

6. ORGANIZATIONAL QUALITY AND COMMUNICATION IMPROVEMENT (QCI)

Rutgers QCI—the University Program for Organizational Quality and Communication Improvement—was established in the fall of 1993. This report describes the context, background, and accomplishments of Rutgers QCI since its inception. Further, it provides both qualitative and quantitative data on QCI program activities, as well as a plan for continued implementation and future directions.

The report is organized to reflect key issues identified by the MSA-QCI Committee. They are: (1) national and state context; (2) Rutgers context and the QCI program; (3) campus summaries; (4) summary, evaluation and recommendations. The area committees and their membership are listed in Appendices 1 and 2.

THE NATIONAL CONTEXT

American higher education is widely acknowledged for academic excellence; indeed students come from all over the world to study in U.S. colleges and universities. At the same time, however, higher education institutions are also increasingly criticized by those we serve through instruction, scholarship, and outreach because of organizational inefficiencies and a lack of a service orientation. For well over a decade, these characterizations of higher education have signaled a change in the way in which colleges and universities are perceived by a growing number of our constituencies. A widening gap has developed between the views of faculty and staff who hold traditional views of the value of higher education, on the one hand, and other constituents—students, parents, employers, taxpayers, legislators, visitors, and the general public—who often have different perspectives on:

- The purpose of a college education
- The process through which the direction for higher education should be set
- The manner in which higher education should be funded
- Whether college and university employees are sufficiently productive
- The adequacy of institutional effectiveness and efficiency
- The importance of being responsive to the expectations of those who utilize and benefit from the teaching, research, and outreach services of colleges and universities.

Such differences in perspective between higher education professionals and the public and other constituencies create barriers to fulfilling institutional missions, undermine the work of the faculty and staff, exacerbate public criticism of higher education, weaken financial and political support, and decrease job satisfaction and security for university employees. To a large degree, this “satisfaction gap” results from different views on what constitutes excellence in higher education.

Traditionally, measures of excellence in higher education have been based largely on peer and professional judgments, which in turn are grounded in academic, disciplinary distinctions of the institution, its programs, faculty, staff, and students. These assessments have been, and continue to be, of vital

importance in assessing academic excellence, and in identifying academic strengths and areas in need of improvement and resources.

For all their strengths, however, peer and professional reviews alone often fail to take account of some of the needs and expectations of the groups which colleges and universities serve through instruction, scholarship, and outreach, and upon whose support the future of higher education depends. In addition to being concerned about the academic excellence of programs and faculty, external constituencies are typically also concerned about service excellence, including such factors as efficiency, responsiveness, accessibility, “user-friendliness,” and value.

The economic, political, and social realities of recent years have forced universities to stand back, reflect, and identify ways to maximize their resources better to serve their various constituencies. These self-examinations have led to the realization that improvements are possible and necessary, and that cooperation, collaboration, and an emphasis on both academic and service excellence are keys to maximizing organizational functioning now and in the future.

OVERVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONAL QUALITY PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Colleges and universities across the country are undertaking a variety of initiatives to meet the many contemporary challenges facing higher education, including:

- Initiating organizational quality programs
- Forming quality-focused partnerships with local and national organizations
- Participating in quality-oriented groups and associations.

Organizational quality programs are designed to support existing organizational improvement efforts and to help guide institutions toward new approaches to self-assessment and organizational improvement. As in healthcare, government, and business, quality programs in higher education are intended to improve key processes within the organization, enhance communication internally and externally, increase interdepartmental collaboration, and to make service excellence a more visible and valued part of the university culture.

Much of the impetus for the higher education initiatives in the area of organizational quality can be traced to the early 1990s. In 1992, IBM provided nine institutions with major grants to begin quality programs.¹ Today, the number of higher-education quality programs is well over 200.² Among the AAU member institutions that now have quality programs are: Cornell, Harvard, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, Penn, Penn State, Rutgers, Syracuse, Texas, and Wisconsin. (See Table 1). According to a recent *Quality Progress* survey, 84% of the 216 colleges and universities that responded are implementing quality practices in their administration.³

¹ Rutgers QCI, Overview and Update.

² American Association of Higher Education.

³ *Quality Progress*, volume 29, number 8 (August 1996).

In 1993, the Total Quality Forum, a national organization composed of quality leaders from major corporations and universities, reported that 31 universities and 18 corporations had developed—or would soon develop—formalized cooperative arrangements for addressing quality improvement.⁴ By 1995, 64 universities and corporations had established formalized quality partnerships.⁵ (See Table 2.) Benefits cited for such partnerships include advice and counsel, expertise and resources, information and material sharing, staff development, and technical assistance. Depending on the relationship, there may also be opportunities for internships and fellowships, collaborative research, and organization-to-organization dialogue.

Colleges and universities have also formed professional groups and associations to heighten information sharing and collaboration across institutions. In January 1993, the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) created the AAHE Quality Initiative to explore the application of continuous improvement principles to higher education and to provide effective exchange of ideas and findings regarding continuous quality improvement. The AAHE program has included two major initiatives: Academic Quality Consortium (AQC) and the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Project. AQC is composed of leaders from 21 campuses (Rutgers among them) where there is an institutional commitment to organizational quality assessment and improvement. The organization provides opportunities to learn and work collaboratively by exchanging information, building on each other's experiences, and expanding on assessment practices already being used. The second initiative, the AAHE CQI Project, was formed to share information on advances with the wider higher education community.

In January 1995, AAHE formed a Higher Education Quality Coordinators Network (CoordNet), composed of approximately 100 campus quality directors. Another effort designed to facilitate partnerships and collaboration is the Conference Board, National Higher Education Quality Council, established in 1994 to encourage information sharing between corporations and universities. Rutgers participates in both.

CORE PRINCIPLES

Higher education quality programs have taken various shapes and sizes, but most have in common an emphasis on the following concepts.

Blending Academics and a Service Orientation

A major research university can be conceived of as a complex organizational system composed of two interdependent components, each with its own associated activities and culture. The first component is academic. This is the domain of the faculty in which excellence is primarily measured by achievement and recognition within one's academic discipline. In the case of individual faculty members, this is generally accomplished by activities that take place outside one's own university—such as publication in journals reviewed by outside disciplinary peers—and by being selected for leadership roles within field. Academic

⁴ Total Quality Forum V (1993). A Report of Proceedings of the Total Quality Forum V: Rise to the Challenge: Best Practices and Leadership. Motorola University: Schaumburg, IL.

⁵ Ibid.

accomplishments are generally measured by the geographic range of their reputation. Thus, faculty members or programs with an excellent reputation in a region are generally regarded as more distinguished than those with an excellent reputation limited to their institution, and a national reputation is better than one limited to a region, and best of all is being prominent internationally.

The second component of the university is the systems, facilities, and support services necessary to create and maintain the kind of environment in which academic excellence—in instruction, research, and service outreach—can be achieved. Necessary to these outcomes is excellent service provided by units such as: facilities, computing, sponsored research support, admissions, registration, communications, advancement, housing, and food services. These services are primarily provided to students, faculty, staff, and other constituencies on campus. The focus of service excellence is within an institution, and the university community and prospective students, alumni, families, and other constituencies for whom these services are provided are in the best position to evaluate the quality of the activities.

Sometimes the service and academic components of research universities are seen as distinct and even unrelated, and tension and competition may exist between them. In a broader institutional perspective, however, academic excellence and a service orientation are inextricably interdependent. For example, if students or family are dissatisfied with their university experience for whatever reasons, student, alumni, public, and state legislative support erodes, and the reputation of the institution is affected. This undermines the university, and reduces the resources available to support the work of the institution and its faculty. And yet without the academic distinctions of the faculty and its programs, the status, prestige, and potential for teaching excellence and student satisfaction are undermined, leading again to decreased admissions and lowered citizen support. Thus, a university's success in achieving its instructional, scholarly, and public service goals is ultimately dependent upon excellence in both academics and service. The organizational quality framework can contribute meaningfully to each domain and to strengthened linkages between the two.

Process Improvement and Collaboration

The work of a college or university can be seen as consisting of a number of key processes associated with instruction, research, outreach, and the creation and maintenance of an environment which appropriately supports these core activities. Work processes develop over time, sometimes by default, and in many instances there are opportunities for improvements in their effectiveness, efficiency, and the extent to which they meet the needs of faculty, staff, students, and other constituencies. Through systematic analysis it is also possible to determine steps that could be shortened or eliminated, procedures that could be streamlined, additional training that could be provided to assist the people to function more effectively, technology that could be introduced to expedite the process, and so on.

Traditionally, institutions of higher education have been structured around essential functions with specific departments responsible for their administration. The result has been the development of elaborate vertical structures and reporting relationships within each functional area. Vertical structures facilitate interaction within functional divisions. At the same time, they set up obstacles to interaction and collaboration between departments. Individuals and departments often become detached from one another and from the overall mission of the organization. As a result, work process fragmentation, compartmentalization, and an “it’s not my job” mentality tend to evolve. Improving the effectiveness or efficiency of these processes therefore often requires the creation of cross-functional, cross-departmental, and cross-role teams whose task is to facilitate and regularize collaboration and coordination.

Communication

Communication is the process through which university directions are set, leadership and collaboration take place, information is gathered and disseminated to and from faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders, and work process coordination and collaboration occur. It is also the mechanism through which relationships are formed and developed—relationships that are essential to the creation of a culture and spirit of teamwork which are necessary to create a shared commitment to excellence within the institution. Communication needs and functions within higher education institutions are quite easy to describe and yet extremely difficult to achieve effectively. With the increasing array of challenges facing colleges and universities, effective communication and collaboration—involving internal and external constituencies—require commitment and communication competence from individuals throughout the institution.

Leadership

Higher education leadership requires a constellation of capabilities for vision-setting, communication, motivation, and consensus-building relative to the institution's mission, vision, and values. Leaders with these abilities are needed as role models throughout colleges and universities, in academic as well as administrative areas. Organizational quality programs strive to heighten awareness and further the development of leadership at all levels within colleges and universities.

Continuous Improvement

The pursuit of excellence requires a substantial commitment of time and resources to a process of continuous improvement and ongoing change. Continuous improvement implies a commitment throughout an organization to a recursive process, consisting of assessment, planning and testing improvements, evaluating outcomes, learning from failures as well as successes, implementing and sustaining successes, assessment, and so on. This includes identifying, studying, and comparing one's own processes to those of benchmark organizations that represent a standard of excellence and a focal point for performance comparison.

Service Orientation

Achieving the teaching, research, and outreach mission of an institution requires understanding and responsiveness to the needs and expectations of a wide range of internal and external constituencies. In addition to faculty, staff, and students, institutions must relate effectively to prospective students, alumni, potential employers, research funding sources, families, and the local community, as well as the general public. These relationships are developed through face-to-face, print, and telephone encounters between faculty and staff and members of these groups. In a given day, tens of thousands of these interactions occur in the context of teaching, research, and service. These encounters form the core of experiences that are remembered and retold, and collectively create the public face of the institution. Organizational quality programs emphasize the importance of understanding and striving to address the needs and the expectations of key stakeholder groups in order fully to achieve teaching, scholarly, and public service goals, recognizing also that their assessments of the institution translate into financial and reputational support or the lack thereof.

THE NEW JERSEY CONTEXT

Colleges and universities have been affected by changes in the environment at the state level. During the past several years, significant cuts in state funding have led to increased tuition costs at public institutions.

In New Jersey, these changes have been dramatic, and funding shortfalls have forced institutions to identify ways to increase revenues, decrease expenses, and operate more efficiently. Decreased resources have also stimulated increased competition among institutions for students and their tuition dollars, as well as for research and outreach revenues. These concerns led to a State Department of Higher Education mandate in 1993–94 charging all colleges and universities to undertake quality initiatives.

The reorganization of the Department of Higher Education has led to new relationships among institutions—and between institutions and prospective students—that are more market-driven than in the past. Increasingly aggressive marketing by some colleges and universities has caused others to reexamine their admissions practices, and has raised institutions’ awareness of student, parent, and public expectations, perceptions, and satisfaction as key considerations.

New Jersey’s institutions have also been stimulated by the state’s corporate community. New Jersey is the home of a number of corporations that are internationally-renowned for their leadership in organizational quality practices, and these organizations have heightened expectation levels among the state’s leaders and citizenry for service excellence in all sectors.

In March 1994, the New Jersey Business/Higher Education Forum sponsored a “Partnerships for Quality” conference held at Rutgers University. This one-day meeting offered one of the first opportunities for leaders of New Jersey business and academic communities to gather and explore possibilities for establishing partnerships to support organizational quality improvement in higher education.

In addition to individualized quality efforts, many New Jersey colleges and universities participate in other organizations as a vehicle for sharing information about organizational quality improvement. For example, many academic institutions are members of the New Jersey Higher Education Quality Roundtable, created to provide the opportunity for New Jersey colleges and universities to learn about and discuss the implications and applications of quality improvement in higher education.

A number of New Jersey colleges and universities have also become involved with Quality New Jersey (QNJ), a nonprofit association composed of representatives from private and public sector organizations concerned about improving quality practices within all sectors of the state. Members of the academic community are involved with various levels of QNJ including participation in the state’s award process—the New Jersey Quality Achievement Award (NJQAA) which recognizes excellence in organizational performance in business, healthcare, government, and education.

