AUTHOR	D'Allegro, Mary Lou
TITLE	Development of a Strategic Plan Based on the Evaluation of Relevant Quality Measures for Joliet Junior College.
PUB DATE	2002-10-00
NOTE	49p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Indicators; Educational Planning; Educational Strategies; Institutional Evaluation; Institutional Research; Policy Formation; Program Administration; *Strategic Planning; Two Year College Students; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Joliet Junior College IL

ABSTRACT

This study aims to develop a strategic plan for Joliet Junior College (JJC) (Illinois), in order to address the needs and expectations of the college constituency. JJC is a public two-year college located 30 miles southwest of Chicago. Approximately 11,500 credit students and 17,000 non-credit students attend one of JJC's three campuses. Although an institutional vision has been established, and institutional goals had been developed for the next strategic planning cycle, concrete key performance indicators had not been constructed. The purpose of this study was two-fold. First, the importance ratings of several quality measures needed to be attained, and the average importance ratings contrasted among college constituent groups for both similarities and differences. Second, based on the input of the constituents, the most appropriate set of academic programs and support services needed to be complied. As a result, these academic programs and support services became the focus of subsequent continuous quality improvement regimens and the college's 2002-2007 strategic plan. The Quality Measure Questionnaire, consisting of 93 key indicators, was sent to a small random sample which was drawn from administrative and support staff, full-time faculty, part-time faculty, students, and college district residents. Quality measures that underscored faculty proficiencies and preparation were determined to be the most important. (Contains 28 references and 9 tables.) (Author/NB)

DEVELOPMENT OF A STRATEGIC PLAN BASED ON THE

EVALUATION OF RELEVANT QUALITY MEASURES

FOR JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE

by

Mary Lou D'Allegro, Ed.D.

October, 2002

A key measures inventory was assembled that reflected the needs and expectations of the college constituency. The inventory included quality measures extending across nine performance indicator categories: (a) faculty and instruction, (b) student outcomes, (c) community collaboration, (d) information technology, (e) student services, (f) funding, (g) facilities and infrastructure, (h) staff, and (i) miscellaneous.

The inventory, the Quality Measure Survey, was administered to six college stakeholder groups: (a) Board of Trustees, (b) administrative and support staff, (c) full-time faculty, (d) part-time faculty, (e) students, and (f) college district residents. The results of this survey indicated that the quality measures: faculty ability to teach, faculty preparation, and faculty training were paramount among all constituent groups. Among the student outcome indicators, success on licensure examinations was considered as most important by all stakeholder groups. Few differences among the stakeholder groups were revealed. Among those quality measures that posted statistically significant results were GPA at transfer institutions, collaboration with business and industry, and state appropriation (funding).

Table of Contents

Background

Joliet Junior College is a public two-year college located 30 miles southwest of Chicago. Approximately 11,500 credit students and 17,000 non-credit students attend one of Joliet Junior College's three campuses. The college currently employs approximately 1,100 staff comprised of classified in seven constituent groups: administrators, faculty, paraprofessional or support staff, clerical, food service, campus police, and physical plant employees. (Joliet Junior College, 2001a, p. 51).

The college's strategic plan expired in 2000. To commence the next strategic planning cycle, a comprehensive needs-analysis was conducted in October 2001. An external consultant conducted several environmental scans that solicited the input of several college constituents. These college constituent groups included community residents, high school counselors, high school students, non-returning students, and area employers. The primary purpose was to identify the training and educational needs and requirements of the community (CLARUS Corporation, 2000, p. 15). The college is also participating in The Higher Learning Commission's Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP). Established as an alternative method of accreditation, AQIP affords post-secondary institutions the opportunity to focus on a few key areas to systematically improve (North Central Accreditation of Schools, 2001). The recommendations from the needs-analysis project, the results from the organizational survey, and the AQIP guidelines provided the catalysts for some of the planning activities that are discussed below.

Nature of the Problem

Although an institutional vision has been established and institutional goals had been developed for the next strategic planning cycle, concrete key performance indicators had not been constructed. Further, the alignment of these performance indicators to stakeholder

expectations had not been ascertained. Symbiotic to AQIP, a few key performance indicators would provide the essential direction to identify the college's crucial issues and operations. These critical issues would then be the targets of an aggressive and comprehensive plan to assess and improve. The problem, therefore, was that no set of appropriate institutional quality indicators had been developed to measure the college's overall performance in terms of its institutional goals, stakeholder priorities, and most importantly, student learning. Therefore, neither the strategic planning initiatives nor the AQIP accreditation process could effectively progress.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was twofold. First, the importance ratings of several quality measures were obtained. Additionally, the average importance ratings were contrasted among college constituent groups for both similarities and differences. The constituent groups for this study were the following: (a) Board of Trustees, (b) administrative and support staff, (c) full-time faculty, (d) part-time faculty, (e) students, and (f) college district residents. Second, based on the input of these constituents, the most appropriate set of academic programs and support services were compiled. As a result, these academic programs and support services became the focus of subsequent continuous quality improvement regimens and the college's 2002-2007 strategic plan.

Review of the Literature

Quality Certification and Award Programs

The lure of quality programs is its simplicity of its structure and subsequent application. Mainly, the Baldrige Quality Award criteria provide powerful introspection tools for the assessment and improvement of the institutions core operations (Blazey, Davison, & Evans et al., 2001, p. 1). The criteria for Malcolm Baldrige for Performance Education support efforts to

align their institutional operations with improved organizational performance. Specifically, the award espouses the value of communicative leadership, strategic deployment, knowledge of stakeholder needs, educational support management, effective performance measurement systems, and analysis of organizational performance (Baldrige National Quality Program, 2000, pp. 13-27). As such, the criteria help institutions focus on the following: (a) student learning results, (b) student stakeholder expectations, (c) financial considerations, (d) faculty and staff resources, and (e) the effectiveness of the organization as a whole (Blazey et al., 2001, pp. 31-41).

In 1999, the North Central Association of Schools (NCA) elevated the importance of quality programs by incorporating continuous quality improvement into its accreditation process. NCA deems adequately competent schools as those that routinely integrate quality improvement principles into their operations and decision-making processes. Again, the premise is simple. Post-secondary institutions are expected to not only deliver exemplary educational opportunities, but also to evolve, adapt, and improve (Spangehl, 2000, p. 4). More importantly, success is measured in terms of the effort exerted to achieve the college mission and to help students learn.

Quality Measures used in Post-Secondary Education

Many challenges must be confronted with the development of an integrated profile of quality measures. Notwithstanding, is the varying set of student educational goals, increased diversification of demographics, and economic situations (Magolda, Terenzini, & Hutchings, 1999, p. 24). Direct counts of resources reflect little apart from size. Surveys rely heavily on judgment calls. Other performance indicators depend on the identification of appropriate best practices (Ewell, 1999, pp. 203-204). In general, organizational performance can be derived from four different perspectives: customer, financial, internal processes, and student learning (Shapiro & Nunez, 2001, p. 31).

Student progress and achievement can be measured in several ways. Among these are student goal obtainment, persistence, transfer preparedness, and degree completion (Alfred, Ewell, Hutchings, & McCleeny, 1999, pp. 9-13). Austin Community College (1999, pp. 3-13) outlined five effectiveness measures specifically slated for the assessment of different academic programs: (a) successful college transfer, (b) completion and retention rates, (c) time to completion, (d) employability, and (e) job placement in a field related to area of study. Transfer measures were directed at liberal art students and those enrolled in Associate of Arts programs. Occupational attainment was the primary assessment device for those enrolled in Associate of Applied Science and certificate programs. The focal indicators for students placed in developmental courses were remedial course completion and completion in sequential course work. Likewise, the Oregon University System (1998, p. 3) identified four quality measures to strengthen their post-secondary system. These measures included: (a) degree completion, (b) graduation competencies, (c) external resource obtainment, and (d) institutional management. Jefferson College (1999, p. 18) posited the articulation of defined student outcomes for each course as a key performance indicator.

Critical thinking, cultural awareness, and sensitivity to diversity are among the learning outcomes to be considered. Also included should be the importance and availability for students to participate in activities that promote wellness, leadership, good citizenship, and community awareness (Alfred et al., 1999, p. 13; Jefferson College, 1999, pp. 40-41). Also listed among the literature are workforce placement, satisfaction of employers, and licensure pass rates (Alfred et al., 1999, pp. 19-21).

