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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR COLLEGE OF DUPage

The following are summary comments on each of the AQIP Categories crafted by the Appraisal Team to highlight College of DuPage’s achievements and to identify challenges yet to be met.

Category One

College of DuPage (COD) has a comprehensive program review process that connects and complies with State requirements and regulations. Such processes enhance the relevancy and currency of academic programs at the College. The College provides instruction at many off-campus centers and sites, which bring course offerings closer to students that live and work away from the main campus. Instructional programming is also connected to robust co-curricular offerings as well as learning opportunities such as internships. This academic programming is supported by extensive academic support services located at the Glen Ellyn campus or offered online at the off-campus centers or sites. COD also offers a wide variety of educational delivery methods and offers classes seven days a week from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. This makes the College highly accessible for students with multiple demands on their time.

COD has a newly established General Education Task Force that examines current general education processes at the College and best practices at peer institutions. The Task Force proposed a list of measureable general education student learning outcomes, which are now under the ratification process. As the lack of systemic and overarching general education student learning outcomes was an issue in the last Portfolio, an opportunity exists for the College to complete the ratification process and to implement and regularly assess the new measureable general education student learning outcomes.

Category Two

COD is able to describe and provide evidence of results of multiple processes and systems for accomplishing other distinctive objectives through its community outreach units, which include Business and Professional Institute (BPI), McAninch Arts Center (MAC), the College of DuPage Foundation, and Resource Development/Grants. Processes for assessing the Continuing Education (CE) division do not appear to be detailed in the portfolio, and results are limited to financial and enrollment data. COD has an opportunity to explore and develop improvements in this area.
It is apparent that the College has provided resources and planning to support those efforts that connect them with the community and therefore builds public support for COD overall. COD is maturing as a continuous quality improvement institution in this Category.

Category Three

COD provides evidence of results for multiple processes and systems for understanding students and other stakeholders. Results show that COD has improved in the areas of student engagement. In other results such as student satisfaction and student impressions of the College environment, COD appears to have less favorable results. COD has set improvement targets for a number of these related processes.

Given declining satisfaction results in the service areas of academic advising and counseling there is the opportunity for COD to shore up the quality improvement processes for measuring, analyzing and evaluating these services. In addition, a quality improvement process for addressing general complaints from other stakeholders, such as employees and residents of District 502 might provide valuable information for future improvements.

Category Four

COD has provided evidence of processes and results for valuing people but appears to have overall lost ground in employee satisfaction over the last few years. This trend, if left unchecked could potentially be problematic for the effectiveness and efficiency of the College and its many employees. COD has used quality tools and processes to identify and assess the results of multiple surveys and has developed an ambitious list of improvement priorities. The improvement process may well be enhanced by the development and use of the Decision Making Template.

Category Five

COD has provided evidence of mixed results of employee satisfaction with leadership and communication based on employment level and duration of employment. There also appears to be a longitudinal downward trend in the way employees perceive the workplace. This downward trend could potentially be problematic for the effectiveness of leadership and communication. COD leadership has set improvement priorities in leadership and communication based on the results of two surveys: Great Workplace and PACE.
Category Six

The results for the effectiveness of processes and systems which support institutional operations appear to be mixed and it is not clear how the College fits targeted areas for improvement with overall strategic planning efforts and goal setting. Some results appear to indicate a longitudinal downward trend in overall student satisfaction. This downward trend and other differences could be magnified by the method of reporting the data in charts.

Category Seven

COD has developed processes and instruments for measuring and analyzing the effectiveness of systems for information and knowledge management. The Balanced Scorecard project should provide a valuable tool for tracking, understanding, and using measures of effectiveness to make data-based decisions. The College’s efforts in providing IT processes and systems that provide needed data for reports, security, access, and service indicate an organization that is maturing in its continuous quality improvement efforts in this Category.

Category Eight

COD has developed new processes and systems to improve its planning for continuous improvement that hold promise for the future. Developing and implementing a more inclusive and structured planning process should pay off in improved buy-in and satisfaction from employees, which should also improve effectiveness of action plans and outcomes. A key indicator of planning success will be the accomplishment of the approved objectives with a correspondent increase in the KPIs or a reiteration of the process with adjustments made.

The portfolio seems to offer multiple evaluation tools for quality assessment – however, the portfolio uses inconsistent reference titles and provides results, which leave the impression of the need for analysis and coherent action. While the decision-making template appears to be a good process it seems to lack specificity as to responsibility for analysis and approval of action.

Category Nine

COD has processes and systems in place to build and maintain collaborative relationships that are important to the College. The College provides both qualitative and quantitative results for some of their priority collaborations with other entities. Targets have been set to improve
collaborative relationships with local high schools and workforce and economic development, which provide an opportunity to begin addressing COD’s declining enrollment trends.

Strategic challenges for College of DuPage are listed in detail within the Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis section of the Appraisal Feedback Report.

ELEMENTS OF COLLEGE OF DUPAGE’S FEEDBACK REPORT

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 Category, and significant issues for your institution. These are presented in three sections of the Feedback Report: Accreditation Issues Analysis, Critical Characteristics Analysis, and Category Feedback. These components are interrelated in defining context, evaluating performance, surfacing critical issues, and assessing institutional performance.

It is important to remember that the Systems Appraisal Team 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 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 the team was unsure about an area, we urged it 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.

Executive Summary: Summative statements agreed upon by the Systems Appraisal Team 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 Category covers. Since institutions are complex, maturity levels may vary from one Category to another.

Strategic challenges for the institution are listed in detail within the Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis section of the Appraisal Feedback Report.

**Strategic and Accreditation 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. Accreditation issues are areas where you have not yet provided evidence that you meet the Commission’s *Criteria for Accreditation*, or where the evidence you have presented suggests you may have difficulties, now or in the future, in meeting these expectations. If accreditation is essential for your institution then any accreditation issues identified are, by definition, also strategic. The Systems Appraisal Team identified both of these kinds of issues through analysis of your Organizational Overview and the feedback it provided for each Category, as well as by reviewing the Index to the *Criteria for Accreditation* that you provided along with your *Systems Portfolio*. This list of strategic issues offers a framework for addressing ongoing improvement of processes and systems, serving as an executive summary of the Report’s key findings and recommendations.

**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 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 Category are identified in the Report.

**Category Feedback:** The Report’s feedback on each of AQIP’s nine Categories 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 Category, and presenting the team’s findings in detail, this section is the heart of the Report.
STRATEGIC AND ACCREDITATION ISSUES

In conducting the Systems Appraisal, the team attempted to identify the broader issues that present the greatest challenges and opportunities for your institution in the coming years. These are all strategic issues, ones you need to grapple with as you identify your institution’s strategies for confronting the future and becoming the institution you want to be. The team also examined whether any of these strategic issues put your institution into jeopardy of not meeting the Higher Learning Commission’s accreditation expectations.

Issues Affecting Compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation: An important goal for the Systems Appraisal was to review your institution’s compliance with the Higher Learning Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation. The peer quality experts who served on the team were all trained in evaluating colleges and universities using the Commission’s Criteria, and the Systems Appraisal process they followed included careful steps to ensure the team used the Criteria as a major factor in their review. As the team reviewed your presentation of your institutions under each AQIP Category, it searched for accreditation-related issues and concerns. In addition, the team used the Index to the Criteria for Accreditation that you provided with your Portfolio to perform a comprehensive review of the Criteria and each Core Component to ascertain whether you presented compelling evidence that your institution complies with each of these Commission expectations.

The Systems Appraisal team concluded that College of DuPage has presented evidence that it complies with each of the Five Criteria for Accreditation and each of their Core Components. Although the Systems Appraisal does not in itself constitute a review for continued accreditation, the team’s conclusion upon reviewing your Portfolio against the Criteria will serve as a telling piece of evidence during the Commission’s next scheduled AQIP review of your institution for Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

Issues Affecting Future Institutional Strategies. The Systems Appraisal Team identified the following strategic issues to assist College of DuPage in prioritizing and taking action on the important broad challenges and opportunities it faces. From these you may discover your vital immediate priorities, shaping strategies that can lead to a quantum leap in the performance of your institution. Implementing these strategies may call for specific actions, so AQIP’s
expectation that your institution be engaged in three or four vital Action Projects at all times will help encourage your administrators, faculty, and staff to turn these strategic goals into real accomplishments. Knowing that College of DuPage will discuss these strategic issues, give priority to those it concludes are most critical, and take action promptly, the Systems Appraisal Team identified:

- Lack of current data and chart scales that reflect a different message from that of the previous portfolio, (1R1 comments) may indicate the portfolio update and the portfolio itself does not serve as an embedded and useful tool in the institution's quality process.

