|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | **Accepted** |  |  | **Accepted** | Very clear and concise. Points out state-level licensing and regulations TREC and certificates. Talks about certificates and marketable skills but not AAS. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | **AWR** | AWR | **Accepted**  Good explanation supported by evidence | **AWR** | Address 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.  ***Strategic Goals*** from Collin.edu   1. Improve student outcomes to meet or exceed local, state, and regional accreditation thresholds and goals. 2. Develop and implement strategies to become a **national** exemplar in program and student outcomes. 3. Create and implement comprehensive integrated pathways to support student transitions. 4. Implement the third Baccalaureate degree by Fall 2022 and continue adding 2+2 programs with university partners. 5. Develop and implement a comprehensive staffing and succession model. 6. Develop a coordinated and systematic approach to engage external stakeholders.   Provides specific data in the form of percentages with explanation.  No direct evidence for Mission: **AWR**  The CE mention could count as evidence of community-centeredness.  **Accepted** for Strategic Goals |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | **Accepted** | **Accepted** | **Accepted** | **AWR** | Enrollment numbers only go to 2021?  Expanding to new campuses.  Express Courses  Competition.  No mention on diverse student population.  Good data in form of numbers and percentages  Overall Good explanation but data lacking. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | *“…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.  Specific evidence of completion and class exam passing rates. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | **Accepted** | **Accepted** | **AWR** | **AWR** | 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. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Clear and concise. Updated regularly. Multiple channels but web site is main channel. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | 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. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | 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).  This section could have been more clear.  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.  Some explanation as to requirements but no analysis. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | Was not completed. However, should it indicate that in the document and delete the unused tables and *Lorem Ipsum* text. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Accepted | AWR | Accepted | Accepted | 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. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Good analysis of program weaknesses and possible remedies. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | AWR |  |  | AWR | 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 very 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%. |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

Executive Summary was clear and concise. Did not allude to any shortcomings in the program or areas for improvement, but did not talk about AAS or Certificates.