Higher Learning Commission
A commission of the North Central Association

230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 | Chicago, IL 60604-1411
312-263-0456 | 800-621-7440 | Fax: 312-263-7462 | ncahlc.org

February 20, 2014

Cristobal Valdez
President
Edison State Community College
1973 Edison Dr.
Piqua, OH 45356

Dear President Valdez:

Enclosed is a copy of Edison State Community College's *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report*. Your Systems Appraisal Team provided extensive detail in the full report by identifying nine distinct groups of what they view as your institution's *strengths* and *opportunities for improvement*, one group for each of the nine AQIP Categories. We are also emailing your institution's Accreditation Liaison a copy of this report.

To receive maximum benefit from your Systems Appraisal, you and your colleagues should plan to invest substantial time in discussing it, considering the team's observations and advice, and identifying which actions will best advance your institution.

We ask that you formally acknowledge receipt of this report within the next two weeks, and provide us with any comments you wish to make about it. Your response will become part of your institution's permanent HLC file. Please email your response to AQIP@hlcommission.org.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Green
AQIP Process Administrator

Systems Appraisal Feedback Report

in response to the *Systems Portfolio* of

EDISON STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

February 13, 2014

for

The Higher Learning Commission
A commission of the North Central Association

Contents

Elements Of Edison State Community College's Feedback Report

Welcome to the *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report*. This report provides AQIP's official response to an institution's *Systems Portfolio* by a team of peer reviewers (the Systems Appraisal Team). After the team independently reviews the institution's portfolio, it reaches consensus on essential elements of the institutional profile, strengths and opportunities for improvement by AQIP Category, and any significant issues related to accreditation. These are then presented in three sections of the *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report*: "Strategic Challenges Analysis," "AQIP Category Feedback," and "Accreditation Issues Analysis." These components are interrelated in defining context, evaluating institutional performance, surfacing critical issues or accreditation concerns, and assessing institutional performance. Ahead of these three areas, the team provides a "Reflective Introduction" followed closely by an "Executive Summary." The appraisal concludes with commentary on the overall quality of the report and advice on using the report. Each of these areas is overviewed below.

It is important to remember that the Systems Appraisal Team has only the institution's *Systems Portfolio* to guide its analysis of the institution's strengths and opportunities for improvement. Consequently, the team's report may omit important strengths, particularly if discussion or documentation of these areas in the *Systems Portfolio* were presented minimally. Similarly, the team may point out areas of potential improvement that are already receiving widespread institutional attention. Indeed, it is possible that some areas recommended for potential improvement have since become strengths rather than opportunities through the institution's ongoing efforts. Recall that the overarching goal of the Systems Appraisal Team is to provide an institution with the best possible advice for ongoing improvement.

The various sections of the *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* can be described as follows:

> **Reflective Introduction & Executive Summary**: In this first section of the *System's Appraisal Feedback Report*, the team provides a summative statement that reflects its broad understanding of the institution and the constituents served (Reflective Introduction), and also the team's overall judgment regarding the institution's current performance in relation to the nine AQIP Categories (Executive Summary). In the Executive Summary, the team considers such factors as: robustness of process design; utilization or deployment of processes; the existence of results, trends, and comparative data; the use of results data as feedback; and systematic processes for improvement of the activities that each AQIP

Category covers. Since institutions are complex, maturity levels may vary from one Category to another.

Strategic Challenges Analysis: Strategic challenges are those most closely related to an institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and quality improvement goals. Teams formulate judgments related to strategic challenges and accreditation issues (discussed below) through careful analysis of the Organizational Overview included in the institution's Systems Portfolio and through the team's own feedback provided for each AQIP Category. These collected findings offer a framework for future improvement of processes and systems.

AQIP Category Feedback: The *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* addresses each AQIP Category by identifying and coding strengths and opportunities for improvement. An **S** or **SS** identifies strengths, with the double letter signifying important achievements or capabilities upon which to build. Opportunities are designated by **O**, with **OO** indicating areas where attention may result in more significant improvement. Through comments, which are keyed to the institution's Systems Portfolio, the team offers brief analysis of each strength and opportunity. Organized by AQIP Category, and presenting the team's findings in detail, this section is often considered the heart of the *Feedback Report*.

Accreditation Issues Analysis: Accreditation issues are areas where an institution may have not yet provided sufficient evidence that it meets the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation. It is also possible that the evidence provided suggests to the team that the institution may have difficulties, whether at present or in the future, in satisfying the *Criteria*. As with strategic challenges, teams formulate judgments related to accreditation issues through close analysis of the entire Systems Portfolio, with particular attention given to the evidence that the institution provides for satisfying the various core components of the *Criteria*. For purposes of consistency, AQIP instructs appraisal teams to identify any accreditation issue as a strategic challenge as well.

Quality of Report & Its Use: As with any institutional report, the *Systems Portfolio* should work to enhance the integrity and credibility of the institution by celebrating successes while also stating honestly those opportunities for improvement. The *Systems Portfolio* should therefore be transformational, and it should provide external peer reviewers insight as to how such transformation may occur through processes of continuous improvement. The AQIP Categories and the Criteria for Accreditation serve as the overarching measures for the institution's current state, as well as its proposed future state. As such, it is imperative

that the *Portfolio* be fully developed, that it adhere to the prescribed format, and that it be thoroughly vetted for clarity and correctness. Though decisions about specific actions rest with each institution following this review, AQIP expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of continual improvement and to inform future AQIP processes.

Reflective Introduction and Executive Summary For Edison State Community College

The following consensus statement is from the System Appraisal Team's review of the institution's *Systems Portfolio Overview* and its introductions to the nine AQIP Categories. The purpose of this reflective introduction is to highlight the team's broad understanding of the institution, its mission, and the constituents that it serves.

Edison State Community College (Edison) was the first general and technical college in Ohio serving three counties, both rural and urban. Edison offers 18 associate degree programs, with 56 full-time faculty and over 200 adjuncts each semester. Edison is serving a diverse student body of 2,911 students during the fall 2013 semester. Edison is a member of CQIN, and received the 2011 and 2013 Silver Level Baldrige Award. Edison has action projects focused on the assessment of four general education outcomes, student retention (Advising as Teaching and First Year Experience), and motivating and valuing people through focused conversations. Employee working core values provide an environment of support, collaboration, and respect. Dashboards and data are shown that demonstrate data is being used to make critical decisions. This CQI journey has Edison intentionally focused on accountability, leadership development and systems thinking in order to elevate its maturity level to aligned and integrated in all AQIP categories.

The following are summary comments on each of the AQIP Categories crafted by the Appraisal Team to highlight **[Institution's]** achievements and to identify challenges yet to be met.

- **Category 1:** Edison State Community College believes that it has moved student services and program review processes from systematic to aligned. Additionally, the assessment of student learning, student preparation, and active communication and support processes are thought to have moved from aligned to integrated. Since 2010, Edison has instituted a number of quality improvements focused on helping students learn. These include a new call center, mandatory new student orientation, faculty advisors assigned at the time of student application, etc. In addition, AQIP Action

Projects have resulted in a First Year Experience requirement for students who place in developmental courses and a new support called "Navigating Edison." Assessment of student learning has been a priority with the inclusion of national benchmarks, as well as increased academic program review. Marketing and data management have been targeted as areas for improvement.

- **Category 2:** Edison State Community College believes that its key non-instructional processes are aligned, stable, and well managed. All Faculty and staff are eligible for professional development funding including tuition reimbursement, in-house training, external training costs, and/or conference attendance. The CQI Teams provide feedback and evaluation of internal and external stakeholder needs in alignment with the College's Key Results. The size of Edison allows it to communicate objectives and goals and maintain relevance in alignment with its Key Results and strategies.

- **Category 3:** Edison State Community College maintains advisory committees for occupational programs, and has begun seeking additional feedback through a series of focus groups representing all stakeholders. Edison believes that this process has moved from reacting through systematic and into the aligned approach to Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholder's Needs. Edison works to actively understand student and other stakeholder needs through examples such as modifying the building expansion into a two-year process due to the feasibility study that revealed the community focus was on the expansion of health sciences and business and industry capabilities rather than the fine arts. An example related to students is the hiring of a Coordinator of Student Life to better meet the social expectations of a younger student population. The College has identified a need for alignment with the Key Results across all areas of the organization.

- **Category 4:** Edison State Community College attempts to sustain positive employee engagement by creating a culture that recognizes employees, celebrates accomplishments, measures and advances accountability and innovation, and integrates leadership learning opportunities that empower employees. Edison believes that its processes in Valuing People are systematic to aligned. Edison's current AQIP Action Project has the stated goal of focusing all recognition of achievement on its core values, AQIP Categories, and the Principles of High Performing Organizations. Edison has put considerable effort towards ensuring that the working environment, their work systems, and personnel policies provide a positive, proactive atmosphere to further their strategic

direction. Edison demonstrates its commitment to the development of its employees, including student workers, by requiring them to participate in an orientation process. Edison plans to coordinate activities across departments through the use of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Timely) tools and the Master Strategic Plan to meet its goal of employee engagement.

