**Real Estate Program Review – Spring 2023**

***Composite Checklist: Overall Judgements*** and ***Comments* Side-by-Side**

|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Benavides**  **Comments** | **Bates**  **Comments** | **Morgan**  **Comments** | **Group Discussion Callouts** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | ACPT |  |  | **ACPT** | Seems well written. Career path, typo on page 3: seller needs to be plural. | Few specifics given re: career paths/degree paths (p. 4) | Very clear and concise. Points out state-level licensing and regulations TREC and certificates. Talks about certificates and marketable skills but not AAS. | Didn’t address career paths.  Typo on page 3. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | R&R | R&R | R&R | **R&R** | Issue: First paragraph page 6: the word “anecdotally 95%” – used too many times. Need real data. Do not bring up. | -Amount of information is not equal to developing skill and challenging intellect (p. 6)  -Specifics are lacking | Addresses Goals 1, 3 and 6 but does not mention the other goals. For 2 (national exemplar), 4 (baccalaureate and 2+2) and 5 (staffing) the document should point out why and how they don’t apply. They mention BA in section four of the document.  Strategic Goals from Collin.edu   * *Improve student outcomes to meet or exceed local, state, and regional accreditation thresholds and goals.* * *Develop and implement strategies to become a national exemplar in program and student outcomes.* * *Create and implement comprehensive integrated pathways to support student transitions.* * *Implement the third Baccalaureate degree by Fall 2022 and continue adding 2+2 programs with university partners.* * *Develop and implement a comprehensive staffing and succession model.* * *Develop a coordinated and systematic approach to engage external stakeholders.*   Provides specific data in the form of percentages with explanation but the percentages are anecdotal. | Anecdotal 95% figure. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | AWR | AWR | AWR | **AWR** | Did not seem to address support for the attraction of a diverse student population.  Do not use “anecdotally 95%”. Typo on page 9. Need Analysis – all explanatory. | -Did not address how the program attracts diverse student population  -Did not analyze the evidence (last bullet point on p. 8) | Enrollment numbers only go to 2021?  Expanding to new campuses.  Express Courses  Competition.  No mention on diverse student population. | No mention on diverse student population.  Lack of analysis – all explanatory.  No discussion of ratio of certificate to AAS completers. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | AWR | AWR | AWR | **AWR** | Need more local data. Source of data? Address the strengths and weaknesses of market demands – 4th bullet. | -Addressed TX not DFW  -Gave salary info not students who “found related employment” (p. 10) | “…average real estate agent earned $79,000” per year.  …an additional 34,000 real estate jobs will need by 2030.  Wide swings in certificate awards due to retroactive awards. | Needs more specific local data: DFW and Collin County.  “found related employment…” no source cited and no specifics about Collin student employments.  Fails to address strengths and weaknesses in terms of market demand. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | R&R | R&R | R&R | **R&R** | Did not provide average class size for most popular classes. Need to reference appendix D.  a. Bullet 2 drop out due to curriculum  a. Bullet 3 course success rate – didn’t address programs  b. **93s% ? 95% no source** cited/anecdotal.  c. San Jacinto as a model? | -C “case with evidence that the program curriculum is current” is really general  -Mentions SJC…to what end is unclear  -Relies solely on TREC, not sure if that is a problem  -D3 (p. 13) not addressed  -Three bullet points on p. 14 not addressed. | Explanatory but not critical analysis.  Could go deeper in several areas including San Jacinto certificates.  Better analysis in Part E.  In part C they compare to San Jacinto but don’t discuss implementing or not. | A. Bullet 2 drop out due to curriculum  A. Bullet 3. course success rate - didn’t address problems  B. 93% ? 95% no source cited - anecdotal.  C. San Jacinto as a model?  D. Advisory Committee curriculum recommendations  E. Several prompts could be addressed in more detail including: Full-time/Part time teaching.  Student Satisfaction –  No discussion of Average class size details as documented in Appendix D. No reference to appendix D.  **No discussion of Gen. Ed courses supporting the workforce courses**. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | ACPT | AWR | AWR | **ACPT** | No evidence of soliciting feedback from students. P. 18 brochure current? Checked by public relations. | Just missing some of the suggested points. | Clear and concise. Updated regularly. Multiple channels but web site is main channel. | No evidence of soliciting feedback from students.  p. 18 Brochure Current? Checked by public relations? |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | R&R | R&R | R&R | **R&R** | Too brief.  