THE RUTGERS CONTEXT

RECOGNIZING THE NEED FOR AN ORGANIZATIONAL QUALITY PROGRAM

Soon after his appointment as president, Dr. Lawrence called for a review of university operations. Three committees were constituted to review various aspects of university operations. The first, the Committee on Administrative Systems Efficiency (CASE) was charged to study and report on administrative systems efficiency. The committee concluded that the university is too large, too complex, and too cumbersome for effective management, resulting in many complaints about administrative processes.⁶

The CASE report provided the impetus that led to the eventual establishment of a quality program at Rutgers. As stated:

Although the university has made dramatic progress in the last decade in advancing its academic objectives, its administrative personnel, processes, and systems have not been developed simultaneously. Although many faculty have become increasingly entrepreneurial, the university's administrative infrastructure for supporting faculty initiatives has not developed a similar level of sophistication.⁷

Many of the problems identified by the committee were characterized as a need to review our service orientation. The emphasis of a number of offices providing services to the university community appears to be on control rather than service. In order to reestablish service as the highest priority, each employee in the university must have his or her daily responsibilities linked directly with the university's mission, goals and objectives.⁸

In its recommendations the committee called for the university to develop a team approach to a process of continuous improvement of service to all of our constituencies.⁹

Immediately following the completion of the CASE report, a follow-up committee charged to study "Routine Requests for Action" was formed. The first recommendation of the so-called "Red Tape Committee" was that Rutgers should establish a quality program with three objectives:

- (1) Service provided to the university community must be of the highest quality possible at the lowest reasonable price.
- (2) An orientation towards the need(s) of the user must be foremost in the day-to-day objectives of each department.

⁶ Report of the Committee on Administrative Systems Efficiency, Rutgers University, March 1991, p. 1.

⁷ *ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 14.

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 23.

- (3) The process should utilize the expertise and the judgment of university employees from all units.¹⁰

The third committee formed by President Lawrence in 1991 was charged to review university communications, inventory current efforts to disseminate university information, assess the effectiveness of the current practices, and recommend improvements.

Over the next few years, several studies were commissioned further to examine university operations, including an independent management audit that reviewed the university structure and established some benchmarks with nationally recognized comprehensive public research universities. This study identified areas and programs that needed the support of a quality program. Many academic and administrative units throughout the university were also seeking ways to improve the quality of their organizations and services, and there was support for the establishment of a university-wide coordinated effort to further these initiatives.

THE RUTGERS QCI PROGRAM

In September 1993 President Lawrence asked Dr. Brent Ruben, Professor of Communication, a faculty member with expertise in organizational behavior, communication processes, and the quality approach, to take the lead in establishing a university-wide quality improvement initiative. The program was named Rutgers QCI—the University Program for Organizational Quality and Communication Improvement—and Dr. Ruben was appointed executive director.

A fundamental goal of the university is to advance our standing as a premier institution, distinguished in teaching, research, and public service. A related goal is the advancement of our standing as a leading choice in higher education among our key constituencies. Rutgers QCI was created to support these goals, and to focus particularly on this second goal, which has a number of important implications for each of the groups that are critical to the university. Examples of these constituencies and desired outcomes include:

- Prospective students: Applying to Rutgers as their first choice
- Current students: Pleased to be attending their university of choice; feeling they are valued members of the university community with the potential and support to succeed
- Families: Proud to have a family member attending Rutgers; recommending RU to friends and acquaintances
- Alumni: Actively supporting the university and its initiatives
- Employers: Seeking out Rutgers graduates as employees; promoting the university among their employees for continuing education
- Colleagues at other institutions: Viewing Rutgers as a source of intellectual leadership
- The public: Valuing the university as an essential state resource; supporting our efforts to further advance excellence

¹⁰ Report of the Committee to Study Routine Requests for University Action, The Red Tape Committee, Rutgers University, February 1992, p. 6.

- Faculty: Pleased to serve on the faculty of a leading, well-supported institution enjoying respect locally, in New Jersey, nationally, and internationally
- Staff: Regarding Rutgers as a preferred workplace, where innovation, continuing improvement, and teamwork are valued; recommending Rutgers to others.

Advancing our standing as a premier institution and a leading choice among our key constituencies requires excellence in academics—a distinguished faculty, high-level research activities, innovative and engaging teaching/learning processes, supporting technology, and quality facilities.

Achieving these goals also requires excellence in communication and a service-oriented culture—enhanced visibility and prominence within the state and beyond; a welcoming physical environment; a friendly, supportive, and respectful social environment; expectations of success; responsive, integrated, accessible, and effective systems and services; and a sense of community.

The Rutgers QCI program was designed to address these goals by providing a coordinated, university-wide center for the development, study, application, and evaluation of organizational quality and communication frameworks, principles, and practices. More specifically, the goals of Rutgers QCI are to:

- (1) Establish and administer a coordinated, university-wide program for organizational quality and communication improvement;
- (2) Provide support, consultation and unit facilitation for expanding standards of excellence, improving work and communication processes and creating a service-oriented culture;
- (3) Serve as a center for excellence in developing, studying, applying, and evaluating organizational quality and communication improvement frameworks, principles, and practices, particularly as they apply to higher education.

QCI provides information and assistance to units in the conduct of self-assessment, and supports units in the improvement of program, systems, procedures and services, and the creation of a more service-oriented environment.

PROGRAM AREAS

The QCI program provides information and assistance to units in the conduct of self-assessment and to support units in the improvement of work processes and communication processes, and the creation of a more service-oriented environment. Specifically, QCI has developed and offers programs in five areas, briefly described in the following section:

- (1) **Assessment:** Organizational self-assessment, identification of strengths and areas for improvement, and action planning;
- (2) **Leadership:** Sharing information on contemporary leadership issues and strategies;
- (3) **Work Processes:** Effectiveness and efficiency of services, systems, and procedures;
- (4) **Faculty, staff and workplace climate:** Assessing and enhancing workplace climate;
- (5) **Service excellence:** Heightening service orientation and satisfaction.

Assessment

QCI has also taken a national leadership role in higher education quality assessment through the development and publication of the Excellence in Higher Education (EHE) organizational self-assessment system (originally called the Tradition of Excellence). This framework is an adaptation to higher education of the criteria and methodology in the Baldrige National Quality Award framework, which is in use

nationally and in some 35 states and foreign countries. The Rutgers EHE system sets out a framework with seven dimensions for conceptualizing organizational quality: (1) leadership; (2) planning; (3) service orientation; (4) information and analysis; (5) faculty, staff, and workplace climate; (6) process management; and (7) excellence levels and trends.

The EHE approach also provides a methodology for using the seven dimensions to rate the organizational quality of a university or any of its component units. Participation in the Rutgers EHE program simultaneously provides an organization with: (1) education in the essential organizational quality concepts; (2) clarification and documentation of the present level of functioning of the unit; (3) strategic plans; and (4) improvement goals and methods.

The program consists of a full-day self-assessment workshop, a half-day priority-setting and planning session several weeks later—at which improvement teams are formed—and follow-up sessions. Ten university units have participated in this process, including Cook College, University Facilities, the Learning Resource Centers, the Office of the Provost–Newark, the School of Law–Newark, University College–New Brunswick, Arts and Sciences–Newark, the Faculty of Management, Computing Services, and the College of Nursing. Participating units and participant evaluations are provided in the summary section of the report. An EHE manual and workbook have been developed for use at Rutgers and are also available to other colleges and universities.¹¹

Leadership

Seminars and workshops developed and offered by QCI provide a forum for discussing the role of leadership in organizational quality, process improvement, and service excellence. The introductory session is two hours in length, and a more extensive leadership workshop is a full day. The need for leadership at all levels guides the content of the workshop, which focuses on the importance of creating a more service oriented culture, the importance of communication and work process improvement, excellence indicators and measurement, and “best practices” sharing. Approximately 550 individuals have attended these programs as of April 1997. Participant evaluations of the program are discussed in the summary section of the report.

Work Process Improvement

Programs in this area help staff identify work processes that can and should be improved, and provide guidance as to how these changes can be made. Objectives of activities in the work process improvement program are threefold: (1) to provide tools and methods of measurement for assessing current work processes; (2) to collect data to identify and assess problem areas; and (3) to refine, improve, and reevaluate these processes. Specific training on process analysis, benchmarking, and root-cause analysis is available. Full-day workshops in the area of process improvement have been provided to approximately 190 participants, and QCI has assisted with the formation and facilitation of many ongoing process improvement teams in various areas of the university, including university facilities, undergraduate admissions, university communications, Cook College, the Rutgers Foundation, and university computing. A more detailed listing is provided in the following sections. Participant evaluations of the program are

¹¹ A national invitational conference on “Excellence in Higher Education” was sponsored by the AAHE in September 1997. Revenues from QCI publications and materials made available to other institutions offset the costs of development and production.

discussed in the summary section. *Process Improvement in Higher Education* and *Root Cause Analysis* workbooks developed for use at Rutgers and are available to other colleges and universities as well.

Faculty, Staff, and Workplace Climate

One of the challenges facing all universities is the creation of an enhanced sense of community. As a part of the effort to make our campuses friendlier, more cordial, cohesive and collaborative places to work, several specific programs have been instituted: an enhanced faculty/staff welcome program (1994), a faculty recognition program (1995), and a university new-employee orientation program (1996). In spring 1997, a Rutgers Faculty Retirement Task Force was also formed to expand faculty retirement information, services, and facilities.

To further these goals, an organizational climate inventory (OCI) has also been developed and pilot-tested in several units, and plans call for wider utilization in the upcoming months. The program was developed by QCI-based on a review of similar programs at Penn State, Johnson & Johnson, and the University of Michigan. OCI provides a method to assess how employees think and feel about their work at Rutgers, to help identify and prioritize organizational improvement needs, and to facilitate the university community's involvement in the improvement, planning, and implementation process.

Service Excellence

The service excellence program presents a framework for clarifying the relevance of the quality approach in higher education. The framework highlights: (1) the institutional (faculty/staff) view of "excellence" which emphasizes peer and professional judgments; (2) the organizational effectiveness perspective (based upon internal faculty and staff self-assessments); and (3) the constituent perspective (which highlights judgments by students, alumni, and external constituencies). The program specifically examines roles played by leaders and front-line staff in addressing the multiple perspective on excellence and in promoting a collegial, service-oriented, responsive environment. The core of the program is a one-day "Face of Rutgers" workshop for staff members at all levels, particularly those who have the most direct contact with students, visitors, and faculty/staff from other departments.

The service excellence program also includes a feedback system workshop, which assists units in developing methods for gathering and utilizing information on expectations and satisfaction levels from key constituency groups. To date, 1,300 individuals have participated in two or more of the service excellence workshops in this program. Participant evaluations are discussed in the summary section of this report. Service excellence publications and a video entitled *A Higher Education* developed for use at Rutgers are also available to other colleges and universities.

The QCI program reports directly to the president. During the first three years of operation, oversight was provided by the vice president for institutional research and planning and the vice president for administration and associate treasurer, reflecting the initial focus of QCI projects. In 1996, the oversight group was expanded to include the university vice president for academic affairs and the vice president for budgeting. The President's Cabinet and the administrative council of the university also play advisory roles.

Resources

The QCI program was funded by the university with very modest resources. Housed within the School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, its university-funded staff included the executive director at one-half time and two full-time members: a senior associate, and an administrative/clerical support person. Recently an education/training coordinator position and a part-time clerk-typist were

added. There are also provost-designated campus coordinators on the Camden and Newark campuses, and a university-wide, volunteer QCI educator network.

A significant portion of the fiscal and human resources were obtained from the private sector. Two of the major sources of funding were Johnson & Johnson and AT&T, both nationally recognized for their leadership in quality activities. Funding included three-year awards to five graduate assistants. During the past two years, both corporations have loaned an executive to provide on-campus assistance. Rutgers has also collaborated with both companies in the areas of corporate education and research.¹² In these and other ways, both companies have contributed substantial resources in support of the university's effort and the Rutgers/J&J and Rutgers/AT&T alliances have become models of useful collaboration between higher education and the corporate community.

The educator network is composed of talented and dedicated people who are interested in promoting and supporting teamwork and service within the university.

Individuals selected to be QCI educators are sponsored and supported by their immediate supervisors. Members of the network provide ongoing consultation, facilitation, assistance, and instructional support to units/departments.

UNIVERSITY COMMUNICATION ABOUT THE RUTGERS QUALITY EFFORT

QCI goals, plans, and programs have been publicized within the university through *Focus*, the faculty and staff newspaper, and through public presentations and workshops. Regular features in *Focus* have recognized quality improvement activities within the university and particular individual contributions through the "Making A Difference" series. (See listing in Appendix 3.)

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES BEYOND RUTGERS

Although less than four years old, the Rutgers QCI program is recognized within the state and nationally as a leader in the area of organizational quality and communication in higher education through its publications, quality programs, and outreach. Appendix 4 lists the QCI publications in full.

Presentations of the QCI philosophy and programs have been made at national invitational conferences and meetings such as the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), The Malcolm Baldrige Education Summit, Academic Quality Consortium (AQC), Higher Education-Business Total Quality Forum, Association of Communication Administrators (ACA), and the Conference Board. Rutgers has been invited to present its QCI model to faculty and staff from the University of Texas, Penn State University, the University of Maryland, Howard University, Wayne State University, and the University of Iowa.

¹² Rutgers QCI, Program for Organizational Quality and Communication Improvement, First Year Summary, January 1995, pp. 6-7. An example of joint research is the NSF proposal submitted in March 1997 by Rutgers, Johnson & Johnson, and AT&T to study the processes by which organizational innovations and "best practices" are disseminated and adopted, and the organizational, communicational, technological, and individual facilitators or barriers to this process. The project has been endorsed by the National Institute of Science and Technology (The Malcolm Baldrige Program).

