Note: Enter "NA" wherever data are not applicable or not available for the program under review.

Program Characteristics
Academic Program Name: **Radiologic Technology**
Degree: **Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.)**
Program CIP Code: **51.0911**
School and Department: **School of Health Professions**
Time frame for this review: **2013-2017**
Date of last internal review: 2013
Current date program reviewed for this report: 1/14/2020

Program Goal Statement and Student Learning Outcomes
Program goal statement:
**Program Mission Statement: The purpose of the Radiologic Technology Program is to provide students with integrated learning experiences in theory and practice that will enable them to provide high quality images and patient care in keeping with the service excellence philosophy of Dalton State College. In the professional course providing these skills and experiences, students are expected to successfully complete the national registry/certification examination.
Program outcomes: **Goal #1: Students will demonstrate clinical competence. **Goal #2:** Students will demonstrate effective communication skills. **Goal #3:** Students will utilize critical thinking. **Goal #4:** Students will exhibit professionalism. **Measurement of Goals: Please refer to Program Outcome Assessment Plan (Appendix).**
**Student learning outcomes • Student will select appropriate technical factors for both standard and digital imaging. • Student will apply appropriate positioning skills. • Student will practice/apply appropriate radiation protection. • Students will demonstrate effective written communication skills with patients and healthcare staff. • Students will demonstrate effective verbal communication skills with patients and healthcare staff. • Students will demonstrate logical image sequencing for patients with multiple exams. • Students will evaluate the quality of images. • Students will utilize professional judgment in delivering patient care. • Students will demonstrate dependability in and adaptability to the clinical environment.

Measurement of Student Learning Outcomes: Please refer to Program Outcome Assessment Plan (Appendix).

** Please note the Program Mission, Goals, and Student Learning Outcomes are approved as listed by the Accreditation Committee for the Program (The Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT).

Brief Assessment of Previous Program Review

Outcome of previous program review (brief narrative statement).

In the last program review is was noted that the strengths of the program were as follows:

1. Dedicated and experience faculty.

2. The passing rate on the national board examination for 2014-2018 was 97.18%

3. Dedicated computer usage and space for the program classroom assists students to self-evaluate their weaknesses and strengths of radiologic curricula.

4. Adequate clinical facilities for student assignments.

5. Dedicated x-ray lab with both conventional and computed x-ray equipment that is used to demonstrate radiologic imaging and positioning techniques.

What improvements have occurred since the last program review or assessment?

Improvements:

1. The department conducted a comprehensive review of the radiologic technology program curriculum with the goal of including more general education requirements for a BS degree while maintaining the radiologic technology credit hours without compromising the integrity of the professional field topics.

2. The program has had two students fail the ARRT national board examination (1 in 2016 and 1 in 2017). The program's overall scores have decreased on the board exam in two major categories: digital imaging equipment and digital imaging acquisition techniques. The program's lab does not have a digital imaging suite that can be used to explain the differences in computerized imaging vs. digital imaging. The students experience digital imaging in the clinical settings, but having the students get "hands-on" training in the program lab is not a possibility at this time. The program faculty have been allowed to purchase a computer tutorial that is a series of eleven lessons on digital imaging. In addition, the program faculty have revised lecture material to reflect the newest information on digital imaging. The goal in the future is to purchase and install digital imaging equipment in the x-ray lab so that students are able to be shown how the equipment operates and

then have scheduled lab practice using the newest equipment. However, the program passing rate on the ARRT exam has a current five-year average (2014-2018) of 97.18%.

Update: The Program purchased new digital x-ray equipment in September 2019 that will assist in the instruction of conventional, computed radiography and digital radiography in the laboratory setting. This addition of new x-ray equipment will lay the foundation for student experience in the advanced equipment that is included in the national board examination (ARRT).

What changes or revisions have been made to the program, its curriculum, or its program/student learning outcomes since the last program review? Please include a follow-up discussion of the previous review's action plan?

The radiologic technology program curriculum was revised and approved by the Academic Programs Committee. The revision was implemented in 2017. The revision's purpose was to expand the pre-rad tech courses to include Anatomy & Physiology (BIOL 2212 and 2213) and Allied Health Terminology (ALHT 1130). These changes were supported by the following rationale:

- Assist students in completing the general education requirements for a BS degree. Many students have expressed interest in completing a BS degree, and there are several options at DSC for that goal (there is future plan to have an "add-on" BS degree completion option for rad tech AAS or to allow students the opportunity to complete the BS in Health and Wellness). The program has not been approved as of December 2019 for the addition of a Radiologic Technology BS degree completion option.
- Several results have occurred due to the previously stated curriculum change. These are
  1. Fewer students are applying to the program due to the following reasons:
     A. The increase in pre-requisite courses required. The older pre-requisite requirement was 24 credits, and starting with 2017, the new pre-requisite requirement is 32 credits.
     B. The rigor of the two Anatomy & Physiology courses (BIOL 2212 and 2213) has proven to be a challenge for the enrolled students. The academic requirement for these two biology courses is students must earn a course grade of at least a "C" to meet program eligibility.

Student Demographics

Enrollment	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	% Change
Headcount	111	94	88	100	100	-9.91%
FTE						
Enrolled Full-time	79	64	48	35	33	-58.23%
Enrolled Part-time	32	30	40	65	67	+109.38%
Female	84	75	69	75	75	-10.71%
Male	27	19	19	25	25	-7.41%

Alaskan Native/Native American/American Indian						
Asian, Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander		1	2	2	2	+100%
Black/African-American	3	1	2	7	5	+67.67%
Hispanic	35	35	22	42	40	+14.29%
Multi-racial	1	1	2		2	+100%
Undeclared	1	1	2	1	1	0%
White	71	55	58	48	49	-71.35%

Analysis and comments on student demographics.

The radiologic technology program historically has a female and white population. However, the population of our service region (northwest Georgia) has had an increase in the Hispanic population, and the College is now designated as a Hispanic-Serving Institution. These students are a tremendous asset to healthcare in general due to their bi-lingual capabilities that can communicate more effectively with the diverse patient populations (both English and Spanish-speaking populations) that each of the clinical facilities is providing services to on a regular basis.

The decrease in the percentage for student full-time enrollment is a result of a change in the program's curriculum. Prior to 2017, each semester of the six-semester program had at a minimum of 12 credits per semester. After the curriculum change in 2017, only two semesters of the program's six semesters have 12 credits (full-time enrollment). The remaining four semesters in the program are considered part-time enrollment since the credits earned are less than 12 credits.

Faculty Indicators of Program Quality	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	% Change
School (not Department) faculty teaching in program (excluding Areas A through E)	2	2	3	3	3	+50%
Full-time program faculty	2	2	2	2	2	0%
Part-time program faculty	0	0	1	1	1	0%
Total program faculty			3	3	3	0%
Percent of program classes taught by full-time program faculty	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Gender (full-time and part-time faculty)	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	% Change
Male	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Female	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Race/Ethnicity (full-time and part-time faculty)	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	% Change
Alaskan Native/Native American/American Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Asian, Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Black/African-American	0	0	0	0	0	0%

Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Multi-racial	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Undeclared	0	0	0	0	0	0%
White	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Tenure Status (full-time faculty)	**Fall 2013**	**Fall 2014**	**Fall 2015**	**Fall 2016**	**Fall 2017**	**% Change**
Tenured	1	1	1	1	1	0
On-tenure track	1	1	1	1	1	0
Non-tenure track				1	1	0
Rank (full-time faculty)	**Fall 2013**	**Fall 2014**	**Fall 2015**	**Fall 2016**	**Fall 2017**	**% Change**
Professor	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Associate Professor	1	1	1	1	1	0%
Assistant Professor	1	1	1	1	1	0%
Instructor/Senior Lecturer/Lecturer				1	1	0%

Faculty Indicators of Program Quality

Highest degree (full-time faculty)	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	% Change
Doctorate	0	0	0	1	1	0%
Specialist	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Master's	1	1	1	0	1	0%
Bachelor's	1	1	0	1	1	0%
Associate's/Other	0	0	0	0	0	0%

Provide additional details, analysis, and comments regarding faculty indicators of program quality.

The number of faculty has remained stable at two full-time members since the program began at Dalton State in 1998. These two positions are the Program Director and Clinical Coordinator. Each faculty member teaches approximately 50% of the courses in the radiologic technology program.

From 2014-1016: The two full-time faculty members were 1. Susan D. West (Program Director/Associate Professor/Tenured) and 2. Cindy Fisher (Clinical Coordinator/Assistant Professor/on Tenure Track). The program added a part-time lecturer (Holly Miller) in 2016. Also, in 2016, the Clinical Coordinator (Cindy Fisher)

passed away. Her faculty position was replaced with the part-time faculty (Holly Miller) transitioning to a full-time/tenure-track position.

In 2016, the Susan D. West (Program Director) completed the EdD degree. In 2017, Holly Miller (Clinical Coordinator) completed the master's degree.

In 2018, a new part-time program lecturer (Tara Moreland) was hired. She has a BS degree and works 19.5 hours per week. As of September 2018, the program advertised for a new full-time faculty to replace the part-time faculty member. Tara Moreland was hired as a full-time lecturer in the rad tech program. The program now has three full-time instructors for the program.

Indicators of Measures of Quality						
Student Input	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	% Change
Mean ACT score	438	416	415	421	430	-1.83%
Mean SAT score	19.3	19.8	19.2	18.3	18.7	-3.11%

Indicators of Measures of Quality: See Appendix.

If applicable to your degree program, provide any additional external quality assurance data/information or results (e.g., professional accreditation results, National Survey of Student Engagement [NSSE], market rankings, etc.).

See Rad Tech Program Effectiveness Data below:

Six Major Indicators of Radiologic Technology Program Effectiveness and Benchmarks:

Indicator	Program Benchmark
1. Program Completion Rate	Annual program completion rate of at least 75%
2. Program Course Effectiveness	Three-year course evaluation average of at least 3.50/5.0
3. ARRT Scores	Five-year average passing rate of at least 80% for first time attempt examinees within six months of graduation
4. Job Placement Rate	Five-year job placement average rate of at least 75% within twelve months of graduation
5. Satisfaction Rate Graduate	Three-year average graduate satisfaction scores of at least 75% one year post graduation
6. Satisfaction Rate Employer	Three-year average employer satisfaction scores of at least 75% one year post graduation

Data Results:

1. First Indicator of Program Effectiveness: Annual program completion rate of at least a 75%. Program completion rate is defined by the JRCERT as the number of students who complete the clinical phase of the program within 150% of the stated program length.

Graduation Year	Percent Completion	Number of Students	Benchmark of 75% Met
2014	76%	17 began, 13 graduated • 4 voluntary w/d	Yes
2015	82%	17 began, 14 graduated • 3 voluntary w/d • 1 dismissal	Yes
2016	88%	17 began, 15 graduated • 2 voluntary w/d	Yes

2017	82%	17 began, 14 graduated • 2 voluntary w/d	Yes
2018	88%	17 began, 15 graduated • 2 voluntary w/d	Yes
2014-2018	**83.53%**	102 began, 71 graduated	Yes

2. Second Indicator of Program Effectiveness: Three-year course evaluation average of at least 3.50/5.00 (70%).

Graduation Year	Didactic Course Evaluation Ave	Benchmark: 70%
2015	4.93/5.00 (99%)	99%
2016	4.86/5.00 (97%)	97%
2017	4.25/5.00 (85%)	85%
2018	4.71/5.00 (95%)	95%
3-Year average	4.68/5.00 (93.6%)	**Benchmark Met 93.6%**

3. Third Indicator of Program Effectiveness: Five-year average credentialing examination (ARRT) pass rate of not less than 75% for first attempt examinees within six months of graduation.

