



Program Review 2025 Peer Review Feedback (Non-Instructional)

On behalf of the Program Review Committee, we thank you for your time and effort in completing your Program Review report 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 overall.

Department/Area/Division Name: Office for Students with Disabilities
Peer Reviewed By: Linda Parker & Alex Parisky

<p style="font-size: 1.5em; color: #0070C0; margin: 0;">Part 1.</p> <p style="margin: 0;">Program Overview</p>	<div style="background-color: #E0F0E0; border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p>Program Overview: Briefly describe how the program contributes to the district mission.</p> </div> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary: A clear connection is described regarding how the program connects to and supports the district mission. <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate: The work of the program described, but it is not obvious how it contributes to the district mission. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Needed: No response or response does not connect the program to the district mission. </p> <p style="margin-top: 20px;"><i>Comments:</i> The program overview clearly aligns OSD services with the district mission of access, equity, and student success. The narrative effectively articulates how academic accommodations, counseling, and individualized planning support students with disabilities in achieving their educational goals. The section demonstrates strong institutional alignment and clearly explains the program's role in supporting a diverse student population.</p> <p style="text-align: right; margin-top: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>REVISION REQUIRED</i></p>
<p style="font-size: 1.5em; color: #0070C0; margin: 0;">Part 2A.</p> <p style="margin: 0;">Analyze the program review data</p>	<div style="background-color: #E0F0E0; border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p>Part 2A: Analyze the program review data for your area including equity data and any internal/external environmental scan information (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, advisory groups, etc.</p> </div> <p>Guiding Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who do you primarily serve and what services do you provide for each of the groups? How is the work of your area measured or quantified? What is your measure of success? How do the demographics served by your area's work compare to AVC's service area demographics? Which race/ethnicity groups experience the largest equity gaps? What are the success and retention rates (S&R) for your area (if applicable)? Did they decrease or increase in the last year?

- Exemplary:** Thoughtful analysis of program review data and any internal/external environmental scan information is included, with a thorough answer to each guiding question.
- Adequate:** Narrative information is provided regarding program review data and any internal/external environmental scan information, but is lacking analysis of data and/or does not fully address each guiding question. The section could be strengthened with more data and analysis.
- Improvement Needed:** No response or response provided does not analyze program review data and any internal/external environmental scan information and/or does not address each guiding question.

Comments: The data analysis is comprehensive, well-supported, and thoughtfully interpreted. The program effectively utilizes DataMart, Tableau, survey data, and internal metrics to demonstrate enrollment growth. Equity data is clearly examined, with appropriate discussion of over- and under-representation and retention/success trends. The analysis reflects strong understanding of program impact and institutional context.

REVISION REQUIRED

Part 2B.

Analyze the program review data

Part 2B: Analyze the program review data, including equity data and any internal/external environmental scan information (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, advisory groups, etc.) to identify the program Strengths, Opportunities & Aspirations:

- **Strengths and Accomplishments:** Guiding Questions
 - What does your program/area do well, including capabilities and greatest accomplishments?
 - What are the practices that were implemented to increase student success/retention rates or completion rates, or other practices that support the college mission?
- **Opportunities and Challenges:** Guiding Questions
 - What does your program/area need to do better to support/improve student success?
 - What actions can be taken to help close equity gaps?
- **Aspirations:** Guiding Questions:
 - What does your program/area want to be known for?
 - What is a desired future?

- Exemplary:** Thoughtful analysis of program review data and any internal/external environmental scan information is included, with a thorough answer to each guiding question regarding Strengths, Opportunities & Aspirations.
- Adequate:** Narrative information is provided regarding program review data and any internal/external environmental scan information, but is lacking analysis of data and/or does not fully address each guiding question regarding Strengths, Opportunities & Aspirations. The section could be strengthened with more data and analysis.
- Improvement Needed:** No response or response provided does not analyze program review data and any internal/external environmental scan information and/or does not address each guiding question regarding Strengths, Opportunities & Aspirations.

