|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | Acceptable |  |  | Acceptable | The review clearly articulates the purpose of the unit, and the greater context. There are some occasional clarity issues in the writing, but the purpose is articulated in a sufficiently clear fashion. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Clear examples and evidence are given in a systematic fashion. The program links to the college mission and strategic plan are detailed carefully. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | While this is a new program and the long-term data is non-existent, there is clear evidence that the demand for the program is real. The program has a soft-start in Fall 2020. Enrollment rapidly grew. The program has added a weekend cohort to meet demand. The next program review will be more telling for this program, as sufficient data to analyze trends becomes available.  |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Being a recently added program, there is a lack of longitudinal data. However, the signs are that this program serves to meet a high demand area. Students are being hired before completing the program. The preliminary data support the assertion that the program is undersupplying market demand. They are working to expand to meet demand. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | No licensure exams are currently used for Welding Technology, so that data does not exist. The industry standard has prospective hires test in-house by the employer. Having faculty become Certified Welding Inspectors is a good step towards documenting the skills of students. The advisory committee makeup supports keeping the program current and insures it meets the needs of the employers. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable, with recommendations | Acceptable | The review says the main mechanism of communication is the program’s online catalog. Their survey data reports that 68% of students heard about the program through word of mouth. That suggests that more should be done to communicate with employers and potential students about the program. Relying on the catalog is a passive approach. They identify the need for improved website and brochure materials, and they are correct. Thought should be taken on how to best market the program going forward. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable, with recommendations | Acceptable | The list of partnerships is certainly adequate, but there is a lack of details on how those connections are being leveraged. They are serving in advisory roles. More thought should be given to this section in future reviews to identify how else these partners can help the program grow and succeed. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Ample evidence is supplied of professional development activities for both faculty and staff. There again are some formatting issues. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | While this section has been skipped, please make sure to delete the placeholder text. The Latin text has no place in this report. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | The review clearly articulates why this is not really possible. The first real viable year for CIP data will be 2023-2024, since in reality the project began operations in 2020. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable, with recommendations | Acceptable, with recommendations | More details would be appreciated in this section. As a new program, the point is well-taken that this is a work in progress. However, a more concrete plan to evaluate the success of the program moving forward is lacking. Some appropriate measures have already been discussed throughout the review – recent graduate job placement, enrollment, retention, successful completion of certificates and degrees, etc.  |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Acceptable |  |  | Acceptable | More details would be appreciated, but an adequate framework is presented. |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

Throughout the document, there are numerous typos, grammatical errors, and formatting issues. These should absolutely be addressed, and care should be taken to avoid these prior to submitting the next review document.

Overall, this young program is off to a great start. Clearly, enrollment is on the rise and they are taking steps to meet the demand including offering additional cohorts as needed. Job placement rates are high, and the demand and appreciation of the program should continue to rise. The only issues with the review come down to a lack of attention to details (grammar, formatting, etc.) and a lack of thorough analysis in some parts of the review. Overall, the review is acceptable but there are definitely issues that need to be addressed in future reviews.