|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments**  **See Individual Reviewer Checklists** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWRC |  |  | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 -AWRC | SR   * States philosophy but does not state purpose/mission statement. * Marketable skills mentioned but unclear if info provided are what’s established. List would clarify; program learning outcomes mentioned but not listed. * Does not explain the industry the program serves. * Addresses career paths for graduates.   Addresses regulatory standards.  R1  The text does not include the program mission or program learning outcomes.  *Recommend including omissions noted*  Inconsistencies within the review as whole:   * On p. 5 the text states that the program “consistently has a *100%* pass rate on all licensing examinations,” as does #5B2 on p. 19, but Appendix F reports the Five-Year Total Pass Rate as *99%.*   Also on p. 5, the text claims, “*Ninety percent* of students become gainfully employed in a dental office within the first *12 months* post-graduation,” while the #4 text on p. 16 states “*98%* of graduates find employment in a dental office within *6 months*,” but the data presented in the table about employment of program graduates on p. 17 is unclear as to the timing of employment and totals for which a percentage could be calculated.  R2  Response does not provide information discussing programs mission statement or marketable skills. The response does not include an overview of their impact on the industry the program serves. |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | SR – AWR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWR | SR – AWR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR   * Addresses how the program relates to the mission and strategic plan. * Addresses articulation agreements.   Does not analyze the evidence provided to show conclusions about the program.  R1  Regarding college mission, text:   * Asserts program develops skills but does not list those skills. * Implies but does not explain how character is strengthened through activities listed.   Regarding the college strategic plan, text for:   * SP1 does not cite local, state, and regional accreditation thresholds and goals nor does it cite actual program student outcomes in comparison. * SP2 lacks information about the national context regarding if/how exemplary development of Objectively Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) for 1st-year students is. * SP5 does not include that any succession model has been developed or implemented. * SP6 does not define its systemic approach to external stakeholder engagement in terms of nature or frequency nor does text provide data on the number of external stakeholders engaged.   Information provided in a portion of text labeled as Core Values section that fills evidence and explanation gaps noted above should be integrated within the text that addresses how the program supports the college's mission and strategic plan.  *Recommend including omissions noted*  R2  The response does not include analysis and evidence discussing the sections on the mission statement and strategic plans. The evidence provided is often vague or unexplained. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | SR – RR  R1 – RR  R2 -AWRC | SR – RR  R1 – RR  R2 - AWRC | SR – RR  R1 – RR  R2 - AWR | SR – RR  R1 – RR  R2 - AWR | SR   * Addressed enrollment pattern. * Does not address next 5 yr implications. * Minimally addresses actions taken to support students. * Does not address attraction of a diverse student population. * Provides analysis of enrollment pattern but does not analyze two remaining queries.   R1  Text lacks any treatment of program enrollment by gender, ethnicity, or race – no data, no discussion of disproportionality of any demographic, no comparison with Collin College’s overall student demographic distributions, no analysis of patterns in enrollment, and no plans regarding enrollment.  There is no reference to demographic data contained in Appendix E.  There is no description of how the program supports or attracts (or plans to do so) a diverse student population.  While the text demonstrates student interest in the program by citing a range of numbers of applications submitted annually, the text does not include the applicant acceptance rate of students offered places in the program (i.e., in prior years after the program accepted the applications of 16 people, did all 16 people actually join/enroll in the program?).  R2  Query is not explicitly answered.  The information provided does not include a discussion of current student demographics distributions. Nor does the response discuss whether enrollment is disproportionate within the program. The response also does not include discussion on actions to take to mitigate these concerns. |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWRC | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR   * Mentions a 37.8% increase but does not state how many jobs are available. * Addresses proportion of graduates that found a job within six months of graduation. * Mentions market demand but does not address anticipated changes over the next 5 years. * Includes a table of program completers but does not address meet/exceed/short local employment demand. * Does not discuss program’s strengths/weaknesses related to market demand.   R1  The text does not include:   * The number of program-related jobs available in the DFW Metroplex. * Identification or discussion of the program’s weaknesses related to market demand.   The text asserts that “Collin College’s standards compete with or surpass many of the competing schools” but does not provide evidence of Collin’s standards or of competing schools’ standards to support this claim.  The text asserts, “Based on surveys, 98% of graduates find employment in a dental office within 6 months,” but does not provide clear evidence of this.  