|  | **Responsive to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall****Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the unit do? | A |  |  | A | Addressed each element of query |
| 2. What is the unit’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Recommendations* With regard to mission (2A as Unit refers to it): directly state that its connection to mission statement centers on institution being community-centered (through its efforts in heightening awareness of college and college activities in geographic region and of college’s role in serving academic and workforce education needs of geographic region).
* With regard to strategic plan (2B as Unit refers to it):

NOTE: If no data available to demonstrate Unit’s *direct* impact on strategic plan goals #1 and #3, then suggest Unit delete mention of these two strategic plan goals altogether.* 1. Provide quantitative or qualitative data to demonstrate *direct* impact of Unit regarding:
		1. strategic plan goal #1 so-called proposed measures
			1. A. six-year completion rate
			2. C. fall-to-fall persistence rate
			3. E. 60x30TX program completions
		2. strategic plan goal #3 so-called proposed measure
			1. A. “Key transitions into and from Collin College are reviewed to ensure quality and currency”
	2. In reference to strategic plan goal #6, clearly state:
		1. So-called proposed measures (i.e., A. clearly articulated definitions, B. total number of engaged stakeholders, C. total numbers of engaged stakeholders broken out by key groups, D. specify implementation of software tool or stage of identification/implementation of such tool)
		2. Measurement data for each so-called proposed measure listed for goal #6
 |
| 3. Why are the unit processes done? | AWR | AWR  | AWR | AWR | 1. Recommendations
	1. Reorganize this section (i.e., 3. Why Do We Do the Things We Do?) to separate *external*-focused functions/services from *internal*-focused functions/services, fully addressing all aspects of this section for each.
	2. At outset on p. 13, emphasize that, apart from College President, Unit is the official initiator of communication about the College to any/all external audiences, manages the College’s brand and public voice/image (including role of ensuring quality and consistency of Collin’s public voice/image with internal-client-issued communications), and responds to media and public information requests to the College.
	3. Either describe in text the importance of data within graphics of pageviews on p. 14-15 as necessary to a primary function and reduce size of graphics OR delete graphics of pageviews altogether.
		1. NOTE: Graphic on p. 15 reveals inaccuracy/inadequacy of statement on p.14, “Traffic on the college’s website, www.collin.edu, has grown continually along with the college;” unique pageviews dropped after 2019-2020 and have not (yet) returned to 2019-2020 number.
	4. Eliminate graphic on p. 16 since text covers same info or reduce size.
	5. On page 16 reference to “questions 2A and 3A” confusing
	6. New role of campus liaisons and new goals mentioned on p. 18
	7. Move information addressing 3A from Appendix to body of report, specifically:
* Self-Service design systems
* Campus Liaisons role
* Cost breakdowns for outsourcing labor

Fundamental Concern about 3B: Because UTD is a university not a community college, it seems inappropriate as a “comparable college” for Benchmarking.1. Recommendations
	1. Clearly address new ideas gained for service improvement from comparable colleges as required in 3B Benchmarking prompt; if not new ideas for service improvement gained, state as much.
	2. Since survey instrument is in Appendix already, remove from body of report (p. 18-19 currently).
	3. Regarding Appendix treatment of 3B
		1. If aim of including Collin’s actual responses and comparable college’s actual responses to survey instrument on p. 55-58 is to compare data, then
			1. Create data table for ease of comparison and readability in Appendix
			2. Provide comparable colleges’ actual responses to survey instrument as supporting documentation, not in Appendix.
		2. If aim of including Collin’s actual responses and comparable college’s actual responses to survey instrument on p. 55-58 is to summarize information, then:
			1. Remove Collin’s responses from Appendix because this information is already in report body.
			2. Retain Unit’s summaries of returned survey data in Appendix.
			3. Provide comparable colleges’ actual responses to survey instrument as supporting documentation, not in Appendix.
 |
| 4. How does the unit impact student outcomes? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | There is no evidence to show the effects of the Unit on student outcomes (of recruitment and possibly of retention – not sure as any case could be made for Unit’s role in completion). * Evidence in this section conveys output of Unit, not impact.
* Unit relies on speculation as to its impact, which is logical and plausible, but Unit does not provide verifiable quantitative or qualitative data to support impact.