- In several different categories the charts used may tend to exaggerate declining numbers or differences with national norms due to small percentage spreads. The exaggeration tends to focus attention in one area, perhaps at the expense of a more significant issue.

- Given declining satisfaction results in the service areas of academic advising and counseling there is the opportunity for COD to shore up the quality improvement processes for measuring, analyzing and evaluating these services. In addition, a quality improvement process for addressing general complaints from other stakeholders, such as employees, and residents of District 502 might be helpful.

- Information and data presented in Category Three (Understanding Students’ and other Stakeholders’ Needs) seems to focus on students and graduates almost exclusively, nearly excluding significant constituents (employers, all levels of government, residents etc. O1a, O8c) that impact the programs and funding of the College in direct and substantial manners.

- In the results provided in Category Four (Valuing People) and Category Five (Leadership and Communication) there appears to be a longitudinal downward trend in the way employees perceive the workplace. This downward trend could potentially be problematic for the effectiveness of leadership and communication. While COD leadership has set improvement priorities in leadership and communication based on the Great Workplace and PACE survey results, it is not clear how these targets align with strategic planning or what steps may be taken to encourage stakeholder buy in.
• Given the magnitude of change presented by conversion from a legacy institutional system to an enterprise wide software solution, it appears the portfolio lacks sufficient detail regarding the conversion to Datatel Colleague, i.e. the timelines of the project’s progress, and how integration into the planning and improvement process of the institution are to be accomplished.

• It is unclear how the targets for improvement fit with the overall institutional strategic planning process since the portfolio presents no clearly delineated plan for prioritizing issues, allocating resources, or integrating improvements to students and other stakeholders’ services into a cohesive institutional strategic planning process.

**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 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 will yield greatest benefit if addressed. 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. 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 can then be incorporated into an updated Systems Portfolio, guaranteeing that future Systems Appraisals will reflect the progress an institution has made.

Within a year following the Systems Appraisal, an institution participates in another AQIP Strategy Forum, where the focus will be on what the institution has learned from its Appraisal (and from its other methods of identifying and prioritizing improvement opportunities, and what it has concluded are its major strategic priorities for the next few years. AQIP’s goal is to help an institution to clarify the strategic issues most vital to its success, and then to support the institution as it addresses these priorities through Action Projects that will make a difference in institutional performance.

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 College of DuPage, 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 that the Systems Appraisal Team recognized and knew what makes College of DuPage 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.

Item   Critical Characteristic

O1a   A key focus of College of DuPage’s alliances is the determination to serve as an advocate for educational, workforce, and economic development for under-represented and under-served constituencies.

O1b   Founded in 1967 and serving a district covering 357 square miles which encompasses part of three counties, COD is a comprehensive, public non-profit, non-residential community college. The College is the second largest post-secondary educational institution in Illinois.
O1c  COD is a part of the 48 college Illinois Community College System with a seven member Board elected at large from the district and one student trustee (elected by COD’s students).

O1d  COD’s commitment to continuous quality improvement and participation in AQIP from the year 2000 underscores its vision: “by 2010, those served by the College of DuPage will be the nations’ best-educated citizens.”

O1e  COD is committed to institutional self-assessment, targeted planning, and implementation of strategies leading to measurable results.

O2a  COD provides the learning community with over 90 academic programs with seven degrees and as many certificates in approximately 50 areas of concentration. Degrees include Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, Associate in Engineering Science, Associate in Fine Arts-Art, Associate in Fine Arts-Music, Associate in Applied Science, and Associate in General Studies. COD provides instruction at approximately 100 sites to 83,000 credit and non-credit students and 100,000 patrons of the visual and performing arts.

O2b  COD’s academic offerings include the first two years of baccalaureate studies, career education, general studies, the fulfilling of various educational, cultural, economic and recreational needs and the accompanying support services.

O3a  COD serves a larger minority population (33% of COD's 14,601 FTE are minority) than the proportion in DuPage County.

O3b  COD’s enrollments, though slowing, are in downward trends.

O3c  The student body, with an average age of 30, is composed of 60% FT and 40% PT students, with 82% of total enrollment on the main campus.

O3d  To assist in meeting stakeholder expectations, input is sought from all constituents regarding educational needs and levels of satisfaction. COD determines short- and long-term needs of students through program review; plus surveys and feedback from advisory committees, local business leaders, and receiving baccalaureate institutions.

O4a  COD’s collaborative relationships include area high schools, local employers, corporate partnerships, local municipal governments, and public and private baccalaureate
institutions in Illinois as well as many out-of-state institutions. Area high schools provide the majority of the College’s traditional-aged students.

O4b  COD is involved in corporate partnerships with major companies for new programming, scholarships, equipment and has forged strategic collaborations with local municipal governments.

O4c  The College of DuPage Foundation, through efforts of supporters and friends has invested over $20 million into student scholarships, programs, technology, facilities, and resources for the College.

O5a  COD employs 304 full-time and 881 part-time faculty; 917 full- and part-time support staff; 50 administrators; and 343 student aides. The FTE student/faculty ratio is 19 to 1. Among the full-time faculty, 29% hold a doctorate degree, 65% hold a master’s degree, and 6% hold a bachelor's degree or less.

O5b  Five bargaining organizations represent COD’s faculty and staff.

O6a  COD’s operating budget of $143.5 million (FY08) is funded by local taxes (47%), tuition and fees (40%), state allocations (11%) a decline from 18% over a period of 9 years, and investments (1%).

O6b  COD has a well developed technology infrastructure which has grown significantly since 1986 and includes a two-way interactive video network linking with 30 sites in northern Illinois and nine other consortia to over 400 sites statewide. All full-time faculty members have PCs, and all offices and classrooms are connected to the campus-wide network.

O6c  COD has nine on-campus buildings, eight regional sites, $143.5 million operating budget, and well-developed technology infrastructure.

O6d  COD has multiple accreditations in addition to AQIP.

O6e  COD supports and maintains a 24-hour a day radio station, and a cable channel.

O7a  COD’s most prevalent competitors include the other community colleges and universities within Illinois for state funds and students, public school systems and local libraries for local property tax dollars, private for-profit and not-for-profit institutions, and corporate training programs.
O7b COD meets the demand for a publically funded baccalaureate institution in the district by collaborating with Northern Illinois University and DePaul University.

O7c COD is positioned based on cost, quality, and facilities to meet the rapid economic change that created a need for training and education for employees of local businesses and community residents.

O7d The College’s district-wide needs assessment identified a need for more sophisticated training and education for employees due to rapid economic change.

O8a Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

O8b Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps; increased numbers of unprepared students; aging facilities and shortage of space in others; underserved community residents; and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

O8c Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes; assessment; institutionalizing recommendations from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnerships; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.

O8d All college action plans are related to long-and short-term planning. A web-based planning process has been implemented that aligns with budgeting and outcomes measurement.

O8e A Balanced Scorecard has been developed and benchmarking continues which provides a procedure to measure academic and non-academic efficiencies.
CATEGORY FEEDBACK

In the following sections, each of which deals with strengths and opportunities for improvement for one of the nine AQIP Categories, selected Critical Characteristics are again highlighted, those the Systems Appraisal Team believed were critical keys to reviewing that particular AQIP Category. The symbols used in these “strengths and opportunities” sections for each Category 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 CATEGORY 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 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.

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

Item  Critical Characteristic
O1a  A key focus of College of DuPage’s alliances is the determination to serve as an advocate for educational, workforce, and economic development for under-represented and under-served constituencies.

O1b  Founded in 1967 and serving a district covering 357 square miles which encompasses part of three counties, COD is a comprehensive, public non-profit, non-residential community college. The College is the second largest post-secondary educational institution in Illinois.

O1e  COD is committed to institutional self-assessment, targeted planning, and implementation of strategies leading to measurable results.

O2a  COD provides the learning community with over 90 academic programs with seven degrees and as many certificates in approximately 50 areas of concentration. Degrees include Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, Associate in Engineering Science, Associate in Fine Arts-Art, Associate in Fine Arts-Music, Associate in Applied Science, and Associate in General Studies. COD provides instruction at approximately 100 sites to 83,000 credit and non-credit students and 100,000 patrons of the visual and performing arts.

