|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | Accepted |  |  | Accepted | The program purpose/mission thoroughly explained. Service industry, learning outcomes, marketable skills, career/degree paths, and accrediting body are clearly identified. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Each aspect of the college mission and strategic plan is addressed and supported with evidence in the appendices (pathways, articulations, industry partners, success rates (graduation, certification & job placement), and satisfaction surveys. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted | Accepted w/Recs | Details regarding enrollment patterns (cap 24) and student support efforts are discussed (advising, touchpoints, reentry, etc.). However, the program does not address student enrollment demographics or provide a plan to attract a diverse student population. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Data regarding market data and required qualifications is evident (# of available positions; AA/certification); With program seats at/near capacity, current market demand, and promising placement rates, does the program plan to apply for an increase in seats or outreach efforts to address the undersupply? If not, what’s the rationale behind that decision? |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | All questions were thoroughly addressed and supported with sufficient documentation. Graduation rates, retention, course/licensure success rates adequately analyzed. Program meets/exceeds institutional and national standards. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Details regarding program feedback solicitation, marketing and outreach are explained with appropriate evidence. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Various efforts noted to build and maintain industry partnerships. Partnership table complete. |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Evidence of consistent professional development involvement amongst faculty/staff is provided. |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Previous CIP (2019-2020) was not attached but accessed via IE site. Generalities were provided regarding program improvements; would have appreciated more specifics (added content, activities, etc.) |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted | General information is provided with regards to the weaknesses. What are some of the weaknesses noted in student surveys? What are the select areas of the credentialing exam that students need to improve upon? |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Accepted |  |  | Accepted |  |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

The Surgical Technology did an exceptional job illustrating its program’s purpose, value, and effectiveness. The program has experienced great success as evidenced by its retention, graduation, certification, and job placement rates. Regarding improvements for future reviews, additional data and further explanation would be beneficial to better address student (#3) and market (#4) demand and program evaluation efforts (#10 - as it pertains to any weaknesses). Overall, this was a well-written program review for which I believe edits aren’t necessary but the recommendations should be noted for future reviews.