|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | AWOR |  |  | AWOR | These are very minor edits, well below the threshold for a comfortable AWOR rating:  I \*think\* there’s do definition of “OR” (third paragraph) – recommend adding it just to be consistent with other definitions.  “Consent to criminal…” bullet point seems to have an extra space.  The last bullet point is a different point size and color.  Previous concerns addressed, and the edits suggested above are very minor typos that are easy to fix (and miss).  This is an excellent introduction overall; very well done! |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | AWOR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Again, very minor, but it illustrates the need to “pre-define” OR, since in the “Strengthens Character” paragraph it looks a bit like the author his highlighting the word “or” through capitalization.  I believe “point 3” of the template is made through the implication that the program has had heavy success since its inception, although actual numerical evidence would be better.  Most of the objection in the previous review was not so much the table’s presence, but the lack of surrounding exposition. Frankly, removing the table entirely does solve the problem, even if it leaves a similar issue with “not supported by numerical data.” |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | Hey! Operating Room is finally defined!  The movement of the table and the paragraph below causes this section to now meet the template criteria, and the “exponential increase in applications” satisfies the need to provide evidence of the statement that the enrollment is expected to double. Explanation of generally “flat” past enrollment aligns with the inclusion of the table here rather than in the previous section. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | AWOR | RR | RR | RR | I \*think\* LLC and CPA technically should be “spelled out” (with abbv. In parentheses) since it’s the first time they appear – everything else has been defined earlier in the document.  The minor edits requested have been made. And the statement spelling out why the salary information was included is just fine and addresses that point. And there is no question that there is a lot of response here (“responsiveness to the prompt” is NOT an issue at all). But the fundamental reason this was given RR originally doesn’t appear to have been addressed at all:  Let’s get specific: these are the prompts I was referring to that are not addressed (either that, or the author was intending for the provided data to “imply” what they address, but either there is nothing to directly address them, or I’m not seeing it after re-reading the section four or five times): “What proportion of the program’s graduates (seeking employment) found related employment within six months of graduation?” and “What changes are anticipated in market demand over the next 5 years? Do program completers meet, exceed, or fall short of local employment demand? How will the program address under-or over-supply?”  As a “random author” reading this and looking for where the provided information matches those prompts I just don’t see it yet. I see a lot of information; I see a lot of things that can be used as supporting evidence. But I don’t see it tied together with clear statements that explicitly spell out how all of these addresses those two prompts. I’m afraid I need it spelled out a lot more explicitly. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | Concerns from previous review largely addressed (a few were not, but the ones specifically listed as the “main recommendations” were all sufficiently addressed). |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | No comments or concerns were addressed. This section of the review appears to be identical to what was previously submitted. Previous “ratings” therefore retained. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWR | Still only saving a single patient’s life? Not multiple patients’ lives?  BUT, that definitely fixed the middle paragraph – that little change made all the difference!  Third paragraph still reads weird, and rest need cleaning up.  There are improvements, although several recommendations still stand, but this section is largely fine as indicated by “AWOR” (the “AWR” in overall is still retained for the same reason as before, but it is not an ongoing concern for the overall rating). |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | This was originally fine, and no changes have been made (as expected given there was nothing wrong). |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | This part was removed as suggested. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | The added paragraph better aligns the original second paragraph to the overall prompt, and the deletion of the first paragraph makes the statement more concise and a clearer match to what the prompt is asking for. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | Perfect! There is now a paragraph to address the actual prompt! And it does so quite well in context with the attached CIP. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | AWOR |  |  | AWOR | Good! Outcomes are now filled out, and CIP appears complete! |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

The re-submission genuinely addresses virtually every concern raised from the original submission. Almost all concerns that were not addressed were either minor, possible misunderstandings due to the reviewer not being “in the field”, or not sufficient to warrant an additional Revisit. Most importantly, the major omissions have been fixed.