O2b  COD’s academic offerings include the first two years of baccalaureate studies, career education, general studies, the fulfilling of various educational, cultural, economic and recreational needs and the accompanying support services.

O3d  To assist in meeting stakeholder expectations, input is sought from all constituents regarding educational needs and levels of satisfaction. COD determines short- and long-term needs of students through program review; plus surveys and feedback from advisory committees, local business leaders, and receiving baccalaureate institutions.

O4a  COD’s collaborative relationships include area high schools, local employers, corporate partnerships, local municipal governments, and public and private baccalaureate institutions in Illinois as well as many out-of-state institutions. Area high schools provide the majority of the College’s traditional-aged students.

O4b  COD is involved in corporate partnerships with major companies for new programming, scholarships, equipment and has forged strategic collaborations with local municipal governments.
O5a COD employs 304 full-time and 881 part-time faculty; 917 full- and part-time support staff; 50 administrators; and 343 student aides. The FTE student/faculty ratio is 19 to 1. Among the full-time faculty, 29% hold a doctorate degree, 65% hold a master's degree, and 6% hold a bachelor's degree or less.

O6c COD has multiple accreditations in addition to AQIP.

O7a COD meets the demand for a publically funded baccalaureate institution in the district by collaborating with Northern Illinois University and DePaul University.

O7c COD is positioned based on cost, quality, and facilities to meet the rapid economic change that created a need for training and education for employees of local businesses and community residents.

O7d The College’s district-wide needs assessment identified a need for more sophisticated training and education for employees due to rapid economic change.

O8a Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

O8b Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps; increased numbers of unprepared students; aging facilities and shortage of space in others; underserved community residents; and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

O8c Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes; assessment; institutionalizing recommendations from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnerships; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.

O8e A Balanced Scorecard has been developed and benchmarking continues which provides a procedure to measure academic and non-academic efficiencies.
Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as College of DuPage’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 1, Helping Students Learn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S/O</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1P1a</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>COD’s newly established General Education Task Force examined current general education processes at the College and best practices at peer institutions. The Task Force proposed a list of measureable general education student learning outcomes which are now under the ratification process. An opportunity exists for the College to complete the ratification process and to implement and regularly assess the new measureable general education student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P1b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Program learning objectives are reviewed in a five-year cycle as mandated by the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB). Quality Improvement Project #7 (QIP) also resulted in learning outcomes that are measurable and in accordance with the ICCB’s Articulation Agreement guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P1c</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Although the QIP#7 proposals have been submitted there does not appear to be a timeline for approval and implementation other than the inclusion in the 2007-2009 Strategic Objectives referenced in 1I2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P1d</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Student learning objectives must be compliant with those set forth by the ICCB and Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI). In addition, career and technical education/vocational student learning objectives must be compliant with program specific standards of their licensing and accrediting bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P1e</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Systematic Program Review processes and related data are identified in Figures 1.3 and 1.4. The process steps for the Career and Technical Education Programs and the Transfer Discipline Programs provide comprehensive data for review and improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P2a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The Curriculum Proposal, Revision, Deletion Process (PRD) and New Program Proposal Flow Chart provide a framework for all proposals for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
new programs and courses to be reviewed, researched, and evaluated. This system may include information from advisory committees/boards, local employers, students, and meets the Illinois Community College Board Academic Program Review process.

1P2b S Proposals for new programs include an ICCB application which requires a feasibility analysis that necessitates documentation of the need for a specific program.

1P2c O The development of new program processes might be strengthened through the additional step of approval by the Leadership Council and the Institutional Effectiveness Council which would perhaps incorporate institutional strategic planning and resource allocation into the process.

1P2d S With input from its Workforce Investment Board, local municipalities, chambers of commerce and professional organizations, the College balances educational market issues with student needs. Student interests are tracked with high school partnerships, feedback during registration, enrollment trends and ad hoc inquiries.

1P2e O COD developed a Quality Improvement Project (QIP) titled Improving Student Academic Readiness which created a system of automatic enforcement of course prerequisites that will soon be implemented.

1P3a O A process that will soon be implemented provides mandatory placement exams for students enrolling in reading, writing, math, and ESL courses.

1P3b S Students may self-assess readiness for alternative delivery modes.

1P3c S Prerequisites and admission requirements for new programs are defined by program and discipline faculty at the time a program is approved.

1P4 S COD communicates its expectations for student preparedness and student learning outcomes and objectives through a variety of documents, the College website, the MyCOD student portal, syllabi, advising and orientation sessions, and multiple College activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1P5a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Academic support and assistance is available to students through the Student Support and Cultural Center, Writing Center, Reading Center, Math Assistance Area, and Speech Assistance Area which is in the Academic Support Center. Services include academic and personal advising, transfer planning, cooperative education and internships, and career services either in person or online. Peer tutoring is offered onsite on-campus and online at the numerous off-campus centers and sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P5b</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Although multiple services are offered on the Glen Ellyn campus, the students at the off-campus centers and sites do not appear to have access to all services other than through online technologies. In particular, it is not clear if face-to-face financial aid assistance is offered at the off-campus centers and sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P5c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The Skills Development Program assists perspective students who have been outside a formal learning environment since high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P6a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Teaching and learning effectiveness is assessed through faculty evaluation, syllabi standards, monitoring student retention and success rates in composition, speech and math, and a three-tiered assessment program. The assessment program includes course, discipline/program, and college-wide assessment levels. The college-wide assessments of general education competencies utilize the ACT/CAAP instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P6b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The Student Outcomes Assessment Committee is in the process of developing an online system in which results of classroom assessments can be shared college-wide, and the CTE programs publish results in the annual Graduate Follow-Up Survey Questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P6c</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>It is unclear how Program Review and ACT/CAAP results are communicated to all institutional and external stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P7a</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>COD offers a wide range of instructional delivery methods and operates on a 7-day per week schedule. The College also offers multiple points within a semester for students to locate courses: 16 week; first 8 weeks; second 8 weeks; and 12 week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1P7b  O  COD has identified course scheduling as an area needing improvement and is currently examining this process as a Quality Improvement Project.

1P8a  SS  COD utilizes internal and external review methods to ensure the currency and effectiveness of curricula. Program review includes written feedback from students, and CTE programs solicit feedback through program advisory councils.

1P8b  O  A visit to the CurricNet web site suggests limited activity of any kind over the past several years; i.e. date and number of forum posts, copyright of 2005, perhaps there is a later version or another web based curriculum development software available.

1P9a  S  Satisfaction data are collected through the Program Review process to determine faculty and administrative support needs. Additionally, the Information Technology Help Desk tracks inquiries from faculty and Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) surveys faculty and staff about needs for workshops and classes.

1P9b  O  Although student satisfaction with support needs is gathered through the Program Review process and the College tracks student use of library and Academic Support Center services, a process for soliciting direct student input on their needs is not described.

1P9c  OO  Faculty development and support may need augmentation. The Teaching and Learning Center does not seem to be available through the main library web site even with a search. The website given in the portfolio has dead links, and the last blog entry was in April 2008. The Center lacked schedules for resource/course availability and provided no information about external development resources and opportunities. It is also not clear if faculty support services through the TLC are available at the off-campus centers and sites.

1P10  S  COD aligns curricular and co-curricular activities through service learning, cooperative education and internships, student groups, a student
newspaper/magazine/journal, student boards, salaried jobs on campus, athletics, and a student-run art gallery.

1P11a SS COD’s processes for student assessment include the use of the ACT/CAAP, program review, pre-course testing, licensing and certification exams, placement instruments, and mandated pre- and post-testing of ESL students.

1P11b O Once the general education student learning outcomes are ratified by the team charged with doing so, assessment of these outcomes will be developed by appropriate stakeholder groups.

1P12 S A variety of methods are utilized to determine student preparedness for transfer or employment including surveys of graduates, employers, and receiving baccalaureate institutions. CAAP assessment testing provides results for general education competencies, and licensing and certification test results are published through a periodic “Consumer Reports.”

1P13 S A number of student performance measures are collected and analyzed including surveys of student goal attainment, persistence rates, degree completion, and grade distribution reports. Additionally, the College participates in the National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP).

1R1a S Using the NCCBP data, longitudinal results are provided for student completer success rates in English, math, and speech courses, developmental courses in math and writing, developmental math and writing retention rates, First Time Full Time (FTFT) degree completion within three years, within term course and term-to-term persistence rates.

