I. Does the Program Review provide in-depth information regarding the program?

Yes, overall it was a good review, but we would also note as did the previous year’s committee that it remains somewhat incomplete. We recommend more specific assessment results be written into future reports in order to demonstrate specific and measurable progress towards project’s stated overall goals. Without specific numbers and percentages it is more difficult to assess in-depth progress and make timely recommendations.

II. Does the Program Review provide evidence of program effectiveness?

Yes, demonstrates some program effectiveness, but needs to provide more specific data results in order to compare and measure effectiveness appropriately – incremental progress can best be measured when there’s a starting point and specific data is added each program review year. Some evening hours were included in this year’s schedule as a result of the previous reviewers’ recommendations.

III. How was the evidence measured for effectiveness?

1. We based our review on the director’s responses to our interview for this review on March 22, 2012. She stated her responses were based on her knowledge of the participants’ progress towards their Personal Success Plan (PSP), the results from the satisfaction surveys, participant feedback, and the staff’s review of participants’ progress towards their academic goals. Thus, this review was based primarily on qualitative data provided during the interview.

IV. Recommendations

1. Last year’s committee noted a low return of the participant satisfaction survey and recommended that an attempt be made to increase the rate of return. The current report still shows a 40% participation rate, and it’s unclear whether the survey was administered in a new format to increase the rate of return, or if the data has not been updated for the current review year. We recommend implementing 1-2 additional methods to increase the rate of response, such as: administering as an online survey, including it as a component of the 5 mandatory workshops participants are required to complete annually, and or have a self-serve drop box. Furthermore, we recommend implementing a needs assessment questionnaire which can be incorporated into the satisfaction survey.

2. SLOs still show no responses under the Results and Implementation Plan sections – if any activity was undertaken/implemented last year to meet any of the 3 objectives, an assessment should now be applicable and a response could now be documented in each of the SLO and Objective sections instead of the stated “N/A” or blank responses. Implementing this recommendation would make the report more complete and show fewer data gaps.

3. Update Assessment results under the 3 Objectives; currently there is no specific or measurable data to substantiate progress towards stated objectives. Providing some quantitative/numerical data will help to strengthen the project’s demonstration of progress towards stated objectives, and potentially help the project staff to clarify strengths and weaknesses to current approaches (i.e. process improvement, and help focus limited resources on areas demonstrating biggest need).

4. Previous year’s review indicated a no response to Program Outreach. During this year’s review, the project coordinator indicated that program is at full capacity and does not to do additional outreach since it has an existing waiting list. This year’s committee recommends the staff document the selection procedures and has a methodology in place to determine who is accepted into the program.
since participants are not taken on a first come first serve basis. This would ensure project compliance with the Districts’ policy on equal access and further align project’s work to the advancement of the College’s mission of universal student access and success (ie Core Competencies Alignment). Furthermore, this could avert the implication that participants are cherry picked, and provide additional data upon which the program’s effectiveness can be measured quantitatively.

5. Include in posted office hours the hours when tutoring and “by appointment” office personnel are available in the office even though the office door may be closed to demonstrate additional non-traditional and evening service hours.

6. We recommend that the External Accountability section be completed with data demonstrating inclusion of external committee members. We strongly recommend that an external Advisory Board be assembled to demonstrate external oversight compliance. Furthermore, we recommend that the Board include a cross section of the educational community in scheduled meetings. This action could provide program staff with innovative cross-sectional feedback to help them address student needs while working within the constraints of current budget shortages. Moreover, this would help to strengthen relationships with community stakeholders, promote common development, and align the program’s objectives with the College’s core competencies (reference Core Competencies Alignment section).