|  | **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 | 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. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWOR | I believe “point 3” of the template is made through the implication that the program has had heavy success since its inception, although actual numerical evidence would be better.  Most of the objection in the previous review was not so much the table’s presence, but the lack of surrounding exposition. Frankly, removing the table entirely does solve the problem, even if it leaves a similar issue with “not supported by numerical data.”  Director and teaching faculty credentialed in CSFA/CSA. Student graduation rates and CSFA pass rate percentages included from 2019-2022**.** Credentials for Program Director, Full-time Faculty, and Adjunct Faculty have been included along with professional development. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | AWOR | AWR | AWOR | AWOR | The movement of the table and the paragraph below causes this section to now meet the template criteria, and the “exponential increase in applications” satisfies the need to provide evidence of the statement that the enrollment is expected to double. Explanation of generally “flat” past enrollment aligns with the inclusion of the table here rather than in the previous section.  Creation of a bridge opportunity for students who don’t possess an associate degree. Partnership with hospitals and surgical facilities to recruit prospective students. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Prompts 2 and 3 are still not addressed.  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. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | 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. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | Program is summarized and links to information about the program is included. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | 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 |  |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | The added paragraph better aligns the original second paragraph to the overall prompt, and the deletion of the first paragraph makes the statement more concise and a clearer match to what the prompt is asking for. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | Perfect! There is now a paragraph to address the actual prompt! And it does so quite well in context with the attached CIP.  Missing a summary in this section.  The didactic and clinical curriculum prepares students for success on the Certified Surgical First Assist (CSFA) credentialing exam through the National Board of Surgical Technology & Surgical Assisting (NBSTSA).  This seems to address the issue. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | AWOR |  |  | AWOR | Outcomes are now filled out, and CIP appears complete!  The CIP is well-documented.  The issue seemed to be addressed. |

**Overall Decision:**

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

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

Checklist votes are average or median consensus among the three reviewers. Comments are “most critical” comments for each section; simple typos and minor editing suggestions are in the individual reviews. Overall rating of “Accepted with Recommendations” consistent with PRSC guidelines: the primary previous concerns that resulted in a Revisit and Revise rating have been addressed in a satisfactory manner.