

Annual Advisory Board Meeting Minutes Surgical Technology (ST) & Sterile Processing Technology (SPT)

Date: April 23, 2026

Time: 6:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Meeting Format: Hybrid – In-Person and Virtual/Zoom Participation

Programs Reviewed: Surgical Technology (ST) and Sterile Processing Technology (SPT)

Surgical Technology / Sterile Processing Technology Representatives

Advisory Board Member	Program	Community of Interest / Role
Christina Boyle, MBA	ST/SPT	Institutional Administration
Erica Mosca, CRCST	SPT	Program Faculty
Dr. Tarek Halim, MD, CST	ST/SPT	Program Faculty / Program Director
Halyna Jasinski, RN, BSN, CST	ST	Program Faculty / Clinical Coordinator
Joseph Santini	SPT	Program Student / Graduate Perspective
Maya Ayad	ST	Program Student
Michelle Robertson, CRCST	SPT	Program Graduate
Karen Soliman, CST	ST	Program Graduate
Sean Noden, CRCST, CIS, CER, CHL	SPT	Employer / Industry Representative
Joseph Millet, CRCST	SPT	Clinical Supervisor / Preceptor / Employer Representative
Theresa Matthews, MSN, RN, CNOR	ST	Employer / Clinical Site Representative
Nadia Holovchuk, CST	ST	Current Practitioner / Industry Professional
Olena Chubata, RN	ST	Licensed Member of Surgical Team
Jeffrey Ashear	ST/SPT	Public Representative

The signed meeting attendance record also reflects additional in-person and virtual participants.

The Advisory Board included representatives from institutional administration, program faculty, current students, graduates, employers, clinical supervisors/preceptors, current practitioners, licensed surgical team members, and the public/community. The composition was structured to obtain input from multiple communities of interest relevant to the Surgical Technology and Sterile Processing Technology programs.



2. Welcome, Introductions and Purpose of Advisory Board

The meeting opened with a welcome and introduction of participants.

The purpose of the Advisory Board was reviewed as collaboration among program personnel, employers, practitioners, graduates, students, clinical representatives, and community members to help ensure that the programs remain current, effective, and aligned with healthcare workforce expectations.

Board members were encouraged to provide open feedback and recommendations regarding program outcomes, curriculum relevance, student preparedness, clinical/externship experiences, equipment and learning resources, workforce needs, and opportunities for continuous improvement.

3. Institutional and Program Updates

Georgian Court University Articulation Agreement

Administration provided an update regarding the articulation agreement between Medical Career Institute and Georgian Court University.

The agreement was developed to provide expanded educational pathways for graduates. Surgical Technology was identified as one of the programs for which applicable credits may transfer toward a Georgian Court University degree.

ABHES Institutional Re-Accreditation

The Advisory Board was informed that the institution was preparing for its upcoming ABHES institutional re-accreditation evaluation.

Members were advised that the evaluation process could include interviews with faculty and staff, tours of instructional laboratories, and visits to selected clinical affiliates. Clinical representatives were informed that facilities selected by the evaluation team would be contacted in advance regarding the feasibility of a site visit.

4. Curriculum Review and Industry Relevance

The Surgical Technology and Sterile Processing Technology curricula were reviewed in relation to current entry-level workforce expectations.

Discussion focused on whether graduates are meeting entry-level expectations, whether new technologies or procedures should be incorporated, whether clinical affiliates are observing student-preparedness gaps, and current employer hiring needs.

Feedback received from Advisory Board members generally indicated that the curricula remained aligned with current workforce expectations.

Surgical Technology

Dr. Tarek Halim indicated that the Surgical Technology program follows the applicable AST curriculum and identified continued exposure to foundational surgical technology skills, laparoscopic technology, and basic open surgical setup as important components of entry-level preparation. He characterized students as very well prepared.

Nadia Holovchuk, CST, rated the Surgical Technology curriculum as excellent and indicated that students/graduates were very well prepared. She did not identify additional skills or workforce trends requiring curriculum changes at that time.

Theresa Matthews, MSN, RN, CNOR, also indicated that the Surgical Technology curriculum appeared aligned with current industry needs.

Sterile Processing Technology

Joseph Millet rated the Sterile Processing curriculum as excellent and aligned with current entry-level workforce needs.

Joseph Santini also rated the curriculum highly but identified opportunities for additional practical exposure involving different tray setups and sterile wrapping.

5. Program Strengths and Areas for Continued Improvement

Program strengths and areas for improvement were presented for both programs.

Sterile Processing Technology

Strengths discussed included the number of affiliated clinical sites and the addition of Old Bridge Medical Center's Central Sterile Department as a student training location.