- **Category 5:** Leading and Communicating has been a focus for Edison State Community College for the past four years. The culture has improved through accountability and a focus on internal service quality.   Edison believes the processes in this category have moved from aligned to integrated because of regular evaluation, open communication, improved leadership development, and an improved culture. Results are demonstrated by cross-functional process teams, improved results scores, open communication and leadership development. A Strategic Master Plan is the guide for this process. Extensive data was provided in this section showing that Edison relies upon established dashboards to make the financial decisions necessary to move in the direction the Board of Trustees, the community, students, faculty and staff believe it should. Edison partnered with LifeSkills Training and Partners in Leadership to try to develop all employees into leaders.

- **Category 6:** Edison State Community College believes its 18 current CQI teams focused on improvement in support operations have moved these processes from being reactive to integrated. Action Projects, Addressing the Need for Student Government and Recognizing Employee Contributions in Achieving the College Mission, are helping to improve these processes from reactive to systematic. In addition to further refinement of Noel-Levitz SSI and CCSSE, Edison has joined NCCBP to better learn from, compare, and benchmark itself nationally. Stakeholder needs, as described also in Category 5, are identified through focus group surveys. Edison reorganized the Student Affairs department in 2012 to better provide an environment in which students can thrive. Edison continues to recognize the need to improve the student government role in college affairs and to create a positive work environment through more employee recognition, and has created Action Projects to address these areas.

- **Category 7:** Edison State Community College has made significant strides in measuring the effectiveness of the institution.   Edison has well-designed processes aimed at preventing problems and evaluating improvements. Edison identifies measuring outcomes that are not data driven, as a possible issue. Edison believes that processes

in this category have moved from systematic to aligned, because the culture has shifted from silos to one of coordination and collaboration.   Edison collects, analyzes, and uses information to manage itself and to drive performance improvement by ensuring departmental survey results are analyzed either within the department or by the IPE Department and then distributed. Edison has developed an Action Project template to better track the effectiveness of initiatives resulting from action projects. Edison recognizes the need for specific processes to measure effectiveness in student services that are non-data driven and identification of specific benchmarks.

- **Category 8:** Edison State Community College planning processes are integrated from the institutional strategic plan to the divisional Action Plans. Edison's leadership team creates an environment that fosters growth, accountability, and quality. Edison has made quality and continuous improvement part of their institution's culture. Edison has built mechanisms by which any stakeholder can measure the College's progress toward its strategic initiatives.   Edison's divisional Action Plan template and a strategic mapping process all are designed to lead to accomplishments of the College's mission. Another indication of continuous improvement in the CQI area is a silver standard for both education and industry with Baldrige awards received in 2011 and 2013.

- **Category 9:** Edison State Community College focused its efforts on increasing and strengthening partnerships and relationships. To manage these partnerships, Edison created a relational database for all contacts. Edison believes that the processes in this category are integrated, because they are evaluated regularly and managed by key individuals. Edison has facilitated college credit for high school students in programs such as Tech Prep, PSEOP, Dual Enrollment, articulation agreements, and the Connect to College grant in an effort to increase the number of high school graduates entering college. In 2013, an Action Project introduced Moves Management as a method of establishing one single point of information and database for all contacts; however loss of personnel has limited this from being completed at this time.

Note: Strategic challenges and accreditation issues are discussed in detail in subsequent sections of the *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report*.

Strategic Challenges For Edison State Community College

In conducting the Systems Appraisal, the Systems Appraisal Team attempted to identify the broader issues that would seem to present the greatest challenges and opportunities for the

institution in the coming years. These areas are ones that the institution should address as it seeks to become the institution it wants to be. From these the institution may discover its immediate priorities, as well as strategies for long-term performance improvement. These items may also serve as the basis for future activities and projects that satisfy other AQIP requirements. The team also considered whether any of these challenges put the institution at risk of not meeting the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation. That portion of the team's work is presented later in this report.

Knowing that **Edison State Community College** will discuss these strategic challenges, give priority to those it concludes are most critical, and take action promptly, the Systems Appraisal Team identified the following:

- Edison has responded to feedback from its 2010 Systems Portfolio in the areas of processes and results. Due to the redundancy of information contained in both Systems Portfolios (2010 and 2013), it is difficult to ascertain if the College understands the continuous improvement process. There are several categories of concern in the process and results sections. While many processes are common to the role of higher education and helping students learn, it is an expectation of AQIP that growth in these processes be reflected in this systems portfolio.

- Edison provides limited processes, results, and improvement in the area of Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives. Due to the redundancy of information contained in both Systems Portfolios (2010 and 2013), it is difficult to ascertain if the College understands the continuous improvement process. Of particular concern is 2I2. While many processes are common to the role of higher education and helping students learn, it is an expectation of AQIP that growth in these processes be reflected in this systems portfolio.

- Data and tables provided are often not clearly identified and the criteria used to determine positive and negative comparisons are not easy to understand, and at times contradictory. For example, retention numbers in Figure 3.7 do not match the retention statistics shown in Figure 3.17 for the same time periods. The disaggregated data sometimes indicate a combination of positive and negative comparisons, yet Edison reports positive results in the aggregated data. Although best-in-class data are reported

for Baldrige Award recipients, comparison to Edison data are not provided on the graphs or charts.

- The process for the evaluation and transcripting of transfer credits for students is not clear.

- While the Strategic Master Plan has set the stage for overall involvement of internal and external stakeholders, it is too soon to demonstrate any measurable change. The portfolio clearly identified in 8I2 that a cultural shift is occurring. Through the planning process and training, the College will need to monitor progress and follow through with training and development, to ensure positive results in planning continuous improvement.

AQIP Category Feedback

In the following section, the Systems Appraisal Team delineates institutional strengths along with opportunities for improvement within the nine AQIP Categories. As explained above, the symbols used in this section are **SS** for outstanding strength, **S** for strength, **O** for opportunity for improvement, and **OO** for outstanding opportunity for improvement. The choice of symbol for each item represents the consensus evaluation of the team members and deserves the institution's thoughtful consideration. Comments marked **SS** or **OO** may need immediate attention, either to ensure the institution preserves and maximizes the value of its greatest strengths, or to devote immediate attention to its greatest opportunities for improvement.

AQIP Category 1: Helping Students Learn*.* This category identifies the shared purpose of all higher education institutions and is accordingly the pivot of any institutional analysis. It focuses on the teaching-learning process within a formal instructional context, yet it also addresses how the entire institution contributes to helping students learn and overall student development. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to learning objectives, mission-driven student learning and development, intellectual climate, academic programs and courses, student preparation, key issues such as technology and diversity, program and course delivery, faculty and staff roles, teaching and learning effectiveness, course sequencing and scheduling, learning and co-curricular support, student assessment, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Edison State Community College** for Category 1.

Edison is a maturing institution in its processes to help students learn. Edison effectively responded to feedback from their 2010 Systems Portfolio and implemented processes related to Helping Students Learn. Using cross-functional teams for input, providing instructors with requisite skills (i.e. learning styles), and providing support for students in key areas such as orientation and developmental courses may have a positive long-term impact on student success and retention. In addition, Edison is making progress in its assessment of student learning and in collecting and using longitudinal data to demonstrate its progress, or to show where improvements can be made. Edison joined NCCBP so that it can use national benchmark data. Edison has an opportunity to continue to evaluate data collected and analyzed regarding student learning. There is an opportunity to collect more relevant data on the effectiveness and student satisfaction of student support services.

1P1, S. Edison has a process in place to determine common or shared learning or development objectives for its students. The Academic Senate formulates General Education requirements for students in various programs; the Senate is made up of faculty and staff as well as adjunct instructors. Edison aligns its six general education outcomes with its Student Core Values outlined in Figure 1.1. General Education outcomes are assessed annually by committee evaluating effectiveness and student competency. Assessments are posted on the College's website for public review.

1P2, S. Edison used an AQIP Action Project to improve the assessment of learning outcomes in response to the 2010 Systems Portfolio Appraisal. Results of the project include longitudinal reporting of annual assessments, benchmarking data, and the determination of discipline-specific objectives. Faculty teaching in a particular discipline determines learning objectives and also solicits input from advisory committees. Faculty align requirements with those of Ohio Board of Regents, as well as industry standards and professional organizations. This approach indicates an institution committed to continuous quality improvement.

1P3, SS. Edison revised its new program needs assessment process in 2012. Anyone wishing to propose a new program must conduct a needs survey and study various aspects of the program, such as employment opportunities, costs, and possible return on investment; they filter these results through a detailed and tested program-costing model it developed in 2007. The community is surveyed to determine the demand for graduates. A cross-functional team reviews proposals which are then vetted by the Curriculum Committee for implementation.

1P4, S. The College has a systematic program review process that occurs every three years for technical career programs and every five years for soft-skills career programs. The College also deploys an annual program assessment cycle. The IPE department prepares a comprehensive summary report containing information such as enrollment and graduation data as well as employment outlook and duplication of programs within 30 miles. Capstone courses are required in many of the career programs. Portfolios and internships are also used in the assessment of program learning outcomes. CCSSE data are used to identify targets for improvement in student learning. They use a Program Planning Model to determine program viability.

