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 **July 31, 2023**. Your program review submission will be published on the college website on August 2, 2022. For clarification of findings, please contact the senior reviewer [ Alaya Swann ].

|  |
| --- |
| Program Review Steering Committee Contact Information  Name and email of the committee member you can contact |
| Alaya Swann, aswann@collin.edu |
| Status of Review  Overall current status of your program review |
| Acceptable without recommendations  Acceptable with recommendations  Revisit and revise |
| Summary  Description of findings from your program review |
| The submission is generally clear and contains a lot of helpful data and information. The biggest areas of revision are to be more consistent and detailed in discussing the university articulation agreements (in some places the review lists they are starting or considering conversations and in some places it says these are complete) and to add quantifiable evidence in a few areas, such as questions 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7. |
| Highlights  Most important reviewer comments |
| Question 2: Although major questions are answered, this section does not contain any specific evidence or data about how the program relates to the mission and strategic plan. Discussion of program completion rates would have strengthened the section, as would discussion of any existing industry contacts and agreements with universities (such as the ones mentioned on pp. 18-19). Additionally, we’d like to see data/numbers added showing evidence of personal characteristics included in courses.  Question 3: The response does a good job of addressing the relationship between the program and student demand overall. A few areas needed additional explanation: Why did the program switch from multiple campuses to only Plano in 2022 (p. 17)? What exactly does the program coach do and how students access him (p. 18)? If there are some classes that are considered “advanced” and require prior knowledge, why are there no prerequisites for any of the courses (p. 18)?  Question 4: This has good information on DFW area jobs, growth, and the relationship of the program to the market. More information on the transfer agreements would be helpful to strengthen this section, considering most jobs in the field do require a bachelor’s degree. The review accurately lists the inability to collect data on recent graduate employment rates as a weakness. However, they did not indicate a feasible plan to collect this data – they just said faculty can informally keep in touch with students (p. 22). A specific plan for something like a post-graduation survey would be beneficial.  Question 5: This section is clear and provides a wide variety of data throughout. However, post-graduation surveys of alumni conducted a specific amount of time following the completion of the program might assess how effective the curriculum is.  Question 6: This section does a sufficient job of explaining the main methods of communication, but lacks evidence to show whether or not these methods are effective. There is no data on the virtual fair attendance numbers, clicks on website, etc. Statistics on inquiries resulting from the website or flyers may be one way to provide evidence on effectiveness.  Question 7: This table includes the two universities that the program has articulation agreements with, but provides no other detail such as how long the articulation agreements are in place for, which the chart requires. The chart also does not include any industry or other relationships. The analysis section does present this as a weakness and says a protocol has been created to find industry partners but no more detail is provided about what the protocol is.  Question 11: This section does a sufficient job of proposing program-associated metrics that may be used to evaluate its success. It nicely summarizes the strengths and most weaknesses. Some weaknesses mentioned earlier in the review needed to be indicated in more detail here again though, such as lack of data on graduate employment rates, lack of relationships with local industry partners for co-ops, and the lack of pre-requisites causing students to sometimes enter more challenging classes unprepared. |

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