

AMARILLO COLLEGE Planning and Evaluation Tracking (PET)

Academic year 2010-2011

Division of: Allied Health Department of: RADIATION THERAPY

Person Responsible: Bill Crawford, Chairman

Person Responsible: Tony Tackitt, Program Director

Purpose Statement: To provide a comprehensive curriculum, for the Amarillo College Service area and beyond, that will enable each graduate to perform the duties and responsibilities of an entry level radiation therapist.

GOAL 1: Students will display clinical competence.

<i>OUTCOMES: Student Learning Objectives</i>	<i>Measurement Tools</i>	<i>Benchmarks</i>	<i>Time Frames/ Responsible Party*</i> <i>*Note: Time Frames are described with respect to the 5 semesters of program "major" coursework</i>	<i>Results</i>
1.1 Students will demonstrate clinical competence with respect to technical/psychomotor applications.	A. Student Clinical Evaluation performance tool: Part II	≥1.5 student avg. (2.0 scale)	Time Frame: 4 th and 5 th (of 5) clinical semesters Responsible Party: Clinical Supervisor or Program Director	Class of 2008: 4 th Sem: N/A* 5 th Sem: 1.96 Class of 09: 4 th Sem: 1.87 5 th Sem: 1.91
	B. Employer Survey of graduates: Question #3	≥ 3.25 (4.0 scale)	Time Frame: appr. 6 months post graduation Responsible Party: Program Director	Class of 2008: 3.9 Average
1.2 Students will demonstrate general clinical competence.	A. Student Clinical Evaluation performance tool	≥1.5 student avg. (2.0 scale)	Time Frame: 2 nd and 5 th (of 5) clinical semesters Responsible Party: Clinical Supervisor or Program Director	Class of 2008: 4 th Sem: N/A* 5 th Sem: 1.94 Class of 09: 4 th Sem: 1.90 5 th Sem: 1.87
	B. Employer Survey of graduates: Question #19	≥ 3.25 (4.0 scale)	Time Frame: appr. 6 months post graduation Responsible Party: Program Director	Class of 2008: 4.0 Average

GOAL 1: *Data Analysis/ Action Plan*

1.1A 2009 benchmark met.

Note: this is a relatively new measurement tool. While the tool has been in use for quite some time, pulling this particular piece of data is new. The program started collecting data in the fifth semester for the class of 2008.

Continue to Monitor as more data is gathered.

If the trend of ratings of around 1.9 continues, consider raising the benchmark.

Consider adjusting time frames for this benchmark to third and fifth semesters instead of fourth and fifth semesters (previous rationale: prior to the third semester, students only have two days per week in clinic and find it hard to establish consistent clinical skills area the third semester incorporates more clinical time, and evaluating students subsequent to that semester on technical skills has seemed logical.

1.1B 2009: benchmark met.

2008: 3.9

2007: 3.6

Data prior to 2007 not collated in a manner conducive to measuring this new benchmark.

Continue to monitor, consider raising benchmark if a trend higher 3.5 continues.

1.2A 2009 benchmark met.

Note: this is a relatively new measurement tool. While the tool has been in use for quite some time, pulling this particular piece of data is new. The program started collecting data in the fifth semester for the class of 2008.

Continue to Monitor as more data is gathered.

1.2B 2009 benchmark met.

2008: 4.0

2007: 4.0

Data prior to 2007 not collated in a manner conducive to measuring this new benchmark.

Continue to monitor, consider raising benchmark if a trend at or near 4.0 continues.

