|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responsive to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| 1. What does the program do? | This FOS covers 3 areas (Civil, Electrical and Mechanical). This document lightly covers one area: Civil. Incomplete. |  |  | **Revisit/Revise** | This application only covers the Civil Engineering which is now suspended. There was no input from the Mechanical or Electrical engineering areas. Thus the review process was unable to be completed. |
| 2. Program’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan. | The descriptions for Civil engineering are adequate. The remaining two areas are missing. Incomplete. | No input for Electrical or Mechanical. | The explanation of the Civil program was sparse but adequate. No support for the other two areas. | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | The relationship of student demand in Civil engineering is addressed. The remaining two areas are missing. Incomplete. | No input for Electrical or Mechanical. | The explanation of the Civil program was sparse but adequate. No support for the other two areas. | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |
| 4. What marketable skills should students have after completion? | The document does not address this issue. Incomplete. | No input for Electrical or Mechanical. | No supporting analysis for Civil and none for the other two areas. | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | The document does not completely address this issue. Incomplete. | No input for Electrical or Mechanical. | Analysis for Civil only. | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |
| 6. How well does program communicate?  | The document does not address this issue. Incomplete. | No input for Electrical or Mechanical. | NA | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built and leveraged? | The document does not address this issue. Incomplete. | No input for Electrical or Mechanical. | NA | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |
| 8. Are faculty supported with professional development? | The professional development for Civil engineering are adequate. The remaining two areas are missing. Incomplete. | No input for Electrical or Mechanical. | This list of professional development covers all areas and not special to this FOS. | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |
| 9. [Optional] Is the program supported with facilities, equipment, and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | See first comment. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | The document does not completely address this issue. Incomplete. | No input for Electrical or Mechanical. | A light explanation lacking data to support their position. Missing remaining two areas. | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |
| 11. How will program success be evaluated? | The document does not address this issue. Incomplete. | NA | NA | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Table | The descriptions for Civil engineering are adequate. The remaining two areas are missing. Incomplete. |  |  | **Revisit/Revise** | See first comment. |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Accepted Without Recommendations |  Accepted With Recommendations | \_\_\_ Accepted with Required Recommendations  | XXX Revisit and Revise |

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

As the programs contained in this FOS are currently suspended, I recommend this review also be suspended until such time as the programs are reinstated. Additionally, it should be the policy of this committee to not review any program that is canceled, suspended, or undergoing transformative changes.