1P6, S. Edison State Community College provides a variety of methods for current and prospective students to learn about course and program requirements. These methods include the "Connect to College" course for high school students, the online course catalog, the Student Handbook, and providing at-risk students with the opportunity to explore college options. Navigating Edison combines student support services with a college orientation that addresses specific skills for student success.

1P8, S. COMPASS is used to assess college readiness of incoming students. Students who test below college-level reading, writing, and/or mathematics are required to complete development coursework. Developmental coursework is available to students at no cost through Adult Basic and Literacy Education. They partner with Upper Valley Career Center's Applied Technology Center to provide technical readiness programs. They have a Learning Center available to students, including offerings in study skills, time management, etc.

1P9, S. Edison has used AQIP to improve the admissions process for students through an active communication and support system. The College addresses differences in learning styles by requiring instructors to take Teaching 1.0 in which they are introduced to learning styles profile and shown how to apply it in the classroom. Additionally, there is a Study Skills advisor in the Learning Center who helps students recognize their own learning styles and helps the student learn how to study consistently with his/her learning style.

1P11, SS. Edison defines documents and communicates, across the institution, its expectations for effective teaching and learning by clearly indicating in Faculty Evaluation procedures the expected, "characteristic of effective teaching." Edison has a clearly defined program of instructor training and multiple evaluation methods to ensure

quality in the classroom. Edison's Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching (CEIT) has developed a series of courses to ensure that all full time and adjunct faculty are trained in technology and pedagogical/andragogical understandings. The Quality Matters rubric is a tool for providing consistency in course design.

1P17, S. Edison determines its graduates have met learning and development expectations by employing both direct and indirect assessment measures. Direct measures include testing and Capstone projects, while student and employer feedback comprise the indirect measures. Edison ensures that all coursework, grade requirements, degree requirements and institutional requirements are reviewed and validated prior to the posting of any degree/certificate.

1R1, S. Edison indicates several measurements of students' learning and development that are collected and analyzed on a regular basis. Edison uses trend, benchmark, and comparative data. These measures are part of a centralized data collection system used to report to various agencies. Historical and trending data are made public.

1R2, O. Edison has a continuous process designed for the assessment of common student learning and development objectives. Results demonstrate appropriate progress at meeting set targets. Figure 1.2 indicates positive trends from 2008 – 2009 to 2012 – 2013 for student learning outcomes in career programs. Assessment results reported in Figures 1.4 – 6 show positive trends, but some results are negative particularly for students taking MTH 122S after completing developmental math. Figure 1.7 suggests opportunities for improvement in the items of comparing and contrasting and logic and reasoning in oral communication.

1R4, O. Edison provides evidence that students completing degree and certificate programs have acquired the knowledge and skills required by its stakeholders through results presented in Figure 1.9. The chart is difficult to read due to words cut-off in column A.   Also, it is not clear who was involved in creating the survey questions and how alignment with stakeholder needs is ensured.

1R5, O. Edison's performance results for learning support processes such as advising, library and labs, is provided. While Library Usage Statistics (Figure 1.12) indicate increase in library use, it is not clear if this is the result of increased student population. Figure 1.3 shows how many students utilized the Learning Center for supplemental instruction in developmental math courses over the past four years. The percentage of

students using the Learning Center has increased dramatically. Performance results for learning support processes are limited to usage and provide no trend data. The College has an opportunity to evaluate these services through different methods and more thoroughly.

1I1, S. Edison appears to be making progress as it moves to more systematic processes. For example, they have adopted the principles and standards of Quality Matters, implemented Navigating Edison, and have assessed General Education and program level outcomes. Edison has also redesigned the Dashboard and Data Repository to better monitor key performance indicators.

AQIP Category 2: Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives. This category addresses the processes that contribute to the achievement of the institution's major objectives that complement student learning and fulfill other portions of its mission. Depending on the institution's character, it examines the institution's processes and systems related to identification of other distinctive objectives, alignment of other distinctive objectives, faculty and staff roles, assessment and review of objectives, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Edison State Community College** for Category 2.

Edison has made improvements in this category; the processes and performance results for Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives are becoming more systematic. The institution has begun to collect more longitudinal data to benchmark itself against Ohio and national colleges. Edison explains a very thorough process for creating, staffing, managing, and delivering key non-instructional processes to serve its significant stakeholder groups, but measurement is an issue. Edison cites many different quantitative tools to measure accomplishing major non-instructional objectives and activities, but does not report on them. As well, Edison does not define how the decision-making process works for implementation and how the process improvements relate to or fit into the College's strategic plan.

2P1, S. Edison has a well-defined process for the chartering of CQI whereby any college stakeholder can request a new CQI Process Team or review a process, or work, by a team. The college president reviews a new request, the CQI Steering Committee then authorizes the request. If the project work is cross-functional, appropriate process team members are added. The process is openly communicated, and deployment includes training and compliance. An Action Project may result to make this

process/response even stronger, Edison may consider reviewing how the need for key non-instructional processes is determined and evaluated.

2P2, O. The Board of Trustees uses Linking and Learning as an opportunity to engage the business community, solicit input, and communicate relative action and academic programming to its constituents. However, there does not appear to be a comprehensive process to determine the objectives for all external stakeholders. Also, it is not clear how Edison uses the input and feedback to determine major non-instructional objectives. There is an opportunity for Edison to be more intentional in its development of a process that includes strategic goals with systematic data collection to achieve its goals and demonstrate improvement in this area.

2P5, O. Edison determines faculty and staff needs, relative to objectives and operations, from annual end-of-year meetings with faculty and staff; when information is deemed "Other Distinctive Objectives" it is taken into consideration by the Dean and the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs. If these two individuals approve, these item(s) are added to the budget for the following year. It would be more helpful to describe how determining faculty and staff needs are part of the process of approving a program or objective. From the portfolio there is no guide on who determines if it is labeled "Other Distinctive Objectives", or how the information is taken under consideration by the Dean and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs. It unclear what defines end-of-year, calendar, budget, or academic? Further, while Edison provides professional development and training for staff with annual goals discussion, the college may benefit from a more thoroughly developed and cohesive process for accomplishing other distinctive objectives.

2P6, O. Edison incorporates information on faculty and staff needs in readjusting objectives, or processes that support them, through the use of a college-wide Strategy Map of initiatives that includes professional development and Enhancement of Culture topics. However, it is unclear from the portfolio how this is tied into planning, strategy approval, and overall college strategic planning. The process for adjusting objectives, based on employee needs, seems to be a decentralized one and lacking a comprehensive approach. It would be helpful to describe how faculty and staff needs affect the development of the non-instructional objectives.

2R2 and 2R3, O. The results reported include faculty and staff involvement in professional development and cross training of personnel. Edison would benefit from

developing a way to measure performance results on non-instructional objectives and activities, and benchmark the results with other institutions. The use of the Small Business and Industry Institute may be a better reflection of progress and connection with and serving of external stakeholders, as well as service on external boards/committees by faculty, staff and administrators, and perhaps events that connect the community to the College. In 2R1 Edison mentions the Noel-Levitz SSI, CCSSE, and surveys of various stakeholders; the results of these tools, and comparisons to other organizations should be referred to here.

2I1, S. Edison has added some processes to help improve this category. For example, they provide more programming for the community and students. They redesigned the Strategy Map and adopted an Action Plan template to track initiatives and link them to Implementation Strategies. By joining the National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP), Edison now can set benchmarks which it can use to compare peer institutions. Edison's processes and performance results for Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives are becoming more systematic and comprehensive, and continued work will help Edison become even more mature.

AQIP Category 3: Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs. This category examines how your institution works actively to understand student and other stakeholder needs. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to student and stakeholder identification; student and stakeholder requirements; analysis of student and stakeholder needs; relationship building with students and stakeholders; complaint collection, analysis, and resolution; determining satisfaction of students and stakeholders; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Edison State Community College** for Category 3.

Edison has made concerted efforts to connect with students from the first point of contact with an immediate email, assigned success advisors, orientation, and student governance. The Student Education Plan may be helpful to students and the College's retention efforts. Edison included students and other stakeholders input for the new Strategic Master Plan. The College has also begun to benchmark itself in many areas through joining NCCBP.

There is an opportunity for Edison to continue to assess, evaluate, track, and analyze data for longitudinal trends.   While it is too soon to assess the culture change impact of the new

accountability processes, Edison is encouraged to continue its continuous quality improvement efforts.

3P1, S. Edison deploys a variety of methods for collecting data from student groups including qualitative and quantitative measures. This information is considered in the strategic planning process as well as department operational planning. Edison could strengthen this response even more by using trend data and explaining how this data is incorporated into division plans, who are responsible, and creating specific and measurable goals.

3P2, S. The college uses a variety of methods to help introduce students to the College environment with mandatory orientation sessions, a Student Education Plan, along with directed assistance specific to the student needs. Separating processing from direct student services has enabled Edison to better meet students' needs. Edison has an opportunity to determine reasons why students do not enroll.

3P3, S. Edison has defined Stakeholder Input Strategies which are reviewed by various committees and departments and used to identify changes needed to meet changing needs of students. A Facilities Master Plan was developed as a result of a Facilities Survey completed by students. Employees participate in a variety of organizations in order to keep abreast of best practices, emerging trends, and new requirements. There is an opportunity for Edison to seek more longitudinal data to analyze specific trends from both internal and external stakeholders for creating a future vision for the College.

