SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT

in response to the *Systems Portfolio* of

JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE

March 16, 2005

Academic Quality Improvement Program
The Higher Learning Commission NCA

30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60602-2504
www.AQIP.org
AQIP@hlcommission.org
(800) 621-7440

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT

In response to the *Systems Portfolio* of

JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE

March 15, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 3

Using the Feedback Report 4

Critical Characteristics Analysis 5

Criteria Feedback 9

Helping Students Learn 9

Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives 14

Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs 17

Valuing People 20

Leading and Communicating 23

Supporting Institutional Operations 25

Measuring Effectiveness 28

Planning Continuous Improvement 30

Building Collaborative Relationships 34

Strategic Issues Analysis 37

Appraisal Summary 39

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

INTRODUCTION

The *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* provides AQIP's official response to your *Systems Portfolio* by a team of readers trained in evaluation. After appraisers independently reviewed your document, the team reached consensus on essential elements of your institutional profile, strengths and opportunities for improvement by Criterion, significant issues for your institution, and an Appraisal Rubric score for each Criterion. These are presented in four sections of the Feedback Report: *Critical Characteristics Analysis, Criteria Feedback*, *Strategic Issues Analysis* and the *Appraisal Summary.* These components are interrelated in defining context, evaluating performance, surfacing critical issues, and assessing institutional performance.

Each member of the Systems Appraisal Team devoted many hours to analyzing and reacting to your *Systems Portfolio*, first individually and then via a consensus process designed to ensure that all feedback you receive is the agreed-upon conclusion of an entire group of intelligent, trained peers. There are no one-person opinions here, no idiosyncratic, subjective opinions. Most of the team's members have had executive responsibilities in colleges and universities, but the team also included at least one person whose work and experience lie outside of higher education, and who could help the team maintain perspective on the work higher educators still have to do to bring quality principles into all areas of the Academy. All team members are committed to promoting continuous quality improvement in higher education and have received training in quality processes. Many team members have also had experience with Baldrige-type quality award programs. We know that you and your colleagues will find the astuteness of their perceptions, as embodied in this report, useful in your commitment for continuous quality learning.

Good as the team was, however, it is important to remember that they had only your *Systems Portfolio* to guide their analysis of your institution's strengths and opportunities for improvement. Consequently, their report may omit important strengths — if you were too modest to stress them in your *Systems Portfolio*, or if your discussion and documentation of them was unconvincing. Similarly, the team may have pointed out areas of potential improvement that are, in fact, already receiving the institution's attention. Again, the team used its best judgment in identifying improvement opportunities. If some of these areas of potential improvement are now strengths rather than opportunities because of your own focused efforts, that is all to your credit. If it was unsure about an area, we urged the team to err on the side of giving your institution the best possible advice about where investing your efforts might pay off. If some of their advice comes after the fact, after you've already tackled an area, no harm is done.

Critical Characteristics: Your *Systems Portfolio*'s "Organizational Overview" provides context for the team's knowledge of your institution's identity, mission objectives, strategic goals, and key

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

factors related to improvement. Critical Characteristics are those features most important for understanding the institution's mission, environment, stakeholders, competitive position, goals, and processes. Characteristics having the greatest relevance to each Criterion are identified in the Report.

Criteria Feedback: The Report's feedback on each of AQIP's nine Criteria specifically identifies 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. Comments, which are keyed to your *Systems Portfolio*, offer brief analysis of each strength and opportunity. Organized by Criterion, and presenting the team's findings in detail, this section is the heart of the Report. At the end of the list of strengths and opportunities for each Criterion is the team's consensus assessment of the institution's stage of development on that particular Criterion. This section consists of a series of statements reflecting the reviewers' assessment of the institution's current status in relation to critical quality characteristics: 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 the Criterion covers. Since institutions are complex, maturity levels may vary from one Criterion to another.

Strategic Issues Analysis: Strategic issues are those most closely related to your institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and quality improvement goals. The Systems Appraisal Team identified these issues through analysis of your *Organizational Overview* and the feedback it provided for each Criterion. This list of strategic issues offers a framework for addressing ongoing improvement of processes and systems, and can serve as an "executive summary" of the Report's key findings and recommendations.

Appraisal Summary: The compilation of the nine rubrics that capture the team's appraisal of the organization's Portfolio description of each of the nine AQIP Criteria. The summary indicates the team's consensus on the developmental maturity of each Criterion description.

USING THE FEEDBACK REPORT

The AQIP *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* is intended to initiate action for improvement. It is therefore important that the Report produced by the Systems Appraisal Team stimulate review of organizational processes and systems. Though decisions about specific actions are each institution's, AQIP expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

continual improvement. At the next Strategy Forum an AQIP institution attends, its peers will examine in detail how it is using the feedback from its *Systems Appraisal*.

An organization needs to examine its Report strategically to identify those areas that, if addressed, will yield greatest benefit. Some key questions that may arise in careful examination of the Report may be: 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*. Rubrics should be used to understand where the opportunities for ongoing systems improvement are greatest, not as scores indicating success or failure. Based solely upon an organization's *Systems Portfolio*, the Report reflects a disciplined, external review of what an organization says about itself. The report should help an organization identify ways to improve its *Systems Portfolio* so it functions better to communicate accurately to internal and external audiences. But the Report's chief purpose is to help you to identify areas for improvement, and to act so that these areas actually improve. These improvements, in turn, can be incorporated into an updated *Systems Portfolio*, guaranteeing that future *Systems Appraisals* will reflect the progress an institution has made.

CRITICAL CHARACTERISTICS ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section is to identify what team members understood to be the critical and distinguishing characteristics of your institution. They are the shared understanding of the most important aspects of Joliet Junior College's identity, its current dynamics and the forces surrounding it, and its internal momentum and aspirations, at least as team members understood them. This section also demonstrates to you, when you study *the Feedback Report*, that the Systems Appraisal Team recognized and knew what makes Joliet Junior College distinctive. Should you find some characteristics that you think are critical and missing from this list, you may want to clarify and highlight these items when you revise your *Systems Portfolio* and other literature explaining your institution to the public.

O1a JJC opened in 1901 as the first public community college in the nation. In 2003 it served 22,558 students in credit courses and 17,574 in non-credit courses.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

O1b JJC adopted CQI in 1992 and has been involved in a CQI Network since 1993.

O1c JJC serves a seven-county 1,442-square-mile area with its 3 campuses, 1 branch, and 20 extension locations.

01d 85% of JJC students come from the 3rd fastest growing county in the nation, expected to increase in population from 500,000 to 1,100,000 by 2030.

O1e JJC's mission includes preparing students for transfer, employment, and lifelong learning by providing transitional, extension, adult, continuing, and workforce education.

O1f JJC endeavors to be an educational leader and innovator, as well as a major catalyst to economic growth.

O1g JJC's vision includes collaboration, innovative delivery, serving a diverse community, recruiting and retaining exceptional faculty, and incorporating all college constituents in planning.

O1h Core values include respect, integrity, collaboration, humor & well-being, innovation, and quality.

