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

   The program review was clearly written.
   The resource request was strongly presented.
   There is a referral system in place for students that require more health care services that student health center aren’t able to provide.

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

   There isn’t mention in the program review how the Student Health Center markets their program on campus.
   **Mission Statement:** The mission statement should not only include the NEVHC’s mission statement but a statement that references the student population.
   **Student Satisfaction Survey:** A survey is mentioned but no details of the specific survey are explained.
   **Professional Development:** The student health center may consider participating in some of the workshops given by the professional development committee.

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

   There isn’t a clear demonstration of how the health center supports the goals of the college as a whole.

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 clear and concise.

   b. The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections

      There out the program review, the focus is what the student health center offers service as part of the NEVHC. There doesn’t seem to be a true connection with the college.
c. Planning Assumptions and Assessment

It seems Health Insurance Enrollment is a need for students. In 2013, 77.48% of the students seen at the Student Health Center were uninsured. However, there isn’t a plan in place in the program review that addresses this issue.

d. Unit Objectives and Resources

Unit objectives are clear.

e. The remaining sections

See section 4b.

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 alignment of the SAO, objectives and resource request is clear.

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

There were no prior recommendations.
### 7. Commendations.

The program review was clearly written.
The resource request was strongly presented.
There is a referral system in place for students that require more health care services that student health center aren’t able to provide.

### 8. Recommendations

**Mission Statement**: The mission statement should not only include the NEVHC’s mission statement but a statement that references the student population.

**Student Satisfaction Survey**: A survey is mentioned but no details of the specific survey are explained.

**Professional Development**: The student health center may consider participating in some of the workshops given by the professional development committee.

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

N/A