Gap Analysis: AQIP Systems Portfolio Review Team Areas to be addressed for the CQR Quality Highlights Report

Category One: Helping Students Learn

1. There is a distinct lack of target setting and benchmarking, which makes data-based decision making difficult. Also, it is not clear how results inform improvements, leading to a culture of continuous quality improvement at the college. While some processes are briefly described, often the approval process or committee structure is unclear. It is also unclear at times how activities, processes and expectations are communicated at the college. RRCC has an opportunity to demonstrate alignment across the institution, to identify program and discipline outcomes and measuring processes. Measurement tools and reporting of results needs detail. RRCC has an opportunity to cite more actual results relative to direct assessment of both common and program learning in all programs.

2. While RRCC provided adequate data regarding compliance with Criterion 4, overall identification and measurement of outcomes appears to have been a common area lacking specific evidence. Information on assessment methods, processes and outcomes was extremely limited. RRCC has acknowledged the need to increase efforts in this area.

3. RRCC demonstrated quality education across offerings via data presented in the systems portfolio. Additional examples and/or specific information regarding policy/process/program review at multiple locations and varying delivery modalities would strengthen the institution's claims in this area. Additionally, movement toward a higher level of maturity will aid in demonstrating the collection, analysis and communication regarding program and degree requirements.

4. The Review Team noted that Core Component 4.B (Demonstrates commitment to ongoing assessment of student learning) was Unclear or Incomplete.

5. In regard to Common Learning Outcomes, It is not clear from the evidence provided how the VALUE rubrics were chosen nor is it clear if other methods and ways of documentation were reviewed by a team and rejected. How faculty will be trained in using the VALUE rubrics and standardizing leveling within the scoring of the rubrics has not been described. The college describes "pockets"/examples of several effective tools for directly assessing student achievement in the program assessment section. However, it appears that RRCC has not identified direct assessment measures for common learning outcomes… At the institutional level, Red Rocks appears to remain at the design and development phase of its outcomes assessment activities and little evidence of data outcomes could be verified with certainty… No internal or external benchmarks were indicated and no comparisons could be found. Interpretations (of results and insights gained) are not discussed.

6. In regard to Program Learning Outcomes, it is not clear from the ILEARN draft document how or at what stage program outcomes will be determined. It is not clear how results are being measured in a quantifiable way, how results compare longitudinally, or if there are benchmarks or targets. RRCC has an opportunity to articulate outcomes for all disciplines and programs. There does not appear to be a uniform process for assessment, setting targets, and measuring results. RRCC has the opportunity to develop metrics and processes to measure student achievement, and to develop a less "siloed" approach to evaluating learning outcomes across all of its programs. More specific lists of program direct and indirect assessment, how often

conducted, and improvements planned would clarify quality and frequency of program assessment across the institution. At this time, Red Rocks has not demonstrated that it has evolved beyond the reacting level. The college could benefit from utilizing information from other institutions with comparable programs to establish external benchmarks.

7. In regard to Academic Program Design, it is unclear how new programs or improvements to existing programs are developed and presented to institutional committees to assure responsiveness to stakeholders' needs. RRCC has the opportunity to find other methods to assess effectiveness and currency of programs such as a program review process. For gtPathways courses at each institution, academic discipline chairs have the responsibility of maintaining courses, reviewing prerequisites and syllabi, and removing obsolete courses on the basis of an annual review. RRCC uses enrollment, program completion and employment data to determine whether probation or suspension is needed. Advisory boards also provide feedback about program viability. The portfolio mentions a seven-year academic program review process, yet it was unclear what is included in this process: clarification regarding program review may move the college to the next level of maturity.

8. In regard to Academic Program Quality, although RRCC has identified a number of committees that select tools and methods to assess program rigor, it is not clear who serves on each of these committees, how often they meet, how they interact, how the approval process moves throughout the institution, how they are reviewed, etc. Clarifying how these entities relate to each other and coordinate processes could move RRCC to a higher level of maturity in this area. There is no discussion of modalities or comparison of success rates in like coursework in differing modalities… it is unclear how gtPathways disciplines are evaluated. While the college is utilizing indirect measures it is important to use direct measures of student learning as an indicator of program quality.

Category Two: Meeting Student & Other Key Stakeholder Needs
1. Results shared often lack specificity and are anecdotal. Only one year of information has been presented, making it difficult to determine if there is a repeated process or a one-time effort. Given the lack of results reported, RRCC will need to develop and implement an aggressive process/program for data gathering and analysis as it is not clear from information provided in the Systems Portfolio that consistent CQI is taking place.

