

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
1. What does the workforce program do?	SR: 10 R1: 10 R2: 10			SR: 10 R1: 10 R2: 10	<p align="center"><u>Senior Reviewer Comments</u></p> <p>Section responds fully to the component, but additional clarity would be helpful regarding the <u>distinctions</u> between the AAS programs and the Certificate programs in terms of what they teach and the types of jobs they prepare students to enter. Specific comments appear below.</p> <p>Comments relating to preceding <u>Executive Summary</u> section: typos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¶ 1, line 2: “5-years” → “5 years” • ¶ 1, line 3: “strengths...is” → “strength...is” • ¶ 1, line 4: “out” → “our” • ¶ 1, line 6: add word “resources” after “college” • Insert space before ¶ 2. • ¶ 4, line 3: delete extra space before “college support.” <p>Comments relating to <u>Section I, Part A</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps explain the umbrella designation “Institute of Hospitality and Culinary Education (IHCE)” up front for readers not familiar with the industry.



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation of the distinctions between the Level 1 and Level 3 certificates would be helpful here. • Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¶ 1, lines 2-3: “Texas Women’s University” → “Texas Woman’s University” • ¶ 1, lines 2-3: Texas A&M University-Commerce → East Texas A&M University (name has changed). <p>Comments relating to Section I, Part B.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¶ 3 (“Culinary and Pastry Arts falls under The Institute...”): This statement would be helpful to include in Section I.A. • Paragraphs 2 and 3 are in a different font style than most of the other text in the document. • Insert a space between paragraphs. • Very minor point: Consider editing for consistency in referencing “Culinary and Pastry Arts” vs. “Culinary & Pastry Arts.” <p>Comments relating to <u>Section I, Part B.2:</u></p>

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider deleting large blue heading “CULINARY ARTS & PASTRY ARTS MARKETABLE SKILLS.” • Text in this section is in a different font style than most of the other text in the document. <p>Comments relating to <u>Section I, Part B.3</u>: Nice, detailed list of industries served by the programs!</p> <p>Comments relating to <u>Section I, Part B.4</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¶ 1, lines 1-2: Would like more detail regarding the career paths to which AAS in Culinary/Pastry Arts leads vis-à-vis Certificates. For example, does AAS lead to supervisory/management positions but Certificates do not? • ¶ 2, line 3: Brief definition of “kitchen brigade system” would be helpful for readers not familiar with the industry. • ¶ 2, line 1: Does phrase “Culinary Arts graduates” in this context include both AAS and Certificate graduates, or just AAS graduates?



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¶ 3, line 1: Does phrase “Pastry Arts graduates” in this context include both AAS and Certificate graduates, or just AAS graduates? • Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¶ 1, line 3: “tailers” → “tailors” • ¶ 3, line 4: “employees” → “employees” • Articulation Agreements portion is in a different font style than most of the other text in the document. • In Articulation Agreements portion, consider editing to (1) ensure period appears after last letter of degree abbreviation in all bullet points; and (2) consistently include (or omit) the words “degree” and/or “in” after each degree abbreviation. • Stating actual URLs for the five institutions may be preferable than a renamed link since the reader may not be reading a digital form of document. • Link relating to the website of Texas A&M University-Commerce (now East Texas A&M University) appears dead.



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhari

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>Comments relating to <u>Section I, Part B.5</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¶ 4: An explanation of how THEC Workforce Education regulates the programs would be helpful for readers unfamiliar with Workforce education—for example, THEC’s WECM course descriptions and student learning outcomes. • ¶ 5: Consider omitting Collin’s Core Values from this section and using, as you did, Section II of the report for that purpose. • Typo: ¶ 2, line 2: “<u>o</u>n 10/2027” → “<u>i</u>n 10/2027” <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Reviewer 1 Comments</u></p> <p>The response effectively covers this section.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Reviewer 2 Comments</u></p> <p>There are some typographic, grammar, and consistency issues in this section that need addressing.</p> <p>Would like to see more explanation of Certificates and clarification of the single AAS with 2 tracks or 2 options?</p>