1R1b OO Data analysis comparing five years ending in 2005 is not current enough and perhaps inadequate for driving decision making in 2008.

1R1c O Figure 1.16 appears to be incorrectly drawn, if so completion may be a greater problem than illustrated by the figure and indicated by averaging
the percentages. The Figures should probably use a more consistent and different scale to illustrate the consistency of performance.

1R1d O Results were not provided for student learning and development outside of the core academic skills areas covered by the NCCBP. As the College regularly collects and analyzes this other data (1P13) it might be useful to add a greater breadth of longitudinal data, thus providing a more complete overview of student learning and development and specific program learning objectives. This would also provide an array of more current results.

1R2 S COD provided a variety of evidence that students have acquired the knowledge and skills base required by the institution and its stakeholders for the awarding of specific degrees or credentials. These results included pass rates on licensure exams where recent COD pass rates exceed national averages, transfer GPA and completers employed in related field.

1R3a SS COD has a reporting mechanism in place which provides the Student Outcome Assessment Project process results and Improvement Plan status for each academic program.

1R3b S ACT/CAAP results showed favorable comparisons of COD student scores in general education outcomes to the national norm.

1R4a S COD provides a variety of comparative results with other higher educational institutions using data from the NCCBP, IPEDS, CAAP, and other state reports. With a few exceptions, the COD results met or exceeded the results from other institutions.

1R4b SS CAAP testing results indicate a successful program was created to increase critical reading and thinking skills and the program is included in the targets for improvement.

1I1 S COD utilized the Systems Portfolio Feedback Report to initiate improvement in current processes and systems for helping students learn. Some of the improvements listed were the formation of the
Program Review Advisory Council, restructuring of the Institutional Effectiveness Council, and implementation of an Efficiency and Effectiveness process.

1I2a  S  COD provided numerous examples of how targets are set for improvement in their current results for student learning and listed specific improvement priorities. Multiple methods are utilized to communicate results and improvement priorities including hard copy distribution, online, email, meetings and minutes, and a newsletter.

1I2b  O  The ICCB Community College Performance Report comparison did not appear to be used in the results section though it is being used to set college level goals for improvement in student learning.

**AQIP CATEGORY 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Critical Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1a</td>
<td>A key focus of College Of DuPage’s alliances is the determination to serve as an advocate for educational, workforce, and economic development for under-represented and under-served constituencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| O3d  | To assist in meeting stakeholder expectations, input is sought from all constituents regarding educational needs and levels of satisfaction. COD determines short- and long-
term needs of students through program review; plus surveys and feedback from advisory committees, local business leaders, and receiving baccalaureate institutions.

**O4a** COD’s collaborative relationships include area high schools, local employers, corporate partnerships, local municipal governments, and public and private baccalaureate institutions in Illinois as well as many out-of-state institutions. Area high schools provide the majority of the College’s traditional-aged students.

**O4b** COD is involved in corporate partnerships with major companies for new programming, scholarships, equipment and has forged strategic collaborations with local municipal governments.

**O4c** The College of DuPage Foundation, through efforts of supporters and friends has invested over $20 million into student scholarships, programs, technology, facilities, and resources for the College.

**O7c** COD is well positioned based on cost, quality, and facilities to meet the rapid economic change that created a need for training and education for employees of local businesses and community residents.

**O8a** Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

**O8b** Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps, increased numbers of unprepared students, aging facilities and shortage of space in others, underserved community residents, and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

**O8c** Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes, assessment; institutionalizing recommendations from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnerships; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.
Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as College of DuPage's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 2, Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S/O</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2P1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>The portfolio does not seem to answer the question of who is involved in setting the other distinct objectives. COD has an opportunity to use the newly implemented planning process to develop a formal system of identifying and prioritizing other distinctive objectives for the College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Although the College places a list of current institutional goals and objectives derived from annual unit plans on the COD intranet site, an opportunity exists to add other supplemental processes for communicating expectations regarding these objectives with external stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The planning process which includes the development of action plans is used to determine faculty and staff needs relative to achieving other distinctive objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P4</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other distinctive objectives and related action plans are developed at the unit level and then reviewed and assessed by the appropriate vice president. However, it is not evident in 2P4 how the objectives are assessed and reviewed, or how feedback is incorporated in readjusting the objectives or the processes that support them, nor is there any indication that anyone reviews the entire set of overall goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD utilizes a variety of measures related to the activities of the Business and Professional Institute (BPI), McAninch Arts Center (MAC), Foundation and Resource Development Grants, and Continuing Education (CE) to assess effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R1a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD provided multiple longitudinal results for the BPI, MAC, CE, and Foundation and Resource Development Grants. COD’s Continuing Education Programs have experienced a $350K increase in revenue over the period FY05 – FY07 although net contributions are not indicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, CE enrollments are down while five of the other seven peers are stable or increased.

2R1b O COD's Foundation and Grant awards increase of 63.5% over the last year indicate results achieved through effort, however, the increase is mainly through two gifts, rather than from an overall increase in giving. The data provided by COD does not clearly indicate whether the increases in Foundation funding are restricted to one department or project or are available for unrestricted use across various programs.

2R2 SS Comparison results are provided for continuing education, Suburban Law Enforcement Academy and Continuing Education, MAC, and COD Literacy Programs.

2R3a S COD provided a variety of quantitative and qualitative results in accomplishing other distinctive objectives which strengthen the overall institution and show evidence of enhancing community relationships. Some examples include results from grant-funded projects, support of regional Illinois artists, a free international film festival, outcomes for ABE and ESL, and outreach and diversity awareness activities.

2R3b O Although the programs listed are exemplary efforts of community outreach, there is no data presented that indicates how COD coherently measures, analyzes, and evaluates the desired outcomes and whether the targets are reached or need revision.

2I1 S COD described multiple methods such as utilizing advisory groups, steering committees, monthly staff meetings, program review, and data analysis for improving processes and systems for those College departments connected to accomplishing distinctive objectives. The Learning Resources Network in-depth program review of the CE and BPI divisions and the commitment to implement their suggestions is a strength.

2I2 S COD provided information on ways the different divisions set targets for improvement along with efforts to strengthen the internal culture of the
College, utilizing strategic planning to build alumni relationships for fundraising, and developing the private side of philanthropy through individual support.

**AQIP CATEGORY 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 College of DuPage that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 3, Understanding Students’ and Other Stakeholders’ Needs:**

**Item** **Critical Characteristic**

O1a A key focus of College of DuPage's alliances is the determination to serve as an advocate for educational, workforce, and economic development for under-represented and under-served constituencies.

O1c Founded in 1967 and serving a district covering 357 square miles which encompasses part of three counties, COD is a comprehensive, public non-profit, non-residential community college. The college is the second largest post secondary educational institutional institution in Illinois.

O2a COD provides a learning community with over 90 academic programs with seven degrees and as many certificates in approximately 50 areas of concentration. Degrees include Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, Associate in Engineering Science, Associates in Fine Arts-Art, Associate in Applied Science and Associate in General
Studies. COD provides instruction at approximately 100 sites to 83,000 credit and non-credit students and 100,000 patrons of the visual and performing arts.

O2b COD’s academic offerings include the first two years of baccalaureate studies, career education, general studies, the fulfilling of various educational cultural, economic, and recreational need and the accompanying support services.

O3a COD serves a larger minority population (33% of COD’s 14,601 FTE are minority) than the proportion in DuPage County.

O3b COD’s enrollments though slowing are in downward trends.

O3c The student body, with an average age of 30, is comprised of 60% FT and 40% PT students, with 82% of total enrollment on the main campus.

O3d To assist in meeting stakeholder expectations, input is sought from all constituents regarding educational needs and levels of satisfaction. COD determines short- and long-term needs of students through program review; plus surveys and feedback from advisory committees, local business leaders, and receiving baccalaureate institutions.

O4a COD’s collaborative relationships include area high schools, local employers, corporate partnerships, local municipal governments, and public and private baccalaureate institutions in Illinois as well as many out-of-state institutions. Area high schools provide the majority of the College’s traditional-aged students.

O4b COD is involved in corporate partnerships with major companies for new programming, scholarships, equipment and has forged strategic collaborations with local municipal governments.

O4c The College of DuPage Foundation, through efforts of supporters and friends has invested over $20 million into student scholarships, programs, technology, facilities, and resources for the university.

