|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the program do? | Accepted |  |  | Accepted | Email contact information is missing. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted |  |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Accepted | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Need more evidence that enrollment down due to marketing, online training options, and challenges to registration. Consider a student survey that will validate these problems.  Note in the next section you discuss Appendix B which documents difficulties enrolling due to website. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Accepted | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Be more clear as to the demand for credit or non-credit classes. Perhaps use an additional source along with indeed to make the case for job demand. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Section V has a few sentences with no periods. See page 14.  CEHS courses are short term. Courses are non-credit. Difficult to ascertain curricular barriers.  Only one dedicated CEHS employee  The advisory committees of the Health Science credit programs help design the curriculum.  Good evidence that the program curriculum is current. CEHS director left 2022 and replacement has not been secured. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | They have hired assistance for new department webpage but enrollment still in decline.  Adm staff updates website and directors initiate changes to the catalog.  They felt that the registration guide was effective in the past (no longer an option). |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Benefit from the Health Science department’s industry partners as well. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Accepted | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations | Only the program manager (ECC) was listed. Perhaps only the one full-time employee is needed for documentation.  Include other part-time CE faculty. Did note that PMs, directors, and faculty and staff of individual programs maintain their professional development as it pertains to their department areas. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Improvements to website updates and Banner grade-reporting. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Increase enrollment by 5% and an effective website to improve user experience. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Accepted |  |  | Accepted |  |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

Overall a good program review, despite only one full-time staff member who appears to be driving the program. Good data was provided. Adequately highlighted the strengths of the program as well as the concerns. The only recommendations were related to providing more evidence of market demand other than job listings on Indeed and perhaps listing the professional development of part-time faculty.