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

- Description of the department and the services they provide was clear.
- Was very clear that the center needs to continue to formulate a more concise way of surveying services.

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

**Mission Statement:** Mission statement needs to be revisited. It seems that it describes the function of the department and not the “Mission” of the department. It also is not clear how it is aligned with the college’s mission statement. There is not reference in regards to student success.

**Faculty /Staff survey section:** The survey reference was incorrect and used figures that did not appear to relate to the Fall 2013 survey.

**Student Satisfaction Survey:** It seems the survey was not summarized or analyzed but instead commented on why and how the survey was inaccurate with the centers numbers.

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

The goal of the department is to assist students abroad to apply for Los Angeles Mission College.

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

**SAO's:** The Service Area Outcomes were not broad in scope. It was not clear how the SAO’s were aligned with the objectives of the department.

b. The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections

- There isn’t any funding or opportunities for professional development for the director.
- The office does not participate in any committees on campus.
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)?

There isn’t a connection with the SAO, objectives and goals of the department.

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

Although a response was given to the last recommendation, the recommendation was not addressed in the rest of the unit assessment.
7. Commendations.

- Description of the department and the services they provide was clear.
- Was very clear that the center needs to continue to formulate a more concise way of surveying services.

8. Recommendations

- To make Service Area Outcomes more broad in scope. To make clear how the SAO’s are aligned with the objectives of the department.
- To address international students instead of veteran students in the planning assumptions and assessments section of the program review.

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

N/A