COLLIN
COLLEGE™

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW CHECKLIST

Program: __Engineering FOS_____   **Reviewer ___Daphne Babcock, Christopher Foree, Nick Morgan**

	Responsive to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
1. What does the program do?	Accepted without Recommendations			Accepted without Recommendations	This section offers a clear and concise overview of what the program does.
2. Program's relationship to the college mission & strategic plan.	Accepted with Recommendations	Accepted with Recommendations	Accepted with Recommendations	Accepted with Recommendations	The foundational information was mostly covered. However, it would be helpful to include more specific details about how the program aligns with the mission and to provide supporting data. 1. Do any of your faculty serve on faculty council, COE, COAT, CAB or as an Academic Planning Coach? 2. There is no mention of Strategic Goal 1: Improve student outcomes to meet or exceed local, state, and regional accreditation thresholds and goals. Can you provide average retention rates and success rates by course? Perhaps that is discussed later in this document.
3. Program relationship to student demand.	Accepted with Recommendations	Accepted with Recommendations	Accepted with Recommendations	Accepted with Recommendations	The response primarily addresses the current situation without considering future plans or anticipated demand. This

Program: __Engineering FOS_____   **Reviewer ____Daphne Babcock, Christopher Foree, Nick Morgan**

					document should serve as a platform for future planning, outlining potential changes and growth for the program. Are there any specific supports for a diverse student population?
4. What marketable skills should students have after completion?	Accepted with Required Changes	Accepted with Required Changes	Accepted with Required Changes	Accepted with Required Changes	The website provides detailed information about marketable skills and their role within the program. Incorporating this material into the document and discussing these skills in greater depth, along with quantitative analysis, would significantly enhance its value.
5. How effective is the program's curriculum?	Accepted with Required Changes	Accepted with Required Changes	Accepted with Required Changes	Accepted with Required Changes	While we acknowledge that the program is currently operating successfully, there is no discussion of efforts to maintain its rigor or address potential future challenges. Additionally, there is limited focus on student satisfaction and strategies for enhancing retention and completion rates.
6. How well does program communicate?	Accepted with Recommendations	Accepted with Recommendations	Accepted with Recommendations	Accepted with Recommendations	Include syllabi/House Bill 2504 Collin webpage to the table as they serve as essential communication tools between faculty and students.
7. How well are partnership resources built and leveraged?	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	"Engineering" is misspelled in the last entry of the table.
8. Are faculty supported with professional development?	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	The response is thorough and well-articulated. Both full-time and adjunct faculty are consistently involved in professional development activities

Program: __Engineering FOS_____   Reviewer ____Daphne Babcock, Christopher Foree, Nick Morgan

				throughout the year, participating at various levels.
9. [Optional] Is the program supported with facilities, equipment, and financial resources?				N/A
10. How have past CIPs contributed to success?	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Improvements noted.
11. How will program success be evaluated?	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Accepted without Recommendations	Weakness addressed – advisors unaware that students must get started on math and science sequences early on. Strengths/Improvements include adding a career coach and a dedicated engineering advisor.
12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Table	Accepted without Recommendations			Accepted without Recommendations	

Overall Decision:

___ Accepted Without Recommendations   ___Accepted With Recommendations   _X__ Accepted with Required Recommendations   ___Revisit and Revise

Program: __Engineering FOS_____   **Reviewer** ____Daphne Babcock, Christopher Foree, Nick Morgan

General comments about the submission or rationale for the conclusion:

This submission significantly improved compared to the initial one (revise and revisit). However, we noted that some important aspects were still not addressed, including the assessment of all marketable skills, potential barriers for completers and transfers, as well as considerations for growth, demand, and future planning.