|  | **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 | It would be helpful to define some of the more technical terms (for example: homeostasis). Noted that the marketable skills listed in the review differed a bit from the ones listed online. Suggest make the review listed ones identical to the online ones for consistency.  Does an excellent job of describing the program from its inception in 2018, speaking to stringent program admission requirements, and attesting to the need of the program in the community, as well as employment opportunities for students after graduation. Includes degree pathways and regulatory standards for the program.  It would have been helpful to have the :”Brief explanation of the industry/industries the program servers” section highlighted in a specific section. I was able to glean it form the areas addressed. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | AWOR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Recommend more explanation behind the table on page 9: a more explicit explanation of what the table is trying to show, specifically. At the end of this section a specific prediction (“enrollment is expected to double”) but no explanation or evidence of what that prediction is based on.  Director and teaching faculty credentialed in CSFA/CSA. Student graduation rates and CSFA pass rate percentages included from 2019-2022**. Include credentials for Director and Faculty** |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Enrollment information is mostly ignored here (perhaps import some of the information from  the previous section). The first two prompts appear to be ignored completely with the fourth prompt only “sort of” addressed, but if that information isn’t available, there is no statement to that effect in the review, so the reason why this information is missing simply isn’t evident.  Creation of a bridge opportunity for students who don’t possess an associate degree. Partnership with hospitals and surgical facilities to recruit prospective students.  A graphic statistical presentation would be helpful to show progress and projected progress. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | The main problem here is that two of the prompt points are simply not addressed, or only partially addressed. Similar to previous section, if the problem is simply that the data are not available (or haven’t been collected) then it would be better to explicitly state that so anyone reading the review knows why the information is missing. It isn’t completely clear why the salary information is provided: it is implied the “high” salaries (most likely) indicates there is high demand, but it would be  better to explicitly state that is the assumption being made.  Demonstrated a need for program in the community with job requests and expected market salaries. **Include the Joint Commission’s statement and Medicare’s**  **statement of requirements for the licensing of surgical assistants**.  A graphic presentation could be helpful to emphasize points. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | Claims a retention rate of 100%, but doesn’t track with the earlier statement that 3 students dropped or withdrew – would that be a 90%-93% retention rate (27-28/30 depending on if you count the “re-enrolled” student who later completed the program).  If the curriculum is subject to external accreditation this topic is simply not addressed at all: if there is none, then might be better to explicitly state that (which would make the presentation more consistent with similar statements made earlier in the document … for example, the statement made as #2 at the top of page 20).  Although \*not\* a problem with the review, the fact that there are only 13 similar programs in the whole country is a pretty neat thing to be able to brag about!  No curriculum barriers are highlighted, and reasons for student withdrawal are included and were listed as personal in nature. Program comparisons to other states included.  Could use some graphics to present data. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | The authors point out that “potential applicants are not Collin Students” … is it implied because they have to have associates degrees to apply so they’re “beyond” community college, or is it simply that most new applicants are just not currently Collin Students?  How do you \*know\* the mentioned methods of getting the word out are actually working (for example: students specifically pointing out in an exit survey they got recruited into the program through the hospital they are working at).  Specify how effectiveness is addressed  BUT overall:  Program is summarized and links to information about the program is included. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | …this section really looks like it needs a serious editing pass: like a first draft that needs to be looked at again, but again, overall  Provided list of industry partners with formal agreements to arrange OJT for students. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | No issues. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  | RR? | Included, but not entirely sure it needs to be – and what is included doesn’t seem to match what this prompt is asking for. I didn’t get the impression they were indicating inadequate facilities or asking for more money added to their budget, so I don’t think this part needed to be present. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | AWOR | AWR | AWR | AWR | First paragraph: One thing that isn’t stated is how did the past CIP actually contribute to the truth of the statement in the paragraph?  \*Which class were the listed assessments actually in (this comment may not be important: I’m not actually clear if the class an assessment is in \*should\* be included in the CIP).  One reviewer also noted this as “Not addressed” indicating that there is some confusion on what part of the CIP is present and what isn’t. (More specifically, if what is provided is intended as “current” or “future.”) |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | RR | RR | RR | RR | Appears to just be absent. This section does not appear to be one where you just “attach the table and be done it with” – there’s an actual prompt where a discussion should take place, and it appears to have been left completely blank in the review. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | RR |  |  | RR | There is a reference to “see below” – but there’s nothing there and the “see below” doesn’t appear to refer to.  What Happens Next section is not completed. |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

Comments regarding corrects to individual typos and other minutiae are retained in the individual reviews, but omitted from the composite.

Overall, the reviewers want to stress that this program review certainly put forth excellent effort toward providing the required prose and evidence at all of the prompts in the template with only some things missing (or where information provided would strengthen the case provided in the review) – and in general where things are missing this is noted in both the composite review above and the individual reviews, but up to the point of the CIP the program review is largely complete and generally “accepted with some recommendations” by the review comittee.

What nudged the overall review into the “Revisit and Revise” category was the seeming lack (or confusion about) the CIP. While a CIP was provided, because the noted tables and other prompts were not completely addressed it wasn’t clear if the CIP provided was intended as the current CIP used to evaluate past and current progress, or the future CIP and the plan going forward. In either case after discussion with the larger Steering Committee it was deemed that the CIP missing in part or completely was too important an exclusion for a review to advance forward, hence the overall rating.