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>This section should set standard for consistency in naming of programs and their capitalization (e.g., “Culinary and pastry” vs. “Culinary & Pastry Arts”).</p> <p>Some bold lead-ins or subheads may help the reader quickly understand what’s being presented here.</p>
2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan.	<p>SR: 3 R1: 3 R2: 3</p> <p>(Programs provided general response but did not address each element of the query or is missing an element.)</p> <p>Specifically, programs addressed only one of the six</p>	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>(The evidence does not sufficiently address the program’s case.)</p> <p>Specifically, programs did not supply evidence for all potentially relevant Strategic Plan goals.</p>	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>(A. The response provides clear and concise support for assertion(s) and conclusion(s) B. The explanations address all pertinent elements of the query C. The analysis is coherent, concise and focused.)</p>	<p>SR: 7 R1: 7 R2: 7</p>	<p>Senior Reviewer Comments</p> <p>Comments relating to <u>Section II, Part A</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very thorough, detailed, and helpful response to this component! The subparts about being student-centered, about being community-centered, and about strengthening character are especially fine. • ¶ 1, lines 3-4: The word “seamless” comes before “certificate of AAS,” but should “seamless” refer here to transferring <u>from</u> an AAS <u>to</u> a bachelor’s program? • Under “Core Values,” subpart “Learning,” a brief definition of “mise en place” would be helpful for readers not familiar with the industry. • Under “Core Values,” subpart “Academic Excellence,” perhaps consider providing a

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
	Strategic Plan goals.		Specifically, to the extent the programs <u>do</u> provide evidence, they analyze and explain that evidence well.		<p>few examples of soft skills that the programs consider important to the industry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under “Core Values,” subpart “Dignity and Respect,” the first sentence refers to “each of the course syllabi within the kitchen protocol <u>which is listed below</u>,” but where this list is supposed to appear is unclear. • Under “Core Values,” subpart “Dignity and Respect,” the last sentence • Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text in this section is in a different font style than most of the other text in the document. • ¶ 1 (“Student-Centered” paragraph), sentence 4: “additional support <u>with</u> career coaches” → “additional support <u>from</u> career coaches” • ¶ 1 (“Student-Centered” paragraph), sentence 4: “to relay information <u>from</u> graduation or certificate completion” → “to relay information <u>regarding</u> graduation or certificate completion” • First sentence of paragraph under “Challenging the Intellect” heading: delete

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>comma after word “classical” in the following phrase: “research of classical, and current food trends.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Service and Involvement” subpart, sentence 3: “that allows the student to tie their experience” → “that allows the students to tie their experience” • “Service and Involvement” subpart, sentence 4: Delete comma after “Community Garden Kitchen of Collin County” and insert comma after “Sam Johnson Senior Citizens Center.” • “Service and Involvement” subpart, sentence 6: Consider making plural the words “market” and “ceremony” in the following phrases: “twice a year farmers market” and “twice a year nurses pinning ceremony.” Consider also making the plural words “farmers” and “nurses” possessive. • “Service and Involvement” subpart, sentence 6: capitalize the word “Campus” consistently in the names of Collin’s campuses.

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Service and Involvement” subpart, sentence 7: “The students participated” → “The students participate” (to make verb in present tense consistently with other verbs in the paragraph) • “Creativity and Innovation” subpart, sentence 5: “Nurses” → “nurses_” (possessive and not capitalized) • “Creativity and Innovation” subpart, sentence 6: “Manger” → “Manager” • “Academic excellence” subpart, sentence 2: delete apostrophe after “students.” • “Academic excellence” subpart, sentence 3: “how to control costs” → “controlling costs” (to make this item grammatically parallel with the other items in the list) • “Dignity and Respect” subpart, sentence 2: “It is also emphasized in their coursework the professionalism...” → “It is Also emphasized in their coursework is the professionalism...” <p>Comments relating to <u>Section II, Part B</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This component asks how the programs are supporting Collin’s 2020-2025 Strategic Plan.

