empowerment of both the Board and the staff, and
- the strategic ability to lead leaders.

Policy governance is a policy structure that clearly defines the role of the Board and the role of the president. It is through the monitoring of the ends, the Board self-assessment, and the evaluation of the president that the Board ensures that the college is using performance based data to improve the leadership system to fulfill all institutional values.

Core Component 5D: The institution works systematically to improve its performance

*Throughout the MQC Feedback Report, limited systematic cycles of evaluation and improvement for many of GRCC’s key process were identified as an Opportunity.*

As we analyzed the feedback, we agreed with this observation as an area that required our immediate attention. We believe we have made huge gains in this area thanks to the very specific feedback we got from the MQA visitors. It is true that at the time of the visit a number of key processes had not undergone a cycle of evaluation and improvement. Some of those processes were relatively new at the time or had been recently revised, thus they had not completed a full cycle yet. However, upon closer examination it was determined that in most cases the real issue was that there was no systematic documentation collected to provide evidence of the evaluation processes and improvements done to key processes. Given the enormity of the task we decided to start by addressing the key processes related to the teaching and learning processes as they are essential to our mission. We developed a comprehensive quality management system summarized in the following figure:
This quality management system (for teaching and learning related processes) aims to bring together the results of the evaluation and improvements made in the following areas:

- Academic Load (for Students)
- Academic Standing
- Admissions – International Students
- Association of College & Research Libraries
- Common Syllabus Elements
- Course Learning Outcomes
- Distance Learning
- Experiential Learning
- Faculty Evaluation
- Financial Aid Literacy
- Academic Program Review
- Accreditation (Regional and Professional)
- Adult Education
- Bookstore Expectations
- Complaint Management
- Developmental Education
- Dual Enrollment
- Faculty/Staff Ethics
- Faculty Hiring
- Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress
As with our policies, each process has an “owner” or “gatekeeper” that is charged with analyzing how the standards for each of the above processes are implemented at the College as well as for determining if the process and outcomes measures of each process are met. The gatekeeper presents a report to one or more of the following groups: Deans’ Council, Academic Governing Council or Cabinet following a schedule (most reports are yearly reports, however some are bi-annual and the Ethics Monitoring is semi-annual). Most of the processes above have gone now through a two-year cycle. The reports include the following: report history; purpose of the process; overview with a general description of the process, policy or activity; progress of recommendations from last report; process and outcomes measures progress; issues or concerns and recommendations of next steps for next year.

What have we accomplished?

- Created an organizational curriculum; a knowledge management system that has increased the reflective practice in a systematic way
  - We know more about what we do and how we do it. We are analyzing processes in a more detailed way than ever before and we have established baseline data in all the areas incorporated into the system so far.
  - We developed a common lexicon and we created greater interdepartmental connections because the platform to share the reports is wider than the specific areas where the work takes place.
  - We have been able to develop specific interventions with short term gains in several areas.
We have a systematic way to address new institutional concerns. As the system has been deployed we have had requests to have other processes be incorporated into it (e.g., Financial Aid Literacy)

- Created a collective awareness of the importance of processes and outcomes. At the same time, a wider audience has better understanding of the whole, how the system works and how processes are connected and affect each other.

- We developed a sense of ownership for policies, procedures and practices and increased the sense of accountability. Gatekeepers are becoming more creative in what they want to do while they are systematically developing next steps.

- The work of some departments has become more focused as evidenced by the departmental plans and individual performance evaluations.

What have we learned?

- The model provides evidence of the systems that are needed to support student success and faculty work. This model helps us systematically talk about outcomes and documents why we are doing something at a particular time in a particular way.

- The model helps us identify gaps and actively seek improvements within a one year cycle.

- Determining and collecting evidence of quality is a complex task. It is monitored in different levels and it is hard to have a complete grasp of the whole.

- Accountability is both horizontal and vertical.

- We have taken the process management work to a new level as we applied process management techniques to the big systemic picture.

- Having a single champion (gatekeeper) is ensuring the deployment of the next steps and the improvements, so fewer things are falling through the cracks.

It is important to capitalize on a cultural strength: GRCC culture is a process oriented culture, and the system is allowing us to bring the cultural strength to improve the system itself.

Link to GRCC Pathway to Success:
The tracking systems in place for the Work System Development model are integrated into the GRCC Path to Success because they inform the plans and goals of the individual and departments who are responsible for each of the work systems and key processes. For example, the improvement actions delineated in each of the TLQM reports become part of the yearly department plan, are sometimes College Action Projects, and in either case, would be incorporated into the Performance Evaluations of the individuals responsible for the work. A midyear check on progress toward individual goals is done as part of all Performance Evaluations. The Provost-Deans team does quarterly checks of progress on department plans. The Strategic Leadership Team does a monthly check in on CAPs. These checks help
assure that we make the planned improvements and achieve results. Each College Action Project does a formal midyear report and an end of year report on progress to SLT.

Link to the Strategic Planning Process:
Strategy teams had been in place at GRCC as early as 1996 (Appendix E). Over the years, the strategic planning process has gone through a number of cycles of evaluation and improvement. The name of the team changed over time (Long Range Planning Task Force, Strategy Team, College Planning Council, and now – Strategic Leadership Team) to reflect the needs and requirements for planning at the time. We believe the members of the MQA site visit team misunderstood comments from members of the Strategic Leadership Team who referred to processes and activities as “new.” We were, in fact, implementing an ambitious new process for strategic planning that incorporated what were previously four separate processes: college wide strategic planning, department level planning, budget planning, and individual performance evaluation. (We have since added facility planning and information technology planning to the mix.) However, the changed process was itself evidence of “systematic cycles of evaluation and improvement.”

Each spring, the members of the Strategic Leadership Team complete an evaluation regarding the extent to which the team is achieving its goals. The information from this survey is used by the SLT Executive Team to prepare recommendations to the President for changes to the bylaws, structure, and operations of the team.
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