2. A systematic method such as a survey to query students about support needs would improve the college's response in this area. Even though the faculty address learning support including information on the syllabi regarding tutoring and support programs, there is little mention of support regarding research or laboratory work to substantiate learning required in these areas as well as the classroom.

3. The portfolio indicates that there are incentives for tutors to receive training, but it is not required. It is not clear how tutors are selected and evaluated, and unclear how other staff qualifications are reviewed. More explanation of this process could be helpful in understanding tutor and support staff qualifications. Discussion of how other support services staff are provided professional development would also be useful.

4. The college is also looking at who should analyze the MAXIENT data. RRCC has the opportunity to also develop staff/faculty measure of integrity and how tracking and analysis of issues can be conducted and might also provide some insights to inform future improvements… Although the

process appears to be well designed, RRCC can improve its data collection activities associated with the process (". . . operational processes may not generate data or the data is not collected, aggregated, or analyzed.") to increase organizational learning and decision-making… The college notes that there is no tracking system but rather handles complaints on a case-by-case basis… Without a process for collecting and analyzing the complaint data, interpretation of results is anecdotal. RRCC has an opportunity to track and analyze data and results of student complaints to learn how to make things better for the students and the college. Comparison data should be used internally as a summative tool to explain areas of major concern.

5. The Academic Standards Committee might provide a mechanism for the broader evaluation of the systems which deliver academic integrity support. How effectively do handbooks and syllabi communicate practices? How well does the Maxient system reporting assist in improving academic integrity? There are additional opportunities to expand development efforts beyond tracking student misconduct. This would allow for greater ability to share results in a manner that supports transparency and ensures compliance.

6. It is important to note there was no mention of how Red Rocks utilizes routine student services such as advising, counseling and library to assist changing student needs.

7. Whereas the college utilizes information from environmental scanning, there doesn't appear to be a repeatable, systematic, data informed process for identifying key external stakeholder groups. An opportunity exists for RRCC to develop an integrated system for gathering input from alumni, adult learners, business and professional learners and other relevant stakeholders as well as using this information in actionable ways… An opportunity exists for the college to implement an annual review, survey, or other instruments to move to the next level of maturity… Overall, there does not appear to be any systematic process for assessing stakeholder needs… A broader range of tools such as satisfaction surveys of business and community could improve ability to evaluate successes in this area… It is not clear how current successes will inform future outcomes and improvements.

8. There is an opportunity for RRCC to increase faculty and staff involvement in order to capture the full spectrum of opportunities to build and maintain relationships with external partners… The portfolio states that the Grants Office has a process to identify partnership opportunities, but no other specific processes are described, and the process to select tools and measures is not evident… Although RRCC does have a set of qualifying questions to guide the college's assessment of its collaborations and partnerships, further information is needed to assess other components necessary to validate that a process exists, frequency of actions and documentation of outcomes… The college does not describe a clear set of tools for tracking the success of partnerships and relationships with stakeholders… RRCC lists a number of partnerships and goals for those partnerships rather than explaining how successful those partnerships are. It is difficult to provide feedback for this section as the tables provided indicate goals to provide future direction, but do not provide an appropriate measure of success… Despite the existence of effective and established partnerships, RRCC has no process in place to truly evaluate or guide the college in building on the success of these partnerships in a strategic and transparent way.

Category Three: Valuing Employees
1. Citing actual results through tables and figures and creating a separate section to discuss interpretation and insights gained from the analysis is a critical component of a complete

continuous quality improvement process/cycle…Red Rocks' greatest challenge in this category is developing the appropriate measures to align with its strategic goals and desired employee competencies across different employee classifications. RRCC needs to identify and employ a comprehensive system that includes benchmarks, outcomes measurement, collecting and analyzing data.

2. There was no explicit discussion of dual credit credential verification, so it is not clear from the evidence provided if the credentialing standards for these instructors follow the guidelines for regular instructors employed by the college. The college has an opportunity to clarify qualifications for this group.

3. While Red Rocks does have a systematic approach for college workforce planning, a faculty governance body doesn't appear to be represented in the planning process. Red Rocks could increase its transparency in making these decisions by including faculty representation in the strategic planning discussions given that they are close observers of instructional needs at the classroom level.

4. In regard to the alignment of evaluation system with institutional objectives, several responses in this section seem to relate more to staff with little specific information about faculty or administrator evaluation. More detail about the actual process or reference to a template/forms used would be helpful.

