

Development of the Malcolm Baldrige Award Criteria into the Culture of the South Carolina
Commission on Higher Education

I have attended various seminars on TQM, Quality, Improvement, Malcolm Baldrige, etc. From this exposure I began to recognize the validity and the necessity of entities having a structured improvement initiative in place and operating effectively. As of the beginning of the 2002-2003 Certified Public Manager program the staff of the Commission on Higher Education had not implemented a formal monitoring system to allow for a structured examination of the results of the Commission's efforts and the accomplishments in relation to the mission and strategic plan. Therefore I decided that the Commission could benefit universally from implementing a formal initiative to gauge the results of its operations and focus on methods of improvement.

OBJECTIVE

The overall objective of this project is to implement the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria into the culture of the Commission on Higher Education. The following lists the steps that will be needed to reach the overall objective.

1. To study and assess the Commission on Higher Education's mission and strategic plan and determine the fit in relation to what we do.
2. To educate the top executives (executive management team, aka EMT) of the Commission on the Malcolm Baldrige National Award Criteria.
3. To gain "buy in" from the EMT of the Commission.
4. To educate the entire staff of the Commission on the Malcolm Baldrige National Award Criteria.

5. To form a steering committee consisting of representatives from each of the four Divisions of the Commission.
6. Devise a realistic strategic plan to fit the role of the Commission on Higher Education.
7. Develop key performance measures; determine benchmarks and data collection processes. Also, develop a method to determine key improvement areas, and a system to monitor the implementation and outcome of the adopted improvement resolutions.

OBJECTIVE STATUS

1. To study and assess the Commission on Higher Education's mission (see below) and strategic plan and determine the fit in relation to what we do.

The mission statement reads as follows, "The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education will promote quality and efficiency in the State system of higher education with the goal of fostering economic growth and human development in South Carolina."

This statement is deemed to be too broad and all-encompassing of higher education. The Commission's role in higher education is to be a coordinating board of the higher education institutions in South Carolina. The Commission certainly plays a role in fostering economic growth and human development in the State but this is a coordinated effort of the Commission, institutions of higher education and the General Assembly. The Commission, with the institutions input, provides direction and develops regulations for the institutions and acts as an advocate of the colleges and universities. Developing a

modified mission proposal will be the responsibility of the Baldrige Steering Committee.

Some resistance is expected from certain factions of the agency.

The current strategic plan addresses goals that are efforts of higher education as a whole.

The Commission plays a role in reaching these goals however the plan is not agency-specific. The Baldrige Steering Committee will be charged with the responsibility of developing a 3-5 year strategic plan proposal that will address the planning processes, strategies, and action plans for this agency only.

2. To educate the top executives (executive management team, aka EMT) of the Commission on the Malcolm Baldrige National Award Criteria.

On August 26, 2002, after the regular weekly EMT meeting I provided a 2 hour presentation on the Baldrige criteria. Interest, skepticism and fear were the three emotions expressed during the presentation. There were thought provoking questions raised and support was offered from the Executive Director. As a result of the meeting the EMT became aware of the potential improvements that could be derived through implementation of such processes but support varied greatly from the six members.

3. To gain "buy in" from the EMT of the Commission.

There was a varying degree of support amongst the EMT members. The members that exuded a fear of change had difficulty seeing beyond the belief that an improvement

initiative would only add more work to an ever-depleting workforce. These members seemed to buy into this idea because the annual accountability report and the Agency Director's Salary Commission adopted the Baldrige Criteria as an effective tool to gauge budgets and Director's salary increases. Other members were able to visualize the potential process improvements that would allow the ever-depleting workforce to manage the day-to-day operations in a more efficient and effective manner. In order to relieve some of the fears that were evident I asked Frank Fusco, Budget and Control Board Executive Director, and proponent of the Baldrige Criteria to provide a Baldrige presentation to the full-staff. This will be addressed further in #4 below.

4. To educate the entire staff of the Commission on the Malcolm Baldrige National Award Criteria.

To propose the implementation of the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria it was essential for all staff members to become aware of the Baldrige criteria, how it was developed, how it could help, and what it meant to the Commission and to individuals jobs and responsibilities. Frank Fusco agreed to speak to the Commission staff. On September 3, 2002 a full-staff meeting was held and Mr. Fusco spoke for approximately 2 ½ hours on the Baldrige Criteria. Interest was shown throughout the participants and Mr. Fusco was able to relieve some anxiety that existed. We have supplied the majority of the staff with the "Pocket Guide to the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria" for further review and study.