The executive director serves on the Academic Quality Consortium, National Higher Education Quality Coordinators Group (CoordNet), Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards Education Pilot Team, Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards Examiners' Panel, and the Conference Board National Higher Education Quality Council.

Rutgers QCI plays an integral role in New Jersey through scholarly presentations at various forums and institutions, including the New Jersey Higher Education Quality Roundtable, Montclair State University, The College of New Jersey, Quality New Jersey, the New Jersey Quality Program, the Johnson & Johnson Quality Institute, and the AT&T School of Business.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE INITIATIVES

The findings of committees and external consultants on the status of the university's operations triggered an early interest within a number of individual units in the quality approach and service excellence.

ADMINISTRATION

In 1993–94, seminars and workshops introducing organizational quality and service excellence principles, practices, and concepts were presented to various university administrative groups including: the President's Cabinet, the Administrative Assembly, the Administrative Council, the Board of Directors of the Rutgers Alumni Association Board, the College Administrative Council, the Newark provost's staff, and participants at the treasurer's luncheon.

Presentations were also made to student groups, including the president's Student Advisory Council, and to students enrolled in organizational studies courses in the Graduate School of Education, College of Nursing, and School of Communication, Information, and Library Studies.

The sessions were designed to emphasize the importance of quality in leadership at all levels in the university to promote collaboration and consensus-building, and to encourage increased attention to the importance of creating a more service-oriented culture.

FACILITIES

One of the first major quality efforts was initiated by facilities in 1993. This division employs 950 workers on the three campuses, making the improvement initiative an important and challenging undertaking. Named Total Quality Service (TQS), facilities' effort has been directed by steering and advisory committees, composed of the leadership and staff from facilities in New Brunswick, Newark, and Camden, representatives of QCI, and an independent consultant with experience implementing quality programs in facilities organizations.

The TQS project began with a review and analysis of the facilities self-study and a survey of facilities' users conducted by the Eagleton Institute. The initiative, which included discussions with deans, interviews with users, and meetings with facilities staff, was aimed at identifying specific needed improvements and methods for creating a more service-oriented culture within the unit.

As a part of the quality program, the facilities management group developed new mission and vision statements that emphasized service, quality, and cost-effectiveness. In their words,

[T]he division has renewed its commitment to continually improve the services, effectiveness, and quality in support of the Rutgers physical environment, and to exceed the expectations of their community customers; to have the highest respect for fellow workers, customers, and the surrounding environment; and to provide a working environment wherein each facilities employee is afforded opportunity for individual development, personal growth, pride in accomplishment and recognition.

Initiatives have been undertaken to benchmark facilities processes against other higher education and private-sector organizations, and additional specific projects have been undertaken to improve:

- Unit-wide self-assessment and planning
- Zone maintenance
- Alterations and renovations process
- Billing and communication
- Classroom maintenance and assistance-requests procedures
- Work orders and service-call procedures
- Postal operations
- Expense recovery
- Warehouse operations
- Facility project administration
- Building coordinators' functioning
- Internal communication
- Front-line staff communication and work skills
- Published guide to services
- Trouble desk functioning
- Billing
- HVAC processes
- Document management
- Key and locksmith services
- Custodian recruitment and hiring (in cooperation with personnel services)
- Staff training
- Standardized user feedback

In these efforts, AT&T has provided extensive assistance, including loaned subject-matter experts and quality consultants to serve as members of a number of work process improvement teams.

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

The Office of Undergraduate Admissions was concerned about internal organizational issues and the need for improved services to its constituents. In 1995, a QCI retreat workshop was conducted for the leadership and staff of the offices of undergraduate admissions on all three campuses, involving most of the 73 employees within the division. The session focused on issues of organizational quality and service excellence, and involved a reexamination of the mission of undergraduate admissions and discussions of a future vision for the unit. Teams were formed to address areas that were identified by the group as priorities, including: (1) improving services provided to, and communication and collaboration with,

various academic and administrative units within the university; (2) exploring ways to improve the availability and use of technology in the admissions process; (3) clarifying indicators of organizational performance; and (4) enhancing internal work processes and communication. Specific activities and projects were undertaken to:

- Heighten shared definition of mission, vision, plans, and improvement priorities
- Improve front-line staff communication and work skills
- Develop a plan for the use of information technology to improve work processes
- Assess and improve internal organizational work climate and communication
- Establish and use a feedback system to assess student and visitor satisfaction with services (New Brunswick)
- Heighten collaboration with university communications and campus information services

A change in the leadership of undergraduate admissions in September 1996 resulted in a reassessment of priorities and a focus on improved work processes, enhanced coordination with academic units, formalized collaboration with university communications and campus information services, the introduction of Web technology to the admissions process, and heightened involvement of faculty and staff in recruitment. Organizational quality concepts are now central to new initiatives such as the Web-based admissions tracking information system now available to applicants, and the shared- services partnership with the campus information services. A pilot program designed to involve staff more actively in introducing the university to prospective applicants and to their families is also based on quality concepts.

UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

Based on the unit's self-study and strategic plan, the Office of University Relations (formerly University Communications) determined that there was a need to reexamine and broaden its operations within the context of the university's mission. In 1995, a QCI retreat workshop was conducted for the leadership and staff of university communications to facilitate a review of the department's mission and to develop a broadened future vision for the unit. Additional workshops were held which emphasized concepts and practices in organizational quality, benchmarking, and planning. This led to the development of several cross- functional teams, composed of representatives of units within university communications in the winter of 1995-96. These teams brought together the talents of our broadcast, publications, periodicals and media relations staff members, and allowed for the exchange of ideas across traditional boundaries. The teams developed mission statements and recommended priorities for the department's marketing and communications plan. In addition, there was a major emphasis on the practical application of quality principles at a department retreat.

Team leaders and other key members of the department compose a steering committee that coordinates quality activities with the department. Current teams work on university advancement, marketing, internal work process and communication improvement, and improved communication among university employees. Specific projects undertaken include:

- Collaboration with undergraduate admissions
- Collaboration with campus information services on publication of a student telephone directory
- Collaboration with campus information services on publication of campus maps
- The faculty/staff directory process

- Redesign of the business card and stationery ordering process to allow direct ordering from printers by faculty and staff
- Collaboration with the bookstore on the development and marketing of Rutgers merchandise
- Collaboration with the division of personnel services on employee communication
- *Focus* coverage recognizing individual, group, and unit contributions to service excellence
- Formation of a formalized network and provision of technical assistance for communication coordinators in academic and administrative units throughout the university

PERSONNEL

The Division of Personnel Services provides administrative support for QCI faculty/staff welcome and recognition programs. The unit was also committed to improving its own services to other units of the university, and to assessing and enhancing work climate and employee satisfaction with the Division. A Quality of Work/Life Assessment/Improvement Inventory (the forerunner of the Organizational Climate Inventory (OCI) program) was developed and pilot-tested in collaboration with personnel. The program consisted of collecting, analyzing, monitoring, and using information on faculty/staff satisfaction and sources of dissatisfaction relative to achieving vision and values of the unit and university. The division's 33 employees participated in the pilot project. As a result of these findings, specific projects have been undertaken within the Division to:

- Improve front-line staff communication and work skills
- Assess and improve internal organizational workplace climate and communication
- Enhance collaboration with university communications on employee communication
- Coordinate faculty service recognition program
- Coordinate new employee orientation program
- Coordinate a new faculty welcome program
- Enhance collaboration among university administrators.

AUXILIARY SERVICES

Auxiliary services staff includes housing (325), dining (600), parking (35), campus supply (11), and the bookstores in New Brunswick and Newark. Within these five auxiliary areas, on any given day, there are countless interactions with students, staff, faculty, and external constituents. QCI's Service Excellence program is being offered to all units, commencing with housing, which provides services for almost 15,000 students. Upon completion in housing, QCI's service excellence program will be provided to the remaining auxiliary units.

UNIVERSITY COMPUTING SERVICES (RUCS)

In 1995, QCI assisted with the coordination of the operational analyses of two areas: finance, and student-services needs and practices. These analyses were designed to document current processes and to serve as the basis for an evaluation of external-vendor-provided integrated, administrative application products.

In 1996–97, QCI worked with RUCS to plan and implement an extensive plan to bring a quality, user-focused approach to computing services. The program will eventually include all of the approximately

200 members of the RUCS administration and staff. The initiative includes “Excellence in Higher Education” self-assessment and planning, focus groups, user surveys, standardized user feedback systems, process analysis and improvement, quality practices and service orientation training for front-line staff, as well as internal workplace climate and work practices assessment.

GRADUATE ADMISSIONS

Graduate admissions’ primary focus was the application process. To assist the unit, QCI conducted three service excellence workshops in 1995 for all staff of the three graduate admissions offices of the university. The emphasis was on improving the application process with an eye toward streamlining procedures and reducing processing time. Attention was devoted to determining how the offices might better serve the academic departments charged with rendering the actual admissions decision. To further facilitate these efforts, a QCI graduate associate worked with the staff of the New Brunswick graduate admissions office to collect feedback from academic departments on their satisfaction with current processes and suggestions for improved services. Future work includes evaluating the responsiveness of the office reception area and the departments’ ability to provide information sought by prospective students. Specific projects have been undertaken to:

- Streamline the application process to assure 24-hour pass-along of applications to the graduate offices where admission decisions are made
- Improve front-line staff communication and work skills
- Assess academic department expectations and satisfaction levels with the admission process.

In 1997–98, an EHE self-assessment and a comprehensive survey of academic departments served by graduate admissions will be conducted.

FINANCIAL AID

Financial Aid touches the lives of a great many students as a topic of vital importance. Recognizing the importance of improving the effectiveness, efficiency, and responsiveness of services to students, the unit asked QCI to provide workshops for unit administration and staff, emphasizing principles and practices of organizational quality, service excellence leadership, and front-line communication skills. The Newark and Camden offices participated in these service excellence workshops as a part of their own QCI campus initiatives, which are discussed in the next sections of the report. The New Brunswick financial aid office completed the workshops in spring 1997.

QCI is also assisting with unit efforts to improve cross-campus collaboration on core processes and information sharing. For the last year, the offices have provided students with feedback forms as they leave the financial aid office. The forms ask students to rate their satisfaction with in-person service encounters and to give suggestions on how services can be improved. The data, collected on a weekly basis, are reviewed by campus directors and their staffs as well as the director of financial aid. This feedback system will be reviewed and refined for use at the Newark and Camden campuses. Improvement projects will be undertaken in financial aid to:

- Assess student satisfaction with services
- Enhance leadership attention to service excellence and organizational quality issues
- Improve front-line staff communication and work skills
- Refine cross-campus coordination on core processes

- Improve processes for information sharing across campuses
- Review and refine the student feedback system
- Design and implement a student services mall on the Newark campus which will include the areas of registration, financial aid and business services using the “one-stop shopping” concept.

OTHER PROJECTS

Learning Resource Centers

At the request of the Learning Resource Centers, QCI conducted a “Tradition of Excellence/Excellence in Higher Education” organizational self-assessment workshop and led follow-up sessions to help with priority setting and action planning. The assessment, conducted in May 1996, led to the formation of unit-wide improvement teams on staff training, internal communication, and organizational climate.

University Libraries

An introduction to the concepts of organizational quality and service excellence was presented to the senior administrators and invited professional staff from university libraries. Dana Library–Newark has participated in the service excellence program in Newark.

Rutgers Foundation

QCI assisted the foundation with the planning, design, and implementation of focus groups with faculty to provide information to the foundation on how they might better serve the needs of faculty and support faculty efforts to secure research funding.

Retired Faculty

Facilitated by QCI, a Rutgers faculty retirement task force was formed in spring 1997. The task force is composed of representatives from current and retired faculty, AAUP, personnel, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Rutgers Foundation, and will seek to identify ways to expand faculty retirement information, services, and facilities, as well as opportunities for additional academic, social and cultural involvement in the life of the university for alumni faculty.

NEW BRUNSWICK CAMPUS

On the New Brunswick campus QCI activities have generally been unit-specific and undertaken in response to particular department-identified problems and requests.

ACADEMIC UNIT INITIATIVES

The New Brunswick campus projects and initiatives outlined below were developed and designed by QCI in cooperation with individual academic units.

Cook College

An organizational self-assessment, planning, and improvement program was the first QCI initiative involving an academic unit. It was undertaken in 1994 at the request of the then executive dean of Cook College and director of the New Jersey Agriculture Experiment Station, Daryl Lund. Actually, this project

was a pilot test of the “Tradition of Excellence/Excellence in Higher Education” organizational self-assessment project. All Cook and NJAES senior leaders and other faculty and staff members participated.

The academic administrative priorities that emerged from the organizational self-assessment included plans to: (1) improve communication and consensus-building, based on their university and collegiate mission, vision, values and goals; (2) enhance recruitment, orientation, and development of mechanisms to enhance the welcome and orientation provided to new faculty and staff; and (3) develop more systematic measures of the expectations and satisfaction levels of students and other key stakeholders. Faculty and staff were involved in the setting of improvement priorities and planning, implementation and reassessment phases in each of these areas:

- Mission/vision/goals statements were framed and distributed to all of the CBI directors and Cook College faculty chairs and departments
- Linkages were developed between the departmental and center mission/vision/goals and the college mission/vision/goals
- A policy was implemented calling for minutes from key meetings to be distributed to faculty and staff via email
- The format and approach of the faculty and staff newsletter were refined
- A new faculty orientation program was developed and implemented in spring 1996
- Evaluation review sessions were implemented for tenure-track faculty
- A feedback system was instituted for the new faculty campus tour and information session
- In-service orientation programs were implemented for cooperative extension faculty
- An expanded faculty/research/outreach directory was developed and distributed
- An organizational climate and satisfaction pilot study was administered in the student affairs unit.

