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. Your program review submission will be published on the college website. For clarification of findings, please contact the senior reviewer.

|  |
| --- |
| Program Review Steering Committee Contact Information  Name and email of the committee member you can contact |
| Jeffery Johnson, Senior Reviewer, JWJohnson@collin.edu |
| Status of Review  Overall current status of your program review |
| Accepted without recommendations  Accepted with recommendations  Accepted with required changes  Revisit and revise |
| Summary  Description of findings from your program review |
| Jeffery Johnson – Accepted With Required Changes The program made significant improvement from the Revise & Revisit version. They supplied more evidence and provided more analysis; however, there are still quite a few impact queries that were not sufficiently addresses and evidence missing. The program provided items in the appendices but several items were listed but never referenced in the body of the review.  Cathleen Akers – Accepted With Recommendations - Overall, this is a well-considered resubmission that addresses almost every concern raised by the review team. This program is admirable in its commitment to student support and success, as well as community engagement and service.  Nevertheless, there are two subsections of the program review that I regard as requiring changes (i.e., Approve with Required Changes (AWRC)) due to the current program review prompts/questions and my understanding of the expectations of program responsiveness to, evidence for, and analysis of them.  Andrea Martinez – Accepted With Recommendations - The revised review clearly demonstrates the Dental Hygiene program’s success and engagement with their community and workforce. Some of the remaining discrepancies within the review include missing evidence or analyses within sections 3 and 11. Section 3 continues to miss discussion of the demographics within the program – specifically, how these demographics affect changes to the program’s future. Section 11 includes new information that was not previously mentioned in other sections. These weaknesses mentioned in section 11 should be addressed earlier in both the executive summary and section 4. |
| Highlights  Most important reviewer comments |
| Although improved, Queries 3 & 11 were the most significant loss of points (Accepted With Required Changes) due to an overall lack of responsiveness and analysis. |

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

Jeffery Johnson November 19, 2024
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