Areas identified for continued attention included student communication/responsiveness and variation in clinical-site availability due to internal facility circumstances.

Surgical Technology

Strengths identified included strong student retention, consistent clinical placements, and instances in which students were hired directly by affiliated clinical facilities.

An area identified for continued attention involved helping students develop the professional behaviors necessary to function effectively in healthcare environments within the limited duration of the program.

6. Program Outcomes Review

The Advisory Board reviewed the institution's 2024–2025 retention, credentialing, and job-placement outcomes.

Program	Retention	Credentialing	Job Placement
Surgical Technology	100%	82%	73%
Sterile Processing Technology	84%	86%	80%

Board members were informed that the outcome measures are used to evaluate overall program effectiveness and identify opportunities for continued improvement.

Multiple Advisory Board Program Review Forms indicated that members believed the reported outcomes met expectations.

Dr. Halim documented continued improvement goals for Surgical Technology, including a future credentialing goal of approximately 85% and a job-placement goal of approximately 75%.

Program Response

Program personnel will continue monitoring retention, credentialing, and job-placement performance through institutional and program effectiveness processes. Credentialing and placement outcomes will continue to receive particular attention as future performance data becomes available.

7. Clinical / Externship Education and Student Preparedness

Clinical and externship representatives were asked to provide feedback regarding professionalism, attendance, communication, technical knowledge, critical thinking, readiness to function in the clinical environment, and willingness to accept feedback.

Overall feedback regarding clinical preparedness was positive.

Surgical Technology Feedback

Theresa Matthews reported positive experience with MCI Surgical Technology students and graduates. She indicated that students were very prepared for the clinical environment and noted that her organization hires MCI surgical technology graduates. She also indicated a willingness to consider MCI graduates for employment.

Nadia Holovchuk rated observed graduates positively across technical skills, professionalism, communication, reliability, ability to learn, critical thinking, and teamwork and indicated willingness to consider MCI graduates for employment.

Erica Mosca identified **ethics and communication skills** as areas that should continue to be emphasized before students enter externship. She also recommended continued instructor-led hands-on preparation prior to clinical placement.

Sterile Processing Technology Feedback

Joseph Millet rated the technical/hands-on skills of observed students/graduates positively and indicated that professionalism and communication skills were good. He also identified reliability, adaptability, critical thinking, and teamwork positively.

Joseph Santini indicated that additional practical exposure to varied tray setups and wrapping procedures could further support student readiness.

8. Professionalism, Communication and Workforce Expectations

The Advisory Board discussed the importance of professional behavior in healthcare environments.

Sean Noden, an experienced Sterile Processing manager, identified personal cell-phone use within clinical departments, particularly during clinical hours, as an industry concern and potential professional red flag.

Joseph Santini indicated that desirable entry-level employees should understand basic job responsibilities, demonstrate openness to continued learning, and adapt to new and challenging tasks.

Erica Mosca similarly emphasized communication skills and professional/ethical behavior as important areas of student preparation.

Program Response

Program faculty will continue reinforcing professionalism, communication, ethical behavior, workplace expectations, attendance, accountability, and appropriate personal electronic-device use before and during clinical/externship education.

9. Laboratory, Equipment and Learning Resources

Advisory Board members reviewed and evaluated laboratories, equipment, supplies, and learning resources.

Overall, members rated the instructional laboratories and equipment positively and indicated that existing resources generally support required student learning and skill development.

Surgical Technology

Several Surgical Technology representatives rated equipment and resources as excellent or good.

Maya Ayad described the laboratory as organized and helpful to her learning experience and indicated that the available instruments and equipment supported her training.

Theresa Matthews and Nadia Holovchuk provided favorable evaluations of the Surgical Technology laboratory and equipment.

Erica Mosca identified an opportunity to increase exposure to laparoscopic/robotic instrumentation and more complete instrument tray sets to support additional hands-on practice.

Sterile Processing Technology

Joseph Santini identified the laboratory environment, equipment availability, equipment functionality, industry relevance, and student learning support positively.

He recommended additional sterile wrap to allow students to practice wrapping more frequently and suggested that a functional sterilizer would further enhance training opportunities.

Program Response

Program personnel will review available laboratory supplies, equipment, and instructional activities to determine where additional hands-on practice can reasonably be incorporated.

Particular consideration will be given to:

- Sterile-wrap availability and wrapping practice;

- Exposure to different tray configurations;
- Opportunities for additional instrumentation practice;
- Available sterilization equipment;
- Surgical Technology exposure to laparoscopic/robotic and varied instrument sets.