University College

At the request of the incoming dean, QCI provided an EHE self-assessment workshop program in fall 1996. Four key improvement priority areas were identified, and self-forming teams have been created to address needs within each area:

- Improving the college’s planning process
- Clarifying and addressing internal human resource needs
- Enhancing internal communication
- Increasing service orientation to student and faculty groups

Center for Advanced Biotechnology and Medicine (CABM)

At the request of the Center for Advanced Biotechnology and Medicine (CABM), QCI assisted with self-assessment and strategic planning for faculty and staff leadership in 1996–97. QCI has also assisted with initiatives resulting from the planning process.

College of Pharmacy

QCI was asked to present an introductory program focusing on principles and practices of organizational quality and service excellence for administrative, office, and front-line staff in fall 1997. An overview session for faculty was presented in spring 1997, and Service Excellence program sessions were scheduled for staff in the office of the dean for fall 1997.

Graduate School of Social Work

At the request of the dean, QCI provided a “Face of Rutgers” introductory workshop for office and front-line staff as part of the unit’s planning retreat.

SERVICE UNIT INITIATIVES

Career Services

To support career services’ efforts to improve their services to students and potential employers, QCI provided service excellence improvement workshops for professional and front-line staff. The sessions were held in 1995.

Scheduling

To facilitate efforts by the Office of Scheduling better to serve the needs of academic departments, QCI provided a “Face of Rutgers” workshop for unit staff. QCI also provided training on focus groups and surveys. Senior department leaders then formed and facilitated focus groups with chairpersons of academic departments to identify problems and opportunities for improvements in services and collaboration.

Environmental Health and Safety

QCI assisted with the initiation and coordination of an approach to the formation of a faculty-staff advisory group to improve protocols and procedures for university environmental-crisis communication.

QCI-RELATED INITIATIVES

The projects and initiatives outlined below were encouraged by QCI’s mission and outreach, and were developed, designed, and implemented by specific units with the support of QCI.

In Campus Information Services, specific improvements have been made as follows:

- Rutgers information: central telephone information and referral service
- Cross departmental collaboration with communications and computing services on Rutgers Web sites (welcome age, INFO On-Line, U-Touch Kiosk)
- Admissions/campus information services partnership
- Visitor center and services development
- “Ask Colonel Henry”—email questions and answers service.

NEWARK CAMPUS

The QCI initiative at Rutgers–Newark started in 1993. Provost Norman Samuels recommended student services as an ideal site to begin development and testing of the QCI approach. The goal of the project was to heighten awareness and skills in the area of service orientation, and to increase interdepartmental collaboration.

In 1995, the provost appointed Dr. Dorothy DeMaio, University Professor and former Dean of the College of Nursing on the Newark campus, as assistant to the provost for QCI. A five-month exploratory study was conducted, including individual interviews with the provost, all associate provosts, all directors of the campus service units, and all academic deans. Based on the findings, a campus-wide QCI plan

tailored specifically for Newark was designed, and the plan was implemented in May 1996. (See Appendix 5.)

In Newark, the QCI program takes a comprehensive approach in that it is intended to cover every staff member and every process within the jurisdiction of the provost. The plan aimed at tapping the strengths of the Newark campus and its service providers on all levels and across administrative and academic units to create a more service-oriented environment, improve communication and work processes, and increase job satisfaction. The following activities/programs served to help Newark in the pursuit of its QCI goals:

- EHE unit self-assessment, priority setting, and improvement planning for administrative and academic leadership
- Organizational quality and service excellence seminars for campus service-unit leadership
- Service excellence leadership and “Face of Rutgers” workshops for all campus service and academic unit staff and leadership
- Intraunit and cross-unit follow-up workshops to educate and facilitate unit self-assessment and/or improvement initiatives and to foster coordination of campus-wide improvement of work processes and communication
- All staff campus-wide events designed to heighten sense of community and recognize the importance of all in the attainment of service excellence values and practices.

EHE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

In September 1996, the provost’s administrative team launched the self-assessment, strategic planning, and improvement initiative. Roger Abrams volunteered the Law School to serve as the first academic unit in Newark to participate in the self-assessment program. Law was joined by the Deans of the Faculty of Management, the Faculty of Arts and Science, Criminal Justice, the Graduate School, the College of Nursing, and the Center for Neurosciences. Self-assessments have been completed for the units mentioned above, except for criminal justice, the graduate school, and the Center for Neurosciences which will be conducted in fall 1997. In all, 35 top-level academic administrators participated in the EHE program, encouraged and strongly supported by the provost and their deans.

SERVICE EXCELLENCE, LEADERSHIP, AND FEEDBACK PROGRAM

The service excellence program afforded the opportunity to learn about the importance of front-line communication and the leadership role played by staff at all levels. Units were encouraged to gather data and examine strengths and weaknesses in their own way and at a reasonable pace. This strategy was aimed at building self-confidence and generating a desire and respect for positive change and personal involvement in the improvement of information sharing and services.

A unique aspect of the first phase of the service excellence program in Newark was the scheduling of related units together. The purpose of this approach was to enhance commonalties and a sense of community, provide a common language, and build a shared commitment to the goals of QCI. The service excellence sessions were conducted by the QCI senior associate and the Newark assistant to the provost for QCI.

The Rutgers Newark QCI campus-wide plan for service excellence commenced on May 21, 1996 with an orientation session for all the campus service unit directors and their first assistants. Immediately following in June 1996, the SE program was launched for all campus staff. During the subsequent nine

months, all directors and staff of admissions, athletics, alumni relations, personnel and business services, campus center, campus communications, campus safety, Dana Library, facilities, financial aid, housing, registrar, and substance abuse sectors participated in the service excellence program.

In March 1997, a campus-wide staff recognition and celebration event was held for all staff who had attended the QCI programs. At the request of the provost and with his full support, four administrative staff members organized and executed this extraordinary event with the assistance of QCI liaisons, and staff representatives from each campus service unit. Approximately 400 staff members attended. It was clear from staff feedback and reactions to the event that the QCI experience brought a heightened sense of enthusiasm, community, and purpose.

NEWARK QCI EDUCATOR NETWORK

A QCI educator network was constituted as a key element in the Rutgers Newark QCI plan. Comprised of talented Rutgers staff, administrative faculty, and students, their interest is in promoting and supporting better teamwork and service on the campus. The objective was to create a group of educators on the campus who were knowledgeable about the culture of the Newark campus, thus affording greater relevance, flexibility, and responsiveness, and ability to serve the vital long-term needs critical to the continuance of the QCI effort. The QCI educators were sponsored by their immediate supervisors, who understood and endorsed the campus-wide quality effort. The network's first assignment was with the Faculty of Management. Other networkers were assigned to work with individual service units as facilitators in the gathering and use of feedback from students, visitors, alumni, and other groups. This group of informed and willing people is committed to maintaining the momentum of the QCI movement in Newark.

NEWARK UNIT REPORTS

Excellence in Higher Education Self Assessment Outcomes

Office of the Provost

The Office of the Provost self-assessment process led to a consensus regarding perceived strengths and seven areas in need of improvement in seven areas: leadership qualities; handling of information and analysis; planning; human resource management; the quality of the day-to-day administrative and management processes; indicators and measures of achievement; and the degree of satisfaction with services experienced by students, faculty, and staff. Five action groups were formed to study further and develop plans to address the areas in need of improvement. The groups and their tasks were as follows.

- “Dashboard” Indicators: Assess and identify what information is needed to support, track, and evaluate the effectiveness of Campus goals, mission, and processes to show how well capabilities and needs are linked.
- Planning: (1) How best to link campus and university plans; (2) how to involve the community broadly (students, alumni, corporate, community, etc.) in the planning process; and (3) how to identify areas and institutions for benchmarking.
- Human Resources: Develop a comprehensive campus human-resources plan to include, among other important features, 360-degree performance evaluations for all staff.
- Communication: Develop more-effective communication between faculty and staff and better communication among all members of the campus community relative to mission, goals, and dashboard indicators.

- Satisfaction and Service Delivery: Develop a more systematic approach and better instruments to measure student satisfaction; identify, analyze, and improve key processes linked to the satisfaction of students, alumni, and other key groups; and train key front-line individuals.

A follow-up session in spring 1997 led to planning for the formation of a faculty/staff campus QCI coordinating committee and several interdepartmental task forces to address campus wide concerns.

Law School

One outcome of the Law School administrator's EHE self-assessment was the development of a conceptually based model of "Professionalism in Administration." Using service quality principles, the document was designed to complement the education law students receive on the importance of professionalism. The document provides professional-behavior guidelines for administrators interacting with students and various client groups.

A second outcome was the recognition of the need to focus on information required to improve the institution. A database project was devised to identify the information needs of each administrative office and the sources of existing information, and proposed new ways of gathering data.

Faculty of Management

Senior leaders at FOM identified 24 potential areas for improvement during the EHE self-assessment process. The group decided on three areas on which to focus, and established a steering committee and three teams to:

- Develop a staff human-resources plan, including attention to development, recognition, training, benchmarking, rewards, and diversity
- Develop a systematic and longitudinal process for collecting and using student expectation and satisfaction data
- Establish service excellence standards for M.B.A. student and potential M.B.A. student contacts, including attention to applications, phone contacts, walk-ins, advising, and faculty.

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

As an outcome of the QCI EHE self-assessment process the FAS–Newark leadership focused on several areas in need of improvement and set the following three priorities:

- Establish a Center for Urban Education to support research with professional staff in the fields of precollege and K–8 education. Created through the reorganization of the Academic Foundations Center and the Department of Education, the center will facilitate professional contact with the greater Newark educational, political, cultural, and social networks. The reorganization also aims to create an Institute for Research in Urban Education.
- Select a more user-friendly budget system. Focus groups reviewed the current software packages and identified and pilot-tested a more user-friendly budget and grant manager software package.
- Form a faculty task force to establish a new program to emphasize basic writing, composition, and research skills.

Service Excellence Program Outcomes

Admissions

Admissions identified the following improvement needs as a part of the service excellence program:

- Regularly scheduled staff meetings that foster enhanced communication by offering staff the opportunity to identify issues, express concerns, and receive updates on office activities and procedures
- An upgrade of hardware and increased staff training to support a reduction in the application process turnaround time.

Athletics and Recreation

Departmental surveys and assessment tools have been used to assess the Newark campus' perceptions of services and specific projects have recently been undertaken to:

- Improve information sharing and communication: increasing sensitivity to staff opinions, soliciting concerns and recommendations regarding future mascot and departmental logos, and collaborating in the revision of recruiting materials and fund raising.

Alumni Relations

Improvements include:

- Improving communication through regular and more-frequent staff meetings.
- Developing an internal communication network to inform the Newark community of alumni events.
- Reviewing and updating job descriptions, where appropriate, to foster and enhance work effectiveness.

Business Services

Specific projects were undertaken which include:

- Developing a uniform telephone greeting. Consumers are graciously greeted and the unit and the name of the responding staff member are identified.
- Implementing staff meetings, interdepartmental meetings, and management/supervisory meetings at least twice per month
- Designing a Web page describing each business service department's mission, hours of operation, services provided, and personnel.

Future QCI initiatives include:

- Cross-training staff on related student information systems such as financial aid and the registrar.
- Developing a unit-self assessment instrument to survey consumer satisfaction.

Campus Communications

The Campus Communications Office has incorporated QCI principles by:

- Setting regular staff meetings to include discussion about better service to constituent groups, working together more effectively, and establishing goals and objectives for the coming year in a more structured way, and by consensus.
- Offering additional support services to other units on the campus, especially admissions.

- Creating Newark-specific recruitment publications.

Campus Safety

The university police were among the most actively involved in the QCI service excellence program in Newark. Staff and supervisors participated together in the process. Collectively, the department decided to focus on improvement in the areas of enhanced communication, shared understanding, and support of cross-departmental communication. Specific projects undertaken to support these areas include:

- Weekly command staff meetings to share ideas, concerns, and for brainstorming. Decisions are routinely forwarded to the respective operational units.
- Incorporating a QCI section into the monthly in-service training to create a mechanism for ideas and concerns to be addressed directly by management for further review, discussion, and action.
- Using the building-liaison program to foster cross-departmental communication and to identify and share problems that can be resolved through group action.
- Establishing monthly meetings between university police and facilities personnel to discuss improvement needs in common work areas.
- Initiating a new quality initiative to address the campus-wide campaign about the dangers of jaywalking and not yielding to pedestrians.

Dana Library

The QCI service excellence sessions served to bring together librarians, staff, and the director, creating a heightened, collective interest in quality-driven activities:

- Conducting an internal nominal-group-technique workshop on the meaning of quality service in a library setting to heighten shared values among the librarians.
- Developing a survey on library services appended to the 1996 graduating seniors' exit survey. The findings were shared with all librarians and library staff, and the group proposed and implemented recommendations for service improvement in areas where needs were identified.
- Conducting an internal staff survey called "Test Your Own Library." The results added to the collective understanding of the importance of improving services and the work environment.

In the year since QCI programs were introduced to Dana librarians and staff, engagement with the QCI process is credited with increased commitment and positive involvement in library activities and public events. Also, there is stronger and more conscious interaction among all levels resulting in a sense that we are all in this together.

