|  | **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 section is acceptable. It describes the purpose as teaching entry level welding positions. As these positions don’t require the AAS degree, this section could be improved by adding a purpose statement related to the degree exit point. When editing for publication, please be sure all outcomes listed contain a verb. In the discussion on regulatory standards, the section describes the WECM requirements. Later in the document, there is discussion about AWS/ SENSE standards, but they are not mentioned here. This is not an accrediting body, but it could support the verification of workplace competencies section.  |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | The program’s active engagement in attaining areas of the college mission and strategic plan is clear and is described with evidence. There could be an improvement if the specific skills that were discussed when implementing strategies to become a national exemplar were discussed. This is a new program, so the discussion in section 5 largely involved providing adequate staffing for the program early growth. In future reports, there should be a discussion on succession planning. The presence of a Career Coach is an excellent intervention to support outreach to external stakeholders and support student recruitment and advising.  |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | There is a clear relationship to student demand. This section would be clearer if the numbers mentioned were easier to match to provided tables. Please work on formatting of tables, spelling, and grammar to increase readability and clarity. Should the career coach be mentioned in student support? The section on demographics was non-specific and could benefit from clearer tables or more detail in the narrative. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Acceptable | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable | Acceptable | The market demand is clear and the discussion provides evidence. This is the first place the lack of understanding of the “Application for graduation” process was mentioned, even though program completion was mentioned in the previous section. I didn’t see any evidence of this in the narrative.  |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Acceptable  | Acceptable  | Acceptable  | Acceptable | Please delete the notation Michelle stopped here after the comment on computer labs on p. 44. There is evidence the program is competitive with area programs in content and currency. The program has a value-added component with aerospace welding applications being included in the curriculum. Great job in noting the necessity of considering the hazards of adding courses for the AAS into the certificates. Again, tables are difficult to read, but the data does seem to support the effectiveness of the current curriculum.  |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | The programs communication is largely the catalog online. There is a notation of a “hidden link”. All communication should be easily accessed. The document notes several areas of improvement needed in the program communication, but there was little to no evidence of analysis of their conclusions.  |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | This section contained a list of partnerships with minimal statements of value in a table. There is no analysis of the partnerships and how the program know what they contribute or how well.  |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | This section listed faculty and what development they had participated in. Although it met a minimal standard on this discussion, more analysis of the development, how it influenced areas of the curriculum and helped student learning, as well as analysis of what further is needed. There is no mention of professional development by the adjunct teachers. Again, consistent table formatting would be helpful to enhance readability and appearance of the report. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | Please remove the prefilled text.  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | This is a new program, there is not previous CIP that has relevant information. Future reports will provide more data here.  |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | Acceptable with recommendations | Please add a plan for future analysis of the data. During the review many weaknesses were identified that are not addressed in evaluating success or in section 12 (future CIP). Demographics, increasing AAS graduates, communication, etc. should be part of a future plan.  |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Acceptable with recommendations |  |  | Acceptable with recommendations | Basic components of the CIP are present and relevant, but to increase the plan clarity and effectiveness the following areas are noted; Outcome #2 measure is unclear how it can lead to the outcome; the action plan does not address anything but working with a dean to develop a new course. Link these areas together with more clarity.  Outcome # 1 “math and measurement skills” was not addressed earlier in the program review under curriculum effectiveness or workplace demand. It is unclear why it is so prominent in the CIP.  |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

This is a new program so they do not have a lot of historical depth. Much of the effort has been put into creating curriculum, staffing, recruiting and getting set up in a new facility. Evaluation will develop over time as more data is collected and several student cohorts have completed the curriculum.

Please do a solid grammar and spelling proof of the final document.

Charts have formatting issues making them difficult to read

Please work to get the areas of weakness you have noted to play a more prominent role in future continuous improvement. Increase the depth of the analysis of the evidence in several areas.
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