



Ohio Partnership for Excellence

Boris E. Slogar, Executive Director
829 Bethel Road, #212
Columbus, Ohio 43214
Office: 614-441-8337
Cell: 614-425-7157

Boris@PartnershipOhio.Org
www.partnershipohio.org

May 21, 2007

Dr. Roy Church, Ph.D.
Lorain County Community College
1005 North Abbe Road
Elyria, OH 44035

Dear Dr. Church:

Congratulations on achieving the Silver Level of recognition for Lorain County Community College! We trust that the feedback provided will be helpful and actionable as you move your organization forward in its journey toward performance excellence.

We look forward to recognizing your organization at our Quest for Success Conference during our Award's Banquet on September 19th. Once again, congratulations!

I will call Robert Callaway in June to set up a time for me to come out and visit. This visit will be to discuss next steps for your organization as well as to provide me a chance to get your feedback and thoughts as we prepare for the next award cycle.

Sincerely,

Boris E. Slogar
Executive Director

TM/attachment

Ohio Partnership for Excellence
2007 Feedback Report



Lorain County Community College (LCCC)

May, 2007

Preparing to read your Feedback Report . . .

Your Feedback Report contains OPE 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 Award Criteria. The feedback is nonprescriptive. It will tell you where the Examiners think you have strengths to celebrate and where they think improvement opportunities exist. The feedback will not say specifically how you should address these opportunities. The specifics will depend on what you decide is most important to your organization.

Applicant organizations read and use feedback comments (both strengths and opportunities for improvement) in different ways. We've gathered some tips and practices from prior Applicants for you to consider.

- Take a deep breath and prepare to benefit from the OPE feedback process. You applied to get the feedback. Read it, take time to digest it, and read it again.
- Celebrate your strengths. You've worked hard and should congratulate yourselves.
- Use your strength comments to understand what the Examiners observed you do well and build upon them. Continue to evaluate and improve the things you do well.
- You know your organization better than the Examiners know it. There might be relevant information that was not communicated to them or that they did not fully understand. Therefore, not all of the comments may be equally accurate.
- Although we strive for "perfection," we do not achieve it in every comment. If Examiners have misread your Application Report or misunderstood your organization on a particular point, don't discount the whole Feedback Report. Consider the other comments and focus on the most important ones.
- Prioritize your opportunities for improvement. You can't do everything all at once. Think about what's most important for your organization at this time and decide which things to work on first.
- You may decide to address all, some, or none of the opportunities for improvement in a particular Item. It depends on how important you think that Item or comment is to your organization.
- Use the feedback as input to your strategic planning process. Focus on the strengths and opportunities for improvement that have an impact on your strategic goals and objectives.

INTRODUCTION

This feedback report is the culmination of an extensive evaluation process of your application report and OPE’s site visit findings. It contains observations made by an examination team from the OPE Board of Examiners. You will find a summary of key themes followed by a detailed listing of strengths and opportunities for improvement by each Item as referenced in the OPE Award Criteria.

The next section provides background information on the examination process and scoring information. Specific comments on strengths and opportunities for improvement follow.

During the application review process, the OPE and the Board of Examiners maintain strict confidentiality of your information and this feedback.

APPLICATION REVIEW

Stage 1, Independent Review

The application evaluation process begins with a Stage 1 review. OPE assigns four or more members of the Board of Examiners to each application. It makes assignments according to the Examiners’ areas of expertise and to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Each Examiner independently evaluates the application report and writes comments relating to the applicant’s strengths and opportunities for improvement and uses a scoring system developed for the Award Program. All applicants in all sectors (government, business, education, health care and not for profit) go through the Stage 1 evaluation process.

Stage 2, Consensus Review

All applicants proceed to the Stage 2 review. A team of Examiners, led by a Team Leader, conducts a series of conference calls or face-to-face meetings to reach consensus on comments that capture the team’s collective view of the applicant’s strengths and opportunities for improvement. Additionally, the team decides on a score for each Item and identifies the issues to clarify and verify during the site visit. The team documents its comments, scores, and site visit issues into a single Consensus Scorebook. The major steps of the Consensus Review process are:

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

After the conclusion of the Consensus Process, the analysis of the Examiners is reviewed by the Panel of Judges to determine which Applicants will receive a Site Visit.

Stage 3, Site Visit Review

If selected for a site visit, the team of Examiners conducts Stage 3 to clarify any uncertainty or confusion regarding the written application report and to verify that the information provided is correct. The team identifies several site visit issues to address by interviewing the applicant's employees or by reviewing documentation on site. After completing the site visit, the team of Examiners prepares a final Site Visit Scorebook. The major steps of the Site Visit Review process are:

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

Stage 4, Judges' Review

During Stage 4, OPE forwards the Application Reports, Consensus Scorebooks, and Site Visit Scorebooks for all Applicants to the Panel of Judges, which makes final recommendations on which applicants should receive an Award. The Judges discuss applications individually and as a group, with the final decision of the appropriate award level determined by a vote.

Some members of the Panel of Judges are from out-of-state. Judges do not participate in discussions or vote on applicants in that they have a conflict of interest or a competing interest. The panel reviews and discusses all conflicts so that all Judges are aware of their own and others' limitations on access to information and participation in discussions and voting.

OPE designs the judging process to allow a balanced assessment of organizational quality. The Panel of Judges considers several factors in addition to the overall score. These include the breadth and relevance of competitive comparisons; observations, verification, and clarification obtained during the site visits; and the strengths and opportunities for improvement identified by the examination team. Recognizing that business, education, government, health care, and not-for-profit each have different needs and dynamics, the OPE Panel of Judges nevertheless seeks to apply consistent standards across all sectors for the final determination of Award levels.

The Judges' final recommendations are then sent to the OPE Board of Trustees for approval. The Judges also identify best practices for recognition and presentations at the annual Quest for Success conference.

Following the Judges' review and recommendations of Award recipients, the Team Leader and the examination team edits the final Site Visit Scorebook (or the Final Consensus Scorebook) to become this Feedback Report.

The major steps of the Judges' Review process are:

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
<p>Panel of Judges' Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application Reports • Consensus Scorebooks • Site Visit Scorebooks • Updated Results (Category 7) 	<p>Evaluation by Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those receiving Site Visits • Those not receiving Site Visits 	<p>Assessment of Organization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall Strengths/ Opportunities for Improvement • Determination of Award Level • Identification of Best Practices

SCORING

OPE designed the scoring system used to score each Item to differentiate applicants in the evaluation reviews and to facilitate feedback. The basis for the Scoring Guidelines contained in each sector's criteria booklet are evidence that a performance excellence system is in place; the depth and breadth of its deployment; and the results it is achieving.

An applicant's total scores fall into one of eight scoring bands. Each band corresponds to a descriptor associated with that scoring range. Figure 1 on the next page provides scoring information on each band. Your organization scored overall in **band 3**.

In the Feedback Report, applicants receive individual scoring bands by each category/item based upon the Scoring Guidelines (Figure 2), which describe the characteristics typically associated with specific scoring ranges.

COMMENTS

Next, are comments from the Examiners, evaluating your organization against the Award Criteria. The Key Themes provide you the most important comments determined by the Examiner team.

Detailed comments by Item follow the Key Themes. Opportunities for improvement are not prescriptive but should be actionable by your organization, if you choose to utilize these opportunities.