Physical Plant

Physical plant staff in Newark have begun the following improvement initiatives:

- Establishing four process improvement teams: surveys, workforce utilization, and energy conservation, and recycling. Final reports outlining recommendations will be presented to the unit staff in mid-May.
- Conducting workshops on teamwork and information sharing initiated by the group as a follow-up to the QCI service excellence program.
- Expanding the cross-departmental communication efforts begun prior to QCI to include more than 50 different campus departments and department representatives.

Financial Aid

To enhance intra departmental communication and provide a forum for brainstorming, the following were implemented:

- Increasing the number of staff meetings and the inclusion of role-playing by staff to develop further skills for dealing with student encounters.
- Participating actively in the planning for a student service mall in Blumenthal Hall, a concept generated through the campus-wide QCI discussions on principles of quality.
- Enhancing cross-campus communication to improve relevance and consistency in services.

Purchasing

The purchasing, telephone services, and postal operations departments identified the need to improve communication and improve services as their two major areas of concern; they made these improvements by:

- Convening bi-weekly meetings with representatives from each of the departments.
- Developing a consumer satisfaction survey to assess faculty and staff satisfaction with the purchasing department's services. Data are now being analyzed.
- Cross-training the purchasing expediter in postal operations to afford more efficient delivery of services, as needed.
- Developing a survey designed to assess satisfaction with telephone services. Responses are currently being collected.
- Establishing a postal consumer council for the purpose of receiving campus input and recommendations.

Registrar

The office plans to upgrade the effectiveness and efficiency of service to students and staff by:

- Improving communication and the timeliness of service to students by educating staff about the admissions and S.A.R. systems, and increasing staff access to these systems.
- Developing a handout to provide information to students during the new orientation process. The new handout is based on staff experience and addresses issues students may likely confront in their next four years.
- Increasing staff involvement in new-student orientation. Information will now be directly provided by staff to students participating in the orientation process. This includes personally conducted office tours in order to ensure accurate, helpful, and consistent information.
- Implementing a new registration process for students admitted to the Graduate School of Management in order to minimize bureaucracy and eliminate dissatisfaction with the existing process.
- Establishing of cross-training of staff with the Financial Aid Office.
- Developing a future student questionnaire/survey.

Academic Service Units/Service Excellence**Law School**

The positive changes and/or major activities of the Law School as a result of the QCI service excellence program are difficult to measure in the short term. Changing a campus culture is a long-term process, but the value of the QCI process itself has resulted in the staff, for the first time, being recognized for their value and ideas about the institution. The service excellence segment of QCI was reported by the unit to

have been “instrumental in putting us on the path toward new life, greater participation, and enthusiasm in team meetings.” Specifically, many staff are now actively involved identifying issues and developing strategies for improvement. Staff members have been surveyed about ways in which they could increase their effectiveness and efficiency, and, based on their input, work enhancement training opportunities and workshops in their particular area of interest are being arranged.

Faculty of Management

The Faculty of Management determined in early spring 1996 that there was a need for improvement in more effectively responding to student needs, enhancing skills in dealing with students and each other and working as a team towards common goals. The entire dean’s office participated along with all assistant deans, directors, assistant directors, administrative assistants, and full-time secretarial staff in a two-day service excellence program. Evaluations completed at the program’s conclusion indicated that the opportunity to get together with people in other departments and talk openly was extremely valuable. Teams were formed to address the areas identified as needing improvement.

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The major outcome of the FAS Newark staff’s participation in the service excellence program was the positive interaction and the opportunity to problem solve with campus colleagues from other units that share common responsibilities. In the FAS Newark unit-specific feedback sessions, staff identified the need for improved communication and cross-departmental meetings, and these meetings are now being arranged. There is momentum and great staff interest in QCI, but at this time the size and organizational structure of FAS Newark does not comfortably fit with the current staff-focused framework of QCI. Meetings with chairs are planned for fall 1997 to discuss the quality framework and service excellence concepts.

CAMDEN CAMPUS

QCI efforts on the Camden campus began in the fall of 1993 with briefings in New Brunswick for the president’s Cabinet, which included Camden Provost Walter Gordon. During academic year 1993–94, QCI initiatives centered in the Office of Student Life at the initiative of Associate Provost Cal Maradonna. Seven separate campus departments report directly to Associate Provost Maradonna: student development, the bookstore, dining services, the student center, residential life, career placement and planning, and student activities.

In Camden, the effort to make Rutgers run more efficiently and to provide better service has to this point been more a matter of developing campus-specific projects than of wholesale adoption of projects developed by QCI. Three major university-wide QCI initiatives have been successfully implemented at Camden: the New Faculty Welcome Program, the Staff Welcome Program, and the Facilities TQS Program. There have been numerous smaller, campus-specific programs developed over the past several years that are consistent with QCI and that have been supported, sustained, and in some cases inspired by the emphasis that QCI has placed on service orientation, communication, process effectiveness and efficiency in university operations. A plan for more-extensive QCI involvement on campus will be developed and implemented beginning in summer 1997.

QCI INITIATIVES

New Faculty Welcome Program

Beginning in 1994, the campus Teaching Excellence Center, with the assistance of the Office of Student Life, implemented the QCI program to welcome new faculty members. New faculty from arts, sciences, and business are given introductions to services provided by the Teaching Excellence Center, the Learning Resource Center, the library, the Career Planning and Placement Office, and the Office of Student Life. Follow-up meeting introduces these faculty members to the head of the campus committee on promotion and tenure from their area. A packet is distributed that includes materials provided by the president's office and QCI: a formal welcome letter, complimentary tickets to football games and other university activities, and information about living in New Jersey.

New Staff Welcome Program

Inaugurated in fall 1996, the university and campus welcome seminar was hosted by the Office of Student Life. Topics covered included a welcome packet overview, a benefits overview, a presentation on Rutgers QCI, basic organizational quality concepts, and service excellence practice.

Facilities

The Camden campus has been actively involved in promoting quality practices through the TQS-QCI program, with particular emphasis on empowering employees, setting realistic goals, reinforcing good behaviors and results, and getting the employees' input in decision-making. Specific improvement projects include:

- Revising job descriptions to create a single source for customer contact. In the past, several people were required to handle a work order, resulted in long delays. Since last December, the backlog of unfinished work orders has been lowered from 2,150 down to 650. Response time has been reduced and consumer satisfaction has been increased.
- Weekly meetings between supervisors and the director. Monthly meetings are also held with each project manager on each current project, and a current master project list is kept to track all outstanding projects to completion.
- Monthly budget reviews. All accounts within physical plant have been assigned to a particular supervisor, and all supervisors know what they can spend.
- Improved communication. Regular "all-hands" meetings are held where all members of the physical plant group are brought together at one time for informative, one hour, very informal meetings to keep all employees informed.
- Safety improvements. A goal to reduce the previous five-year average number of accidents in the organizations by 35% has been established, and a team was set up to review the various accidents that had been occurring. In the last calendar year accidents were reduced by 30%.
- Customer satisfaction monitoring and improvement. In October 1996, a customer satisfaction survey was conducted. Areas of dissatisfaction have been identified, and steps are taken to correct these areas. Baseline information indicated that 77% of our customers were completely satisfied. A goal of 85% or higher was set, and after three months this goal was met.
- Coordination with New Brunswick Quality Initiative. The Camden physical plant also participates on quality teams with the New Brunswick campus.

QCI-RELATED IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Over the past several years there have been a number of independent efforts on the Camden campus which are consistent with QCI's emphasis on improving service and communication and increasing efficiency in the use of facilities. Five of the most notable are listed below:

Bookstore

Students once waited in long lines each semester to purchase books from the campus bookstore. In spring 1992, the university provided funds for a bookstore addition to the student center, including a multi-purpose room. Utilizing this room for three weeks at the beginning of each semester, a self-service book operation with up to six cashiers is now in operation, reducing lines by 80%.

One-Card Campus

In 1993, the campus had expanded its food program and was starting a meal program. At that time the campus had a minimum of three identification cards for students to carry: a university ID card, a library card, and housing ID card. Using QCI principles, a decision was made to develop a single ID card so that students could use the card at the registrar's office, library, dining services and housing.

Student Advisory Panels

Over the past three years the Office of Student Life has established advisory panels comprised of interested students who provide feedback on important issues concerning campus services. These panels, which now meet once a month, started in traditional areas like housing, dining, and the bookstore, but then were expanded into student development, career planning, campus center and student activities. Changes resulting from the panels include: expanded hours, added services, increased product selection, changed policies, and new programs.

Cyber Cafe

In 1995, the campus did a survey of student computer users to determine satisfaction with campus resources and services in the area of student computing. The results indicated that there was some student dissatisfaction with areas of support services when using computers in the labs. Through collaboration among students, staff, dining services and the bookstore, the Cyber Cafe was born. The cafe serves coffee, cold beverages and snacks to students while "cyber attendants" help students familiarize themselves with computers in an informal setting.

Email Hot-line

In an effort to give students access to staff and answers to questions and complaints, an e-mail address was established which students may use to ask questions, get information or complain about services offered on campus. Students are guaranteed a response in 48 hours, and requests are forwarded to the appropriate office on campus.

CURRENT AND FUTURE PLANS

In summer 1996, Provost Walter Gordon named Associate Provost Cal Maradonna as coordinator for QCI efforts on the Camden campus. A campus plan was developed to broaden the integration of organizational qualities and service-oriented principles.

The service excellence program in Camden will focus on the roles of front-line staff and leaders. The program will emphasize the university's commitment to service excellence with the goal of improving

work processes and enhancing the quality of the workplace. Emphasis is on a balanced approach that will benefit students, faculty, and staff.

In the first phase of the project, QCI will begin its training as a pilot program working within the Student Life Division. Training workshops will subsequently be offered to other units reporting to Associate Provost Maradonna. The program will begin in summer 1997. The service excellence program will be conducted by the QCI staff and members of the QCI educator network, which will include six faculty and staff from the Camden campus. In the second phase, a “mini-program” that condenses the main points of the service excellence courses into a brief one- or two-hour workshop will be developed as a way to provide an orientation for newly-hired employees.

SUMMARY, EVALUATION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final section of this report presents an evaluative review of the Rutgers QCI initiative in terms of four developmental phases, followed by observations and recommendations.

Phase I: Developing QCI concepts and resources

Phase II: Initiating pilot projects

Phase III: Linking QCI to all university units

Phase IV: Integrating QCI principles and practices into the Rutgers culture

The analysis begins with a summary of what QCI has accomplished in Phase I, the phase in which QCI concepts and resources were developed. Considered next is Phase II, the selection and implementation of pilot projects. The review then assesses the progress to date and the challenges to be addressed in expanding organizational quality principles and practices to other units (Phase III), and in fully integrating this framework within university culture (Phase IV). The analysis also includes a series of recommendations.

PHASE I: DEVELOPING QCI CONCEPTS AND RESOURCES

In the beginning phase of QCI’s development, the following factors were identified as critical to the successful establishment of the initiative:

- Developing and using internal resources wherever possible
- Building on the tradition of excellence at the university
- Encouraging broadly based involvement and leadership for the program
- Focusing on areas of greatest need and opportunity
- Anticipating and addressing concerns about the value and substance of the approach, particularly among faculty
- Clarifying the appropriateness of the organizational quality approach for higher education
- Structuring the program to address the unique challenges faced by Rutgers
- Being sensitive to structural, governance, cultural, and geographical issues
- Establishing “centers of excellence” to serve as models

This assessment guided QCI plans and activities in Phase I. The major goal in the initial phase was to adapt the framework of organizational quality for the special setting and culture of higher education.

Concepts and methods that were appropriate to an academic culture and to Rutgers were developed and communicated within the university. Principles of organizational quality and leadership embodied in the quality framework were emphasized, rather than particular tools and techniques. Methods were also developed for disseminating information about QCI and organizational quality concepts and services. Efforts were also made to build upon and complement existing Rutgers excellence initiatives.

Operationally, modest funding required solicitation of additional support, the judicious use of external resources, and the creation of a support network of faculty, staff and students with expertise in organizational quality concepts and practices. Table 3 lists the impressive outcomes of QCI's efforts in working towards this goal.

Finally, the concern with structural, governance, cultural, and geographical issues pointed to the importance of active support and involvement by university and unit leaders for all QCI projects, and assistance from individuals serving as campus and unit coordinators for QCI activities. Broad involvement and sensitivity to differences between the perspectives of administrators, faculty, staff, and students were seen as critical to all aspects of the work of QCI.

Core concepts of organizational quality as applied to higher education were also developed in Phase I. Basic to this framework is the idea that a major research university is a system composed of two interlinked and complementary organizational subsystems—one academically-focused and one service- focused. Each has its own distinct, and at times competing, activities and culture. To be successful, organizational quality improvement programs need to address the challenges of the institutional system as a whole, as well as the needs of the components and their relationship to one another.

The Rutgers QCI core quality principles served to guide the development of five QCI program areas, as mentioned previously:

- (1) Self Assessment. Organizational self-assessment and planning activities using the "Excellence in Higher Education" framework.
- (2) Leadership. Seminars, workshops, and skill-building modules for individuals at all levels of leadership within the university.
- (3) Work Process Improvement. Procedures and methods for work process improvement such as process analysis, benchmarking, and root-cause analysis.
- (4) Faculty, Staff, and Workplace Climate. Expanded university-wide activities for welcoming and recognizing faculty and staff, and methods for systematically assessing workplace climate and faculty/staff satisfaction.
- (5) Service Excellence. Formal workshops, "The Face of Rutgers," for university staff who are in highly visible service roles, together with systematic feedback about the impact their services have on target groups—be they students, parents, prospective students, high school guidance counselors, visitors, faculty, other staff, and so forth.

