

PET FORM  
Planning and Evaluation Tracking  
(2012-2013 Assessment Period)

Division of: **Allied Health**

Person Responsible for this Division: **Mark Rowh**

Department of: **Radiation Therapy**

Primary Person Responsible for this Form: **Tony Tackitt, Program Director**

Purpose Statement (With Last Updated Date): 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.

**NOTE:** The majority of the goals/outcomes on this PET form are from the Strategic Plan's Strategy 1.1, Task 1.1.1.

---

**Goal Statement #1: Students will display clinical competence** (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).

**Outcome/Objective Statement #1**

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

**1A)** (Original Number: 1.1A)

In the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> semesters (of 5 clinical semesters), students will demonstrate clinical competence with respect to technical/psychomotor applications by scoring equal or greater to a 1.5 student average (2.0 scale) as evaluated by the student Clinical Evaluation performance tool: Part II (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Task 1.1.1).

**1B)** (Original Number: 1.1B)

Approximately 6 months post-graduation, students will demonstrate clinical competence with respect to technical/psychomotor applications by being evaluated at equal or greater to a 3.25 average (4.0 scale) as evaluated by the Employer Survey of graduates: Question #3.

**1C)** (Original Number: 1.2A)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> semesters (of 5 clinical semesters), students will demonstrate general clinical competence by scoring equal or greater to a 1.5 student average (2.0 scale) as evaluated by the student Clinical Evaluation performance tool.

**1D)** (Original Number: 1.2B)

Approximately 6 months past graduation, students will demonstrate general clinical competence by scoring equal or greater to a 3.25 average (4.0 scale) as evaluated by the Employer Survey of graduates: Question #19.

• Results (If Applicable, Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)

**1A)** (1.1A)

Class of 2011:

4<sup>th</sup> Sem: 1.82

5<sup>th</sup> Sem: 1.94

**1B)** (1.1B)

Class of 2011:

3.70 Average

**1C)** (1.2A)

Class of 2011:

4<sup>th</sup> Sem: 1.88

5<sup>th</sup> Sem: 1.92

1D) (1.2B)

Class of 2011:

4.0 Average

- Analysis

- Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis

(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):

Outcome statement time frames are described with respect to the 5 semesters of program “major” coursework.

1A (1.1A)      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.

1B (1.1B)      benchmark met.

1C (1.2A)      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.

1D (1.2B)      benchmark met.

- Improvements

- List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year: Successfully meeting benchmark so no new improvements were made.
- Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful: N/A
- What Budget Implications Were Involved with this Improvement? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): N/A

- Recommendations/Actions for 2012-2013

- Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?): Program Director and Program Advisory Committee
  - Action Plan: Continue to monitor and consider raising benchmarks. Raising benchmarks is subject to approval by the Program Advisory Committee.
  - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date): Meet annually.
  - What Budget Implications Are Involved with this Action? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): None.
-

## Goal Statement #2:

**Students will Understand and Display Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving Skills.**

### Outcome/Objective Statement #2

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

**2A)** (Original Number: 2.1A)

In the 5<sup>th</sup> semester (of 5 clinical semesters), students will exhibit critical thinking and problem solving skills in the clinical environment by scoring equal or greater to a 1.5 student average (2.0 scale) as evaluated by the Student Clinical Evaluation Performance tool: Question #12 .

**2B)** (Original Number: 2.1B)

Approximately 6-12 months post-graduation, students will exhibit critical thinking and problem solving skills in the clinical environment by being evaluated as equal or greater to a 3.25 average (4.0 scale) on the Employer Survey of graduates: Question #4.

**2C)** (Original Number: 2.2A)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester of major coursework, students will demonstrate an understanding of critical thinking and problem solving skills in the didactic environment by scoring equal or greater to 40% on a 50% scale as evaluated by the RADT 1142 Quiz over understanding of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving.

**2D)** (Original Number: 2.2B)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester of major coursework, students will demonstrate an understanding of critical thinking and problem solving skills in the didactic environment by scoring equal or greater to 8 on a 10 point scale as evaluated by the RADT 1142 Homework assignment: submit a Graphic Organizer.