Figure 1: SCORING BAND DESCRIPTORS

Scoring Band	Descriptors
0–275 1	The organization demonstrates the early stages of developing and implementing approaches to Category requirements, with deployment lagging and inhibiting progress. Improvement efforts focus on problem solving. A few important results are reported, but they generally lack trend and comparative data.
276–375 2	The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the basic requirements of the Items, but some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment. The organization has developed a general improvement orientation that is forward looking. The organization obtains results stemming from its approaches, with some improvements and good performance. The use of comparative and trend data is in the early stages.
376–475 3	The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the basic requirements of most Items, although there are still areas or work units in the early stages of deployment. Key processes are beginning to be systematically evaluated and improved. Results address many areas of importance to the organization’s key requirements, with improvements and/or good performance being achieved. Comparative and trend data are available for some of these important results areas.
476–575 4	The organization 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. Results address key customer/stakeholder, market, and process requirements, and they demonstrate some areas of strength and/or good performance against relevant comparisons. There are no patterns of adverse trends or poor performance in areas of importance to the organization’s key requirements.
576–675 5	The organization demonstrates effective, systematic, well-deployed approaches responsive to the overall requirements of the Items. The organization demonstrates a fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and organizational learning that result in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of key processes. Results address most key customer/stakeholder, market, and process requirements, and they demonstrate areas of strength against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks. Improvement trends and/or good performance are reported for most areas of importance to the organization’s key requirements.
676–775 6	The organization demonstrates refined approaches responsive to the multiple requirements of the Items. These approaches are characterized by the use of key measures, good deployment, evidence of innovation, and very good results in most areas. Organizational integration, learning, and sharing are key management tools. Results address many customer/stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements. The organization is an industry* leader in some results areas.
776–875 7	The organization demonstrates refined approaches responsive to the multiple requirements of the Items. It also demonstrates innovation, excellent deployment, and good-to-excellent performance levels in most areas. Good-to-excellent integration is evident, with organizational analysis, learning, and sharing of best practices as key management strategies. Industry* leadership and some benchmark leadership are demonstrated in results that address most key customer/stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements.
876–1000 8	The organization demonstrates outstanding approaches focused on innovation, full deployment, and excellent, sustained performance results. There is excellent integration of approaches with organizational needs. Organizational analysis, learning, and sharing of best practices are pervasive. National and world leadership is demonstrated in results that fully address key customer/stakeholder, market, process, and action plan requirements.

*Industry refers to other organizations performing substantially the same functions, thereby facilitating direct comparisons.

Figure 2: Scoring Guidelines

SCORE	PROCESS (For Use With Categories 1–6)	RESULTS (For Use With Category 7)
0% or 5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No systematic approach is evident; information is anecdotal. (A) ▪ Little or no deployment of an approach is evident. (D) ▪ An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems. (L) ▪ No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently. (I) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are no organizational performance results or poor results in areas reported. ▪ Trend data are either not reported or show mainly adverse trends. ▪ Comparative information is not reported. ▪ Results are not reported for any areas of importance to your organization's key mission or business requirements.
10%, 15%, 20%, or 25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item is evident. (A) ▪ The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item. (D) ▪ Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident. (L) ▪ The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving. (I) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A few organizational performance results are reported; there are some improvements and/or early good performance levels in a few areas. ▪ Little or no trend data are reported. ▪ Little or no comparative information is reported. ▪ Results are reported for a few areas of importance to your organization's key mission or business requirements.
30%, 35%, 40%, or 45%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An effective systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident. (A) ▪ The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in early stages of deployment. (D) ▪ The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident. (L) ▪ The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the other Criteria Categories. (I) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improvements and/or good performance levels are reported in many areas addressed in the Item requirements. ▪ Early stages of developing trends are evident. ▪ Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident. ▪ Results are reported for many areas of importance to your organization's key mission or business requirements.
50%, 55%, 60%, or 65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An effective systematic approach, responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident. (A) ▪ The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units. (D) ▪ A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes. (L) ▪ The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the other Criteria Categories. (I) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improvement trends and/or good performance levels are reported for most areas addressed in the Item requirements. ▪ No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels are evident in areas of importance to your organization's key mission or business requirements. ▪ Some trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show areas of good to very good relative performance. ▪ Organizational performance results address most key customer, market, and process requirements.
70%, 75%, 80%, or 85%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident. (A) ▪ The approach is well deployed, with no significant gaps. (D) ▪ Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing. (L) ▪ The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the other Criteria Items. (I) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current performance is good to excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements. ▪ Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels are sustained. ▪ Many to most reported trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show areas of leadership and very good relative performance. ▪ Organizational performance results address most key customer, market, process, and action plan requirements.
90%, 95%, or 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident. (A) ▪ The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units. (D) ▪ Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization. (L) ▪ The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the other Criteria Items. (I) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current performance is excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements. ▪ Excellent improvement trends and/or sustained excellent performance levels are reported in most areas. ▪ Evidence of industry and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas. ▪ Organizational performance results fully address key customer, market, process, and action plan requirements.

Key Themes

- a. **What are the most important strengths or outstanding practices (of potential value to other organizations) identified?**
- LCCC supports its value of Community Responsibility and Stewardship by responding to the needs of the community and strengthening its key communities. Examples include the establishment of the Corporate and Community Outreach Services, GLIDE program, the inclusion of community members on LCCC's committees, the composition of the DBT, and through the participation of senior leaders and staff on non-profit boards and organizations. The University Partnership may be a best practice.
 - LCCC has demonstrated a focus on continuous improvement. This continuous improvement framework is evident in its leadership system through the Leadership Model (Figure 1.1-1), its strategic planning process through the Strategic Visioning Process (Figure 2.1-1), its information analysis processes through the Data Usage Model (Figure 4.1-1), and its human resource processes through the Strategic Asset Model (Figure 5.1-1). LCCC utilizes OPE, Baldrige, and AQIP assessments as inputs to continuously improve these processes. These models support LCCC's Value of Ongoing Assessment of Effectiveness.
 - LCCC has several processes in place to listen and learn from its stakeholders in order to build relationships with the community. The college seeks community involvement through advisory boards, community events, and engagement sessions designed to allow stakeholders to have a forum to provide input during the Strategic Visioning and other processes. By listening and learning from its stakeholders, LCCC demonstrates a commitment to maintain levy support despite changing attitudes toward local levies, allowing LCCC to meet its mission of providing an affordable education.
 - LCCC utilizes various approaches demonstrating its commitment to valuing faculty, staff and partners. Committees/Councils, comprised of a cross section of employees throughout the organization are used to deploy most processes. Committees are empowered to make decisions. Human resource plans have undergone cycles of improvement to increase employee recognition and benefits, formal and informal recognition, the LiveSmart Program, and educational benefits for faculty and staff. These approaches assist LCCC in addressing its strategic challenge to retain and motivate high performing employees
 - LCCC has demonstrated that it is dedicated to being the low cost provider of education through its mission to provide affordable education. LCCC has identified affordability as a principal success factor and has identified the rising cost of doing business combined with decreasing financial support from the state as a strategic challenge. To remain competitive and meet its strategic challenge, LCCC has instituted an annual budget and planning process to equitably distribute its limited funds, Lean/Six Sigma projects designed to create cost savings of at least \$20,000, and a Continuous Improvement Council designed to improve processes. These cost saving measures along with continued levy support from the community have allowed LCCC to remain competitive with its tuition costs.

Key Themes

b. What are the most significant opportunities, concerns, or vulnerabilities identified?

- Although LCCC utilizes the annual Budget and Planning Process along with the Strategic Vision Process to identify strategic priorities, LCCC's current specific goals and strategic objectives of Vision 2015 are not linked to action plans. Additionally, the Indicators of Effectiveness (Figure 4.1-2) are not yet aligned to the strategic plan goals for Vision 2015. Without clear, measurable action plans and indicators of effectiveness linked to the organization's strategic priorities, it may be difficult for LCCC to measure progress toward achieving its strategic objectives, respond to changing needs and directions, and address barriers to success.
- LCCC has not systematically deployed its human resources and student learning processes to include all educational offerings and all employee groups, including adjunct faculty and part-time employees. Without full deployment of its processes to all educational offering and employee groups, LCCC may be missing opportunities to help achieve its mission to promote education, economic, cultural and community development. Further, it may provide a barrier to deploying its value of Excellence in Learning and Teaching.
- Although LCCC has developed systematic approaches for communication with staff and faculty, including e-mail, intranet, division meetings, employee input meetings, and the FYI newsletter, these communication processes have not been deployed to fully meet the needs of all employee groups for effective and timely communication. Without fully deployed approaches that meet the needs of full time faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff for effective communication, it may be difficult for LCCC to address its strategic challenge to retain and motivate their employees.
- Although LCCC has developed approaches to collect data and information from students, stakeholders, and from learning-centered processes, the information collected about the various processes are not systematically used to improve all processes of importance to LCCC. Additionally, relevant data is not shared within all levels of the organization. Without a clear process to deploy data and information within the organization for continuous improvement, it may be difficult for LCCC to identify potential blind spots and prepare for them proactively.
- Although LCCC has improved its human resource processes, succession planning and career progression processes have been systematically deployed throughout all levels of the organization and within all relevant employee groups. Without a fully deployed processes to ensure succession planning and career progression, it may be difficult for LCCC to plan for unanticipated changes, as well as meet its strategic challenge of attracting, retaining and motivating high performing employees.
- Although LCCC has developed a manual to prepare for emergencies such as a pandemic, the emergency response plan has not been shared with all students, stakeholders, and employees. Additionally, since the disaster approach has recently been developed, it has not yet been assessed for cycles of improvement with relevant stakeholders, including staff

Key Themes

and faculty who would be involved in implementation of the plan. Without full deployment of the emergency plan, it may be difficult to ensure continuity in emergencies and continued availability to information and resources in the event of an emergency.

