

**Los Medanos College**  
**Unit/Program Review Feedback**  
**Report**

Unit/Program Name: Child Development

Unit/Program Review Year: 2011/12

**The Unit/Program Review and Plan has been carefully read:**

- This unit/program review either “meets” or “exceeds” all institutional expectations
- This unit/program review “does not meet” institutional expectations in one or more areas and thus requires changes and/or additional information in your unit/program document. Please see Feedback below for more information.

Unit/Program review section	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<b>General: Mission, Description, Membership</b>		√	
<b>2009/10 Status, Reasons, Improvements</b>			√
<b>2010/11 Status, Reasons</b>		√	
<b>2011/12 Objectives</b>			√
<b>2011/12 Rationale</b>			√
<b>2011/12 Activities</b>		√	

**Feedback:**

**Mission, Description, Improvements**

The Mission Statement is well written and accurately describes the Child Development program.

The Description outlines the department’s degrees and certificates, highlights the Child Study Center, and describes the types of services provided to LMC students.

Suggestions:

1. Spell check or proof the Mission Statement. A minor typographical error was found in the third sentence that should be corrected.
2. The description should include the work the department has been doing with “First 5 of Contra Costa”
3. Define all acronyms and abbreviations such as “NAEYC”. This will be very helpful for those who are not familiar with the program’s partnerships and associated organizations.

**2009/10 Status, Reasons, Improvements**

Program information was extremely well documented with valid reasons for progress. Program improvements listed are directly linked to student and faculty success, improved family relationships, and increased safety and security for the children and staff.

**2010/11 Status, Reasons**

Suggestions:

1. In order to thoroughly understand the objective concerning safety, additional details should to be included. What were the problems the department encountered in regards to the handicap accessibility? What solutions were considered, and finally, how was the problem resolved?
2. Define the acronym "CLASS".

**2011/12 Objectives**

Objectives are clear, measurable and address the department's needs.

Questions:

1. Tracking is a great idea. How will this be measured? Will the department utilize surveys?
2. The timeline for the "Student Mentoring Support" objective may have an incorrect date. Should this be "2011FA" instead of "2011SP"?
3. Should funding from the Mentor Teacher Grant dissipate, what is the department's backup plan?

**2011/12 Rationale**

Rationales are clearly linked to the program's mission statement and reflect the needs of the department.

**2011/12 Activities**

Activities for the department are impressive. The department activities clearly address the needs demonstrated by the data (Perkins and ARCC).

Questions:

1. In regards to *Procare* software, who will receive training? Who will be training the trainers?
2. Will there be assistance for Erlinda Jones?
3. Without grants, how will the department accomplish the activities?
4. In regards to tracking students, what resources will you use to accomplish this activity?

**Reviewed by:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_