O1i JJC's 2003 budget was $68.9 million. Revenues came from 54% local, 29% tuition, 16% state and 2% other sources. Expenditures were 54% instructional, 5% academic support, 7% student services, 14% plant, 7% administration, and 13% institutional support.

O1j JJC has made a commitment to Long Term Planning by using a 3-year window to manage their: Financial Plan which includes strategic planning, revenue and expense forecasting, and quality planning calendar. An Annual budget connects these elements.

O1k JJC is governed by two bodies: a locally elected Board of Trustees with 7 members and 1 non-voting student member, and the State of Illinois Community College Board, which has authority over its planning, budgeting and program requirements.

O2a JJC offers two associate degrees aimed at transfer (AA and AS); one general associate degree aimed at transfer and non-transfer courses (Associate of General Studies), and three types of programs aimed at employment in a specific field—48 AAS degree programs and 98 programs leading to certificates of achievement or certificates of completion.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

O2b JJC offers credit and non-credit courses in 13 academic departments, occupational skills, contract and customized training, small business development, incubation, Adult Basic Education and Secondary Basic Education, English as a Second Language, general education development, and personal enrichment.

O3a In fall 2004, 76% of JJC's 12,751 credit enrollment was in transfer programs; 24% in occupational programs. The enrollment of students in transfer courses is increasing faster than in the occupational courses.

O3b 77% of credits were generated at the Main campus, 10% at north campus, 3% at City Center and 10% at other locations.

O3c While more than 20,000 students are taking at least one credit hour in a given semester, only about 900 graduate (complete studies) each year.

O3d Tuition and fees are $1,740 per year for a full time student. About 20% of students receive financial aid, compared to about 50% of all community college students nationwide. 74% of JJC students work more than 20 hrs. per week.

O3e The majority of JJC students are first-generation college students below the age of 28; 62% are first generation college students; 24% are from minority populations. The Latino student population is the fastest growing minority segment (123% in five years).

O3f 18.2% of credit students were enrolled in a developmental course, compared to the Illinois community college average of 14.5%. J

O3g 282 high school students completed 1,336 credit hours at 4 locations as part of dual enrollment.

O3h Student use of the Internet has doubled over 5 years.

O4a JJC encourages employees to volunteer in community service programs (5,000 hours in FY04).

O4b JJC's collaborations are many and varied but are tightly aligned with stated institutional core values. JJC has strong collaborations with area high schools and a local employer for its Pharmacy Technician program. JJC Tech Prep served 3,531district HS students in FY2004.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

O5a 184 full-time faculty (26% of the faculty) teach 53% of credit courses; 519 part-time faculty (76% of the faculty) teach 47% of credit courses; 89% of all full-time faculty hold at least a master's degree.

O5b 9% of full-time faculty and 22% of full-time administrators come from minority populations.

O5c JJC's support staff has 102 full-time and 87 part-time employees; clerical staff 78 full-time and 140 part-time; and plant staff 60 full-time and 34 part-time.

O5d There are five bargaining units at JJC, representing faculty, clerical, food service, campus police, and physical plant employees.

O6a ICCB exerts planning, regulatory and fiscal authority over JJC including budget, borrowing and financing, capital planning and expenditures, taxation, bonds, facilities use, articulation and information.

06b JJC operates in an interdependent environment (forced by the ICCB relationship) creating statewide reporting and evaluation systems to be a standing requirement for the school.

O6c The number of users of 27 computer labs—615 computers--at the main campus has tripled in 4 years. The college provides 54 hours per week help desk support. Computers for faculty, staff and computer labs are maintained on a four-year replacement cycle.

07a No other public postsecondary institutions are located within JJC's district boundaries. Traditional and on-line for-profit institutions are perceived as competitors.

O7b JJC views its competitors as six 2-year colleges and four 4-year colleges in and surrounding the JJC district. Many JJC students attend other institutions at the same time or after completion of JJC studies.

O8a The college is implementing a Performance Appraisal System that aligns employee and departmental goals to institutional goals and provides incentives for reaching them.

O8b JJC strongly supports quality improvement in education especially through its involvement in AQIP. JJC considers the AQIP Self-Study a significant team effort reflecting the overall emphasis for quality improvement at JJC.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

O8c Revenue streams may not keep pace with actual and potential student enrollment growth.

O8d JJC expects its programs and offerings to be in high demand based on the rapid growth of the region and on its competitive pricing.

CRITERIA FEEDBACK

In the following sections, each of which deals with strengths and opportunities for improvement for one of the nine AQIP Criteria, selected *Critical Characteristics* are again highlighted, those the Systems Appraisal Team believed were critical keys to reviewing that particular AQIP Criterion. The symbols used in these "strengths and opportunities" sections for each Criterion stand for *outstanding strength* (SS), *strength* (S), *opportunity for improvement* (O) and *pressing or outstanding opportunity for improvement* (OO). The choice of symbol for each item represents the consensus evaluation of the Systems Appraisal Team members, and deserves your 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 CRITERION 1: *HELPING STUDENTS LEARN*

Helping Students Learn identifies the shared purpose of all higher education organizations, and is accordingly the pivot of any institutional analysis. This Criterion focuses on the teaching-learning process within a formal instructional context, yet also addresses how your entire institution contributes to helping students learn and overall student development. It examines your 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.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Joliet Junior College that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Criterion 1, *Helping Students Learn*:

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

O1e – JJC's mission includes preparing students for transfer, employment, and lifelong learning by providing transitional, extension, adult, continuing, and workforce education.

O2b – JJC offers credit and non-credit courses in 13 academic departments, occupational skills, contract and customized training, small business development, incubation, Adult Basic Education and Secondary Basic Education, English as a Second Language, general education development, and personal enrichment.

O3c – While more than 20,000 students are taking at least one credit hour in a given semester, only about 900 graduate (complete studies) each year.

O3e – The majority of JJC students are first-generation college students below the age of 28; 62% are first generation college students; 24% are from minority populations. The Latino student population is the fastest growing minority segment (123% in five years).

