|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responsive to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall**  **Judgment** | **Comments** |
| 1. What does the unit do? | A |  |  | A | The authors successfully explain the purpose and the context of the service unit. |
| 2. What is the unit’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan? | A | AWR | AWR | AWR | 2A: I think the authors could provide empirical evidence that supports the assertion that Communications supports the college mission through enhancing the “community-centered” awareness of Collin College… attendance increases, enrollment numbers… the section relies solely on qualitative or anecdotal data— and I think there should be some measurable success that could be included. While I understand it would be impossible to directly credit Communications with increases in enrollment or attendance at events—an attempt should be made.  2B: A similar attempt should be made to include empirical evidence in this section. While I believe that it would be inaccurate to claim Communications was the SOLE reason for improved results—I think the authors could claim some role in the increase in the numbers. Specifically rates of completion and retention; and the increase in dual credit enrollment. |
| 3. Why are the unit processes done? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Overall, I feel this section needs more context and history to understand why the authors are presenting the data and information they believe is relevant. I also believe this is an incredibly difficult section to create, because the information and rationale behind these types of decision is not always evidenced based… but rather aspirational (what you hope to make happen). Therefore, I feel the authors need to have some flexibility in how the engage and interpret these questions.  3A. I am not sure internal/external is the best way to contextualize and explain what Communications PR does. I would assume that in addressing things like website traffic it would be impossible to know what is internal versus external as they are currently defined.  3B. I think the comparison of TCC and UTD are appropriate and make sense from a Communications standpoint. But again, I feel that some explanation and context would help talk about why these institutions are best available metrics for this section. |
| 4. How does the unit impact student outcomes? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | I think the success of the section will require anecdotal evidence—so possibly some student interviews or focus groups would provide the authors with some “evidence” to support their points. I think the requirements of this section and the nature of the Communications efforts are a difficult merger. However, I do believe the authors could provide specific examples of how they crafted niche communication efforts for specific and diverse audiences. These efforts would help to make a stronger case. |
| 5. How effectively does the unit communicate? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | I think this section can be strengthened with minimal examples of the efforts describes. Who did Clarus suggest they target?—provide an examples of the targeted message they employed. What were the recommendations made by the website design firm… what was the rationale behind these suggestions… how were they implemented in the current plans to revise the website.  Again, this cannot measured with the precision that other units might be able to answer the same question. |
| 6. Does the unit build and leverage partnerships? | A | AWR | AWR | A | I think this section answers the question as asked. But I am assuming there is assumption of more context of how some, if not all, of these partnerships are mutually beneficial. I feels some concrete examples of how Collin works with these partners would go a long way to explain how important maintaining these partnerships are to the college. |
| 7. Are staff supported with professional development? | A | A | A | A | While I think this section could be edited and more concise (bullet points would suffice), I have no issues with it’s current state. |
| 8. [Optional] Does the unit have sufficient facilities and equipment? |  |  |  |  | NA |
| 9. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | It appears that a change in the nature of the Communications PR department has resulted in a major shift in CIP goals and plans.  Again, I more detailed and contextualized narrative explaining the history of the department… who we were before versus who we are now… and how that has had a direct impact on our CIP goals would be helpful and improve the response.  Overall, I think the authors are answering the questions as best they can given the change in leadership and structure—but some history and context might go a long way to explain some of the alterations to the goals and the limited progress on new goals.  NOTE: It may be this unit should be allowed to abstain from this section; or simply create a version of the question that allows them to more directly answer completely. |
| 10. How will the unit evaluate its success? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | (NOTE: This is another section the unit might be allowed to abstain from answering. The unit does not and probably cannot have direct impact on student outcomes—in fact, it functions to support other departments and outside directives. Therefore, since they are almost always support objectives and goals they play little role in creating—this question would be difficult to answer in the best of circumstances, but impossible in this current moment of transition.)  I find this section difficult to assess, in part because of the changes in the leadership structure and the mission of Communications PR.  I appreciate the efforts to reduce to workload of campus-wide professionals through embedded coordinators… but I think there should be attempt to document how the workload will shift and what that time savings means for the rest of the staff.  I also think this is an opportunity to set some “soft” communication goals that might also streamline communications to both external and internal audiences… the production of newsletters should get easier and more systematic the more you produce them and there are tools to measure how audiences are engaging with these materials… at some point that should be part of the plan. |
| 11. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Tables | AWR |  |  | AWR | I think both B and C should be revisited to more completely address the expectations of the chart.  i.e. “Information Sessions with clients”—might be a tool for measurement, but I need more context/narrative to understand how that would work.  Similarly, Tracking and trying to measure READERSHIP of The Roundup might be a more effective tactic than just simply stating we are going to continue to produce and hope everyone reads it. |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Accepted Without Recommendations | Accepted With Recommendations | Revisit and Revise |

**General comments about the submission or rationale for the conclusion:**