|  | **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 | Few specifics given re: career paths/degree paths (p. 4) |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Accepted with Recommendations | R&R | R&R | R&R | -Amount of information is not equal to developing skill and challenging intellect (p. 6)  -Specifics are lacking  -Anecdotal evidence of 95%, not a true statistic …Comparing an actual stat to the anecdotal number is problematic |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | R&R | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | R&R | -Did not address how the program attracts diverse student population  -Did not analyze the evidence (last bullet point on p. 8) |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | -Addressed TX not DFW  -Gave salary info not students who “found related employment” (p. 10) -Sources on some stats missing  -Strengths and Weaknesses was spotty |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | R&R | R&R | R&R | R&R | -C “case with evidence that the program curriculum is current” is really general  -Problematic “statistic” relied on again  -Evidence is 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. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Accept with recommendations | Accept with recommendations | Accept with recommendations | Accept with recommendations | -No evidence of student feedback  -No process to described in terms of keeping the website up to date  -p. 18, one box not checked |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Accept with recommendations | Accept with recommendations | Accept with recommendations | Accept with recommendations | -No specific evidence of the “routinely” and “frequently” invited guest speakers: Who, when, what topic, attendance numbers, etc.  -Only one box on the R.E. Advisory Committee, shouldn’t there be more evidence of partnerships? |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Accept with recommendations | Accept with recommendations | Accept with recommendations | Accepted | No professional development given in terms of teaching and learning |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Accept with recommendations | Accept with recommendations | Accepted | Accepted |  |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | R&R | R&R | R&R | R&R | Discussed strengths and weaknesses of the program. The question is how will you evaluate your success though… |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | R&R |  |  | R&R | -Too much, it would be better to focus on one or two things instead of opening the scope up (creating a whole new class doesn’t get at the problem)  -One of the things should be to get real numbers on CC students who pass the exam, not anecdotal. |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

-8-10 bullet points throughout the program review not addressed.

-Evidence lacked specifics

-The “anecdotal 95%” is problematic for a number of reasons 1. It is compared to an actual statistic (apples and oranges) 2. It was not a random sample 3. It is relied on heavily in this report

-No evidence of teaching and learning professional development, all Real Estate continuing education