- Results (If Applicable, Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)

**2A)** (2.1A)

Class of 2011:

4<sup>th</sup> Sem: 1.90

5<sup>th</sup> Sem: 1.90

**2B)** (2.1B)

Class of 2011:

4.0 Average

**2C)** (2.2A)

**2011 Quiz grade class avg.** 40% on 50% scale

**2D)** (2.2B)

**2011 class average:** 7pts on 10 pt scale

- Analysis

- Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis

(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):

Outcome statement time frames are described with respect to the 5 semesters of program “major” coursework.

**2A)** (2.1A) 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.

**2B) (2.1B)** benchmark met.

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

**2C) (2.2A)** benchmark met.

Grades were at the very low end of the benchmark.

**2D) (2.2B)** benchmark not met.

- **Improvements**

- List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year:  
2C (2.2A) and 2D (2.2B): A graphic organizer project and quiz were developed and given to students to ensure that students demonstrate an understanding of critical thinking and problem solving skills in a didactic environment.
- Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful: Successful – Students scored at the low end of the benchmark on the RADT 1142 Quiz dealing with Critical Thinking/Problem Solving and did not meet the benchmark for the RADT 1142 graphic organizer. As a result of these findings, future improvements can be made. Faculty was left with the impression that the concepts behind critical thinking were simply not emphasized in class. In 2012, faculty emphasized the critical thinking component of the RADT 1142 course, and resultant artifact grades showed significant improvement (this will be reflected in the next PET form submission data). 2012 Grades on quiz was an average of 97.6% (9.8 on 10.0 scale), and grades on graphic organizer example were an average of 100% (10 on a 10 scale). Benchmark met.
- What Budget Implications Were Involved with this Improvement? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): Not applicable.

- **Recommendations/Actions for 2012-2013**

- Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):  
T. Tackitt
- Action Plan: For Outcomes 2C (2.2A) and 2D (2.2B), emphasize this information more in class the next academic year. Use course data to gauge whether new teaching techniques led to increased thinking and skill development.
- Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date): 2012-2013.
- What Budget Implications Are Involved with this Action? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): None

---

**Goal Statement #3: Graduates will be able to Communicate Effectively, both Orally and in Writing.**

**Outcome/Objective Statement #3A**

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

**3A)** (Original Number: 3.1A)

In the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> semester (of 5 clinical semesters), students will demonstrate an effective and professional understanding of communication skills/rapport with staff and patients and effectively perform patient education procedures by scoring equal or greater to a 1.5 student average (2.0 scale) as evaluated by the Student Clinical Evaluation Performance tool: Question #2 .

**3B)** (Original Number: 3.1B)

Approximately 6-12 months post-graduation, students will demonstrate an effective and professional understanding of communication skills/rapport with staff and patients and effectively perform patient education procedures by being evaluated at equal or greater to 3.25 (4.0 scale) on the Employer survey Question #6.

**3C) (Original Number: 3.2A)**

In the 5<sup>th</sup> (final) semester of major coursework (RADT 1271 course), students will demonstrate the ability to communicate ideas and relevant information in writing by scoring equal or greater to 8.5 (10 point scale; amounts to 10% of course grade) as evaluated by the Research Article Critique Grade in RADT 1271 (Technology Research).

**3D) (Original Number: 3.2B)**

In the 1<sup>st</sup> semester RADT 1291 Course, students will demonstrate the ability to communicate ideas and relevant information in writing by scoring equal or greater to 16 (20 point scale) on the RADT 1291 Ethics & Law in Radiation Therapy: Activity IC, Module 4: Making and critiquing arguments for and against Physician-Assisted Suicide.

- Results (If Applicable, Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)

**3A) (3.1A)**

Class of 2011:

4<sup>th</sup> Sem: 1.91

5<sup>th</sup> Sem: 1.94

**3B) (3.1B)**

Class of 2011:

4.0 Avg

**3C) (3.2A)**

Class of 2011:

8.8 avg.

**3D) (3.2B)**

Fall 2011: 19.8

- Analysis

- Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis

(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):

Outcome statement time frames are described with respect to the 5 semesters of program "major" coursework.

**3A) (3.1A)** 2011 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.

**3B) (3.1B)** benchmark met.

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

**3C) (3.2A)** benchmark met.

Trend is towards scores in excess of 9.0.

