

Survivor – Program Review Island Focused FLEX, Fall, 2012 (August 15, 2012)
Evaluation Summary

Major Take-aways or what you would do differently after attending this:

- How to enter data in new format.
- What a comprehensive program review is.
- Process of program review is more clear!
- I understand 5-year versus annual review differences.
- I would have liked 2-3 members from my department to work on program review.
- I like the smart idea—makes it easy to understand.
- I actually know what program review is now. That's good.
- I am pretty sure I understand what is needed, though I am dismayed at how much time this will take (me away from my students).
- Knowledge of program review process.
- Able to see/understand "cycle".
- FLEX can be fun and engaging.
- I understand the process better so now I am feeling better about the process and know that I can complete it.
- Write clearer or SMART objectives.
- Get started on program review earlier than if I had not attended. Gave me confidence and motivation.
- The new website.
- The new P-drive Program Review is awesome.
- Become more involved in the program review process.
- Helpful hand-outs.
- I need to put in more thought on how to best include advisory board input into the development of the AS-T degree.
- More thought needed regarding integration of planning, assessment, program review into the resource allocation process.
- Become a pro-active in developing alliances with other departments and partnerships with faculty of other departments to improve student retention and achievement.
- Thinking about how to use more data.
- Think more globally—consider working with others groups to improve SLO.
- Understanding of the assessment/program review/RAP cycle.
- Integrate more data to support....Appreciate the challenges of distinguishing objective/rationale and activities.
- Understanding the definition of terms that apply to program review: objectives vs. activities.
- This is going to be more work than I thought.
- Completed partial draft of program review.
- I'm an adjunct so I'm not required to be involved, but I will definitely think about how I can give input to those in my department.
- Program review is not as over-whelming as I had thought it would be. It was useful to see how it is broken down into achievable objectives, rationale and activities.

Major Strengths:

- More time on teaching but entertaining
- Survivor theme was so clever. Well-organized! Very useful info!
- Fun, variety. Multiple good presenters, competitions.
- The diverse expertise of the presenters.
- Time to discuss topic with other faculty and administrators.
- They had a lot of humor.
- It kept your attention for six (6) hours.
- Laid back atmosphere surrounding something that actually engenders much stress.
- Good variety of hands-on and presentations.
- Good tempo☺ Kept moving.
- Good explaining the difference between objectives, rationale and activity.
- Fun and variety.
- The presenters.
- Activities; variety.
- Well-planned/organized. Informative and FUN!
- Fun, well-organized, easy to understand.
- The games and the “Gil” masks.
- Variety of activities to make the learning points.
- Pictures of Gil.
- Discussion among group members.
- The overview of the integrated planning cycle.
- Clarity in explaining the program/unit cycle, date use, etc.
- The knowledgeability of the presenters.
- Short speeches.
- Creative, positive, upbeat, fun, colorful.
- Kept my attention.
- Application of concepts. Working as a team.
- It was fun!
- Evaluating the objectives used as activities.
- Upbeat style, well-organized, and useful info.
- Feeling more comfortable with the process.
- Fun and informative; Loved the energy and positive vibes.
- It was fun and informative.
- It was well-organized and the sessions were helpful.

What changes to the activity would you make?

- Less games
- Ran out of coffee too quick.
- None.
- A component of computer hands-on with the new program review on-line browser.
- N/A
- Real objectives aren't always the best examples...my alliance was still a little confused about what makes a good objective after the “Gil” game.
- PLEASE don't use so many acronyms!
- Try to get all program leads to attend.

- I would like to have more on CPR because the questions are different – we spent more time on annual program review.
- None.
- None.
- Real data to work with.
- Be clear about time for exercises. Font on data PowerPoint too light; data activity needed to be more focused with handouts for all.
- None.
- More time to make decisions on “whose data is it”.
- None.
- None.
- Not enough time to evaluate data/discuss how to collect it/analyze it.
- N/A
- None at this point.
- More group activities developing objectives, rationale and activities used as examples.
- Actual rum and coconut shell bras.
- None, it was great!
- I am linear so I had to start with PR document at top rather than objectives, which should be based on goals which are at end of document.
- More structure for the small group participation—maybe tweak it up a bit so we can get more accomplished.

What additional training would you like to see offered on this topic?

- Detailed instruction on program review
- Need to play with final submission tool.
- Department computer training/professional development.
- I liked the idea of mini-sessions to help with actual objectives and a time to get feedback.
- Maybe a follow-up on PSLO.
- Maybe we could workshop some of our objectives. This way we get better objectives and also give different departments a chance to coordinate their objectives, etc.
- Actual training on PR electronic components.
- Computer application of info on how to put in.
- See above.
- On-going—like the CAMP idea.
- I would like some assistance in determining how best to divide up our classes into cohorts.
- Incorporation of an on-going process approach to the review itself. Help along the way with feedback before submission.
- More examples of LMC data and what we might do in terms of interpretation and action-planning.
- Help all year long.
- I need assistance understanding the resource allocation process and how to properly plan, prepare, and submit requests for consideration.
- Using the technology.
- More departmental workshops.

- Rough draft feedback on a voluntary basis.
- Tune-up 1 or 2 days during semester.
- Follow up on program review submittal tool.
- I like the idea of Survivor II.
- A repeat “how to” after the program is ready.
- How to use the program review application.
- Please have consultants available during the semester.
- Maybe a tune-up during fall semester.
- Like the idea of “camps”.
- A boot camp where people can learn of the language.

Other Comments:

- Thank you for your great thinking and hard work!! Great Job!!!
- Impressive.
- Thank you for spear-heading this project. The on-line system is much better (excellent) compared to previous years.
- Outstanding job of planning/implementation.
- I liked image of cycle—would like leadership to provide “time and space” for conversation.
- Thank you! Very well-planned; smooth-sailing. Aloha! Great lunch too!
- Loved every part of the theme!
- I do not understand our budget and do not know who is responsible for what. I never see budget reports. I remain unclear about the status of funding available to support our program.
- Great organization/levity/meeting our intellectual level.
- A great creative approach to learning.
- Sweet!
- Nice job! Food was excellent.
- Thanks. I know this was a big think to develop!
- Lunch was tasty!
- Thanks for making this fun.
- Thanks for a great day.

Numerical rating evaluation results:

I am leaving “Program Review Island” with:

5 4 3 2 1 An understanding importance of date to inform Program Review.

5 4 3 2 1 An understanding of LMC’s integrated planning cycle; including assessment, program improvement planning, resource allocation, implementation and reassessment.

5 4 3 2 1 Elements of the 12-13 Comprehensive Program Review.

5 4 3 2 1 At least one draft of an objective with related rationale, activity and timeline that

Please rate the workshop/activity from 1 to 5 in each category (circle your answer):

(5=Strongly Agree, 4=Slightly Agree, 3=No Opinion, 2=Slightly Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree)

5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	AVG
5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4.68
5	4	5	4	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	5	5	4.73	
5	5	4	3	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	0	4.57
																													4.30		