P. 2 AMARILLO COLLEGE Radiation Therapy PET form

GOAL 2: Students will Understand and Display Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving Skills

OUTCOMES: Student Learning Objectives	Measurement Tools	Benchmarks	Time Frames/ Responsible Party	Results
2.1 Students will exhibit critical thinking and problem solving skills in the clinical environment	A. Student Clinical Evaluation performance tool: Question #12	≥ 1.5 (2.0 scale)	Time Frame: 5 th (of 5) clinical semesters Responsible Party: Clinical Supervisor or Program Director	Class of 2008: 4 th Sem: N/A* 5 th Sem: 1.91 Class of 09: 4 th Sem: 1.91 5 th Sem: 1.93
	B. Employer survey of graduates Question #4	≥ 3.25 (4.0 scale)	Time Frame: 6-12 months post graduation Responsible Party: Program Director	Class of 2008: 3.9 Average
2.2 Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical thinking and problem solving skills in the didactic environment	A. Quiz: RADT 1142 over understanding of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving	$\geq 40\%$ on 50% scale	Time Frame: 2 nd semester of major coursework Responsible Party: Didactic Faculty	Previously used quiz had elements of other competencies included in the quiz. A dedicated quiz for this benchmark will be employed beginning spring semester 2010.
	B. RADT 1142 Homework assignment: submit a Graphic Organizer	≥ 8 on 10 point scale	Time Frame: Responsible Party: Didactic Faculty	No results yet, new outcome measurement tool.

GOAL 2: *Data Analysis/ Action Plan*

2.1A 2009 benchmark met.

Note: this is a relatively new use for this particular measurement tool. The program started collecting data in the fifth semester for the class of 2008.

If the trend of ratings of around 1.9 continues, consider raising the benchmark.

2.1B benchmark met

2008: 3.9

2007: 3.6

Data prior to 2007 not collated in a manner conducive to measuring this new benchmark.

If the trend of ratings of around 3.5 continues, consider raising the benchmark.

2.2A no data yet.

As described in the "Result" section, a new measurement tool dedicated specifically to this outcome will be employed beginning spring semester 2010

2.2B no data yet.

As described in the "Result" section, a new measurement tool dedicated specifically to this outcome will be employed beginning spring semester 2010

GOAL 3: Graduates will be able to Communicate Effectively, both Orally and in Writing.

OUTCOMES: Student Learning Objectives	Measurement Tools	Benchmarks	Time Frames/ Responsible Party	Results
3.1 Students will demonstrate an effective and professional understanding of communication skills/rapport with staff and patients and effectively perform patient education procedures.	A. Student Clinical Evaluation performance tool: Question #2 <hr/> B. Employer survey Question #6	≥1.5 (2.0 scale) <hr/> ≥ 3.25 (4.0 scale)	Time Frame: 3 rd and 5 th (of 5) clinical semesters Responsible Party: Clinical Supervisor or Program Director <hr/> Time Frame: 6-12 months post graduation Responsible Party: Program Director	Class of 2008: 4 th Sem: N/A* 5 th Sem: 1.94 Class of 09: 4 th Sem: 1.94 5 th Sem: 1.99 <hr/> Class of 2008: 4.0 Avg
3.2 Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate ideas and relevant information in writing.	A. Research Article Critique Grade in RADT 1271 (Technology Research) <hr/> B. RADT 1291 Ethics & Law in Radiation Therapy: Activity IC, Module 4: Making and critiquing arguments for and against Physician-Assisted Suicide	≥ 8.5 (10 point scale) Amounts to 10% of course grade <hr/> ≥16 (20 point scale)	Time Frame: 5 th (final) semester of major coursework—RADT 1271 Course Responsible Party: Program Director <hr/> Time Frame: 1 st semester RADT 1291 Course Responsible Party: Course faculty	Class of 2009: 9.4 avg. <hr/> Fall 2009: 21.5 (note: very good writing resulted in bonus points for several students)

GOAL 3: *Data Analysis/ Action Plan*

3.1A 2009 benchmark met.

Note: this is a relatively new use for this particular measurement tool.

The program started collecting data in the fifth semester for the class of 2008.

If the trend of ratings of around 1.9 continues, consider raising the benchmark.

3.1B benchmark met

2008: 4.0

2007: 3.8

Data prior to 2007 not collated in a manner conducive to measuring this new benchmark.

If the trend of ratings of around 3.5 or higher continues, consider raising the benchmark.

3.2A: benchmark met

Class of 2008: 9.6 .

