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

The purpose and mission of the program is clearly stated and outlines well the program’s connection to the college. Also, the explanation of the population served and how the services of the program will be used by students is explained clearly.

SAOs and Objectives are clear and delineate well what the expected outcomes are for the activities performed by the program.

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

An advisory committee is listed in the document (in the External Accountability section) with a list of members, but no information regarding meetings, minutes, or recommendations coming from the group are included in the CPR.

The Recommendations section under the Accreditation or Compliance Status section refers to documentation available in the Title V HSI office, but at least a short explanation of any audit findings or corrective action plans relating to audits in recent years should be addressed within the CPR.

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

The CPR documents well the interconnectedness of the Title V HSI program with the college, documenting the efforts made to establish continuing systems of employing tutors in specific subjects, funding of success centers and staff, and workshop offerings for students. The core functions of the program, as explained in the Program Mission section, outline three components that directly support the mission and goals of the 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

      SAOs appear to be up-to-date and complete, including data and analysis of prior year’s outcomes and expectations.

   b. The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections

      The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections appear to be complete. Some sections have minimal information (in particular, requests for additional facilities and space, requests for additional professional development opportunities), but it appears the reason for this sparseness is due to a lack of requests for additional resources, as the program is able to meet the needs of staff (professional development) and the program as a whole (facilities).

   c. Planning Assumptions and Assessment

      Service Area Planning Assumptions is not addressed in the document, but this appears related to the fact that the Title V grant funding the program is about to expire and is not renewable. The Self-Assessment section that follows is also noted that the program will end, but it would be recommended that commentary and analysis by the program director be included regarding the expected (or known) effect the program will have on the college in future years (i.e., the “sustainability and continuing of implemented practices, processes, staffing, etc.”).

   d. Unit Objectives and Resources

      Unit Objectives and their related Resource Requests are well stated, with well-stated outcomes and measures. But, considering the closeout (ending) of the program will occur in late 2014, the status of all three Objectives remains In Progress. If the program is closing out, will there be a continued assessment of the Objectives, or should the status indicate the closeout status of the program.
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 CPR appears to connect evidence (including a significant amount of supplemental materials) to analysis and formulation of the SAOs and Objectives. There are no Resource Requests attached to Objectives, but considering the one-point source funding of the program (a single federal grant), the program would not require additional general fund budgeting during its tenure (5 years) on campus.

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

The Title V HSI grant program does not have prior recommendations from a subsequent validation process as the program is relatively new and would not have been through a previous CPR and validation cycle.

7. Commendations.

The CPR is well laid out, including key information on the functions of the program, and the ways the program is connected to multiple disciplines and offices of the college. A highly inclusive list of supplemental files is included, ranging from survey results to examples of flyers used for their sponsored events. The CPR makes a strong case for how involved the program has been in establishing a number of success centers and labs, and in offering tutoring services for students.

8. Recommendations

Considering the wealth of supplemental files, additional references within the CPR document would assist readers in linking the items (files) to the applicable sections of the CPR. Also, additional information regarding any audit findings (if they exist) and appropriate corrective action plans (if required) should be included in the CPR.

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