In the process of developing principles and programs, QCI has had impressive national participation and leadership in the higher education quality movement through a wide variety of publications, which are listed in Appendix 4, and through invited presentations within New Jersey and nationally, which are listed in Appendix 6.

PHASE II: INITIATING PILOT PROJECTS

Once the QCI program was funded and a conceptual framework was developed, initial projects needed to be selected. QCI's approach in Phase II was to concentrate first on service improvement needs identified in the "Red Tape" report and other university organizational studies. In addition, some units asked QCI to work with them on organizational assessment or particular work-process improvement projects. Thus, a pilot-project approach was utilized, whereby the QCI framework and materials developed in the five programs were applied, tested, and refined at various pilot-project sites throughout the three campuses of the university. The goal was that subsequently, these "centers of excellence" could be models that would help to disseminate and promote organizational assessment and improvement approaches and methods throughout the university.

The initial pilot projects included: focus groups and surveys of users of services (facilities); organizational self-assessment (Cook College); workshops on mission and vision-setting (undergraduate admissions and university communications); workplace climate and morale assessment undergraduate admissions and personnel); service and leadership training (undergraduate admissions, student services' Newark); and work-process improvement teams (facilities, undergraduate admissions, university communications, and Cook College).

Number, Type, and Participant Evaluation of Activities

Three types of measurement have been employed by the review committee to assess QCI's accomplishments to date. These include: (1) analysis of the number and types of quality-related activities in each of the program areas; (2) evaluations by participants who have been recipients of particular QCI programs; and (3) summaries of the experiences of Rutgers faculty and staff who have taken leadership roles in the initial pilot projects generated by QCI. Each of these is reviewed in the following sections.

Organizational Self-Assessment

As of March 1997, 10 university units and more than 100 unit leaders participated in the EHE self-assessment and improvement planning process. Evaluations were solicited from each of the following.

Cook College–New Brunswick
 Facilities–New Brunswick
 University College–New Brunswick
 Provost's Office–Newark
 Law School–Newark
 Arts and Sciences–Newark
 Faculty of Management–Newark
 Learning Resource Centers–all campuses
 Rutgers University Computing Services
 College of Nursing

Table 4 shows the total participation in QCI/EHE programs. Evaluation of the program, based on 107 completed questionnaires, were ranked on a scale from 1 to 7, 7 being "outstanding."

Overall usefulness: 5.4
 Identifying strengths and improvement needs: 5.81
 Encouraging meaningful dialogue: 5.26

Leadership Education

Programs in the leadership area include:

- “Introduction to Quality and Service Excellence”
- Leadership seminar
- Facilitator training
- Presentations to students.

“Introduction to Quality” provided an overview presentation on the basic concepts of organizational quality and service excellence, and their relevance to higher education. This program was presented to a total number of 597 individuals. (See Table 4.)

The Leadership workshop was presented to the Faculty of Management staff-New Brunswick; housing supervisors New Brunswick; facilities supervisors New Brunswick; Faculty of Management staff Newark; facilities supervisors Newark; Faculty of Arts and Science staff Newark; and nursing staff–Newark. A total of 557 individuals have participated in this program. Participant ratings were 3.34 for “Appropriateness,” and 3.35 for “Expectations Met” (on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being “outstanding”).

Students were introduced to concepts of organizational, leadership, and Rutgers QCI. They also presented an overview of opportunities for participation in QCI projects. A total of 320 individuals attended these sessions.

In addition to the leadership programs, a series of programs was developed for the educator’s network. These sessions provided Network faculty, staff, and students with enhanced background on organizational quality concepts and practices, and specific QCI programs and approaches.

Work Process Improvement

Work process analysis and improvement programs were offered in the following areas:

- Process improvement workshop
- Benchmarking workshop
- Root-cause analysis workshop

Full-day workshops in the area of process improvement were provided to approximately 190 participants, and QCI has assisted with the formation and facilitation of approximately 33 ongoing process improvement teams in eight different areas of the university. These included university facilities, undergraduate admissions, university communications, Cook College, the Rutgers Foundation, and university computing. Additionally, initiatives involving cross-department work process collaboration groups have been formed. The following units worked together to expand current work processes and service across department lines: university communications and undergraduate admissions, university communications and the Rutgers Foundation, and campus information, RUCS, and university communications.

The benchmarking workshop provided an introduction to methods for systematic comparison and information gathering on the ways other leading organizations perform similar processes, and how those practices might be translated into improvements at the university for 19 individuals from facilities and from assorted other units within the university community. The average rating was: “overall usefulness” 5.88, “encouraging meaningful dialogue” 5.78, and “building teamwork and consensus” - 4.94 (on a 1–7 scale, with 7 being “outstanding”).

The root -cause analysis workshop introduced concepts and techniques for the analysis of underlying causes of work process problems to 42 members of the university community. (See Table 4.)

Faculty, Staff, and Workplace Climate

The faculty welcome and staff orientation programs, developed in 1993, provides information, materials and invitations to new faculty and staff on all three campuses to welcome them to the campus and university community. Faculty benefiting from this welcome program numbered 110 in 1993, 111 in 1994, 90 in 1995, and 93 in 1996.

The new staff orientation program pilot session was attended by 43 individuals on the Newark, New Brunswick, and Camden campuses in 1996. Of the 33 evaluations received, 21 participants indicated the program was "very useful"; 10 responded "useful"; and 2 responded "somewhat useful."

The faculty recognition program was initiated in 1994 to acknowledge faculty service contributions and celebrate collective faculty accomplishments at the university. Faculty attending the recognition luncheon numbered 230 in 1994, 231 in 1996, and 176 in 1997. See Table 4. In 1996, 68 faculty returned the evaluations which indicated the following responses: "excellent" 35%; "very good" 35%; "good" 19%; "fair" 7%; and "poor" 3%. Responses for 1997 have not yet been analyzed.

The Organization Climate Inventory (OCI) was utilized on a pilot basis in university admissions, Cook College student affairs, personnel and facilities. A total of 137 individuals completed the survey.

Service Excellence

To date, 897 participants have attended service excellence workshops feedback system program.

Total Participation

A total of 4,397 individuals participated in the QCI activities listed. While specific data on overlap were not calculated, it is estimated that more than 3000 different individuals were involved in at least one of the activities.

EXPERIENCES OF FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS IN QCI LEADERSHIP ROLES

This section presents a different perspective: the in-depth experiences of representative, highly active participants in QCI programs, most employed at Rutgers for at least 5 years. These experiences were captured in two-and-one-half-hour focus groups, consisting of six and eight participants respectively, conducted in January 1997. (See Appendix 7.)

Questioning focused on four central issues: (1) How QCI participants had become engaged in the program; (2) problems and challenges that QCI faced in achieving its mission; (3) potential solutions to these problems; and (4) outcomes to date. The focus groups were taped and transcribed, and themes were identified.

Engagement

The focus groups indicated that those staff and faculty who have taken QCI leadership roles have tended to become involved: because QCI appealed to them from the perspective of their academic discipline; as an additional voluntary work commitment for the good of the university; or because they perceived that achieving the goals of QCI were central to their success as administrators.

For example, participating faculty members indicated that QCI presented them with an opportunity to practice professional skills and/or conduct research. One faculty member noted, "I was interested in this topic as a psychologist." Another focus group participant from the Faculty of Management noted that much of her research and academic work has been in the area of TQM, so she sees particular relevance in QCI for her own interests.

Many of those who had participated did so primarily because they felt that QCI has many potential benefits, including enhancement of their ability to do their jobs well and the success of the university in a

competitive environment. In fact, several administrators had been experimenting with quality-oriented programs before the advent of QCI. One administrator said that he had been in the human resources area for many years: “I have spent a lot of time conducting and participating in the various programs—whether they be ‘quality circles’ or ‘excellence’ or other names.” When discussions about QCI started developing, he went to his superiors and expressed an interest in becoming involved because he thinks QCI is a good and important program.

Outcomes

Among focus group members it was almost universally noted that QCI has had a significant impact:

- It seems to me that the most successful thing we have been able to do is really signaling the need for culture change...the environment is noticeably different here from what it was a couple of years ago, and that there is an awareness to the importance of quality principles and quality programs....
- QCI has also been instrumental in bringing faculty and staff together to talk about, number one, assessment, and number two, implementing change. I can probably list about twenty different things that happened [on my campus] that are part of the [QCI] ... way of thinking.

The value of specific QCI programs is also recognized, as the following comments from three individuals suggest:

- QCI has also been instrumental in bringing faculty and staff together to talk about, number one, assessment, and number two, implementing change. far we have done 38 sessions on the Newark campus. The provost has gone through the Tradition of Excellence [EHE] program and so has the Law School. I must give the dean credit because it was he who agreed to be the first academic unit to go through it. His experience with that has been exceptional.
- QCI has also been instrumental in bringing faculty and staff together to talk about, number one, assessment, and number two, implementing change. We have been using the QCI Organizational Climate Inventory. The Student Affairs Office [at Cook College] volunteered to be the pilot for us to implement the survey. So it has been an excellent tool with which to gather information from employees as to where their thoughts are, in what ways they are satisfied with working conditions, and just what we can do to provide an exemplary environment.
- QCI has also been instrumental in bringing faculty and staff together to talk about, number one, assessment, and number two, implementing change. I think the Excellence in Higher Education [methodology] is an excellent tool and perhaps it can be used at this time by our new dean in assessing where we have been, where we should go, and to look at some priorities.

Most important, perhaps, QCI has helped the university begin to move from bureaucratic compartmentalization to community. Several participants commented that some of the major benefits of this experience in the past year and one-half have been the process of creating cross-functional teams, exposing people from different units to a different way of thinking, a different way of relating to one another, and a different perspective.

Another individual remarked that QCI programs provide “an opportunity for management, staff, faculty, students—everyone—to come together, sit down, assess themselves and then, as a diverse group, move ahead.”

Noted another,” we found some departments never met. Large units never had regular meetings or talked to each other on a day-to-day basis. They were beginning to have meetings, and that has improved communication.”

PHASE III: LINKING QCI TO ALL UNIVERSITY UNITS

The long-term goals of the QCI program are to encourage greater organizational effectiveness, efficiency, and collaboration among all units university-wide. In Phases I and II, concepts and resources were developed, and a number of pilot projects were initiated. Through these projects, the QCI programs were developed, tested, and refined. The result is the establishment of five well-developed programs and a number of emerging centers of excellence at various points in the University. Linking and extending these projects on a university-wide scale is the challenge associated with Phase III. The focus groups discussed these challenges.

Challenges, Problems, and Potential Solutions Emerging from the Focus Groups

Focus group participants noted several aspects of the Rutgers culture that continue to represent particular challenges for QCI. The first is known in Rutgers lore as the “RU Screw.” As several university studies have shown, although students, faculty, staff, and administrators have a generally high regard for the academics at Rutgers, this is often not the case for services. The Rutgers bureaucracy has frequently been perceived to be unwieldy, complex, dehumanizing, and inefficient. Encounters have been seen as leading to hassles and frustration—in short, the “RU Screw.” This situation is in part due to the rapid growth of the university, a historically complex organizational structure, budgetary cutbacks, and until recently, lack of attention. While many improvements such as touch-tone registration and new financial aid procedures have done much to address aspects of this long-standing problem, there is much still to be done to bring greater consistency in user-friendliness to many university systems, facilities, procedures, and personnel.¹³ The “RU Screw” is part of the problem that QCI must address, and at the same time, it is a barrier to the reforms that are needed. One focus group participant who was relatively new to the university remarked,

- When I came to Rutgers... I had as a function of my job to get out and hear what people had to say. One of the things that came out very strongly was this notion of the “Rutgers Screw.” Students and also faculty talked about the organization being out of control to the disadvantage of the student. It seemed to me, and a number of others, that TQM could be adapted specifically toward this notion of service to students.

Another participant said:

- I think one of the consequences of this culture that we all reference in one way or another is that it creates a dulling of the senses in noticing discourtesy and instability, and not putting that extra bit of effort into an interaction, not acknowledging good work or extra effort on the part of other people.

It should also be noted that these same systems, facility, procedural, and personnel impediments affect not only students, but also faculty, staff, visitors, alumni, and others.

Faculty engagement is seen as crucial. Given the central role faculty play on- and off-campus as representatives of their departments, disciplines, and the university, their support and involvement is essential if the university is to be successful in addressing issues of organizational quality and service excellence. Given this, differences and potential conflicts between the faculty/academic culture and the administrative/service culture of the University were also mentioned as challenges to be addressed in Phase III. As one focus group member expressed it,

¹³ Recent studies by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning point to impressive levels of student satisfaction in some categories, and to challenging opportunities for improvements in others.

- The institution, this institution, is about a research faculty committed to conveying through teaching and research the very best of academic practice. In an academic environment driven by peer review, individual assessment, individual measures of success . how do we . at the same time link that faculty with the values of the institution . It is turning around that “If I succeed, Rutgers succeeds,” to “If Rutgers succeeds, I succeed.”

Building broad-based faculty support for QCI will be a substantial challenge. As a faculty member said,

— I would say as a faculty member and ... [an administrator], that most of the QCI focus has been explicitly and determinedly on staff, not faculty. Yet if the fundamental premise is to make Rutgers a place that is responsive to its constituencies, the faculty of the university is what it's all about. And yet the faculty have a culture of their own, and they are going to be a tough nut to crack....

As another focus group member commented:

- Interestingly, while we intended to involve faculty . the fact is that getting the faculty involved, getting them to buy in, is very, very difficult.

Another focus group member related the problem of involvement in QCI to lack of rewards:

- The fact is that the reward structure of the University promotes the separation we have been talking about. There are no rewards for faculty if they work with staff, if they volunteer their time to the admissions process, or to career services, or anything like that. These are nuisances at best for faculty.