Graduation Year	Percent Passing on 1st ARRT attempt	Number of Program Students	Benchmark: 75% or greater passing rate Five-year Ave
2014	100%	13 of 13 students passed on 1st attempt within 6 months of grad	100%
2015	100%	14 of 14 students passed on 1st attempt within 6 months of grad	100%
2016	93%	14 of 15 students passed on 1st attempt within 6 months of grad	93%
2017	93%	13 of 14 students passed on 1st attempt within 6 months of grad	93%
2018	100%	15 of 15 students passed on 1st attempt within 6 months of grad	100%

5-Year average	97.18%	69/71 = 97.18% Raw data calculation	Benchmark Met 97.18%

DSC Program and National Statistics on ARRT National Board Examination:

Graduation Year	# Taking Exam	# Passing on 1st Attempt	Program Percent Passing ARRT	Program Ave ARRT Score	National Ave ARRT Score	National Ave Passing Rate
2014	13	13	100%	86%	84%	89%
2015	14	14	100%	85%	84%	88%
2016	15	14	93.33%	84%	83%	87%
2017	15	13	93.33%	81%	84%	89%
2018	15	15	100%	88%	84%	89%
Total	71	69	67/71 = 97.18% Raw data calculation	84.8% 5-Year Ave	83.8% 5-Year Ave	88.4% 5-Year Ave

4. Fourth Indicator of Program Effectiveness: Five-year average job placement rate of not less 75% within 12 months of graduation.

Graduation Year	Percent Job Placement	Number of Students
2014	92%	12 of 13 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation; 1 not actively seeking employment
2015	100%	14 of 14 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation
2016	100%	14 of 14 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation (1/15 employed even though the student did not pass the ARRT exam on the 1st attempt)
2017	100%	13 of 13 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation
2018	100%	15 of 15 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation

5-Year average	98.4%	Benchmark Met: 75% Five-year average job placement rate within 12 months of graduation

*Note: Not actively seeking employment (as defined by the JRCERT Standard Five: Obj. 5.2) is described as follows:

1) Graduate fails to communicate with program officials regarding employment status after multiple attempts OR
2) Graduate is unwilling to seek employment that requires relocation OR
3) Graduate is unwilling to accept employment due to salary or hours OR
4) Graduate is on active military duty OR
5) Graduate is continuing education.

5. Fifth Indicator of Program Effectiveness: Three-year average rate for **graduate surveys** of at least 75% one-year post graduation.

Graduation Year	Graduate Evaluation Ave	Benchmark: 75% or greater evaluation score 3-year average
2014	96%	Met
2015	95.51%	Met
2016	98%	Met
2017	96.32%	Met
3-Year average	96.61 %	Benchmark Met 96.61%

6. Sixth Indicator of Program Effectiveness: Three-year average rate for **employer surveys** of at least 75% one-year post-graduation.

Graduation Year	Employer Evaluation Average	Benchmark: 75% or greater evaluation score 3 year average
2014	98%	Met
2015	96%	Met
2016	97%	Met
2017	95%	Met
3-Year Average	96%	Benchmark Met 96%

Development and Revision of Mission, Goals, and Outcomes:

The program director and faculty will develop and review annually the program's mission statement, goals, outcomes, and assessment procedures. Each of the aforementioned will be reviewed and revised by the Program Advisory Committee.

For more information regarding program effectiveness data, visit the JRCERT website at www.jrcert.org.

