

Validation Process

1. Deans and Validation Team Members will complete the rubric below for each section of the Instructional Discipline Summary and for each Award Summary. Rubrics will be completed individually by each Dean and Validation Team Member.
2. The 4 scores for each program from each Validation Team members will be averaged together by OIE to give an average Validation Team score.
3. The Validation Teams will receive the Dean's scores and average Validation Team score for each program that they validated. They will have a group Validation Team meeting to discuss the scores and to develop Commendations and Recommendations for each program.
4. Results of the Validation Team group meeting will be forwarded to the Academic Senate and Shared Governance Council for review and final validation.

Validation Team Composition

- Academic Programs – 2 faculty members, 1 student services representative, 1 administrator
- Student Service Programs – 2 student services representatives, 1 faculty member, 1 administrator
- Administrative Services – 2 administrators, 1 faculty member, 1 student services representative

Validation Timeline

1. Dept Chairs submit reports by March 11
2. Validation Teams are formed by March 15
3. Dean and Team Member Validations are completed by March 22
4. Validation Team Meetings are held beginning March 23
5. Validations submitted to Academic Senate by April 25
6. Validations submitted to Shared Governance Council by May 6

Validation Rubric

The validation rubric consists of five questions and will be filled out individually by the Dean and each Validation Team Member. One rubric will be completed for each of the following components of the Comprehensive Program Review:

1. Instructional Discipline Summary – Access section
2. Instructional Discipline Summary – Success section
3. Instructional Discipline Summary – Accountability section

4. Instructional Discipline Summary – Partnerships section
5. Award Summary

Thus, for a single discipline that offers one degree and one certificate, the Dean and each Validation Team member will complete a total of 6 rubrics (i.e. 1 for each of the 4 sections of the Instructional Discipline Summary, and 1 for each of the two awards).

After completing all Validation Rubrics individually, the Validation Team will have one group meeting. There, they will receive the average of the 4 scores from the Validation Team members and they will receive the Dean’s scores. Using those scores as a basis, the Validation Team will provide each program with recommendations and commendations.

	E	S/Y	NI/N	U	NC	N/A
1. Explanations were provided for each prompt/question						
2. How well do the responses address the data provided for this section?						
3. An improvement plan or explanation was provided if results were in category 1 or 2						
4. How well does the improvement plan address the data provided for this section?						
5. Rate the quality of the improvement plan for this section						
6. Comments:						

Instructions to Dean and Validation Team Members for filling out the validation rubric:

You must provide a score for each question in the rubric. Do not leave any questions blank. Use the descriptions of each score below to fill out your rubric.

1. Explanations were provided for each prompt/question
 - Yes: There was a response for each required question in this section
 - No: There was at least one required question in this section that was not answered.
2. How well do the responses address the data provided for this section?
 - Exemplary: Responses indicate a thorough knowledge of issues, data and solutions related to the measure.
 - Satisfactory: Responses are thoughtful and reflect some knowledge of issues, data and solution. Responses may require more detail or more thoughtfulness.

- Needs Improvement: Responses do not clearly use the data to identify issues. Responses may be difficult to understand due to grammatical issues.
 - Unsatisfactory: Responses are irrelevant to the measure (e.g. Responses to access measures describe success measures instead of access measures), or responses are incomplete.
 - Not Completed: No attempt was given to respond to the questions for this section
3. An improvement plan or explanation was provided if results were in category 1 or 2.
- Yes: For any measure in category 1 or 2, the program provided either an improvement plan, or a reasonable explanation that describes why an improvement plan is not necessary
 - No: For any measure in category 1 or 2, the program did not provide an improvement plan or reasonable explanation that describes why an improvement plan is not necessary.
 - N/A: Not applicable. No measures were in category 1 or 2.
4. How well does the improvement plan address the data provided for this section?
- Exemplary: The improvement plan is directly related to the data that it plans to improve. For example, if a program received a rubric score of 1 for their course fill rate, the improvement plan directly addresses the course fill rate.
 - Satisfactory: The improvement plan is somewhat related to the data that it is required to improve.
 - Needs Improvement: The improvement plan is only slightly related to the data that it is required to improve. It may require more detail. It may be difficult to understand due to grammatical issues.
 - Unsatisfactory: The improvement plan is not related to the data that it is required to improve. It is either irrelevant to the specific measure (e.g. Improvement plan for course fill rate describes improving the success rate instead of the course fill rate), or it is incomplete.
 - Not Completed: The program did not provide an improvement plan for any measure in category 1 or 2.
 - N/A: Not applicable. No measures were in category 1 or 2.
5. Rate the quality of the improvement plan for this section.
- Exemplary: The improvement plan indicates a thorough knowledge of issues, data and solutions related to the measure. If implemented, it will markedly improve the specific measure.

- Satisfactory: The improvement plan reflects some knowledge of the issues, data and solution related to the measure. The improvement plan may need more detail or thoughtfulness. If implemented, it may improve the specific measure.
- Needs Improvement: The improvement plan does not completely address the specific measure. It may be difficult to understand due to grammatical issues. If implemented, it is unlikely that it will improve the specific measure.
- Unsatisfactory: The improvement plan does not address the specific measure. If implemented, it will not improve the specific measure.
- Not Completed: The program did not provide an improvement plan for any measure in category 1 or 2.
- N/A: Not applicable. No measures were in category 1 or 2.

Possible Recommendations from Validation Team

1. Rewrite section with Dean supervision
2. Rewrite section with all full-time discipline faculty
3. Meet with Vice President of Academic Affairs to discuss section

Possible Commendations from Validation Team

1. Inclusion of plan into College Strategic Planning Process
2. Prioritization for funding
3. Existing resources will be allocated for plan