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Opportunity (Purpose or Primary Reason for Project):

ICC has numerous mechanisms to collect student and employee feedback, which includes both satisfaction and dissatisfaction data. (See attached chart) Opportunities or gaps in these processes include the following:

- Data is not aggregated college-wide to identify common issues or opportunities for improvement
- Feedback processes do not all have mechanisms for tracking responses and/or resolution to students/employees
- Service recovery is limited and not standardized college-wide
- Data collection/analysis is not standardized college-wide to insure validity and reliability
- There is a gap of 1.02 between importance and satisfaction on the 2008 SSI for ‘Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available (item 67)

Business Case (Budget Information):

Lack of a systematic process to collect, analyze and act on student and employee feedback may cause the college to miss opportunities to:

- Identify and correct issues that cause dissatisfaction and compromise ICC’s effort to provide an ‘Exceptional Educational Experience.’ It is generally accepted that effective feedback and complaint processes increase customer (student) referrals to generate additional business (enrollments).
- Process owners may spend time and money to act independently when a coordinated effort would have been more efficient
- Cost and consequences of poor service recovery and/or problem resolution can be large (the cost to gain a new customer typically far exceeds the cost to retain a current customer)
- The Baldrige and AQIP feedback reports both cited the lack of a systematic campus wide process to collect, analyze, identify trends and communicate complaint information in order to address student and stakeholder issues and concerns. Acting on this OFI (Opportunity for Improvement) will strengthen future AQIP System Portfolios and Baldrige applications.
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Goal (Expected Outcomes, Deliverables, and/or Results):
Phase I (Sept./Oct., 2011)
- Determine all current sources of feedback and complaints and identify process owners (to include channels, communication of channels, process to receive, resolve and track, etc)
- Determine student needs and requirements for feedback/complaint channels
- Determine VOB (needs of the organization for aggregation and analysis)
- Categorize feedback/complaints by type, validity, severity, etc.
- Identify unmet needs/gaps in feedback/complaint processes

Phase II (Oct.-Dec., 2011)
- Identify criteria/standards for service recovery and service recovery options (Need VOC from Phase I)
- Develop mechanisms to insure student awareness of feedback channels (Need VOC from Phase I)
- Develop additional means to collect feedback/complaint data where gaps exist (Need VOC and Analysis from Phase I)
- Develop a process to aggregate feedback from all sources and identify common themes in order to address issues with broad dissatisfaction and confirm areas of excellence (Need understanding of mechanisms and types of data from Phase I and from previous step; could be done concurrently with next step as sub-group (1) of the team)
- Develop process for responding to student feedback, capturing results and implementing the appropriate service recovery (Need understanding of types, current processes and tracking from Phase I; could be done concurrently with previous step as a sub-group (2) of the team)
- Establish a process for communicating feedback throughout the College to make use of the data (Need understanding of Analysis process from above)
- Identify leading measures to provide more timely analysis of complaint/feedback process (Need all from above)
- Develop communication and training needed to implement the improved feedback and complaint processes (Need all from above)
- Establish an overall process owner to ensure processes are appropriately reviewed for effectiveness and improvement and data is aggregated, communicated and effectively used

Scope (Constraints, Boundaries, and/or Key Risks):
- The project will focus on student feedback and complaint mechanisms, which may include employees in some cases. Feedback mechanisms specifically for employees, such as an employee discrimination complaint are out of scope for this project, but improvements may be replicated post-project to include them.
- An internal channel or mechanism is in scope if the student provides feedback/complaint data that suggests ICC has done something incorrectly or could do something better. For example, customer service email survey, Facebook, web portals, etc.
- An internal channel or mechanism is out of scope if a set of specific rules are applied to a set of conditions (i.e. Grade Exclusion Policy where grades are excluded based on elapsed time and grade received)
- Non-credit data will be in scope only with respect to aggregating college-wide data for analysis.

Timeline (Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, and Control):
Define/Measure: Sept-Oct 2011 – Phase 1
Analyze/Improve: Oct-Dec 2011 – Phase 2
Adjusted timeline as of 12.06.11 for phase 2: Analyze/Improve: Dec 2011-Feb 2012
Primary Measures:

- Gap between student importance and satisfaction ratings with feedback channels on SSI (i.e. awareness of feedback channels, perception of getting the ‘run around’)
- Number of complaints by type/severity
- Percentage of complaints with timely response/resolution as appropriate (timeliness to be determined by team)
- Time to respond/resolve complaint
- Student satisfaction with feedback channels/response/recovery (process measure embedded in feedback processes and to be determined by team)
- Cost of service recovery (time, financial, lost customers)

Data & Supporting Documents

- Feedback Summary
- Student Feedback Collection Process Diagram
- Web Portal Screen Shots