|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responsive to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall**  **Judgment** | **Comments** |
| 1. What does the unit do? | Accepted without recommendations |  |  | Accepted without recommendations | Nice description of the purpose and activities of this division. The narrative addresses what they do and why the do it. Their purpose is clearly stated. |
| 2. What is the unit’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Clear ties are made to the strategic plan. However, more data to specifically document how the priority and goals were met would be helpful. This would aid in analyzing what additions could be made to improve. But overall this item was addressed. |
| 3. Why are the unit processes done? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Again, there is a nice clear narrative to respond to the component. Overall, it appears this was addressed well. However, I would like to see more analysis on why they are seeing the changes they saw. Perhaps a survey to address why a student did or did not visit advising. You see a dip in awareness and usage – try to find out why. Does the lack of advising staff play a role? You showed that we are understaffed relative to some area peers. Is that part of the issue? What should be done differently to move the needle? |
| 4. How does the unit impact student outcomes? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | There is some nice data, but we are missing the next step in the analysis. What can be done to improve? What is the source of the increase in dissatisfaction? It isn’t clear from what is presented. How do we find out? Tie the data to real outcomes if possible – are students that see advisers completing awards at a higher rate (or faster) than those that do not? Is there a measurable value-add? These should be addressed in future reviews. |
| 5. How effectively does the unit communicate? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | The narrative provides a detailed picture of the communication approaches utilized by the service unit. The use of focus groups is a great step, with the move to the new website. No concerns were evident from the narrative. |
| 6. Does the unit build and leverage partnerships? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | A variety of partnerships were detailed, both with internal and external partners. The appropriate partnerships seem to have been well-addressed, and the narrative provides a nice picture of what is going on and why. |
| 7. Are staff supported with professional development? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Nice comprehensive list of activities. Some clarity could be added on why certain professional development activities were chosen, and an overall analysis of whether staff are receiving enough and the right kind of professional development would be helpful. But that is not required. |
| 8. [Optional] Does the unit have sufficient facilities and equipment? |  |  |  |  | NA |
| 9. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | This section is well-written and addressed the prompt appropriately. The data points to some interesting trends that really should be delved into more deeply. How can we improve data collection to avoid holes like those identified? Is it possible in Cougar Compass? Will it be possible in Workday Student, if that does indeed replace Cougar Compass? This should at least be a target for the next review – you know what you need to find out. |
| 10. How will the unit evaluate its success? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | The narrative does address the prompt. However, more should be done to make sure that there will not be the same lack of data next time. How do we ensure that the needed data is obtained?  In particular, how will we improve on making sure students are competing credentials to meet HB8? What can be done to improve identifying students that are close to an award, and how can we guide them to that award once they are identified? How can we be more proactive rather than passive? |
| 11. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Tables | Accepted without recommendations |  |  | Accepted without recommendations | I think the list makes sense. I would like to see a little more on what steps will be taken to meet these and ensure the data will be collected effectively. I do think adding a goal related to being more pro-active in helping students complete awards is also important in light of HB8. How can that be added? |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| X Accepted Without Recommendations | Accepted With Recommendations | \_\_\_Accepted with Required Recommendations | Revisit and Revise |

**General comments about the submission or rationale for the conclusion:**

Overall, the program review document does a good job in addressing what they do and why. There are some issues with data collection and analysis that were highlighted above, but they are mainly recommendations for improvement rather than serious deficiencies. The service unit appears to be doing a good job of analyzing what they are doing, why the are doing it, and what might be done to improve.