

# **Administrative Response**

## **Radiography Program Review**

### **December 2nd, 2011**

We thank you for your tireless dedication to your profession, students and the community as you've created, maintained and improved the outstanding quality of The Radiography Program. Your program has a proud history reaching back to 1969, providing excellent educational services to your students during the 42 years since opening, while meeting the training/employment needs of health care employers in the district.

Also, we thank you for a thoughtful, extremely well organized review addressing the vast majority of the items noted in the Program Review guidelines. Your presentations were also thoughtful, thorough and well organized.

This response contains 4 sections: 1) Commendations, 2) suggestions/observations, 3) response to recommendations/areas of SAC needs, and, 4) Closing comments.

#### **Commendations**

- JRCERT Accredited, based on compliance with the 9 Standards
- Community affiliates, which include 12 hospitals, satellite clinics and 4 large metropolitan free standing clinics
- Clear and concise statement of Program Mission and Goals
- Documented assessment driven changes to RAD 203 and RAD 105 for Communication and Critical thinking and Problem Solving core outcomes respectively
- Clear and Concise mapping of Outcomes to Core Outcomes
- Use of hybrid design in RAD 100 and RAD 105
- Close adherence to national curriculum developed by ASRT, resulting in the development of RAD 203
- Use of inquiry based learning for both didactic and clinical courses
- Making use of the Health Admissions Office to offer Informational Sessions at all campuses
- Use of on-line course, "Exploring the Health Professions"
- A very active Advisory Committee which includes student representatives
- Use of Advisory Committee to interview applicants
- Use of End of 4<sup>th</sup> Term Self-Evaluation
- Use of Program Exit Survey and Graduate Survey
- Industry donation of equipment (mobile fluoroscopy machine (C-arm))
- The inclusion of more 'role playing and student practice in critical thinking' based on outcomes assessment
- Shared use of simulation lab with Nursing

- Professional development activities including the writing of and contributions to textbooks, articles
- Excellent working relationship with Financial Aid, particularly Clarice Anderson, on behalf of your students
- Use of Google Documents (noted words of appreciation to Andy Freed for his help setting this up) for tracking student in clinical settings including charts to track “Reject Analysis” which leads to course adjustments. This, also, has proven to be a Green initiative through the savings in paper, time and the transporting of hard copy forms from clinical to campus
- Required use of Library for RAD 122, RAD 203 and RAD 211
- Student tutoring by: 1) instructors, 2) peer tutors, and 3) Student Success office
- Extremely high completion rates on the ARRT exam

### **Suggestions/Observations**

Assessment was identified as an area of focus for PCC during our very recent accreditation visit, and the April 2010 Interim Accreditation Report noted that: *PCC must document “progress in demonstrating, through regular and systematic assessment, that students who complete their programs have achieved the intended learning outcomes of degrees and certificates. Further, the college must begin to demonstrate, in a regular and systematic fashion, how the assessment of student learning leads to the improvement of teaching and learning.”*

We applaud you for the integration of Google Docs in the treatment of assessment of outcomes which has enabled real time viewing of results for students, clinical supervisors, and department faculty. As noted by Kendra Cawley, your Assessment Plan, with the course outcomes mapped clearly to the core outcomes, and including benchmarks, is excellent and has been used as a model for others. We also appreciate and acknowledge extensive use of the data gathered to adjust your courses and program, as shared in the program review presentation. In future program reviews, it would be helpful to provide a little more detail assessment tools and results, as well as somewhat more specific connections between student assessment and program changes. Some of this was included in the annual assessment report submitted June 2011, and could have meaningfully been included here as well, possibly as appendices. Without more information, it is hard to understand the meaning of an average score of “4.8” , or to understand how improvements could be made to teaching and learning based on these assessment results. While these were explained very well in the presentation, a written record provides stronger evidence of the good assessment work that is done in the Radiography program.

In future program reviews, please do include all of the sections from the Program Review Outline. In this report, Section 6, with questions specific to CTE Programs, was not included (though some of the information appeared in other sections, such as information about the program outcomes and their assessment and a copy of advisory committee minutes). Also, in Section 2, SACs are asked to revisit the Core Outcomes Mapping Matrix for your SAC and update as appropriate. We would like to keep this information updated as much as possible. RAD’s matrix is posted at <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/core-outcomes/rad.html>. For assistance, contact Scott McBeth at x4555 or [scott.mcbeth@pcc.edu](mailto:scott.mcbeth@pcc.edu)).

Note was made of the once a year, two hour training your provide for purposes of Continuing Education. If it would be of any value to document participation in this through PCC, I suggest you contact Dorinda Gustafson, Instructional Administrative Assistant in the Math and Industrial Technology Division at Sylvania as she has had extensive experience creating the necessary paperwork for official CEU offerings. She can be reached at X-4373 or [dgustafs@pcc.edu](mailto:dgustafs@pcc.edu).

Your use of Google Doc is, indeed an innovation which should be shared with others. We suggest you contact Greg Rapp, Business Faculty at Sylvania and co-chair of PEAK, as that group may be interested in learning about your successes and once having done so, may be able to help spread the word regarding its many benefits. He can be reached at X4897 or [grapp@pcc.edu](mailto:grapp@pcc.edu).

### **Recommendations/areas of SAC needs**

1. Include additional data for teaching and learning assessment. We should determine if current tools include enough of the criteria that measure success/failure. The Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Sciences has recommended that programs use different tools and measure different outcomes from time to time to better assess all areas of their curriculum and training.

*We applaud your for considering this. And, as you know accreditation requirements continue to focus on the assessment, course/program modifications, learning cycle for our students. As you explore this option and consider including new outcomes and measurements, we urge that you document it through your SAC and as appropriate, making official changes through the Curriculum Committee and/or Degrees and Certificates Committee.*

2. Due to the Program's structure, faculty experience a high degree of autonomy. More group discussion on course materials, test questions and student portfolios should occur to be sure the Program is truly measuring student learning in a consistent and appropriate manner. The SAC should continue to hold monthly meetings as well as the scheduled College Sac meetings to foster this collaborative effort.

*We applaud you for noting this and taking the necessary steps to implement it.*

3. The small number of faculty teaching in the Program may be a detriment in the event of an extended absence of any member. It is important to pursue the hiring of additional part-time faculty to both learn the courses of the Program but also to fill-in for absent instructors.

*Again, we applaud you for your forward thinking on this. We support this proposal/plan. As suggested during your presentation, we suggest you engage your Advisory Committee as you search for more Part Time Faculty.*

4. Without the financial assistance from the Bond Measure, the Program cannot afford to replace the antiquated energized equipment in the lab. We recommend that the Bond project team consider our lab as being a project that could be moved forward on their list when the HT building is on-line for improvements.

*Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Bond projects in the HT building have reached 50% schematic design and are currently being priced. As we move forward with finalizing the design, it will be important to have specifications for the equipment needed, as well as modifications to your facilities to accommodate said equipment. If you haven't already, please obtain this information and provide copies for your Division Dean to have at the ready for when design conversations and budgeting happens.*

## **Closing Comments**

It was immediately obvious to us that you take great pride in this program and have dedicated countless hours to continuously improve your offerings. We applaud you for the many hours this has taken. We commend you for the use of multiple forms of assessments which are routinely used to make program adjustments while addressing student needs.

In closing, we want to thank you for a very thoughtful, well organized written Program Review and engaging presentation.

Administrative Response submitted by Jeff S. Triplett on behalf of the Deans of Instruction.

Birgitte Ryslinge  
Jeff Triplett  
Julie Kopet  
Scott Huff  
Kendra Cawley