5. In regard to establishing employee recognition, compensation, and benefit systems to promote retention and performance, the climate survey appears to be a way the college is measuring these efforts, but it is not clear if this has been a regular or recurring part of the process. It is also unclear how comprehensive the process is and what impact it has on all employees.

6. The college has an opportunity to create a well-planned, comprehensive and ongoing professional development program to ensure all instructors are current in instructional content for their disciplines and pedagogical processes in all modalities… RRCC might consider how the effect of (current) training will be felt and can be measured to inform further improvements. Furthermore, the college has an opportunity to ensure the training is comprehensive and coordinated.

Category Four: Planning and Leading
1. In the results and interpretation section RRCC needs to identify appropriate assessment tools and measurements, in order to report concrete and specific data. Furthermore, the reflection, analysis and the insights gained which can lead to improvement, need development.

2. In areas 2A (Operates with integrity in all functions), 2C (Governing Board is sufficiently autonomous) and 2E (Policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition and use of knowledge) strong evidence was not provided regarding processes that support policies and actions in these areas.

3. RRCC has publicly articulated its mission and the portfolio provides evidence that the mission guides the work of the institution. The college could benefit from a regular communication plan to convey the Mission to stakeholders Reviewers also believe that examples of how diversity is included in the curriculum or what events regarding diversity occur on campus, for example, are essential in demonstrating support of Criterion 1C.

4. It is not clear whether engaging external and internal stakeholders in strategic planning is a recurring process that is embedded within the strategic plan or just a one-time endeavor. It is also unclear how the college assures that action plans maximize current resources and meet future needs. No interpretation or insights were discussed other than the perception that the college was doing well in some areas but not in others. A more detailed and nuanced data collection process might provide more actionable data for decision making. RRCC needs to clarify how communication between academic divisions and departments occurs.

Category Five: Knowledge Management & Resource Stewardship
1. RRCC needs to demonstrate application of the complete cycle of continuous quality improvement. Although the portfolio describes some effective strategies and plans, actual results and analysis are missing. Demonstrating appropriate tools and results together with developing an integrated process for reflection and insight which links to actionable strategies, will allow the college to capitalize on its strengths.

2. In the area of planning, RRCC has clear data in regard to fiscal and physical resources and the budgeting. However additional information regarding communication between and among divisions and the linkage between processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning and budgeting needs to be more clearly articulated in order for the team to gain a clear understanding of how RRCC demonstrates its compliance with Criterion 5.

3. The Review Team noted that Core Component 5.C (Conducts systemic planning integrating assessment of student learning with budgeting) was Unclear or Incomplete.

4. The portfolio does not explain how data, as well as information and performance results that departments need, are determined so that units and departments may plan and manage effectively. It is unclear how information flows to all constituents, for example from a dean to the department faculty or from the supervisor to staff. There does not appear to be a systematic process to measure, review and analyze results, nor to interpret them and make quality improvements based on that information. It appears that infrastructure decisions are made by a committee, but it is not clear who serves on this committee and if their capacity is advisory or decision-making.

5. The college has an opportunity to better demonstrate just how resources are allocated and aligned with mission, vision, and goals. For example, it might show percentages of budget that are assigned to instruction and services. Also setting internal benchmarks and targets, giving feedback on budgetary management, and how improvement decisions are made based on such data as the Facilities Condition Index would help move RRCC to the next level of maturity.

Category Six: Quality Overview
1. Determining appropriate metrics for each category, developing ongoing measurement processes, finding comparison data, setting targets, and using the information to drive improvement should be the commitment of all AQIP institutions. In addition, the college has indicated that benchmarking and trend identification are important, as these are key features of a CQI organization. This, combined with the targets and goals set forth by the state of Colorado should position the college for gathering and interpreting data to make sound, data-based decisions. Interpretation of data and resulting insights should assist the college in learning from

the data it gathers to make sound decisions and improvements. These are first steps in moving organizational systems to a more mature level.

2. The Review Team noted that Core Component 5.D (Institution works systemically to improve its performance) was Unclear or Incomplete.

3. It is unclear how improvement projects/initiatives are evaluated and how these data are used to make changes. Other than evaluative feedback stemming from the college's participation in AQIP Action Projects and Strategic Forums, information provided in the portfolio does not allow the reviewer to assess the processes for deploying and evaluating improvement initiatives. Also results of these initiatives are difficult to assess due to no benchmarks, targets, comparison or quantifiable data.

4. It remains unclear how the Collaboration Council, the Strategy Forum Team, and the Executive Team relate to each other to prioritize and implement potential action projects. There was minimal information regarding what RRCC learned as a result of its experiences with the CQI initiatives.