|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | Acceptable |  |  | Acceptable | This is a clear, thorough explanation of what the program does. The review provides relevant information about the degrees/certificates, classes offered, marketable skills, program outcomes, and career paths that the program may lead to. The program also consulted with the advisory committee to ensure it is meeting market need and added a plan for a new program outcome accordingly. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Acceptable | Revisit and Revise | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable with Recommendations | Although major questions are answered, this section does not contain any specific evidence or data about how the program relates to the mission and strategic plan. Discussion of program completion rates would have strengthened the section, as would discussion of any existing industry contacts and agreements with universities (such as the ones mentioned on pp. 18-19). Additionally, we’d like to see data/numbers added showing evidence of personal characteristics included in courses, members of the ‘advisory committee’, etc. The response does not specifically address the intellectual component of the college mission statement. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable | The response does a good job of addressing the relationship between the program and student demand overall.  A few areas needed additional explanation: Why did the program switch from multiple campuses to only Plano in 2022 (p. 17)? What exactly does the program coach do and how students access him (p. 18)? If there are some classes that are considered “advanced” and require prior knowledge, why are there no prerequisites for any of the courses (p. 18)? Later, on p. 36, the review mentions potentially adding prerequisites, but this is discussed nowhere else in the review.  Finally, the section on ‘Supporting Diverse Populations” is fairly thin. The question/prompt on p. 15 asks about enrollment by demographics and the review doesn’t include this info. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable | Acceptable | This has good information on DFW area jobs, growth, and the relationship of the program to the market. The information on percentages of DFW area jobs requiring associate’s vs bachelor degrees is very helpful for indicating specific weaknesses. More information on the transfer agreements would be helpful to strengthen this section, considering most jobs in the field do require a bachelor’s degree.  The review accurately lists the inability to collect data on recent graduate employment rates as a weakness. However, they did not indicate a feasible plan to collect this data – they just said faculty can informally keep in touch with students (p. 22). A specific plan for something like a post-graduation survey would be beneficial. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommendations | This section is clear and provides a wide variety of data throughout. The first section provides helpful data about course completion and success rates. The differences between Collin’s courses and other colleges courses is well justified with a discussion of DFW’s specific needs.  There is an extra box of filler text on pp. 27-28 that needs to be removed. The review is also missing a couple of responses on part C (p. 31) about professional association requirements and any external accreditation.  No evidence is provided of the curriculum being effective. Post-graduation surveys of alumni conducted a specific amount of time following the completion of the program might assess how effective the curriculum is. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable with Recommendations | This section does a sufficient job of explaining the main methods of communication, but lacks evidence to show whether or not these methods are effective. There is no data on the virtual fair attendance numbers, clicks on website, etc. Statistics on inquiries resulting from the website or flyers may be one way to provide evidence on effectiveness.  Additionally, more info on how the program coach visits work would be helpful, as well as a timeline for when the program coach will start, since the review indicates this is something that will happen in the future. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable with Recommendations | This table includes the two universities that the program has articulation agreements with, but provides no other detail such as how long the articulation agreements are in place for, which the chart requires.  The chart also does not include any industry or other relationships. The analysis section does present this as a weakness and says a protocol has been created to find industry partners but no more detail is provided about what the protocol is. They do not answer the “how do we know” part of the question. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | This section sufficiently addresses the provided opportunities for professional development |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | This demonstrates increasing enrollment/completion and provides some changes the program made to help accomplish these goals through previous CIPs. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommendations | Acceptable | This section does a sufficient job of proposing program-associated metrics that may be used to evaluate its success. It nicely summarizes the strengths and most weaknesses.  Some weaknesses mentioned earlier in the review needed to be indicated in more detail here again though, such as lack of data on graduate employment rates, lack of relationships with local industry partners for co-ops, and the lack of pre-requisites causing students to sometimes enter more challenging classes unprepared. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Acceptable |  |  | Acceptable | This is clear and specific. |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

The submission is generally clear and contains a lot of helpful data and information. The biggest areas of revision are to be more consistent and detailed in discussing the university articulation agreements (in some places the review lists they are starting or considering conversations and in some places it says these are complete) and to add quantifiable evidence in a few areas, such as questions 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7.