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Joliet Junior College's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Criterion 1, *Helping Students Learn.*

1C1	O	JJC has attempted to demonstrate alignment of learning objectives at the course, programmatic, institutional and societal levels (Figure 1.1) and that learning objectives are aligned with institutional mission (Figure 1.2). As JJC continues to evolve in its identification of measurable general education outcomes, it will benefit from not only identifying the outcomes but also from establishing appropriate means to measure them to assure that instruction is aligned with desired outcomes.
1C3	S	In an attempt to enhance learning, JJC has made a commitment of personnel and technology resources to facilitate a broad spectrum of instructional and other IT delivery methods. While there is only anecdotal evidence and short-term data on performance, JJC shows progress in its goal to provide multiple delivery modes through technology and flexible scheduling.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

1P1	O	At JJC faculty determine program learning objectives (reviewed every five years by the Academic Assessment Committee) and course learning objectives (reviewed by faculty every two years). In addition, JJC established a subcommittee within the Assessment Committee in Fall 2003 that is charged with developing clear learning objectives for general education and finding means to assess them. However, at this point, the means for assessing the learning objectives are unclear, making it difficult to determine if these learning objectives are being measured on an institution-wide basis.
1P3	S	JJC's mandatory placement and counselor led advising systems are designed to determine the abilities of incoming students and to place them at appropriate levels. Tech Prep, placement tests and proficiency exams are some of the tools used at JJC to assist in making these assessment and placement decisions.
1P3	O	Processes for determining and reviewing pre-requisite skills beyond the basic ones and to align advanced courses with prerequisites might be useful in advising students.
1P4	O	JJC provides outreach to potential high school students and counselors using a variety of printed materials, electronic media, and face-to-face contact to provide information about programs, course requirements and expectations. Expanding this reach to include employers, parents and community groups would cast the net more widely and assist JJC to achieve its desired goal of reaching more current and potential stakeholders. As it employs these many communication tools, JJC could benefit from developing processes for measuring the effectiveness of these communication efforts.
1P5	O	JJC acknowledges that part-time and "self-advised" students are not getting needed assistance in selecting programs of study that match their interests and abilities. An AQIP Quality Action Project has been defined to address this issue.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

1P6 O JJC has an extensive process for reviewing faculty at all levels, including post-tenure review. However, processes for determining and documenting effective teaching largely use indirect measures of student learning, such as student course evaluations, admission to transfer institutions, and results from employer satisfaction surveys. Although the Best Practices initiative is useful in sharing information about projects, activities or changes within the institution—including external best practice—could assist the institution in benchmarking its performance.

1P7 O Although JJC describes a potentially effective system for scheduling course offerings based on student and institutional needs, it is unclear how it builds an effective and efficient course delivery system that incorporates technology and learner-centered approaches that are sensitive to multiple learning styles. For example, the process takes into consideration various information sources for identifying scheduling needs (enrollment patterns, availability of facilities and faculty, etc.) but it is not clear how systematic and effective the process is. A focused evaluation of the process may reveal important avenues for improvement.

1P8 O JJC's program review process lacks criteria and processes for identifying existing programs and courses for discontinuation. JJC's ability to improve its curricula could be enhanced if there were more thorough processes for monitoring career, transfer and General Education programs. These processes, utilizing input from affected stakeholders, could encourage more efficient use of the college's scarce resources.

1P11 O Processes for assessment of student learning are determined by individual instructors and department faculty. They are then articulated on course syllabi and in program assessment plans that must be approved by the JJC Assessment committee. However, evidence is lacking that a systematic, institution-wide approach exists and this makes it difficult to understand the assessment of learning objectives at the institutional level.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

1P12	S	Through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and individual departments, JJC collects data on many institutional variables – graduate preparation for continuing education and employment, annual rates of transfer to senior institutions, grades, persistence and completion. Students re-entering the workforce after retraining are also tracked to evaluate employment success. Collection and analysis of these data can provide the college with useful summative feedback on program effectiveness.
1R2	S	The college evaluates its effectiveness through collection of data on various factors from many different sources. It has also aligned assessment of student learning with program review processes but since this only began in FY 2005 there are no results to report.
1R2	O	JJC relies almost exclusively on indirect measures of student learning and provides data from the Faces of the Future Survey. The results and improvement examples show analysis of *methods* to improve student learning but the data on student achievement of learning outcomes is not presented. JJC might benefit from using systematic assessment processes that reflect more direct measures.
1R3	O	As it relates to helping students learn, JJC cites only results associated with technology. The college began to align program review with assessment of student learning in FY 2005, but no preliminary results are reported. Also, JJC associates dramatic increases in the use of electronic resources, such as on-line courses and Blackboard, with enhanced learning but no data is presented to substantiate that increased use equates to enhanced learning.
1R3	O	JJC provides no results for other processes for helping students learn, such as counseling, tutoring, mentoring or other forms of learning support. Developing regular measures in these areas can provide effectiveness data to support student learning.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

1R4 O Data presented by JJC show that the college lags behind other Illinois community colleges in students' perceptions about institutional contributions to certain learning categories, including graduation/transfer rates. The Faces of the Future Survey results show that students at JJC evaluate the college's contribution to enhancing their computer skills substantially lower than the national average. Other areas suggest opportunities for improvement in academic advising and campus security.

1I1 O JJC presents a structure for improving processes and systems that help students learn and develop. However, the process for identifying priorities for improvements is unclear and there are no obvious connections to particular planning activities that set priorities and commit resources for improvement.

1I2 O The college has established institutional improvement priorities. However, it does not show evidence of specific measurements or performance targets for these improvement priorities. Establishing measurements and setting targets can help make the outcomes more tangible and allow for more effective evaluation of its results.

Overall, the Systems Appraisal Team saw Joliet Junior College's performance on this Criterion as Developing, characterized by:

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CRITERION 2: *ACCOMPLISHING OTHER DISTINCTIVE OBJECTIVES*

Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives addresses the processes that contribute to the achievement of your institution's major objectives that complement student learning and fulfill other portions of your mission. Depending on your institution's character, it examines your 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.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Joliet Junior College that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Criterion 2, *Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives*:

O1f – JJC endeavors to be an educational leader and innovator, as well as a major catalyst to economic growth.

O1g – JJC's vision includes collaboration, innovative delivery, serving a diverse community, recruiting and retaining exceptional faculty, and incorporating all college constituents in planning.

O2b – JJC offers credit and non-credit courses in 13 academic departments, occupational skills, contract and customized training, small business development, incubation, Adult Basic Education and Secondary Basic Education, English as a Second Language, general education development, and personal enrichment.

O4a – JJC encourages employees to volunteer in community service programs (5,000 hours in FY04).

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Joliet Junior College's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Criterion 2, *Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives*:

2C2, 2C3	S	Table 2.1 provides evidence that JJC has begun to align its distinctive objectives at the program, department and unit levels. Learning can be facilitated as successful approaches and processes are adopted and used throughout the institution.
2P1	OO	At JJC, institutional goal-setting involves the entire campus community but the relationship between various governance structures and the Quality Planning Team (QPT) is unclear for such processes as setting proposed goals at the department, unit or program level. Also, incorporating input from external stakeholders could provide a broader perspective and allow the college to identify objectives that communicate the uniqueness of JJC.
2P2	S	JJC employs a number of electronic and print media to communicate distinctive objectives.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

2P2	O	JJC states that the "budget is the most precise and direct method of communicating how decisions about institutional objectives, priorities, and goals are set." However, it is unclear how the budget process communicates JJC's expectations regarding its other distinctive objectives.
2P3	O	JJC partially measures community involvement by employee volunteer man-hours (5000 in FY 2004). However, broad, its general statements of community relationships do not clarifying specific purposes. Moreover, specific effectiveness measures for employee volunteer hours and college service are not clearly stated and appear disconnected from JJC's mission.
2P4	O	It is unclear how feedback is used to adjust or revise JJC's other distinctive objectives and the processes that support them.
2R1	O	Analyzing and categorizing types of community service contributions and their benefits to the community can provide the institution with information about employee interests that could be used to coordinate endeavors and enhance communication with the community.
2R1, 2R2	S	JJC provides results related to accomplishing its other distinct objectives such as number of businesses served and incubated.
2R2	O	JJC has not identified comparison data that would allow the college to evaluate its efforts toward its distinctive objectives in relation to other institutions, which may limit its ability to gauge its own progress.
2I1, 2I2	O	Although JJC lists general targets for improvement, it is unclear what specific improvement priorities are being targeted by JJC and how they will be addressed.
2R3	O	Investigating local workforce needs and collecting data on college service to local industries could provide JJC with an opportunity to extend and enhance its distinctive objectives.