3P4, S. Edison creates, prioritizes, and builds relationships by researching possible partnerships that provide opportunities for innovation with other educational organizations, communities, and with business and industry.

3P5, S. Edison looks at feedback from various input mechanisms and emerging labor trend data to determine which new markets to target. Potential programs are then vetted to ensure they fit with the mission of the College and are needed by area employers.

3P6, O. Edison has a defined process for on-site and online students to utilize complaint logs which are annually compiled by the Director of Institutional Research. Edison does not indicate how it analyzes the complaints, how it selects courses of action (other than having a supervisor meet with a supervisee), or how it communicates the action it does take to the students. The evidence for collecting complaints from stakeholders is limited to present and past students.

3R1, O. Edison identifies many different surveys that are used to determine the satisfaction of its students and other stakeholders. Qualitative data are mentioned, but no examples are given. The use of qualitative tools like interviews and focus groups could help identify areas for improvement that quantitative measures do not.

3R2, O. Figure 3.1 of Student Satisfaction Survey results indicate declines in student satisfaction from 2010 – 2013 in several student service areas including admissions, advising with your faculty advisor, career advising, classroom instruction, Internet Café, and student activities. The results for these areas are also below the target of 95%. These trends and gaps suggest opportunities for improvement in these student service processes.

3R3, O. Figure 3.6 indicates an overall decline in the market penetration rate from 2009 to 2013. Figure 3.7 of 15th day retention from 2008 – 2015 suggests stagnation. These figures indicate opportunities for Edison to improve. Figures 3.8 – 3.10 indicate improvement in the number of degrees and certificates completed primarily from increases in AAS, AS, and Transfer Module degrees and certificates.

3R4, O. Edison refers to figure 3.12 which is a count of the number of responses to each question. Nowhere were any questions listed with the satisfaction percentages; therefore no conclusion can be drawn on whether those surveyed were satisfied with Edison, or not. Simply showing the total number who responded to the survey, without listing a total of those to whom the survey was sent and without any results does not demonstrate that this result has been met.

3R6, S. Edison compares its results with NCCBP and Baldrige recipients' data. These comparisons indicate that the College's results compare favorably with benchmark data. Figure 3.13 does indicate that from 2004 – 2013, student satisfaction results are close to the 95% benchmark, although 2012 and 2013 indicate declines from the previous years.

3I1. O. While Edison describes many methods for collecting data from student groups, including both qualitative and quantitative measures, it is unclear how the data are used. Edison creates, prioritizes, and builds relationships by researching possible partnerships that provide opportunities for innovation with other educational organizations, communities, and with business and industry. Including the College's results on Figures 3.14 – 16 may help Edison identify its stretch targets for improvement.

AQIP Category 4: Valuing People. This category explores the institution's commitment to the development of its employees since the efforts of all faculty, staff, and administrators are required for institutional success. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to work and job environment; workforce needs; training initiatives; job competencies and characteristics; recruitment, hiring, and retention practices; work processes and activities; training and development; personnel evaluation; recognition, reward, compensation, and benefits; motivation factors; satisfaction, health and safety, and well-being; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Edison State Community College** for Category 4.

Edison has developed systematic processes in the hiring and evaluation of employees. The College is also using quantitative comparisons to identify strengths and opportunities for improvement. Edison may want to consider adding qualitative tools in its assessment process so it can determine why some employees feel undervalued, and why one group of employee satisfaction results has increased while others have not. Many activities do appear to be reactive, rather than part of a comprehensive approach; therefore, the College is encouraged to continue seeking motivational factors as part of the continuous improvement process.

4P1, S. Edison identifies a process where supervisors work with Human Resources to identify characteristics and skills necessary to fill open positions and increase the value of employees for organizational effectiveness. Academic requirements for faculty are based on guidelines of the Higher Learning Commission and Ohio Board of Regents.

4P2, S. Edison has implemented hiring processes to determine new employees have appropriate credentials, skills and values. After meeting minimum qualifications, candidates are required to submit official documentation, depending upon the position requirements. Behavioral style interviews are completed with cross-functional teams and assess a candidate's alignment with CQI and Edison's Employee Working Core Values. The new employee orientation and faculty responsibilities as outlined in the ESEA Agreement help to provide alignment with Edison's values.

4P3, S. Edison deployed a CQI Process Team to define a hiring process which has been continuously improved since its inception in 2003. It is a well-defined process with expectations outlined relating to timeline, credentials and interviews. Extensive recruitment advertisements are used, which also covers minority recruitment. Professional development, in-house and external, and tuition reimbursement are

provided as retention efforts.

4P4, SS. All employees, regardless of classification, participate in a year-long orientation that includes understanding the College quality efforts, mission, vision, initiatives, support organizations, and how each individual fits into Edison's Core Values. Additionally, convocations and meetings with the President's Cabinet, Dean's Council, and Academic Senate, increase the employee's knowledge of the College. Also, adjunct faculty have opportunities for orientation and have the ability to serve on College committees.

4P5, O. While a succession plan is in place for the President and an annual staff evaluation process is being implemented in 2014, cross-training and staff succession planning for all employees should be established.

4P6, S. Edison utilizes several methods to ensure both organizational productivity and employee satisfaction, including service on CQI Committees, professional development, employee feedback, inter-departmental transfers, as well as updated position descriptions. In 2010, an automated system provided an analysis of positions with salary information. Salary adjustments were made for those below the 70% standard local amount. The budgeting process was used to provide this minimum benchmark. The salary analysis process will be used again in 2014.

4P7, S. Edison has a comprehensive plan for ethical conduct that complies with the Ohio Ethics Commission, local, state, and federal regulations. Training is provided to the Board of Trustees, faculty, and staff.   The information is in the Faculty Handbook and on the College website. Students are also held to high ethical standards through course instruction and academic policy and guidelines.

4P8, S. Training needs are identified with supervisors during the annual review process. Requests for training are evaluated based on Edison's strategic initiatives and those of the program. Staff are cross-trained and have the opportunity to participate on college-wide committees and cross-functional teams. Edison provides monthly professional development and training relative to strategic initiatives and Key Results.

4P9, S. Edison has developed a continuous and broad-based training program that encompasses departmental and college-wide goals integrated on a Strategy Map. Action plans are developed by those who are responsible for leadership. Tuition waivers and/or tuition reimbursement, and/or conference/workshop attendance, are all a part of

professional development. Faculty have access to professional development leave per contract.

4P11, O. While Edison has a compensation plan for faculty and staff, and benefit plans available to full- and part-time permanent employees, the response does not address how the recognition, reward, compensation, and benefit systems are designed and aligned with institutional objectives.

4P12, S. Edison uses a Baldrige-based Employee Satisfaction Survey to measure employee satisfaction on key issues. The results are categorized and reviewed by the Board of Trustees. The President's Cabinet and Dean's Council then identify areas for improvement. Additionally, the Academic Senate and union leadership meet regularly to discuss issues, including employee satisfaction/motivation.

4R1, O. While Edison conducts an annual Employee Satisfaction Survey, results are mixed. The survey results indicated a low satisfaction score for employees being valued by the College (76%), and a high importance score, signaling a need for improvement in this area. This statement was scored most important by all employees, in all categories. There is an opportunity to determine what measures should be collected to identify why employees feel undervalued.

4R3, O. Edison provided data with mixed results. Evidence is lacking for productivity and effectiveness of employees. Figures 4.3-4.8 do not indicate the number of employees who participated in the survey. It is not clear how Library gate counts and Learning Center usage measure productivity of faculty, staff, and employees. Noel-Levitz SSI is used to measure instructional effectiveness, and Edison may benefit by identifying other ways to measure staff productivity and effectiveness.

4I1, O. Although Edison conducted "Valuing People Action Projects" in 2005, 2008, and 2012, Edison recognized an opportunity to increase its efforts in valuing people. Five major initiatives were identified as part of the 2012 project which resulted in the professional development budget being increased by 150% for 2014. The results in 4R1 and 4R3 do not provide baseline data to determine if these actions are improving processes for valuing people.

AQIP Category 5: Leading and Communicating. This category addresses how the institution's leadership and communication structures, networks, and processes guide planning,

decision-making, seeking future opportunities, and building and sustaining a learning environment. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to leading activities, communicating activities, alignment of leadership system practices, institutional values and expectations, direction-setting, use of data, analysis of results, leadership development and sharing, succession planning, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Edison State Community College** for Category 5.

Edison has made some recent improvements in the area of leading and communicating since its last Portfolio. This includes leadership development for all, accountability training, and the SOAR Appreciative Inquiry process in development of the 2013 Strategic Master Plan. While data is collected and analyzed in some areas of the College, there does not appear to be a comprehensive process for using the data to guide decision making and for seeking new opportunities. Edison has defined the role and responsibilities of its Board of Trustees and Academic Senate, and both rely upon data in their decision making. However, results suggest that there is a gap in the roles and responsibilities of employees in leading and communicating in departments and for faculty.