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>That plan consists of six strategic goals. In response, the programs describes how they are supporting only one of those goals (Goal #2 (“Develop and implement strategies to become a national exemplar in program and student outcomes”), plus one of the elements of a different list—namely, Element #1 of Collin’s <u>Master Plan</u> (“Ensure maximum utilization of college facilities, programs, and resources”). The programs’ responses regarding these two topics are excellently detailed and responsive; however, the programs do not address five of the six Strategic Goals, if only to explain why some of those goals may not apply to the programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First sentence under heading “B”: “several” → “two” • “Collin College Master Plan #1” subpart, ¶ 1, sentence 1: Insert a comma after “Room A140” and after “capstone.” • “Collin College Master Plan #1” subpart, ¶ 1, sentence 3: “coop” → “Co-op”



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Collin College Master Plan #1” subpart, ¶ 2, sentence 1: Begin sentence with “In” (“<u>In</u> CHEF1305...”). • “Collin College Master Plan #1” subpart, ¶ 3, sentence 1: Begin sentence with “In” (“<u>In</u> HAMG1321...”). • “Collin College Master Plan #1” subpart, ¶ 4, sentence 2: “theme compli<u>menting</u>” → “theme-compl<u>em</u>enting” <p align="center"><u>Reviewer 1 Comments</u></p> <p>The program aligns with the college’s mission statement by student engagement through interactive learning, service learning, problem solving, community activities, developing marketable skills, strengthening character and challenging the intellect.</p> <p>More information is needed to cover the Strategic Goals.</p> <p align="center"><u>Reviewer 2 Comments</u></p> <p>There are some typographic, grammar, and consistency issues in this section that need addressing.</p>

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					Strategic Goals not addressed fully. (Master Plan vs. Strategic Goals; There is NO “Strategic Plan.”)
3. Program relationship to student demand.	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>Specifically, programs do not discuss the demand for the Level 3 Certificates.</p>	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>(The evidence does not sufficiently address the programs’ case.)</p>	<p>SR: 1 R1: 1 R2: 1</p> <p>(A. The response provides a limited support for assertions or conclusions B. The analysis lacks coherency, clarity and focus.)</p> <p>Specifically, Programs’ narrative analysis of program awards statistics does not appear to align with the figures in the program awards table.</p> <p>Narrative analysis of facilities-related</p>	<p>SR: 5 R1: 5 R2: 5</p>	<p>Senior Reviewer Comments</p> <p>Comments relating to <u>Section III, Part A</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¶ 1: Clarification would be helpful regarding the timeline of COVID-19 social distancing restrictions and impact on awards. Per programs’ analysis, social-distancing restriction occurred August 2020 to May 2021, causing students to restrict or delay coursework until AY 2022-23. Yet per table, largest number of combined awards, 69, during the five-year period occurred in the intervening AY, 2021-2022. ¶ 2: Clarification would be helpful regarding the programs’ statement that the facilities allow 16 AAS awards per year. Is this figure for Culinary Arts and Pastry Arts separately (i.e., 32 per year total)? Table reflects more than 16 AAS awards for both programs combined in AYs 2020-2021, 2021-2022, and 2022-2023. ¶ 2: Good description of “bubble” of students ready to take the capstone and complete in Spring 2025. This information helps explain the 2023-2024 award figures, which are lower than those during the pandemic year of 2020-2021. Programs need to address student demand for the Level 1 and Level 3 certificates.

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
			<p>limitations on number of AAS completers per year may <u>potentially</u> conflict with figures in award statistics table.</p> <p>Narrative analysis does not identify the key figures from appendix tables or graphs to support assertions made.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart A.1 overall: Consider incorporating key figures from the section III appendix in the narrative analysis. • Subpart A.1, sentence 2: Insert the following underlined words: “The program <u>enrollment</u> will <u>remain</u> [or <u>be</u>] flat....” <p>Comments relating to <u>Section III, Part B</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough, detailed discussion of this subpart • Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First sentence: “5-years” → “5 years” (hyphen removed) • Subpart 1): Stating the actual URL for the orientation link may be preferable to providing a renamed link since the reader may not be reading a digital form of document. • Subpart 3), last sentence: Remove the underlined word “a” in the following phrase: “by <u>a</u> program coaches.” • Subpart 4), sentence 1: Insert a space between “implemented” and “a.” <p>Comments relating to <u>Section III, Part C</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider incorporating key figures from the section III appendix in the narrative analysis to support assertions made. • Typos or other non-substantive issues:



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhari

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentence 1: Remove comma after "industry." Sentence 1: "attracts" → "attract" (to agree with plural subject) Sentence 1: "embraces" → "embrace" (to agree with plural subject) Sentence 2: "section <u>three</u>" → "section <u>III</u>" Sentence 2: "supports" → "supporting" Sentence 4: Capitalize first letter of first word: "Enrollment." Sentence 5: "the overall the program trends higher enrollments" → "the overall program trends <u>demonstrate</u> higher enrollments" <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Reviewer 1 Comments</u></p> <p>Limited evidence. Appendix III is mentioned but data is not analyzed or summarized enough.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Reviewer 2 Comments</u></p> <p>The evidence here seems thin. It references Appendix Iii, but very little (if any) of that data is addressed/summarized/analyzed here, leaving only the top-level statements about the total awards given.</p>

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>Relies too much on the reader having to reference the Appendix to understand the data. Words like “strong” or excellent” in the response aren’t supported in the response.</p> <p>Level 3 certificate demand not addressed.</p> <p>There are some typographic, grammar, and consistency issues in this section that need addressing.</p>
4. Program relationship to market demand.	<p>SR: 3 R1: 3 R2: 3</p>	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>Specifically, Glass Door’s job posting total for Dallas does not appear sufficiently granular to support assertions regarding (1) the market demand for positions for</p>	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>Specifically, programs’ analysis of Glass Door data is insufficiently detailed to support assertions regarding market demand for the program’s graduates in the relevant geographic areas.</p>	<p>SR: 6 R1: 6 R2: 6</p>	<p>Senior Reviewer Comments</p> <p>Typos or other non-substantive issues relating to first paragraph in <u>Section IV</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence 2: Delete extra space before “ACF accredited skills.” • Typos or other non-substantive issues: • Sentence 1: Remove comma after “industry.” • Sentence 3: “employees” → “employ<u>e</u>es” <p>Comments relating to <u>Section IV, Part A</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is Glass Door’s total number of food service postings in Dallas on a given date a reliable metric of jobs available for program graduates in Collin County other nearby areas outside Dallas? Of the 5,695 jobs referenced in the narrative,

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
		which the programs' graduates would be qualified; and (2) the full geographic area in which the programs' graduates would seek employment.	Narrative lacks analysis of the data relating to the ten-year projection for the Accommodation and Food Services jobs graph in the Section IV of the Appendix.		<p>how many are entry-level or mid-career, for which program graduates would be qualified?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The date on which the 5,695 figure was obtained would be helpful, as the linked page supplied in the narrative reflects a different number as of April 12, 2025. • Section IV appendix contains an excellent graph illustrating projected job outlook in Texas for Accommodation and Food Services jobs. Analysis of this data in the narrative report would be helpful. • Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence 1: Set off the phrase "an online employment website" with commas. • Sentence 3: Insert apostrophe in "Associate's." • Sentence 4: Delete space after forward slash in "Culinary/Pastry Chef." • Sentence 5: Insert the word "have" after the phrase "Collin College." <p>Comments relating to <u>Section IV, Part B</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the absence of any formal survey results regarding post-graduation employment, do the programs have anecdotal evidence? • Sentence 2: Data to support the assertion that labor shortages in the DFW and nationally for in-



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>line workers, managers, and supervisors would be helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the speculative nature of the reference to students' potential 100% employment rate, consider inserting the underlined language in the clause below: "our students could <u>potentially have</u> a 100% employment rate if they so choose to participate." <p>Comments relating to <u>Section IV, Part C</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentence 1 mentions growth projections, presumably those reflected in Texas data for Accommodation and Food Services jobs in the Section IV appendix. More detailed analysis of this data would be helpful—for example, for which of the listed positions would program graduates be qualified? <p align="center"><u>Reviewer 1 Comments</u></p> <p>This section mentions job numbers from Glassdoor but doesn't include details like job types and levels.</p> <p align="center"><u>Reviewer 2 Comments</u></p> <p>Section only generally refers to Glass Door reporting number of jobs but provides no other details on types of jobs/positions within</p>

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>the industry, at what level, or specific geographic area (e.g., why Dallas rather than certain counties).</p> <p>Feel like more information is needed on titles/demand apart from the number (e.g., from US Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Outlook).</p> <p>E.g., “As illustrated in the growth projections of the Hospitality & Food Service Industry...” (Where is this illustrated?)</p> <p>Is there program demand beyond the current facilities? (No evidence shown of that.)</p>
<p>5. How effective is the program’s curriculum?</p>	<p>SR: 3 R1: 3 R2: 3</p> <p>Specifically, peer school comparisons did not include certificate programs.</p>	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>Specifically, evidence did not include (1) peer institution comparison data relating to certificate</p>	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>Specifically, programs do not explain differences in course offerings as compared to peer schools.</p>	<p>SR: 7 R1: 7 R2: 7</p>	<p>Comments relating to <u>Section V, Part A</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good, detailed description of the programs’ key success factors in minimizing barriers to completion! • When referring to specific courses, identifying the courses’ titles along with their rubrics and course numbers will assist readers who are not familiar with the programs’ curricula. • Typos or other non-substantive issues:

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
		<p>programs; (2) advisory committee attendance information for 2024 meetings; (3) data to support the assertion that student base, facilities, and the college's overall approach affect differences in Collin's course offerings compared to those of peer institutions.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second bullet-point: Insert a period at the end of the sentence. • Third bullet-point: Insert a period at the end of the sentence. • Fourth bullet point, sentence 4: Consider clarifying the phrase "cooperative work experience" as referring to an actual course by capitalizing it and identifying the course number(s). Alternatively, refer to the course as "Co-op" since the report earlier refers to the course in that way. • Fourth bullet point, sentence 5: capitalize "Co-op." • Fourth bullet point, last sentence: insert word "and" after "schedules." • Sixth bullet point, sentence 1: insert word "required" after "ACF." <p>Comments relating to <u>Section V, Part A.1</u>: typos or other non-substantive comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 1 underneath program awards table, last sentence: Insert the underlined words as follows: "...<u>in</u> the academic years of 2023 <u>and</u> 2024, increased student engagement/persistence <u>resulted</u> in 25 Culinary students...." • Paragraph 2 under program awards table: Good explanation for the low demand for the Level 3

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>certificates and their potential sunseting! I would like to see this information provided in Section III of the Program Review regarding student demand.</p> <p>Comments relating to <u>Section V, Part A.2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the Student Success, Failure, and Withdrawal Chart in the Section V appendix, highlighting the HAMG 1321 course in red font was very helpful! • Sentence 1: Consider supporting the assertion that the programs have excellent success rates by referencing key data from the Student Success, Failure, and Withdrawal Chart, such as the average of all the success rates, or the range of success rates excluding those for HAMG 1321. • Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence 5: “into the program” → “<u>in</u> the program” • Last sentence: “<u>fucus</u>” → “<u>focus</u>” <p>Comments relating to <u>Section V, Part B:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart 1.a.: Consider pointing out that the although the average number of Pastry Arts completers (22.6) over the five -year period <i>combined</i> was fewer than 25, the average number of completers <i>per year</i> was greater than five.

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After subpart 1.a., delete the boldface words “in last 5 years.” <p>Comments relating to <u>Section V, Part C:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart 1, ¶ 1: The programs refer to the comparison course charts for Collin and three peer schools in the Section V appendix, and the programs observe that slight differences exist as a result of student base, facilities, and the college’s overall approach. However, the programs do not identify what the differences in student base, facilities, and the college’s overall approach are and how those differences have affected specific course offerings. • Subpart 1, ¶ 1: An explanation of why Collin does not offer a course that the peer schools do (such as CHEF 1302 – Principles of Healthy Cuisine) and why Collin offers a course that the peer schools do not (such as CHEF 2380 – Co-op, Culinary Arts) would be helpful. • Subpart 1, ¶¶ 1-2: The programs address only AAS programs, and the comparison course charts for Collin and three peer schools in the Section V appendix address only those schools’ AAS course offerings. A comparison of Collin’s certificate offerings with those of the three peer schools would be helpful.



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart 1, ¶ 2, sentence 1: insert the underlined language as follows to clarify that Collin and Dallas Colleges are the only two schools in the immediate DFW area to offer an AAS in Pastry Arts: “only <u>Collin College and Dallas College</u> offer[] an AAS degree in Pastry Arts.” • Subpart 1, ¶ 2, sentence 2: Function of word “<u>changed</u>” in sentence is unclear. Perhaps delete it? • Subpart 2 typo: “refected” → “<u>reflected</u>” • Subpart 3: Are the certificate programs also accredited by ACF, or just the AAS programs? • Section V of Appendix, peer schools charts: Stating actual URLs under each of these charts may be preferable to providing renamed links since the reader may not be reading a digital form of the document. <p>Comments relating to <u>Section V, Part D</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart 2: Question asks for the number of employers that attended the last two meetings. Programs responded regarding a November 2022 meeting and an April 2023 meeting. Did any advisory committee meetings occur in 2024? • Subpart 3: typos or other non-substantive issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main paragraph, sentence 1: “brough” → “<u>brought</u>”