O6b COD has a well developed technology infrastructure which has grown significantly since 1986 and includes a two-way interactive video network linking with 30 sites in northern Illinois and nine other consortia to over 400 sites statewide. All full-time faculty members have PCs, and all offices and classrooms are connected to the campus-wide network.

O6e COD supports and maintains a 24-hour a day radio station, and a cable channel.
O7b COD meets the demand for a publicly funded baccalaureate institution in the district by collaborating with Northern Illinois University and DePaul University. O7c COD is positioned based on cost, quality, and facilities to meet the rapid economic change that created a need for training and education for employees of local businesses and community residents.

O7d The College’s district-wide needs assessment identified a need for more sophisticated training and education for employees due to rapid economic change.

O8a Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

O8b Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps, increased numbers of unprepared students, aging facilities and shortage of space in others, underserved community residents, and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

O8c Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes, assessment; institutionalizing recommendation from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnership; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as College of DuPage’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 3, Understanding Students’ and Other Stakeholders’ Needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S/O</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3P1a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD utilizes the following instruments to identify, analyze, and then select a course of action regarding student and other stakeholder’s needs: placement tests, CAAP assessment, satisfaction surveys,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Follow-up Survey, Student Engagement Survey, and the Academic Program Review.

3P1b SS In addition to student satisfaction surveys, COD has proactively developed a Student Services Scorecard Measures continuous improvement team that develops balanced scorecards. This exceeds the ICCB requirements to review academic and service programs every five years.

3P1c S COD established a committee and process to assess student evaluations of satisfaction with counseling services to help reverse the downward trend uncovered through analyzing several instruments.

3P2 S COD builds student relationships through a wide variety of processes and activities which include recruitment, admissions, orientation, placement testing, academic advising and counseling. Some examples of the processes used to maintain student relationships are faculty contact, student clubs and organizations, athletics, the College-owned radio station, and student participation on institution-wide committees.

3P3a S COD lists (Figure 3.3) a variety of methods and processes used to analyze the changing needs of key stakeholder groups and then uses specific outcome measures information related to enrollment and stakeholder satisfaction to respond to those needs.

3P3b O COD’s process for determining needs of major stakeholders appears to be based for the most part on informal interaction rather than a formal data gathering and evaluation process.

3P4 S COD uses a Community Needs Assessment every three to five years along with ongoing advisory groups and focus group surveys to build, measure satisfaction, and maintain relationships with key stakeholders.

3P5 S COD determines targeted programming for new student and stakeholder groups through analysis of stakeholder feedback, demographic and labor trend data, the strategic planning process, reports, programs at other colleges, and cooperative agreements.
3P6a  S  Policies such as the Students' Rights and Responsibilities, Grievance Policy, and Student Appeal Procedures are available in the College Catalog. COD responds to complaints in a variety of ways and front-line employees are empowered to resolve complaints. Complaint and comment trends are analyzed and acted on with the assistance of the Research and Planning Office.

3P6b  OO  It is not apparent how COD handles and processes complaints from other stakeholders, such as employees and residents of District 502.

3P7  S  COD uses results from surveys, focus groups, individual interviews, academic and administrative program reviews, and input from external advisory committees to measure satisfaction.

3R1a  S  COD utilizes the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (SSI) and in 2005 used the ACT Student Opinion Survey to determine and analyze student satisfaction.

3R1b  OO  Declining satisfaction results have resulted in the College setting opportunities for improvement in several service areas including academic advising and counseling effectiveness, concern for the individual, admissions, and financial effectiveness. There appears to be a significant difference between the 2005 ACT Student Opinion Survey and the 2005 Noel-Levitz Survey (-9%) with academic advising and counseling remaining an issue.

3R2  O  COD has mixed longitudinal performance results for building relationships with students and has analyzed the SSI results to set a new baseline through the use of the Counseling Services Evaluation and Outcomes Assessment Committee survey.

3R3a  S  Performance results (2004-2006) for stakeholder satisfaction from the Graduate Follow-up Survey, the COD Board of Trustees, and local Legislative Breakfasts were positive.

3R3b  O  Performance results based on a 2000 District-Wide Needs Assessment, a 2002 high school focus group, and the 2002 community college
consortium are dated and may not provide COD with current information on stakeholder satisfaction for decision making.

3R4 O Although the results for in-district high school senior applicants show a one-year increase, the actual increase in enrolled students is only nine more than in 2004. There were also fewer (140) high school contacts in 2007 than in 2004.

3R5 S COD provides results from the National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP), the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), the ACT Student Opinion Survey (SOS), and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). COD compares favorably in the areas of market penetration for community participation (NCCBP) and student impression of quality (SOS). COD also shows some improvement in most areas reported from 2003 to 2006 on the CCSSE.

3I1a S COD analyzes data from multiple sources to identify areas needing improvement in understanding students’ and other stakeholders’ needs. The opportunities are then prioritized by the Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) and implemented through Quality Improvement Project (QIP) teams working with the Quality Improvement Council (QIC).

3I1b O It is not clear how the above process integrates with College senior leadership and the overall strategy of the institution.

3I2a S After the QIP teams review and analyze benchmark and trend data, the QIC sets targets for improvement. The QIC utilizes multiple methods to communicate the targets to students and other stakeholders.

3I2b O COD has set laudatory improvement targets and demonstrated a communication process; however, it is unclear how the targets and priorities are arrived at in the context of overall institutional leadership and environment.
AQIP CATEGORY 4: VALUING PEOPLE

Valuing People explores your institution’s commitment to the development of your employees since the efforts of all of your faculty, staff, and administrators 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 College of DuPage that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 4, Valuing People:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Critical Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1a</td>
<td>A key focus of College Of DuPage’s alliances is the determination to serve as an advocate for educational, workforce, and economic development for under-represented and under-served constituencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1b</td>
<td>Founded in 1967 and serving a district covering 357 square miles which encompasses part of three counties, COD is a comprehensive, public non-profit, non-residential community college. The College is the second largest post-secondary educational institution in Illinois.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1d</td>
<td>COD’s commitment to continuous quality improvement and participation in AQIP from the year 2000 underscores its vision: “by 2010, those served by the College of DuPage will be the nation’s best-educated citizens.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1e</td>
<td>COD is committed to institutional self-assessment, targeted planning, and implementation of strategies leading to measurable results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3a</td>
<td>COD serves a larger minority population (33% of COD’s 14,601 FTE are minority) than the proportion in DuPage County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5a</td>
<td>COD employs 304 full-time and 881 part-time faculty; 917 full- and part-time support staff; 50 administrators; and 343 student aides. The FTE student/faculty ratio is 19 to 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the full-time faculty, 29% hold a doctorate degree, 65% hold a master's degree, and 6% hold a bachelor's degree or less.

O5b Five bargaining organizations represent COD’s faculty and staff.

O8a Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

O8b Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps, increased numbers of unprepared students, aging facilities and shortage of space in others, underserved community residents, and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

O8c Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes, assessment; institutionalizing recommendations from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnerships; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as College of DuPage’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 4, Valuing People.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S/O</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4P1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>It is not clear how the Human Resource Department identifies specific credentials, skills, and values required for all employees of the College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4P2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD utilizes traditional sources and processes for recruiting and hiring and provides orientation and training as well as a career ladder for employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4P3  O  Other than listing communication methods, COD does not describe how work processes and activities are designed so they contribute both to organizational productivity and employee satisfaction.

4P4a  S  The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) offers a variety of training programs for full-time employees and Figure 4.2 describes the three levels of employee development.

4P4b  O  It is not apparent whether part time faculty and employees have access to training or development opportunities, although they are assessed within COD’s evaluation system (4P6).

4P5a  S  The TLC monitors and assesses training sessions while training needs are identified during the annual employee performance evaluation.

4P5b  O  COD classified employees discuss training needs and goals with supervisors during annual performance feedback reviews. It is unclear how training needs are determined for non-classified employees and how these needs are aligned with planning, continuous improvement and Categories One and Two.

4P7  S  Compensation packages and benefits are determined through negotiations with the various unions. Additionally, COD offers employee recognition awards listed in Figure 4.3.

4P8a  S  COD utilizes two employee satisfaction surveys related to College climate (PACE and Great Workplace Team). The results of the surveys are analyzed by the Cabinet.

4P8b  O  COD seems to rely on open forums and reviews of surveys by the Cabinet to select courses of action on key issues, however the continued existence of the issues may indicate a more formal process is needed.