Indicators of Measures of Quality

Student Output	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	% Change
Exit scores on national/state licensure (If applicable)	89%	85%	84%	81%	88%	-1.12%
Graduating majors' mean GPA	3.49	3.63	3.61	3.68	3.69	+5.73%
Employment rate of graduates (if available)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Number of students entering graduate/professional programs	1	0	1	1	0	-100%

Describe the extent to which students have achieved current program outcomes during this program review cycle (most recent year). **See Appendix for Program Assessment Plan.**

Each student group has achieved the program outcomes as evidenced by the program retention rate of 84.70% from 2014-2018. This percentage means that 85 students started the program and 72 students graduated from the program within 150% of the stated program length.

The graduates have scored 84.8%/100% for the program average score on the ARRT examination from 2014-2018. The national score average for 2014-2018 was 83.8%

The program five-year average passing rate on the ARRT exam for 2014-2018 was 97.22%, and the national five-year average was 88.6%.

The decrease in program average scores for the national certification exam (ARRT) has a percentage change of -1.12%. The ARRT exam had a revision of the exam content which was implemented in 2017. The new exam has a restructured format that includes an emphasis on digital radiography. The program has purchased new digital x-ray equipment (in 2019) to assist in the instruction and demonstration of digital imaging radiologic techniques with the goal of increased student scored on future ARRT exams.

The percentage of students entering post-graduation education programs has decreased by 100%. This decrease is correlated with the number of graduates who went to work full-time in the professional field (which was 100%) and did not seek further education.

The program is meeting the benchmarks of program effectiveness and program quality.

Describe the extent to which students have achieved current student learning outcomes during this program review cycle (most recent year).

Each student has successfully completed each radiologic technology course with a course grade of 75% "C" or better. Each student has also passed with a 75% "C" or better all of the 71 imaging procedures competencies as required for program graduation.

Please see the 2017-2018 Program Assessment Plan, which is attached as an Appendix.

Indicators of Measures of Quality

If available, provide additional information and/or results of other indicators of quality related to student output such as completer satisfaction surveys, employer satisfaction surveys, stakeholder satisfaction surveys, completion and continuation rates, attrition rates, starting salaries of graduates, etc.

Graduation Year	Percent Job Placement	Number of Students
2014	92%	12 of 13 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation; 1 not actively seeking employment
2015	100%	14 of 14 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation
2016	100%	14 of 14 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation (1/15 employed even though the student did not pass the ARRT exam on the 1st attempt)
2017	100%	13 of 13 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation
2018	100%	15 of 15 graduates employed w/in 12 months of graduation

5-Year average	98.4%	Benchmark Met: 75% Five-year average job placement rate within 12 months of graduation

Graduation Year	Graduate Evaluation Average	Benchmark: 75% or greater evaluation score 3-year average
2014	96%	Met
2015	95.51%	Met
2016	98%	Met
2017	96.32%	Met
3-Year average	96.61 %	Benchmark Met

Graduation Year	Employer Evaluation Average	Benchmark: 75% or greater evaluation score 3-year average
2014	98%	Met
2015	96%	Met
2016	97%	Met
2017	95%	Met
3-Year Average	96%	Benchmark Met

The program has achieved high marks for program retention, graduate program evaluations, and employer evaluations. The program is meeting the employment needs of the north Georgia and southern Tennessee regions.

Describe efforts undertaken to achieve and maintain curricular alignment within the program and currency to the discipline.

The program faculty continually pursues continued education in high-educational teaching methodologies as well as the newest trends in radiological imaging. The faculty has attended seminars on high-impact teaching practices that will serve the rad tech student population by assisting students to be able to be more effective problem-solvers and critical thinkers in the healthcare arena. The faculty is currently studying the newest

imaging procedures involving digital imaging which will facilitate more effective teaching of digital content to the enrolled students.

Indicators of Measures of Viability

Internal Demand for the Program	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	% Change
Number of students enrolled in the degree program	34	34	34	34	34	0%
Number of students who applied to the program (if applicable)	75	75	75	75	75	0%
Number of students admitted to the program (if applicable)	17	17	17	17	18	+5.88%
Percent of classes taught by full-time faculty	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Describe additional details as deemed appropriate.