- Although LCCC values Community Responsibility and Stewardship and has audit approaches in place to assure compliance to its financial processes, LCCC has not developed a systematic approach for measurement of its key compliance processes for its educational programs and offerings. Without systematically monitoring compliance for all key areas, it may be difficult for leadership to be assured it is achieving and surpassing regulatory and legal requirements, as well as addressing risks associated with programs, offerings, services and operations. Additionally, it may be difficult for LCCC to meet its strategic challenges for institutional growth and economic development without proactively measuring and developing goals to address risks.
- c. Considering LCCC's key factors, what are the most significant strengths, opportunities, vulnerabilities, and/or gaps (related to data, comparisons, and linkages) found in its response to Results Items?**
- LCCC has demonstrated several positive trends in areas of importance to the organization. For example, LCCC has experienced positive trends for work system performance results for Performance Appraisal Ratings (Figure 7.4-1), several key faculty and staff learning and development results (Figure 7.4-2, Figure 7.4-3, and Figure 7.4-4), unqualified financial audit results with no findings in the last two audit reports in 2004 and 2005 (Figure 7.6-5), and Learning-centered processes such as the number of degrees awarded (Figure 7.5-1).
 - LCCC has demonstrated some positive results used against comparisons. Examples include: LCCC's Retention Rates for full- and part-time students exceed the comparison average of the 30 other two-year colleges in the Great Lakes Region from 2003 to 2005 (Figure 7.5-1), NorthCoast 99 results indicate favorable trends from 2005 to 2006 in all eight areas measured with results comparing favorably to the median score (Figures 7.4-6 & 7), and ACT Survey Results trend positively for most indicators with favorable comparisons (Figure 7.5-9).
 - Although LCCC has demonstrated positive results in several areas of importance, there are key results missing in several areas. For example, work system effectiveness, including results of skill sharing, retention rates, job classification results, diversity results, and faculty evaluation results are missing. Additionally, key results related to ethical behavior and regulatory indicators, as well as community volunteerism are missing. Without key results data for all areas of importance to the organization, it may be difficult for LCCC to ensure good performance at all levels and within all areas.
 - Although LCCC uses comparison and competitive data, many of these data are sector averages and LCCC is only in the early stages of developing positive results with comparisons to best-in-class and competitors. Competitor and comparative data is missing for several key measures of importance to the organization, and data is not segmented for

Key Themes

many key result areas. For example, no comparative data is provided for many results including Success Rates in Top 30 Courses (Figure 7.1-10), CAR and PAR assessments (Figures 7.1-7, 8), and percentage employed after 6 months/field of study (Figure 7.1-5 & 6). In addition, data is not segmented by student and market segments. Without systematically segmenting and comparing results data, it may be difficult for LCCC to know if it is meeting its strategic challenge related to institutional growth and economic development.

Category 1 Leadership

Item 1.1 Senior Leadership

Score 60%

Strengths

- Senior leaders set organizational vision and values through the Leadership Model (Figure 1.1-1), which involves collecting input from students and stakeholders through surveys and meetings. Senior leaders then work with the Board of Trustees through the Strategic Visioning Process to set direction in alignment with Mission, Vision and Values of the College. Vision and values are communicated and deployed through various committees/councils and through communication tools (Figure 1.1-2). This process was improved through OPE, Baldrige, and AQIP feedback to gain more input from citizens.
- Senior leaders create a sustainable organization through a focus on cost avoidance strategies, re-design of courses and use of technology, implementation of the Decade Challenge Plan to manage financial resources, and passage of local levies. The implementation of cost saving strategies is aligned with LCCC's mission of providing affordable education.
- Senior leaders utilize a communication process that includes the DBT, President, VPs, ALT, OC, organizational units, and committee meetings. To motivate and recognize faculty and staff, senior leaders attend formal recognition ceremonies to make presentations and reinforce high performance. In response to feedback, a new recognition program has recently been implemented to increase formal and informal recognition.

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC's vision and values are not deployed to all key suppliers, partners, full time and adjunct faculty, staff and students. Without deploying the vision and values to all staff, suppliers, partners, and students, it may be difficult to ensure alignment throughout all levels of the organization.
- Although LCCC has instituted policies and procedures, a Campus Code of Conduct and a Professional Code of Ethics, the effectiveness of these approaches is not measured, monitored, and assessed for improvement opportunities. Without systematic approaches for measuring and improving the effectiveness of these processes, it may be difficult for LCCC to assure the public that it focuses on promoting an environment that ensures ethical and legal behavior.
- The Strategic Horizon program is not fully deployed past the leadership structure to all levels and types of employees identified by LCCC. Without fully deploying processes for succession planning and providing leadership opportunities to all appropriate categories of employees, LCCC may be missing the opportunity to develop future leaders.

Category 1 Leadership

- Two-way communication methods are not deployed to all employee and faculty groups, including adjunct faculty, part time employees and student employees. Processes to empower and recognize all staff, students and other stakeholders are not fully deployed.
- Due to a transition in the Visioning Process, LCCC has not deployed its focus on action. Action plans aligned to the Strategic Plan are not shared throughout the organization. Without sharing action plans to accomplish its objectives and balancing value for students and other stakeholders, it may be difficult for LCCC to achieve its goals and attain its organizational performance expectations.

Item 1.2 Governance and Social Responsibilities **Score 50%**

Strengths

- The approach for evaluation of performance of senior leaders includes an annual evaluation of the president by the DBT members and a semi-annual performance review of Vice Presidents by the president.
- LCCC learns of public concerns with current and future programs, offerings, services, and operations through feedback gained from Advisory Committees, ongoing evaluations of academic programs, and assessment of graduate placements, job growth, and economic indicators. Annual meetings of all advisory boards provide a forum for the president and vice-president to directly hear feedback from the community. LCCC analyzes trends to study, prepare, and respond to both positive and negative shifts that may impact the educational needs of the community.
- LCCC promotes and ensures ethical behavior through new employee orientation, codes of conduct, and policies and procedures. Leadership regularly communicates ethics expectations through the communication tools (Fig. 1.1-2) to internal and external stakeholders.
- LCCC actively supports and strengthens its key communities through inclusion of community members on committees, establishment of Corporate and community Outreach Services, composition of the DBT, and participation of senior leaders and staff on non-profit boards and organizations.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Processes to assure day-to-day accountability of management processes have not been fully deployed. For example, the current annual performance review process for leadership and faculty does not ensure day-to-day accountability for management's action. Additionally, it is not evident that fiscal policies and procedures ensure transparency in operations as it relates to stewardship of public funds and how audits have improved performance. Without systematic processes, fully deployed, to ensure operational and fiscal accountability in day-to-day operations, it may be difficult for LCCC to meet its goal of

Category 1 Leadership

ongoing assessment of effectiveness and its strategic challenge of maintaining levy support.