One of the realities that Rutgers faces in the 1990s is that the resources available to the university are quite lean in comparison to the past. Whether resources will be sufficient to enable success of the many organizational improvements that are needed and to support the efforts of QCI to facilitate these changes was a concern of many focus group participants. One faculty member who had helped to facilitate QCI workshops expressed particular concern about the availability of sufficient resources to follow through on the QCI program.

The issue of resources was an important issue to another faculty member from the Newark Campus.

- When I was asked to be involved with this, the provost [asked me to become involved] . there was a QCI office in New Brunswick which was going to provide support. [But, the QCI office] is two people. So we need significantly to look for resources.... The provost is planning to institutionalize QCI in his office. He has given my time [and] a fifty percent secretary. I do have a Ph.D. student... [QCI] must have additional resources.

Much of the discussion in the focus groups revolved around potential solutions to the challenges QCI faces that have emerged from the experience in Phase II. Of these, the issue occupying particular attention in the focus groups had to do with broadening the commitment to organizational assessment and improvement activities, and expanding involvement in QCI, particularly among the faculty. Focus group participants voiced pride in Rutgers' academic life and its faculty, but acknowledged that faculty involvement in organizational quality assessment and improvement was needed.

Some felt that efforts to involve faculty should focus on explaining how the success of QCI was to their benefit. As a faculty member said, The task is to develop some constructive process that will help faculty and interest them I think that if QCI is going to succeed with faculty, there must be some consideration about how to develop a dialogue between faculty and administrators.

One idea proposed to stimulate faculty involvement was to develop a core group of faculty who had worked with QCI and supported its mission. This core group would serve as a locus of support, legitimacy, and communication with other faculty who were less informed and/or reluctant to support QCI.

In contrast, other focus group participants felt that it would be more realistic and ultimately beneficial to focus QCI efforts on the staff rather than faculty, with the thought that success in administrative and service departments would eventually “spill over” to the faculty. We note, in this regard, that there are approximately 5,500 full time staff at Rutgers a large and vitally important group within the university community.

Having an effective, realistic operational strategy was also considered to be important by focus group participants. One aspect of this strategy was the recognition that QCI needed to be seen as a long-term strategy rather than a “quick fix.” One participant noted:

- I don’t want this to become another flash in the pan. I don’t want it to become another quality circles [program] or some other program like that. A lot of attention was paid to programs like that for a short period, but then people went about their business in the same way they had before. QCI has to be a long- term commitment.

Several participants also noted that it was important for the university to be realistic in its thinking about QCI goals, and to focus initially on opportunities for high impact that entail a minimum expenditure of resources.

Several participants suggested that the university could be more aggressive in promoting the QCI program:

- I would like to reiterate the suggestion of QCI advertising, perhaps in grander style, its involvement, inspiration, and motivation in the creation of the new things that are happening here.

In sum, the focus groups surfaced at least five types of challenges facing QCI. These are: 1) continuing perceptions of unresponsive services (the “RU Screw”); 2) the challenge of broadening involvement, particularly among faculty; 3) the lack of rewards for involvement in QCI; 4) the need for additional university resources to be devoted to organizational self-assessment and improvement generally; and 5) the active promotion of QCI.

PHASE IV: INTEGRATING QCI PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES INTO RUTGERS’ CULTURE

Phase IV describes the review committee recommendation for QCI’s long-range goals. The suggested goals for this phase are:

- To assure an appropriate degree of ongoing self-assessment and self-improvement at every level, area, and campus of the university
- Meaningfully to engage the resources and collaborative efforts of faculty, staff, students, and other key groups
- To integrate organizational quality principles and practices into the fabric of the university culture and community.

In Phase IV, as the principles and practices of organizational quality become an ingrained part of the university culture, the goal of QCI would be to have the faculty and staff at all levels develop a sense of ownership of the organizational quality initiative.

In this phase, the role of QCI relative to particular units or campuses might be variable. For example, as mentioned above in the focus group discussion, quality improvement might be permanently established as a regular component of the Newark provost's office. In contrast, other units, or even particular individuals, might seek periodic and selected consultation from a centralized, university-wide QCI office. Such variation would particularly be predicted in a university culture where individual initiative, independence of thought, and creativity are highly valued.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of the Phase II QCI initiatives involve units and processes that are university-wide in scope. Some are campus- and unit-based. The Newark campus has a systematic program in place that will involve all academic and administrative units. The Camden campus has a plan for a phased introduction of QCI programs, with the eventual goal being the involvement of all campus units. On the New Brunswick campus, some student service units and several academic units have benefited from QCI programs.

Beyond the intrinsic contributions of QCI projects undertaken to date, these successes demonstrate QCI's potential contribution in other areas of the institution. For these reasons, it is important for the Phase II projects to continue successfully to maturity. In Phase III, it is also essential to extend the influence of QCI principles and practices more widely and more systematically within the University.

To date, QCI has been of great significance within some units and for some faculty and staff leaders, but the pattern is uneven from unit to unit and campus to campus. For instance, while programs emphasizing service excellence concepts and practices have been presented to all front-line staff on the Newark campus, few of the front-line staff of faculties, schools, and departments in New Brunswick have had any exposure to these programs.

Similarly, while the Excellence in Higher Education organizational self-assessment process has been initiated in all academic units in Newark, few New Brunswick units and no Camden units have begun this process. And, while a number of work-process improvement activities have been undertaken in several administrative and service units in New Brunswick, fewer have yet been initiated in Newark and Camden.

Moreover, while students have been, and will continue to be, beneficiaries of many of QCI's initiatives, as a group, they have not been as involved in QCI activities as they might be. Our students are valuable sources of information. Instituting more regular, campus- and unit-based feedback systems that allow students to share their perceptions on the services they receive throughout the university is one important step in involving this group in organizational quality assessment and improvement. Another step is to engage students, where appropriate, with faculty and staff to address improvement needs.

To achieve Phase IV goals, it is recommended that QCI look across the university as a whole, identify additional areas where its programs could be beneficial, and endeavor to extend assessment and improvement activities to these units. In some areas, this will simply require providing additional information to unit leaders about available QCI programs and services. In other areas, there may be no perceived need for organizational assessment or improvement programs, whether for philosophical, technical, political, organizational or other reasons; and in these areas more extensive outreach and administrative encouragement will be needed. Plans should be developed to reach out to these groups; to learn about the reasons for their lack of involvement, interest, and perhaps skepticism; and to develop ways to establish constructive engagement with them.

A number of suggestions on how Phase IV goals could best be achieved came forth from the focus groups described above and from discussions within this review committee. These can be summarized as five general recommendations:

- (1) Integrate QCI's core principles—blending academics and service, process improvement and collaboration, attention to communication, leadership at all levels, continuous improvement, and service orientation—as central themes of the Rutgers vision for the future and emphasized elements in the *University Strategic Plan*.
- (2) Stimulate university, campus and unit leaders to play a more active role in encouraging the introduction of QCI approaches and programs.
- (3) Undertake additional targeted communication and outreach activities for faculty and students.
- (4) Continue to look for low-resource/high-impact projects with a positive spin-off for QCI's reputation.
- (5) Provide additional information about QCI programs and accomplishments through print and electronic media.

Specific recommendations for broadening the involvement of additional administrative units, students, and faculty, include the following.

Increasing Administrative Involvement **Workshop/Conference for QCI “Alumni”**

Bring together staff who have been heavily involved in QCI training programs and initiatives during phases I and II. Discussions should focus around progress made and how these “alumni” could support each other and coordinate activities across functions and areas that they perceive are in need of improvement. This could provide leads to projects where progress could be made quickly, to begin bringing together the “islands of success” to create a critical mass for future outreach and expansion.

“Best Practices” Sharing

Collect case-study examples of good practice from throughout the university. Publication and distribution will facilitate information sharing, link people with similar concerns throughout the university, and clarify ways in which QCI can support improvement efforts.

Increasing Student Involvement.

Formation of a University-wide Council Composed of Representatives from the Various Student Government Quality of Life Committees

Involve existing student government committees focused on quality of life issues, and officers whose jobs include responding to student complaints. The Rutgers College Governing Association even has a student complaint hotline. Individuals engaged in these efforts have a great deal of interest and willingness to help to contribute to improvements at the university. QCI could coordinate a regular meeting of these students for feedback, suggestions, and the identification of opportunities for participating in assessment and improvement efforts.

Regular Assessment of Email Question-and-Answer Services

Link QCI efforts with question and answer services now operating within the university including: “Ask Colonel Henry” (Campus Information Services), “Ask a Librarian,” “Ask Hal” (for RUCS), and a general email service on the Camden campus. These provide a great deal of anecdotal information from students (plus faculty, staff, parents, alumni and others, for that matter) about the issues and problems being confronted every day in services and communication. A regular assessment by QCI, or a forwarding of interesting or illustrative questions to QCI, could be a very useful means to involve greater numbers of students, and student concerns, in QCI initiatives.

Increasing Faculty Involvement

Two critical, related themes run through the focus group and review committee discussion on faculty engagement: (1) the need to increase faculty interest in and commitment to organizational quality and

service excellence goals; and (2) the need to promote the crucial interlinking of both service excellence and academic excellence improvement among both administration and faculty.

A crucial component of increasing faculty involvement is to emphasize ways in which QCI can help to address topics of particular importance to faculty. Recommendations for achieving this goal, based on the focus group and the Review Committee discussions, are listed below.

Creating a QCI Faculty Support/Advisory Group

This group could collaborate with the QCI staff to identify organizational quality issues and improvement strategies for issues of particular concern to faculty. Such issues might relate, for instance, to improvements in support processes for instruction, research, and outreach.

Increasing Faculty Involvement in Existing and Newly Forming QCI Programs and Activities throughout the University

While more than 30 faculty members are currently involved in one way or another with QCI activities, it is desirable to increase this number in Phase III. To the extent that it is possible, the goal would be to include faculty in areas and activities where their academic expertise and interests would best match the program or project needs. Thus, for example, additional faculty with interests in organizational studies from various disciplines might be encouraged to become more involved with the implementation and/or assessment of the Excellence in Higher Education organizational self-assessment process. And faculty with expertise in human resource issues could be encouraged to participate in the planning and implementation of faculty and staff assessment and improvement projects.

In addition, a number of other faculty groups are likely to be particularly receptive to concerns about quality of services, including: departmental chairs and directors; faculty concerned with teaching effectiveness, such as Teaching Excellence Center directors, teaching award winners, and other prominent advocates for undergraduate education; and faculty who have an interest in viewing and influencing the university in the kind of cross-cutting, multi-functional manner QCI seeks to cultivate. Some other areas where faculty are likely to see relatively clear connections between academic excellence and service quality are in: improving service in departmental, school, and collegiate offices; improving connections between career planning/placement, college advising, and faculty advising; streamlining promotion and reappointment procedures; and integrating service excellence and academic excellence perspectives in the University Strategic Plan.

Creating a Faculty/Administration Process Committee

Another area for constructive engagement, particularly because for some time it has been a major concern of many faculty members, is found in the need for greater collaborative involvement of faculty in university decision making. What seems to be needed are ways for the process of decision making in areas of interest to the faculty and the administration to be more collaborative and collegial. QCI could play a role in promoting increased communication and collaboration by applying core principles of the quality movement. (For example, this concept runs through QCI's Excellence in Higher Education system, and it is reflected in QCI's core principle of "Process Improvement and Collaboration" through partnership among different functional groups, such as faculty and administration.)

Thus, QCI might sponsor and facilitate a Faculty-Administration Process Committee, which would focus not on any substantive issues per se, but rather on facilitating and enhancing the degree of collaboration between faculty and administration. This collaboration would be in: (1) university-wide areas such as the University Strategic Plan, budgeting for the university library system, and marketing of the university to groups like prospective undergraduates and constituencies associated with the capital campaign; and (2) campus-specific areas such as the relationship in New Brunswick between the residential colleges, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and the professional schools.

Developing In-Depth Case Studies of QCI in Practice

An important premise of the quality movement is that for an organizational innovation like QCI, there is a crucial need for systematic quantitative and qualitative evaluation of program processes and outcomes. One type of evaluation that requires relatively low resources, but meets some of the needs of formal evaluation, is to conduct selected, in-depth case studies of QCI programs in action. Such cases would also be useful for communication and educational purposes. In line with this, a very important advantage of such an evaluation would be to provide faculty in-depth examples of how QCI programs function and how they intertwine academic and service concerns and goals.

Focusing on Services to Faculty

QCI could focus on a particular area of critical interest to all faculty at this time, the increasing challenges faced by the library properly to meet the needs of the students and faculty. Present and anticipated conditions suggest that the arena of excellence in library services will be of particular interest to the faculty as recipients of those services for the foreseeable future.

Long-Term Recommendations

Finally, the review committee offers the following long-range recommendations for QCI:

- (1) Encourage the sharing of best practice information within the university and between the university and other organizations.
- (2) Serve as a resource for new and continuing organizational innovation projects.
- (3) Continue a national leadership role in the study and application of organizational quality and communication improvement principles and practices, particularly as they apply to higher education.
- (4) Foster collaboration and synergy among constituencies of the institution. A crucial value of the quality philosophy is the recognition that the multiple constituencies of a university faculty, administrators, staff, students, parents, guidance counselors, legislators, tax-paying citizens, employers, and so forth will have different and at times competing perspectives, concerns, and objectives. It is the goal of quality programs like QCI to develop cross-unit and cross-functional approaches and processes for reducing the potential problematic consequences of these differences and for maximizing potential synergy to the benefit of the entire university community.

