|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | Accepted with recommendations |  |  | Accepted with recommendations | Need to edit and remove strikethroughs, clearly identify industries that program serves when discussing target market, clearly state information on career paths of SCM, such as actual job titles, clarify regulatory standards |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted with recommendations | Link on Strategic Plan #4 does not work. Include more detail on how engagement with external stakeholders is systematic, with examples. More information on how Handshake is used (Strategic Goal #6). Additional edits on narrative for clarification. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | Need more analysis on data that was provided, to elaborate on how program will increase diversity and attract more students, on addressing the student gender divide. Need to explain enrollment decrease from 2020 to 2021. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Accepted with recommendations | Revisit and revise | Revisit and revise | Revisit and revise | Need to include active jobs and remove expired link from Indeed. Include data of graduates seeking employment and found employment within 6 months of graduation. More analysis on what data shows on market demand. Are there B.A. degree agreements in place? Who are the graduates who found employment in SCM? More on strengths and weaknesses of the program related to market demand. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Accepted | Accepted with recommendations | Revisit and revise | Revisit and revise | Narrative states “rigorous” comparison, but only lists two other programs. Need more analysis on low student success rates. Need to remove highlights. Advisory Committee minutes are not signed (2022). Link on pg. 33 not working. More analysis needed on grade distribution tables. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Accepted  | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | More information needed on how program informs students and makes them aware of program literature. Are there links to social media? Is the program website the only source of information? |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Accepted | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted | Accepted with recommendations | Good use of advisory committee resources. Possibly include Career Coach Ricketts in listing of campus resources? Edit “Broward.” |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | accepted | One professor does it all??!! Provided information in table but is there any data on how the professional development added value to the program? |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | Need description of how CIP has been used to make improvements – more analysis needed. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted with recommendations | Accepted with recommendations | Focuses on success in IBUS 2332 and math-related issues. Need more information on how program is developing alumni pipeline connection. More information needed on internship opportunities. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Accepted with recommendations |  |  | Accepted with recommendations | Program priorities for the next two years are not related to the priorities identified in Table 1 CIP Outcomes. |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Accepted Without Recommendations | [x]  Accepted With Recommendations | [ ]  Revisit and Revise |

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

Overall a good program review, especially as it appears that only one faculty member is driving this program. Good data was provided, but additional analysis of that data would prove beneficial for the overall program assessment, as well as for the development of goals and CIP. Recommendations generally related to need for more analysis of data, editorial issues, and broken hyperlinks.