- Although the President and senior leaders are reviewed by the performance management system, the review process does not systematically use inputs from faculty, staff, and students to improve both their personal leadership effectiveness and the effectiveness of the leadership system of the college and the Board. Additionally, LCCC does not utilize a systematic approach to evaluate the effectiveness of the performance of the District Board of Trustees to identify opportunities to improve.
- Compliance processes that ensure the integrity of LCCC's learning processes are not fully deployed to all faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and staff. LCCC does not routinely track measures and goals for achieving and surpassing regulatory and legal requirements for its learning processes, and for addressing risks associated with programs, offerings, services and operations. Without measuring and developing goals to address risks, it may be difficult for LCCC to meet its strategic challenges for institutional growth and economic development.
- Although LCCC utilizes new employee orientation, the Code of Conduct, and policies and procedures to ensure ethical behavior, LCCC's de-centralized model of complaint management to the Division level does not include a process for routine monitoring and improvement of issues related to ethics and compliance. Beyond the PACE and Climate periodic surveys, there are no routine approaches to monitor and improve ethical behavior. Without a systematic approach to monitor ethical behavior that is deployed to all levels of the organization, it may be difficult to ensure that LCCC continuously improves and proactively addresses blind spots.

Category 2 Strategic Planning

Item 2.1 Strategy Development

Score 50%

Strengths

- The long term strategic visioning process occurs every 5-7 years to develop long term strategies using listen and learn activities to build the vision, and share and act on the vision. Strategic visioning uses the 70-member Vision Council comprised of 35 internal employees/students and 35 external stakeholders to balance needs. LCCC has made refinements to the strategic planning process from OAE, Baldrige and AQIP feedback reports. The annual planning and budget process is aligned to the Strategic Visioning Process and addresses key issues related to budget, facilities, enrollment, technology, strategic challenges and visioning initiatives.
- Through the annual planning process, JSBC conducts the SWOT analysis and an environmental scan of key factors including regulatory environment, technology, demography, competition, and needs of students, stakeholders, and employees. LCCC has refined the processes through the use of annual and multiple cycles such as sharing the vision through employee engagement sessions. The analysis is used to determine the ability to execute the plan which is presented by the President to the District Board of Trustees for approval.
- LCCC ensures its ability to execute the strategic plan through the “Act on the Vision” component of the strategic plan. LCCC selects the appropriate venue (committee, council or individual) for leadership and the President to meet with to initiate the charge for implementation.

Opportunities for Improvement

- While LCCC incorporates listening and learning sessions to refine its mission, vision, and values, and develops specific strategies through the Strategic Visioning Process, this process does not include a systematic approach for identification of blind spots. Without a systematic approach to address blind spots it may be difficult for LCCC to remain agile to respond when events require a change in direction.
- Although LCCC identifies strategic challenges in P.2B and states they are addressed through Vision 21 initiatives, Vision 21 has now been superseded by Vision 2010 planning efforts (Vision 21 closed out with 85% completed). Although the strategic challenges in P.2B, including Maintain Access and Affordability, Maintain Levy Support, Attract and Retain High Performing Employees, and Shift Programs and Services to Enter Different Work Environments, are challenges confronting LCCC today, it is not evident that these challenges are aligned to the specific components of the new strategic plan Vision 2015. Without developing and communicating a strategic plan that addresses the identified strategic challenges, it may be difficult for LCCC to meet the governor’s goal for higher education enrollment.
- Although the committees and councils systemically collect data, the results are not systemically disseminated to all stakeholders and groups in order to achieve the

Category 2 Strategic Planning

organizational mission. Without systemically sharing information, this may impede the achievement of comprehensive communication with all stakeholders.

- Due to Vision 2015 planning efforts underway, there are no time tables for accomplishing the goals of Vision 2015. During the transition of Vision 21 to Vision 2015, communication about the developing plan, as well as what the objectives are for the interim, have not been fully deployed beyond the committee/council structure to all faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff. Without timelines established and communication of the key objectives, it may be difficult for LCCC to determine the completion of goals for this transitional fiscal year as well as for the future years under Vision 2015.

Item 2.2 Strategy Deployment

Score 35%

Strengths

- LCCC develops and deploys Human Resource action plans to achieve objectives through a committee-based process with membership composition based on their expertise. The team develops actions plans, and resources are allocated through annual planning and the budget process. If circumstances dictate, the team is empowered to make adjustments to action plans.
- LCCC's AQIP HR design team was developed in response to feedback from OPE, Baldrige and AQIP and guides LCCC's HR development derived from short and long-term strategic objectives.

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC's key performance measures for tracking progress on action plans is the overall completion of strategic objectives identified in Figure 2.1-2 over a 5- to 7-year time period under Vision 21. LCCC does not have key performance measures for tracking progress on current action plans aligned with Vision 2015. Without key performance measures, it may be difficult for LCCC to measure progress.
- Although LCCC utilizes the strategic visioning process to conduct its strategic planning process to identify priorities, the Vision 2015 goals and objectives are not linked to action plans. Without action plan linkage, it may be difficult to evaluate progress toward achievement.
- Action plans are not fully deployed past the team level to all work units and levels of employees. It may be difficult for LCCC to remain agile to meet its goals without an approach to deploy plans and modify plans throughout all levels of the organization.
- For Vision 2015 planning, LCCC does not provide performance projection for strategic objectives identified through its short- and long-term planning horizons or how this performance compares with competitors and comparable organizations. Without performance projections, and comparison to competitors, it may be difficult for LCCC to monitor performance and progress toward achieving its objectives.

Category 3 Student, Stakeholder, and Market Focus

Item 3.1 Student, Stakeholder & Market Knowledge Score 50%

Strengths

- LCCC utilizes the Joint Center for Policy Research (JCPR) to conduct surveys to determine the student and market segments for current and future educational programs. The process includes identifying up-coming academic program reviews, approving institutional research needs, conducting external market analysis, and providing recommendations. The marketing office also holds a marketing campaign to invite students to take summer classes.
- LCCC uses a variety of listening and learning methods as listed in Figure 3.1-1, including feedback from prospective and enrolled students. The Enrollment Planning Council (EPC) utilizes information collected through these sources to develop enrollment projections and plans that are aligned to organizational needs and College operations.
- LCCC keeps listening/learning methods current by continuing participation in conferences, seminars, and through continued use of OPE, Baldrige, AQIP feedback and the CMDS / Jenzbar / ACT survey.
- Institutional Effectiveness and Planning (IEP) collects and analyzes performance of high school graduates. The data is segmented by school district and shared annually with the school districts. Additionally, ASSET/COMPASS test data are used by academic advisors and counselors in concert with a student's goals to determine a plan of action.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Although LCCC utilizes the JCPR to conduct market research for the EPC to use for enrollment planning, the processes that LCCC utilizes are not fully deployed to facilitate analysis of the external market to enhance existing markets and develop new markets. Additionally, the approach has not been deployed for use with all relevant programs including children's learning, workforce development, Lifelong Learning, and economic development. Without a fully deployed systematic process to conduct external market analysis on a proactive periodic basis, LCCC may not be able to implement new programs to attract new students in a timely manner.
- The processes utilized for determining competitor markets are not fully deployed. For example, analysis of JCPR data does not include all students currently being served by other education providers including other colleges, online degree programs, and for-profit educational programs listed as competitors in the organizational profile. Without a process to include competitors and students in market analysis, LCCC may miss the opportunity to offer services within this sector.

Category 3 Student, Stakeholder, and Market Focus

- Although LCCC utilizes perception data such as ACT Student Satisfaction, CCSSEE, OBOR, and Graduate Tracking Surveys, processes are not fully deployed to use relevant information and feedback from current, former, and future students. This includes utilization of offerings, facilities, voluntary departure or transfer, and complaint data to make process improvements and to develop new services. Without a process to analyze complaint data, LCCC may be missing the opportunity for program and process improvement and development of cycles of learning.