Overall, the Systems Appraisal Team saw Joliet Junior College's performance on this Criterion as Developing, characterized by:

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CRITERION 3: *UNDERSTANDING STUDENTS' AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS' NEEDS*

Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs 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.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Joliet Junior College that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Criterion 3, *Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs*:

O3c – While more than 20,000 students are taking at least one credit hour in a given semester, only about 900 graduate (complete studies) each year.

O3e – The majority of JJC students are first-generation college students below the age of 28; 62% are first generation college students; 24% are from minority populations. The Latino student population is the fastest growing minority segment (123% in five years).

O4a – JJC encourages employees to volunteer in community service programs (5,000 hours in FY04).

O4b – JJC's collaborations are many and varied but are tightly aligned with stated institutional core values. JJC has strong collaborations with area high schools and a local employer for its Pharmacy Technician program. JJC Tech Prep served 3,531district HS students in FY2004.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Joliet Junior College's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Criterion 3, *Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs*:

3C1, 3C2	S	JJC has identified key subgroups and the requirements and expectations of those subgroups. In addition, the short and long term needs of specific subgroups are analyzed from a collection of information including performance feedback. This data collection and analysis has resulted in development of successful approaches and processes that are occasionally adopted and used throughout the institution.
3P1	O	Individual departments or committees are responsible for assessing and evaluating the needs of existing student groups. However, there is no evidence of a process by which that information is translated into actions or policies. Also, assessing and evaluating community and employer needs may assist JJC to identify new prospective student groups whose needs the college may be able to meet.
3P2	S	JJC has utilized its website along with students' participation on committees to maintain relationships, disseminate information and enhance communication with students.
3P2	O	JJC's proposed AQIP action project, which is to provide a comprehensive student orientation, represents an opportunity to strengthen the college's relationship with students.
3P3	O	With the exception of advisory committees, there is little evidence demonstrating how external stakeholders' needs are identified. Without a systematic approach, JJC may miss valuable opportunities related to key stakeholders.
3P4	S	JJC utilizes a variety of endeavors to build and maintain relationships with key stakeholders, such as their permanent float, the Tech Prep liaison, the Counselors' Breakfast, and the encouragement of volunteerism.
3P6	S	JJC employs a variety of methods to collect complaint information, process and address complaints, and analyze results to inform decision making.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

3R1, 3R2	O	While a large number of surveys are identified to measure student satisfaction and relationships, the limited results appear sketchy and focused on program completers, who constitute only a small percentage of students. JJC's Systems Portfolio does not provide sufficient information to adequately assess the institution's results regarding student satisfaction.
3R3	O	The public and private return data for JJC (Figure 3.4) is reported but its interpretation is unclear. The 2002 data citation of 21.4% for public rate of return and 17% for private return is anecdotal and does not provide trend data. Therefore, the data creates more questions than it answers and does not measure stakeholder satisfaction.
3R4	O	The JJC Systems Portfolio does not provide sufficient information to adequately assess the institution's results for building relationships with its key stakeholders.
3R5	O	Results of satisfaction surveys reflect opportunities for improvement when compared to state and national survey results.
3I1,3I2	O	JJC has not provided a clear method for systematically improving its processes for understanding student and stakeholder needs, as well as for targeting its priorities.

Overall, the Systems Appraisal Team saw Joliet Junior College's performance on this Criterion as Developing, characterized by:

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

AQIP CRITERION 4: *VALUING PEOPLE*

Valuing People explores your institution's commitment to the development of your faculty, staff, and administrators since the efforts of all are required for institutional success. It examines your 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.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Joliet Junior College that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Criterion 4, *Valuing People*:

O1g – JJC's vision includes collaboration, innovative delivery, serving a diverse community, recruiting and retaining exceptional faculty and incorporating all college constituents in planning.

O1h – Core values include respect, integrity, collaboration, humor & well-being, innovation and quality.

O4a – JJC encourages employees to volunteer in community service programs (5,000 hours in FY04).

O8a – The college is implementing a Performance Appraisal System that aligns employee and departmental goals to institutional goals and provides incentives for reaching them.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Joliet Junior College's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Criterion 4, *Valuing People*:

4P2	O	The average age of JJC employees is 46.5, which provides a rich opportunity to capitalize on both tradition and experience. However, as the graying of personnel occurs, it will be important to collect and analyze pertinent age-related data for use in recruitment and hiring practices. A healthy institution typically hires and retains a combination of new and experienced talent.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

4P2	SS	With a 123% increase in the Latino student population, JJC has been responsive to stakeholder needs by recently creating the position of Minority Resources Manager and converting the ENLACE coordinator position from grant funding to operational funds. These actions support JJC's vision of serving a diverse population and they are evidence of the college's commitment to serving underrepresented groups.
4P2	O	JJC encourages newly hired personnel to attend orientation training and provides limited orientation opportunities for new faculty, leaving this largely to individual departments. A more systematic orientation process could acclimate newly hired personnel to institutional expectations and responsibilities related to accountability and effectiveness.
4P4	S	Tuition waivers are offered to JJC employees. This encourages personnel to continuously seek training and education throughout their JJC careers.
4P4	S	In addition to current training initiatives, JJC is initiating a Quality Action Project to creating a culture that encourages, supports and promotes professional development and is planning a Great Teacher's Seminar. This demonstrates the college's commitment to ongoing development of its personnel.
4P4	OO	It is not clear how professional development opportunities are made available to employees at remote locations and to the part time faculty and staff, who make up the majority of the employees (76% of faculty and 56% of clerical, plant and support staff.) Accessibility to professional development opportunities can improve performance of all employees.
4P5	O	Processes for determining training needs are unclear. JJC's Systems Portfolio addresses only training specific to technology and customer service. JJC's new action project to create a culture that encourages, supports and promotes professional development" may give JJC an opportunity to address these concerns.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

4P6	O	The Performance Appraisal System is designed to integrate and align job performance with organizational mission, goals and objectives. However, it is unclear how JJC provides feedback to employees as part of their personnel evaluation system. An effective feedback process is essential to effective evaluation and improved employee performance.
4P8	OO	JJC does not explain how it analyzes results from its employee satisfaction surveys or how it selects a course of action. Without processes for analysis and action the value of the satisfaction surveys remains unclear.
4P9	O	Although JJC communicates its policies related to health and safety, it is unclear how the college evaluates employee satisfaction, health, safety, and well-being. Without evaluation, the effectiveness of these policies remains undocumented, which can hinder continuous improvement efforts.
4R1	S	Faculty salaries at JJC are above state averages. JJC budget expenditures (54% instructional and 13% institutional support) reflect the value JJC places on academic instruction, faculty, and staff.
4R3	OO	JJC does not provide evidence of how the productivity and effectiveness of its faculty, staff, and administrators help the college to achieve its goals.
4I1	O	Although the core values committee has established programs for recognition of employees that are tied to core values (i.e. annual awards celebration, Pat on the Back recognition and recognition on the JJC website), it remains unclear how JJC improves its current processes and systems for valuing people.
4R2	S	JJC is monitoring the shifting demographics of its region and using results from focus groups and surveys to set targets for improvement priorities.