A continued focus on leading and communicating may provide further improvement through a fully integrated communication plan, and methods of benchmarking the College with other colleges on both a regional and national basis.

> **5P1, O**. Edison's mission and vision were defined by the Board of Trustees and President with input from various stakeholders in 2001-02. Although the mission and vision are in the review process in light of the 2013 Strategic Master Plan, it is not clear the systematic process being used or who is involved in the review.

> **5P2, S**. Edison uses a variety of data, including surveys, advisory committees, and program review results to revise budgets, curriculum, program outcomes, textbooks, and software. Major initiatives are monitored with an interactive tracking sheet with the initiatives aligned with Key Results. The Board of Trustees has adopted a governance style included in its Policy Governance Manual. These processes suggest data-driven decision making, with clear delineation of the role of the Board as governance and the role of the President as implementation of policy.

> **5P3, S**. The Board and the College are intentional in seeking input from both internal and external stakeholders through a variety of methods, including student surveys,

career advisory committees, and high school and College partners. . The Board also uses "Linking and Learning" to gain stakeholder insights through four off-site meetings annually at area business/industry locations.

5P4, O. While the Board of Trustees and the President develop College direction and strategies which are guided by "Ends Statements" and stretch goals are based on data analysis and comparison with cohort institutions, there appears to be no method of demonstrating how these "Ends Statements" are monitored and/or evaluated. Also, beyond the two identified stakeholders listed in Figure. 5.1, i.e., students and community, no other stakeholders or their needs are identified or addressed.

5P5, S. Edison has various data sources in order to make decisions, such as a Dashboard, Data Repository, and Colleague software. While decisions are made by the President's Cabinet and the Board of Trustees, a number of different groups provide input to the decision making process. These include: the Dean's Council, Academic Senate, CQI Steering Committee and CQI Teams, and cross-functional committees. Students have an opportunity for inclusion as members of the President's Council and the Student Government Board. The President's Cabinet and the Dean's Council follow through on carrying out the decisions.

5P6, S. Edison describes a thorough process for collecting, dispersing, analyzing and using data in decision making processes. Data is openly available on the Dashboard and Data Repository for all areas of the College to use in making decisions. A more comprehensive data usage plan may help the College uncover strategic or managerial issues.

5P7, S. Communication occurs at various levels.   Leadership associated with a group is responsible for communicating with that group. Many of these areas of communication may be informal; however, specific communications are distributed by the President and Vice President. Communication also takes place with all employees through monthly meetings, addresses, and newsletters. An overall communications plan can be helpful to the College, so that it does not appear that communication is top-down.

5P9, S. Edison provides several leadership development opportunities to its employees. Examples include LifeSkills Training and Partners in Leadership. Edison also encourages all faculty and staff to seek leadership activities at the regional, state, and national levels. Best practices for leadership are communicated and shared through the

Dean's Council, President's Cabinet, Academic Senate, and in-house training.

5R1, S. Edison collects and analyzes measures of performance in leading and communicating through Baldrige-based Employee Satisfaction Surveys that have been in place since 2010, and also evaluates leadership performance in six areas. An AQIP Action Project in 2009-11 also focused on communication and leadership which resulted in a new required employee orientation, and coordination of resources between supervisors, faculty and staff to accommodate students. Annual performance evaluations have been used to elevate and improve leadership and communication.

5R2, O. Although Figures 5.3-4 indicate that employees know the College's mission, and how their jobs fit into the mission, Figures 5.5-6 suggest that the employee involvement in departmental decision making lags. Although Figure 5.8 shows positive trends for leading and communicating for four of the five employee groups, full-time faculty lags behind. Figure 5.9 also indicates low satisfaction with employees being informed and whether the organization values what they think. The gaps in departmental decision making and full-time faculty satisfaction suggest opportunities for improvement in the processes for leading and communicating in these two areas.

5I1, S. Edison demonstrates progress with some areas of improvement in leading and communicating since its last Portfolio, including leadership development, Internal Service Quality, accountability training for all, Linking and Learning for the Board of Trustees for business stakeholders, and the involvement of internal and external stakeholders in the SOAR Appreciative Inquiry process for the development of the 2013 Strategic Master Plan. It is not clear that there is a comprehensive systematic process deployed to improve leading and communicating.

AQIP Category 6: Supporting Institutional Operations. This category addresses the variety of institutional support processes that help to provide an environment in which learning can thrive. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to student support, administrative support, identification of needs, contribution to student learning and accomplishing other distinctive objectives, day-to-day operations, use of data, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Edison State Community College** for Category 6.

Edison State has identified key processes in supporting institutional operations and collecting data to determine stakeholder needs. It appears that many changes and improvements are being attempted; it is not clear if these supporting institutional operations are systematically reviewed, or have been given enough time for valid conclusions. In addition, Edison did not match support needs with stakeholder groups, which makes it difficult to determine if all stakeholders are represented.

6P1, O. Edison lists in Figure 6.1 processes and the associated stakeholder needs and support operation. Support needs are identified based on surveys, focus groups, staff surveys, etc., however, it is not clear how the support services needs are identified, targeted for action plans, or addressed in other ways. There does not appear to be a comprehensive approach for key stakeholders other than students.

6P2, O. While Edison has developed a grid showing needs and areas of the College responsible for providing those needs, there appears to be additional important areas not covered, e.g., human resources. There is an opportunity for Edison to further develop this grid to be more inclusive and help assist planning.

6P3, S. All employees have access to an Emergency Procedures Handbook which details actions to take in the case of an emergency. The Edison-Alert notification system sends email and/or text notifications to community members. Service areas have area-specific emergency procedures in place, and campus security personnel are visible throughout the campus. Information Technology procedures include measures to prevent loss of data and down-time, and help in recovery of all information systems.

6P4, S. Edison State uses cross-functional process improvement teams to address process improvement opportunities. Any employee may suggest formation of a team. The Dean of IPE is responsible for facilitating the work of each team and team's meeting minutes, process flowcharts, and documents are disseminated throughout the College. The deployment of a new process is disseminated through electronic media and special training sessions. In the future, the College may benefit from development of a flow chart for this process.

6P5, S. Edison documents its support processes that encourage knowledge sharing, innovation and empowerment through formal measures such as employee satisfaction surveys, feedback responses, data collection and review to improve the effectiveness of the work place. Edison encourages employees to bring back ideas from professional

development experiences that could be tailored to Edison's organizational structure. New ideas are considered and supported if they fit into alignment with Edison's mission, vision and values.

6R1, O. Although Figure 6.1 indicates processes and operations that are measured, it is unclear the frequency with which these are administered or how they are measured. It is also not clear how measurement data are systematically used to improve these processes and operations. The program review process deployed for career programs may serve as a good model for the systematic review of supporting institutional operations.

6R2, O. Edison alternates the CCSSE and the Noel-Levitz SSI biennially to collect student satisfaction data. However, there is no trend data or analysis. The College may benefit from examining its processes as they relate to data collection and analysis.

6R3, O. While Edison provides some comparative results related to administrative support service processes, some discussion about the results, especially those not trending positive, would help the College better understand the results.

6I1, O. There is limited evidence of a systematic and comprehensive approach to processes related to Supporting Institutional Operations. While some areas of Edison demonstrate improvement, such as the reorganization of Student Affairs and the implementation of the Academic Alert systems, overall the approach appears to be reactive and on an ad hoc basis. The AQIP Action Project, implemented to improve timely feedback to students, may support student learning.

6I2, S. Improvements in cross-functional processes are made through CQI process teams. KPIs are regularly reported in the College's Dashboard and Data Repository. This year, Edison used the CQI Steering Committee to review all process teams and as a result 22 teams were retired.

Edison State has identified key processes in supporting institutional operations and collecting data to determine stakeholder needs. It appears that many changes and improvements are being attempted; it is not clear if these supporting institutional operations are systematically reviewed, or have been given enough time for valid conclusions. In addition, Edison did not match support needs with stakeholder groups, which makes it difficult to determine if all stakeholders are represented.

AQIP Category 7: Measuring Effectiveness. This category examines how the institution collects, analyzes, and uses information to manage itself and to drive performance improvement. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to collection, storage, management, and use of information and data both at the institutional and departmental/unit levels. It considers institutional measures of effectiveness; information and data alignment with institutional needs and directions; comparative information and data; analysis of information and data; effectiveness of information system and processes; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Edison State Community College** for Category 7.

Edison has made many improvements, but there is much more work to do. As more improvements are made, it is important that Edison focus on the systems to ensure that the processes are clear and complete. Edison seems to be at the critical point where the culture is ready for quality improvement, but the processes still need to mature. Maturity will add intention to many processes that now seem inadequate. Edison provides evidence of processes that provide management and distribution of data in the area of measuring effectiveness. There is an opportunity to systematically and comprehensively analyze this data and ensure alignment with Edison's mission, vision, and areas of continuous improvement.

> **7P1, S**. Edison uses a variety of methods to identify and measure effectiveness of instructional and non-instructional services. Program review, assessment of student learning, and General Education outcomes are the primary sources of measurement for instructional services and programs. Results of CCSSE and Noel-Levitz SSI surveys are also used as methods of measuring effectiveness. For non-instructional services, including facilities and IT services, "School Dude" and "Track-IT" are used respectively.

