The Program Review Steering Committee has completed its review of your submission. Attached you will find the full composite review for your program. After reading this document, if you would like to make any changes or updates to the program review document that you had originally submitted to the committee, please do so and forward the edited submission to effectiveness@collin.edu by **July 31, 2023**. Your program review submission will be published on the college website on August 2, 2023. For clarification of findings, please contact the senior reviewer, Alexis Bohanna (abohanna@collin.edu).

|  |
| --- |
| Program Review Steering Committee Contact InformationName and email of the committee member you can contact |
| Alexis Bohanna – abohanna@collin.edu |
| Status of ReviewOverall current status of your program review |
| [x]  Acceptable without recommendations [ ]  Acceptable with recommendations[ ]  Revisit and revise |
| SummaryDescription of findings from your program review |
| The Surgical Technology authoring team did an excellent job communicating its program’s purpose, value, and effectiveness. The authors provided a plethora of data with a thorough analysis of much of the data provided. The following sections were the document’s strengths: #1 (purpose), #2 (mission/strategic plan), #5 (curriculum), #6 (communication), #8 (professional development, and #12 (future CIPS). Overall, as reviewers unfamiliar with the overall scope of this program, the authors provided a wonderful illustration.Additional data and further explanation would be beneficial to better address the following sections for future reviews: #3 (student demand), #4 (market demand), #7 (leveraging partnerships), #10 (past CIPS), and #11 (program evaluation). More insight is provided below. |
| HighlightsMost important reviewer comments |
| Please reference the attached Composite Checklist for additional comments.* Student Demand (3) - The program did not address student enrollment demographics or provide a plan to attract a diverse student population. Discussing whether there appears to be any disproportionate enrollment by gender, race, and ethnicity would have been helpful.
* Market Demand (4) - With program seats at/near capacity, current market demand, and favorable placement rates, does the program plan to apply for an increase in seats? If not, what’s the rationale behind that decision?
* Partnerships (7) - More elaboration on the value of each organization to the program would have been beneficial (more than just clinical sites). Do these partners serve as advisory board members? In what other ways are partnerships leveraged?
* Facilities, Equipment, Financial (9) – Are these factors limitations to increasing seats or program expansion? If so, the authoring team may want to complete this section for future reviews.
* Past CIPS (10) - Previous CIP (2019-2020) was not included in the appendices but was accessed via the IE site. **Be sure to include it in the appendix for future reviews**. Additionally, generalities were provided regarding program improvements (i.e., “..the program adds content, competencies…”; What specific improvements have been made (content, activities, etc.)? Statements like the following would demonstrate a more thorough analysis supported by facts/documentation -- “Based on the previous CIP, this program added [specific content or activity] to address [an area of weakness], and the result has been [outcome].”
* Program Evaluation - More data regarding weaknesses and the analysis thereof would have been insightful. What are some of the shortcomings noted in surveys? What specific actions does the faculty intend to take to capitalize on strengths, mitigate weaknesses, and improve student success and learning outcomes?
 |
|  |

As the senior reviewer in the review process, I acknowledge the notification of findings to the author and supervisor.

\_\_\_\_\_\_Alexis Bohanna\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_4/17/2023\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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