The program has two cohort groups operating at the same time, one freshman (first-year) cohort and one sophomore (second-year) cohort. Each cohort group is comprised of 17-18 students. The professional field curriculum (AAS degrees) begins in the summer semester and extends for six semesters. The program has 75 slots for applications that begin June 1 and end November 1. Each applicant is required to experience a clinical apprenticeship prior to a program admission interview. Upon evaluation of each applicant's admission points, the 17-18 students with the highest numbers of points are awarded program admission.

Currently, with the change to different pre-rad tech courses required (BIOL 2212, BIOL 2213, ALHT 1130) starting with the entering freshman group of 2018, there have been fewer program applicants in the admission pool as compared to previous years. The faculty anticipate that the new curriculum requirements will become more familiar with DSC students so that they can plan to complete the 32 pre-rad tech courses during their first year at DSC, and, therefore, more student will be ready to apply to the rad tech program and applicant numbers should increase to levels seen previously.

Indicators of Measures of Productivity

Graduation	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	% Change
Number of degrees conferred	13	14	15	15	15	+15.38%
Total student credit hours earned	97	97	97	97	97	0%

Describe any institutional-specific factors impacting time to degree.

There are no factors that prohibit the rad tech majors from completing the pre-rad tech courses in a timely manner so that the students are ready to engage in the admission process of the program. There are many opportunities for day and evening classes for the 32 pre-rad tech course completion.

Evidence of Program Viability

Based on evidence from **ALL** of the above information, data, and analysis, discuss whether continued resources should be devoted to this program. This discussion must be evidence-based. Your comments should consider external factors and address questions such as the following: Are your students getting jobs? What is the job outlook for graduates? Are students prepared for the jobs they get? How is the field changing? Are program faculty members in contact with employers and getting back feedback on graduates' job performance? Do employers state or suggest a need for changes in the program?

The Radiologic Technology program has a 97.18% passing rate (five-year average 2014-2018) on the national certification examination administered by the ARRT (American Registry of Radiologic Technologists), while the national average pass rate for the same five-year period is 88.6%.

The five-year program average score on the ARRT is 84.8%, while the national ARRT average score is 83.8% for the same time period.

The program has a five-year average program completion rate of 83.53% with 102 students starting the program and 72 students graduating.

The program has a five-year average job placement rate of 98.4%.

The graduate program evaluation and employer evaluation 3-year averages are 96.50% and 97%, respectively. Graduate and employer evaluation comments concerning the quality of the educational curriculum and clinical experiences suggested that Dalton State better prepared its graduates to perform radiologic images than did similar programs in the region.

The job outlook for the next five years in radiological imaging is very favorable. The *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics) has predicted for the time period 2016-2026, there will be a 13% increase in available jobs for imaging technologists. This percentage equates to approximately 30,300 new jobs. The median salary for imaging technologists in 2017 was $60,070/year ($20.88/hour).

Overall the program is viable to the college by supporting strategic plan initiatives that provide highly qualified graduates to fill current and projected job vacancies into the future.

Program Strengths and Weaknesses

Based upon this review, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the program?

Strengths:

1. Dedicated and experienced faculty. The program director has a 36 years teaching in radiologic technology education and has had only 2 students fail the national board examination during that time.

2. Dedicated computer usage and space for the program classroom assists students to self-evaluate their weaknesses and strengths in the radiologic curricula.

3. Adequate clinical facilities for student assignments.

4. Dedicated x-ray lab with both conventional and computerized equipment that is used to demonstrate radiologic imaging and positioning techniques.

5. New Sim-Lab in the School of Health Professions building.

6. New equipment (digital imaging x-ray unit) has been approved and installed Fall 2019 to be used in the program laboratory.

