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

Considering that the transfer center coordinator has only been in the position for 2 years, the CPR was well written. Over the past two years that I have been coordinating the Transfer/Career Center, Ms. Walker has initiated a collaborative relationship with other Student Services departments, Academic Affairs and specially funded programs. She has done so through several activities i.e. Annual transfer fair, partnership with the English department to support transfer students in drafting their personal statements for transfer applications, and faculty support to promote transfer services and events. Being that the Teacher Pathways Program grant is co-located with the Transfer/Career Center will allow the staff to assist in transfer awareness and promotion of the services.

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

Staff is needed in order for Ms. Tashini to continue the work she is currently doing.

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

The department is offering different activities; workshops and collaboration with other departments to assist students succeed.
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

Three of the SAO’s are aligned with the unit objectives and goals.

b. The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections

Quality & Accessibility: Although the fall 2014 was clearly summarized and analyzed.

c. Planning Assumptions and Assessment

The document has made sound planning assumptions and assessment of the needs of the program and has written a plan of action.

d. Unit Objectives and Resources

The SAO’s, unit objectives and resource request are in alignment.

e. The remaining sections

Overall the CPR is well written and concise. All sections were clear and well written.
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 SAO’s were well written and meaningful. They included clearly defined desired outcomes.

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

There were no prior recommendations to address.

7. Commendations.

- The department has shown a growth in student activities in the short amount of time the coordinator has been there.
- The alignment of the SAO’s with the unit objectives was clear.

8. Recommendations

- Meet with Dr. Master to go over the assessment methodology.
- Research other methods of providing professional development.

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

N/A