However, student outcomes should not be limited to short term outcomes (Dey, Wimsatt, Rhee, & Meader, 1999, p. 4). Instead, the long-term effect on occupational and life quality should be ascertained. In fact, Dey (et al., 1999, p. 25) demonstrated that educational attainment

was the primary attribute that affected long-term occupational status. Unfortunately, the study

failed to link college quality to such attributes as faculty compensation, number of faculty with

terminal degrees, library expenditures, and selectivity of applicants. Ewell (1999, p. 206)

mirrors this sentiment that longitudinal data forms a better basis for policy making.

Faculty development, workload, service, and contribution to discipline are all valid

measures of quality (Colorado Commission on Higher Education, 2001, p. 6; Outcalt & Rabin,

1998, p. 4). The number of training and professional development activities should also be

documented (Jefferson College, 1999, p. 18). This includes leadership development activities

(Alfred & Kreidler, 1991, p. 37). Whether quality indicators should pontificate the importance

of the development of internal professional activities is for the stakeholders to decide (Jefferson

College, 1999, pp. 56-57). Special attention to opportunities for faculty to hone their curriculum

development skills should be exerted (Jefferson College, 1999, pp. 42-43). As with student

access, faculty access to technology should be underscored (Jefferson College, 1999, pp. 46-47).

In addition, the input required to attract and retain quality faculty should be considered. This

includes the outlay for salary and benefit packages (Henry & Lovejoy, 1997, p. 13).

Undoubtedly, stakeholders, especially those external to the organization, are interested in

an organization's financial stability. Acknowledgment of certain revenue sources including

tuition, federal and state appropriations, grants, and endowments and expenditures such as

salaries, operating expenses, and capital outlay are within the realm of reporting the effectiveness

of an organization (Henry & Lovejoy, 1997, p. 55). Comparisons of college expenditures per

full-time equivalent student with peer institutions should also be examined (Colorado

Commission on Higher Education, 2001, p. 6). External stakeholders are also interested in the

college's ability to self-support its operations (Outcalt & Rabin, 1998, p. 4). However, in direct

opposition to student outlay and organizational self-sufficiency, is the trepidation of affordable

higher education. Therefore, many organizations have explored new avenues of efficiency such as outsourcing, profit centers, auxiliary enterprises, and collaboration with peer institutions (King, 1999, p. 15). In turn, these creative pecuniary endeavors become the object of stakeholder scrutiny especially with respect to these peripheral ventures' potential to improve the educational process.

Partnerships are increasingly central to the sustenance of an organization. Educational outcomes can be benefited by a network of institutions because they are more likely to have more resources and external influence than an isolated college (Alfred & Carter, 1997, p. 47). Among the other sectors that could potentially partner with post-secondary institutions are business, community, other colleges, elementary and secondary school districts, and internal organizational units (Henry & Lovejoy, 1997, p. 11; Jefferson College, 1999, pp. 24-25). Alumni opportunities for association with the college should be deliberated (Jefferson College, 1999, pp. 38-39). Schroeder (1999, p. 47) posits a collaborative culture that is student focused, interdependent, communicative, and purposeful. The effectiveness of college collaborative efforts should be measured in light of these qualities.

Accessibility of education has long been a standing point of contention for stakeholders. According to the Alfred and Carter (2000, p. 9), access should continue to be the foundation of the college's core purpose. Potential students want convenience, responsiveness, and flexibility (Alfred & Carter, 2000, p. 2). In addition, students need to perceive they are empowered to make decisions about their educational endeavors. No longer are colleges pitted against each other in terms of expectations of convenience, responsiveness and availability. They are pitted against standards of access derived from other industries (Alfred & Carter, 2000, p. 15). Also at issue is the accessibility of different uses of technology such as the Internet, distance course delivery, student services, faculty interaction, and the equity of this access across student groups.

All are legitimate stakeholder concerns (Jefferson College, 1999, pp. 46-47; Upcraft, Terenzini, & Kruger, 1999, p. 34).

The rapidity of the change in student characteristics begs the question of equity of access (King, 1999, p. 5). Hence, one such quality measure would be the availability of courses at satellite centers and the convenience of their locations (Jefferson College, 1999, pp. 24-25). However, accessibility to higher education goes beyond campus locality. Indicators of progress would include the inclusiveness of student services, campus climate, technology, and faculty interactions with respect to a diverse student demographic (King, 1999, pp. 7-8).

The manifestation of technology has proliferated college campuses worldwide. Because of its prohibitive cost, scope, and required expertise, prudent technology plans will mitigate the financial and human resource void brought on by that technology (Rice & Miller, 2001, p. 328). It follows that a careful set of quality measures reverberate the college's mission, academic program offerings, faculty expertise, and sustained infrastructure. Measures must reflect how technology has improved student learning (Magolda et al., 1999, p. 32). At the very least, computer literacy competencies should be assessed (Jefferson College, 1999, pp. 46-47). Students expect access to technology from a variety of sources such as computer laboratories, electronic delivery of student services, or distance delivery of courses. Unfortunately, there has been no clear theoretical basis for determining what combination of demographics is best served by distance access to services. Further, there has been a scarcity of the number of original research studies and the robustness of the results across different instructional technologies and populations (Merisotis & Phipps, 1999, pp. 14-15). Because of the prohibitive cost and resources needed to provide some academic programs, especially those that are technologically intensive, institutions need to actively seek partnerships to share the investment in these resources (Schroeder, 1999, p. 47).

In sum, for possible inclusion performance indicator questionnaire, several categories of quality measures have been gleaned in the review of the literature. Among the most prevalent of the performance indicators used by colleges and state college systems are:

(a) access (Alfred & Carter, 2000, p. 9),

(b) affordability (ACPA, 1999, p. 1),

(c) fiscal stability (Henry & Lovejoy, 1997, p. 55),

(d) student outcomes (Austin Community College, 1999, pp. 3-13),

(e) faculty workload and compensation (Ewell, 1999, p. 206),

(f) faculty training (Jefferson College, 1999, p. 18),

(g) management of federal and state mandates (Lovell, 2001, pp. 83-84),

(h) collaborative endeavors (King, 1999, p. 5), and

(i) technological management (Magolda et al., 1999, p. 32). Undeniably, many different stakeholder groups should be involved in the identification of those key performance indicators (Ruben, 2001, p. 50). Incorporation of the priorities of various stakeholder groups into the strategic plan engenders the college's accountability to these groups (Ruben, 2001, p. 12).

Research Questions

To accomplish this investigation, four questions were posed for this project. 1. What set of quality measures best monitors the quality of the college's programs and services? 2. Of those set of quality indicators, what measures does the college constituents view as the most important measures of institutional effectiveness? 3. Are there statistically significant differences in the ratings given to the quality measures among the different constituent groups? 4. Based on a construed set of quality indicators and the importance ratings given to these measures, what key academic program and support service areas are targeted for the next iteration of the strategic plan?

Procedures

Key indicators were generated by the review of the literature and as the result of the implementation of the quality measure development methodology purported in question one. The preconceived set of quality measures were clustered in the following nine categories: (a) faculty and instruction, (b) student outcomes, (c) community collaboration, (d) information technology, (e) student services, (f) funding, (g) facilities and infrastructure, (h) staff, and (i) miscellaneous. A committee consisting of administrators, full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and students was assembled to comment on existing quality measures and suggest additional ones. The Quality Measure Questionnaire consisting of 93 key indicators was subsequently assembled.

A small random sample was drawn from the following groups: (a) administrative and support staff, (b) full-time faculty, and (c) part-time faculty. A draft of the Quality Measure Questionnaire was mailed to each participant's home address along with a cover letter explaining the research project, a participation consent form and a pre-paid, self-addressed envelope.

Due to the time constraints imposed by the college's executive leadership team and the strategic planning implementation schedule, not all stakeholder groups were randomly sampled for the pilot administration of the Quality Measure Questionnaire. Instead, convenience sampling was deployed. The Board of Trustees and college district residents were administered the quality measure inventory in person. This transpired at the second of five Joliet Junior College community planning meetings. All college district resident participants and all the Board of Trustees in the second of the five community planning meetings were involved in the pilot study. For the student constituents, the Quality Measure Questionnaire was distributed to three student clubs. The clubs were chosen based on their diversity of the demographics of the participants and the purpose and function of the clubs. Students involved with the Student

Alliance, Black Student Union, and the Culinary Arts Club were asked to complete the Quality Measure Questionnaire at one of their club meetings.