Comments: The section clearly identifies strengths supported by data, including comparable success and retention rates and significant completion gains. Risks are appropriately framed, particularly regarding staffing shortages, OCR compliance exposure, interpreter capacity, and alternative media access. Opportunities for case management implementation and

	<p>expanded professional development are well articulated. The analysis demonstrates strong awareness of both operational and compliance-related challenges.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>REVISION REQUIRED</i></p>
<p>2C. Progress towards Outcomes Improvement Plans</p>	<p>Review and comment on progress toward past Outcomes Improvement Plans. (List your past OIPs and progress towards those goals.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary: Outcomes Improvement Plans are clearly listed, along with brief commentary about progress and the current status of those plans.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate: Information is provided about Outcomes Improvement Plans for the area, but Plans have not been clearly listed and/or progress is unclear.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Needed: No response or response provided does not make evident that Outcomes Improvement Plans have been developed nor if progress has been made.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Outcome Plans are clear and . Strengthening timelines and defining specific performance targets would improve clarity and accountability.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>REVISION REQUIRED</i></p>
<p>2D. Progress towards past program review goals</p>	<p>Review and comment on progress towards past program review goals. (List your past program review goals and progress towards those goals.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary: Past program review goals are clearly listed, along with brief commentary about progress and the current status of those goals.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate: Information is provided about past program review goals, but goals have not been clearly listed and/or progress is unclear.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Needed: No response or response provided does not make evident what the past goals are nor if progress has been made.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The section documents limited progress due to staffing constraints; however, several goals remain unaddressed across multiple cycles (Alternative Media Specialist, Clerical II, Education Advisor, interpreters). The program should differentiate between goals delayed due to institutional processes and goals requiring revised internal strategies.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>REVISION REQUIRED</i></p>
<p>3. Program Review Goals</p>	<p>Based on Part 2 above, please list program/area goals for 2024-2025.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary: Each goal is connected to an ILO/PLO/SLO/OO and ESP Goal. The goals are student-centered and are connected to the analysis in Part 2 above. Steps to be taken to achieve the goals are delineated, as well as the measure of success for each.</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate: Goals are formed, and each is connected to an ILO/PLO/SLO/OO and ESP Goal, but not all goals are clearly connected to analysis in Part 2 and/or are not student-centered. Steps to be taken to achieve the goal and the measure of success are provided for each, but may be unclear or hard to understand. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Needed: No response or goals listed are not connected to an ILO/PLO/SLO/OO and ESP Goal. Goals listed are actually resource requests, rather student-centered goals. Steps to be taken to achieve the goal and the measure of success are unclear or not provided. <i>Comments:</i> Goals are clearly aligned with institutional priorities and student success measures. Action steps are logical and tied to measurable outcomes, particularly in staffing, case management, and accommodation access. The structure of this section is strong. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>REVISION REQUIRED</i></div>
--	--

<p>4. Resource Requests that Support Program Needs</p>	<p>Resource Requests that Support Program Needs (based on above analysis)</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary: Each resource request entered is clearly connected to and supports a goal from Part 3. Each resource request is entered on the Program Review document. <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate: Resource requests have been entered, but not all are clearly connected to goals from Part 3. Each resource request is entered on the Program Review document. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Needed: No response or resource requests do not relate to goals from Part 3. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A: No response because additional resources are not needed at this time and/or funding for resources exists from another source. <i>Comments:</i> Resource requests are clearly connected to documented demand growth and compliance risk. Budget details are specific and aligned with program goals. The justification for staffing increases and interpreter hiring is well supported by data and fiscal impact. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>REVISION REQUIRED</i></div>

<p>5. Program Review Data</p>	<p>Insert your Program Review Data here, as well as any other supporting data. Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting data/information
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary: Program Review Data and other supporting data (if applicable) is inserted, and is understandable and relevant to the report. <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate: Program Review Data and other supporting data (if applicable) is inserted, but is difficult to understand and/or may not be clearly relevant to the report. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Needed: No data is provided, or data provided is unreadable or does not support the report.

Comments: The supporting data provided is thorough and appropriately aligned with the narrative analysis in Part 2. Enrollment trends, disability category growth, equity comparisons, retention and success metrics, survey data, and interpreter expenditure breakdowns are clearly documented. The inclusion of both internal tracking (accommodation letter rates) and Chancellor's Office data strengthens the credibility of the review.

The interpreter cost comparison (PEI vs. agency hours and expenditures) is particularly helpful in substantiating resource requests. Overall, the data is sufficient, relevant, and appropriately integrated into the program analysis.

REVISION REQUIRED

Additional Comments: