

Your feedback is important and could help guide future comprehensive program review processes. What, if anything, can be improved (e.g, workshop sessions, frequency of consultations, topic of consultations, etc.)? What do you propose as an alternative? Please use the sticky notes to post: fourth icon down to the left.

The sticky note was too small to include all of my text, but here are my thoughts:

I enjoy the intentions and purpose behind the CPR process; however, I do wish there was more incentive (?) for programs who are undergoing review to attend and participate in the scheduled consultation (workshop) dates. To account for time conflicts (where program reps may be unable to join our IEC meetings), I suggest that in exchange for about 45 minutes of *some* of our monthly 2-hour meetings, we could instead schedule a check-in meeting with our assigned programs outside of the Monday 2:10pm-4pm time blocks. For example, the month of October would look like:

Meeting #1: October 9th, 2:10-4pm

Meeting #2: October 23rd, 2:10pm-3:15pm

Meeting #3:

CPR teams schedule a 30-45 minute check-in with their respective programs sometime *within* the month of October to discuss the assigned topic and relevant data points, and collaborate on areas of curiosity or concern, etc.

I think this set-up may allow us to get more participation from programs (because of the time flexibility), while also providing a fair monthly time/labor commitment for IEC members.

- Monique Ubungen
(Paralegal Studies CPR Team)

Additional meetings with program staff/faculty would be helpful during the CPR process.

Bite-size workshops, instead of an hour-long info session. Topics that the programs want. Allow past participants to view their experiences with the new CPR

I saw comments about onboarding new members to the committee and I agree with that. There is also a lot of documentation, so allowing members time to read, absorb, and reflect on the information/material would be great. For visual learners, a timeline or some type of visual that explains how everything is connected would also be extremely helpful. I agree with meeting with program staff/faculty during the CPR process.

I think an onboarding packet that introduces the individuals undergoing the CPR and the individuals apart of the committee that would introduce everyone but also as a group go over the requirements, dates etc.

For folks who have participated in CPR consultations a number of times, the broader orientations feel a little like a waste of time.

Instead, I would prefer to familiarize myself with the program I am supporting, along with their data, while the CPR team is orienting themselves to the process.

Dividing and conquering in this way can allow for us to spend more time working together as a larger team.

Two out of three programs had not reviewed the data in any detail and had very little drafted at the time of the consultations.

I'm not sure what can be done about this. The programs clearly need help, but not necessarily on IEC's schedule/timeline.

I think the poster boards are one way of expression of the amazing accomplishments achieved.

However, poster presentations make the assumption that our colleagues are at their optimal happiest place when creating a poster board.

Are the posters limiting and not inclusive?

Have colleagues been asked if they would have interest in other forms of expressing their work but still in a presentation form?

Does every presentation have to be the same as the rest?

I thought the process was informative and helpful for both parties. Suggestions for improvement would be to have more time with team members to review department data and

Your feedback is important and could help guide future comprehensive program review processes. What, if anything, can be improved (e.g, workshop sessions, frequency of consultations, topic of consultations, etc.)? What do you propose as an alternative? Please use the sticky notes to post: fourth icon down to the left.

**Dedicated 1:1
time with IEC
support
outside of the
IEC meeting.**

**Cliff Notes
for
returning
members.**