Table on p. 20-21.  No specifics of guest speakers.  Other partnerships. | No specific evidence of the “routinely” and “frequently” invited guest speakers: Who, When, what topic, attendance numbers, etc. | Too brief and no specifics provided. Table on p. 20-21 only contains mention of the advisory committee and seems missing other data? Refers back to section 5.D for contributions of advisory board but that doesn’t address this section specifically from an analysis standpoint. | Too brief and no specifics provided. Table on p. 20-21 only contains mention of the advisory committee and seems missing other data? Refers back to section 5.D for contributions of advisory board but that doesn’t address this section specifically from an analysis standpoint.  No specifics of guest speakers.  Other partnerships? |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | ACPT | ACPT | ACPT | **ACPT** | The Appendix document has all the appendices, and they are not labeled so they are hard to find. Need page numbers in Appendix. | No professional development given in terms of teaching and learning | All data provided in Appendix J. This appeared to be TREC reports of CE credits which all real estate agents must do. Appendix section not labeled so difficult to navigate except by clicking heading in Table of Contents (which is not clearly labeled).  There is probably an issue at hand about the types of professional development. There is industry professional development and there is instructor professional development. This document does not address anything beyond the industry development – which is not only required for their working licenses but also to their own personal advantage. | All data provided in Appendix J. This appeared to be TREC reports of CE credits which all real estate agents must do. [Note: Appendix section not labeled so difficult to navigate except by clicking heading in Table of Contents (which is not clearly labeled).]  There is probably an issue at hand about the types of professional development. There is industry professional development and there is instructor professional development. This document does not address anything beyond the industry development – which is not only required for their working licenses but also to their own personal advantage. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | Should state Not Applicable. |  | Was not completed. However, should it indicate that in the document and delete the unused tables and Lorem Ipsum text. | Should state Not Applicable. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | **AWR** | **AWR** | **AWR** | **AWR** | Consider on two prompts, should PLO/Program Competencies.  2. No specifics as to overall improvements.  No specific data which would have been gathered for the CIP. These anecdotal data details were not included in this Section 10 analysis | Did not give PLOs/Pgm. Competencies | Two Expected Outcomes from 2020.  There was good analysis of the failures due to faulty due dates in the online course.  Only anecdotal evidence which indicates a faulty Expected Outcome, Measure and Target. | Considering only two prompts, should include PLO/Program Competencies  2. No specifics as to overall improvements.  No specific data which would have been gathered for the CIP. These anecdotal data details were not included in this Section 10 analysis. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | AWR | **AWR** | AWR | **AWR** | Explore collecting hard data rather than anecdotal date licensure passing. | Discussed strengths and weaknesses of the program. The question is how will you evaluate your success though… | Good analysis of program weaknesses and possible remedies. | This document should explore other avenues for collecting hard data on student success rather than relying solely on anecdotal state licensure passing and Principles of Real Estate I. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | R&R |  |  | **R&R** | Outcome 1 measure is more Action Plan than measure. NO specifics of an instrument or which data will be collected.  Possible issue with data collection and conclusion based on ambiguity of control vs. variables.  p. 33 – typo registration. | Too much, more focus  One of the things should be to get real numbers on CC students who pass the exam, not anecdotal. | Two of the targets are increasing the pass rate of the Principles of Real Estate I course. The Measures column does not give measures but rather the actions they will take.  The second two Outcomes are focused on enrollment but not selected for CIP. However, the target of increasing enrollment is not necessarily going to be due to increased awareness of the program, which is their approach.  The second outcome is confusing since the “measure” is to create an alternative course to Principles of Real Estate I course while the Target is to increase pass rate of Principles of Real Estate I to above 70%. | Outcome 1 measure is more Action Plan than measure. No specifics of an instrument or which data will be collected.  Possibly an issue with data collection and conclusion based on ambiguity of control vs. variables.  p. 33 – typo Registration. |