Overall, the Systems Appraisal Team saw Joliet Junior College's performance on this Criterion as Developing, characterized by:

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CRITERION 5: *LEADING AND COMMUNICATING*

Leading and Communicating addresses how your institution's leadership and communication structures, networks, and processes guide your institution in setting directions, making decisions, seeking future opportunities, and building and sustaining a learning environment. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to leading activities, communicating activities, alignment of leadership system practices, institutional values and expectations, direction setting, future opportunity seeking, decision making, use of data, leadership development and sharing, succession planning, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Joliet Junior College that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Criterion 5, *Leading and Communicating*:

01f – JJC endeavors to be an educational leader and innovator, as well as a major catalyst to economic growth.

01g – JJC's vision includes collaboration, innovative delivery, serving a diverse community, recruiting and retaining exceptional faculty, and incorporating all college constituents in planning.

01h – Core values include respect, integrity, collaboration, humor & well-being, innovation, and quality.

01k – JJC is governed by two bodies: a locally elected Board of Trustees with 7 members and 1 non-voting student member, and the State of Illinois Community College Board, which has authority over its planning, budgeting and program requirements.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Joliet Junior College's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Criterion 5, *Leading and Communicating*:

5P1 O JJC has not clearly described its processes, whereby leaders set institutional directions that are aligned with the mission, vision, and values.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

5P3	O	Although JJC's decision-making processes are systematic and involve multiple stakeholders (i.e., the use of informal workshops to present information to the Board), it is unclear how decisions are actually carried out. The lack of clear implementation practices may negatively impact the effectiveness of the decisions.
5P4	S	Leaders at JJC rely on data from feedback reports, survey results, assessments, and multiple internal and external evaluations in their decision-making processes. The assessment of JJC's campus policing is an example of an effective process.
5P8	O	The president of JJC has announced plans to retire in 2005; however, the college has no formal leadership training or succession plan. The development and implementation of such plans can strengthen JJC's leadership, while ensuring the future continuity of JJC's mission, vision, and values.
5R1	O	Although JJC describes processes for leading and communicating, few results are presented. This makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the leadership in producing actual results.
5R1	S	The bi-annual chair evaluation system, which is new in the 2003-2007 faculty contract, has the potential to become a "best practice" for other Illinois community colleges and to help enhance collaborations.
5R2	O	JJC's results for leading and communicating, as compared to other institutions, are either too preliminary to be evaluated or are anecdotal in nature. The ability to compare its leadership with that of similar institutions is key to developing effective quality improvement processes.
5I1	O	The need for clarity and improvement in campus communications was identified as a key issue in the Campus Conversation Day in spring 2004. As a result, JJC has decided on the development of an AQIP Quality Action Project to address this opportunity for improvement.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

5I2 S JJC uses multiple approaches to communicate to stakeholders its results for leading and its improvement priorities. Examples of those approaches include Campus Briefs, e-mail, formal presentations, annual reports, alumni newsletters and newspaper articles.

Overall, the Systems Appraisal Team saw Joliet Junior College's performance on this Criterion as Developing, characterized by:

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CRITERION 6: *SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS*

Supporting Institutional Operations addresses the variety of your institutional support processes that help to provide an environment in which learning can thrive. It examines your 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.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Joliet Junior College that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Criterion 6, *Supporting Institutional Operations*:

01i – JJC's 2003 budget was $68.9 million. Revenues came from 54% local, 29% tuition, 16% state and 2% other sources. Expenditures were 54% instructional, 5% academic support, 7% student services, 14% plant, 7% administration, and 13% institutional support.

05c – JJC's support staff has 102 full-time and 87 part-time employees; clerical staff 78 full-time and 140 part-time; and plant staff 60 full-time and 34 part-time.

05d – There are five bargaining units at JJC, representing faculty, clerical, food service, campus police, and physical plant employees.

08a – The college is implementing a Performance Appraisal System that aligns employee and departmental goals to institutional goals and provides incentives for reaching them.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

08b – JJC strongly supports quality improvement in education especially through its involvement in AQIP. JJC considers the AQIP Self-Study a significant team effort reflecting the overall emphasis for quality improvement at JJC.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Joliet Junior College's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Criterion 6, *Supporting Institutional Operations*:

6P1	SS	JJC uses multiple methods to identify and evaluate the support service needs of students. These include data for entering, currently enrolled and graduating students, and alumni. JJC uses its complaint system to collect qualitative data about services. This can provide insight into performance that empirical data alone cannot communicate.
6P2	O	JJC has a variety of methods for identifying faculty, staff and administrator needs for support services. However, methods to determine needs of external stakeholders are not identified.
6P3	S	JJC has established policies to effectively manage key student and administrative support service needs on a day-to-day basis. Knowledge sharing, innovation, and empowerment are incorporated into these processes.
6P3	O	JJC has a well-developed system for documenting its processes and making information available through its web site, public folders, and publications. However, it is unclear what feedback mechanisms exist and how they are institutionalized.
6P4	SS	JJC uses data to inform decision-making and to make programmatic or service adjustments. For example, JJC implemented online student services based on data that showed increases in student use of the internet.
6P5	O	JJC collects and analyzes performance measures of student and administrative support tied to ICCB, AQIP, strategic planning, faculty reviews, student evaluations, program review, budget, performance appraisal systems, compliance reports, and audits. However, the regularity for collecting and analyzing these measures is unclear. The extent to which these various measures have been aligned into a single scorecard process is also unclear.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

6R1	S	JJC has compiled results from evaluation of services in many areas, with several documented improvements to stakeholder satisfaction or outcomes. Examples include results from the Occupational Follow-Up Survey (showing that student satisfaction increased about 13% from May 2003 to May 2004) and the significant results shown in Table 6.3 reflecting increased satisfaction with student support services.
6R2	O	The results for administrative support service processes presented by JJC are based on opinion surveys and do not incorporate other data. The Systems Portfolio also does not address patterns of financial capacity, as well as other indicators of institutional health and viability. Therefore, it is difficult to determine the actual results of these processes.
6R3	S	The college utilizes data sources, such as ICCB data and IPEDS, to compare itself to other institutions within the state and nationally. Some of these data show that JJC compares favorably to its peer institutions.
6R3	O	Although JJC utilizes a range of comparative data to evaluate its own processes and indicators, few are well suited to compare support services for students.
6I1	S	JJC has an effective process for setting improvement targets which is linked to institutional mission, goals, and budgeting.
6I2	S	JJC sets targets for improvements based on external mandates and data from various internal sources. One of several current improvement priorities, decided upon from internal data, is to develop an IT strategic plan.

