

APPENDIX C – PREVIOUS CIP

Table 1: CIP Outcomes, Measures & Targets Table (focus on at least one for the next two years)

| A. Expected Outcome(s) Results expected in this unit (e.g. Authorization requests will be completed more quickly; Increase client satisfaction with our services) | B. Measure(s) Instrument(s)/process(es) used to measure results (e.g. survey results, exam questions, etc.) | C. Target(s) Level of success expected (e.g. 80% approval rating, 10 day faster request turn-around time, etc.) |
|--|--|---|
| Increase efficiency, effectiveness and customer satisfaction by implementing a district year-round phone bank (collaboration with Advising and Financial Aid) | Baseline data include call volume and costs. New tracking will be compared to baseline. Customer service surveys. | Reductions in cost for temporary workers. Reduction in full time staff being pulled away from other duties to supervise phone bank. Customer satisfaction with ARO increase by 10%. |
| Increase efficiency, effectiveness and customer satisfaction by developing and utilizing an in-house application process. | Track out-of-state coded residency notification emails and compare. | Reduce the number of residency emails by 25%. |
| Increase efficiency, effectiveness and customer satisfaction by implementing College Source Degree Audit System | Track system reports and customer service surveys. | Increase customer satisfaction related to degree audit and schedule building by 25%. |

Table 2. CIP Outcomes 1 & 2 (FOCUS ON AT LEAST 1)

| | |
|--|---|
| H. Outcome #1 Increase efficiency, effectiveness and customer satisfaction by implementing a district year-round phone bank (collaboration with Advising and Financial Aid). | |
| I. Measure (Outcome #1) Baseline data include call volume and costs. New tracking will be compared to baseline. Customer service surveys. | J. Target (Outcome #1) Reductions in cost for temporary workers. Reduction in full time staff being pulled away from other duties to supervise phone bank. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Customer satisfaction with ARO increase by 10%. |
| <p>K. Action Plan (Outcome #1) A formal request was submitted for review which included call volume and anticipated budget.</p> | |
| <p>L. Results Summary (Outcome #1) Due to the restructuring of Student and Enrollment Services, the implementation of the year-round phone bank for Admissions has been postponed. In an effort to enhance information for students and the community, the Admissions website was redesigned. Content was consolidated and decision paths were built based on student type.</p> | |
| <p>M. Findings (Outcome #1) None available at this time.</p> | |
| <p>N. Implementation of Findings The proposal for the phone bank will be resubmitted next fiscal year.</p> | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>A. Outcome #2 Increase efficiency, effectiveness and customer satisfaction by developing and utilizing an in-house application process.</p> | |
| <p>B. Measure (Outcome #2) Track out-of-state coded residency notification emails and compare.</p> | <p>C. Target (Outcome #2) Reduce the number of residency emails by 25%</p> |
| <p>D. Action Plan (Outcome #2) Work with the IT department to identify software solutions and develop an in-house admissions application that will have built in residency logic. The data collected will be loaded directly in to the student information system. A student's residency status will be calculated based upon their responses in the application.</p> | |
| <p>E. Results Summary (Outcome #2) Measuring the effectiveness of the in-house application related to residency should not have been established related to the quantity of emails. Therefore, the number of out-of-state residence students was calculated in Spring 2016 (prior to the full launch of the new application) compared to Spring 2017 (after launching the application). The results show a significant reduction in the number of out-of-state students.</p> | |

F. Findings (Outcome #1)

From the admissions applications processed, the following percentages of out-of-state students were calculated

| Term | Total Applications | Out-of-state applications | Percentage |
|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Spring 2016 | 9,691 | 3,743 | 38.6% |
| Spring 2017 | 9,392 | 2,374 | 25.2% |

This was also compared to the district-wide headcount statistics to check for variance in student status

| Term | In District | Out-of-state applications | |
|-------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Spring 2016 | 18,233 (69%) | 931 (4%) | |
| Spring 2017 | 19,103 (69%) | 1,030 (4%) | |

There was no change in the student demographic of in-district compared to out-of-district.

The in-house admissions application helped to accurately classify students upon admission

G. Implementation of Findings

With the new in-house application, students are better served through greater accuracy of tuition calculation upon admission.