After completing the instrument, all participants were additionally queried about the clarity of the instructions and items, ease of completion, and overall format of the instrument. Modifications were made to the questionnaire based on the aggregated results of the evaluation forms completed by the pilot study participants. Further, to assess the reliability of this instrument, a coefficient-alpha was performed on the pilot administration of the Quality Measure Questionnaire.

A random sample for each the following stakeholder groups: (a) administrative and support staff, (b) full-time faculty, (c) part-time faculty, and (d) students. Each random sample except the student stakeholder group, was mailed the Quality Measure Questionnaire to their home address. The mailing included a cover letter explaining the project, instructions to complete, and a stamped address return envelope.

The Quality Measure Questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of 10 course sections, proctored by the Research Analyst. Before the surveys were distributed, the sample of course sections was inspected to ensure that it included at least one evening section, a section conducted at a location other than main campus, and that the sample spanned several departmental areas. The surveys were then administered during the second week of the spring 2002 semester.

Concurrently, all college district residents who attended the last three of five community planning meetings hosted by Joliet Junior College were asked by the planning meeting facilitators to complete the quality measure inventory. The Board of Trustees, required to attend all the community planning meetings, were also requested to complete the survey at these last three gatherings. The college district residents that attended the community planning meetings

were more likely to have a vested interest in the future success of the college than a random sample of the residents of the college district. It was also conjectured that the number of surveys collected at the meetings would surpass the number returned by a random sample of community residents.

After all the completed surveys were collected, the importance ratings for each quality measure in conjunction with the respondent's stakeholder group designation were entered into a database. Also entered into the database was the location of the meeting essentially coded as on-campus or off-campus. The average importance ratings across all college stakeholder groups as well as for each constituent category were calculated using the statistical software package, SPSS. A list was generated that sorted the quality measures by average importance rating. Inventories sorted by ascending average importance ratings for each constituent group were also compiled. An one-way ANOVA was performed for the posted average quality measure importance ratings for each quality measure across stakeholder groups.

The Quality Initiative Committee consented on the crucial quality areas that they thought the college should focus resource allocation in the next strategic planning cycle. This was accomplished via a Delphi Technique in which each participant was asked to write down five strategic planning areas, in order of importance, on an index card. After each quality area was written on newsprint in front of the room, the team as a group, was asked to combine any areas that were similar. Next, the average ranks were computed for each quality area. The five areas that had the lowest average rank were slated for inclusion in the strategic plan.

Limitations

Because of the constraints imposed on the pilot administration of the Quality Measure Questionnaire, it could be possible that a completely representative set of respondents were not portrayed. Therefore, it was possible that the modifications made to the quality measure

inventory could have been different than the alterations that would have been indicative from the original and more purposeful pilot sample. Although the sample was based on a randomized selection, participation was voluntarily and, therefore, possibly compromising the randomness of the sample. The findings may lack generalizabity to other post-secondary institutions or even to other community colleges. Those who chose to participate may be inherently different from those who refused to participate. This may have skewed the results toward those who are inclined to participate in such quality initiative projects. It was also possible that some of the participants had priorities that are not aligned with the welfare of Joliet Junior College. However, the variety of constituent groups and the number of participants should have mitigated this. Joliet Junior College is multifaceted. As such, it was possible that the essential departments were not included in the development, validation, interpretation, and application of the results of this applied dissertation.

RESULTS

Quality Measure Ratings

The return rate for each of the constituent groups with the exception of the college district residents are listed in Table1. The best return rate was posted by the student stakeholder group. This was, in part, because all students who were asked to participate during class time, consented. The large number of student respondents also corresponds to the fact that ten sections, with an aggregate average size of 19.3 students, were polled. The small return rate for the of Board of Trustees group may be attributed to the sentiment that all of the members of this group reviewed the original inventory and several did not feel the need to complete the final Quality Measure Questionnaire.

Because there are over 500,000 residents in the Joliet Junior College District and therefore, a return rate comparable to the other stakeholder groups would be unlikely. It was also

deemed unreasonable that the majority of the residents would have enough cause to compel them to attend the community planning meetings. As such, a return rate was considered inappropriate and not calculated for this stakeholder group. Because a return rate was not determined for the college district resident stakeholders, a return rate for the overall sample was also not computed.

The average importance ratings for all the quality measures for the overall sample are listed in Table 2. The quality measures are sorted in ascending order by the assigned average importance ratings.

The range between the most important quality measure average and the least important average quality measure was 1.46. The quality measures are listed in ascending order of mean importance rating. As shown in Table 2, the quality measures with the smallest or most important average ratings for the overall sample were faculty's ability to teach and faculty preparation and training. The next most important average rating was student satisfaction with instruction. The next two items after the convenience of schedule quality measure pertained to student service areas, career and transfer counseling. The fifth smallest average importance rating, success rates on licensure and certification examinations, was rated as the most important student outcome. Interestingly, the perform accessibility (Americans with Disabilities Act) projects quality measure was rated as the tenth most important. Although, the item was only rated by less than ten percent of the sample, those who did rate this item were adamant about its importance.

The quality measures with the largest or least important average ratings for the overall sample were faculty with terminal degrees and recruiting and retaining minority faculty. The third largest average importance rating was posted by the increase of the number of underrepresented groups. The high average importance ratings for both recruiting/retaining minority faculty and increase in the number of underrepresented groups may be attributed to the

limited number of minority respondents. This was, in part, due to the low number of minority

college district residents that were expected and actually attended the community planning

meetings. It could also be attributed to the low percentage of minorities who are full-time

faculty, part-time faculty, and administrative and support staff that work at the college.

Another surprising result considering the recent increasing pressure for community

accountability was the large average quality measure rating for the use of student outcomes in

the budget process. This was the seventh largest average quality measure.

All told, 41 quality measures had a posted importance rating average of $\underline{M} = 1.00$ ($\underline{SD} =$

.00, $\underline{n} = 3$) for the Board of Trustees stakeholder group. Nonetheless, the scope of the quality

measures is expansive. The quality measures span all nine quality measure categories: (a)

faculty and instruction, (b) student outcomes, (c) community collaboration, (d) information

technology, (e) student services, (f) funding, (g) facilities and infrastructure, (h) staff, and (i)

miscellaneous. Overwhelmingly, there were six funding quality measures with an average

importance rating of 1.00: state appropriation (funding), local funding, institutional ability to

obtain external grants, increase tuition to align with program delivery, adequate contingency

reserve account, and secure funding for academic programs. The Board of Trustees respondents

also deemed faculty's ability to teach, faculty use of technology in instruction, and faculty

education/training performance indicators most important. There were several student outcome

measures including success on student licensure/certification examinations, oral communication,

and computer literacy skills. Also distinguished as most important by all of the Board of

Trustees sample were the quality measures, collaboration with community constituents, staff

training, increase in number of permanent facilities, and maintenance of computer and library

resources.

As with the overall sample, faculty ability to teach and faculty education/training were prominent importance quality measures. As with the overall sample, the Board of Trustees also chose the student licensure/certification examination performance indicator among their most important. Expectantly, the Board of Trustees had more of a focus on funding issues than the general sample. Also expected was the Board of Trustees honing on facilities and equipment quality measures.

The faculty ability to teach and student satisfaction with instruction quality measures were rated as most important by the administrative and support staff sample. These average importance ratings are listed in Table 3. These results were similar to both the Board of Trustees and overall samples. Also listed was the student satisfaction with instruction performance measure. Predictably, the staff also ranked compensation of staff competitive with other colleges and compensation for educational advancement quality measures among the ten most important quality measures. Regular software and hardware upgrades may also have been listed because these expenditures may be perceived as favorably impacting the staff as well as the students.

As with the overall sample, career counseling was listed as an important quality measure by the staff sample. Interestingly, the quality measure, improvement of computer literacy skills, was the only student outcome to be listed for this sample. Unlike the Board of Trustees sample, there were no quality measures with respect to funding or facilities listed among the most important.

Similarly, the ten smallest average importance ratings are listed in Table 4 for the full-time faculty sample. As shown, there were only 17 full-time faculty respondents. Like the Board of Trustees and administrative and support staff samples, the full-time faculty also rated faculty ability to teach as most important. Dissimilar to the overall sample, Board of Trustees, and administrative and support staff samples, transfer counseling and articulation agreements

performance indicators had the second and third most important average ratings, respectively. Also unlike the overall sample and the administrative and support staff sample, improvement of oral communication was considered as one of the ten most important quality measures.