Item 3.2 Student & Stakeholder Relationships and Satisfaction Score 45%

Strengths

- LCCC builds relationships with enrolled students, prospective students, and stakeholders through a variety of methods listed in Figure 3.1-1, Items P.1D and P.1E, including special events, clubs, surveys (CSSE/ACT) partnerships, non-credit offerings and advisory boards. Relationships and satisfaction are measured through the use of surveys which serve as input to the Strategic Visioning Process.
- LCCC's access mechanisms to enable students and stakeholders to seek information include a centrally located facility which is accessible by the county transit system, telephone, web portal, and advertisements in publications. Students can make complaints utilizing the grievance and complaint process outlined in the College Catalog and Student Code of Conduct Handbook.
- LCCC determines student and stakeholder satisfaction through the use of various surveys conducted by either the Joint Center for Policy Research (JCPR) or the office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning (IEP). Results are compared with national or statewide databases, performance gaps and changes are identified, and trends are tracked for high importance areas. This information is distributed to different groups responsible for creating action plans for improvement.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Although LCCC assesses contact requirements through monitoring utilization, the approaches are not fully deployed and integrated to build student and stakeholder relationships and improve satisfaction. For example, contact requirements are not determined for each mode of access and deployed to all people and processes responsible to maintain student and other stakeholder relationships. Without a process to determine contact requirements for each group, LCCC may be missing contacts from segments of their stakeholder, student or community population.

Category 3 Student, Stakeholder, and Market Focus

- Complaint data received at the Division level are not aggregated and analyzed for use in improvement throughout the organization, nor are stakeholder complaint data systematically utilized during the strategic planning process. Without a systematic approach to utilize complaint data to improve relationships and meet customer requirements, LCCC may be missing opportunities to build relationships and to improve satisfaction.
- LCCC's satisfaction determination methods are not fully deployed to all customer and stakeholder groups and all services offered, including non-credit offerings, children's learning, lifelong learning, and workforce development. Without deploying satisfaction determination methods to all segments and offerings LCCC may be missing an opportunity to satisfy all customer groups, as well as improve programs and processes.

Category 4 Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management

Item 4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Review of Org Performance Score 40%

Strengths

- LCCC utilizes its 8-step Data Usage Model (Figure 4.1-1) to select, align, and use information to monitor overall organizational performance. This model includes monitoring of Indicators of Effectiveness (Figure 4.1-2) and the status of strategic planning initiatives (Figure 2.1-1). Key performance measures, such as remediation rates of recent high school graduates, number of recent high school graduates attending college, employability of applicants, and attainment of student learning goals are routinely tracked to support organizational decision making and innovation.
- LCCC collects comparative data from several sources including the OBOR Performance Report, providing comparative educational data for Ohio's 38 public colleges and other comparative surveys such as NorthCoast 99, PACE/Climate, CCSSE, and ACT.
- LCCC reviews organizational performance and capabilities by organizing data into a report format that is graphically represented with a written explanation along with raw data. The reports are deployed to committees/councils to make action plans to improve performance. The president and DBT review the indicators of effectiveness and strategic visioning initiatives on an annual basis.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Although it is designed to achieve goals, the data usage model does not fully track and align data received through various sources to track daily operations and how the data are integrated to track overall organizational performance. Without a systematic approach, fully deployed, to select, collect, and align data, it may be difficult to ensure that daily operations lead to the achievement of organizational goals.
- Although LCCC collects comparative data from various sources, the data are not systematically used to support operational and strategic decision making and innovation. Without the systematic use of this comparative data, it may be difficult for LCCC to identify opportunities to implement stretch goals and innovations.
- Although LCCC regularly reviews some results including the indicators of effectiveness and AQIP action plan data, LCCC does not utilize a systematic approach for regularly reviewing and communicating results throughout the organization. Additionally, LCCC does not utilize a systematic approach for keeping its performance management system agile to respond to rapid or unexpected organizational and external changes. Without systematic processes for results review, it may be difficult for LCCC to ensure agility and to adapt rapidly to unexpected events.
- The indicators of effectiveness, including results, targets, and benchmarks are not systematically deployed to all employees past the committee/council structure. Without this deployment, it may be difficult for organizational alignment and attainment of goals.

Category 4 Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management

Item 4.2 Information and Knowledge Management

Score 60%

Strengths

- LCCC makes needed data and information available to all full- and part-time employees through the password protected CMDS/Jenzabar, web portal, Intranet/CampusNet, e-mail, telephone, fax, and other communication tools listed in Fig. 1.1-2. Students and stakeholders can access information through distance learning, the web portal, or the learning management system. The learning management system (ANGEL) integrates academic programs, campus news, events, personnel forms, student registration, financial aid, and online classes. The process is updated through the technology master plan and is integrated with the annual budget and planning process.
- LCCC ensures hardware and software are reliable, secure, and user-friendly by making Information Systems and Services (IS & S) the point of contact to centralize purchases, installation, maintenance and repair, firewall protection, and virus scans. LCCC has instituted a three-year churn program to replace hardware and software and maintains an IS & S help desk for employees and students. The Technology Master Plan is updated annually in alignment with the budgeting process.
- LCCC transfers knowledge through the use of councils made up of a cross section of employees, students, and in some cases, other stakeholders, to share information and knowledge through CMDS/Jenzabar and CRM database, web page, communications, and training.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Although LCCC utilizes the committee/council structure to share information, the collection and transfer of faculty and staff knowledge is not systematically deployed to all employees, as well as the transfer from and to students, stakeholders, suppliers, and partners. Additionally, LCCC does not systematically identify, share, and implement best practices outside of posting them on the web portal. Without the systematic sharing of information to all stakeholders, LCCC may miss opportunities for improvement.
- Although LCCC utilizes passwords to control access to the system, LCCC does not have a systematic process in place to inform IS&S about the departure, addition, or change of position of employees, or the change of passwords. Without a systematic process in place, it may be difficult for LCCC to ensure data integrity and security, as well as that improper access to the system cannot occur.

Category 5 Faculty and Staff Focus

Item 5.1 Work Systems

Score 60%

Strengths

- LCCC manages works and jobs with a “flat” organizational structure comprised of four types of employees, including faculty, administrators, professional and technical, and support staff. The Faculty Senate and the Staff Council are subcommittees used to promote collaboration and cooperation on matters of performance management and salary. LCCC has realized cycles of improvement in the management of work and jobs through the use of the AQIP HR Design Team.
- LCCC has adopted a formal Performance Management Process for Support Staff (Figure 5.1-2) that includes a mid-year appraisal for new employees to provide an opportunity to formulate a developmental plan. Full-time faculty is reviewed at the end of the academic year by the respective academic division director and includes peer evaluations, a professional activities summary, and student evaluations.
- LCCC employs the use of committees and councils to ensure compensation while recognition and reward programs reinforce high performance work and a student and stakeholder focus. The Joint Salary and Benefits Committee uses a comprehensive score card to monitor key information against similar community colleges to recommend salary levels each year for all types of employees. The HRD Committee and StC organize numerous campus-wide reward and recognition programs listed in Figure 5.1-3.
- Attraction and retention of staff is the first step of LCCC’s Strategic Asset Model, Figure 5.1-1. Characteristics and skills of potential employees are identified in position descriptions which are reviewed by the Hay Group and the SkillsMax process for non-faculty positions to ensure the position description meets current and future needs. Positions are posted internally and advertised externally to attract a culturally diverse market. A screening committee with a cross-section of employees is empowered to interview and recommend three candidates for hire to the organizational unit director or Vice President. The Hay Study is used to assign salary ranges that are appropriate to markets and audit job descriptions to ensure they match duties performed.

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC has not fully deployed an approach for managing work systems. For example, the Faculty Senate does not currently include adjunct faculty who teach many of the courses on campus. Additionally, the Faculty Senate uses separate work systems and performance review systems than the StC. Although there is early evidence of alignment and integration of these systems with some coordination and process improvement by the AQIP HR Design team, the work systems are not fully deployed. Without fully organizing and managing work systems, it may be difficult to assess if HR processes are meeting the needs of faculty and staff, whether communication is full deployed and effective, and whether the strategic goals for retaining a high performing workforce are being met.

