|  | **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 is a clear, thorough response to the question. The review provides relevant information about the degrees/certificates, classes offered, marketable skills, program outcomes, and career paths that the program may lead to. The program also consulted with the advisory committee to ensure it is meeting market need and added a plan for a new program outcome accordingly. Some of this material seems better suited to answering question 4 (relationship to market demand) though.  |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | AWR | RR | AWR | AWR | This section does not contain any specific evidence or data about how the program relates to the mission and strategic plan. Discussion of program completion rates would have strengthened the section, as would discussion of any existing industry contacts and agreements with universities (such as the ones mentioned on pp. 18-19).  |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | AWR | Acceptable | AWR | AWR | This section provides helpful information about program growth. An explanation of definitions of enrollment vs headcount would be helpful. I also would have liked to get specific enrollment numbers for the earlier years – the only specific numbers provided are for Plano Campus in Fall 2022, but what were the previous years’ enrollment at the other campuses? Why did the program stop offering courses at the other campuses? There is also an explanation of the lack of prerequisites or recommended course order, but it seems that there are some classes that are considered “advanced” and require prior knowledge. Why does the program require the “faculty member [to work] with the student to mediate the gap in knowledge” instead of creating pre-requisites to ensure students have the knowledge and skills they need before entering these advanced classes? This element of the program is discussed in more detail on p. 36 and the review mentions potentially adding prerequisites. A program coach is mentioned briefly on p. 18 – more information on how this program coach is utilized would be beneficial, or at least a reference to where in the document the reader can find more information. Do students need to seek out the coach, is there a screening process, or does every student meet with the coach periodically?  |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Acceptable | Acceptable | AWR | AWR | This has good information on DFW area jobs, growth, and the relationship of the program to the market. However, a more specific plan to collect data on recent graduates to get the data on employment rates would be helpful. The informal method of keeping in touch with formal students mentioned on p. 22 doesn’t seem practical. The program’s current inability to collect this data could/should be listed as a weakness. The information on percentages of DFW area jobs requiring associates vs bachelor degrees is very helpful for indicating specific weakness. More information on the transfer agreements in process would be helpful to strengthen this section, considering most jobs in the field do require a bachelor’s degree.  |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | This section is clear and provides a wide variety of data throughout. The first section provides helpful data about course completion and success rates. The differences between Collin’s courses and other colleges courses is well justified with a discussion of DFW’s specific needs. There is an extra box of filler text on pp. 27-28 that needs to be removed. A weakness mentioned is the need to strengthen ties with local co-op employers. Discussion of the relationship of curriculum to potential transfer opportunities would strengthen the section.  |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | This section is clear and provides good detail about the website, the program coach, and student evaluations. What classes does the program coach visit though, without any clear progression between classes? This section also says the program coach will start doing these things - when?  |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | This table includes the two universities that the program is discussing articulation agreements with, but provides no other detail such as a potential timeline or relationship of current Collin coursework to the university bachelor degree programs. P. 5 says the articulation agreements have been finalized - what are these details? The chart also does not include any industry or other relationships. What industry partners does the program use for co-ops or other external opportunities? If none, how can the program reach out to create these area relationships?  |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | This section is clear and thorough.  |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | N/A |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | This demonstrates increasing enrollment and completion and provides some changes the program made to help accomplish these goals.  |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | This section nicely summarizes the strengths and weaknesses. Some weaknesses mentioned earlier in the review needed to be indicated in more detail here again though, such as the articulation agreements with universities, lack of data on graduate employment rates, lack of relationships with local industry partners for co-ops, and the lack of pre-requisites causing students to sometimes enter more challenging classes unprepared.  |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Acceptable |  |  | Acceptable | This is clear and specific.  |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

The submission is generally clear and contains a lot of helpful data. The biggest areas of revision needed are to be more consistent and detailed in discussing the university articulation agreements (in some places the review lists they are starting or considering conversations and in some places it says these are complete), as well as more discussion about how to collect missing data on graduate employment rates, etc.