Any additions will be evaluated based on curriculum requirements, educational value, available resources, and entry-level training needs.

10. Employer Feedback and Workforce Demand

Employers and industry representatives were asked to comment on current hiring needs, desirable qualities in new employees, workforce shortages, emerging technologies, and graduate employability.

Joseph Millet reported that entry-level Sterile Processing employees are hired within his organization and identified **second-shift positions** as particularly difficult to fill.

He indicated that adaptability and the ability to learn equipment and job responsibilities are important characteristics in entry-level employees.

Theresa Matthews reported that her organization hires MCI Surgical Technology graduates and provided positive feedback regarding graduate preparedness.

The overall feedback supported continued community need for graduates who possess strong technical skills as well as professionalism, communication, adaptability, reliability, and a willingness to learn.

11. Advisory Board Recommendations and Institutional Response

The Advisory Board's principal recommendations and institutional responses are summarized below.

Advisory Board Recommendation / Input	MCI Institute Response / Follow-Up
Continue providing strong hands-on preparation in both ST and SPT.	Program faculty will continue emphasizing applied laboratory practice and evaluate opportunities for additional hands-on activities.

Advisory Board Recommendation / Input**MCI Institute Response / Follow-Up**

Increase SPT practice involving different instrument tray setups and sterile wrapping.

SPT faculty will review laboratory activities and supply availability to determine opportunities to increase tray-setup and wrapping practice.

Consider additional sterile wrap for repeated student practice.

Program personnel will review consumable supply levels and instructional needs.

Consider functional sterilization equipment as an additional SPT training resource.

Program personnel will evaluate current equipment resources and feasibility based on educational need and available resources.

Continue exposure to current ST instrumentation, including laparoscopic/robotic instruments and varied tray sets.

ST faculty will review available instrumentation and opportunities for additional hands-on exposure consistent with entry-level curriculum requirements.

Reinforce ethics, professionalism and communication before clinical placement.

These areas will continue to be reinforced throughout classroom, laboratory and pre-clinical preparation.

Reinforce expectations concerning cell-phone use during clinical hours.

Professional conduct and clinical-site expectations, including appropriate use of personal electronic devices, will continue to be reinforced with students.

Continue monitoring credentialing and job placement outcomes.

Program personnel will monitor outcomes through the Program Effectiveness Plan and institutional effectiveness processes.

Continue preparing adaptable, reliable employees who can learn on the job and respond to changing workplace demands.

Program faculty will continue incorporating professional behaviors, accountability, problem-solving and adaptability into student preparation.

12. Overall Program Effectiveness

The Advisory Board feedback was predominantly positive regarding both programs.

Members generally indicated that:

- curricula were relevant to current entry-level expectations;
- laboratories and instructional resources supported student learning;
- students/graduates were appropriately prepared for clinical and employment settings;
- employers would consider hiring MCI graduates; and
- both programs were effectively preparing students for entry-level employment.

The Board also provided several practical opportunities for continuous improvement, primarily involving increased hands-on exposure, professional communication and conduct, and continued monitoring of credentialing and employment outcomes.

13. Follow-Up Advisory Board Input

Additional written Advisory Board feedback associated with the April 23, 2026 review was received following the formal meeting.

Sean Noden submitted additional SPT feedback on May 5, 2026, including the recommendation regarding personal cell-phone use during clinical hours.

Joseph Millet submitted additional SPT feedback dated April 28, 2026. His evaluation supported the curriculum, student preparedness and overall program effectiveness.

These written submissions are maintained as supporting Advisory Board documentation.

14. Conclusion

The Advisory Board meeting concluded following review of the Surgical Technology and Sterile Processing Technology programs, including curriculum relevance, outcomes, clinical education, student preparedness, facilities and equipment, employer expectations, workforce demand, and opportunities for continued improvement.

Board members were thanked for their participation, professional expertise, and recommendations.

15. Supporting Documentation Maintained

Supporting documentation for the April 23, 2026 Advisory Board meeting includes:

- ABHES Advisory Board Information Form
- Advisory Board Meeting Attendance Record
- Annual Advisory Board Presentation/Agenda
- Advisory Board Member Information & Meeting Acknowledgment Forms
- Laboratory and Equipment Feedback Forms
- Employer Feedback Forms
- Advisory Board Member Program Review Forms
- Supporting documentation verifying Advisory Board member qualifications, where applicable
- Post-meeting Advisory Board feedback
- Evidence of distribution of meeting minutes

The ABHES Advisory Board Information Form documents that the minutes were distributed by email to Advisory Board members and program personnel on April 30, 2026.