Category 5 Faculty and Staff Focus

- Although LCCC tracks diversity and shares an annual report with the community, LCCC does not systematically use processes within the committee/council structure to capitalize on the diverse ideas, cultures, and thinking of the faculty, staff and students. Without an approach to capitalize on the diverse ideas of all its stakeholders, it may be difficult for LCCC to ensure its diversity approaches are deployed to all types of employees, and within all levels of the organization.
- While LCCC encourages a cross section of employees to serve on committees and councils, and has several well-developed communication methods available, it has not systematically deployed its approaches to ensure effective communication and skill sharing across departments, jobs and locations. Without deployment of effective approaches, it may be difficult for LCCC to empower, motivate, and retain their employees.
- Performance evaluation processes are not fully deployed to all faculty and staff groups. By deploying performance feedback processes to all adjunct faculty and part time staff, it may assist LCCC with meeting its strategic challenge related to retaining a high performing workforce, as well as help employees to contribute to the achievement of LCCC's strategic objectives.

Item 5.2 Faculty and Staff Learning and Motivation Score 50%

Strengths

- Training is addressed through the Development phase of the SAM. Organization-wide training is coordinated through HRD, while organizational units, committees, FS, StC, and the ALT are responsible for coordinating training for individual units. Campus-wide programs are developed through HRD with input from employees through surveys, councils, and subcommittees. Organizational priorities and a professional skills matrix are used to align training to the achievement of the strategic plan. Training programs (listed in Figure 5.2-1) for all categories of employees are available, and HRD developed post-class surveys in 2005/2006 to help evaluate the conduct training.
- LCCC addresses new employee orientation with faculty through Convocation and Faculty/Curriculum Development Days. Faculty and staff orientation is also offered with online training and a half-day workshop.
- Education and training is delivered via Campus Net, video, interactive TV, and on-site classes. The delivery mechanisms are determined through input received through e-mail, telephone, or in-person, and from feedback after the class, community outreach, and the enrollment planning committee process. LCCC also utilizes formal mentoring programs for new faculty employees.

Category 5 Faculty and Staff Focus

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC's training approaches are not deployed to all levels and types of employees including part-time and adjunct staff. Additionally, gaps exist in how the training is conducted by organizational units, committees, FS, StC, and ALT is integrated into the overall training methodology of HRD. Without an identified training approach it may be difficult to measure faculty and staff knowledge, skills and capabilities.
- LCCC's education, training, and development approaches do not address all key organizational needs associated with diversity, communication, leadership development, performance improvement, and safety. Increasing faculty and staff training approaches associated with these needs may assist all levels of employees with understanding their role as it relates to the Mission, Vision, and Values of the organization.
- While LCCC utilizes approaches for faculty and staff education to ensure they are properly prepared to deliver learning-centered processes such as subject matter expertise and understanding the developmental needs of non-traditional students, these processes are not fully deployed to all faculty groups throughout the College.
- Although LCCC utilizes the SAM model to reinforce the use of new knowledge and skills on the job, deployment has not extended to how the organization can retain this knowledge for long-term organizational use. Without full deployment of a process to capture knowledge, discuss key projects, and transfer key information from retiring or terminating employees, LCCC may be missing an opportunity to learn, improve processes, and adequately prepare for transitions in staffing.

Item 5.3 Faculty and Staff Well Being and Satisfaction Score 60%

Strengths

- LCCC ensures workplace health through the LiveSmart program, developed in 2004, that features annual health fairs, personal trainers, lunch and learn programs, walking programs, weight watchers, non-credit courses and nutrition coaches. Security is ensured through Campus Security.
- LCCC utilizes key processes to determine factors related to satisfaction and motivation, including the PACE/Climate survey which is administered biennially, employee engagement sessions to provide a forum for two-way communication, an annual survey regarding the Convocation theme, and a new staff progression plan.
- LCCC utilizes the biennial PACE/Climate survey and the Northcoast 99 assessment to measure employee satisfaction. Survey results are analyzed by the Institutional Planning Council and recommendations for improvement are forwarded to the appropriate committee, council, or organizational unit for implementation. One improvement that resulted from the survey was the creation of Employee Engagement Sessions for non-faculty positions to provide a forum for two-way communication.

Category 5 Faculty and Staff Focus

Opportunities for Improvement

- Beyond the Division and department level, LCCC does not systematically review performance measures or improvement goals for workplace health, safety, security, and ergonomics. Additionally, the processes for involving employees to take part in improving each of these factors has not been fully deployed and tailored to a diverse workforce. Without measuring and creating improvement goals for these factors, it may be difficult for LCCC to ensure approaches are effective.
- Although the HR AQIP Design Team systematically tracks action plans and works with processes to improve, LCCC currently has no approach in place to proactively and regularly monitor indicators such as employee retention, absenteeism, grievances, safety and productivity, nor to assess and improve well-being, satisfaction and motivation. Without measures to monitor faculty and staff productivity and well-being measures, LCCC may be missing an opportunity to improve work systems and meet its strategic challenge of retaining a high performing workforce.
- The AQIP HR Design Team, IPC and committees/councils do not systematically relate assessment findings to key organizational performance results. Without relating assessment findings to key organizational performance results, it may be difficult for LCCC to identify priorities for improving the work environment to improve organizational performance results.

Category 6 Process Management

Item 6.1 Learning-Centered Processes

Score 50%

Strengths

- LCCC's key learning-centered processes include curriculum development and implementation, and assessment of student learning. Curriculum Development and Implementation are outlined in Figures 6.1-1 and 6.1-2 and are designed to consistently develop and implements courses or programs. Assessment of student learning takes place across the curriculum on a three-year cycle.
- Class/Course level outcome assessments are achieved through the Course Assessment Record (CAR) designed to assess one or more course outcomes each semester. Program/Cluster (PAR) level outcome assessments focus on the assessment of programmatic/cluster outcomes where one-fifth of all academic programs and clusters are subject to a five-year review each academic year. The CAR and PAR are combined into an institutional report-CARD which is reviewed by the AQIP Assessment Design Team.
- LCCC utilizes input from many sources to determine key learning-centered process requirements including the Graduate Tracking Survey, the CCSSE, and student evaluations of faculty. Student learning rates and styles are addressed through the Student Referral Process. This process individualizes the career path and course selection procedure and may create a seamless transition from high school and/or the work force.
- LCCC utilizes the GEASC, AQIP Assessment Design Team and faculty to determine process measures and indicators for assessing student learning. Those measures include the Graduate Tracking Survey, CAR/CARD results, PAR, Program/Cluster Reviews, and CCSSE results.

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC does not have a systematic approach for effectively utilizing formative and summative assessments. Use of formative and summative assessments within and between all Operations System Review cycles may provide opportunities for improved vertical and horizontal alignment.
- Information on student segments and individual students is not developed and used to engage all students in active learning. Increased student engagement in all learning environments may provide LCCC with improved student learning results and enrollment.
- Cycles of learning are not shared with other organizational units to drive organizational learning and innovation. Developing a process for intentionally sharing improvements and lessons learned may provide LCCC with opportunities to create breakthrough and/or best practices.

Item 6.2 Support Processes and Operational Planning

Score 40%

Strengths

- Key support processes are based on their benefit to support learning-centered processes and are determined/refined based on LCCC's performance improvement system, feedback reports, and benchmarking. Support processes are outlined in 6.2-1 and include learning/support services, financial, facilities, information technology, HR, research and information, and resource development.
- Input from faculty, staff, students and stakeholders is collected from the strategic visioning process, advisory groups meetings, and internal committee/councils to determine the key requirements of support processes which are listed in Figure 6.2-1: Key Support Processes.
- Support processes are improved through the plan, do, study, refine performance improvement system. LCCC's "toolbox" concept and major tools reduce variability and keep processes current. Major "tools" include Lean/Six Sigma projects designed to attain results in savings of at least \$20,000, the Continuous Improvement Council, and the Operations System Review.
- Operational continuity in the event of an emergency has been ensured by the development of a College Campus Security manual that is coordinated with local agencies. Each organizational unit maintains a manual and the information is accessible on the web portal.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Although LCCC has developed a College Campus Security manual to help ensure continuity of operations, its deployment is limited in that all faculty, staff, and stakeholders do not know their role in case an emergency should arise. Fully deploying the emergency preparedness process to all faculty and staff may assist them with knowing what to do in the event of an emergency. Additionally, ensuring that key stakeholders understand their roles in an emergency may provide opportunities for stakeholder feedback, process improvement, and improved safety.
- Continuity of operations in the event of an emergency may be improved through practice of emergency processes and procedures. Practice may provide opportunities to identify implementation and communication gaps in the event of an emergency and send a positive "safety message" to the community. Without a process to systematically review emergency preparations, LCCC may be jeopardizing student, faculty, and staff safety.
- Although LCCC does have Lean Thinking and Six Sigma processes that are used to reduce costs in support areas, the College has not fully deployed these or other systematic continuous improvement processes in all work areas to prevent errors and rework to minimize overall costs. Fully deploying processes to proactively prevent errors and rework may provide LCCC with increased efficiency and/or productivity, as well as improved or additional revenue streams.

