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

The strengths of the DSPS Comprehensive Program Review were:
- Relevant documents were attached
- Through listing of program services and breakdown of population serviced
- Very clear organizational chart as well as duties of employees
- There is a clear link to objectives and SAOs
- Thoroughly addressed prior year recommendations and thoughtfully addressed many relevant issues in Program Review
- Good use of data and analysis.

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

In future program reviews consider using the statistical data from the College’s Student Satisfaction and Faculty/Staff surveys.

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

The CPR supports the college’s mission by providing students access and quality services for students to meet their educational goal.
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

      Results clearly stated:
      - Thorough implementation plan
      - Reevaluation timeline seems reasonable
      - Good explanation as to why some SAOs are being retired

   b. The rest of the Unit Effectiveness sections

      Presented a very thorough description of job duties for each permanent staff.
      Good use and analysis of In-house DSPS Student and Staff survey.
      Addressed training needs and knowledge base of DSPS staff via staff survey.
      Provided a clear explanation of space issues and equipment needs.

   c. Planning Assumptions and Assessment

      Anticipated need is realistic and appears to be feasible in the areas of technology, student need, and funding trends.

   d. Unit Objectives and Resources

      Unit objectives and resources seem adequate and are related.
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 connections between SAOs, analysis and improvement objectives were clear. Resource requests seemed relevant and valid. Good use of supporting documentation.

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

All recommendations from prior validations were addressed and responded to.

7. Commendations.

Good use of assessment method, interpretation of results, and implementation plan. It was a very thorough well written and thought out program review.
8. Recommendations
Incorporate data and analysis from the Campus Student and Faulty/Staff Satisfaction Survey.

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