**3D) (3.2B)** benchmark met.

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

Note: very good writing resulted in bonus points for several students

- Improvements

- List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year: Successfully meeting benchmark so no new improvements were made.

- Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful: [N/A](#)
  - What Budget Implications Were Involved with this Improvement? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): [N/A](#)
  - Recommendations/Actions for 2012-2013
    - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?): [Program Director and Program Advisory Committee](#)
    - Action Plan: [Continue to monitor and consider raising benchmarks](#). Raising benchmarks is subject to approval by the [Program Advisory Committee](#).
    - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date): [Meet annually](#).
    - What Budget Implications Are Involved with this Action? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): [None](#).
- 

**Goal Statement #4: [Graduates will Demonstrate and Understanding of Professional Growth and Development.](#)**

**Outcome/Objective Statement #4A**

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

**4A)** (Original Number: 4.1A)

In the 1<sup>st</sup> semester RADT 1291 course, students will demonstrate an understanding of what is meant by “professionalism” with an eye towards developing and instilling professional and individual growth by scoring equal or greater to 9 (10 point scale) as evaluated on the RADT 1291 Module 3 Activity 1; Assignment-students describing what the Radiation Therapists Code of Ethics means in their own words.

**4B)** (Original Number: 4.1B)

In the final (5<sup>th</sup>) semester RADT 1271 course, students will demonstrate an understanding of what is meant by “professionalism” with an eye towards developing and instilling professional and individual growth by scoring equal or greater to 9 (10 point scale; 10% of grade) as evaluated by the RADT 1271 Radiation Therapy Professional Service Project.

**4C)** (Original Number: 4.1C)

In the final (5<sup>th</sup>) semester RADT 2366 course, students will demonstrate an understanding of what is meant by “professionalism” with an eye towards developing and instilling professional and individual growth by completing the community service requirement in order to successfully complete the final clinical course as evaluated by completing the 16 hr community service requirement (documented on Clinical competency profile).

**4D)** (Original Number: 4.2A)

In the 1<sup>st</sup> semester RADT 1401 Course, students will demonstrate an understanding of the structure of healthcare facilities as well as professional organizations/entities involved in the field of radiation therapy by scoring equal or greater to 8 (10 point scale) as evaluated by the RADT 1401 Quiz: “Hospital Organization and Professional Organizations”.

**4E)** (Original Number: 4.2B)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester RADT 1142 Course, students will demonstrate an understanding of the structure of healthcare facilities as well as professional organizations/entities involved in the field of radiation therapy by scoring equal or greater to 40% (0-50% scale) as evaluated by the RADT 1142 Quiz: “Federal/State Agencies, Professional Organizations”.

- Results (If Applicable, Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)

**4A)** (4.1A)

Fall 2011:

Class Avg: 9.4

**4B)** (4.1B)

**2011:**

10.0

**4C)** (4.1C)

**Class of 2011:**

Completed as a requirement for completion of final clinical course.

**4D)** (4.2A)

**Class of 2011:**

Class Average = 8.8

**4E)** (4.2B)

**Class of 2011:**

44% on 50% scale

- **Analysis**

- Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis  
(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):  
Outcome statement time frames are described with respect to the 5 semesters of program “major” coursework.

**4A)** (4.1A) benchmark met (exactly).

**4B)** (4.1B) 2011 benchmark met and exceeded.

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

Radiation therapy professional service project started in 2006.

Benchmark not met in 2006 and 2007. Trend is towards higher scores.

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.

**4C)** (4.1C) benchmark met.

The community service requirement is mandatory for completion of the final clinical course, hence graduation.

**4D)** (4.2A) benchmark met.

This is a new item that started in 2010.

**4E)** (4.2B) benchmark met.

This is a new item that started in 2010.

- **Improvements**

- List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year:  
**4D)** (4.2A) and **4E)** (4.2B): Quizzes were developed and given to students and data was collected to ensure that students demonstrate an understanding of healthcare facilities as well as professional organizations/entities involved in the field of radiation therapy.
- Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful: Preliminary Findings Deemed Successful – Students seem to be successfully proving their understanding of healthcare facilities and professional

organizations/entities involved in the field of radiation, but results will be monitored for a few more years.