I do not think the Unit has or has had any measurement instruments to gauge its impact on student outcomes. |
| 5. How effectively does the unit communicate? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | 1. Recommendations
	1. Identify data/goals from College’s recruitment plan.
	2. Identify which (and/or simply quantity of) printed literature and electronic communications produced by Unit aim to support to College’s recruitment plan.
	3. Provide data that demonstrates/evidences impact of Unit’s recruitment-geared printed literature and electronic communications on College’s recruitment numbers (i.e., how many new students at Collin attributed some form of Unit’s output to their decision to enroll at Collin).
	4. If case can be made for Unit’s impact on student outcome of retention:
		1. Identify data/goals from College’s retention plan.
		2. Identify which (and/or simply quantity of) printed literature and electronic communications produced by Unit (and/or by internal clients with Unit’s assistance) aim to support to College’s retention plan.
		3. Provide data that demonstrates/evidences impact of Unit’s (and/or internal client’s) retention-geared printed literature and electronic communications on College’s retention numbers.
	5. Describe the **processes** in place to ensure that information is current, accurate, relevant, and available.
		1. Specify if there are regularly scheduled reviews (e.g. monthly, or annually at end of academic or fiscal year), or if there are specific triggers (e.g., Registrar sends email to AVP that withdrawal date for 16-week classes changes from 8th to 10th week of semester and all print and digital literature must reflect change as of specified date), or whatever mechanisms employed to check currency, accuracy, relevance, and availability of information.
	6. Broaden definition of what Unit conceives of as “literature” on p.23 to address the digital ads, videos, social media posts, and any other strategic messaging produced directly and indirectly by the Unit for a student audience and then answer report questions of “How does the program ensure that students are informed/aware of unit literature? Is unit literature made accessible to all students (i.e., can they obtain the information they need)?”
		1. If Unit cannot answer for current students, then answer first question regarding prospective students (i.e., How does the program ensure that students are informed/aware of unit literature?).

NOTE: Although Unit commendably solicited student feedback through Clarus survey for digital messaging and for College’s website redesign, this student feedback served to aid Unit’s work planning not to measure its impact.1. Recommendations
	1. Create a subsection 5B header over discussion of Unit’s web/internet presence.
		1. Reformat narrative to list format, even if retaining descriptive aspects now present on p. 23.
		2. Add list of social media URLs that Unit maintains for College.
2. Reorganize contents of table.
	1. Contents of “Type” column consist of URLS instead of categorical descriptor of literature as report form designates.
		1. Consider consolidating literature by Type and listing more than one name of literature in “Title” column. Examples:
			1. Use “graphic download” under “Type” column and in “Title” column, list letterhead and logos in single cell.
			2. Use “user guides/manuals” under “Type” column and in “Title” column, list guides for editorial and social media styles and graphics standards manual.
		2. If consolidate in this way and checkboxes differ, annotate under “Date of Last Review/Update” column. (Also, list responsible parties if more than one, annotating who links to which title if necessary/desirable.)
 |
| 6. Does the unit build and leverage partnerships? | AWR | AWR? | RR | RR? | Recommendations1. MUST explain value added by each partnership (or partnership type, see discussion of “Description” column below) to Unit’s outcomes (impact).
2. For first row, break out into multiple rows,
	1. Removing “External Relations” from first column
	2. creating individual rows each for:
		1. the federal and state elected office districts combined
		2. Baylor Scott…Board
		3. Richardson Chamber of Commerce…Committee
			1. If any other local chambers of commerce are also partners, list together in this row
		4. Plano ISD…Class 2
			1. If any other ISDs are also partners, list together in this row
	3. Describe the partner/organization type categorically (e.g., local chamber(s) of commerce).
	4. In last column regarding value, indicate
		1. what partner (partner type) provides to Unit (**not** what Unit supplies to partner)
		2. explanation of how that partnership advances the Unit’s outcomes
3. In second row, similar to first row: break into multiple rows to list individual media outlets that are partners; in “Description” column note type of media outlet (e.g., newspapers); in last column regarding value, indicate
	1. what partner (partner type) provides to Unit (not what Unit supplies to partner)
	2. explanation of how that partnership advances the Unit’s outcomes
4. In third row, the President’s Office seems to be described as a client rather than a partner.
5. In the fifth row, I thought Campus Liaisons were employees of the Unit, not partners.
6. In sixth row, shift individual internal partners listed in second column into first column (but remove President’s Office since already in its own row); consider if appropriate to create separate row for partners that provide distinctive value to Unit’s outcomes.
 |
| 7. Are staff supported with professional development? | A | AWR | AWR | A | Recommendations (Appendix)1. Edit narrative text in last column (i.e., “How is it Valuable to the Unit?”) to
	1. tighten focus on answering question about value added to Unit as a collective group or team
	2. remove language that reflects personal development journey or benefit to employee as an individual person
2. Consider using a single row to list all the monthly communications department guest speakers one time and list everyone who attended (annotated as necessary if they missed one) and then focus on value of these guest speakers to Unit rather than value to individual Unit employees.
 |
| 8. [Optional] Does the unit have sufficient facilities and equipment? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | RR | RR | RR | RR | 1. I do not see any discussion of specific student outcomes in terms of numbers or qualitative measurement (i.e., no measurement of Unit’s impact on student recruitment for new campuses).
2. The portions of this section on Goals 1 and 2 do not seem to engage with improvement but rather to convey College Leadership’s required change of “goals” – which are really targeted directives of work not a measurable goals--and Unit’s output in relation to those “goals.”
 |
| 10. How will the unit evaluate its success? | RR | RR | RR | RR | I do not think the Unit understands the language/terms of CIP.Their expected outcomes sound like aspirational goals.The measures convey no actual instrument of measurement.The targets focus on outputs and not outcomes. |
| 11. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Tables | RR |  |  | RR | I do not think the Unit understands the language/terms of CIP.Their expected outcomes sound like aspirational goals.The measures convey no actual instrument of measurement.The targets focus on outputs and not outcomes. |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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