However, as with the overall sample, Board of Trustees, and administrative and support staff respondents, the faculty education/training quality measure was deemed as the seventh most important performance indicator by the full-time faculty sample. Concomitantly, faculty time dedicated to teaching was also listed for full-time faculty as one of the ten most important. The quality measure, perform accessibility projects, also received an average rating of 1.25. However, only four full-time faculty respondents rated this item. Therefore, this item was not listed in Table 5.

Likewise, the ten quality measures with the smallest average important ratings are listed in Table 5 for the part-time faculty sample. The measures listed for the part-time faculty sample were similar to the full-time faculty in terms of faculty ability to teach as being rated as the most important quality measure. Similar to the other samples, faculty education/training also made the most important quality measure list. Three student outcome quality measures were listed, primarily, improvement of writing skills, improvement of oral communication, and improvement of critical thinking skills. This is the largest number of student outcomes listed of any sample with the exception of the Board of Trustees sample. Although other samples listed some student outcomes, mainly critical thinking and computer literacy skills, none list both writing skills and oral communication. Likewise, the basic employment skills quality measure was not assigned as most important by any other constituent group.

Similar to the administrative and support staff sample, quality measures regarding compensation were essential to the part-time faculty sample. In fact, two compensation quality measures, compensation of staff competitive with staff at other colleges and compensation for

programs that encourage excellence, were posted among the ten smallest average importance ratings.

The ten smallest average importance ratings are listed in Table 6 for the student sample. Once again, faculty education/training and faculty ability to teach had the smallest average importance ratings. Although listed as the second most important rating, the student sample was the only sample that did not rate the faculty ability to teach as the most important quality measure. Other similarities between the faculty and staff samples were the appearance of the transfer counseling, and transfer rates of courses quality measures. Both transfer counseling and transfer rates were important to the student sample. Also crucial was employment and career counseling. In tandem with success rates of licensure and certification examinations, the students were focused on their reasons for attending college, chiefly to transfer and find employment. Plainly, the student respondents were focused on student outcomes and student services more than the Board of Trustees, faculty and staff samples. In fact, there were only three performance measures that was not related to student outcomes or student services.

The ten smallest average importance ratings are listed in Table 7 for the college district resident sample. Eleven quality measures were listed for the college district sample because the ninth, tenth, and eleventh quality measures posted the same importance rating average, $\underline{M} = 1.39$. As with all the other samples, the faculty ability to teach performance indicator was rated as the most important quality measure by the college district sample. Coupled with faculty education/training, the college district sample was similar to all other samples with respect to including these two quality measures as among the most important performance indicators. However, there were some differences between the college district resident sample and other samples. For example, collaboration with business and industry shown in Table 7 was not listed as a most important measure by any other sample with the exception of the Board of Trustees

sample. Also, expenditures for maintaining information technology was listed as a most important quality measure by only the college district resident sample. Most notably was the appearance of the job skills training quality measure that was not posted on any other sample list.

An one-way ANOVA was performed for each quality measure across constituent groups. The result of each ANOVA computation, principally the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, F-test result, and probability corresponding with the F-test value, is posted in Table 8. As shown in Table 9, 26 quality measures were statistically significant, $p < .01$. This level of significance was chosen because of the multiplicity of ANOVA comparisons that were computed. One problem that exists from performing many inferential comparisons is the probability of committing a Type I error, rejecting the null hypothesis when it should not be rejected, increases as the number of comparisons increases. The probability of committing a Type I error for the entire set of comparisons can be computed by $FW_\alpha = 1 - (1 - \alpha)^c$, where α is the probability or significance level and c is the number of comparisons (Keppel, 1982, pp. 145-146). Setting c for the number of quality measures, 93, and substituting p for α, at $p = .05$, it would be expected that at least one ($FW_\alpha = .99$) F-statistic would be deemed significant by chance. At $p = .01$, that probability decreases slightly to $FW_\alpha = .61$. Therefore, the more conservative probability level ($p < .01$) that yielded a lower chance of rejecting the null hypothesis by chance in any given ANOVA comparison was chosen.

Strikingly, five of these statistically significant ANOVA comparisons involved the faculty and instruction performance indicator category. In particular, faculty ability to use technology in instruction ($F(5, 307) = 4.08$, $p < .01$) was statistically significant as the performance indicator appeared on the Board of Trustees, student, and college district sample lists of most important quality measures. Of note was the statistical significance of the faculty with terminal degrees quality measure ($F(5, 296) = 3.73$, $p < .01$) because this item was not

among the most important quality measures for any constituent group. Paradoxically, the largest

average importance rating for faculty with terminal degrees was declared by the full-time faculty,

($\underline{M}$ = 3.44, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.32, $\underline{n}$ = 16). The next largest average importance rating for this item was

posted by the part-time faculty ($\underline{M}$ = 2.85, $\underline{SD}$ = .88, $\underline{n}$ = 26). Nevertheless, the differences of

average importance ratings among stakeholder groups induced the quality measure to be

statistically significant. Two other faculty quality measures posted a statistically significant

difference between groups but were not ranked by any constituent group as most important was

the percentage of institutional expenditures dedicated to instruction ($\underline{F}$(5, 300) = 3.68, $\underline{p}$ < .01)

and training opportunities for part-time faculty ($\underline{F}$(5, 302) = 13.46, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Ironically, the part-

time faculty sample posted the largest rating for the training opportunities for the part-time

faculty quality measure ($\underline{M}$ = 2.50, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.04, $\underline{n}$ = 28). The smallest average importance rating

for this measure was discerned by the Board of Trustees ($\underline{M}$ = 1.67, $\underline{SD}$ = .58, $\underline{n}$ = 3).

The faculty ability to teach item was also statistically significant ($\underline{F}$(5, 305) = 3.62, $\underline{p}$ <

.01) although all the stakeholder groups depicted this item as one of their most important quality

measures. That said, the within group variance, $\underline{MSE}$ = .226, was small. In other words, the

variance within each group was small relative to the between group variance. Importantly,

stakeholders of the same constituent type were exceptionally similar in their response to this

item.

Among the student outcome quality measures, only GPA at transfer institutions ($\underline{F}$(5,

299) = 3.57, $\underline{p}$ < .01) and regular review of student outcomes ($\underline{F}$(5, 296) = 3.85, $\underline{p}$ < .01) were

statistically significant. Although neither measure was distinguished as a most important quality

measure on any constituent group list, the variability between groups was apparent. For the GPA

at transfer institutions quality measure, the within group variance was minuscule, $\underline{MSE}$ = .696.

However, a related quality measure, transfer counseling appeared as a most important quality

measure for the full-time faculty and student samples. Another performance indicator relevant to GPA at transfer institutions, transfer rate of courses, was listed as one of the most important measures by the student sample. For the regular review of student outcomes performance indicators, the full-time faculty surprisingly posted the largest or least important average rating for regular review of student outcomes ($\underline{M} = 2.18$, $\underline{SD} = .64$, $\underline{n} = 17$) while the part-time faculty posted the next largest average importance rating for this item ($\underline{M} = 2.08$, $\underline{SD} = .89$, $\underline{n} = 26$). In contrast, the Board of Trustees posted the smallest average importance rating ($\underline{M} = 1.33$, $\underline{SD} = .58$, $\underline{n} = 3$).

For the community collaboration category, only one quality measure was statistically significant, collaboration with business and industry ($\underline{F}(5, 293) = 8.86$, $\underline{p} < .01$). Interestingly, this performance indicator emerged on the Board of Trustees, administrative and support staff, and college district resident sample lists of most important quality measures. However, there were no other community collaboration quality measures that were rated as most important by any constituent group.

There were two student services quality measures with statistically significant results, primarily counseling for high school students to align with 9-12 curriculum ($\underline{F}(5, 299) = 3.83$, $\underline{p} < .01$) and career counseling ($\underline{F}(5, 297) = 3.29$, $\underline{p} < .01$). The performance indicator, counseling for high school students to align with 9-12 curriculum, was only listed by the Board of Trustees sample as most important. In fact, this group had the smallest importance average ($\underline{M} = 1.00$, $\underline{SD} = .00$, $\underline{n} = 3$). In contrast, the largest importance average for this item was part-time faculty ($\underline{M} = 2.04$, $\underline{SD} = 1.02$, $\underline{n} = 26$). Hence, there was over a one-point difference between these two sample's importance rating averages. Career counseling was cited by all samples except the Board of Trustees and the college district resident samples. However the within group variance

for this quality measure was small, $\underline{MSE}$ = .469, indicating that constituents of a particular group tended to respond with the same rank for career counseling.