Weaknesses and concerns:

1. No concerns noted.

Recommendations for Follow-Up and/or Action Plans (if needed)

Issue/Concern:

The program submitted a budget request for digital imaging equipment in the 2018. The cost was estimated to be $25,000 to include equipment and installation.

Specific action(s):
New digital imaging equipment was approved in 2018 for purchase and installation was scheduled for September 2019.

Expected outcomes:

New digital equipment was purchased and installed in September 2019.

Time frame for achievement: Installation of new equipment in September 2019.

Person(s) responsible: Budgeting personnel

Resources needed: The funds for new digital x-ray equipment were allocated, and the equipment was purchased and installed in September 2019.

Prepared by:

Signature _Susan D. West_ Date: _1/14/2020_

Dean's Approval:

Signature: _Gina M. Kertulis-Tartar_ Date: _01/15/2020_

Approval of the Chair of the DSC Comprehensive Program Review Committee:

Signature: _Marilyn M. Helms_ Date: _1/22/2020_

Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) Categorical Summation:

Check any of the following to categorically describe action(s) the institution will take concerning this program.

☑ Program **MEETS** Institution's Criteria

    ☐ Program is critical to the institutional mission and will be retained.

    ☐ Program is critical to the institutional mission and is growing, or a high demand field, and thus will be enhanced.

☐ Program **DOES NOT MEET** Institution's Criteria for continuation.

    ☐ Program will be placed on monitoring status.

    ☐ Program will undergo substantive curricular revisions.

    ☐ Program will be deactivated.

    ☐ Program will be voluntarily terminated.

    ☐ Other (Please elaborate):

VPAA Signature: _Adrian Epps_ Date: _01/22/2020_

Adrian L. Epps, Ed.D.

Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs

Outcomes Assessment Plan

Dalton State College Radiologic Technology Program

Fall 2017, Spring 2018, and Summer 2018

Goal 1: Students will demonstrate clinical competence.					
Outcome(s)	**Measurement Tool**	**Benchmark**	**Timeframe**	**Responsible Party**	**Results**
1.1 Students will select appropriate technical factors for both standard and digital imaging.	Laboratory Simulation Evaluation (Item 4)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 3	Laboratory Instructor (Clinical Coordinator)	Average: 93 Met Benchmark
	Competency-Based Evaluation (CBE) (Item A.7)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	2nd Year – Semester 5	Laboratory Instructor (Clinical Coordinator)	Average: 94 Met Benchmark
	Student End-Semester Summary Evaluation (Item 6.C)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	2nd Year – Semester 5	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	Average: 98 Met Benchmark
	ARRT Pass rate for graduating class on 1st attempt	Average score of 75% or higher for all students	1 month post-graduation	Program Director, Clinical Coordinator, Lecturer	Average: 100% 15/15 Passed on 1st attempt Met Benchmark
	Graduate/Alumni Survey (Item 9)	Average score of 75% or higher for all students	1 year post-graduation	Program Director	Average: 95.51% Met Benchmark
	Employer-Graduate Survey (Item 2)	Average score of 75% or higher for all students	1 year post-graduation	Program Director	Average: 96% Met Benchmark 2017 Results for 2018 grads June 2019.

1.2 Students will apply appropriate positioning skills.	Laboratory Simulation Evaluation (Item 12)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 3	Laboratory Instructor (Clinical Coordinator)	Average: 93 Met Benchmark
	Competency-Based Evaluation (CBE) (Item A.9)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	2nd Year – Semester 5	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Instructors	Average: 94 Met Benchmark
	Student End-Semester Summary Evaluation (Item 6.B)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	2nd Year – Semester 4	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	Average: 96 Met Benchmark
	Employer-Graduate Survey (Item 11)	Average score of 75% or higher for all students	1 year post-graduation	Program Director	Average: 96% Met Benchmark 2017 Results for 2018 grads June 2019.
1.3 Students will practice/apply appropriate radiation protection.	Laboratory Simulation Evaluation (Item 10)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 1	Laboratory Instructor (Clinical Coordinator)	Average: 93 Met Benchmark
	Competency-Based Evaluation (CBE) (Item A.12)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 2	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Instructors	Average: 94 Met Benchmark
	Student End-Semester Summary Evaluation (Item 6.A)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 2	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	Average: 99 Met Benchmark
	Student End-Clinical Rotation Evaluation (Item 6)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 2	Clinical Instructors	Average: 90 Met Benchmark

