

Goal 1– Students will demonstrate clinical competence					
Student Learning Outcomes	Measurement Tools – A minimum of 2 measuring tools/assessment methods per student learning outcome is required.	Timeframe – A formative measure used (while students are in the first year of the program), and a summative measure used (when students are close to program completion and/or graduates) is recommended for best practices.	Benchmark Should be a score above passing. Examples are: A percentage score, A score based on a scale, such as a Likert score (include the scale)	Actual Data Results Include the number of students evaluated	Past 3 – 5 years of Data Results – Identify each year's results separately for comparison purposes.
1.1 Students will demonstrate the ability to position patients to produce diagnostic images	Instructor evaluation of student clinical performance (late April-early May of 5 th semester). Procedures Objectives & Technical Skills section, question # 9 [Completes the needed projection and position of the patient with accuracy to best demonstrate the anatomy of interest (angles tube correctly, detents, positions correctly, aligns tube and Bucky, etc.) Semester 5– acceptable image produced 95%+ of the time.]	1st Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	All students will score “Consistently, but not always/A little above Average” or above	a. 25 of 25	2023-2024 16 students scored “Satisfactory” or above. 1 student scored Needs Improvement 2022-2023 15/16 students scored ‘satisfactory’ or above; 1 student scored themselves as ‘Excellent’ but the instructor marked them down to ‘needs improvement’ 2021-2022 17 of 17 scored satisfactory or above 2020-2021 (16 of 16 students scored “Satisfactory” or above)

	RAD 261 clinical lab test	2 nd Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	All students will score a 78% or higher	b. 22 of 22	New tool, data not available
1.2 Students will provide appropriate patient care by responding to patient needs.	Patient Transfer Skill Check	1st Year-fall semester RAD 110 instructor	All students will pass the skills check	a. 25 of 25	New assessment tool; baseline data will be established with the 2025-2026 cohort.
	Instructor evaluation of student clinical performance (late April-early May of 5 th semester). Critical Thinking skills section, question # 1. [Promptly evaluates patient's physical or cognitive limitations which influence how procedures are performed using sound reasoning and judgement and responds appropriately by making needed modifications to communication and/or positioning to safely perform the procedure. Semester 5 – Student can interpret the patient's condition and can respond without guidance from the technologist.]	2nd Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	All students will score "Consistently, but not always/A little above Average" or above	b. 22 of 22	New assessment tool; baseline data will be established with the 2025-2026 cohort.

Student Learning Outcome 1.1

Analysis: The benchmark was met on both current measures. All 25 first-year students met the expected level on the clinical positioning measure, and all 22 second-year students scored 78% or higher on the RAD 261 clinical lab test. Historical clinical-evaluation data also demonstrate consistently strong performance in patient positioning, with nearly all students meeting or exceeding expectations.

Action Plan based on Analysis: Continue the current instructional and clinical approach to positioning. Maintain the RAD 261 clinical lab test as a summative measure and use results to identify any specific positioning skills that require additional practice or remediation.

Results/Improvement(s) noted based on the action plans that were implemented: The newly added RAD 261 clinical lab test provides a more direct, competency-based measure of positioning performance near program completion. The 2025-2026 results establish baseline data for comparison in future assessment cycles.

Re-evaluation Date: Summer 2027

Student Learning Outcome 1.2

Analysis: The benchmark was met for both measures. All 25 first-year students passed the Patient Transfer Skill Check, and all 22 second-year students met or exceeded the expected level on the clinical performance evaluation related to recognizing patient limitations and modifying care appropriately.

Action Plan based on Analysis: Continue early patient-transfer instruction and skills validation, followed by repeated application of patient-care and modification skills in the clinical setting. Reinforce safe transfer techniques and patient-specific adaptations through simulation and clinical feedback.

Results/Improvement(s) noted based on the action plans that were implemented: The Patient Transfer Skill Check provides an early formative measure of patient-care skills, while the clinical evaluation confirms that students can apply these skills with increasing independence by program completion. Current results establish baseline data for the revised assessment plan.

Re-evaluation Date: Summer 2027

Goal 2— Students will learn to think critically and how to apply problem solving strategies