> **7P2, S**. The CQI Steering Committee coordinates continuous quality initiatives and the establishment of CQI Process Teams. All faculty and staff can request a process review through the Steering Committee. An annual CQIN project is also identified by a selected group of faculty and staff. An Assessment Committee has responsibility for improving the quality of assessment data collected. These organizational structures suggest that Edison has begun to integrate quality improvement processes throughout the institution.

> **7P3, O**. While Edison indicates that work units and academic departments determine information and data needs, it is not clear what process is used to determine these needs. Edison may consider a process where IR works with departments and units to determine what is needed and how it can best be accessed, collected, analyzed, and

reported.

7P5, S. Edison uses external benchmarks available through NCCBP, Noel-Levitz SSI, and CCSSE to identify strengths and opportunities for improvement. Figures 7.1-2 indicate how Edison uses CCSSE results to identify high and low engagement practices.

7P7, S. Edison has numerous processes in place to ensure the timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of its information systems and related processes. These processes include accuracy checks, a technology recovery plan, and several software protection systems.

7R1, O. Edison identifies bandwidth management, storage area network monitoring and work orders, as the measures it collects and analyzes regularly. While these are good to measure and analyze, Edison may consider using many different measures; for example, it would be beneficial to add user satisfaction. Edison describes some sources of comparative data but does not address how it determines the need for comparative data or the criteria for selecting sources of comparison.

7R2, O. While Edison uses student and employee satisfaction and work order completion as measurements of effectiveness for operations, the College may benefit from reviewing best practices of other like institutions to determine if there are additional methods of measuring effectiveness of operations that may prove helpful to the institution.

7R3, O. Although Edison provides national Baldrige recipient results in several categories as in Figure 7.7, it is not clear in these charts where Edison results are reflected. Inclusion of the College results in charts of national Baldrige recipients may help the institution identify stretch targets and best-in-class practices to drive quality improvement initiatives.

7I1, O. Although several projects and initiatives are listed, it is not clear if these initiatives have improved the quality of measuring effectiveness. Figure 7.9 indicates an opportunity for improvement in the employees' response to the statement, "I have the technology I need to successfully do my job".

AQIP Category 8: Planning Continuous Improvement. This category examines the institution's planning processes and how strategies and action plans are helping to achieve the institution's mission and vision. It examines coordination and alignment of strategies and action

plans; measures and performance projections; resource needs; faculty, staff, and administrator capabilities; analysis of performance projections and results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Edison State Community College** for Category 8.

While Edison is to be commended for the development of its Strategic Master Plan, it will need to continue to monitor progress to ensure that the key targeted outcomes are met and evaluated to demonstrate measurable outcomes. Edison has an opportunity to continue to focus on training and inclusiveness as part of its continuous improvement planning process.

8P1, S. Edison's Strategic Master Plan drives its short and long term planning. The master plan contains Core Themes with Key Results that provide stakeholders a framework for aligning and implementing strategies to attain the Key Results. Implementation Strategies also guide stakeholders in establishing priorities, addressing changing needs, and guiding the College in continuous improvement. Each division aligns its plans with the Strategic Master Plan to ensure focus. The Action Plan Template allows for tracking and assessment of each plan.

8P2, S. Long-term strategies are developed based on the Strategic Master Plan, while short-term strategies are generated through AQIP and CQIN. The Action Plan Template (Figure 8.3) aligns action projects with the Strategic Master Plan. Three AQIP projects, an annual CQIN Team, and CQI Process Teams complement these divisional activities. These activities suggest that quality improvement is beginning to be integrated throughout the College.

8P5, S. Edison's Strategic Master Plan was developed in cooperation with all Edison stakeholders. Edison sets measures and performance targets based on feedback from surveys, discussions, and comparative analysis. The budget process appears to be inclusive; Figure 8.5 appears to provide limited information related to timelines.

8P7, S. Edison's planning process encompasses risk assessment, including financial risk, in addition to other resources that are needed or affected by institutional initiatives. Edison has developed an inclusive zero-based budgeting process that centers on financial viability to meet the requirements of the State and is monitored by the Ohio Board of Regents, the Edison Board of Trustees, and the Vice President of Administration and Finance. Edison's Program Viability Model measures risk and responsibility for the College. Cross-functional CQI teams focus on risk awareness within

their projects.

8R1, O. Edison measures the effectiveness of its planning processes by monitoring initiatives and achievement of targets. Achievements of initiatives in Action Plans are monitored at the divisional level through periodic updates and percentage-of-completion reporting; this process is really a measurement of the implementation process, not the planning process. Edison may benefit from determining if the planning process is fulfilling the needs of the institution by setting appropriate goals, not just achieving goals.

8R2, O. Edison alludes to performance results but there is no concrete evidence provided in this response that demonstrates performance results.

8R3, OO. Edison did not provide results for targets or projections. Figure 8.4 indicates KPI changes, but provides little information about this data, and lacks a timeline. The College has described its process for setting goals and may benefit by taking this opportunity to include these goals.

8R4, O. Edison provides some comparative data, however some charts are not clear. For example, Figure 8.8 indicates the direction is positive, but there is no clear trend in the number of degrees awarded. It is not clear how the performance results are linked to measures within the Strategic Master Plan, including Action Plans, KPIs, or Implementation Strategies. There is an opportunity for Edison to more fully describe its comparison in each of the charts provided.

8I1, O. Edison has identified a variety of changes implemented since its last portfolio. While some of these changes have positively impacted the area of Planning Continuous Improvement, and Edison's 2013 Strategic Master Plan, it may be to soon to realize results. Edison has an opportunity to demonstrate that targeted goals are being met through the Strategic Master Plan.

AQIP Category 9: Building Collaborative Relationships. This category examines the institution's relationships – current and potential – to analyze how they contribute to the institution accomplishing its mission. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to identification of key internal and external collaborative relationships; alignment of key collaborative relationships; relationship creation, prioritization, and building; needs identification; internal relationships; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these

areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Edison State Community College** for Category 9.

The introduction to this category indicates that Edison views itself as Integrated in building collaborative relationships, stating it has been proactive in creating and building collaborative relationships with stakeholders, but the responses to the various items do not reflect the strengths in this category. Edison may benefit by better articulating its processes and results related to building collaborative relationships, as well as how they prioritize, measure, and evaluate if they are working. While Edison focuses on specific actions or efforts, its processes do not provide sufficient evidence for a comprehensive approach, and results are extremely limited.

9P1, S. One of Edison's Core Themes in its Strategic Master Plan is "Understanding Student and Stakeholders Needs." This Theme was implemented through the SOAR process participation by all of Edison's stakeholder groups in early 2013. Edison has also updated its Handbook regarding building relationships and has placed it on the College's website. Edison has developed extensive partnerships and relationships with K-12 school districts to facilitate college credit for high school students through dual enrollment, articulation agreements, Tech Prep, and a Connect-to-College grant. College visit days have also been instituted for grades 6 through 10 as well as grades 11 and 12. The President also meets regularly with K-12 superintendents, which has led to additional collaborations for high school student programs. Edison's response to this question would be strengthened by mentioning how it prioritizes relationships with educational institutions or other organizations.

9P2, S. Edison has created and built relationships that reflect opportunities for its students to transfer to local four-year educational institutions through articulation agreements for bachelor degree programs. Some of these four-year institutions offer baccalaureate classes on-line, and in-person at Edison. Edison has fostered relationships statewide through the creation of the transfer Assurance Guide. Edison builds relationships with employers through the participation of area employers on Edison's Advisory Committees, Program Review Committees, Capstone presentations and internships. Edison's response to this question would be strengthened by describing how it prioritizes these relationships.

9P3, OO. While Edison states it follows all government statutes and regulations, no evidence or examples are provided in the portfolio to demonstrate how this assists

students. As well, Edison does not identify a process for creating, prioritizing, and building relationships with organizations that provide services to its students.

9P5, S. Edison creates, prioritizes, and builds relationships with education associations, external agencies, consortia partners and the general community, such as the local Chambers of Commerce, the Heart training program, and free programs and training offered by the SBDC. The library and child care center privileges provided to service area residents are also indicative of relationships Edison has built with local citizens. Edison does carefully adhere to regulations of the State of Ohio and Ohio Board of Regents related to collaborations. Edison's response to this question would be strengthened by describing how it prioritizes these relationships.

9R1, O. In Figure 9.1 Edison identifies various stakeholder groups which with it builds collaborative relationships and the methods it uses to collect and analyze data. Edison's response to this question would be strengthened by providing evidence specifying the measures used to analyze performance in this category**.**

9R3, OO. Edison reflects in Figure 9.3 its comparison results through NCCBP as evidence of showing positive comparative results for its processes used to Build Collaborative Relationships with other higher education institutions and organizations outside of higher education. Edison may benefit from a more thorough description of comparison with other organizations and how Edison fares in this comparison, as well as the value of the comparison for future growth.