Class of 2007: 9.3;

Class of 2006: 9.9;

Trend is towards scores in excess of 9.0.

Consider raising benchmark

3.2B benchmark met

Note: this is a new measurement tool (data began to be collected fall 2009).

If the trend of high grades continues, consider raising the benchmark.

GOAL 4: Graduates will Demonstrate and Understanding of Professional Growth and Development

<i>OUTCOMES: Student Learning Objectives</i>	<i>Measurement Tools</i>	<i>Benchmarks</i>	<i>Time Frames/ Responsible Party</i>	<i>Results</i>
4.1 The student will demonstrate an understanding of what is meant by “professionalism” with an eye towards developing and instilling professional and individual growth.	A. RADT 1291 Module 3 Activity 1; Assignment-students describing what the Radiation Therapists Code of Ethics means in their own words	≥9 (10 point scale)	<u>Time Frame:</u> 1 st semester RADT 1291 Course <u>Responsible Party:</u> Course faculty	Fall 2009 Class Avg: 9.0
	B. RADT 1271 Radiation Therapy Professional Service Project	≥9 (10 point scale) Amounts to 10% of course grade	<u>Time Frame:</u> Final (5 th) semester RADT 1271 Course <u>Responsible Party:</u> Course faculty	2009: 10.0
	C. RADT 2366: Final Clinical course. 16 hr community service requirement (documented on Clinical competency profile)	Student must complete the community service requirement to successfully complete the final clinical course	<u>Time Frame:</u> Final (5 th) semester RADT 2366 Clinical Course <u>Responsible Party:</u> Program director	Class of 2009: Completed as a requirement for completion of final clinical course
4.2 The student will demonstrate an understanding of the structure of healthcare facilities as well as professional organizations/entities involved in the field of radiation therapy	A. RADT 1401 Quiz: “Hospital Organization and Professional Organizations”	≥8 (10 point scale)	<u>Time Frame:</u> 1 st semester: RADT 1401 Course <u>Responsible Party:</u> Course faculty	2009: no data yet. Previously used quiz had elements of other competencies included in the quiz. A dedicated quiz for this benchmark will be employed beginning spring semester 2010.
	B. RADT 1142 Quiz: “Federal/State Agencies, Professional Organizations”	≥ 40% (0-50% scale)	<u>Time Frame:</u> 2 nd semester RADT 1142 Course <u>Responsible Party:</u> Course faculty	Previously used quiz had elements of other competencies included in the quiz. A dedicated quiz for this benchmark will be employed beginning spring semester 2010.

GOAL 4: *Data Analysis/ Action Plan*

4.1A benchmark met (exactly).

Continue to monitor scores over time.

4.1B 2009: 10.0 benchmark met and exceeded.

2008: 9.8

2007: 8.25

2006; 8.125

Radiation therapy professional service project started in 2006.

Benchmark not met in 2006 and 2007. Trend is towards higher scores. Continue to monitor trends.

Note: The professional service project varies significantly from year to year. This can easily result in a wide variation of scores from one year to the next.

4.1C benchmark met.

The community service requirement is mandatory for completion of the final clinical course, hence graduation. The community service requirement is not graded, merely required. While the requirement is considered an integral part of learning about and acquiring “professional development” with respect to “taking the blinders off” and personal growth and development as it applies to professional development, consider removing this measurement tool and benchmark (with consultation from JRCERT and communities of interest) while retaining the requirement itself,

4.2A No data yet. Previously used quiz had elements of other competencies included in the quiz. A dedicated quiz for this benchmark will be employed beginning spring semester 2010.

4.2B No data yet. Previously used quiz had elements of other competencies included in the quiz. A dedicated quiz for this benchmark will be employed beginning spring semester 2010.

GOAL 5: Program Effectiveness will result in Graduates as Entry-Level Radiation Therapists.

