

**Peer Review Report for
Program Name: Counseling and Matriculation
Date: 03/26/2012**

Assessment of Self-Study Report

___ The self-study reflects a thorough effort to present a well-documented review of the program; analysis of each data element is thorough, unbiased and accurate; narrative information indicates clear connections of the program to institutional learning outcomes and mission; conclusions, goals/objectives, planning and recommendations are well-substantiated by the analysis of the data.

___ The self-study reflects a substantial effort to present program information; analysis of data is thorough and accurate; narrative information is complete and addresses the criteria; conclusions, goals/objectives, planning and recommendations relate to the analysis of the data.

X The self-study presents adequate program information; analysis of data measures is provided; narrative information is provided and addresses the criteria; conclusions, goals/objectives, planning and recommendations relate to the analysis of data.

___ The self-study report is lacking in one or more areas and/or contains some inaccuracies. The report must be revised and resubmitted in order to meet the requirements of the program review process. Complete/revise Area(s)_____.

Comments about the self-study report

Overall view of self-study:

Interviews with members of the Counseling Division indicate that the self-study report represents the participation of full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, classified, and the division dean. Based on interviews with division faculty and staff, the Peer Team feels the report is a balanced and accurate reflection of the division.

Comments on specific areas:

Area 4:

The source of any student to counselor ratio used in the report needs to be cited.

The argument for hiring more counseling faculty would be considerably stronger if supported by comparative statistics for similar counseling divisions in community colleges and/or best practice standards from a national organization or other group, e.g. the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges.

Area 5:

It is apparent that the division is making a significant effort to collect and analyze data from division programs and activities. However this data needs deeper thought and analysis. The presentation of statistics and analysis that appears on pages 21 and 22 is unclear. As presented, the data fail to show that the five-factor matriculation component model was the strongest

predictor of student success. Discussion with institutional research staff revealed that the significance of the five-factor stepwise multiple regression was .19, which indicates weak significance. A breakdown in communication between the researcher and the division faculty member resulted in an inaccurate interpretation of the data.

The term “follow up” needs to be clarified. The same definition should be used by all members of the division to ensure consistency when compiling and analyzing statistics.

Area 6:

The division is currently using SLOs, and assessment data from these has been used to make positive changes in counseling programs. Next year the division will be transitioning to OOs in all areas except HD classes, which will continue to use SLOs. However, Division minutes for Fall 2011 fail to record any discussion of SLOs or OOs.

Recommendations to the program:

Use multiple standard/best practices sources for student to counselor ratios in community colleges.

All members of the division should use the same definition for specific terms to ensure consistency in data collection.

Continue to develop and utilize SLOs and OOs.

Document any discussion of SLOs and OOs when it occurs.

Continue to collect and analyze institutional data and use this information to guide planning.

Cite any sources for standards used to measure division programs, activities, and staffing.

Comments to the program:

The Peer Review Team feels that the Counseling Division is making every effort to offer students quality services during very difficult economic times. The Team felt that the report met all of the requirements listed in the second rubric except “analysis of data is thorough and accurate”.

Therefore the report was placed lower on the rubric scale than would otherwise have been the case.

Peer Review Team Members

Mrs. Carolyn Burrell, Chair

Dr. Jeffery Cooper

Dr. Karen Cowell

Ms. Melanie Parker