4P9  S  In addition to analyzing the results of the PACE survey every 3-4 years, the College provides for employee health, safety, and well-being through multiple measures and processes including employing a Coordinator for
Public Safety, an Emergency Response Plan and Handbook, and a Wellness Program.

4P10  S  COD measures and analyzes the effectiveness of valuing people through administering the PACE survey every 3-4 years, an annual Great Workplace Team survey, and also conducted an employees' needs survey in 2007, which focused on satisfaction of the Wellness Program.

4R1a  S  COD regularly collects a variety of measures related to valuing people through PACE, Great Workplace survey, and a recent Wellness Program survey.

4R1b  OO  Continuing downward result trends in nearly all categories within the PACE and Great American Workplace Surveys offer opportunities for COD to investigate relating to Valuing People.

4R2  OO  Although some results for valuing people show improvement, COD has an opportunity to analyze and develop improvement processes for the multiple areas where employee satisfaction decreased over multiple years.

4R3  O  COD provides employee enrollment in TLC workshops and classes over time but does not indicate if this training has resulted in employee improvement in productivity and effectiveness.

4R4a  O  COD participates in the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) climate survey which indicates that the College was below the norm base in the 2003 results for each of the six climate factors. COD has the opportunity to analyze these results to determine needed improvement processes.

4R4b  O  Although COD states that their performance indicators on “Valuing Colleagues” from the National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP) have increased from 2005 to 2006, Figure 4.11 indicates increases in grievances and harassment claims.
COD has recently completed an AQIP Action Project on valuing people through enhanced communication and formed a Communication Advisory Committee. This Committee will use the Problem Solving and Decision Making Template (Fig. 4.13) to identify and assess internal communication processes and then make improvements when gaps are identified.

COD lists extensive and ambitious targets for improvement in communications and involving employees in planning and decision making. The College has the opportunity to utilize the collected data and results on valuing people and the new Decision Making Template process for accomplishing improvement.

COD seems to have established a rich data bank resourced through multiple evaluation tools. However, with significant issues unresolved there appears to be a lack of coherent clearly delineated processes available to address the issues.

**AQIP CATEGORY 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 College of DuPage that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 5, Leading and Communicating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Critical Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
O1a A key focus of College Of DuPage’s alliances is the determination to serve as an advocate for educational, workforce, and economic development for under-represented and under-served constituencies.

O1c COD is a part of the 48 college Illinois Community College System with a seven member Board elected at large from the district and one student trustee (elected by COD’s students).

O1e COD is committed to institutional self-assessment, targeted planning, and implementation of strategies leading to measurable results.

O3a COD serves a larger minority population (33% of COD’s 14,601 FTE are minority) than the proportion in DuPage County.

O3d To assist in meeting stakeholder expectations, input is sought from all constituents regarding educational needs and levels of satisfaction. COD determines short- and long-term needs of students through program review; plus surveys and feedback from advisory committees, local business leaders, and receiving baccalaureate institutions.

O4a COD’s collaborative relationships include area high schools, local employers, corporate partnerships, local municipal governments, and public and private baccalaureate institutions in Illinois as well as many out-of-state institutions.

O4b COD is involved in corporate partnerships with major companies for new programming, scholarships, equipment and has forged strategic collaborations with local municipal governments.

O4c The College of DuPage Foundation, through efforts of supporters and friends has invested over $20 million into student scholarships, programs, technology, facilities, and resources for the College.

O5b Five bargaining organizations represent COD’s faculty and staff.

O6a COD’s operating budget of $143.5 million (FY08) is funded by local taxes (47%), tuition and fees (40%), state allocations (11%) a decline from 18% over a period of 9 years, and investments (1%).

O6b COD has a well-developed technology infrastructure which has grown significantly since 1986 and includes a two-way interactive video network linking with 30 sites in northern
Illinois and nine other consortia to over 400 sites statewide. All full-time faculty members have PCs and all offices and classrooms are connected to the campus-wide network.

O7a COD’s most prevalent competitors include the other community colleges and universities within Illinois for state funds and students, public school systems and local libraries for local property tax dollars, private for-profit and not-for-profit institutions and corporate training programs.

O7b COD meets the demand for a publically funded baccalaureate institution in the district by collaborating with Northern Illinois University and DePaul University.

O7c COD is positioned based on cost, quality, and facilities to meet the rapid economic change that created a need for training and education for employees of local businesses and community residents.

O8a Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

O8b Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps, increased numbers of unprepared students, aging facilities and shortage of space in others, underserved community residents, and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

O8c Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes, assessment; institutionalizing recommendations from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnerships; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.

O8e A Balanced Scorecard has been developed and benchmarking continues which provides a procedure to measure academic and non-academic efficiencies.
Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as College of DuPage's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 5, Leading and Communicating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S/O</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5P1a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The Leadership Council oversees the strategic planning process, which is aligned with the mission, vision and values of the College. An Online Planning Database (ODB) is utilized to assist the strategic planning process and requires that action plans be tied to the institutional strategic objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5P1b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>External alignment is achieved via advisory boards and the Health Care Leadership Council (HCLC) which has broad stakeholder representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5P2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>COD has begun working on systemic approaches to seeking future opportunities and building and sustaining a learning environment. The College has the opportunity to align this work with the strategic planning and budgeting processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5P3a</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A template to aid institutional decision making has recently been developed which provides the opportunity to promote decision making based on the input of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5P3b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Multiple advisory committees are utilized to obtain input and provide communication links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5P3c</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>There is an opportunity to increase student input via participation on advisory groups and committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5P4a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>An Institutional Balanced Scorecard was developed by the Cabinet with key performance indicators and outcome measures with targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5P4b</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>An opportunity exists for COD to use the results of the measures of effectiveness in future decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5P4c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The Academic and Student Affairs divisions have also developed a strategic plan with six objectives and accompanying measurable sub-objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COD utilizes formal and informal methods to communicate between and among institutional levels and constituents of the organization.

The College communicates expectations about the mission, vision, and values through publications, online, and media. The President communicates expectations during In-service Days and official communications.

COD encourages and promotes the development of leadership through the allocation of funds and encouragement for professional development, retreats, colloquia, seminars, and other events.

Additionally, the Cabinet is offering a series of meetings with supervisors and the Academic Vice President is meeting with academic administrators to reinforce leadership development.

A Human Resource Succession Plan has been recently developed which, when implemented, will provide the opportunity to identify and develop successors for key institutional positions in the College.

COD measures and analyzes the results of leadership and communication through the use of the Great Workplace Survey, ACT Survey of Student Opinion, Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE), Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and the National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP).

COD tracks the results for leadership and communication primarily through the PACE and Great Workplace Team surveys. The results are mixed for satisfaction of employees in all groups. Based on the downward trend from 1994 to 2006 in the way employees perceive the workplace climate (PACE), the College has the opportunity to develop and implement improvement strategies in this area.

The College uses the PACE survey to provide comparisons with other institutions in organizational climate. The narrative indicates the reported
results are since 1996 but Figure 5.7 indicates the results are based on a 2006 PACE survey.

5I1a S  The College has identified Leading and Communicating as one of the institutional priorities for 2008 based on the results of the PACE and Great Workplace surveys.

5I1b OO While COD identified climate and satisfaction issues beginning in 1994, there is an opportunity to address root causes with greater detail regarding how the institution’s improvement processes are maturing in a manner that responds to these issues.

5I1c O  The QIC has created a Communications Advisory Committee that will make recommendations to the QIC regarding potential improvements in the communications and leadership area. Protocols can be developed to act upon these recommendations.

5I2 O  The President and Cabinet have set improvement priorities based on the results from the Great Workplace Survey, although these are not detailed in the portfolio.

AQIP CATEGORY 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 College of DuPage that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 6, Supporting Institutional Operations:

Item  Critical Characteristic
O1a A key focus of College of DuPage’s alliances is the determination to serve as an advocate for educational, workforce, and economic development for under-represented and under-served constituencies.

O2b COD’s academic offerings include the first two years of baccalaureate studies, career education, general studies, the fulfilling of various educational, cultural, economic and recreational needs and the accompanying support services.

O3a COD serves a larger minority population (33% of COD’s 14,601 FTE are minority) than the proportion in DuPage County.

O3d To assist in meeting stakeholder expectations, input is sought from all constituents regarding educational needs and levels of satisfaction. COD determines short- and long-term needs of students through program review; plus surveys and feedback from advisory committees, local business leaders, and receiving baccalaureate institutions.

O4a COD’s collaborative relationships include area high schools, local employers, corporate partnerships, local municipal governments, and public and private baccalaureate institutions in Illinois as well as many out-of-state institutions. Area high schools provide the majority of the College’s traditional-aged students.

O4b COD is involved in corporate partnerships with major companies for new programming, scholarships, equipment and has forged strategic collaborations with local municipal governments.

O4c The College of DuPage Foundation, through efforts of supporters and friends has invested over $20 million into student scholarships, programs, technology, facilities, and resources for the College.

O6a COD’s operating budget of $143.5 million (FY08) is funded by local taxes (47%), tuition and fees (40%), state allocations (11%) a decline from 18% over a period of 9 years, and investments (1%).

O6b COD has a well developed technology infrastructure which has grown significantly since 1986 and includes a two-way interactive video network linking with 30 sites in northern Illinois and nine other consortia to over 400 sites statewide. All full-time faculty members have PCs, and all offices and classrooms are connected to the campus-wide network.
COD has nine on-campus buildings, eight regional sites, $143.5 million operating budget, and well-developed technology infrastructure.

COD is positioned based on cost, quality, and facilities to meet the rapid economic change that created a need for training and education for employees of local businesses and community residents.

The College’s district-wide needs assessment identified a need for more sophisticated training and education for employees due to rapid economic change.

Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps, increased numbers of unprepared students, aging facilities and shortage of space in others, underserved community residents, and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes, assessment; institutionalizing recommendations from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnerships; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.

All college action plans are related to long-and short-term planning. A web-based planning process has been implemented that aligns with budgeting and outcomes measurement.

A balanced Scorecard has been developed and benchmarking continues which provides a procedure to measure academic and non-academic efficiencies.
Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as College of DuPage's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 6, Supporting Institutional Operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S/O</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6P1a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD identifies student support service needs through student feedback from surveys, comment cards, focus groups, emails, complaint analysis, benchmarking with other institutions, and student leadership participation on advisory committees. The College also utilizes placement testing to help identify academically under-prepared students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6P1b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The Cabinet uses data regarding support services needs when determining allocation of funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6P2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD identifies key stakeholder, faculty, staff, and administrator support service needs through advisory committee feedback, surveys, comment cards, email, meetings, service unit evaluations, and user requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6P3a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Managers and supervisors monitor the key day-to-day student, administrative and organizational support service processes. A number of these operational areas conduct satisfaction surveys and analyze measures of productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6P3b</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Over 700 student and administrative tasks have been documented into process maps which are reviewed by a cross disciplinary team and utilized to share knowledge and empower staff to implement improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6P4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD collects both formal and informal feedback from stakeholders along with other data to improve processes and to benchmark both internally and externally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6P5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD measures and analyzes student and administrative support service effectiveness with surveys, sales figures, tracking response time, tracking the number and types of registrations, line usage reports, and help desk usage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COD provides mixed results for student satisfaction with student and administrative support services processes with some multi-year declines.

COD provides mixed results with comparisons to other schools from the 2005 ACT SOS survey. It is not clear if the results have substantially changed after three years of analysis and improvement efforts.

Continuous Improvement (CI) teams have met to deal with improvements to the current processes and systems that support institutional operations.

It is not clear how the CI teams prioritized which processes and systems most needed improvement, for example admission and registration issues (Fig. 6.7, 6.7).

It is not clear how the targets for improvement fit with the overall institutional strategic planning process since the portfolio presents no clearly delineated plan for prioritizing issues, allocating resources, or integrating improvements to students and other stakeholders services into cohesive institutional strategic planning processes.

**AQIP CATEGORY 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 College of DuPage that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 7, Measuring Effectiveness:

*Item Critical Characteristic*
O1b Founded in 1967 and serving a district covering 357 square miles which encompasses part of three counties, COD is a comprehensive, public non-profit, non-residential community college. The College is the second largest post-secondary educational institution in Illinois.

O1c COD is part of the 48 college Illinois Community College System with a seven member Board elected at large from the district and one student trustee (elected by COD’s students).

O1d COD’s commitment to continuous quality improvement and participation in AQIP from the year 2000 underscores its vision: “by 2010, those served by the College of DuPage will be the nations’ best-educated citizens.”

O1e COD is committed to institutional self-assessment, targeted planning, and implementation of strategies leading to measurable results.

O3d To assist in meeting stakeholder expectations, input is sought from all constituents regarding educational needs and levels of satisfaction. COD determines short- and long-term needs of students through program review; plus surveys and feedback from advisory committees, local business leaders, and receiving baccalaureate institutions.

O6a COD’s operating budget of $143.5 million (FY08) is funded by local taxes (47%), tuition and fees (40%), state allocations (11%) a decline from 18% over a period of 9 years, and investments (1%).

O6d COD has multiple accreditations in addition to AQIP

O7d The College’s district-wide needs assessment identified a need for more sophisticated training and education for employees due to rapid economic change.

O8a Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

O8b Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps, increased numbers of unprepared students, aging facilities and shortage of space in others,
underserved community residents, and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

O8c Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes, assessment; institutionalizing recommendations from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnerships; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.

O8d All college action plans are related to long-and short-term planning. A web-based planning process has been implemented that aligns with budgeting and outcomes measurement.

O8e A Balanced Scorecard has been developed and benchmarking continues which provides a procedure to measure academic and non-academic efficiencies.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as College of DuPage’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 7, Measuring Effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S/O</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7P1a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD selects and manages data and information at the micro level (i.e. student entry-level assessment results) and macro level (i.e. three-year cycle of institutional surveys). Reviews of this data have led to further systematic studies and QI projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7P1b</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>COD is in a transition period from a collection of non-integrated data systems to an Enterprise Resource Plan system providing further opportunities for an integrated approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7P2a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Data needs of departments and units are determined and met through the Office of Research and Planning and the Information Technology (IT) staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple teams have been involved in the reviews, evaluations and recommendations regarding assessment of reporting needs and systems.

COD determines the needs and priorities for comparative information and data in an effort to ensure performance effectiveness and improve performance levels. Comparative data is collected through nationally normed surveys, participation in the National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP), and the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB).

Institutional-level information and data are prepared and distributed by the Finance Office and the Office of Research and Planning. Reports are analyzed by the Cabinet and all major Research and Planning reports are placed on the College’s intranet site.

Although COD ensures department and unit analysis of data and information align with organizational goals through utilizing the centralized Online Planning Database (OPD), the Institutional Strategic Plan, Academic Program Review process, and the ICCB Performance Report, it is not clear what the process is to ensure the data is analyzed and action steps initiated.

The IT division ensures the effectiveness of the College’s information systems and processes through the IT Strategic Plan and use of an IT Dashboard. The Dashboard measures the effectiveness of security, networks, office and classroom technology, special services, and systems and operations. The College has also developed an Information Security Plan to safeguard customer information.

The IT division has processes in place that track the usage of email, viruses removed, spam messages deleted, help desk calls, work requests, student portal statistics, mainframe availability, and transaction and response times.

The online IT Dashboard provides numerous results for measuring and analyzing the effectiveness of IT processes, systems, and services.
Results related to meeting data needs will be reported following the transition from a legacy system to a purchased program.

Results comparison data from the NCCBP and ICCB are maintained through the Balanced Scorecard which is reflected in Figure 7.4. The Balanced Scorecard provides stakeholders an overall view of goal attainment and opportunities for improvement.

A sub-team of the Institutional Effectiveness Council oversees the process for improving processes and systems for measuring effectiveness aided by the Balanced Scorecard instrument.

COD is currently developing outcome measures and baseline data from those measures of effectiveness. The Balanced Scorecard project is part of this effort with the goal of developing a comprehensive set of indicators for all stakeholders.

**AQIP CATEGORY 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 College of DuPage that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 8, Planning Continuous Improvement:

**Item   Critical Characteristic**

O1a A key focus of College of DuPage's alliances is the determination to serve as an advocate for educational, workforce, and economic development for under-represented and under-served constituencies.
O1d  COD’s commitment to continuous quality improvement and participation in AQIP from the year 2000 underscores its vision: “by 2010, those served by the College of DuPage will be the nation’s best-educated citizens.”

