|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | 10 |  |  | 10 | Focusing just on responsiveness to this particular question, the review follows the “Suggested points to consider” point-by-point. Since we’re explicitly excluding evidence and analysis here, 10/10. Accepted Without Recommendations |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Again, followed the mission statement and strategic goals point-by-point, with detailed evidence. Accept Without Recommendations |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | Although this section attempts to address the instructions by saying “There is a large disparity when comparing gender distributions between the Interior Design Program and the Collin College population”, this comparison is never actually presented or analyzed – only comparison with the *national* Interior Design student population is made. Accepted With Recommendations |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | No DFW-specific employment data is given or compared. Accepted With Recommendations. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | The claim about media-driven misperceptions (HGTV) driving student dropout is anecdotal and speculative at best. Discussion of student evaluation *comments* (not just averages) would be helpful as well. The explanations for the reasons for the low success rates for courses below 75% are interesting, but not well-supported or analyzed. Accepted With Recommendations. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | It’s not clear whether current tools *are being used effectively* by students -- just that they exist. There is little discussion of how current communication tools are evaluated or improved beyond informal observation. Accepted With Recommendations |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | The list of partnerships is good, but there’s little to no discussion of how the program is *leveraging* those partnerships, or how the program knows about the impact of those partnerships one way or the other. Accepted With Recommendations. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | No issues. Accepted Without Recommendations |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | No issues. Accepted Without Recommendations. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | There’s a detailed list of PLOs and how they’re assessed, but no discussion of how past CIPs have led to any improvement with respect to the PLOs. Accepted With Required Recommendations |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | Typo (“Scoence”) at bottom of p.69. All the specific faculty action list items focus on what faculty have done or are currently doing rather than what they intend to do going forward on the basis of the most recent CIP. The same arises when discussing the rationale for the expected outcomes chose for the CIP. Accepted with Recommendations. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | 10 |  |  | 10 | No issues. Accepted Without Recommendations. |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Accepted Without Recommendations | [x]  Accepted With Recommendations | [ ]  Accepted with Required Recommendations | [ ]  Revisit and Revise |

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

Overall, the Interior Design program submitted a well-organized and thoughtful review. However, some areas did not fully meet all of the prompt’s requirements, especially when it came to using past CIPs to inform future action. That being said, these issues are neither pervasive nor serious enough to warrant mandatory changes.

Accepted With Recommendations