1. What do you see as the main strengths of the comprehensive program review (CPR)?

The strengths are that the Outreach Component has established connections with institutions in the community. In addition, the program review explains well how the services of the center are connected to the mission of the college and serves the college well.

2. What do you see as the areas most in need of improvement in the CPR?

In the Service Area Planning Assumptions where there is an anticipated expected demand in the growth of the college, an explanation for additional data and analysis is needed. How much growth is expected for the number of students calculated to be served by the center? What % of growth is this in comparison to prior years?

3. To what extent does the CPR demonstrate support for the mission and goals of the college as a whole?

It appears that the described documented services offered by the Center link directly the colleges’ mission and goals. The CPR documents that the Assessment Center is integrated into the Admission process of the college. Moving forward (due to state law changes) will be even more integrated into the student entry process.
4. To what extent is each of the following sections properly completed and up-to-date? If improvements are needed, specify them.

a. Unit Effectiveness—SAOs

The three SAO’S are completed and up to date. Since all of them have future assessments it will be implicit that outcomes be recorded, analyzed and reported when available in future program review cycles.

b. The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections

It appears that they are complete. There is an analysis based on increased enrollment which should be included in (and expanded upon) the Planning Assumptions section.

c. Planning Assumptions and Assessment

The section is thorough in the number of assumptions presented, however, additional information (data and analysis of the expected growth in enrollment and the effect on the center’s workload) is still needed.

d. Unit Objectives and Resources

It appears concise, straight and forward, clearly specifying the objectives and needs of the Center.

e. The remaining sections
5. To what extent are there clear connections from useful evidence (including but not limited to SAO assessments) through meaningful analysis, sound improvement objectives, and relevant resource requests (if any)?

The survey results through analysis clearly demonstrate a connection to the Objectives and Resources, indicating the students’ needs are being analyzed and addressed.

6. To what extent are recommendations from prior validation addressed effectively?

No prior recommendations were noted in the CPR document.

7. Commendations.

Although the Center has not had the appropriate number of personnel and funding for the services, they have successfully assisted as many students as possible. Also, the document is succinct and very clear on most objectives and SAO’s. The document also gives us an indication of the direction of the Center for future planning.
8. Recommendations

1) Additional data analysis of expected enrollment increases and the workload effect it will have on the Center should be expanded upon.

2) We are missing evidence or data that supports the objective and the Student Service Area Outcome that clarifies the reason and needs to start G.E.D. testing.

3) Clarification under the Service Area Planning Assumptions that should include a more direct proposed statement in regard to the change in budgeting for the two full time employees paid out of this programs’ funding, specifically after the SB1456 funds are available to the center.

9. Responses to the validating team’s questions from the program director.