- What Budget Implications Were Involved with this Improvement? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): **None.**

- **Recommendations/Actions for 2012-2013**

- Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):  
**T. Tackitt, JRCERT, and communities of interest.**
- Action Plan:  
**4C) (4.1C) – 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.**
- Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date): **Measurement tool will be reevaluated during the 2012-2013 year.**
- What Budget Implications Are Involved with this Action? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): **None.**

---

**Goal Statement #5: Program Effectiveness will result in Graduates as Entry-Level Radiation Therapists.**

**Outcome/Objective Statement #5A**

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

**5A) (Original Number: 5.1)**

In the past five years, program completion rates will be satisfactory as demonstrated by 80% or more of students that begin the program (accepted as majors in the program) completing the program as evaluated by college data sheets, program grade sheets, and graduate surveys (No Excuses: Goal V).

**5B) (Original Number: 5.2)**

6-12 months post-graduation, program graduates will express overall satisfaction with the program by rating their experience at an average of 3.25 or greater (4.0 scale) as evaluated by the Graduate Survey: Question #10.

**5C) (Original Number: 5.3)**

6-12 months post-graduation, employers will express overall satisfaction with AC students by rating the students at an average of 3.25 or greater (4.0 scale) on the Employer Survey: Question #20.

**5D) (Original Number: 5.4)**

Over a five year period (data accrued 6-12 months post-graduation), certification exam pass rates will be satisfactory as demonstrated by a pass rate equal or greater to 85% over a 5 year period as evaluated by the ARRT certification exam 1<sup>st</sup> attempt pass rate.

**5E) (Original Number: 5.5)**

Over a five year period (data accrued 6-12 months post-graduation), employment rates will be satisfactory as demonstrated by an 85% pass rate or higher over a 5 year period as evaluated by the ARRT certification exam 1<sup>st</sup> attempt pass rate.

**5F) (Original Number: 5.6)**



Upon the completion of the annual advisory committee meeting, the program mission/purpose statement will be revised as necessary and will be deemed as satisfactory within the program advisory committee minutes.

- Results (If Applicable, Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)

- 5A) (5.1)**

- 2007: 12/12

- 2008: 10/10

- 2009: 9/10 (Takura)

- 2010: 8/9 (John B.)

- 2011: 7/9 (Bob H, Amy G.)

- Reporting period for JRCERT: 46/50 = 92%

- 5B) (5.2)**

- Class of 2011:**

- 4.0 Avg

- 5C) (5.3)**

- Class of 2011:**

- 4.0 Avg

- 5D) (5.4)**

- Class of 2011:**

- 2007: 11/12 (Tho T)

- 2008: 10/10

- 2009: 8/9 (Jennifer W)

- 2010: 6/8 (Jaslyn, Kristen)

- 2011: 7/7

- 5 year TOTAL: 42 /46 = 91%

- 5E) (5.5)**

- Class of 2011:**

- 2007: 12/12

- 2008: 9/10

- 2009: 9/9

- 2010: 5/8

- 2011: 6/7

- TOTAL: 41 /46=89% for 5 year period

- 5F) (5.6)**

- Class of 2011:**

- Accepted as is, Spring 2009 Advisory Committee Meeting.

- Analysis

- Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis

- (Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):

Outcome statement time frames are described with respect to the 5 semesters of program “major” coursework.

**5A) (5.1)** benchmark met

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.

**5B) (5.2)** benchmark met.

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

**5C) (5.3)** benchmark met.

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

**5D) (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.

**5E) (5.5)** benchmark met.

Employment rates are 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.

**5F) (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.

- **Improvements**

- List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year: *Successfully meeting benchmark so no new improvements were made.*
- Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful: *N/A*
- What Budget Implications Were Involved with this Improvement? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): *N/A*

- **Recommendations/Actions for 2012-2013**

- Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?): *Program Director and Program Advisory Committee*
  - Action Plan: *Continue to monitor and consider raising benchmarks. Raising benchmarks is subject to approval by the Program Advisory Committee.*
  - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date): *Meet annually.*
  - What Budget Implications Are Involved with this Action? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details): *Done.*
-