Overall, the Systems Appraisal Team saw Joliet Junior College's performance on this Criterion as Maturing, characterized by:

Growing, emergent processes that typically achieve many of their goals have been put in place. Successful approaches and processes are occasionally adopted and used throughout the institution. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in most areas. Recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance can be found in several areas. Information is collected on performance of outstanding organizations with similar processes but used irregularly Feedback is periodically used to set performance targets in a few areas. A record of significant improvements, occurring periodically, as the result of specific initiatives is provided.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

AQIP CRITERION 7: *MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS*

Measuring Effectiveness examines how your institution collects, analyzes, and uses information to manage itself and to drive performance improvement. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to collection, storage, management, and use of information and data – at the institutional and departmental/unit levels; 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.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Joliet Junior College that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Criterion 7, *Measuring Effectiveness*:

O1b – JJC adopted CQI in 1992 and has been involved in a CQI Network since 1993.

O1g – JJC's vision includes collaboration, innovative delivery, serving a diverse community, recruiting and retaining exceptional faculty, and incorporating all college constituents in planning.

O1j – JJC has made a commitment to Long Term Planning by using a 3-year window to manage their Financial Plan which includes strategic planning, revenue and expense forecasting, and quality planning calendar. An annual budget connects these elements.

06b – JJC operates in an interdependent environment (forced by the ICCB relationship) creating statewide reporting and evaluation systems to be a standing requirement for the school.

O8b – JJC strongly supports quality improvement in education especially through its involvement in AQIP. JJC considers the AQIP Self-Study a significant team effort reflecting the overall emphasis for quality improvement at JJC.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Joliet Junior College's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Criterion 7, *Measuring Effectiveness*:

7C1	S	JJC has invested heavily in an integrated technology infrastructure to deploy centralized, decentralized, and external data when needed. This "information highway" is used to transport strategies to stakeholders and promote increased utility and learning by them. Hence, recording of improvement projects and performance levels have occurred in a few areas in the past two years**.**
7P1	O	Insufficient information is presented to determine how JJC selects, manages, and uses data to support student learning, institutional objectives, strategies, and improvement efforts. This makes it difficult to determine the effectiveness of these processes.
7P3	O	Although JJC collects comparative data in conjunction with external reporting requirements, it is unclear what criteria and methods JJC employs for selecting sources of comparative information and data within and outside the education community. This leaves the impression that JJC only responds to reporting requirements, as opposed to developing a systematic approach to collection of comparative data based on strategic institutional priorities.
7P4	S	JJC judges its performance in relation to other community colleges at both the state and national levels by analyzing comparative information and data. It also uses surveys and longitudinal data to analyze its own performance trends over time. In addition, it makes this data and information available to the public in both electronic and printed formats. Hence, communication to its stakeholders is a demonstrated, strategic priority.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

7P5	SS	JJC considers how department and unit analysis of data and information aligns with institutional objectives in the budget process, program review, development of the annual ICCB Performance Report, accreditation processes through AQIP, data requests to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and the Performance Appraisal System. The analysis is shared through reports, the Annual Budget, Annual Three-Year Financial Plan, Unit Cost Study, Fact Book, PQP Report, JJC Strategic Plan, and AQIP Action Projects. This use of multiple measures and processes strengthens JJC's efforts toward systematic quality improvement.
7P6, 7P7	O	It is unclear how JJC ensures the effectiveness of its information systems and related processes, as well as what measures it collects and analyzes regarding the effectiveness of its system for measuring effectiveness.
7R1a	S	JJC uses an internally directed system for determining effectiveness of its Information Systems based on state and federal regulatory and reporting requirements, software performance capabilities regarding confidentiality, accuracy, timeliness, security, accessibility and warehousing.
7R1b	O	It is unclear whether or not the JJC system for measuring effectiveness is meeting the institution's needs. It appears that feedback is only anecdotal.
7I1	O	The description of improvements in measuring effectiveness is stated largely as processes, rather than specific accomplishments that enhance performance. There is no clear example indicating how current process performance is improved.
7I2	S	JJC has a system for setting targets for improvement, identifying specific improvement priorities, and communicating priorities to its stakeholders.

Overall, the Systems Appraisal Team saw Joliet Junior College's performance on this Criterion as Maturing, characterized by:

Growing, emergent processes that typically achieve many of their goals have been put in place. Successful approaches and processes are occasionally adopted and used throughout the institution. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in most areas. Recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance can be found in several areas. Information is collected on performance of outstanding organizations with similar processes but used irregularly Feedback is periodically used to set performance targets in a few

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

areas. A record of significant improvements, occurring periodically, as the result of specific initiatives is provided.

AQIP CRITERION 8: *PLANNING CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT*

Planning Continuous Improvement examines your institution's planning processes and how your strategies and action plans are helping you achieve your mission and vision. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to institutional vision; planning; strategies and action plans; coordination and alignment of strategies and action plans; measures and performance projections; resource needs; faculty, staff, and administrator capabilities; measures; analysis of performance projections and results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Joliet Junior College that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Criterion 8, *Planning Continuous Improvement*:

O1f – JJC endeavors to be an educational leader and innovator, as well as a major catalyst to economic growth.

O1g – JJC's vision includes collaboration, innovative delivery, serving a diverse community, recruiting and retaining exceptional faculty, and incorporating all college constituents in planning.

O1j – JJC has made a commitment to Long Term Planning by using a 3-year window to manage their: Financial Plan which includes strategic planning, revenue and expense forecasting, and quality planning calendar. An annual budget connects these elements.

O8b – JJC strongly supports quality improvement in education especially through its involvement in AQIP. JJC considers the AQIP Self-Study a significant team effort reflecting the overall emphasis for quality improvement at JJC.