Thirty-one percent of all the funding quality measures had statistically significant results. This encompassed four funding performance measures, increase tuition to align with increase in program delivery ($\underline{F}(5, 290)$ = 5.18, $\underline{p}$ < .01), use of student outcomes assessment in budgeting process ($\underline{F}(5, 290)$ = 4.39, $\underline{p}$ < .01), adequate contingency reserve account ($\underline{F}(5, 289)$ = 5.42, $\underline{p}$ < .01), and secure funding for academic programs ($\underline{F}(5, 292)$ = 3.65, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Contrary to these results, the funding quality measures were scarce among the stakeholders' most important performance indicators. The quality measures, increase tuition to align with increase in program delivery, adequate contingency reserve account, and secure funding for academic programs were only cited by the Board of Trustees sample as one of its most important quality measures. However, another funding quality measure, state appropriation (funding), was among the most important quality measures for the full-time faculty sample. In addition, expenditures for maintaining information technology was registered as the ninth most important quality measure by the college district resident sample.

On the other hand, there was merely one facility quality measure that supported a statistically significant difference average importance rating among stakeholder groups. Expenditures for maintaining college facilities ($F(5, 291)$ = 3.38, p < .01), albeit not listed on any constituent group's registry of most important quality measures, had nonetheless posted a statistically significant ANOVA result. As with the faculty ability to teach and career counseling performance measures, the within group variance, $\underline{MSE}$ = .575 was fairly small.

More than half of the staff quality measures posted statistically significant results. Specifically, five performance indicators, compensation of staff competitive with other college staff ($\underline{F}(5, 289)$ = 7.58, $\underline{p}$ < .01), compensation for programs that encourage excellence ($\underline{F}(5, 290)$

$= 4.01$, $\underline{p} < .01$), compensation for educational advancement quality measure ($\underline{F}(5, 290) = 3.84$, $\underline{p} < .01$), training in instructional pedagogies ($\underline{F}(5, 290) = 5.26$, $\underline{p} < .01$), and in-service technology training for employees ($\underline{F}(5, 290) = 5.47$, $\underline{p} < .01$), had statistically significant group means among stakeholder groups. This was despite the fact that items in this category rarely appeared on any constituent group most important quality measure list with the exception of the administrative and support staff and part-time faculty sample tables. The administrative and support staff listed compensation of staff competitive with staff at other colleges, compensation for programs that encourage excellence, and compensation for educational advancement as most important. The part-time faculty sample honed on compensation of staff competitive with other college staff and compensation for programs that encourage excellence. Undeniably, the compensation items were important to the administrative and support staff and the part-time faculty but not the other constituent samples. Two other staff quality measures, encouragement for participation at conferences and in-service technology for employees, were rated as most important by all of the participants in the Board of Trustees sample.

The ANOVA comparisons for support for an integrated student system ($\underline{F}(5, 291) = 4.96$, $\underline{p} < .01$), technology in instructional settings ($\underline{F}(5, 289) = 4.05$, $\underline{p} < .01$), and Internet presence that promotes programs ($\underline{F}(5, 291) = 3.66$, $\underline{p} < .01$) were statistically significant. Regardless, only the Board of Trustees listed any one of these information technology quality measures as most important. In fact, they listed all three performance indicators in addition to Internet capabilities that facilitate admissions and registration and Internet access in the Learning Resource Center and other on-campus locations performance indicators.

Three of the miscellaneous quality measures, increase visibility in local area ($\underline{F}(5, 289) = 5.80$, $\underline{p} < .01$), communication with K-12 districts ($\underline{F}(5, 292) = 7.19$, $\underline{p} < .01$) and communication with students ($\underline{F}(5, 290) = 3.31$, $\underline{p} < .01$) posted statistically significant results. As with the staff

performance measures, the increase visibility in local area quality was not on any stakeholder group most important quality measure list. The part-time faculty awarded this quality measure the largest average importance rating ($\underline{M} = 2.15$, $\underline{SD} = 1.01$, $\underline{n} = 26$) while the Board of Trustees' average importance rating was the smallest ($\underline{M} = 1.33$, $\underline{SD} = .58$, $\underline{n} = 3$) of all the constituent group importance rating averages. Accordingly, the range between the largest and smallest group means, .82, posted a statistically significant ANOVA result.

Likewise, the communication with K-12 districts was not rated as most important by any constituent group but the difference between groups was statistically significant. Interestingly, the counseling for high school students to align with 9-12 curriculum student service quality measure ANOVA comparison was also statistically significant.

The college district sample did list communication with students as one of its most important quality measures. Surprisingly, it did not result to be a most important item on the student sample list.

<div align="center">Identifying Key Quality Areas</div>

The results of the Quality Measure Questionnaire were shared with each member of the Quality Initiative Committee by mailing a compilation of the results to each member prior to the first committee meeting. A copy of the Quality Measure Questionnaire was also sent in the same mailing. At the first meeting, the committee jointly decided to focus on key quality areas before discerning the academic departments and support services that should be included in the strategic plan. This was, in part, due to the large amount of information that the team was asked to comprehend. This was also in response to a new budgeting process that was going to aim at particular quality area categories as identified by the Quality Measure Questionnaire.

As a result, at the first meeting the Quality Initiative Committee was asked to identify five crucial areas that the improvement processes and strategic plan should highlight and to order

these planning areas by importance. After each quality area was written on newsprint in front of the room, the team was asked to combine any areas that were similar. A listing of the emergent strategic planning or quality areas is shown in Table 9. They are listed by ascending average rank. The average rank assigned to each area and the number of respondents who ranked the quality area is also listed.

As seen, there was somewhat a capricious development of the quality areas without regard to the results of the Quality Measure Questionnaire. For example, facilities and information technology were not rated as most important by the majority of the stakeholder samples but five committee members pleaded for their inclusion. Because of an ongoing initiative to attract more minority students, it was not surprising that an underrepresented quality area surfaced. There was also consensus about combining information technology with the state-of-the-art facilities quality measure, two areas that posted poor importance rating averages by all stakeholder groups. One committee member expressed concern that the American Disability Act quality measure was being ignored. The group further concurred that this would be a part of the facilities quality area. On the other hand, a quality area encompassing faculty training-and compensation were congruent to the quality measure importance ratings. Although communication with stakeholders posted the third lowest average rank and was ranked by six of the seven committee members, the Quality Initiative Committee decided to fold it into the collaboration with external stakeholder quality area. In sum, the five quality areas proposed for the strategic plan were: (a) enabling students to reach their academic goals, (b) serving underrepresented students, (c) faculty and faculty support training and compensation, (d), state-of-the-art facilities, and (e) collaboration with external agencies.

Discussion

Faculty and Instruction

Overwhelmingly, quality measures that underscored faculty proficiencies and preparation were determined to be most important by the college's stakeholders. Faculty and instruction performance indicators were ubiquitous in studies that featured higher education strategic plans and state performance funding programs reported in the literature (Jefferson College, 1999, p. 18; Colorado Commission on Higher Education, 2001, p. 6; Outcalt & Rabin, 1998, p. 4). The ability of the faculty to teach coupled with their education and training was most important to every stakeholder group. With the college's purpose and mission at the forefront, the stakeholders focused on the deliverables inherent to any post-secondary institutions, instruction.

Incongruously, the college stakeholders did not believe that a faculty member with a terminal degree ($\underline{M} = 2.56$, $\underline{SD} = 1.03$, $\underline{n} = 332$) was an important attribute. Accordingly, this quality measure was ranked ninetieth of the ninety-three quality measures by the overall sample. The stakeholders did not perceive a terminal degree as a necessary prerequisite to providing quality education. Excluded from some of the most important quality measure lists with the exception of the Board of Trustees, student, and college district resident samples was the quality measure, faculty ability to use technology in instruction. As such, an ANOVA comparison revealed that this quality measure ($\underline{F}$ (5, 307) = 4.08, $\underline{p}$ < .01) was disparately rated between stakeholder groups with respect to importance. As with obtaining a terminal degree, use of technology in instructional settings was not considered an important faculty attribute across all stakeholder groups.

