

Data Quality Evaluation Methodology

Review each prioritized engagement tactic, establish a data quality score based on an average across 5 dimensions

	COMPLETENESS <i>Historical volume of data</i>	TIMELINESS <i>Ease of access to data</i>	VALIDITY <i>Subjective measure of confidence in outcome attribution</i>	CONSISTENCY <i>Predictable, repeatable results for a tactic</i>	INTEGRITY <i>Accurate inputs, and process standardization</i>
★★★★★	3+ years	Automated ETL, simple logic	81-100% confidence	Frequent, broad client mix, Clear plans	Standard process, complete input
★★★★☆	2-3 years	Automated ETL, complex logic	61-80% confidence	Frequent, Wavering client mix, Clear plans	~Standard process, minor input gaps
★★★☆☆	1-2 years	Manual ETL	41-60% confidence	Occasional, Unstable client mix, Clear plans	~Standard process, major input gaps
★★☆☆☆	6 months - 1 year	Flat files, unstructured data	21-40% confidence	Rare, Narrow client mix, Unclear plans	Non-standard process, many input gaps
★☆☆☆☆	<6 months	3 rd party, limited, unclear links	1-20% confidence	Rare, Exclusive client mix, Unclear plans	Variable process, many input gaps
☆☆☆☆☆	No data	No data	0% confidence	No data	No data

Tactic Quality Scores With Recommendations

		SCORE	SERVICES PROVIDED	ENGAGEMENT INDEX
PRINT	Tactic 1	4.4	✓	✓
	Tactic 2	4.2	✓	✓
	Tactic 3	4.2	✓	✓
TELEPHONIC	Tactic 4	4.4	✓	✓
	Tactic 5	4	✓	✓
	Tactic 6	3.6	✓	✓
	Tactic 7	2.8	✗	✗
WEBINARS	Tactic 8	3.0	✗	✗
	Tactic 9	3.0	✓	✗

		SCORE	SERVICES PROVIDED	ENGAGEMENT INDEX
DIGITAL	Tactic 10	3.4	✓	✓
	Tactic 11	3.4	✓	✓
ONSITE EVENTS	Tactic 12	3.6	✓	✓
VIRTUAL	Tactic 13	3.6	✓	✓
PARTNER INTEGRATION	Tactic 14	3.6	✓	✓
	Tactic 15	3.6	✓	✓
INCENTIVES	Tactic 16	3.6	✓	✓
	Tactic 17	3.6	✓	✓
	Tactic 18	3.2	✗	✗
	Tactic 19	2.8	✗	✗