|  | **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 portion is clear and explains what they do, addressing all questions noted in the instructions |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | I hesitated on “Analysis” because I’m not sure I’d say it’s coherent, concise, and focused. But, it is closer to acceptable than acceptable with revision. Evidence for all claims is provided. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Acceptable | Revisit/Revise | Revisit/Revise | Revisit/Revise | Statements such as “our research with local HVAC professionals has shown that while there continues to be a very strong demand for entry level employees who have completed a certificate program, there is virtually no industry demand for degreed technicians” are offered without evidence. Interviews with professionals could be provided (but it’s also possible the demand for degreed technicians lies in companies not interviewed – perhaps in different but related fields). This could yield numbers and also give the name and type of employer who was asked.   There is a lot of discussion about things that the program intends to create or implement, which are not currently in place. If they are already mid-creation, details were not provided. The program is quite new, but many of the plans for addressing issues are quite vague. Sentences which begin “we expect,” “we are working,” etc. are common, but made without evidence.   While some elements have adequate evidence and analysis, I’m choosing revisit/revise because I believe it needs to be addressed. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | This portion provides sufficient evidence and analysis to address the questions asked. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommen-dations | Acceptable | Completions rates are given, potential issues are addressed and plans for improvement are given. TSI and industry demand are again given as barriers, without evidence for either. Some limitations (funding, accreditation) are not within the program’s control.   Over the last 5 years, have any of the ‘ideas’ created by the faculty to increase involvement of advisory committee members been implemented? |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommen-dations | Acceptable with Recommen-dations | Acceptable with Recommen-dations | This is difficult to assess because the program is awaiting the tools to communicate via website. The link given goes to a program information webpage. The new site should be published this semester, according to the document. If this happens soon, perhaps the new information could be added. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | A detailed list of community partnerships is provided. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | A detailed list of faculty professional development is provided. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Reasoning and results are provided. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Acceptable | Acceptable with Recommen-dations | Acceptable | Acceptable | Strengths include student placement in careers, and specifically with community partners, though the program has admitted to having very little knowledge of student career paths after they leave the program. A request could be made of community partners, and companies calling with job openings, to inform the program if our students are hired. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Revisit/Revise |  |  | Revisit/Revise | Outcomes are different between statement and table. The ‘exams’ outcome seems too non-specific. CIP is blank. |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

I am using this box to make suggestions regarding spelling, sentence structure, word usage, and punctuation.

There are several spelling or capitalization errors, including unlimeted, SYllabi, class room (instead of classroom), draw back (instead of drawback), direction (instead of direct), and many others.   
There are several missing hyphens (hands-on, tailor-made). There is inconsistency with HVAC-R, which is sometimes called HVAC/R, and sometimes HVACR. Many sentences begin with ‘As well,’ which is a phrase meant only to end a clause, not begin one. “Is” and “are” are often replaced with ‘being,’ creating a sentence fragment (i.e. “The most prominent local option being Texas A&M University in Commerce for the BAAS degree.”). Colloquial phrases are used unnecessarily (e.g. ‘a far cry,’ ‘right in the classroom,’ ‘call them out.’). Many commas are missing, and at least one is replaced by a period. Apostrophes are sometimes present when they should not be, and not when they should.