Student Outcomes

The AQIP criteria emphasize a college's focus on processes that help students learn (North Central Association of Schools and Colleges, 2000). Inopportunely, only one student

outcome was prevalent on any stakeholder groups' most important quality measure list, success on licensure and certification examinations quality measure. For the overall sample, it was the fifth most important quality measure (M = 1.45, SD = .48, n = 347). In addition, this quality measure made the Board of Trustees, full-time faculty, student, and college district samples' most important quality measure lists.

With only a perfunctorily examination of the results, the other student outcomes appear to have made a dismal showing. Improvement of oral communication was only on the Board of Trustees and part-time faculty sample lists. The student outcomes, improvement of writing skills (M = 1.48, SD = .64, n = 27) and improvement of critical thinking skills (M = 1.56, SD = .80, n = 27) quality measures did appear on the part-time faculty most important list. Aligned with these average ratings results, no ANOVA comparison was significant.

However, the next most important student outcome, the thirteenth most important rating for the overall sample was improvement of oral communication (M = 1.54, SD = .74, n = 341). That said, the tenth most important rating average and, hence, on the list of most important quality measures, faculty use of technology in instruction, posted an average importance rating of M = 1.53 (SD = .79, n = 348). In addition, the student outcomes, critical thinking skills and computer literacy, both posted an average importance rating of M = 1.55 (SD = .72, n = 341) while the student performance measure, writing skills, received an average importance rating of M = 1.57 (SD = .70, n = 342). From a practical vantage, there is not much difference among these average importance ratings. Therefore, these student outcomes were not ignored by the stakeholder groups; there were plainly other quality measures that were rated slightly more important. In fact, improvement of computer literacy skills and oral communication were posted on the Board of Trustees and staff and administration samples most important quality measure lists.

<u>Community Collaboration</u>

The direction of AQIP encourages innovative collaborative relationships (Spangehl, 2000, p. 1). However, from an examination of the lists of the most important quality measures for each stakeholder group, it was evident that the quality measures that were determined to be most important were traditional existing partnerships. This was clarified by the appearance of only one community collaboration quality measure, collaboration with business and industry, in any stakeholder group's most important quality measure table.

<u>Student Services</u>

There were fewer student services quality measures than in any other category. However career counseling ($\underline{M}$ = 1.48, $\underline{SD}$ = .70, $\underline{n}$ = 336) and transfer counseling ($\underline{M}$ = 1.50, $\underline{SD}$ = .72, $\underline{n}$ = 337) were ranked by the overall sample as sixth and seventh most important respectively. The student service, career counseling, appeared on all the stakeholder lists with the exception of the Board of Trustees. On the other hand, the quality measure, transfer counseling, surfaced on only the full-time faculty and student samples' most important quality measure lists. No student service was posited as the most important quality measure by the small groups. Admittedly, the college district residents may be unfamiliar with the array of student services that epitomize a community college. Possibly as a result, no student service materialized from the small group discussions.

One baffling result is the significant ANOVA result of the quality measure, counseling for high school students to align with 9-12 curriculum ($\underline{F}$ (5, 299) = 3.83, $\underline{p}$ < .01). With further inspection, the administrative and support staff gave it an average importance rating of $\underline{M}$ = 1.34 ($\underline{SD}$ =.55, $\underline{n}$ = 32) while the part-time faculty posted the largest average importance rating, $\underline{M}$ = 2.50 ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.10, $\underline{n}$ = 26). This 1.16 difference may account for the significance of this ANOVA comparison. Interestingly, the administration and staff have been focusing on such programs as

Tech-Prep and GED education that examine the high school curriculum and its ability to prepare

students for the academic rigors of college. From the results of this item, it was apparent that the

faculty should be more involved and be more informed about its importance. In the case of the

importance of communicating with K-12 districts, the college culture prevailed. The college has

a limited number of such partnerships. As such, this item was not suitable to be most important

by any stakeholder group.

Funding

Expectedly, the Board of Trustees had a vested interest in the revenue and funding

quality measures. This was substantiated by the number of funding items, six, that appeared on

their most important quality measure list. This represents almost half (46.2%) of all the funding

quality measures. The obtainment and use of college expenditures are fundamental to the

determination of the effectiveness of an organization (Henry & Lovejoy, 1997, p. 55). However,

no other stakeholder group depicted these measures as most important as confirmed by the

ANOVA results. The scarcity of the funding quality measures determined to be most important

by the other stakeholder groups may be attributable to the limited number of constituents that

understand the potential ramifications of external funding on the welfare of the college.

Quality Areas

In part, the quality areas provided some clarity to an otherwise complex and possibly

confusing interpretation of results. The quality areas may have also eased the difficult process of

choosing only a few vital processes that adhered to those results (North Central Accreditation of

Schools, 2001). The quality areas seemed to effectively compartmentalize the stakeholders'

expectations and priorities into five distinct focal points. For example, the faculty and faculty

support training and compensation quality area parallels to the results of the study. Explicitly,

faculty preparation and training was consistently rated as most important by all constituent groups.

On the other hand, some of the quality areas were not aligned with the results of the Quality Measure Questionnaire. The servicing underrepresented students quality area and the state-of-the-art facility quality area were not particularly important to the stakeholder groups in terms of the facilities quality measures. In fact, the increase in number of underrepresented groups item posted the third largest average importance ranking. Overall, the quality measures, expand scope of instructional technology, and increase number of permanent facilities, did not resonate well with the overall sample. On the other hand, separate examination of the quality measure ratings by constituent group revealed that some of the facilities quality measures were important to specific groups. For example the quality measure, hardware/software updates and faculty ability to use technology in instruction, were determined to be most important by the constituent groups.

Recommendations

Soliciting Stakeholder Involvement

Joliet Junior College has over 15,000 non-credit students (Joliet Junior College, 2001b, p. 1). As such, the constituent groups for this study could have been expanded to include non-credit students. The response rates for the administrative and support staff, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty samples could have been improved by conducting a follow-up mailing to non-respondents. Due to time constraints, this was not executed for this research project. The follow-up mailing could have been accompanied by a telephone call to alert participants about the Quality Measures Questionnaire. The stakeholder analysis did not separate part-time students from full-time students although students were asked to identify their attendance status. A separate analysis of the quality measures for part-time students could have revealed

information not gleaned by the aggregate student sample. For example, part-time students may have had different priorities and expectations of the college, and hence, different quality measures may have been identified as important for this stakeholder group.

The quality areas, albeit pertinent to the controversial issues at the college, did not completely reflect the results of the Quality Measure Questionnaire and the small group discussions. Hence, the quality areas may not completely address the expectations and priorities of the college's stakeholders. This may be, in part, due to the length of the quality measure survey. In addition, the committee had a limited time to review the results. Another reason for the incongruence of the results to the quality areas may be the shortsightedness of individual committee members. At times, some committee members were more attuned to their own departments than the institution as a whole. As a possible resolution, an external consultant could be appointed to establish the quality areas based on the quality area importance rating tabulations. As a corollary, the Quality Initiative Committee was a voluntary campus committee. A larger committee that was appointed by an executive manager in which involvement was mandatory may have yielded different quality areas.

Strategic Planning Process Recommendations

The academic programs, especially in the enabling students to achieve their academic goal quality area, should be reviewed by the college's professional occupational advisory committees. Because these academic programs were primarily career focused, the business and industry leaders in the college's district should also be engaged in prioritizing the college's resources expended on academic degree programs that lead to occupational certification and licensure examinations.

All academic department and support service areas, albeit resources did not permit, should have had the opportunity to volunteer to be part of the strategic plan and to tender their

operations and current outcomes to an improvement plan. Having both a systematic improvement process and a departmental strategic plan in place can only strengthen the department's ability to meet stakeholder expectations. That said, the improvement tactics and strategic plan that were developed with the extensive input and analysis of stakeholder input can provide a model for those departments that did not participate. Hopefully, the improvement of those academic programs and support services will provide apt enticement for other departments to follow.

During the next strategic planning cycle, systematic solicitation of the college's stakeholders should be conducted. In fact, regular input from the various stakeholder groups should become part of the strategic plan's implementation activities. Feedback should include the administration of the Quality Measure Questionnaire to ascertain any shift in stakeholder needs and expectations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfred, R., & Carter, P. (1997). Strategies for building high-performing colleges. *Community College Journal, 6*(5), 41-47.

