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1. What do you see as the main strengths of the comprehensive program review (CPR)?
   - Overall, the CPR is an excellent, in-depth description of the Counseling Department.
   - The CPR is well written and easy to follow
   - There is continuity throughout marked by a “bright line” between the SAO’s, the objectives and the resource requests.
   - Data is reported on and is used to develop and evaluate objectives
   - Student satisfaction survey results were thoroughly analyzed and student concerns are being addressed through thoughtful planning efforts
   - Data from the faculty/staff survey was analyzed fully and suggested changes are being addressed through the SAO/Objective/Resource Request process

2. What do you see as the areas most in need of improvement in the CPR?
   - The program mission statement as a whole is very strong, however, is the statement, “Orientation is made available to all students and is highly recommended . . . “ accurate or is orientation considered “mandatory” per SB1456?
   - SAO’s (some small details such as reporting of results; criterion levels)
   - Advisory Board – consider adding breadth to the Advisory Board in the way of student participation, other LAMC programs and key community partners.

3. To what extent does the CPR demonstrate support for the mission and goals of the college as a whole?
   The Counseling Department CPR clearly demonstrates through the services and supports it provides students an alignment with the mission/goals of LAMC. The Counseling Department clearly articulates its role in servicing students via educational planning, and it also demonstrates an understanding of the importance of improving institutional effectiveness via technology, training, campus governance and planning.
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 SAO’s are excellent! They are very well thought out incorporating meaningful data from surveys and other important sources. The only improvements to note are:

- Clarify the criterion level for SAO 5; since the outcome is increasing SEP completion, can you be more specific regarding the criterion for this objective rather than repeating the criterion stated in SAO 4 (“80% of users will report yearly they are satisfied or very satisfied with those services”)
- SAO’s 6/7 – given that you have indicated that assessment took place in Spring 2014, were there results to report on?
- SAO’s 8/9 – please note what a “significant gain in knowledge by 80% of respondents” looks like from pre-test to post-test.

b. The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections

Overall, this section is very well done!

- The analysis of the survey results and SARS data is linked to SAO’s and delineates an implementation plan that will address the findings in meaningful, substantive ways.
- Professional Development Needs are well connected with SAO’s, Objectives and Resource Requests
- Facilities/Equipment – Need for space is addressed here but there is not an SAO/Objective/Resource Request linked.

c. Planning Assumptions and Assessment

This section is well done.

One thing to consider:

- Under the Service Area Planning Assumptions section: have there been any recommendations from the Advisory Committee that will help guide planning over the next 3 years?

d. Unit Objectives and Resources

The Unit Objectives and Resource Requests are well thought out and they are nicely connected to the SAO’s and other meaningful data/information (e.g., surveys/SARS data).

There were a couple of questions that emerged in reviewing this section:

1. Objective 6 – If the Spring 2014 retreat did take place you may want to indicate such.
2. Objective 3 – Should the end date be 5/1/15 or 6/1/15 like several of the other SAO’s?
e. The remaining sections

The remaining sections are very well done!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a consistent “bright line” evident in the CPR connecting meaningful data (including SAO’s) with improvement objectives and resource requests. The Counseling Department has done an exceptional job in this regard and it is clear that the much time/energy/thought has gone into assuring that meaningful analysis was carried out to determine viable outcomes/objectives/resource requests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. To what extent are recommendations from prior validation addressed effectively?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The recommendations from the prior validation (2010-2011) have been addressed adequately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Commendations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Counseling Department has delivered an exceptional CPR that is well written, easy to read, and comprehensive in scope. Meaningful data is strewn throughout the CPR and it is well connected to outcomes (SAOs), objectives and resource requests. The CPR also nicely demonstrates the breadth of the Counseling Department’s services and how they support/align with the mission/goals of LAMC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Recommendations

- Clarify the criterion level for SAO 5; since the outcome is increasing SEP completion, can you be more specific regarding the criterion for this objective rather than repeating the criterion stated in SAO 4 (“80% of users will report yearly they are satisfied or very satisfied with those services”)

- SAO’s 6/7 – given that you have indicated that assessment took place in Spring 2014, the results should be reported out.

- SAO’s 8/9 – please note what a “significant gain in knowledge by 80% of respondents” looks like from pre-test to post-test.

- Consider whether student participation on the Advisory Committee is warranted.

- Consider an SAO/Objective/Resource Request that addresses the need for additional space for the Counseling Department.

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