|  | **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 | Really great work. Each component addressed.The program purpose/mission thoroughly explained. Service industry, learning outcomes, marketable skills, career/degree paths, regulatory standards and accrediting body are clearly identified. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Nicely done. 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 w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Lots of data and each question was answered well. 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. A discussion on whether there appears to be any disproportionate enrollment by gender, race and ethnicity would have been helpful.Some examples of the student self-assessment and mid-year program evaluation would be good to add as well. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Good data, good analysis. 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. Were there any curriculum recommendations from the advisory committee specifically? |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Details regarding program feedback solicitation, marketing and outreach are explained with appropriate evidence. Good analysis as to how many people are reached and interact with the program. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Various efforts noted to build and maintain industry partnerships. Excellent listing of connections with organizations. More elaboration on the value of each organization to the program would have been beneficial (more than just a clinical site). What specifically do the students gain from their clinicals in this area? |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Accepted | Very thorough! 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. Be sure to attach for future reviews.Generalities were provided regarding program improvements; would have appreciated more specifics (added content, activities, etc.)Statements like, “based on the previous CIP this program added….to address an area of weakness and the result has been…”Or; “As per the prior CIP identifying a growth area in student credentialing exam section of\_\_\_\_\_ faculty adjusted the curriculum to include teaching and assignments in \_\_\_\_\_, and that has contributed to success by increased student scores in that section of the credentialing exam from 73% to 80%”What improvements have been made based on the CIP? |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | Accepted | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | Accepted w/Recs | General information is provided with regards to the weaknesses. More data regarding weaknesses and the analysis thereof would have been insightful. Add more details/evidence regarding the Student Surveys (the statement; “overwhelmingly positive” is hard to quantify). 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?What specific actions does the faculty intend to make to; capitalize on strengths, mitigate weaknesses, improve student success and learning outcomes?  |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | Accepted |  |  | Accepted | SMART goals! |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

The Surgical Technology did a great 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, leveraging partnerships (#7), and program evaluation efforts (#10 & 11). Overall, this was a well-constructed program review for which the reviewers believe should be accepted and recommendations noted for implementation on future reviews.