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

The SSS/TRIO program is managing what is presented to be a very student centered program with limited staff and resources. Despite the limitations, the program seems to receive positive student feedback.

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

The SAO and Objective sections are the areas most in need of improvements. The assessment methods used should provide the appropriate evidence for the SAO. In the Objective section, consider using consistent language when referring to persistence and/or retention. The activity sections (under objectives) could have provided more detailed information.

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 access, student success, student transfer and improving basic skills.

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 need to re-work first SAO so that the assessment method will provide the appropriate evidence for that outcome.

   b. The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections

   SSS/TRIO Evaluation/survey could have been included in the supplemental materials section.

   Campus student satisfaction survey #614 and #502 could have been addressed.

   In the professional development section, including the specific names of some conferences as well as workshops would have been helpful for a better understanding of the program.

   The need for adequate tutoring space was expressed yet there was no related objective or resource request. Possibly consider adding for next time if tutoring space is still an issue.
c. Planning Assumptions and Assessment

Under challenges, the lack of staffing to cover the front office is stated. However, in the projections, it is stated that the support staff is adequate. Consider making language more consistent.

d. Unit Objectives and Resources

Objective 1- consider adding a persistence measure and criterion or delete persistence altogether.

Objective 2- in the activity section, consider adding more information on how this will be done and include what interventions are taken for those students that are not in good standing.

Objective 3- consider using persistence and not retention here to be consistent with the expected outcome and measure.

e. The remaining sections

The remaining sections appear to be 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)?

This program does not have a long history of prior program reviews. Therefore, the presentation of data and analysis was not as robust and therefore the program could not include improvement objectives.

Although the connections between Objectives and SAO’s was evident, the assessment method for one of the SAO’s was not clear.
6. To what extent are recommendations from prior validation addressed effectively?

There was one prior recommendation that was not addressed.

7. Commendations.

Student needs in the program seem to be met via tutoring, workshops and counseling services. The program seems to be able to provide adequate counseling services with limited funding.

8. Recommendations

In the future, consider detailing the types of services offered (the names of workshops, field trips to where?, how students are mentored and by who?).

Whenever possible, include information and analysis on campus student satisfaction/Faculty/staff surveys.

Whenever possible, include additional supplemental materials.

In future program reviews, respond to all sections and avoid leaving areas blank.

In future program reviews, respond to prior year’s recommendations.

Attach program flyer to detail services further.

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

No questions.