|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | Accepted without Recommendations |  |  | Accepted without Recommendations | Marked improvement from previous submission. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | -Could expand responses in this section especially related to partnerships with high schools and response to labor market demand (introduce some content from section 4 here).-This area could use some work. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations |  |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations |  |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | -Would like to have seen references to SLO's, feedback from advisory board, possible demonstrated KSA's for student preparedness for workforce.-Correlate student outcome to successful meeting of workforce skills. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations |  |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | -Partnerships identified limited in scope and only to those external to the college. Need to identify internal collaboration with Communications (PR), CAB, and possibly Career Centers. Do industry partners address hardware/software needs or just feedback on curriculum?-Need more information on internal and external partnerships.-Weak on internal partnerships which could be strengthened. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations |  |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | -Consider referencing feedback from advisory board regarding curriculum.-Reasoning for repeating same CIP.-This section was a little weak. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted without Recommendations |  |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Revisit and Revise |  |  | Revisit and Revise | -New CIP looks identical to previous with addition of faculty recruiting. CIP focuses on one capstone course and is subject to professor grading. Previous goal appears to have been met with no rationale why it is being repeated.-Reasoning for repeating same CIP.-It was really tough to tell why the same CIP goals were identified as in the earlier CIP. Were previous goals not met? Why is there a new standard? Etc. |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

Since this program review was Revisit and Revise from previous year, highest rating possible was Accepted With Recommendations. Marked improvements over previous submission. Would like to see enhancements to the CIP, other comments provided for specific sections above. Data presented was excellent.

Clean tables with empty data cells.