9I2, O. Edison provides evidence for the collection, review and evaluation of data to measure its effectiveness in meeting its goals, and to serve both internal and external stakeholders. Most prominently used in this process is the survey approach, and the feedback derived provides longitudinal trend data and an improved ability to compare itself with other community colleges in the Ohio community college cohort and NCCBP colleges. Edison's response to this question may be strengthened by providing evidence addressing how the College culture and infrastructure helps select processes to improve and set targets for improved performance.

Accreditation Evidence Edison State Community College

The following section identifies any areas in the judgment of the Systems Appraisal Team where the institution either has not provided sufficient evidence that it currently meets the

Commission's Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components, or that it may face difficulty in meeting the Criteria and Core Components in the future. Identification of any such deficiencies as part of the Systems Appraisal process affords the institution the opportunity to remedy the problem prior to Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

Place evidence issue(s) here. If there are none, add "No evidence issues noted by the team," or similar statement.

Criterion 1: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	1A	1B	1C	1D	
Strong, clear, and well-presented.				X	
Adequate but could be improved.	X	X	X		
Unclear or incomplete.					
Criterion 2: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	2A	2B	2C	2D	2E
Strong, clear, and well-presented.	X	X	X	X	X
Adequate but could be improved.					
Unclear or incomplete.					
Criterion 3: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	3A	3B	3C	3D	3E
Strong, clear, and well-presented.		X		X	
Adequate but could be improved.	X		X		X
Unclear or incomplete.					
Criterion 4: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	4A	4B	4C		
Strong, clear, and well-presented.		X			
Adequate but could be improved.	X		X		
Unclear or incomplete.					
Criterion 5: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	5A	5B	5C	5D	
Strong, clear, and well-presented.	X	X	X	X	
Adequate but could be improved.					
Unclear or incomplete.					

1P1 & 1P2. Core Component *3.B. 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.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 3.B.

Edison has six measurable General Education outcomes that address critical thinking skills, effective communication and interpersonal skills, math skills, global awareness, and scientific inquiry. General Education courses and the associated outcomes are required in all programs with career programs

requiring 15 semester hours of General Education equivalency. General Education outcomes are assessed annually and evaluated for effectiveness and competency achievement. Edison performs annual outcomes assessments of both General Education and technical programs each spring with reports submitted in August. The Assessment Committee initiates and monitors more in-depth discipline and program review processes on a three- to five-year cycle. This assessment process triggers curriculum changes, which then follow a well-established process from Faculty to the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs for change and adoption. Edison posts current and historical General Education Assessment Reports on its website.

1P2 & 1P18. Core Component *4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 4.B.

Edison has targeted education achievement through an Action Project which developed a "Tracking System for the Assessment of Student Learning." The system provides longitudinal reporting, benchmarking, and program assessment reports. Entry-level student competency is assessed in the areas of basic reading, writing, and mathematics through interviews and testing. Compass test placement scores align with OBR requirements and program-specific requirements are addressed through additional assessments. "Across-the-curriculum" assessment is completed by the Assessment Committee which is a cross-functional group of faculty members and administrators.

1P4 & 1P10. Core Component *1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.*

Evidence is adequate but could be improved for Core Component 1.C.

Edison understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society through the requirement of a General Education outcome that states, "Develop a mental habit which is open-minded, tolerant, appreciative or diversity and aware of global cultures." Edison recently embraced a campus-wide reading and study of the book, "Understanding and Engaging Under-Resourced College Students".

Edison's attention to human diversity, as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves, is demonstrated by: the recent addition of a Veteran's lounge, free tuition for senior citizens, requiring a disability support statement in every syllabus, and by providing a child development center available to the entire district.

However, there is no evidence that addresses Edison's role in a multicultural society. It would be helpful if Edison includes more information on its geographic area demographics and how it compares those with its student demographics, i.e., age, gender, ethnicity, etc.

1P4 & 1P12. Core Component *3.A. The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.*

Evidence is adequate but could be improved for Core Component 3.A.

With respect to the degrees Edison is offering, AA, AS, AAB, AAS, and Certificates; the degrees are appropriate to higher education and a community college, as listed in the Institutional Review section of the portfolio. The annual program assessment and three- or five-year program review ensure that Edison's programs are current and the program outcomes are relevant.   Edison uses a syllabus template, online course templates and online course sites for all courses taught, whether online or face-to-face. General Education courses are required in all programs; Edison does not differentiate between courses taught face-to-face, at a distance, or at various locations. The IPE Department is also fully involved with research and data collection for viability and preparation of the Program Planning Model.

The ADN degree is not mentioned in the list of degrees although nursing students are referenced in the systems portfolio.

1P4 & 1P13. Core Component *4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.*

Evidence is adequate but could be improved for Core Component 4.A.

Edison evaluates career programs using two assessment processes. There is an annual program assessment and a three-year program review for technical programs and every five years for the soft-skill career programs. Edison evaluates the success of its graduates through input from the program advisory committee and selected professionals working in the field. Program review committees require the participation of an adjunct or student. A program's review may be more frequent if there are indicators that the program has received complaints from graduates, low enrollment, low number of graduates, poor retention, poor revenue, or lack of qualified faculty. Both internal and external feedback is sought through surveys.

Edison does require faculty qualifications for dual enrollment programs in local high schools to document the minimum 18 graduate credits in the subject in addition to a master's degree and that learning outcomes of the courses meet its rigorous standards.   Edison maintains programs that are accredited by nine specialized accreditation organizations. Edison uses (in part) the Ohio Transfer Module to determine prerequisites (1P5).

To measure the success of their graduates Edison uses external validation testing, such as NCLEX for nursing students or requires capstone courses for some programs. Indirect measures of student success include employer surveys and student satisfaction surveys. There is also some limited transfer data to other Ohio colleges and universities.

There is no evidence that Edison evaluates transfer credits and certifications prior to posting them to official transcripts.

1P6. Core Component *2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 2.B.

Expectations for student preparation and program-specific learning objectives are communicated through the online course catalog, and the website provides access to the Student Handbook, program information, syllabi, and FAQs. The "Connect to College" program provides high school freshmen, sophomores, and seniors with tools to understand college expectations. Navigating Edison is an initiative that partners orientation and new student registration. This process outlines student success skills and maps an educational plan for coursework.

1P7 & 1P15. Core Component *3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 3.D.

Edison employs several tools to support student career choices such as Career Assessment questionnaires, the Holland Code Career Model personality tool, and the TypeFocus career planning tool. The Learning Center provides free services to students such as academic tutoring and additional resources for students in developmental courses, first-generation students, and students with learning disabilities. Online tutoring services are available through eTutoring.org, the Online Writing Lab, and Scaffold to the Stars. These services provide support through question-and-answer format, live chats, and web conferencing.

1P11. Core Component *2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 2.D.

Edison's Faculty Handbook cites its position on Academic Freedom and Responsibilities which includes instructor freedom to present materials pertinent to the subject, in an unbiased manner. Students are expected to respect ethical standards and exhibit academic honesty as identified by the core education value of Ethics. The Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching is committed to supporting the communication of knowledge and the love of learning by Faculty through the provision of resources.

1P11. Core Component *2.E. The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 2.E.

Full-time and adjunct instructors are required to complete courses in technology and pedagogical/andragogical content. The Quality Matters Rubric, based on national standards of best

practice, is used as a tool to ensure consistency throughout course design. The Assessment Committee measures processes relating to student core values such as ethical behavior to monitor plagiarism and cheating.

1P16. Core Component *3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.*

Evidence is adequate but could be improved for Core Component 3.E.

Edison needs to improve evidence about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Edison identifies some clubs and organizations as co-curricular. As examples, Phi Theta Kappa aligns to all General Education outcomes; the Edison Photo Society aligns to critical thinking, diversity, and using information resources; and the Society for Business and Human Resource Management aligns to all but mathematics. Edison also aligns its co-curricular development goals with the student core values and makes efforts to be certain each student is introduced to and has modeled the characteristics graduates are supposed to reflect, regardless of degree or discipline.

3P1. Core Component *4.C. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.*

Evidence is adequate but could be improved for Core Component 4.C.

Edison identifies the changing needs of its students groups through academic deans and faculty who monitor enrollment, retention, persistence and completion rates in their respective programs through Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), the annual program assessments, and the three to five year program review. Edison seeks feedback through surveys such as the CCSSE student engagement survey, the Noel-Levitz SSI, marketing analyses, and employer surveys. The Strategic Master Plan includes a Core Theme for Helping Students Learn. One of its implementation strategies is to "Establish a systemic approach to recruitment, college-readiness and retention with a focus on success, graduation and transfer."

Evidence is lacking of a systematic approach and commitment to ongoing improvement in this area. While Edison's goals for student retention, persistence and completion rates are ambitious, but attainable and appropriate to its mission; student population and educational offerings are unclear. Several comparisons were shown in the results sections, but no goals were listed. Edison provides retention data in Figures 3.7 and 3.17, but the numbers are not comparable for the same time span. Edison demonstrated persistence in Figure 3.19 and

completion of programs in Figures 3.8 and 3.9, but these numbers were not given as a percentage of headcount, so it's not known if percentage of graduation rose due to an increase in headcount, or if the increase was due to better completion rates. No analysis of these results in 3P1 was provided.

3P3 & 3P5. Core Component *1.D. The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 1.D.