Alfred, R., & Carter, P. (2000). *Contradictory colleges: Thriving in an era of continuous change.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 439 738)

Alfred, R., Ewell, P., Hudgins, J., & McCleeny, K. (1999). *Core indicators of effectiveness for community colleges.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Alfred, R., & Kreidler, P. (1991). Creating culture institutional effectiveness. *Community, Technical and Junior College Journal, 61*(5), 34-39.

Austin Community College. (1999). *College measures criteria.* Austin, TX: Austin Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 448 803)

Blazey, M. L., Davison, K. S., & Evans, J. P. (2001). *Insights to performance excellence in education, 2001.* Milwaukee, WI: American Society for Quality.

CLARUS Corporation. (2000). *Proposal for marketing and enrollment audit at Joliet Junior College.* Alliance, NE: Author.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education. (2001). *Quality indicators/performance measures, institutional performance, points, scoring and governing board performance funding percentages for FY 2001-2002.* Stanford, CA: National Center for Postsecondary Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 449 710)

Dey, E. L., Wimsatt, L. A., Rhee, B. S., & Meader, E. M. (1999). *Long-term effects on the occupational status of students.* Stanford, CA: National Center for Postsecondary Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 440 580)

Ewell, P. T. (1999). Linking performance measures to resource allocation: Exploring unmapped terrain. *Quality in Higher Education, 5*(3), 191-208.

Henry, T. C., & Lovejoy, W. H. (1997). *Report to joint education committee, Wyoming Legislature.* Cheyenne, WY: Wyoming Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 423 920)

Jefferson College. (1999). *Long range plan.* Hillsboro, MO: Jefferson College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 441 538)

Joliet Junior College. (2001a). *At a Glance, Non Credit Students.* Joliet, IL: Joliet Junior College, Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Joliet Junior College. (2001b). *Joliet Junior College factbook: 2000.* Joliet, IL: Joliet Junior College, Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Joliet Junior College. (2001c). *Organizational survey: Executive summary.* Joliet, IL: Joliet Junior College, Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Keppel, G. (1982). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (2nd ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

King, P. (1999). *Improving access and educational success for diverse students.* Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 430 446)

Lovell, C. D. (2001). Understanding the relationship of federal policies and community colleges: A proposed analytical policy framework. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College, 7*(2), 77-86.

Magolda, M. B., Terenzini, P. T., & Hutchings, P. (1999). *Learning and teaching in the 21st Century.* Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 430 446)

Merisotis, J. P., & Phipps, R. A. (1999). What's the difference? Outcomes of distance vs. traditional classroom-based learning. *Change, 31*(3), 12-17.

North Central Association of Schools. (2001). *The AQIP Quality Criteria.* Retrieved February 11, 2001, from the World Wide Web: http://aqip.org/criteria.html

Oregon University System. (1998). *Performance measures and indicators: 1998 baseline.* Eugene, OR: Oregon University System. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 430 466)

Outcalt, C., & Rabin, J. (1998). *Responding to accountability mandates.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California at Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 421 181)

Rice, M. L., & Miller, M. T. (2001). Faculty involvement in planning for the use and integration of instructional and administrative technologies. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 33*(3), 328-336.

Ruben, B. D. (2000). *Excellence in higher education 2000: A Baldrige-based guide to organizational assessment, planning, and improvement.* Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Shapiro, L. T., & Nunez, W. J. (2001). Strategic planning synergy. *Planning for higher education, 30*(1), 27-34.

Spangehl, S. (2000). *The AQIP quality criteria* (pp. 1-21). Chicago, IL: Academic Quality Improvement Project.

Upcraft, M. L., Terenzini, P. T., & Kruger, K. (1999). *Looking beyond the horizon: Trends shaping student affairs.* Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 430 446)

Table 1

<u>Return Rate of the Quality Measure Questionnaire for Each Constituent Group</u>

Constituent Group	<u>n</u>	Return Rate
Board of Trustees	3	42.8%
Administrative and support staff	33	16.5%
Full-time faculty	17	34.0%
Part-time faculty	28	28.0%
Students	191	100.0%
College district residents	35	--
Did not identify	43	--
Total	**350**	--

<u>Note</u>. Return rate is based on the proportion of the number of surveys returned to the number of surveys distributed.

Table 2

Average Importance Ratings for Quality Measures for the Overall Sample

Quality Measure	M	SD	n
Faculty ability to teach	1.19	.48	347
Faculty education/training	1.25	.57	348
Student satisfaction with instruction	1.36	.57	347
Convenient scheduling of courses	1.45	.67	330
Success rates: licensure/certification examinations	1.45	.69	347
Career counseling	1.48	.70	336
Transfer counseling	1.50	.72	337
State appropriation (funding)	1.50	.77	331
Communication with students	1.51	.73	328
Perform accessibility (American with Disabilities Act) projects	1.53	.79	341
Faculty ability to use technology in instruction	1.53	.73	348
Expansion of job skills training	1.53	.73	331
Improvement of oral communication	1.54	.74	341
Transfer rates of courses	1.54	.76	331
Student satisfaction with JJC services	1.55	.74	347
Improvement of critical thinking skills	1.55	.69	342
Improvement of computer literacy skills	1.55	.72	341
Percent of students who meet academic goal	1.56	.67	342
Regular software and hardware upgrades	1.56	.77	300
Employer satisfaction with JJC students	1.57	.75	343
Improvement of writing skills	1.57	.70	342
Maintain programs eligible for accreditation	1.59	.76	328
Institutional ability to obtain external grants	1.60	.80	331
Communication with external stakeholders	1.60	.75	330
Internet access in Learning Resource Center and other on-campus locations	1.60	.76	330
Faculty availability outside of class	1.60	.74	344
Compensation for programs that encourage excellence	1.61	.92	329
Communication with internal stakeholders and vendors	1.62	.83	331

Quality Measure	M	SD	n
Articulation agreements with other colleges	1.62	.81	333
Develop emergency contingency plan	1.64	.82	328
Employment related to field of study	1.64	.83	342
Compensation for educational advancement	1.65	.81	329
Expenditures for maintaining information technology	1.65	.80	328
Counseling for high school students to align with 9-12 curriculum	1.65	.83	338
Internet capabilities that facilitate admissions and registration	1.66	.80	329
Provide clear course outcomes to students	1.66	.73	337
Faculty time dedicated to teaching	1.67	.75	344
Compensation of staff competitive with staff at other colleges	1.67	.85	328
Award systems for excellent teaching practices	1.67	.80	326
Sufficient services for disabled students	1.68	.82	328
Use of data to improve academic programs and support services	1.68	.74	339
Collaboration with business and industry	1.71	.80	332
Graduation rates at JJC	1.72	1.35	341
GPA at transfer institutions	1.72	.83	340
Secure funding for academic programs	1.72	.78	330
In-service technology training for employees	1.75	.83	329
Expenditures for Learning Resource Center	1.75	.86	327
Technology in instructional settings	1.76	.78	327
Developmental education	1.76	.76	336
Ratio of campus available computers to students	1.76	.84	327
Faculty/student ratio	1.76	.81	346
Expenditures for maintaining college facilities	1.77	.77	329
Internet presence that promotes programs	1.77	.82	330
Increase in programs at off-campus facilities	1.78	.85	328
Sufficient campus security	1.79	.91	289
Regular review of course outcomes	1.79	.77	334

Quality Measure	M	SD	n
Institutional expenditures dedicated to instruction	1.80	.75	339
Support for integrated student systems	1.80	.78	330
Training in instructional pedagogies	1.81	.82	329
Collaboration with other community colleges	1.82	.81	330
Encouragement for participation at conferences	1.85	.87	329
Increase visibility in local area	1.85	.88	330
Adequate program specific computer laboratories	1.86	.84	330
Collaboration with state education agencies	1.87	.87	329
Basic employment skills	1.88	1.90	337
Local funding	1.89	1.39	332
Increase in Learning Resource Center database resources	1.89	.88	327
Expenditures for student services	1.89	.78	330
Improvement of leadership skills	1.90	.85	340
Expand scope of instructional technology	1.91	1.42	325
Graduation rates at 4-year institutions	1.93	2.45	340
Increase in use of Learning Resource Center circulated materials	1.94	.91	328
Student tuition expense ratios comparable to other community colleges	1.94	.95	325
Ratio of smart classrooms to course sections	1.94	.86	326
Increase in instructional aids in classroom	2.00	.94	328
Recognition for advances in discipline	2.00	.88	329
Increase number of permanent facilities	2.00	.97	330
Recognition for networking with professional colleagues	2.00	1.40	328
Communication with K-12 districts	2.02	.94	331
Collaboration with K-14 (initiatives)	2.07	.93	333
Leaders in provision of C-E-D Economic Development Councils	2.09	.86	331
Provide alumni opportunities	2.11	.94	332
Adequate contingency reserve account	2.12	.90	329