O1e  COD is committed to institutional self-assessment, targeted planning, and implementation of strategies leading to measurable results.

O3a  COD serves a larger minority population (33% of COD’s 14,601 FTE are minority) than the proportion of DuPage County.

O3d  To assist in meeting stakeholder expectations, input is sought from all constituents regarding educational needs and levels of satisfaction. COD determines short- and long-term needs of students through program review; plus surveys and feedback from advisory committees, local business leaders, and receiving baccalaureate institutions.

O4b  COD is involved in corporate partnerships with major companies for new programming, scholarships, equipment and has forged strategic collaborations with local municipal governments.

O5b  Five bargaining organizations represent COD’s faculty and staff.

O7a  COD’s most prevalent competitors include the other community colleges and universities within Illinois for state funds and students, public school systems and local libraries for local property tax dollars, private for-profit institutions and corporate training programs.

O7c  COD is positioned based on cost, quality, and facilities to meet the rapid economic change that created a need for training and education for employees of local businesses and community residents.

O7d  The College’s district-wide needs assessment identified a need for more sophisticated training and education for employees due to rapid economic change.

O8a  Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

O8b  Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps, increased numbers of unprepared students, aging facilities and shortage of space in others,
underserved community residents, and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

O8c  Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes, assessment; institutionalizing recommendations from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnerships; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.

O8d  All college action plans are related to long-and short-term planning. A web-based planning process has been implemented that aligns with budgeting and outcomes measurement.

O8e  A Balanced Scorecard has been developed and benchmarking continues which provides a procedure to measure academic and non-academic efficiencies.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as College of DuPage’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 8, Planning Continuous Improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S/O</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8P1</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>COD describes a formal, comprehensive, and collaborative planning process which utilizes continuous improvement tools such as the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) and encompasses three cycles. These cycles incorporate operational and strategic planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8P2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Processes are in place for selecting both short- and long-term strategies and goals and are tied to environmental scanning and strategic planning. These processes include significant data analysis and involve key stakeholders for both short- and long-term strategy development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8P3a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Key action plans are developed from strategic objectives and employees are able to submit action plan proposals via the Online Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Database (OPD). Action plan development and approval is tied to the budgeting process.

8P3b SS The Online Planning Database (OPD) allows all stakeholders access to current action plans, a variety of reports, and progress toward goals.

8P4 S Coordination and alignment of the planning processes is the responsibility of the Leadership Council and the Quality Improvement Council. Proposed action plans are required to include alignment of institutional goals and strategies.

8P5 S Academic/Student Affairs have developed a collaborative process to select measures and set performance targets based on nationally-normed benchmark data. This can serve as a template for the other divisions.

8P6 S The Cabinet prioritizes and approves requests for action plans which are mandated to include needed funding and resources. COD provides funding for improvement plans out of the annual operating fund budget.

8P7a S Employee development funding can be requested through the development and approval of action plans and can also be identified through the annual performance evaluation process.

8P7b S The Five-Year Financial Plan includes improvement funding within the operating funds, equal to one percent of the operating budget. One fourth of this 1% of total operating fund budget is identified as permanent funding that is allocated to improvement projects.

8P8 O While the College utilizes data from the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) survey to measure and analyze the effectiveness of the planning process, employee overall satisfaction results from the PACE survey have been declining over the past few years. The College has an opportunity to identify the factors causing this decline, as well as the opportunity to measure additional factors, such as planning effectiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8R1a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD lists a significant number of both completed and active action plans over four years in Figure 8.3. The College is using a more selective approach to the types of projects it undertakes and places in the ODB, although the selection process is not described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8R1b</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>While the number of projects is utilized to evaluate the planning process (quantity), there is an opportunity to delve more into the quality of the improvements that are achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8R1c</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>As written, the portfolio does not describe any celebrations of the outcomes of the completed action plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8R2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Although COD provides numerous targets for Key Performance Indicators (KPI) that flow from the 2008-2012 strategic objectives in Figure 8.2, there are no results described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8R3a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD tracks its performance in planning continuous improvement as compared to other colleges through participation in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, National Community College Benchmarking Project, Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, ACT Student Opinion Survey, and other Illinois community colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8R3b</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>There is an opportunity to provide more specificity related to the data time frames and identify who the peers are for comparison. Comparisons with organizations outside the educational community, where appropriate, could enhance the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8R4</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>Employee satisfaction with the planning process from the PACE survey from 1999-2006 shows a steady decline, indicating an opportunity for the College to improve planning effectiveness. While satisfaction is one measure, there is also the opportunity to evaluate the contribution the planning process makes to quality improvement at the College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8I1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>The College has an opportunity to improve processes and systems for planning continuous improvement through the restructured governance structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the new formal, systematic approach to planning matures, COD has an opportunity to improve targeting, prioritizing, and communication of planning continuous improvement processes.

**AQIP CATEGORY 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.

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

**Item**  **Critical Characteristic**

O1a  A key focus of College of DuPage’s alliances is the determination to serve as an advocate for educational, workforce, and economic development for under-represented and under-served constituencies.

O2b  COD’s academic offerings include the first two years of baccalaureate studies, career education, general studies, the fulfilling of various educational, cultural, economic and recreational needs and the accompanying support services.

O3d  To assist in meeting stakeholder expectations, input is sought from all constituents regarding educational needs and levels of satisfaction. COD determines short- and long-term needs of students through program review; plus surveys and feedback from advisory committees, local business leaders, and receiving baccalaureate institutions.

O4a  COD’s collaborative relationships include area high schools, local employers, corporate partnerships, local municipal governments, and public and private baccalaureate
institutions in Illinois as well as many out-of-state institutions. Area high schools provide the majority of the College’s traditional-aged students.

O4b COD is involved in corporate partnerships with major companies for new programming, scholarships, equipment and has forged strategic collaborations with local municipal governments.

O6b COD has a well developed technology infrastructure which has grown significantly since 1986 and includes a two-way interactive video network linking with 30 sites in northern Illinois and nine other consortia to over 400 sites statewide. All full-time faculty members have PCs, and all offices and classrooms are connected to the campus-wide network.

O7b COD meets the demand for a publically funded baccalaureate institution in the district by collaborating with Northern Illinois University and DePaul University.

O8a Key challenges include meeting developmental needs of students; coordinating advising; and developing relationships with high schools to meet student needs. The focus of early COD AQIP Action Projects related to those challenges resulted in improvements as well as creating a process that aligns budgeting and outcome measurements.

O8b Key vulnerabilities include decreased state funding and imposed tax caps, increased numbers of unprepared students, aging facilities and shortage of space in others, underserved community residents, and a need for improved communication and collaboration of employees.

O8c Key strengths include improved linkage of corporate and private funding with state and federal grants; improved planning and information flow processes, assessment; institutionalizing recommendations from 3 action projects; a facilities master plan funded by bonds for an offsite location and some regional sites; increased development of regional and community centers and partnerships; and implementation of an integrated approach to data collection, processing and analysis.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as College of DuPage’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 9, Building Collaborative Relationships.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S/O</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9P1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD uses the Plan Do Check Act (PDCA) method to create, prioritize, and build relationships with other organizations. Examples of priority relationships include area high schools, four-year institutions, local employers, and community and social agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9P2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD utilizes surveys, focus groups, and other data sources to create a balanced scorecard to measure satisfaction of high school and other high priority relationships (Figures 9.4 &amp; 9.5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9P3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD utilizes both informal and formal methods of creating and building relationships within the organization. In particular, the Continuous Improvement (CI) teams are required to be cross-functional, to have college-wide membership, and are encouraged to include all stakeholders in development and deployment of action plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9P4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD measures the results of collaborative relationships via a balanced scorecard as outlined in Figures 9.4 and 9.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9R1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD provides multiple results for building collaborative relationships including partnerships with schools and school districts, dual credit and dual enrollment numbers, four-year institution partnerships, local employers and the DuPage Workforce Board, local municipal governments, community members, and local media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9R2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD reports favorable collaborative relationship comparison results with other community colleges through membership in the National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP) in the area of business and industry productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9I1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD analyzes data from surveys, focus groups, interviews, and demographic reports to identify improvement opportunities and has processes in place to then implement those improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9I2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>COD has processes in place and utilizes CI teams to review, analyze results, and set improvement targets for collaborative relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current targets for improvement include relationships with local high schools, local municipal governments, community and service agencies, Illinois four-year institutions, and the local communities.