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 [ ].

|  |
| --- |
| Program Review Steering Committee Contact Information  Name and email of the committee member you can contact |
| Professor Jeremy Prince jprince@collin.edu |
| Status of Review  Overall current status of your program review |
| Acceptable without recommendations  Acceptable with recommendations  Revisit and revise |
| Summary  Description of findings from your program review |
| The Committee accepted the Surgical Assisting Program Review, with an overall rating of Accepted With Recommendations (AWR).  The committee was in agreement that 10 of the 12 objectives received an Accepted Without Recommendation (AWOR) rating.  One objective, “Program relationship to market demand” received an AWR rating, and the “Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources?” objective was dropped as it was not deemed relevant to the review.  The program submitted a much improved CIP since the last submission last April.  In Table 1 of the CIP, specific measures and targets were listed.  This table was not addressed completely in the April submission, which resulted in an RR rating from the committee.  The revised CIP section was given a rating of AWOR.  The “Program relationship to market demand.” Still needs some areas addressed, but revisions have improved the rating to AWR.  Christian specifically noted the following would improve this section with the following:  A clear statement that tied together the various statements in the section.  Overall, the consensus of the Committee is this is a good program with a great future ahead of it. |
| Highlights  Most important reviewer comments |
| From Christian Aars:  “The re-submission genuinely addresses virtually every concern raised from the original submission. Almost all concerns that were not addressed were either minor, possible misunderstandings due to the reviewer not being “in the field”, or not sufficient to warrant an additional Revisit. Most importantly, the major omissions have been fixed.”  I believe this statement reflected the view of the entire committee. |

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

\_\_Professor Jeremy Prince\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_March 19, 2024\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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