Concluding Comment

To the extent that Rutgers QCI is successful, it will continue to foster increasing assessment and improvement throughout the institution aimed at increasing the effectiveness and efficiency university systems, procedures, and services. Ultimately, the goal of the initiative is to contribute to the university efforts to advance our standing as a premier research university, and a leading choice in higher education among our key constituencies, including current and prospective students, alumni, parents, employers, colleagues at other institutions, the general public, and our own faculty and staff.

TABLE 1**EXAMPLES OF UNIVERSITIES WITH QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

Carnegie Mellon	Michigan
Cornell	North Carolina
Duke	Ohio State
Georgia Tech	Penn
Harvard	Penn State
Howard	Rochester Institute of Technology
Illinois	Rutgers
Iowa	Syracuse
MIT	Texas
Maryland	Wisconsin

TABLE 2**EXAMPLES OF UNIVERSITY/BUSINESS QUALITY PARTNERSHIPS**

(Adapted from Ruben, B. D. *Quality in Higher Education. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1993*)

Babson College/The New England	Rutgers University/AT&T, Johnson & Johnson
Carnegie Mellon University/Xerox	Syracuse University/Corning, Inc.
Cornell University/Proctor & Gamble	Texas A & M University/3M
Duke University/Northern Telecom	University of Arizona/Intel
Duquesne University/Westinghouse	University of Maryland/Westinghouse
East Texas State University/Texas Instruments	University of Michigan/General Motors
Georgia Institute of Technology/Milliken & Co.	University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill)/Northern Telecom
Howard University/Ford Motor Company	University of Pittsburgh/Westinghouse
Illinois Institute of Technology/Nalco Chemical	University of Tennessee (Knoxville)/Eastman Chemical Company
Iowa State University/Texas Instruments	University of Texas/Ford Motor Company
Massachusetts Institute of Technology/IBM	University of Wisconsin (Madison)/Proctor & Gamble, IBM
Michigan Technological University/3M	Wayne State University/Ford Motor Company
North Carolina State University/Milliken & Co.	
Ohio State University/Ford Motor Company	
Pennsylvania State University/Dupont, IBM	
Purdue University/Motorola, Inc.	
Rochester Institute of Technology/IBM	

TABLE 3

QCI-DEVELOPED RESOURCES

Campus Coordinators

Coordinators at Camden and Newark provide campus-based planning, coordination, support and liaison with campus leaders and QCI.

Faculty-Staff-Student Educator Network

Volunteer faculty, staff, and students from all three campuses with organizational development expertise support QCI activities and assist with training and other activities.

Department Affiliates

Volunteers from various university departments serve in liaison roles between QCI and their organization.

Corporate Support

Corporate support comes in the form of funds, services, facilities, materials, consultants and organization-to-organization consultation.

QCI Graduate Student Awards (QCI Graduate Associates)

50% of GA-level funding by Johnson & Johnson and AT&T for five students for three years.

Loaned Executives (Corporate Associates)

Senior executives from Johnson & Johnson and AT&T with experience in organizational quality programs work with QCI on a part-time basis to assist with planning, development and implementation activities.

TABLE 4**PARTICIPATION IN QCI PROGRAMS**

<u>Programs/Activities</u>	<u>Participant Totals</u> ¹⁴
Organizational Assessment	107
Excellence in Higher Education	107
Leadership Education	
Introduction to Quality/Service Excellence	597
Leaders Seminar	557
Facilitator Training	87
Student Presentation	320
TOTAL	1561
Work Process Improvement	
Process Improvement Workshop	190
Benchmarking Workshop	19
Root Cause Analysis Workshop	42
Process Improvement Teams	297
TOTAL	548
Faculty, Staff, and Workplace Climate	
Faculty Welcome Program	
1993	110
1994	111
1995	90
1996	93
TOTAL	404
New Staff Welcome Program	
1996	43
1997	63
TOTAL	106
Faculty Recognition Program	
1994	230
1996	231
1997	176
TOTAL	637
Organizational Climate Inventory	137
TOTAL	137
Service Excellence	
"Face of Rutgers" Workshop	630
Feedback System Workshop	267
TOTAL	897
GRAND TOTAL	<u>4397</u>

¹⁴ As of April 23, 1997

APPENDIX 1

UNIVERSITY COMMUNICATION ABOUT THE QUALITY EFFORT

RU Focus Articles

2/25/94 *Higher Education and Business: Partnership for Quality*

3/4/94 *Rutgers QCI Announces Corporate Partnerships*

12/9/94 *Celebrating Our Most Senior Faculty*

1/17/95 *Marketing Study to Assess Communication Needs*

3/24/95 *Higher Education Looks at New Quality Approaches*

4/21/95 *Quality in Higher Education: Beyond TQM*

9/1/95 *Strategic Plan Gives Shape to University's Future & Multicultural Student Life*

9/8/95 *Newsmakers—Dr. Ruben Named as Baldrige Examiner*

9/15/95 *Market Study Recommends Communications Strategy Faculty and Staff*

10/20/95 *New Faculty Receive a Warm Welcome*

11/10/95 *Facilities Teams Build New Customer Focus*

1/31/96 *MSA Committees Hit the Ground Running*

2/9/96 *Multicultural Plan Begins to Bear Fruit*

3/29/96 *Faculty Survey to Go On-Line*

4/5/96 *Self-Assessment is Becoming an Essential Strategy*

4/22/96 *Departments Engage in Service Excellence Strategies*

9/20/96 *A Tale of Frustration—University Services from a Student Point of View*

10/4/96 *Rutgers New Welcome Page Takes a Marketing Message to the World Wide Web*

10/18/96 *RU Begins Self-Study for Middle States Accreditation*

10/25/96 *RUCS Sets New Agenda*

12/13/96 *Helping Staff Feel Right at Home—A New Welcome Program Focuses on Quality Issues*

RU Focus—Making A Difference Series

1/27/95 *Sheila Clark*

2/24/95 *Carol Pepe, Donna Smith, Chandra Ganguly*

4/28/95 *Asbed Vassilian*

9/26/95 *Robert Settle, George Robledo, Michael Baccoli*

10/27/95 *Marcia Milgrom*

2/2/96 *Clare LeCompte Jones*

4/26/96 *Tom Pfannkoch*

9/20/96 *Philip Jones*

2/7/97 *Jeffrey Jannarone, Thomas Kujawski*

Electronic Publications

Fall 1994 *Quality Assurance Brent Ruben Leads the Push for Excellence in Higher Education, Online Interview: Coordinators Corner*

Rutgers QCI Website

<http://www.scils.rutgers.edu/QCI/QCI.html>

WCTC Radio

9/27/95 *Quality in Higher Education*

APPENDIX 2

QCI PUBLICATIONS

Ruben, B. D. ed.

Quality in Higher Education. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1995. contains the following, inter al.:

Ruben, B.D. The Quality Approach in Higher Education: Concepts and Context for Change (pp. 1-34).

_____Defining and Assessing Quality in Higher Education: Beyond TQM (pp. 157-172).

_____What Students Remember: Teaching, Learning, and Human Communication (pp. 189-200).

Ruben, B. D. and Lehr, J.

Excellence in Higher Education: A Guide for Organizational Self-Assessment, Strategic Planning and Improvement. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1997.

_____ *Excellence in Higher Education: Workbook*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1997.

Tromp, S., Warner, D.B. Ruben, D. and Waldman, D.

Process Improvement in Higher Education. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1997.

Tromp, S. and Warner, D.

Root Cause Analysis in Higher Education. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1997.

Ruben, B. D., Tromp, S. and Rison, M.

Service Excellence Leadership in Higher Education, Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1997.

Rison, M., Tromp, S. and B. D. Ruben.

Team Facilitation. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1997.

Ruben, B.D.

The Face of Higher Education: Quality and Service Excellence on the Front Line: An Introduction and Workbook. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt 1996).

Lederman, L.C.

Asking Questions and Listening to Answers. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1996).

Ruben, B.D.

Tradition of Excellence: Higher Education Quality Self-Assessment Program. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1995.

APPENDIX 3**NEWARK CAMPUS QCI PROGRAM TIMELINE**

ACTIVITIES	DATE	PARTICIPANTS
Provost appoints Dorothy J. DeMaio University Professor to leadership of QCI project	October 1995	
Campus Survey Re: Leadership receptivity to quality initiatives	Oct 1995 to April 1996	All campus service units and academic units
Campus Plan Developed	April 1996	
Provost presents campus plan	May 1996	All campus service units and academic units
Leadership Workshops offered	May 1996 to Dec 1996	All campus service units and participating academic units
Face of Rutgers Workshops offered	Sept 1996 to Jan 1997	All campus service units and participating academic units
Campus Updates disseminated by Dorothy J. DeMaio	Ongoing	Campus-wide distribution, as relevant
Feedback Workshops with individual units	Jan 1997 to Mar 1997	All campus service units and participating academic units
OCI Organizational Climate Inventory workshop offered	Mar 1997 to May 1997	All campus units and Participating

<p>QCI Educator Networkers assigned to assist and facilitate individual unit QCI initiatives</p>	<p>Dec 1996 -</p>	<p>All campus service and participating academic units</p>
<p>Campus-wide Event Get-together to renew QCI connections</p>	<p>Mar 6, 1997</p>	<p>Entire Newark Campus Staff</p>
<p>SE and EHE Workshops deferred until Fall 1997</p>	<p>September 1997</p>	<p>Criminal Justice Graduate School- Newark Center for Neurosciences Complete College of Nursing</p>

APPENDIX 4

INVITED QCI PRESENTATIONS

- B. D. Ruben and J. Lehr. "Tradition of Excellence: Baldrige-Based Assessment of Higher Education Quality." New Jersey Higher Education Roundtable, Feb. 1995, Pemberton, NJ.
- "A Baldrige-Based Approach to Higher Education Self-Assessment, Strategic Planning and Quality Improvement." American Association of Higher Education, June, 1995, Boston, MA.
- B. D. Ruben. "A Comprehensive Approach to Quality in Higher Education." National Conference on Quality and Retention, July, 1995, New York, NY.
- B. D. Ruben. "The Faculty Role and the Culture of Higher Education: Implications for Quality Initiatives in Higher Education." The Conference Board, July, 1995, New York, NY.
- B. D. Ruben. "The Quality-Communication Linkage: A Critical Relationship for Higher Education." Ford Motor Company-Wayne State University Symposium, Oct, 1995, Detroit, MI.
- "Higher Education Planning and Assessment: Uses of the "Tradition of Excellence." American Association of Higher Education, Jan, 1996, Memphis, TN.
- B. D. Ruben. "Higher Education Quality Initiatives: The Communication Challenge. Business-Higher Education Total Quality Forum, Mar, 1996, Pittsburgh, PA.
- B. D. Ruben. "University Leadership Opportunity for Organizational Communication—Faculty: the Case of Rutgers' QCI". Eastern Communication Association, Apr, 1996, New York, NY.
- B. D. Ruben. The Quality-Communication Linkage: A Critical Relationship for Higher Education Ford Motor Company—University of Texas Symposium, May, 1996, Dearborn, MI.
- S. Tromp). Quality Partnerships NJ Quality Roundtable, Fairleigh Dickinson, May, 1996, NJ.
- S. Tromp. Process Improvement in Higher Education. Montclair State University, June, 1996, NJ.
- B. D. Ruben. Corporate-University Partnering: A University Perspective AT&T School of Business, Aug, 1996, Somerset, NJ.
- B. D. Ruben and J. Lehr. University Leadership Opportunities for the Field of Communication: The Case of Rutgers QCI—The Rutgers Program for Organizational Quality and Communication Improvement. Speech Communication Association/Association of Communication Administrators, Nov, 1996, San Diego, CA.
- B. D. Ruben. Excellence in Higher Education: A Baldrige-Based Approach to Quality Self Assessment, Strategic Planning and Improvement in Higher Education—A Progress Report . American Association for Higher Education Quality, Feb, 1997, Orlando, FL.
- S. Tromp. Service Excellence: The 'Outsider' Perspective . Registrar's Conference, Mar, 1997, Iona College, NY.

S. Tromp. Use of the Modified Focus Group Technique. College of New Jersey, Mar, 1997, Trenton, NJ.

B. D. Ruben. Excellence in Higher Education: The Rutgers Approach to Organization Self-Assessment and Improvement. Presented at the Baldrige Education Summit, Department of Commerce, Washington, DC, July 1997.

B. D. Ruben. an J. Lehr. Excellence in Higher Education. Invitational Workshop, AAHE (American Association for Higher Education), Washington, DC, Sept 1997.

APPENDIX 5

FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS

Harold Beder, Faculty, Graduate School of Education, Facilitator

Linda Lederman, Faculty, Department of Communication, Facilitator

Dorothy DeMaio, University Professor, Nursing

Richard Engle, Associate Vice President for Facilities

Christine Haska, Vice President for Institutional Research & Planning

Rosemary Howell, Assistant Dean, Cook College

Kenneth Kressel, Faculty Member, Psychology; Director, Teaching Excellence Centers-Newark

Cal Maradonna, Associate Provost, Camden

Rosa Oppenheim, Associate Dean, Faculty of Management

Stephen Otzenberger, Director of Personnel Services

Stephen Pick, Graduate Student, Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology

Ronald Rice, Faculty, Department of Communication, SCILS

Joseph Seneca, Vice President for Academic Affairs

William Walker, Executive Director of University Communications

Cheryl Wallace, Graduate Student, Communication, Information & Library Studies

Matthew Weismantel, Director, Campus Information Services