|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | Accepted without Recommendations  10 |  |  | Accepted Without Recommendations | The authors gave a good explanation of what CADD is, main areas of specialization, degree and certificate programs, 5 marketable skills, and how the program interacts and utilizes resources with Collin College and the community. They also point the reader to other questions in the review for more elaboration. [pp.4-6] |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Accepted without Recommendations  4 | Accepted without recommendations  3 | Accepted with required changes  1 | Accepted with Required Changes | Collin College mission statement: Addresses and presents evidence on all 3 parts of Collin College’s mission. The authors do a great job describing how they meet the College’s mission statement. However, there is little to no analysis of the 3 parts. For instance, for “Challenging Intellect,” the review states that a real world project was assigned to students in a course and the students took on the project. One will assume it was successful, but no measurable outcome was mentioned. The reader does not know whether the project was successful or in what way the project may have satisfied “Challenging Intellect.” [pp.7-8]  College’s strategic plan: The authors address and provide ample evidence to support all 7 parts of the College’s strategic goals. However, there is little to no analysis of the evidence presented. I suspect that the outcomes of the program’s initiatives are likely positive, but the authors will need to clarify to the reader how the things they are achieving the strategic goals. [pp.8-10] |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Accepted with Required Changes  2 | Accepted with Required Changes  1 | Accepted with Required Changes  1 | Accepted with Required Changes | The authors make a great case that students want the certificate. Enrollment is steadily increasing. Their data analysis shows 10% enrollment increase per year. The review goes further to expect that growth may be even higher than projected more with dual credit offerings for Allen High School. The review addresses the discrepancy of less AAS completers to higher certificate due to early employment opportunities. Great job with this question!  Unfortunately, the review does not address the questions, “Discuss whether or not there appears to be any disproportionate enrollment by gender, race, and ethnicity & If any differences exist discuss possible reasons why the gap exists, and plans to address these issues to close gaps in enrollment rates between groups of students.” The review mentions that there is active marketing towards diverse student populations through many initiatives, but there is no evidence presented or analysis of these initiatives. The reader doesn’t know whether there is any disproportionate enrollment or the initiatives stated are successful. [p.12] |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Accepted without recommendations  4 | Accepted with recommendations  2 | Accepted with required changes  1 | Accepted with recommendations | The authors explain well that Texas has a higher demand than the national average and that salary does not increase with higher degrees. Collin College’s low price and quality education is very advantageous to students. So, the authors presented evidence and analysis of market demand for CADD certificate earners and graduates. They also show clear evidence that while DFW has less projected demand than Texas’s overall demand, it’s still above the national.  What was not so clear is whether employers need and hire specifically Collin College graduates and certificate completers. The evidence and analysis presented was the general job market demand and hiring, but not much was presented for the hiring of Collin College graduates. The authors do point out this weakness and will be trying to address tracking Collin College graduates. The authors acknowledge that it’s unclear whether a certificate or degree would be better for a student.  The authors did try to address the question with the limited data at their disposal. It seems the authors were unable to answer the second part of the question of “do employers hire the program’s graduates.” This is likely due to lack of data of graduate tracking which is typical in workforce programs with both certificates and degrees. [pp.13-15]  The authors may want to consider this as part of their CIP since it could significantly improve their program. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Accepted without recommendations  4 | Accepted without recommendations  3 | Accepted with required changes  1 | Accepted with required changes | The authors addressed and provided evidence for all questions. It’s obvious by the review that the program takes its curriculum seriously, has a close relationship with its advisory board, and considers local demand. In particular, question C was well done. A strong case was made by the authors that Collin College’s curriculum is current and relevant compared to competitor community colleges. [pp.16-22]  Where the authors could make improvements is question E, “Make a case with evidence that the program is well managed.” Throughout this question, the authors reference appendix data for average class size, grade distributions, and contacts hours taught. The data referenced in the appendix is not summarized or discussed, so unfortunately, there is no “case” or analysis made by the authors for the program being well managed. For question E, the authors did well for the question, “How well are general educational requirements integrated with technical coursework.” For this question, evidence and analysis were present. The authors gave a good breakdown of how general education coursework increased student success in the program. If the authors could do the same analysis for the other points, summarize, and make a case that the program is well managed, it would fully answer this question. The authors already make great cases in questions 5A and 5C. It only needs to be extended to question 5E. [pp.23-24]  Additionally, some PDFs used in the appendix could be edited. For instance, student satisfaction surveys include every program. The PDFs could be edited such that only CADD information is present instead of every discipline. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Accepted with required changes  2 | Accepted with recommendations  2 | Accepted with required changes  1 | Accepted with required changes | I think because Collin College experienced a website redesign, the first link is outdated. It is perhaps this one now:  <https://www.collin.edu/department/constructionmanagement/computeraideddrafting.html>  The above link has the mission statement, program degree plans, and student learning outcomes the authors explain. However, I could not find the “Job opportunities/Career Events” link mentioned in the third paragraph. From the author’s description of what is in this link, it must be updated. Further, it is stated in the description that students have voiced that this link is the more useful resource on the website. Fortunately, the flyer link mentioned later works and a PDF can be download.  Overall, the authors make a case with evidence that the program literature and electronic sites are up-to-date and accurate if the links are properly updated.  Improvements:  The second part 6A question is not addressed: “… support the program’s recruitment plan, retention plan and completion plan.” The authors have provided evidence of a website and program flyer, but does not describe the program’s recruitment plan, retention plan, or completion plan and how these resources support those plans.   In question 6B, the link for the CADD Program website is broken. It may have to be updated to the link mentioned previously. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Accepted without recommendations  4 | Accepted with recommendations  2 | Accepted with recommendations  2 | Accepted with recommendations | A list of partners and organizations primarily from the CADD Advisory Committee is provided.  Questions/Possible improvements: The description ‘Ask the Experts’ is unclear. What does this mean? For Beck, co-op opportunities for description could be added. For the column, formal agreement/duration – I would add something like “n/a” for presentation purposes. ‘Click or tap here to enter text’ for the entire column could be cleaned up.  In question 7, it says internal Collin departments could be added if they help to advance program outcomes. Since Collin College has many departments working together, are there any that can be listed?  Does Collin College have any university articulation agreements?  Maybe add the contact information for partner/organization |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Accepted without recommendations  4 | Accepted with recommendations  2 | Accepted with recommendations  2 | Accepted with recommendations | 5 faculty with professional development and value are provided to the reader. Great job!  Possible Improvements: For Zhiqiang Wang, 4 professional development are listed, but under the value column, it says 1-11. Are there 11 professional development that are supposed to be listed?  For Shela Crisler, the numbering for professional development starts with #5. Should it start with #1 like all the others? Also, this faculty is the only one without any professional development’s value. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | The authors completed this section. The summary is that they have adequate facility, equipment and funding currently and for the next 5 years. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Accepted without recommendations  4 | Accepted with recommendations  2 | Accepted with recommendations  2 | Accepted with required changes | The authors explained their reasoning for their CIP assessing the same PLOs as before and targeting overall student success to be greater.  Possible improvements: CIP tables are included in the appendix but I think a brief explanation of previous CIP could be inserted at the end of the first paragraph to help the reader understand the rationale of the PLOs targeted and why they are increasing the threshold for success for their next CIP. The question asks to describe how the previous CIP to make improvements to the program over the past 4 years, but it was not fully explained. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Accepted without recommendations  4 | Accepted without recommendations  3 | Accepted without recommendations  3 | Accepted without recommendations | The authors did an excellent job summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of their program. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Accepted with recommendations  8 |  |  | Accepted with recommendations | Future CIP focus on the same PLOs from before focusing on competency and success rate. The difference now is that the bar is set higher. Previously, the percentage of students achieving the success rate to be met is much higher than before. Before the CIP aimed for 80% of students scoring at 70% or higher on all PLOs. The future CIP aims for 90% of students scoring between 90-95% on all PLOs. Based on the CIP data in the appendix, this seems possible. Also, it's clear from the data that class sizes are getting larger compared to before. Working with a larger data set in the future will help them achieve their CIP.   What is unclear is how this CIP will improve their program. It’s measuring the same criteria as last CIP.  The authors state that they will be looking into tracking student employment after graduation. This could be consider into their CIP, as it is a stated weakness in the review. |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Accepted Without Recommendations | Accepted With Recommendations | Accepted with Required Recommendations | Revisit and Revise |

Accepted with required changes

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

Overall, the review was well done. The authors addressed all questions, and generally provided evidence, aside for the second part of question 3. The program clearly has a lot of positives going for them. Enrollment is increasing and looking at their previous CIP data, scores are increasing as well. There were some instances, where evidence was provided, but not enough analysis was provided. For instance, in question 2, the authors did a great job providing evidence, but did not state the outcomes of their initiatives which would have contributed to analysis. Moreover, in question 10, the authors provide evidence of achieving their CIP, but did not state how their previous CIP helped improve their program in the past 4 years.   
  
The authors did an excellent job in question 5 about the program’s curriculum. They compared Collin College’s program against a 2 and 4 year program. It’s clear that the program takes what it adds and incorporates into its curriculum seriously. They also have a close relationship with their advisory board. The authors were also very good at clearly stating their strengths and weaknesses, and more importantly, have future plans to address their weaknesses. Great job!