5. To form a steering committee consisting of representatives from each of the four Divisions of the Commission.

Members

Chair: Mr. Charlie Fitzsimmons, Director of Administration & External Relations

Finance Representative: Joe Pearman, Senior Project Analyst

Planning & Assessment Representative: Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong, Director of Planning and Assessment

Academic Affairs Representative: KaTina Johnson, Senior Administrative Assistant

Student Services Representative: Dr. Karen Woodfaulk, Director of Student Services

The responsibilities for members of the Baldrige Steering Committee will be to:

- Oversee the development and measure of the key performance indicators related to their division and measures that cut across all divisions
- Collect data, assess the results, recommend improvement and implement these improvement processes
- Assist in preparation of the Annual Accountability Report
- Reporting to the steering committee
- Ensure the Division Directors are kept apprised of the progress of the Committee and the results of the Division's key performance indicators.

6. Devise a realistic strategic plan to fit the role of the Commission on Higher Education.

The steering committee will be the catalyst in the proposal of the new strategic plan. The committee has yet to meet on this item as of yet. We are awaiting a date by the Committee Chair to discuss this matter.

7. Develop key performance measures; determine benchmarks and data collection processes. Also, develop a method to determine key improvement areas, and a system to monitor the implementation and outcome of the adopted improvement resolutions.

The rewording of the mission (if deemed necessary by the committee) and the development of the strategic plan will need to be the first steps to designing performance measures. However a small contingent of Baldrige proponents within the office have met and developed certain measures that may be implemented by the Steering Committee once the strategic plan process is complete. We developed 2 goals:

- a. Collection of data: We collect a vast amount of data from the institutions of higher education, both public and independent. Therefore we felt it was important to analyze the data collection processes.
- b. Customer Satisfaction: Although there is still some difference of opinion of who is the Commission on Higher Education's customer we felt that the institutions and their management were a prime customer. Therefore customer satisfaction is one of our goals.

We have developed five measures from these two goals to aide in determining the effectiveness of our operations. These measures are listed in **Attachments A-E**.

The Commission issues an annual Statistical Abstract. The Abstract contains tuition, finance, facilities, and faculty statistical data of the Colleges and Universities in South Carolina. We have designed and included in the back of the Abstract a customer satisfaction survey (**See Attachment F**). This survey has yet to be formally included as part of the proposed measures. However we hope that this survey will be one of a number of surveys used in the future to assess customer satisfaction.

SYNOPSIS

This project will have a distinct impact on the processes the Commission on Higher Education has had in place for years. With sufficient focus and support from the leadership of the Commission operations will be streamlined and the needs of the customers will become a known factor. Fact-based decision making will replace gut-based decisions and good guesses. In a time such as these, where the State is experiencing economic imbalance and budget cuts that put a strain on the workforce, not implementing an improvement initiative such as the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria may be suicide for the agency. The flow of this project has not met the initial timeline (**Attachment G**) that was constructed. This is mainly attributable to the possibility of tough decisions being made on documenting where we need to be five years down the road and how we are going to get there (fear of change resides here). These decisions are also required to be made by a group of individuals that have an inordinate amount of

demands placed on their time schedules. When this project began it was noted that the time issue would be a roadblock however it has been a learning experience to see the difficulty of convincing others that change can be positive.

ATTACHMENT A

PROPOSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES

DIVISION: ALL DIVISIONS

NAME:

GOAL 1 : PROVIDE ACCURATE DATA FOR PUBLIC USE

Description of measure

Evaluate accuracy of data

Input Measure

1. How many times does data have to be resubmitted?

2. What were the reasons for data resubmission?

Output Measure

1. Resubmission rates over a 6 month high data submission period

2. Common reasons for resubmissions over the same 6 month period

Outcome Measure

1. Decrease in resubmission rates

2. Evaluate common reasons and change process to help eliminate common reasons

ATTACHMENT B

PROPOSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES

DIVISION: ALL DIVISIONS

NAME:

GOAL 1: PROVIDE ACCURATE DATA FOR PUBLIC USE

Description of measure

Evaluate Usefulness of Data to CHE

Input Measure

1. Prioritize all data reports within each division for divisional use
2. Prioritize all data reports within CHE for CHE use
3. Ask selected institutional representatives to prioritize CHE data use
4. Gather selected institutional representatives for a focus group on why specific reports aren't used.

