|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responsive to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| 1. What does the program do? | Acceptable |  |  | Acceptable | Section is written clearly and provides a thorough overview of the prompt and suggested points to consider. |
| 2. Program’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable | Does this really address the program’s relationship to the college mission? Need to tie the college mission into your evidence. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Section is written clearly and provides an in-depth analysis of data in support of the prompt and suggested points to consider. Data and graphs are easy to read and interpret. |
| 4. What marketable skills should students have after completion? | Acceptable | Accepted with Recommendations | Acceptable | Acceptable | Marketable skills information is weak. Recommend using O\*Net OnLine, Careeronestop.org,  JobsEQ or some similar database to pull marketable skills. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Section is written clearly and provides an in-depth analysis of data in support of the prompt and suggested points to consider. Data and graphs are easy to read and interpret.  Program exceeds the Carl Perkins standard of 78% for retention. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Acceptable | Accepted with Recommendations | Acceptable | Acceptable | There is only one metric for the website to provide feedback for the current communication plan. How do you know if the rest of the communication strategies are working? For example, there was no mention on feedback on the Facebook page or the printed literature to see if those communication avenues were effective or not. There needs to be an assessment on these areas.  Perhaps you could include a Program Interest Form on the department website.  You state that there is a specific marketing initiative geared toward increasing females in STEM and specifically computer science. You have a link to the Society of Women Engineers (SWE) – Collin College FB Page on the department website under resources but the last post on that page was November 22, 2019. Is SWE – Collin College still an active group?  Who maintains the Collin College Computer Science FB Page? This information is not indicated in the Program Review Literature Review Table. The last time there was a post on this page was October 29, 2022. It was more active in 2019. Does it need to be reassigned to a responsible party?  You did not address the grading policies or course syllabi in Section B of the Program Review Literature Review Table. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built and leveraged? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | All components addressed. |
| 8. Are faculty supported with professional development? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | All components addressed. |
| 9. [Optional] Is the program supported with facilities, equipment, and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Section provides an in-depth analysis of data in support of the prompt and suggested points to consider. Data and graphs are easy to read and interpret. |
| 11. How will program success be evaluated? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | All components addressed. Good summary of program strengths and weaknesses. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Table | Accepted with Recommendations |  |  | Accepted with Recommendations | Measures #1 and 2 are clearly understandable (comprehensive exam) but #3 and 4 would be helped by more details on scope of project – what aspects of the project will be graded for student comprehension? |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Accepted Without Recommendations | X Accepted With Recommendations | Revisit and Revise |

**General comments about the submission or rationale for the conclusion:**

In summary, the Computer Science FOS Program Review clearly provides an in-depth analysis of the data in support of the prompt and suggested points to consider. The reviewers identify the program strengths and weaknesses and address areas where improvements can be made. There were four areas that were “Accepted with Recommendations.” In Section 2.0, although it may be understood as to how the program supports the college mission, please tie the college mission into your evidence. In Section 4.0, the marketable skills information is weak. Our recommendation is to use O\*Net OnLine, Careeronestop.org, JobsEQ or some similar database to pull marketable skills. For Section 6.0, there is only one metric for the website to provide feedback for the current communication plan. You state that there is a specific marketing initiative geared toward increasing females in STEM and specifically computer science. You have a link to the Society of Women Engineers (SWE) – Collin College FB Page on the department website under resources but the last post on that page was November 22, 2019. Is SWE – Collin College still an active group? Who maintains the Collin College Computer Science FB Page? This information is not indicated in the Program Review Literature Review Table. The last time there was a post on this page was October 29, 2022. It was more active in 2019. Does it need to be reassigned to a responsible party? For Section 12.0, more specific details (grading, etc.) should be addressed for measures #3 and #4.

You did not address the grading policies or course syllabi in Section B of the Program Review Literature Review Table.