Category 7 Results

Item 7.1 Student Learning Outcomes

Score 25%

Strengths

- LCCC has experienced positive levels and trends in many key measures of student learning. Success Rates of Developmental Education Students (Figure 7.1-3) shows that performance has remained consistent from 2002 to 2004 at 70%. Percent of Graduates employed after 6 months/field of study (Figure 7.1-5) has remained consistent around 90% from 2001 to 2005, with 80% of students employed in their field of study (Figure 7.1-6). Five-Year RN pass rates have remained consistent around 90% from 2000 to 2004 (Figure 7.1-11).
- LCCC has experienced results favorable to comparisons for key measures of student learning. Time to Degree (Figure 7.1-1), Three-year success rates (Figure 7.1-2), and Success Rates of Developmental Education Students (Figure 7.1-3), compares favorably against Community College Averages. Five-Year RN pass rates (Figure 7.1-11) compare favorably against the cohort average, and Student Learning CCSSE Benchmarks (Figure 7.1-12) compare favorably to large college and CCSSE cohort averages.

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC has experienced negative levels and trends in many key measures of student learning. Time to Degree (Figure 7.1-1) has increased from 4 years in 2002 to 4.3 years in 2004. Assessment of General Education Outcomes (Figure 7.1-7) through CAR indicates that the complete achievement of success criteria has decreased from 85% in 2003 to 70% in 2005 while partial, and no achievement of success criteria has increased in the same time period. While PAR assessments have only been required since 2004, during that time only 55% of programs achieved the success criteria, while 20% of programs have yet to be assessed.
- LCCC is missing key student learning results including initiatives to advance creative learning opportunities (2.1-2) including: Learning Assessment and Validation Center, Weekend Degree Programs, Asynchronous Delivery Systems, Educational Media Products, and Partner in Education Reform. Results are also missing for measures of products such as non-credit offerings, workforce training, Center for Lifelong Learning, and economic development.
- LCCC is in the early stages of using comparative data. Increasing the use of comparisons to include results of other groups, other Colleges, and competitors may assist LCCC to demonstrate relative excellent performance, show areas of opportunity, and demonstrate areas of education sector leadership.

Category 7 Results

Item 7.2 Student and Stakeholder-Focused Outcomes

Score 30%

Strengths

- LCCC has experienced positive levels and trends for student and stakeholder satisfaction. Overall satisfaction data measured by the ACT survey shows increasing levels of satisfaction from 4.0 in 1997 to 4.25 in 2006 (Figure 7.2-1a). Performance is positive compared to the 2006 national average.
- LCCC has experienced positive levels and trends for building relationships with students and stakeholders. Results of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) indicate that the overall opinion of LCCC, Figure 7.2-8, has remained steady at 90% from 1992 to 2004, with 2004 as the last data point (Figure 7.2-7), has also either maintained in the 90% range or slightly improved for full and part time students and for all ethnic groups. Student endorsement of Post Secondary Education Option (Figure 7.2-9) has experienced a positive trend from 2003 to 2006. Enrollment growth (Figure 7.2-11) has increased from 2001 to 2005 with a composite of 47%, meeting the strategic challenge of 5% per year.

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC has experienced declining levels of performance for some key measures of satisfaction. Graduate tracking surveys administered between 2001 and 2005 indicate declining or flat performance for LCCC's graduates (Figure 7.2-2). Goals met for UP Graduates (Figure 7.2-3) also declined from 95% in 2002 to 78% in 2005. Academic items from the Graduate Tracking Survey (Figure 7.2-4 and Figure 7.2-5) also experienced declining performance from 2001 to 2005 for the seven items surveyed. Comparison data is not provided for Graduate Tracking Survey results (Figures 7.2-2 through 5).
- LCCC has experienced declining levels of performance for some key measures of building relationships. CCSSE Results Related to Educational Experience, Figure 7.2-6, has declined for two of the four ethnic groups and for both full- and part-time students. African American students noticed a sharp decline, from 83% in 2004 to 67% in 2006.
- LCCC does not use comparisons for several key measures of student and stakeholder satisfaction and building relationships, including graduate tracking survey results (Figures 7.2-2 through 7.2-5), CSSE Results (Figures 7.2-6 through 7.2-8), and Student Endorsement of PSEO (Figure 7.2-9).
- LCCC does not provide key results for many areas of importance, including Vision 21, Priorities of Promoting Community Collaboration and Growth, satisfaction of stakeholders or OBOR Data. Additionally, measures are not provided for all programs including non-credit offerings, workforce trainings, Center for Lifelong learning, or economic development. Student learning results are not segmented by programs identified in the organization profile or by student intent segments.

Category 7 Results

Item 7.3 Budgetary, Financial, and Market Outcomes

Score 30%

Strengths

- LCCC has experienced FTE growth of 30% for the past five years while revenue per FTE has grown only 7% (Figure 7.3-1). LCCC has supplemented this deficit using cost savings, Foundation resources and levy millage. The amount of money generated by the levy for LCCC has risen slightly every year for a total increase of approximately 14% since 2001. The amount of money generated for UP has increased approximately 90% since 2001, Figure 7.3-3.
- LCCC increased tuition and fees by 23% from 2001 to 2006, which was the lowest increase in comparison to several local competitors and a community college average of 35%. This is especially noteworthy considering one of LCCC's key factors contributing to its success relative to competitors is affordability.
- LCCC has experienced steady market share at 29% from 2001 to 2005, with the percentage of graduating seniors, segmented by county high schools, choosing LCCC growing incrementally from 27% in 2001 to 30% in 2005 (Figure 7.3-7,8).
- LCCC has experienced positive trends in its non-duplicated headcounts for several of its programs and offerings. Credit headcount has increased from 1999 to 2006 by 50% (Figure 7.1-9). Distance learning has been increasing at a rate of 23% per year from 2000 to 2005, with 28% of all students being enrolled in at least one Distance learning class (Figure 7.3-11). PSEO enrollment has also grown from 6.5% in 2003 to almost 8% in 2005, comparing favorably against averages provided (Figure 7.3-12). Non-credit education and training contracts with employers and organizations for workforce education has increased between 2002 and 2006 in alignment with LCCC's economic development goal to offset job losses within the county (Figure 7.3-13).

Opportunities for Improvement

- While the Foundation is ranked 13th in assets nationally among community colleges, foundation support decreased yearly from 2002 (\$1,250,000) to 2005 (\$700,000). LCCC does not provide comparative data to determine if this is a growing trend among similar institutions. Without this comparative data, it may be difficult for LCCC to identify potential threats to their continued competitiveness.
- LCCC does not provide comparisons for some measures of financial performance including Percent Change in Revenue (Figure 7.3-1) and Local Levy Funding (Figure 7.3-2). Revenues are also not segmented by program type to identify most profitable programs. Without segmentations and comparisons, it may be difficult for LCCC to identify opportunities for improvement.
- LCCC does not report results for several budgetary and financial measures, including performance against budget, instructional and administration expenditures per student, expenses, reserves, etc. Without measuring financial performance for areas of importance

Category 7 Results

to the college, it may be difficult for LCCC to meet strategic challenges related to the fiscal environment, maintaining affordability, and institutional growth.

- LCCC does not present results for key measures of market performance including achieving VISION 21 Priorities, such as Stimulate Workforce and Economic Development, build the college infrastructure to accomplish priorities, and childhood and center for lifelong learning programs and comparisons for non-duplicated headcounts. Without monitoring key measures of market performance, it may be difficult for LCCC to meet strategic challenges related to institutional growth and economic development.