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main paragraph, sentence 3: replace “each members” with “members’ having” • Main paragraph, sentence 3: “<u>of</u> schedule” → “<u>to</u> schedule” • Indented paragraph 2, sentence 3: Insert a comma after “program.” • Indented paragraph 2, last sentence: Consider replacing the underlined words as follows: “The program increased <u>the visibility to students</u> by including...” → “The program increased <u>students’ exposure to these new economic realities</u> by including....” • Subpart 4, ¶ 1: Replace “item #4” with “subpart 3” or “subsection 3.” • Subpart 4, ¶ 2, sentence 1: Replace the period after “Culinary Arts AAS degree” with a colon (:). • Sub[art 4, ¶ 2, last sentence: Consider replacing “The North Texas market is increasing...” with “The increase in the North Texas market’s....” • Insert a space between paragraphs. <p>Comments relating to <u>Section V, Part E</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence 2: Delete “was” after “Covid-19.” • Subpart 2: Insert a space between paragraphs. • Subpart 4, Sentence 1: Consider supporting the assertion that the programs have excellent



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>success rates by referencing key data from the Student Success, Failure, and Withdrawal Chart or Grade Distribution Chart, such as the average of all the success rates, or the range of success rates excluding those for HAMG 1321.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart 4, last sentence: “<u>27%</u> success rate” should be “<u>75%</u> success rate.” • Subpart 4: typos or other non-substantive issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence 5: “<u>into</u> the program” → “<u>in</u> the program” • Sentence 7: Singular verb “is” should be plural verb “are.” • Subpart 6 question duplicates Subpart 4 on the template by no fault of the program review’s author. Please see comments above relating to Subpart 4 as the response there is the same as the response to this Subpart 6. • Subpart 7: Insert a space between paragraphs. • Subpart 7, ¶ 4, last sentence: Singular verb “is” should be plural verb “are.” • Subpart 8: Insert a space between paragraphs. • Subpart 8, indented ¶ 1): Delete comma after “review.” • Subpart 8: The programs might consider administering exit surveys of students (for example, during the capstone) to gauge student satisfaction and obtain other feedback.

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subpart 8, last paragraph: Regarding student complaints about the shortage of textbooks, is the shortage the result of diminished supply by the publisher? <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Reviewer 1 Comments</u></p> <p>Competitive programs are mentioned, but there's little analysis. Some differences are noted, but not really explored. What makes Collin's AAS and Certificate programs better or worse?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Reviewer 2 Comments</u></p> <p>The competitive curricula are referenced but there is little-to-no analysis of these comparisons. Differences are mentioned, but not substantially addressed. Is there anything about the Collin program that is inferior or superior to the compared programs? Is there any strategy on Collin's part to address those? (For both AAS and Certificates.)</p> <p>Some of this section seems to defer readers to the appendices with very little reference to specific data, and relatively little analysis.</p>

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					What is the scale for the Student Evaluation Report graph on p. 30?
6. How well does program communicate?	SR: 4 R1: 4 R2: 4	SR: 3 R1: 3 R2: 3	SR: 3 R1: 3 R2: 3	SR: 10 R1: 10 R2: 10	<p><u>Senior Reviewer Comments</u></p> <p>Comments relating to <u>Section VI</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stating actual URLs for the departmental websites, both in the narrative response to Section VI.A. and in the Program Literature Table, may be preferable to providing renamed links since the reader may not be reading a digital form of the document. • Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart A, sentence 2: “Whe” → “When” • Subpart A, sentence 2: “departmentant” → “departmental” • Subpart A, sentence 2: Insert comma after “department website.” • Subpart A, sentence 2: “provided” → “provides” (present tense) • Subpart A, sentence 2: “an monthly” → “a monthly” <p><u>Reviewer 1 Comments</u></p> <p>The response effectively covers this section.</p> <p><u>Reviewer 2 Comments</u></p>

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>There are some typographic, grammar, and consistency issues in this section that need addressing.</p> <p>When including links, best practice is to provide the URL after the name of the link (so those using a hard copy know where they are located).</p>
7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged?	SR: 4 R1: 4 R2: 4	SR: 3 R1: 3 R2: 3	SR: 3 R1: 3 R2: 3	SR: 10 R1: 10 R2: 10	<p><u>Senior Reviewer Comments</u> Comments relating to <u>Section VII</u>: In the Program Stakeholder Resources and Partnerships Table, consider including institutions that are parties to relevant articulation agreements and any internal Collin departments used to advance the programs' outcomes.</p> <p><u>Reviewer 1 Comments</u> The response effectively covers this section.</p> <p><u>Reviewer 2 Comments</u> Internal Partners?</p>
8. Are the faculty supported with professional development?	SR: 4 R1: 4 R2: 4	SR: 3 R1: 3 R2: 3	SR: 3 R1: 3 R2: 3	SR: 10 R1: 10 R2: 10	<p><u>Senior Reviewer Comments</u> Programs supplied completed Employees Resources Table in the Appendix.</p> <p><u>Reviewer 1 Comments</u></p>

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					The response effectively covers this section. Reviewer 2 Comments [None]
9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources?					Senior Reviewer Comments Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section IX, Part B, sentence 2: “that” → “than” • Section IX, Part B, last sentence: singular “is” → plural “are” • Program Facilities Resources Table in Section IX of Appendix: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last row (relating to Red Room), column 2: End sentence with a period instead of a comma. • Last row (relating to Red Room), column 5, sentence 1: “Redroom” → “Red Room” • Last row (relating to Red Room), column 5, sentence 1: “at” → “a” Reviewer 1 Comments [None] Reviewer 2 Comments [None]
10. How have past CIPs contributed to success?	SR: R1: 2 R2:	SR: R1: 3 R2:	SR: R1: 2 R2:	SR: R1: 7 R2:	Senior Reviewer Comments Comments relating to <u>Section X, Part A</u> : Tables uploaded in Section X.A. of Appendix are the programs’ POCA documents instead of previous CIP

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhari

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
	<p>Narrative answer in Subpart B.2. should appear in Subpart B.1. In narrative, programs did not identify all improvements made as a result of the previous CIP process. Of the nine unique CIPs on the Culinary Arts and Pastry Arts CIP tables combined, programs' response to Subpart B contains discussions of only one (CIP #1, same for both Culinary and Pastry).</p>	<p>Specifically, Section XI of Appendix contains programs' completed previous CIP tables.</p>	<p>Specifically, In its narrative answer to Subpart B., programs addressed only one of the nine unique CIPs on the Culinary Arts and Pastry Arts CIP tables combined. Narrative does not include discussion of the improvements, supported with analysis of the specific before-after data and action plans.</p>		<p>tables. Program uploaded previous CIP tables in Section XI of Appendix instead. Two separate sets of CIP tables exist: one for Culinary Arts and one for Pastry Arts. CIP #1 is the same for both programs.</p> <p>Comments relating to <u>Section X, Part B</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The narrative provided in Subpart 2 should appear in this section since they relate to specific learning outcomes/program competencies. • Even though the completed previous CIP tables appear in Section XI of the Appendix, the narrative does not discuss the improvements, supported with analysis of specific before-after data and action plans, that resulted from the CIP process with respect to <u>all nine</u> unique CIPs. • Subpart 2: This section should be for any broader improvements to the programs outside the program learning outcomes/program competencies in Subpart 1. • Subpart 2: Typos or other non-substantive issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skip spaces between paragraphs. • ¶ 3, Insert comma after "CHEF1310." <p style="text-align: right;">Reviewer 1 Comments</p>

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
					<p>Only some CIPs are summarized. The report should cover all CIP data and analysis clearly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Reviewer 2 Comments</u></p> <p>X.B.1. Should be improvements to the program around PLOs/Program Competencies (which are currently in X.B.2.)</p> <p>X.B.2. Should be overall improvements to the program (e.g., course order, or lab support).</p> <p>Document summarizes only some of the CIPs. Report should summarize all the data and assessments from the CIP cycle (including analysis) without having to read the Appendices. (Appendices have the FULL story; report should give the “Cliff Notes”.)</p>
11. How will program evaluate its success?	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>Specifically, programs did not provide rationales for all expected outcomes in the</p>	<p>SR: 2 R1: 2 R2: 2</p> <p>Specifically, programs did not provide data supporting the rationales for all</p>	<p>SR: 1 R1: 1 R2: 1</p> <p>Specifically, programs did not analyze data relating to rationales for all</p>	<p>SR: 5 R1: 5 R2: 5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Senior Reviewer Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs did not address strengths and weaknesses in this section. • Instructions for Section XI ask programs to provide rationales for the expected outcomes chosen for the CIPs. In tables attached to Section XII of Appendix, programs describe the expected outcomes as PLOs, consisting of four PLOs for Culinary Arts and five PLOs for Pastry Arts.

WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
	programs' new CIP tables.	expected outcomes in the programs' new CIP tables.	expected outcomes in the programs' new CIP tables.		<p>Narrative response to Section XI identifies rationales only for Culinary PLOs #2 (relating to integral sauce-making) and #3 (relating to chicken fabrication).</p> <p>Reviewer 1 Comments More needs to be added here. There are no specific strengths or weaknesses highlighted, nor any explanation of how they're being addressed.</p> <p>Reviewer 1 Comments Really feel like there should me more here.</p> <p>No strengths or weaknesses are directly identified, nor how those strengths and weaknesses are being addressed (specifically for sections I-!X of the Program Review.)</p>
12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP)	<p>SR: 8 R1: 8 R2: 8</p> <p>Program attached new CIP Outcomes tables but left blank the box calling for</p>			<p>SR: 8 R1: 8 R2: 8</p>	<p>Senior Reviewer Comments Comments relating to <u>Section XII.A</u>: Programs attached their respective POCA documents in this section of the Appendix.</p> <p>Comments relating to <u>Section XII.B</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program attached new CIP Outcomes 1 and 2 tables attached to Section XII.B. of Appendix. Format of table template in Appendix differs from standalone CIP template posted in Program </p>



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

	Responsiveness to the Component	Evidence	Analysis: Explanation/Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence	Overall Judgment	Comments
	“Description of Action Plan to Improve Learning.”				<p>Review portal. In three tables, programs describe the expected outcomes as PLOs, consisting of four PLOs for Culinary Arts and five PLOs for Pastry Arts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs completed the boxes corresponding to boxes A, B, C, on the standalone CIP template posted in Program Review portal. However, programs left blank the box corresponding to box D (“Description of Action Plan to Improve Learning”). <p align="center"><u>Reviewer 1 Comments</u></p> <p>Action plan was left out.</p> <p align="center"><u>Reviewer 2 Comments</u></p> <p>Section D on tables needs to be completed.</p>
13. Program-Level Learning Objectives (PLOs)					<p align="center"><u>Senior Reviewer Comments</u></p> <p>Programs attached their completed Program Data Assessment Data Reports in the Appendix, which was the primary purpose of Section XIII.</p>



WORKFORCE PROGRAM REVIEW COMPOSITE CHECKLIST

Program: Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts

Senior Reviewer: Gage Waggoner

Reviewer 1: Ophela Eftekhar

Reviewer 2: Richard J. LeBlanc, Jr.

Overall Decision:

Accepted Without Recommendations

Accepted With Recommendations

X Accepted with Required Recommendations

Revisit and Revise

General comments about the submission or rationale for the conclusion:

Required Changes

Section III (Program Relationship to student Demand):

- Provide and analyze data reflecting level of student demand for the Level 1 and Level 3 certificates in Culinary Arts and Pastry Arts.
- Specifically identify, summarize, and analyze the key data from the Section III Appendix in the narrative analysis to support the assertions made.

Section X (Continuous Improvement Plan):

- In Subpart B.1, discuss the improvements, supported with analysis of specific before-after assessment data and action plans, that resulted from the CIP process regarding all nine unique program learning outcomes/program competencies on the CIP tables for Culinary Arts and Pasty Arts. The reader should be able to understand the analysis and its underlying data without having to read the Appendix.
- In Subpart B.2, address broader improvements to the programs outside the program learning outcomes/program competencies in Subpart B.1.

Section XI (Evaluation of CIP Success): Identify the strengths and weaknesses of Culinary Arts and Pastry Arts programs and discuss how the programs are addressing them.

Recommended Changes

- Correct the identified typographical, formatting, and other non-substantive issues identified.
- Consider incorporating the suggestions identified in the reviewers' other comments.