



PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARY

Program: **Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts**
J. LeBlanc, Jr.

Reviewers: **Gage Waggoner, Ophelia Eftekhari, Richard**

Contact Person for Program Authoring Team: **Ron Reczek**

The Program Review Steering Committee has completed its review of your submission. Attached you will find the full composite review for your program. After reading this document, if you would like to make any changes or updates to the program review document that you had originally submitted to the committee, please do so and forward the edited submission to effectiveness@collin.edu **by Friday, June 13, 2025**. Your program review submission will be published on the college website on August 2, 2025. For clarification of findings, please contact the senior reviewer, Gage Waggoner.

| |
|---|
| PROGRAM REVIEW STEERING COMMITTEE CONTACT INFORMATION <i>Name and email of the committee member you can contact</i> |
| Gage Waggoner, GWaggoner@collin.edu |
| STATUS OF REVIEW <i>Overall current status of your program review</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable without recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable with recommendations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable with required recommendations (changes) <input type="checkbox"/> Revisit and revise |
| SUMMARY <i>Description of findings from your program review</i> |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Required Changes</u></p> <p><u>Section III</u> (Program Relationship to student Demand):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. <p><u>Section X</u> (Continuous Improvement Plan):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. <p><u>Section XI</u> (Evaluation of CIP Success): Identify the strengths and weaknesses of Culinary Arts and Pastry Arts programs and discuss how the programs are addressing them.</p> |

PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARY

Program: **Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts**
J. LeBlanc, Jr.

Reviewers: **Gage Waggoner, Ophelia Eftekhari, Richard**

Contact Person for Program Authoring Team: **Ron Reczek**

Recommended Changes

Correct the identified typographical, formatting, and other non-substantive issues identified.

Consider incorporating the suggestions identified in the reviewers' other comments.

HIGHLIGHTS

Most important reviewer comments

"[Section I.] responds fully to the component, but additional clarity would be helpful regarding the distinctions between the AAS programs and the Certificate programs in terms of what they teach and the types of jobs they prepare students to enter."

"[Section I.] should set standard for consistency in naming of programs and their capitalization (e.g., 'Culinary and pastry' vs. 'Culinary & Pastry Arts')."

"[Section II.B.] asks how the programs are supporting Collin's 2020-2025 Strategic Plan. 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 Master Plan ('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."

"The evidence [in Section III.] 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. 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. Level 3 certificate demand not addressed."

"[Section IV.] only generally refers to Glass Door reporting number of jobs but provides no other details on types of jobs/positions within the industry, at what level, or specific geographic area (e.g., why Dallas rather than certain counties). . . . Is there program demand beyond the current facilities? (No evidence shown of that.)"

"[In Section V.,] [t]he 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.) Some of this section seems to defer readers to the appendices with very little reference to specific data, and relatively little analysis."



PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARY

Program: **Culinary Arts & Pastry Arts**
J. LeBlanc, Jr.

Reviewers: **Gage Waggoner, Ophelia Eftekhari, Richard**

Contact Person for Program Authoring Team: **Ron Reczek**

"[In Section VI.,] [w]hen 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)."

"[Regarding Section X.,] Subpart 1:

- The narrative[s] 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 all nine unique CIPs."

"[Section X., Subpart 2] should be for any broader improvements to the programs outside the program learning outcomes/program competencies in Subpart 1."

"[Section X] 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.')."

"[In Section XI,] [n]o strengths or weaknesses are directly identified, nor how those strengths and weaknesses are being addressed (specifically for sections I-IX of the Program Review.)"

"[In Section XII,] [p]rograms 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')."

As the senior reviewer in the review process, I acknowledge the notification of findings to the author and supervisor.

/s/ Gage Waggoner
Gage Waggoner, Senior Reviewer

May 15, 2025
Date