|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | AWOR |  |  | AWOR | Addresses all aspects of the prompt with good details about the program's purpose, learning outcomes, target industry, career paths, and relevant regulations. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | AWOR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Clearly outlines efforts to develop student skills, strengthen character, and challenge the intellect, connecting these elements to the mission statement.  Provides detailed information on strategies to improve student outcomes, become national exemplar, and support student transitions, demonstrating alignment with the strategic plan.  Documentation of supporting evidence should be provided. Analysis is clear and concise, but should be connected to documentation of evidence to make sure specific aspects of the mission and strategic plan are addressed. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | AWOR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Effectively addresses all aspects of the prompt, including enrollment patterns, student support initiatives, and diversity considerations. Clearly explains challenges and proposes solutions to improve enrollment and student success.  Evidence is strong, including enrollment data for both tracks, details about student support services, and information on program demographics, but documentation of evidence should be provided.  Offers a clear and well-supported analysis of the evidence, but should be connected to documentation. They connect data on enrollment to plans for improvement and explain rationale behind student support initiatives. This effectively demonstrates how these aspects contribute to student success in the program. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | AWRR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Mostly addresses key points. Discusses job availability, employer interest, and graduate placement (with limitations acknowledged) but information on future demand projections and articulation agreements is missing.  Evidence includes postings from Indeed.com and ZipRecruiter along with salary data from Salary.com and employer feedback about the program's curriculum, but documentation should be provided.  Analysis connects job postings to local market demand but doesn't elaborate on projected growth. They mention employer requests and lack of competition, but should include data on future job trends and how program prepares graduates for those demands (e.g., mention of RPSGT credential). They acknowledge limitations of graduate placement data, but don't offer solutions to improve data collection. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | AWOR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Directly addresses all aspects of prompt and analyzes data on program completions, course success and completion rates, and identify potential barriers to completion.  Discusses completion rates, enrollment flow data, course success rates, and success rates on the RPSGT exam but documentation should be provided. Evidence provided in Appendix A for meeting minutes and Appendix B for grades.  Good analysis of data related to program, connecting high drop-out rate in first year to overnight clinical schedule and implemented solutions. Analysis could be stronger by acknowledging impact of prerequisite course success rates on program enrollment based on data included and exploring reasons and solutions for lower success rates in Biology 2404 and proposing solutions. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | AWRR | AWR | AWRR | AWRR | Addresses most key aspects of prompt including methods for soliciting student feedback, website maintenance procedures, but no discussion of efforts to ensure accessible materials.  Discusses soliciting feedback through information sessions and advisory committee review but should provide documentation. Program Lit Review seems complete and provides link for evidence. They mention website updates but don't specify the frequency.  Analysis explains how they gather feedback but doesn't elaborate on how incorporated into improvements. While they mention director updates, a formal process for ensuring accuracy and accessibility would strengthen the analysis. No mention of accessibility considerations for program materials. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | AWOR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Addresses all key aspects of the prompt regarding partnership resources.  Partnership Resources Table provides evidence, but documentation should also be provided.  Analysis is clear and comprehensive, but should be linked to documented evidence. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | Addresses basics of professional development, but more analysis needed.  Analysis does not directly discuss the evidence provided. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | N/A |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | AWOR | AWOR | AWR | AWOR | Addresses both aspects of the prompt, describing CIP-driven improvements in program outcomes (enrollment, retention) and student performance (RPSGT exam pass rates, clinical evaluation).  Evidence provided in Appendix D. They mention data sources like RPSGT pass rates, employer feedback, and graduate surveys used to inform improvements.  Explains how CIP influenced enrollment and retention through recruitment strategies and interview process. Describes refining student performance evaluation in critical areas but don't directly connect it to specific PLO improvements. While they mention considering employer and graduate feedback, could use specific examples of how this feedback led to curricular or service changes. Connection between CIP and its impact on program outcomes is clear for enrollment and retention but link between CIP and improvements in student performance related to PLOs could use more details or specific examples. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | AWR | AWRR | AWRR | AWRR | Addresses all aspects of the prompt, but could be significantly more thorough. Identifies some strengths but focuses primarily on one area for improvement (RPSGT exam pass rate). Doesn't fully address weaknesses identified previously or provide comprehensive plan to capitalize on strengths.  Mentions positive feedback and exceptional lab resources but doesn’t elaborate on specifics of the feedback or quantify the quality of lab resources. Documentation would be helpful.  Analysis is limited. They acknowledge need to improve RPSGT pass rates, but lack details on how to capitalize on program strengths or address weaknesses identified previously. Planned curriculum modifications based on exam data are not explained. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | AWR |  |  | AWR | Completed tables as required, but based on the above, should be more thorough. |

**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:**