**Reviewers: Christopher Foree, Cathleen Akers, Bridgette Kirkpatrick**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responsive to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall****Judgment** | **Comments****Christopher Foree** | **Comments****Cathleen Akers** | **Comments****Bridgette Kirkpatrick** |
| 1. What does the unit do? | A AA |  |  | AAA | The authors successfully explain the purpose and the context of the service unit. | Addressed each element of query |  |
| 2. What is the unit’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan? | AAWRAWR | AWRAWRAWR | AWRAWRAWR | AWR AWRAWR | 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. | 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)

Measurement data for each so-called proposed measure listed for goal #6 | What is evidence for increased retention recruitment? Are numbers increasing? Really hard to quantify.. but don’t give specific numbers page 10 “clear evidence…. Dozens of articles..”Surely there’s a number or a range of numbersPage 11 states numbers are increasing while they seem to be steady or dropping. Quantify even if can’t quantify the department’s rolePage 11 2B What are the letters referring to 1 ACE, 3A etc?  |
| 3. Why are the unit processes done? | AWRAWRRR | AWRAWRAWR | AWRAWRAWR | AWRAWRAWR | 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. | 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.

 Provide comparable colleges’ actual responses to survey instrument as supporting documentation, not in Appendix. | Which services add the biggest value to the college? Discuss any discrepancies between the services named in these two questions. Not sure this question was answered.Does the Connection Newsletter bring value? What evidence other than sent to 620K people?Page 14 graph: data doesn’t match text, 2019-2020 up, but numbers decline after“How has the function evolved..” they didn’t answer the questionAPPENDIX What if outsourced? They don’t have numbers when they have estimates in which there could be numbers at least ranges.Have numerous VPs, and multiple paid third-party services  |
| 4. How does the unit impact student outcomes? | AWRAWRAWR | AWRAWRAWR | AWRAWRAWR | AWRAWRAWR | 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. | 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. | There isn’t data, it would be hard to get data, if not possible, just say so. |
| 5. How effectively does the unit communicate? | AWRAWRA | AWRAWRA | AWRAWRA | AWRAWRA | 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. | 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.

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? | AAWRA | AWRAWRA | AWRRRA | ARRA | 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. | 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.

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? | AAA | AAWRA | AAWRA | AAA | While I think this section could be edited and more concise (bullet points would suffice), I have no issues with it’s current state. | 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

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. | They have addressed the issue and hopefully they will get an increase –how about taking a Collin College course? All staff list staff meeting guest speakers—could acknowledge the list once for everyone and not re-list  |
| 8. [Optional] Does the unit have sufficient facilities and equipment? |  |  |  |  | NA |  | N/A |
| 9. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | AWRRRAR | AWRRRRR | AWRRRRR | AWRRRRR | 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.  | 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).

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.” | The report discusses the leadership changes in the department; reads as making excuses.If rewritten with context of leadership change, would be more powerful.Original Goals and outcomes followed by New goals and outcomes, then answering the question of reaching their goals—it would be betterPg 39 text reads they met monthly goals except for X months—there were lots of months not met, that is not meeting a goal. Maybe a table with when met, when not met, then explainFrom March 2020 CIP have personnel reclassifications and still don’t have reclassification? The VP Ext relations is still reviewing 3 years later?Page 41 3 changes implemented in F2020—list and number |
| 10. How will the unit evaluate its success? | AWRRRAR | AWRRRRR | AWRRRRR | AWRRRRR | (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. | 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. | Pg 44 Strengths examples of jobs that don’t fit college’s strategic goals?Why compare UTD and not other CCs? Did other CCs not respond? What other colleges did you survey? Appendix and section answers are redundant |
| 11. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Tables | AWRRRAWR |  |  | AWRRRAWR | 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. | 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. | Need to have measurable goals |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

This program review has a lot of good, it is not bad enough to Revise and Revisit, but we strongly suggest the recommended changes to be incorporated. Overall, they had many changes that disrupted their department—restructuring and changes in leadership. We recommend they address the original CIP/goals, then the new. As it currently reads, it isn’t the report of the facts that it should be. It flips back and forth and often sounds like excuses where it should just be a report.

Some information that was asked for, such as How does the unit impact student outcomes? This question is almost impossible to quantitate, we feel that it is way beyond the program review to determine such a thing. We recommend the rubric be altered for programs, such as this one, not include “impact on student outcomes” etc.

CIP needs a lot of work, need to have measurable goals. SMART goals.