Item 7.4 Faculty and Staff Outcomes

Score 25%

Strengths

- LCCC has experienced positive trends for work system performance results for Performance Appraisal Ratings, Figure 7.4-1. Although performance declined slightly from 2003 to 2004 the percentage of employees who have met or exceeded their goals increased for both administration and professional/support staff from 2004 to 2006.
- LCCC has experienced positive levels and trends for several key faculty and staff learning and development results including an increase of activities supported by HRD Training/Development, increasing for all employee types from 2003 to 2006 (Figure 7.4-2); increasing money spent on conference and training travel from 2003 to 2006 (Figure 7.4-3); and an increase in fee waivers for employees and their dependents from 2003 to 2006 (Figure 7.4-4).
- LCCC has experienced positive levels and trends for key measures of staff well-being and satisfaction. LiveSmart program results indicate that employees are getting healthier from 2004 to 2005 through assessments of nutrition, exercise, diabetes, weight, and stress at Health Risk Assessment Fairs (Figure 7.4-5). NorthCoast 99 results also indicate favorable performance from 2005 to 2006 in all eight areas measured, results are also favorable compared to the median score (Figures 7.4-6 & 7).

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC is missing key results for work system effectiveness. Examples include: skill sharing, retention rates, job classification results, FS and StC results, teaching effectiveness evaluations, and results achieved through use of the skills matrix. Without measuring the effectiveness of its work system processes, it may be difficult for LCCC to measure and improve the effectiveness of its work systems.
- LCCC is missing key results for several faculty and staff learning processes described including surveys analyzed by HRD to implement training and development and to improve delivery mechanisms; professional development matrix results to ensure training achieves strategic plan challenges and goals; surveys relative to training effectiveness administered post class; innovation and suggestion rates, courses completed, cross training rates and

Category 7 Results

results of the formal mentoring program. It may be difficult for LCCC to measure the effectiveness of its employee learning and development without measuring the effectiveness of all of its key learning and development processes.

- Although performance is favorable compared to the database average, LCCC has experienced declining trends from 2000 to 2003 for all seven categories measured by the PACE/Climate surveys listed in Figure 7.4-8, including overall satisfaction. This trend is consistent among all employee segments and particularly apparent among the administrative segment. Additionally, the last survey was administered in 2003, LCCC has stated it will complete another survey in 2007.
- LCCC is missing key measures of several of the key workplace health, safety and satisfaction process described including results analyzed from Employee Engagement Sessions, Convocation Surveys, and other measures collected by the HR AQIP Design team such as turnover rates, recruiting, benefits/compensation, and employee relations. Without measuring the effectiveness of all of its key processes, it may be difficult for LCCC to evaluate the effectiveness of its faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Item 7.5 Organizational Effectiveness Outcomes

Score 35%

Strengths

- LCCC's Retention Rates for full- and part-time students exceeds the comparison average of the 30 other two-year colleges in the Great Lakes Region from 2003 to 2005 (Figure 7.5-1).
- LCCC has experienced positive trends for several key results for learning-centered processes. The Number of Degrees/Certificates Awarded by Type (Figure 7.5-2) increased from 2001 to 2005 for all types of student intent. There is a positive trend of 410 degrees awarded in 2001 to 585 in 2005 in the applied degree area in addition to an increase from 210 in 2001 to 325 in 2005 in the Arts and Science area (Figure 7.5-2). LPN Licensure passing rates (Figure 7.5-4) have been increasing from 2001 at 93% to 2004 at 94%. These results compare favorably against averages provided.
- LCCC measures the effectiveness of other key processes with ACT Survey Results and is trending positively for most indicators in (Figure 7.5-9). LCCC has experienced improving or consistent performance for the Library from 4.17 in 1997 to 4.31 in 2006 as compared to the National Norm of 4.24.
- LCCC received cost savings through the L/SS projects at \$93,546 in the IS&S Service contract area, \$151,066 in Mechanical service contracts, and \$93,546 in employment contracts. Web site page visits have increased approximately 1,650,000 between 2004 to 2006, which allowed for more efficient operations and reduction of costs (Figure 7.5-10).

Category 7 Results

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC has experienced negative trends for some key measures and indicators of learning-centered processes. Retention Rates (Figure 7.5-1) for full time students from 2003-2005 decreased from 61% to 55% and remained flat at 42% for part time students. University Partnership Graduates by Degree Earned (Figure 7.5-3) has experienced a negative trend since 2001, although increasing slightly in 2006. Also results of Program/Cluster reviews (Figure 7.5-6) indicate that in the past five years only 46% of the program clusters that were reviewed were completed on schedule and 37% of which were completed more than a year after the due date.
- LCCC's performance is below comparison levels for some organizational effectiveness outcomes. LCCC states that LPN Nursing Licensure Rates exceeded the cohort average 5 out of 6 years; however, Tri-C, a local competitor exceeded LCCC's rates in 3 out of the past four years. The ACT results for OSR Team in 2006 are lower than the National Norm in 5 of the 8 categories (Figure 7.5-9).
- Although LCCC provides results of OSR Reviews in (Figure 7.5-8), the results are presented as goals and not as quantifiable results. Additionally, measures for operational performance of key support processes, including measures of effectiveness and efficiency, are not provided.
- LCCC provides limited results for several key learning and support processes, including results for non-credit offerings, and lifelong learning offerings or workforce development offerings. Additionally, results are not presented for many key support processes listed in 6.2-1 such as facilities and research, and network availability.

Item 7.6 Leadership & Social Responsibility Outcomes

Score 30%

Strengths

- As measures of stakeholder trust, LCCC has passed four levies with a 54% pass rate (Figure 7.6-2) since 1992, and has ranked in the top 3 of 5 leadership dimensions in a nationwide survey of 13 community colleges (Figure 7.6-3). Additionally, positive results in overall perception of UP educational quality are reported (Figure 7.6-4 and 7.6-13).
- LCCC consistently receives unqualified financial audit results and received no findings in the last two audit reports in 2004 and 2005 (Figure 7.6-5).
- The number of workshops for business increased 50% from 2002 to 2006 (Figure 7.6-8). Participation in professional development courses provided to employed individuals also increased from approximately 4000 in 2003 to 12,000 in 2006 (Figure 7.6-9).

Category 7 Results

Opportunities for Improvement

- LCCC is missing several key results. As an example, key measures and indicators of ethical behavior, regulatory indicators, and support for key communities are not provided, nor are results used to address impacts their products have on society, including co-op placements, job growth and economic indicators. Code of Conduct and Affirmative Action policy are both listed as key institutional policies/procedures (pg 4) yet no data on violations is presented. Key fiscal accountability results described in 1.2 are not provided, including Foundations 501c3 external audit results and regulatory agencies' audit findings. Additionally, although DBT members, senior leaders, and employees serve on community boards and organizations (pg 5), no data is presented on participation.
- LCCC is in the early stages of obtaining comparative data. Comparisons are not provided for VISION 21 results (Figure 7.6-1), levy results (Figure 7.6-2), audit results (Figure 7.6-5), or organizational citizenship results (Figure 7.6-7). No results are available for Vision 2015.
- Data is not segmented for several key measures, including Vision 21 results (Figure 7.6-1), stakeholder trust results (Figure 7.6-2), crime data (Figure 7.6-6), and organizational citizenship results (Figure 7.6-7). Without segmenting data, it may be difficult for LCCC to ensure good performance at all levels of the organization.
- Key measures of leadership and social responsibility outcomes are missing or demonstrate unfavorable results. For example, Vision 21 initiatives last reported data point is from 2005 (Figure 7.6-1), trend data is not provided for the Leadership Dimensions Survey (Figure 7.6-3), and trend data are not provided for the UP Perception survey results (Figure 7.6-4). Additionally, LCCC has experienced a negative trend for professional development served to the unemployed (Figure 7.6-10) and a negative trend for the number of companies/individuals assisted by GLIDE (Figure 7.6-12). Monitoring and improving key results for leadership and social responsibility may assist LCCC with achieving its goals of maintaining community support, passage of levies, and achievement of long-term sustainability of the college.