OUTCOMES:	Measurement Tools	Benchmarks	Time Frames/ Responsible Party	Results
5.1 Program Completion Rates will be satisfactory	College data sheets, Program Grade sheets, Graduate Surveys	≥ 80% of students that begin the program (accepted as majors in the program) complete the program.	Time Frame: Data accrued over the previous 5 years Responsible Party: Program Director	2002: 11/13 (Jodi G. Sandy L) 2003: 11/13 (Jack B., John T.) 2004: 11/12 (Audra B) 2005: 10/13 (Stacie M., Nelson, Jana R.) 2006: 8/10 (Heidi, Amy H) 2007: 12/12 2008: 10/10 2009: 9/10 (Takura) Reporting period for JRCERT: 82/93 = 88% Benchmark met. 5 year period: 49/55= 89%
5.2 Program Graduates will express overall satisfaction with the program	Graduate Survey: Question #10	≥ 3.25 (4.0 scale)	Time Frame: Data accrued annually 6-12 months post-graduation Responsible Party: Program Director	Class of 2008: 4.0 Avg
5.3 Employers will express overall satisfaction with the graduates	Employer Survey: Question #20	≥ 3.25 (4.0 scale)	Time Frame: Data accrued annually 6-12 months post-graduation Responsible Party: Program Director	Class of 2008: 4.0 Avg
5.4 Certification Exam pass rates will be satisfactory	ARRT certification Exam 1 st attempt pass rate	≥ 85% pass rate	Time Frame: Over previous 5 year period. Data accrued annually 6-12 months post-graduation Responsible Party: Program Director	(2002: 11/11 2003: 11/11) 2004: 9/ 10 2005: 10/10 2006: 8/8 2007: 11/12 2008: 10/10 5 year TOTAL: 48 /50=96%' JRCERT reporting period total: 70 /72 = 97%

5.5 Employment rates will be satisfactory	College data sheets, Graduate Surveys	≥ 75% within 6 months of graduation <i>(exempting students that continue with their higher education or choose not to seek employment in the field after graduation, or other extenuating circumstances)</i>	<u>Time Frame:</u> Over previous 5 year period. Data accrued annually appx. 6 months post-graduation <u>Responsible Party:</u> Program Director	2004: 9/ 10 2005: 10/11 2006: 8/8 2007: 12/12 2008: 9/10 *2 started as part time TOTAL: 47 /50=94% for 5 year period
5.6 Program Mission/Purpose Statement will be satisfactory	Program Advisory Committee Minutes	Reviewed and accepted or revised at annual Advisory Committee meeting.	<u>Time Frame:</u> Annual, at Advisory Committee Meeting <u>Responsible Party:</u> Advisory Committee/Program Director	Accepted as is, Spring 2009 Advisory Committee Meeting.

GOAL 5: Data Analysis/ Action Plan

5.1 benchmark met.

Consider raising the benchmark in consultation with advisory committee.

Note: the field is currently experiencing a tightening job market. It has been noted in the past that a tighter job market results in higher attrition unless retention. This should be taken into consideration with respect to adjusting the benchmark.

5.2 benchmark met

2008: 4.0

2007: 3.9

Data prior to 2007 not collated in a manner conducive to measuring this new benchmark.

If the trend of ratings of around 3.5 or higher continues, consider raising the benchmark.

5.3 benchmark met

2008: 4.0

2007: 4.0

Data prior to 2007 not collated in a manner conducive to measuring this new benchmark.

If the trend of ratings of around 3.5 or higher continues, consider raising the benchmark.

5.4 benchmark met

Note: the 85% benchmark has been with respect to any individual year, not necessarily a five-year period.

The national average tends to be in the low 80 percentile. Regardless, consider raising benchmark with respect to a five-year period.

5.5 benchmark met.

Employment rates are substantially higher than benchmark. However, the job market has recently tightened considerably.

Consider adjusting the benchmark, however, the program director is currently not in favor of adjusting the benchmark in light of the fluid job market situation.

5.6 benchmark met

The program mission and goals are reviewed annually by the program advisory committee and accepted or recommended for revisions. The program Mission and goals were last revised shortly after the last accreditation cycle.