|  | **Responsiveness to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What does the workforce program do? | AWR |  |  | AWR | Response now addresses the program’s purpose and implementation of their mission statement as well as which marketable skills the program provides their graduates. The response also addresses connection to the industry served with analysis of student learning outcomes and brief overview of student success following graduation.  |
| 2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan. | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | The response does not include enough detailed evidence in sections discussing strengthening character, (#16) coordinated and systematic approach to stakeholders, and academic excellence.  |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | AWRC | AWR | AWRC | AWRC | Query remains weak in its analysis of demographic data. Although the response mentions demographic differences within student enrollment regarding an increase in technological literacy and notes on an increase in male applicants, the response does not address why these may occur or how these can be representative in the future.  |
| 4. Program relationship to market demand. | NA | NA | NA | AWR | Query now addresses market demand within the metroplex but does not address market projections for the next 5 years.  |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | NA | NA | NA | AWR | Response addresses completion rates of students within the last four years. Response does not include analysis of course success rates for each course. Their overall success rates are reviewed in section E.  |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | Response still does not include discussion or plan to address student feedback or surveys in section 6a. |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | No comment – effectively addresses the program query |
| 8. Are the faculty supported with professional development? | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | AWOR | No comment – effectively addresses the program query |
| 9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | AWR | AWR | AWR | AWR | The response now addresses comparative standards among other competitive dental hygiene programs in the state.  |
| 11. How will the program evaluate its success? | AWRC | AWR | AWR | AWRC | Response includes discussion of “assessing the explorer competency and the proficiency of students with explorer instrumentation” as being a weakness within the program. This concern was not address in the previous prompts within the program review. Despite this, the review includes an explanation of how this issue will be remediated.  |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) | AWR |  |  | AWR | Response has included measurements for intended outcomes.  |

,

**Overall Decision: ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Accepted Without Recommendations | [ ]  Accepted With Recommendations | [ ]  Accepted with Required Recommendations | [ ]  Revisit and Revise |

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

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.