Student Learning Outcomes	Measurement Tools – A minimum of 2 measuring tools/assessment methods per student learning outcome is required.	Timeframe – A formative measure used (while students are in the first year of the program), and a summative measure used (when students are close to program completion and/or graduates) is recommended for best practices.	Benchmark Should be a score above passing. Examples are: A percentage score, A score based on a scale, such as a Likert score (include the scale)	Actual Data Results Include the number of students evaluated	Past 3 – 5 years of Data Results – Identify each year's results separately for comparison purposes.
2.1 Students will demonstrate the ability to modify standard positioning techniques.	Instructor evaluation of student clinical performance (late April-early May of 5 th semester). Critical Thinking skills section, question # 2 [Student is able to formulate equipment modifications based on patient condition and/or ability to safely perform the procedure. Semester 5 – student recognizes the need to modify from routine; student can devise and execute a plan to obtain diagnostic images with little to no coaching]	1st Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	All students will score "Consistently, but not always/A little above Average" or above	a. 25 of 25	2023-2024 14 of 14 students scored Always/Excellent/Above average 2022-2023 2021-2022 (14 of 14 scored consistently but not always/A little above average or above 2020-2021 (18 of 18 students scored "Consistently, but not always/A little above Average" or above) 2019-2020 (9 scored consistently, but not always, 4 consistently, 1 most of the time); 2018-2019 (11 at the level of expectations or above)

	RAD 211 trauma lab test	2nd Year-Fall semester, RAD 211 instructor	All students will score a 78% or higher on the lab test	b. 22 of 22	new assessment tool, data not available
2.2 Students will recognize imaging errors.	RAD 112: Written Test, Spines Question #9 A radiograph of an “AP open-mouth projection of the cervical spine reveals that the zygapophyseal joints are not symmetric. No fracture or subluxation is present. Which one of the following positioning errors most likely led to this radiographic outcome?”	1st Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	At least 80% of students will answer the selected imaging-error question correctly.	a. 23 of 25	New assessment tool, data not available
	Instructor evaluation of student clinical performance (late April-early May of 5 th semester). Procedure Objectives & Technical Skills section, # 20 (Evaluate the completed image for acceptable quality to include: a. Anatomical demonstration b. Alignment c. Radiographic brightness and contrast d. Image identification e. Visibility and correct placement of lead markers f. Visibility of radiation protection such as collimation and shielding).	2nd Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	Students will score “Consistently, but not always/A little above Average” or above	a. 22 of 22	2023-2024 14 of 14 students scored Always/Excellent/Above average 2022-2023 2021-2022 (14 of 14 scored consistently but not always/A little above average or average) 2020-2021 (18 of 18 students scored “Consistently, but not always/A little above Average” or above), 2019-2020 (6 always, 2 consistently, 1 most of the time);

Student Learning Outcome 2.1

Analysis: The benchmark was met on both measures. All 25 first-year students met or exceeded the expected clinical-evaluation level for modifying procedures based on patient condition, and all 22 second-year students scored 78% or higher on the RAD 211 trauma lab test. Historical data also demonstrate strong performance in this area.

Action Plan based on Analysis: Continue to incorporate trauma and non-routine positioning scenarios throughout laboratory and clinical instruction. Use the RAD 211 trauma lab test to evaluate students' ability to recognize when routine positioning is inappropriate and independently develop a safe alternative.

Results/Improvement(s) noted based on the action plans that were implemented: The addition of the RAD 211 trauma lab test strengthens direct assessment of critical thinking and procedure modification. The 2025-2026 cohort met the benchmark and provides baseline data for future comparison.

Re-evaluation Date: Summer 2027

Student Learning Outcome 2.2

Analysis: Students demonstrated strong ability to recognize imaging errors. Twenty-three of 25 first-year students (92%) correctly answered the selected RAD 112 spine image-analysis question, exceeding the 80% benchmark. All 22 second-year students met or exceeded the expected level on the clinical image-evaluation measure. Historical clinical data also show consistently strong performance.

Action Plan based on Analysis: Continue integrating image critique into positioning courses, laboratory activities, and clinical education. Review the selected RAD 112 question with students who miss it and continue emphasizing recognition of positioning errors and the corrective action needed to obtain a diagnostic image.

Results/Improvement(s) noted based on the action plans that were implemented: The addition of a course-based written measure provides earlier assessment of image-error recognition before students reach the summative clinical evaluation. Current results establish baseline data for the new assessment tool.

Re-evaluation Date: Summer 2027

Goal 3— Students will model professionalism.

Student Learning Outcomes	Measurement Tools – A minimum of 2 measuring tools/assessment methods per student learning outcome is required.	Timeframe – A formative measure used (while students are in the first year of the program), and a summative measure used (when students are close to program completion and/or graduates) is recommended for best practices.	Benchmark Should be a score above passing. Examples are: A percentage score, A score based on a scale, such as a Likert score (include the scale)	Actual Data Results Include the number of students evaluated	Past 3 – 5 years of Data Results – Identify each year's results separately for comparison purposes.
3.1 Students will demonstrate professional behaviors.	Instructor evaluation of student clinical performance (late April-early May of 5 th semester), Initiative section, question # 2 [Watches for exams, initiates exams without being told (self-starter)]	1st Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	All students will score "Consistently, but not always/A little above Average" or above	a. 25 of 25	2023-2024 17 of 17 students scored satisfactory or above 2022-2023 15 of 16 students scored satisfactory or above