O8d – JJC expects its programs and offerings to be in high demand based on the rapid growth of the region and on its competitive pricing.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Joliet Junior College's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Criterion 8, *Planning Continuous Improvement:*

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

8C1	O	JJC has identified five key initiatives for its future, as well as five areas of focus in its vision for the next 5-10 years. However, the portfolio fails to include short- and long-term strategies. Therefore, the Systems Portfolio provides an insufficient basis for determining how JJC's strategies align with its mission and vision.
8P1	S	JJC's Model for Educational Excellence 2002-2007 was developed with input from over 500 constituents, faculty, staff, community residents and students, through a series of focus groups. In terms of the long-term strategic plan, all stakeholder groups were included in the process. The strategic plan was developed on the basis of the mission that has remained stable for 20 years. The vision provides new directions focusing on diversity of students, outreach to adults with learning challenges, and partnerships with business and industry.
8P1	O	Although JJC sets annual goals, it appears that it has not adjusted its longer-term goals since they were developed in 2001-02. The portfolio also fails to explain how modification to the college's mission and vision are addressed. This indicates a need for a more systematic process that regularly assesses JJC's comprehensive vision for the future in light of its annual goals.
8P6	S	JJC links planning and budgeting for appropriate resource needs through the Annual Three Year Financial Plan and Annual Budget processes and also connects college goals and mission with planned activities and resources with the Quality Planning calendar.
8P7	S	The Performance Appraisal System (PAS) is currently being implemented at almost every level in the institution. The PAS links individual, departmental and institutional goals and measures actual performance against these goals. Therefore, successful approaches are beginning to emerge.
8P7	O	JJC's redesigned classification and compensation structure and personnel review system are useful steps to ensure employee capabilities align with changing institutional strategies. However, the processes for developing and nurturing capabilities, as well as for assessing success remain unclear.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

8P8	O	Planning continuous improvement seems to be in the infancy phase at JJC and only anecdotal information is available concerning processes. In addition, performance of these processes occurs at irregular intervals. JJC indicates that one Quality Action Projects will include processes to address this deficiency.
8R1	S	Figure 8.5 lists 63 results from JJC's five areas of priority (with 20 sub-areas) established by the JJC Strategic Plan 2002-2007. Although some of these results are still in their initial stages, reported results provide convincing evidence of progress toward addressing the priorities of the Strategic Plan.
8R2	S	JJC has set specific performance projections and targets for strategic initiatives in all five areas over the next one to three years (e.g. assessment of General Education and increased faculty development). This indicates that JJC is beginning to develop targets for measurement, process improvement, and performance. This is a positive step toward making continuous improvement part of the institutional culture.
8R3	O	JJC compares its performance to other Illinois community colleges in several categories including enrollment growth, new program development, and growth in distance education. Serving on the Valley View Area Baldrige Task Force has allowed JJC to be benchmarked against several business and educational entities. Extending these comparisons through more specifically identified measures, identifying benchmark institutions for specific goals, and collecting trend data over time could help JJC learn even more from other educational entities.
8R4	O	There is no mention of integrated efforts to train teams on the usage of tools, PDCA cycles, process management, or to help them identify ways to measure effectiveness of the system. Specific training in traditional quality process empowers and deploys change effectively. Without knowledge and experience of the quality tools, systemic improvement remains sporadic at best.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

8R4 O Although JJC has been involved in more planning activities over the past two years "than any time in the 103-year history of the institution," it acknowledges a lack of data-driven evidence to verify that its system for planning continuous improvement is effective. By continuing to strengthen its measurement efforts, JJC can develop a systemic method of improvement across the institution.

8I1 O Figure 8.7 appears to describe the planning process, as opposed to improvement strategies for that process. There is no evidence of process metrics that are measured over time leading to trend data that promotes continuous improvement of that system.

8I2 O JJC does not state what specific improvement priorities it is targeting or how they will be addressed. Without specific targets it is difficult to evaluate the success of JJC's continuous improvement efforts. This suggests that the college is just beginning to gather results and that there is no systemic method for reporting them.

Overall, the Systems Appraisal Team saw Joliet Junior College's performance on this Criterion as Developing, characterized by:

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CRITERION 9: *BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS*

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

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Joliet Junior College that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Criterion 9, *Building Collaborative Relationships*:

O1g – JJC's vision includes collaboration, innovative delivery, serving a diverse community, recruiting and retaining exceptional faculty, and incorporating all college constituents in planning.

O3g – 282 high school students completed 1,336 credit hours at 4 locations as part of dual enrollment.

O4b – JJC's collaborations are many and varied but are tightly aligned with stated institutional core values. JJC has strong collaborations with area high schools and a local employer for its Pharmacy Technician program. JJC Tech Prep served 3,531district HS students in FY2004.

O7a – No other public postsecondary institutions are located within JJC's district boundaries. Traditional and on-line for-profit institutions are perceived as competitors.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Joliet Junior College's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Criterion 9, *Building Collaborative Relationships*:

9P1	OO	Although JJC cites a variety of collaborative relationships, it does not appear to have a systematic process for creating, prioritizing, building and fostering these relationships. In a district with growing population, development of new collaborative relationships will be valuable. The lack of such a process may hinder JJC's growth and development with current and future collaborative relationships.
9P2	S	An example of how JJC responds to the changing demographics of its district is its recently developed partnership with the MRxI Corporation to offer continuing education and certification for the Corporation's rapidly growing number of pharmacy technicians.
9P2	O	JJC's mechanisms for aligning itself with the needs of its collaborative partners appear to be uneven, with its strongest connections to high schools and weaker ties elsewhere. Identifying other potential partners can give JJC more opportunities to build collaboration.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

9P2	O	JJC states that "prioritization, of course, is contingent on revenue stream and institutional expenditure priority." By focusing on resources as the limiting factor, JJC may miss the opportunity to explore how well it meets the needs of those involved in collaborative relationships. Information about needs and capabilities of collaborators can help JJC develop and implement innovative ways to share resources in partnership that will further the college's vision "to initiate and sustain more collaborative relationships."
9P4	S	In the area of economic development JJC reports that it collects and analyzes 10 measures of building collaborative relationships. JJC collects data that are mandated by external entities for use in reporting and tracking its own performance, as well as revising programmatic and service delivery.
9R1	S	The increase in dual enrollments, the 3,531 district high school students served through the Tech Prep program, and the 70,000 K-12 students served in the Education to Careers program indicate successful working relationships with area high schools.
9R2	S	Results for businesses served through the Institute of Economic Technology and Illinois Community College Business and Industry Centers significantly exceeded the Illinois median over a three-year period.
9I1	OO	It is unclear from Figure 7.4 how JJC improves its current processes and systems for building collaborative relationships. There is no concrete evidence of a coordinated institutional approach to continuous improvement in this area.
9I2	O	JJC asserts that its “targets for improvement are set by the processes and systems inherent in four JJC performance indicators relating to collaborative relationships as stated in 9C1 and 9C2.” However, it is not clear what these processes and systems are or how they are used to set targets for improvement.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

9I2 O JJC reports that 76% of its 12,751 credit enrollment was in transfer programs, but the transfer rate of first year, first time students to four year institutions was only 20%. This suggests that JJC has an opportunity to establish collaborations with other institutions that may improve transfer rates. This would align with JJC's improvement priority to increase 2+2 articulation agreements and dual enrollment agreements with four year colleges and universities.

Overall, the Systems Appraisal Team saw Joliet Junior College's performance on this Criterion as Developing, characterized by:

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

STRATEGIC ISSUES FOR: Joliet Junior College

Strategic issues are those most closely related to Joliet Junior College's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and quality improvement goals. The Systems Appraisal Team identified these issues through analysis of your *Organizational Overview* and the feedback it provided for each Criterion. This list of strategic issues is included to assist you and your colleagues on prioritizing the important issues facing Joliet Junior College. Among these you may discover your vital immediate priorities, the opportunities and challenges that can lead to a quantum leap in the performance of your institution. AQIP expects an institution to have three or four vital Action Projects at a time in order to encourage administrators, faculty, and staff to prioritize their efforts and resources. The Systems Appraisal Team has listed more than three or four issues, trusting that Joliet Junior College will discuss and prioritize those it concludes are most critical. Hopefully, this *Strategic Issues Analysis* will intensify your continuing quality efforts.