Quality Measure	M	SD	n
Review student outcomes in continuing education areas	2.12	.92	337
Training opportunities for part-time faculty	2.15	.89	343
Use of student outcomes in budget process	2.18	.91	329
Leaders in provision of Department of Family Services programs	2.21	.90	329
Citizenship and participation in community services	2.25	.99	341
Increase tuition to align with increase in program delivery	2.25	1.07	328
Increase in number of underrepresented groups	2.51	1.17	341
Faculty with terminal degrees	2.56	1.03	332
Recruiting/retaining minority faculty	2.65	1.17	337

Note. The rating scale is as follows: 1 = most important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = neutral, 4 = somewhat not important, 5 = not important.

Table 3

Average Importance Ratings for Quality Measures for the Administrative and Support Staff
Sample

Quality Measure	M	SD	n
Faculty ability to teach	1.00	.00	32
Student satisfaction with instruction	1.12	.33	33
Collaboration with business and industry	1.13	.34	32
Compensation of staff competitive with staff at other colleges	1.13	.34	32
Compensation for programs that encourage excellence	1.13	.34	32
Career counseling	1.16	.37	31
Faculty education/training	1.18	.39	33
Improvement of computer literacy skills	1.18	.39	33
Compensation for educational advancement	1.19	.40	32
Regular software and hardware upgrades	1.20	.50	25

Note. The rating scale is as follows: 1 = most important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = neutral,
4 = somewhat not important, 5 = not important.

Table 4

Average Importance Ratings for Quality Measures for the Full-time Faculty Sample

Quality Measure	M	SD	n
Faculty ability to teach	1.06	.24	17
Transfer counseling	1.18	.39	17
Articulation agreements with other colleges	1.18	.39	17
Improvement of oral communication	1.19	.40	16
Success rates: licensure/certification examinations	1.24	.44	17
Compensation of staff competitive with staff at other colleges	1.24	.44	17
Faculty education/training	1.24	.44	17
Career counseling	1.24	.44	17
State appropriation (funding)	1.24	.44	17
Faculty time dedicated to teaching	1.25	.45	16

Note. The rating scale is as follows: 1 = most important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = neutral, 4 = somewhat not important, 5 = not important.

Table 5

Average Importance Ratings for Quality Measures for the Part-time Faculty Sample

Quality Measure	M	SD	n
Faculty ability to teach	1.21	.57	28
Compensation of staff competitive with staff at other colleges	1.35	.56	26
Compensation for programs that encourage excellence	1.46	.58	26
Student satisfaction with instruction	1.46	.58	28
Improvement of writing skills	1.48	.64	27
Improvement of oral communication	1.52	.89	27
Percent of students who meet academic goal	1.52	.64	27
Faculty education/training	1.54	.88	28
Improvement of critical thinking skills	1.56	.80	27
Basic employment skills	1.58	.76	26

Note. The rating scale is as follows: 1 = most important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = neutral, 4 = somewhat not important, 5 = not important.

Table 6

Average Importance Ratings for Quality Measures for the Student Sample

Quality Measure	M	SD	n
Faculty education/training	1.23	.54	191
Faculty ability to teach	1.27	.55	191
Student satisfaction with instruction	1.34	.59	190
Convenient scheduling of courses	1.43	.67	178
Success rates: licensure/certification examinations	1.49	.73	191
Transfer counseling	1.51	.76	182
Career counseling	1.51	.75	184
Transfer rates of courses	1.51	.74	181
Faculty ability to use technology in instruction	1.54	.72	191
Employment related to field of study	1.54	.77	186

Note. The rating scale is as follows: 1 = most important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = neutral, 4 = somewhat not important, 5 = not important.

Table 7

Average Importance Ratings for Quality Measures for the Community Resident Sample

Quality Measure	M	SD	n
Faculty ability to teach	1.00	.00	34
Faculty education/training	1.15	.36	34
Communication with students	1.21	.42	33
Faculty ability to use technology in instruction	1.35	.69	34
Success rates: licensure/certification examinations	1.35	.49	34
Collaboration with business and industry	1.37	.49	35
Career counseling	1.38	.60	34
Expansion of job skills training	1.38	.55	34
Convenient scheduling of courses	1.39	.66	33
Compensation for programs that encourage excellence	1.39	.83	33
Expenditures for maintaining information technology	1.39	.50	33

Note. The rating scale is as follows: 1 = most important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = neutral, 4 = somewhat not important, 5 = not important.

Table 8

Results of the One-Way ANOVA Comparisons for Each Quality Measure

Quality Measure	SS	F	p
Faculty ability to teach	4.09	(5, 305) 3.62	.003
Faculty ability to use technology in instruction	9.95	(5, 307) 4.08	.001
Institutional expenditures dedicated to instruction	9.74	(5, 300) 3.68	.003
Faculty with terminal degrees	18.90	(5, 296) 3.73	.003
Training opportunities for part-time faculty	13.46	(5, 302) 3.62	.003
GPA at transfer institutions	12.42	(5, 299) 3.57	.004
Collaboration with business and industry	20.80	(5, 293) 8.86	.000
Counseling for high school students to align with 9-12 curriculum	12.30	(5, 299) 3.83	.002
Career counseling	7.73	(5, 297) 3.29	.007
Increase tuition to align with increase in program delivery	27.85	(5, 290) 5.18	.000
Use of student outcomes assessment in budgeting process	16.42	(5, 290) 4.39	.001
Adequate contingency reserve account	20.18	(5, 289) 5.42	.000
Secure funding for academic programs	9.86	(5, 292) 3.65	.003
Expenditures for maintaining college facilities	9.73	(5, 291) 3.38	.006
Compensation of staff competitive with staff at other colleges	23.41	(5, 289) 7.58	.000
Compensation for programs that encourage excellence	16.39	(5, 290) 4.01	.002
Compensation for educational advancement	11.45	(5, 290) 3.84	.002
Training in instructional pedagogies	16.49	(5, 290) 5.26	.000
In-service technology training for employees	17.54	(5, 290) 5.47	.000
Support for an integrated student system	14.12	(5, 291) 4.96	.000
Technology in instructional settings	11.83	(5, 289) 4.05	.001
Internet presence that promotes programs	11.59	(5, 291) 3.66	.003
Increase visibility in local area	20.31	(5, 289) 5.80	.000
Communication with K-12 districts	28.11	(5, 292) 7.19	.000
Communication with students	8.30	(5, 290) 3.31	.006

Note. The rating scale is as follows: 1 = most important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = neutral, 4 = somewhat not important, 5 = not important.

Table 9

Quality Areas for the Strategic Plan

Quality Area	Average Rank	Percent of Quality Team Respondents who Ranked Area
Enabling students to reach their academic goals	1.57	7
Serving underrepresented students	2.67	3
Faculty training and compensation	2.86	7
Communication with all stakeholders	3.00	6
State-of-the-art facilities	3.00	5
Collaboration with external agencies	3.33	7
Information technology	4.00	3

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: DEVELOPMENT OF A STRATEGIC PLAN BASED ON THE EVALUATION OF RELEVANT QUALITY MEASURES FOR JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE

Author(s): MARY-LOU D'ALLEGRO, Ed.D.

Corporate Source: JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE	Publication Date: OCTOBER 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [X]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please	Signature: *Mary Lou D'Allegro*	Printed Name/Position/Title: MARY-LOU D'ALLEGRO
	Organization/Address: JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE 1215 HOUBOLT ROAD, JOLIET, IL 60431	Telephone: 815.280.2568 FAX: 815.729.4256
		E-Mail Address: MDALLEGRO@JJC.EDU Date: 10-8-02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone:	301-552-4200
Toll Free:	800-799-3742
FAX:	301-552-4700
e-mail:	info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW:	http://ericfacility.org