



Program Review Peer Review

Program/Division/Area Name:	Career Technical Education
Date:	3/12/2021

On behalf of the Program Review Committee (PRC), we thank you for your time and effort in completing the Program Review this year and for your ongoing efforts to continuously improve AVC's programs and services for our students. Your program review allows the rest of AVC to better understand your efforts and how they support the college mission, vision, EMP and other goals.

Program Review Committee Feedback

<i>Program Review Report Section</i>	<i>Exemplary:</i> Reflects a clear and thorough report that presents a well-documented review of the program.	<i>Adequate:</i> The self-study adequately presents program information for each section e.g. analysis of data; narrative information is provided regarding goals/objectives, planning, and recommendations relating to the analysis and use of data, institutional learning outcomes, and mission.	<i>Improvement Needed:</i> One or more sections of the report are lacking and/or contain some inaccuracies. The report must be revised and resubmitted in order to meet the requirements of the program review process. Complete/revise Part(s) mentioned in the Comments Section.	<i>Comments:</i>
Program Overview, Overall	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This report is extensive and cohesive. It has been well thought out and designed to close the loop.
1.1.Program's contribution to the District Mission	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequately covered.
1.2.Program highlights	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Program highlights are thorough
2.A. Results of environmental scan information for program	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Because environmental scans are necessary for CTE designation,

				most programs had exemplary results. Please see comments at the end, specific to each area.
2.B. Analysis of program review data	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Please see comments at the end, specific to each area.
2.C. Progress towards SLO/PLO/OO Action Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Most descriptions were exemplary, yet concise, but some were vague. Please see comments at the end, specific to each area.
2.D. Progress towards past program review goals	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Please see comments at the end, specific to each area.
3. 2020-2021 Planning: Division/Program/Area Goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Most disciplines were exceptional Please see comments at the end, specific to each area.
4. Resource Requests that Support Program Needs	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent Please see comments at the end, specific to each area.

COMMENTS:

Overall, this is an exemplary Program Review that highlights the significant contribution of the division to the AVC community. The division has goals focused on programmatic improvement and student success, and utilizes data to support its goals and resource requests.

Additional Comments by Discipline:

ACCT: Nicely done. Good detail regarding progress in Part 2D.

AFAB: Nicely done. Excellent program highlights in Part 1.2

AERO: Well done, except Part 2C is rather vague. Comments regarding progress toward Action Plans are required. In Part 3, goal #3 should be re-worded to be a student-oriented goal, rather than a resource request.

AFMT: Nicely done. In Part 2B, SWOT analysis could be strengthened by utilizing more data.

ACRV: Well done, except in Part 3, goals #3, 4, 5 & 6 should be re-worded to be student-oriented goals, rather than a resource requests.

AM: Needs improvement. Part 2A is required despite being a new program. Advisory committee recommendations and labor market data should be included to support the creation of the program. In Part 2B, while Program Review data may not exist yet, at least an observational / anecdotal SWOT analysis could be considered. For Parts 2C & 2D, it would be appropriate to leave these blank since the program is new and does not have prior Action Plans and Program Review goals. In Part 3, the goals should be re-worded to be student-oriented goals, rather than resource requests. In Part 4, each resource request should be supported by a goal in Part 3.

ABDY: Well done. Part 2A should include labor market data and advisory committee recommendations. In Part 3, the goals should be re-worded to be a student-oriented goals. In Part 4, each resource request should be supported by a goal in Part 3.

AUTO: Nicely done. In Part 2B, SWOT analysis could be strengthened by utilizing more data.

BUS: Nicely done. Part 2A should include labor market data. In Part 4, each resource request should be supported by a goal in Part 3. Specifically, the request for technology does not appear to be connected to a current goal.

CA: Well done. Part 2A should include labor market data. In Part 2B, SWOT analysis could be strengthened by utilizing more data. In Part 3, the goals should be re-worded to be a student-oriented goals. In Goal #1 should simply be to improve student retention and success rates. One of the steps to achieve that goal would be to identify data. In Part 4, each resource request should be supported by a goal in Part 3. Specifically, the request for faculty does not appear to be connected to a current goal.

ELEC: Nicely done. Part 2A should also include advisory committee recommendations. Thoughtful reflection on progress in Part 2D.

ELTE: Needs improvement. Good program highlights in Part 1.2. In Part 2B SWOT Analysis, it is mentioned that two full-time instructors are needed in “opportunities” analysis; this may need additional data analysis to support and was also not mentioned in the program goals. In Part 3, the goals should be re-worded to be a student-oriented goals. The steps to achieve the goals are vague and need to be specific pointing to resources needed. In Part 4, each resource request should be supported by a goal in Part 3. For example, the request for faculty does not appear to be connected to a current goal.

IMTA: Needs improvement. Part 2A is required despite being a new program. Advisory committee recommendations and labor market data should be included to support the creation of the program. In Part 2B, while Program Review data may not exist yet, at

least an observational / anecdotal SWOT analysis could be considered. For Parts 2C & 2D, it would be appropriate to leave these blank since the program is new and does not have prior Action Plans and Program Review goals. In Part 3, goals are required and need to be written. In Part 4, each resource request should be supported by a goal in Part 3.

MGT: Nicely done. Part 2A should include labor market data. In Part 2B, SWOT analysis could be strengthened by utilizing more data.

MKTG: Nicely done. Part 2A should include labor market data. In Part 4, each resource request should be supported by a goal in Part 3. Specifically, the request for technology does not appear to be connected to a current goal.

OT / BIP: Nicely done. Part 2A should include labor market data.

RE: Well done. In Part 2B, SWOT analysis could be strengthened by utilizing more data. In Part 5, the Program Review data is difficult to read/understand.

WELD: Nicely done. Goals are focused on student success.