- S JJC has a system of collecting and analyzing data based on department and unit requests and managed by the Information Technology Department and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Data from other institutions is collected and reported as required by state and federal agencies. JJC has already identified IT as an area of focus and has

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

identified an IT consultant who will guide the work. With increasing reliance upon technology, JJC could benefit from determining the internal and external benchmarking needs for institutional objectives and collecting and analyzing data related to these needs.

- S JJC may wish to consider implementing a more effective orientation program for part-time faculty. With part-time faculty comprising 74% of total faculty and teaching almost 50% of credit courses, sheer numbers suggest that they have a critical role in understanding, interpreting and carrying out the vision and mission of JJC. Because they teach 47% of credit courses, their influence upon student learning is pervasive. Identification of the specific needs of part-time faculty can also help in addressing their needs, increase their level of satisfaction and stimulate them to become better teachers.
- S JJC does not have well-developed processes for developing leadership skills at all levels, planning for succession and evaluating leadership. In light of the coming retirement of the president, more effective processes in this area would enhance the transition to new leadership.
- S JJC has not developed a systematic process to foster on-going development of innovative and learning-centered instructional methods. As JJC develops its assessment processes for General Education and incorporates program assessment and improvement strategies into its program review, it will need to provide faculty with the tools and knowledge to foster improvements in student learning.
- S Systematically collecting input from external stakeholders, analyzing it, and putting it to use in making changes can position JJC to respond to external needs. It can help JJC potentially develop new markets and partnerships with other institutions, including business and industry, as well as form the basis for future planning activities. The expansion of service learning through inclusion in the curriculum can not only provide a better experience for students, but also help in building collaborative relationships.
- S JJC faces challenges caused by declining revenue at a time when growing student populations will require more financial support. Nonetheless, it has plans to continue improvements in the areas of technology and facilities, which suggests JJC's commitment to Core Component 2b: "The organization's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future."
- S JJC has made increasing the diversity of its staff and faculty a priority in light of the increasing diversity of students and the demographics of the region. JJC recently opened a new Minority Resources Manager position, provided institutional funds for the ENLACE coordinator position, and established offices of Minority Student Affairs and Student Accommodations and Resources (StAR), showing a commitment to serving

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

underrepresented populations and serving a diverse community. Growing Latino populations and college student service projects (ENLACE and Project Achieve) provide opportunities to serve this growing potential student segment.

- S By its own admission, much of the execution of institutional strategies is decentralized, with follow-up conducted by the President's Cabinet and the Quality Planning Team. This decentralized oversight occurs in an environment that relies upon many processes that are based on one-way communication. JJC has an opportunity to evaluate its formal communication processes to determine which ones best lend themselves to two-way communication systems that include a continuous feedback mechanism. This may encourage seamless, pervasive decision making. JJC's initiatives to implement Quality Improvement Processes can help foster effective decision making.

APPRAISAL SUMMARY FOR: JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE

The Systems Appraisal conducted by the Academic Quality Improvement Program of The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools provides a comprehensive examination of the Joliet Community College conducted by a trained team composed primarily of higher education peer reviewers. In order to provide fresh and objective insights and perspectives the team also included reviewers from outside higher education. Following is the Appraisal Team's summary evaluation of Joliet Community College's current performance in each of the nine AQIP Categories.

AQIP CATEGORY 1: *Helping Students Learn* identifies the shared purpose of all higher education organizations, and is accordingly the pivot of any institutional analysis. This Category focuses on the teaching-learning process within a formal instructional context, yet also addresses how your entire institution contributes to helping students learn and overall student development. It examines your 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.

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CATEGORY 2: *Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives* addresses the processes that contribute to the achievement of your institution's major objectives that complement student learning and fulfill other portions of your mission. Depending on your institution's character, it examines your 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.

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CATEGORY 3: *Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs* 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.

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CATEGORY 4: *Valuing People* explores your institution's commitment to the development of your faculty, staff, and administrators since the efforts of all are required

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

for institutional success. It examines your 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.

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CATEGORY 5: *Leading and Communicating* addresses how your institution's leadership and communication structures, networks, and processes guide your institution in setting directions, making decisions, seeking future opportunities, and building and sustaining a learning environment. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to leading activities, communicating activities, alignment of leadership system practices, institutional values and expectations, direction setting, future opportunity seeking, decision making, use of data, leadership development and sharing, succession planning, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

AQIP CATEGORY 6: *Supporting Institutional Operations* addresses the variety of your institutional support processes that help to provide an environment in which learning can thrive. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to student support, administrative support, identification of needs, contribution to student learning

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

and accomplishing other distinctive objectives, day-to-day operations, use of data, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Growing, emergent processes that typically achieve many of their goals have been put in place. Successful approaches and processes are occasionally adopted and used throughout the institution. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in most areas. Recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance can be found in several areas. Information is collected on performance of outstanding organizations with similar processes but used irregularly Feedback is periodically used to set performance targets in a few areas. A record of significant improvements, occurring periodically, as the result of specific initiatives is provided.

AQIP CATEGORY 7: *Measuring Effectiveness* examines how your institution collects, analyzes, and uses information to manage itself and to drive performance improvement. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to collection, storage, management, and use of information and data – at the institutional and departmental/unit levels; 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.

Growing, emergent processes that typically achieve many of their goals have been put in place. Successful approaches and processes are occasionally adopted and used throughout the institution. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in most areas. Recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance can be found in several areas. Information is collected on performance of outstanding organizations with similar processes but used irregularly Feedback is periodically used to set performance targets in a few areas. A record of significant improvements, occurring periodically, as the result of specific initiatives is provided.

AQIP CATEGORY 8: *Planning Continuous Improvement* examines your institution's planning processes and how your strategies and action plans are helping you achieve your mission and vision. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to institutional vision; planning; strategies and action plans; coordination and alignment of strategies and action plans; measures and performance projections; resource needs; faculty, staff, and administrator capabilities; measures; analysis of performance projections and results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

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

Reliable processes that work consistently to achieve their goals are being developed and implemented. Successful approaches and processes are sometimes adopted and used in units other than where they originated. Occasional short-term (under two years) data on performance results exist in a few areas. Evidence exists of recent (within last two years) of improving levels of performance in a few areas. Anecdotal information is on hand about processes and performance of other organizations Feedback is occasionally used to set performance targets in a few areas. Anecdotal evidence of improvements, occurring at irregular intervals is provided.

©2005 Academic Quality Improvement Project, The Higher Learning Commission. All rights reserved. This report may be reproduced and distributed freely by Institution Name.