	Employer-Graduate Survey (Item 3)	Average score of 75% or higher for all students)	1 year post-graduation	Program Director	Average: 96% Met Benchmark 2017 Results for 2018 grads June 2019.

		Goal #2: Students will demonstrate effective communication skills.			
Outcome(s)	Measurement Tool	Benchmark	Timeframe	Responsible Party	Results
2.1 Students will demonstrate effective written communication skills with patients and healthcare staff.	Laboratory Simulation Evaluation (Item 25)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 2	Laboratory Instructor (Clinical Coordinator)	Average: 93 Met Benchmark
	Competency-Based Evaluation (CBE) (Item A.18)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	2nd Year – Semester 4	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Instructors	Average: 94 Met Benchmark
	Student End-Semester Summary Evaluation (Item 8)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 2	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	Average: 98 Met Benchmark
	Employer-Graduate Survey (Item 4)	Average score of 75% or higher for all students	1 year post-graduation	Program Director	Average: 96% Met Benchmark 2017 Results for 2018 grads June 2019.
2.2 Students will demonstrate effective verbal communication skills with patients and healthcare staff.	Laboratory Simulation Evaluation (Item 25)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 3	Laboratory Instructor (Clinical Coordinator)	Average: 93 Met Benchmark
	Competency-Based Evaluation (CBE) (Item A.6)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	2nd Year – Semester 4	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Instructors	Average: 94 Met Benchmark
	Student End-Semester Summary Evaluation (Item 8)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 3	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	Average: 98 Met Benchmark

COMPREHENSIVE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

	Employer-Graduate Survey (Item 5)	Average score of 75% or higher for all students	1 year post-graduation	Program Director	Average: 96% Met Benchmark 2017 Results for 2018 grads June 2019.
.					

Goal #3: Students will use critical thinking skills.					
Outcome(s)	Measurement Tool	Benchmark	Timeframe	Responsible Party	Results
3.1 Students will demonstrate logical image sequencing for patients with multiple exams.	Laboratory Simulation Evaluation (Item 5)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	2nd Year – Semester 4	Laboratory Instructor (Clinical Coordinator)	Average: 93 Met Benchmark
	Competency-Based Evaluation (CBE) (Item A.16)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 3	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Instructors	Average: 94 Met Benchmark
	Student End-Semester Summary Evaluation (Item 6.B)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	1st Year – Semester 3	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	Average: 98 Met Benchmark
	Employer-Graduate Survey (Item 6)	Average score of 75% or higher for all students	1 year post-graduation	Program Director	Average: 95% Met Benchmark 2017 Results for 2018 grads June 2019.
3.2 Students will evaluate the quality of images.	Competency-Based Evaluation (CBE) (Item B.6)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	2nd Year – Semester 5	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Instructors	Average: 93 Met Benchmark
	Student End-Semester Summary Evaluation (Item 6.C)	Average score of 84% or higher for all students	2nd Year – Semester 5	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	Average: 94 Met Benchmark
	ARRT Examination Class Average Score	Average score of 75% or higher for all students	2 months post-graduation	Program Director	Average: 87.6 Met Benchmark

	Employer-Graduate Survey (Item 7)	Average score of 75% or higher for all students	1 year post-graduation	Program Director	Average: 94% Met Benchmark 2017 Results for 2018 grads June 2019.

Dalton State College