Q1 - What did you submit via Nuventive/Improve this year? (check all that apply)


| Field	Choice Count
Comprehensive Program Review	9
Annual Update	1
Resource Requests	0
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	0
Service Area Outcomes (SAOs)	2
Mid-cycle Review	0
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	0
Total	12

Q2 - How user-friendly did you find the Nuventive/Improve portal?

Field	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Responses
How user friendly did you find the Nuventive portal?	1	4	3	1	1	11

Field	Choice Count
Very user friendly	1
Somewhat user friendly	6
Neither friendly or unfriendly	1
Somewhat user unfriendly	3
Very user unfriendly	0
Total	11

Q3 - What kind of comprehensive program review did you submit this year?

Field	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Responses
What kind of comprehensive program review did you submit this year?	1	2	2	0	0	6

Field	Choice Count
Instructional	2
Student Services	4
Total	6

Q4 - Please comment on the comprehensive program review questionnaire. Do you have any feedback on the type or flow of prompts you were required to respond to?

Please comment on the comprehensive program review questionnaire. Do you have any feedback on the type or flow of prompts you were required to respond to?

Too many questions and they were repetitive.

We needed better leadership on program review, people didn't meet for peer review, people didn't know they needed to actually collect and report on data, and the questionnaire given was an old version.

Numerous people noted that the questionnaire was hard to navigate--with people finding it difficult to see numerous requests put in.

The review questions and flow are fine. However, the feedback form needs to be changed to just a comment form for each of the questions asked and responded to by the peer reviewers, as the check boxes mostly do not apply to the questions asked and are unnecessary.

If this is in reference to the program review questions, I think we should look at whether any can be eliminated or merged. There seems to be some repetition and it's long. Everything went well though. Just one point: I think the SLO/PLO limits and requirement of numbers did not really fit. It forced us to enter something that did not totally make sense. We explained it in the narrative, but I wonder if that part can be improved. In general everything was a great improvement all around this year though.

Q5 - Were you able to find all of the data you needed to complete your program review?

Field	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Responses
Were you able to find all of the data you needed to complete your program review?	2	2	2	0	0	6

Field	Choice Count
No	0
Yes	6
Total	6

Q6 - How would you assess the data dashboards and packets provided by PRIE?

An unexpected error has occurred

Q7 - Please share your suggestions for how we might improve the Resource Request process.

Please share your suggestions for how we might improve the Resource Request process.

With the district and trustees stating we don't have the money, let's agree that they don't want to spend money on instruction. That is the message I hear, so let's skip the paperwork.

Q8 - Are you familiar with where to upload your SLO and/or SAO assessment methods and outcomes in Nuventive/Improve?

Field	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Responses
Are you familiar with where to upload your SLO and/or SAO assessment methods and outcomes in Nuventive?	1	3	2	1	1	8

Field	Choice Count
Yes	5
No	0
Maybe (would like help with this)	3
Total	8

Q9- Were you able to find the information you needed regarding the program review process, timelines, forms, guides, tutorials, etc. on the Program Review website?

Field	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Responses
Were you able to find the information you needed regarding the program review process, timelines, forms, guides, tutorials, etc. on the Program Review website?	1	1	1	0	0	8

Field	Choice Count
Yes	8
No	0
Total	8

Q10 - Do you have any other suggestions for how we might improve the program review and/or resource request processes at Cañada College? If so, please submit them here or feel free to email the members of the Program Review Work Group at canprogramreview@smccd.edu.

Do you have any other suggestions for how we might improve the program review and/or resource request processes at Cañada College? If so, please submit them here or feel free to email the members of the Program Review Work Group at canprogramreview@smccd.edu.

I am a part of SSPC, which does a great job of disseminating information and helping us through this process. However, I have found Nuventive to be very frustrating to use in the past, with bugs in various places. I've had to redo complete sections in there because of this. I hope that Nuventive continues to improve the software and usability, as this is one part of the program review process that I don't look forward to.

Student servies needs to do some work. The peer review process this year, in my opinion, happened extremely poorly with some departments not gathering to meet and an apparent old peer review sheet being used. There were numerous meetings cancelled and it caused some major confusion as well as lack of inter-department work that usually is needed for program review.

With the district and trustees stating we don't have the money, let's agree that they don't want to spend money on instruction. That is the message I hear, so let's skip the paperwork.

I think we just need to make sure we have enough analysts in PRIE and that they have enough time. The more staff in PRIE the better since this allows them to get around to departments and provide timely data through out. Some faculty and staff need to support with interpreting data as well. In sum, PRIE staff are outstanding but they seem short staffed compared to prior semesters and given their many tasks.