|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responsive to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall**  **Judgment** | **Comments** |
| 1. What does the unit do? | Accepted without Recommendations |  |  | Accepted without Recommendations | Good job, information is concisely presented. Directly addresses all aspects of the question: unit purpose, services/products, constituents served, and regulatory standards. Each section is clearly delineated and provides relevant details. Strong general description of the unit’s services and regulatory obligations. References federal regulations (2 CFR Parts 25, 170, 183, and 200) and names specific agencies. Assuming there is no mission statement since it’s not uploaded |
| 2. What is the unit’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan? | Accepted with Required Changes | Accepted with Required Changes | Accepted with Required Changes | Accepted with Required Changes | The unit’s relationship with the college Mission Statement was overall well done. There could have been more a little more analysis. Evidence and analysis is lacking in the relationship to the college’s Strategic Plan. More details are needed describing how the funds from the external organizations have been used specifically to align with the college’s Strategic Goal #5. Details from Section IV could also be discussed here.  Responsiveness: Identifies a specific strategic goal (Goal 5: Expanding educational access through external partnerships) and explains how the Grants Management Office (GMO) contributes to it. But it doesn’t address other goals or overall strategic plan.  Evidence: Provides list of partnerships, demonstrating external engagement but no evidence of the nature and impact of that engagement. References reputation with and funding received from federal and state agencies but does not quantify impact or provide evidence of it. Including data or examples of specific grant-funded initiatives (e.g., a program launched through a partnership) would improve the evidence  Analysis: Doesn’t explain how partnerships expand educational access, just assumes impact. Explanations of what these partnerships have accomplished or may accomplish and how the collaborations align with strategic plan would help, as would clarifying the impact on students, faculty and the college. |
| 3. Why are the unit processes done? | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Section A-“second highest source of operating revenue” is anecdotal-provide data. Section A2-explain funding status for FY25. Section A4-more details regarding the operations of the service unit. Section A5-more details, how are the grant applications being streamlined and what confusions have existed regarding funding opportunities. Is there training available for identifying grant opportunities or applying? Section A7-Does the unit feel like they operate efficiently? Section B-minimal comparison to other benchmark institutions, however, unit explained why. Would like to see other information compared such as services offered at other institutions, ex. training.  Responsiveness: Provides clear justification for the unit's needs and explains its evolution over time with supporting data. A clearer explanation of what they do would help. Some areas could be expanded for clarity, such as the efficiency discussion, where it’s not clear how close to “as efficiently as possible” they operate.  Analysis: it presents a strong case for why the unit is necessary but could more deeply analyze alternative service models and possible modifications to improve efficiency. The section on outsourcing acknowledges risks but does not quantify potential costs or compare efficiency. Notes challenges in grant submission due to short deadlines and limited personnel but doesn’t propose specific strategies to address these constraints (e.g., hiring, better tracking, internal training). The benchmarking section could explore what other institutions do differently to secure higher staffing or potential funding levels. |
| 4. How does the unit impact student outcomes? | Accepted with Required Changes | Accepted with Required Changes | Accepted with Required Changes | Accepted with Required Changes | Content in sections B and C would also apply to section A. In B, provide the amount of funds available (listed in C) and number of students impacted. Section D-specifics and details on how the Carl Perkins grant aids students. Section E-more details on the direct-to-student grants. Aren’t student outcome effects addressed in the grant application. |
| 5. How effectively does the unit communicate? | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | How does the service unit share grant opportunities with faculty and staff? Is information shared with program coaches? |
| 6. Does the unit build and leverage partnerships? | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Extensive list of established partnerships |
| 7. Are staff supported with professional development? | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Table supports evidence and responds to criteria |
| 8. [Optional] Does the unit have sufficient facilities and equipment? |  |  |  |  | The Unit Financial Resources Table is not complete. Operating Budget CC1131 has been started but not completed. |
| 9. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Outcome #2 Table-Findings says Outcome #1 instead of Outcome #2. |
| 10. How will the unit evaluate its success? | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Review presents a dependency on outside agencies as a weakness, this is the nature of grants and should not be considered a weakness of the service unit. Another deficit of the program is the inability to connect leaders with appropriate bandwidth to work with grants. How is this going to be addressed? |
| 11. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Tables | Accepted with Required Changes |  |  | Accepted with Required Changes | Revisit the “Measure” For Outcome 1. What is the instrument/process that is going to be used to improve tracking and impact. Determining the number of students positively affected is not a measure of improvement. Likewise, the “Measure” for outcome 2 reads more like an action plan not a measure. |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Accepted Without Recommendations | X Accepted With Recommendations | \_\_\_Accepted with Required Recommendations | Revisit and Revise |

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

The program was well done. However, there are a few areas for general improvement. Prompts were addressed throughout the review, however, additional evidence and a more thorough analysis is needed for the “What is the unit’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan?” and “How does the unit impact student outcomes?” sections. Inclusion of specific grant funded initiatives, programs, projects, equipment, etc. would improve the “Evidence” of these prompts. Additionally, explicitly explain how partnerships and funds have expanded educational access and impacted students, programs, and faculty. The action plans, targets, and measure of the unit’s continuous improvement plan needs to be reviewed for clarification.