The data table included at the end of this section, which presumably supports that statement (i.e., 98% of graduates employed within 6 months), is problematic and raises doubt about the accuracy of the percentage and underlying data:   * It is unclear if the text claim of graduates “finding employment in a dental office within 6 months” is equivalent/synonymous to the column heading “Employed in the Fourth Quarter of the Year Following Completion.” * The table does not provide the annual total number of program completers to compare to the number employed “in the Fourth Quarter of the Year Following Completion.” * It is unclear if the years in the first column apply to the year of program completion or the “Year Following Completion,” which seems to be the year of hire (if there is a difference?).   + The table notes that the number of program completers employed in 2019 was “15,” but in the next section of the review (i.e., #5. How Effective Is Our Curriculum, and How Do We Know?), the second sentence states that 14 students completed the program in 2019.     - If the year noted in the table signifies the year of program completion, then how could 15 program completers become employed when only 14 students completed the program in 2019?     - Likewise, if the year noted in the table signifies the “Year Following Completion,” how could 15 program completers become employed in 2020 when only 14 students completed the program in 2019? * The row labeled “Total” reads “76,” but the numbers in the column add up to 74.   + If 76 actually represents the total number of program completers and NOT the total number of completers employed, then the row should be labeled as such.   + If 76 does represent the total number of program completers, then 74 employed completers/76 completers = 97.37% - not 98% as the text states.   Recommend:   * Including the number of program-related jobs available in the DFW Metroplex. * Identifying and analyzing the program’s weaknesses related to market demand. * Including evidence of Collin’s standards and the standards of other schools in the area to clearly demonstrate the competitiveness of Collin’s program. * Clarifying evidence (data) regarding program completers gaining employment by using a consistent measurement of time.   Resolving inconsistencies in data reported in different sections of the review or, as appropriate, clarifying wording to ensure that data in one section of the review does not appear inconsistent with another section.  R2  Query is not thoroughly answered.  The response does not include discussion of program comparisons. The response does not include acceptance or completion rates to programs outside of Collin College – both with unaffiliated and affiliated programs or universities.  The response does not include explicit information or data on the number of available jobs in the region. Response also does not address how the program will change to meet market demand. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR   * Addresses number of completers last 4 years. * Addresses substantive students dropping out of program. * Does analyze course success rates and completion rates of each course in program. * Stated 73 completers but does not provide evidence. * Stated 100% of test takers pass licensure exam but does not provide evidence. * Stated 93% retention rate but does not provide evidence. * Does not compare program curriculum to two or more comparable colleges. * Addresses alignment with professional association standards. * Addresses curriculum subject to external accreditation. * Advisory committee answers 1 & 2 are not in the answer portion of the document. * Addresses advisory committee’s impact over last five years. * Addresses curriculum recommendations by the advisory committee over the last five years. * States average class size of 24 but does not provide evidence. * Does not address grade distributions. * Addresses contact hrs taught by full/part time faculty. * Does not address courses with a success rate below 75%. * Does not address how well general education requirements are integrated with technical coursework. * Does not address student satisfaction.   Appendices C-D are listed but no references are made to address elements of query.  R1  #5A text does not include any data about:   * course-level completion rates * course success rates * frequency with which courses are scheduled   There is no analysis (quantitative or qualitative) of any courses in the program.  The text on p. 18 claims, “There is no point in the program where a substantive percentage of students drop out,” but does not provide data (in terms of semester, month, or which courses students were enrolled in at the time of leaving the program) to support this claim.  The text on p. 18 also claims the program has “consistently” had “successful completion of 15 students (including achieving full licensure) over the past 5 years.” However, data provided in the same paragraph note that 14 students completed the program in 2019 and 2023, and Appendix F notes that 14 out of 15 students attempting the National Dental Hygiene Examination in 2020-2021 passed – which contradicts “consistently.”  #5B1 on p. 18 reports the number of completers as 73, but, the table at the end of #4 (p. 17 of review) suggests that 76 program completers in the last five years, among an unspecified total number of program completers in the last five years, were employed soon after program completion; is there some discrepancy in one section or the other? How could 76 program completers become employed when only 73 students completed the program in that same window of time?  #5B2 on p. 19 notes that the licensure pass rate is 100% but Appendix F reports the Five-Year Total Pass Rate as 99%. (NOTE: #1, p. 5 made a similar claim about a 100% pass rate on the licensing exam.)  #5B3 on p. 19 includes no data/evidence to support the claim of a 93% retention rate; it is unclear if the retention rate is for the program cohort or for “students enrolled in program courses on the census date… [and still] enrolled on the last class day,” as retention standard prompt notes.  #5C (p. 19-20) claims:   * Program alignment with professional association guidelines, but the text does not provide a comparison or crosswalk to support this claim. * A curriculum review schedule involves faculty only in a three-year rotation covering two courses per year, but the text does not provide this schedule to support the claim nor any indication of recommendations or changes made as a result of the curriculum review process. Although #5D4 implies that the advisory committee has a role in making curriculum recommendations, the description of the curriculum review process makes no mention of any specific mechanism for advisory committee involvement.   #5C also does not include any comparison of curriculum to competing schools.  The text of #5E (p. 21-22) does not include data on or analysis of:   * Grade distributions * Course success rates * Integration of general education requirements with technical coursework\* * Student satisfaction\*\*   \*Although Appendix C consists of the “68-Hour Curriculum Outline” for the AAS in Dental Hygiene and includes the course numbers and titles for technical and general education courses, there is no express discussion, explanation, or engagement with the integration of general education requirements with technical coursework in the body of the review.  \*\*Although Appendix D consists of “Student Satisfaction-Student Survey of Program Goals-Outcomes,” there is no express discussion, explanation, or engagement with student satisfaction in the body of the review. Also, there is no context for the survey, such as noting the year or the point in the semester the survey was completed. Given that the total number of respondents was 33, it is unclear who the survey population was.  #5E claims on p. 21, “Collin College has the best [student/faculty] ratios compared to other programs in the area,” but there is no evidence provided about other programs to support this claim.  #5E notes on p. 22 the “average class size for every dental hygiene cohort is now 24 students,” but this seems to be identifying the actual cohort size rather than the average class section/course size.  Section #5 ends with a list of four appendices (p. 22-23), but none of the contents of any of them are clearly referenced in the body of the review text for this section.  Recommend:   * Including course completion rates and course success rates and analysis thereof. * Including a description of the frequency with which courses are scheduled. * Integrating evidence contained within appendices into text response, particularly student satisfaction, and providing analysis thereof. * Providing evidence for drop-out data analysis, curriculum review schedule, curriculum review outcomes, and faculty/student ratios for other programs in the area.   Resolving inconsistencies in data reported in different sections of the review or, as appropriate, clarifying wording to ensure that data in one section of the review does not appear inconsistent with another section.  R2  Response does not thoroughly examine the curricula or programs offered by other colleges or universities. The response does not discuss or provide conclusions for appendices – curriculum outline, student satisfaction, unduplicated enrollment, and national board dental hygiene examination results. |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR – AWR  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR – AWR  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR – AWR  R1 – AWRC  R2 - AWR | SR   * Program website & Facebook page are mentioned. “See Table” would help clarify. * Does not address how the program ensures students are informed of program literature. * Addresses who is responsible for monitoring & maintaining unit’s website and describes processes.   Program Literature Review Table completed; only 1 link missing – Information sheet.  R1  The title questions for #6 are not answered by the text – How Effectively Do We Communicate, and How Do We Know? There is no evidence or analysis of the effectiveness of communication.  For #6A, it is unclear if the program has a recruitment plan, retention plan, or completion plan for program literature or electronic sites to support.  In #6A, the text does not include any information about the program soliciting student feedback regarding its website or literature, nor does it describe any means of obtaining student feedback to make improvements to any method of communicating program information.  The text for #6A also does not provide any description of efforts to ensure that students are informed about or made aware of program literature.  Although the prompt for #6B indicates that each program literature item in the Program Literature Review Table should document the elements of information that the item provides, the program website is the only item among the five listed that documents such elements, albeit only partially.  If there is an expectation that program literature should in some way include all elements of information that are parenthetically noted in the #6B prompt, then the following appear to be missing within the items listed in the Table:   * current academic calendars * grading policies * course syllabi * availability of awards   In #6B, there is no example of the “Information sheets with QR code which leads students seeking program information to our webpage” provided as evidence (not via hyperlink or as an appendix).  Recommend documenting the elements of information provided by each literature item in the table (#6B).  R2  Response does not include discussion or plan to address student feedback or surveys in section 6a. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR  Addressed each element of the query evidenced by completing the Partnership Resources Table and providing a coherent analysis.  R1  This section lists and describes partnerships but does not expressly address resource leveraging (as noted in the title for #7 – How Well Are We Leveraging Partnership Resources and Building Relationships) in terms of analysis that is directly linked to advancing program outcomes.  If any of the descriptions in the table under the column “How is it Valuable to the Program?” include references to the advancement of program outcomes, then those descriptions do not expressly label or identify them as such.  Recommend identifying specific program outcomes that each partnership resource serves.  