Edison's mission and vision direct its responsibility of providing education services and learning opportunities to its service area. The mission statement focuses not only on Edison's students, but more broadly on the public good. Edison supports the community through its library services for the general public, and community members are welcome to obtain a courtesy library card. In 2013 Edison hosted a series of focus group listening sessions following the SOAR approach to Appreciative Inquiry (AI). The 199 attendees represented Edison's key stakeholders: faculty and adjuncts, classified and administrative staff, students, academic partners, and external stakeholders, and discussed "How can Edison better respond to the needs of our community and how can we better respond in the future?"

4P2 & 4P10 Core Component *3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.*

Evidence is adequate but could be improved for Core Component 3.C.

Edison has a student-to-faculty ratio of 15:1 which ranks in the 25th percentile of the 2013 NCCBP study. The Curriculum and Assessment committees are primarily driven by full-time faculty. Edison's hiring practices uses a cross-representation committee for formulating and presenting situational and behavioral style interview questions. Candidates are hired according to qualifications, comprehension of CQI, and characteristics related to Edison's Employee Working Core Values.

Edison cites examples of processes determining effective faculty and commitment to low student-to-faculty ratio. Additional evidence on how the College identifies the need for staff and the effectiveness of its programs and student services is needed.

4P7 Core Component *2.A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 2.A.

Edison operates according to the standards of the Ohio Ethics Commission and Ohio Revised Code. All faculty and staff are subject to Section 2921.42 (Having an Unlawful Interest in a Public Contract) and Section 2921.43 (Soliciting or Receiving Improper Compensation) of the Ohio Revised Code. All staff are subject to Ohio Revised Code Chapter 102 (Ethics), and faculty are subject to Section 102.04 (C). In addition to annual ethics training, employees are educated on Edison's Employee Working Core Values to promote and encourage integrity in all facets of the College. The Employee Policy Manual includes policies related to upholding ethical standards. Ethics training is provided to members of the BOT annually.

4P7 Core Component 2.*E. The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 2.E.

Edison has an established academic honesty policy providing a distinct set of guidelines for compliance with ethical conduct involving research and scholarly practice. This policy can be found in the Student and Faculty Handbooks as well as on the Edison website. Any unethical conduct by faculty or staff results in disciplinary action up to and including termination. Course syllabi include Edison's academic honesty policy and guidelines; additionally students may receive guidance from the library and Learning Center as well as from faculty during office hours.

5P1 & 5P2. Core Component *1.A. The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.*

The evidence is adequate but could be improved for Core Component 1.A.

Edison's mission and vision statements were developed by the BOT and the President through a process that included stakeholders within their service area. Edison provides learning opportunities (part of its mission statement) through student support services where academic advising is conducted to teach students about their program of study, the curriculum and the next steps they need to take.

There is no mention of planning and budgeting priorities that are aligned with and support Edison's mission in this section.

5P2 & 5P6. Core Component *5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.*

The evidence provided is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 5.C.

Edison's planning process encompasses the institution and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups through an appreciative inquiry approach called SOAR: Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations and Results.   Through this SOAR process, stakeholders (including students) tell Edison its strengths, core competencies, advantages and challenges.

Edison developed a new Strategic Plan in 2013 that aligns three Core Themes with their mission, vision and values and then places five Key Results under the respective themes. The plan identifies implementation strategies for each of the Key Results.

Edison's planning anticipates emerging factors such as technology through implementation of their Strategic Master plan. Human, technological, and equipment resources needed to carry out each initiative identified in each of the three Core Themes are included.

5P2. Core Component *2.C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.*

The evidence is strong, clear and well-presented for Core Component 2.C.

Edison is governed by a nine-member BOT, of which three are appointed from each of the three counties in its service area. The 2013 BOT Policy Governance Manual states that the board will "operate always mindful of its civic trusteeship obligation to the citizens of Darke, Miami and Shelby counties." The Manual also states that the BOT will "demonstrate commitment and accountability to the general public by competent, conscientious and effective decision making". The BOT establishes the board of governance policies, but delegates the development and implementation of these policies to the President. The collective bargaining agreement establishes the role of faculty to oversee academic matters.

5P3 & 5P8. Core Component *1.B. The mission is articulated publicly.*

The evidence is adequate but could be improved for Core Component 1.B.

The mission statement is published on Edison's webpage as well as in the Student Handbook, the BOT Policies and Procedures Manual, the Faculty Handbook, and on public affairs and marketing materials. The Edison brand communicates the emphasis on "A personal experience, a rewarding education."

There is no evidence that the mission document identifies the nature, scope and intended constituents for Edison's programs and services.

5P5 & 5P9. Core Component *5.B. The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.*

Evidence is strong, clear and well-presented for Core Component 5.B.

The BOT Job Description indicates the Board must ensure the financial and personnel resources are available for resource development.   Edison has written in the 2012 Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Article Two that The "Senate is a part of Edison Community College governance and as such recommends changes relative to academic matter to the President" in writing.

Edison involves students in the governance process through representation on the President's Council and through the Student Governing Board.

Edison involves employees in organizational structures that help govern the College. The teams seek input and provide information for decisions and communicate the outcomes to their respective departments. Standing committees include CQI Steering Committee, Curriculum Committee, AQIP Action Project Teams, Advisory Committees, CQIN Teams, Professional Development Committee for Faculty and staff, and the Assessment Committee.

The Academic Senate recommends academic changes such as curriculum, General Education, program requirements, academic standards, advising, professional development in curriculum and instruction, and the teaching/learning environment to the President.

7P2 & 7P4. Core Component *5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.*

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-represented for Core Component 5.D.

Edison documents evidence of performance of its operations in emails, folder sharing, discussion boards through Blackboard, video conferencing, public folders, SharePoint, the Dashboard and Data Repository, the college-wide initiatives Strategy Map, intranet, and specific websites.

Edison learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities and sustainability, and its component parts. Analysis by Deans, at the work unit, program or discipline level, closely monitor enrollment trends, retention, completion and student learning. In addition, Career Services continuously reviews area and state-wide employment trends that could impact program offerings.

Results of the Employee Satisfaction survey are used throughout Edison to drive strategic change.

8P6. Core Component 5.*A. **The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.***

Evidence is strong, clear, and well-presented for Core Component 5.A.

Edison uses zero-based budgeting. Its annual budget is based on enrollment projections (enrollment growth and retention). Edison's fiscal focus is further defined based on individual program needs. Resources may be reallocated over time to other areas, e.g. recently hired additional math and engineering faculty, due to enrollment growth in these areas. Edison ensures that faculty and staff have appropriate credentials and experience.

The Budget Team meets several times throughout the budget cycle and works collaboratively to allocate funds that will best meet the college-wide mission and strategic initiatives.

Edison's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas, or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity. The College provides training for staff and faculty, as well as professional development opportunities. Edison's priority is educating its citizens.

Edison plans for technological advancements to support its curriculum, as well as other services, to be efficient in energy consumption.

Quality of Systems Portfolio For Edison State Community College

Because it stands as a reflection of the institution, the *Systems Portfolio* should be complete and coherent, and it should provide an open and honest self-analysis on the strengths and challenges facing the organization. In this section, the Systems Appraisal Team provides Edison State Community College with constructive feedback on the overall quality of the portfolio, along with suggestions for improvement of future portfolio submissions.

The Appraisal Team offers the following comments about the quality of Edison State Community College's Systems Portfolio.

- The overview sections were concise and reflect Edison's self-assessment of progress in quality improvement.

- The process responses provided a narrative for the components of the process, but could have been strengthened with flow charts that indicate when decisions occur during a calendar, fiscal, or academic year. For instance, the budgeting process is unclear as to the time in the academic year when decisions are made.

- The graphs and charts provided in the results section were confusing and lacked narrative interpreting the results. The arrows used in graphs suggested positive trends when the actual trend data were sometimes negative. The use of graphs/data from Baldrige recipients was encouraging, but Edison did not indicate on the graphs/data how its results compare to those of the Baldrige recipients and why this is important to Edison.

- The responses to improvement questions tended to be more anecdotal. Criteria or actions reported did not reflect measurable results in determining improvement.

- There was repetition throughout the categories making it difficult to distinguish the responses to specific categorical questions.

- Edison reports its name differently throughout the systems portfolio. Reporting its corporate name of Edison State Community College should be uniform in its publications.

Using the Feedback Report

The AQIP Systems Appraisal process is intended to initiate action for institutional improvement. Though decisions about specific actions rest with each institution, the Commission expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of continual improvement and to inform future AQIP processes.

Some key questions that may arise in careful examination of this report may include: How do the team's findings challenge our assumptions about ourselves? Given our mission and goals, which issues should we focus on? How will we employ results to innovate, grow, and encourage a positive culture of improvement? How will we incorporate lessons learned from this review in our planning and operational processes? How will we revise the *Systems Portfolio* to reflect what we have learned? How an organization interprets, communicates, and uses its feedback for improvement ought to support AQIP's core values, encouraging involvement, learning, collaboration, and integrity.

The Commission's goal is to help an institution clarify the strategic issues most vital to its success, and then to support the institution as it addresses these priorities in ways that will make a difference in institutional performance.