Output Measure

1. Analyze data for prevailing trends between groups
2. Analyze focus group information for patterned trends

Outcome Measure

For all reports that fall at the bottom third of the priority lists for two or more groups,
re-evaluate presentation of data; reassess possible internal uses not realized.
Either eliminate report or present data report in more user friendly fashion

ATTACHMENT C

PROPOSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES

DIVISION: ALL DIVISIONS

NAME:

GOAL 1 : PROVIDE ACCURATE DATA FOR PUBLIC USE

Description of measure

Evaluate process used for gathering data

Input Measure

Survey to institutional users of data. Survey will target ease of collection, general usefulness, timeliness, etc.

Output Measure

Number of returned surveys

Satisfaction rate

Outcome Measure

Have we met a predetermined benchmark to evaluate satisfaction rate.

For example, if we believe that the satisfaction rate of users should be at equal to

or greater than 85%, is there other peer data we can use to

compare our satisfaction rate which would allow us to be satisfied that the benchmark

is valid?

ATTACHMENT D

PROPOSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES

GOAL 2 : INCREASE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

Description of measure

A. Survey and/or focus groups involving to EXTERNAL customers.

EXTERNAL Customers identified as 1) institutions, 2) legislators

3) Students/Parents/High School Counselors 4) Other outside agencies/entities

B. Comparison with other State agencies

Input Measure

1. Number of surveys returned. Return rate

2. Number of people responding to focus group invitation

3. Number of evaluations returned from face-to-face or group presentations
(students/

high school counselors/parents)

4. Satisfaction rate of two other State agencies survey (if we can get)

Output Measure

Percentage of external customers satisfied with services

Number of patterned responses in focus group satisfied with services

Comparison of CHE satisfaction rate with other State agency rates

Outcome Measure

Increase of xx% in satisfaction rate of EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS OR

CHE external customer satisfaction rate should equal or exceed other State agencies'

satisfaction rates

ATTACHEMENT E

PROPOSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES

DIVISION: ALL DIVISIONS

NAME:

GOAL 2 : INCREASE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

Description of measure

A. Survey and/or focus groups involving to INTERNAL customers.

INTERNAL Customers identified as CHE Agency Staff

A. Survey and/or focus groups involving to INTERNAL customers.

B. Comparison with other State agencies

Input Measure

1. Number of surveys returned. Return rate

2. Number of people responding to focus group invitation

3. Satisfaction rate of two other State agencies survey (if we can get)

4. Retention rate of employees

5. Leave Usage of employees

Output Measure

Percentage of INTERNAL customers satisfied

Number of patterned responses in focus group satisfied with services

Comparison of CHE employee satisfaction rate with other State agency rates

Analysis of retention rate of employees

Analysis and comparison of leave rates of employees to other agencies

Outcome Measure

Increase of xx% in satisfaction rate of INTERNAL STAFF

CHE INTERNAL STAFF satisfaction rate should equal or exceed other State agencies'

satisfaction rates

Retention rates should be benchmarked with an outside entity

Leave rates should be comparable to other Agencies

Attachment F

Timeline Chart for Implementation of Malcolm Baldrige Criteria

<u>Task</u>	<u>August</u>	<u>Sept</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>	<u>Jan</u>
Meet with EMT to discuss overview of Baldrige	26th					
Full Staff attendance at Frank Fusco's Baldrige presentation		3rd				
Director's meet with their staff to discuss mission, and possible key performance measures, assign an action person** from the Division to sit on the Baldrige task force.		11th				
Meet with senior management to develop strategic plan for CHE. Administration will oversee the development of the plan.						Waiting for completion and approval from Commission
Determine key performance measures for the Agency and stipulate the method of collection and benchmarks.			Five proposed measures completed			
Baldrige Task Force meets to collaborate on collection of data and measurement processes. Report on current events and discuss the direction of the agency as it relates to the Baldrige criteria.			Meeting not Called	Meeting not Called	Meeting not Called	Meeting not Called

** The responsibilities for members of the Baldrige task force will be to oversee the measure of the key performance indicators related to their Division. To include collection of data, assessing the results, recommending improvement and implementing these improvement processes, assist in preparation of the Annual Accountability report, reporting to the task force, and ensuring that the Division Director is kept apprised of the progress of the Baldrige Task Force and the results of the Division's key performance indicators. Charlie Fitzsimmons will be the representative of the Administration Division and will Chair this Committee.