R2  No comment – effectively addresses the program query |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWOR | SR  Addressed each element of the query evidenced by completing the Employee Resources Table and providing a coherent analysis.  R1  Dates of the professional development listings are largely absent; the few dates (years) provided are incidental to titles of workshop/presentation and appear to fall outside the five-year time frame the introductory text claims.  Recommend providing dates for professional development listings.  R2  No comment – effectively addresses the program query |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | SR  Program state “No deficiencies at this time”  R1  “Blank”  R2  Response does not address the request and need for a fifth full-time faculty member for the program. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | SR – AWR  R1 – RR  R2 - AWR | SR – AWRC  R1 – RR  R2 - AWRC | SR – AWRC  R1 – RR  R2 - AWRC | SR – AWRC  R1 – RR  R2 - AWRC | SR  Program CIP dated 11/24/2020 is included as Appendix G & referenced in response. The CIP included two Expected Outcomes. Only one outcome pertaining to the lab was presented & analyzed.  R1  While the description addresses how the program facility expansion and CIP Outcome #2 made overall improvements to the program, if the description references the improvement of any specific program outcomes, then the description does not expressly state or clearly identify those program outcomes.  There is no evidence provided for CIP Outcome #1 Sealant Placement. Appendix G indicates that employer evaluations post-graduation would serve as the measure for the expected outcome and that 100% of those would reflect skill competency, but there is no mention of the employer evaluations in the text for #10.  R2  The response is too general and fails to discuss changes and actions taken in addressing CIP plan  Within the response provided, it does not discuss major differences between programs within other schools. The response outlines that the program is comparatively “competitive with other dental hygiene schools in the area” without explaining this assertion. |
| 11. How will program evaluate its success? | SR – AWRC  R1 – RR  R2 -RR | SR – AWRC  R1 – RR  R2 - RR | SR – AWRC  R1 – RR  R2 - AWRC | SR – AWRC  R1 – RR  R2 - AWRC | SR   * Program identifies a long list of strengths but only one weakness. One weakness isn’t supported by data nor discussion up to this point regarding full/part time faculty needs or hours.   No actions are presented to capitalize on strengths nor mitigate weaknesses.  R1  Despite the prompt noting that the summary of program strengths and weaknesses should contain no surprises and be based “on the information, analysis, and discussion that have been presented up to this point,” the basis for the inclusion of the following listed strengths is unclear:   * Personnel changes * Clinical board pass rates * Increased access to technology   Likewise, the weakness of not having a fifth full-time faculty member is surprising and is not clearly based on the content provided in the review up to this point.  The text provides no rationale for the expected outcomes chosen for the CIPs identified in #12.  R2  Response includes new data within their weaknesses that has not been reviewed in previous prompts. The response fails to respond to how these issues will be solved in the future. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | SR – AWOR  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWR |  |  | SR – AWRC  R1 – AWR  R2 - AWR | SR  CIP isn’t rooted in Q#11 weaknesses nor discussion of program throughout the review.  R1  The Measure identified for CIP Outcome #1 is a pre-test, but that does not measure the degree of success of the outcome; the Target indicates that the degree of success will be measured by a post-test of calibration competency. This applies to pages 56 and 57.  The Measure for CIP Outcome #2 in the table on p. 59 does not align with the wording for the same measure provided in the table on p. 56; p. 59 does not include “skill evaluations in Pre-clinic.”  Recommend revising wording as noted.  R2  Response does not thoroughly explain how outcomes will be measured. The current explanation is vague and difficult to follow.  Response does not include examination or overview of weaknesses mentioned in the previous prompts – such as the need for new faculty. |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Accepted Without Recommendations | Accepted With Recommendations | Accepted with Required Changes | Revisit and Revise |

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

SR – Revisit and Revise - The program did a good job of attempting to supply information. However, many areas were either not addressed, lacked data and/or lacked analysis resulting in an incomplete overall review of the program.

R1 – Revisit and Revise – My rationale for the conclusion (overall decision) is based on what I regarded as the absence of responsiveness, evidence, and analysis to #3, #10, and #11. I acknowledge that my assessment of #10 and #11 differs from those of my teammates.

In general, my sense of this submission is that the lack of engagement in the responses with the terms/vocabulary used in the review questions/prompts made it unclear about the extent to which the responses were acceptable. The most significant example of this centers on program learning outcomes. If the program learning outcomes are contained in any of the responses in this submission, then I did not recognize them as such because this submission contains no list labeled “program learning outcomes.”

R2 – Revisit and Revise - Based on the present review, it is clear that the faculty and staff meet the needs of their students and community. Many of their partnerships with the community added a highlight to the overall work the program does for Collin College. However, many queries were completely unanswered or explored within the documents provided. Overall, the analysis and evidence presented lacked thoroughness. There were several pieces of important evidence that was missing – particularly in sections 3, 4, 10, and 11. The absence of this evidence resulted in the overall review of the program to be weak and unclear.