|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | 4 |  |  | 3 | AAS and BAT in cybersecurity; provide affordable industry relevant education in this program |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | The program has pathways w/ stackable credentials, students can obtain certifications, program is nationally recognized (this section was a bit hard to follow: probably where there’s a page break, pasting and use of too many acronyms—but evidence is thereNeed marketable skills included; not just program learning outcomes |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | They have 10 charts and/graphs, plus what is in the appendix but address all of it with a couple of sentences. They need to either use 1 chart that shows the great enrollment numbers and discuss with a few sentences and N/A the rest of the prompts. If they show so many graphs, they need to address why they showed them and give some analysis to each. There is no discussion of program demographics. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | A component of the question refers to the need for Bachelor’s degree for students to be employed; they offer one, but don’t explain if we have an articulation with other CCs in cybersecurity for their students to transfer in (mention working with TCC). The job numbers and prospects are fine. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | They have addressed most queries but have not made comparisons of bachelor’s to other programs in the area, UTD, UNT and SMU are on the map they provided for other cyber training institutions. They only make comparisons to Dallas and Tarrant CCs for the AASThey provide evidence of incorporating information from advisory committee in programs and what they do |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | Overall, they answer the prompt and provide a list of items on how well they communicate, but broken links and inaccessible information provided do not bode well in convincing me that everything is working as it should on their actual website that students might see. They do not share any advertisements or program sheets in the appendix. Appendix N contains information pasted from the Collin website about tuition and program requirements.[**https://collin.campusconcourse.com/search?timeframe=current\_future**](https://collin.campusconcourse.com/search?timeframe=current_future)It takes me nowhere that is useful and the next is brokenThese issues were addressed with authors. Have not heard back as of my review. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No information given |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No information given |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | Revise and revisit—there isn’t enough information provided in the response, no tables that are requested, etc |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | They don’t seem to even address the CIP in the prompt. All PLOs are assessed in the end of program courses (capstone) in either the AAS and/or BAT.The CIPs that they include have great numbers that don’t seem to need improving. It does not strike me as a true continuous improvement plan if assessments don’t have results that tease out program deficiencies that need can be addressed and be reviewed for efficacy.  |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | They have evidence of improvement and of ways in which to improve further. However, the evidence and items don’t seem to be related to the actual CIP (at least I don’t see how they are related). They give good ideas and justifications—they need to add these to the Future CIP and determine how to measure them for the next review period.  |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | 0 |  |  | 0 | I don’t see a new CIP—items under number 11 should be placed into CIP form and addressed there |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

Appendices are frustrating: A and Q and O and L contain same information; D, E, J, K, P are all empty as is sub folder of B for BAT syllabi. I’m not sure AAS subfolder B contains all syllabi for all classes as they seem to have a lot of classes and it only has 8 syllabi

Section III.1. Student demand there are 11 charts, some of which are duplicated, most of which are not discussed. There doesn’t seem to be an issue with student demand for the program as it has grown substantially over the past few years. Most prompts could just be N/A.

CIP data is confusing to me unless I’ve substantially missed a point or 2. I don’t see future CIPs and I don’t understand how proposed improvements relate to past CIP results.

I understand that this review includes 2 programs, the AAS and the BAT, however, there seem to be some large gaps in the review as though the authors didn’t communicate about who was addressing which prompts and adding appropriate materials to the appendix.