<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division:</th>
<th>Lead Validator:</th>
<th>Extension:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Michong Park X7868</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 6, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Year:</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Team:</td>
<td>Michong Park and Diana Bonilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Clearly written program review.
- Presented a strong case for resource requests.
- Good use of transfer data.

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

- The number of objectives and resource requests significantly outweigh the number of SAO’s. Assessing outcomes that relate to some of these objectives have the potential to further help support resource requests.

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

- The CPR supports the mission and goals of the college by detailing this program’s focus on student success, student transfer and student equity.
4. To what extent is each of the following sections properly completed and up-too

Indicate assessment method for SAO 1.

If planning on many objectives and resource requests, consider linking with additional SAO’s to measure program effectiveness.

b. The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections

Consider addressing any relevant data from the campus student satisfaction/faculty/staff survey.

Overall, this program review seems to reflect and support what the program is requesting in objectives and resources.

c. Planning Assumptions and Assessment

Service Area Planning Assumptions section: consider mentioning expected demand for counseling services and describe student demographics.

d. Unit Objectives and Resources

The number of objectives and resource requests significantly outweigh the number of SAO’s.

Objective 1-needs a measure and criterion (i.e. positive impact and by how much over the next how many years?)

Overall, some of the objective areas in assessment method and expected outcome and measure could be re-worked to be clearer (refer to Dr. Lee’s comments).

e. The remaining sections

Seems adequate.
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)?

Clear connections between objectives and SAO’s. Based on 2 SAO’s, the connection is clear however, when requesting resources, it would make a stronger case to support this request by linking to SAO’s.

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

There were no prior recommendations.

7. Commendations.

- Clearly written program review.
- Presented a strong case for resource requests.
- Good use of transfer data.

8. Recommendations

- Consider responding to campus faculty and staff survey when applicable (i.e. respondent 82).
- Consider linking more objectives and resources to SAO’s.
- Consider changing Academic Advisor (whenever referenced) to counselor, adjunct.

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

No questions.