					2021-2022 17 of 17 students scored satisfactory or above 2020-2021 (16 of 16 students scored "Satisfactory" or above), 2019-2020 (18 satisfactory or above)
	Speed mock interview rubric	2 nd Year Spring Semester, Department Head	All students will earn 30 out of 40 possible points	b. 22 of 22	New assessment tool, data not available
3.2 Students will exhibit a professional and courteous attitude.	Instructor evaluation of student clinical performance (late April-early May of 5 th semester), Professionalism section, question # 2 (Smiles, greets patient and staff, exhibits professional and courteous attitude.).	1st Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	Students will score "Consistently, but not always/A little above Average" or above	a. 25 of 25	New assessment tool, data not available
	Instructor evaluation of student clinical performance (late April-early May of 5 th semester), Professionalism section, question #2 (Smiles, greets patient and staff, exhibits a professional and courteous attitude.)	2nd Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	All students will score "Consistently, but not always/A little above Average" or above.	b. 22 of 22	New assessment tool, data not available

Student Learning Outcome 3.1

Analysis: The benchmark was met on both measures. All 25 first-year students met or exceeded the expected level for initiative and professional behavior in the clinical setting, and all 22 second-year students earned at least 30 of 40 points on the speed mock interview rubric. Historical clinical data also demonstrate consistently strong professional behavior.

Action Plan based on Analysis: Continue reinforcing professional expectations throughout didactic, laboratory, and clinical courses. Maintain the speed mock interview as a summative activity to assess professional presentation, communication, preparedness, and readiness for employment.

Results/Improvement(s) noted based on the action plans that were implemented: The speed mock interview adds a career-readiness component to the assessment of professionalism and provides students with an opportunity to demonstrate professional behaviors in an employment-focused setting. Current results establish baseline data for this new tool.

Re-evaluation Date: Summer 2027

Student Learning Outcome 3.2

Analysis: The benchmark was met. All 25 first-year students demonstrated a professional and courteous attitude at or above the expected level, and all 22 second-year students met or exceeded the expected level on the summative clinical professionalism measure.

Action Plan based on Analysis: Continue to emphasize respectful communication, courtesy, teamwork, and professional conduct in classroom, laboratory, and clinical settings. Clinical faculty and preceptors should continue providing timely feedback when professional behaviors need improvement.

Results/Improvement(s) noted based on the action plans that were implemented: Using the same professionalism behavior across formative and summative clinical evaluations allows the program to monitor development from the first year through program completion. The 2025-2026 results establish baseline data under the revised assessment plan.

Re-evaluation Date: Summer 2027

Goal 4— Students will communicate proficiently.

Student Learning Outcomes	Measurement Tools – A minimum of 2 measuring tools/assessment methods per student learning outcome is required.	Timeframe – A formative measure used (while students are in the first year of the program), and a summative measure used (when students are close to program completion and/or graduates) is recommended for best practices.	Benchmark Should be a score above passing. Examples are: A percentage score, A score based on a scale, such as a Likert score (include the scale)	Actual Data Results Include the number of students evaluated	Past 3 – 5 years of Data Results – Identify each year's results separately for comparison purposes.
4.1 Students will use appropriate oral communication with patients	RAD 112 Spines Lab Test	1st Year-spring semester RAD 112 Instructor	All students will earn 10 points on the patient communication section of the lab grading form	a. 25 of 25	New assessment tool, data not available
	Instructor evaluation of student clinical performance (late April-early May of 5 th semester), communication skills section, question # 7. (Properly instructs and explains procedure to patient during exams, using clear, simple, age appropriate language that is understandable on the patient's level).	2nd Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	All students will score "Consistently, but not always/A little above Average" or above	b. 22 of 22	2023-2024 14 of 14 students scored Always/Excellent/Above average 2022-2023 2021-2022 14 of 14 students scored consistently but not always/ A little above average or above 2020-2021 (17 of 18 students scored "Consistently, but not

					always/A little above Average” or above 1 of 18 students scored “Most of the time/Average”
4.2 Students will accurately collect and document accurate patient history.	RAD 112 Spines Lab Test	1st Year-spring semester RAD 112 Instructor	All students will earn 10 points for “ <i>Patient history and pregnancy status obtained</i> ”	c. 25 of 25	New assessment tool, data not available
	Student performance evaluation, (late April-early May of 2 nd semester) communication skills section, question # 8. (Communicates with professional staff, students, and physicians in written or verbal form using correct terminology, pronunciation, and spelling to describe anatomy, procedures, or directional concepts.).	2nd Year-spring semester Clinical Coordinator	Students will score “Consistently, but not always/A little above Average” or above	22 of 22	2023-2024 14 of 14 students scored Always/Excellent/Above average 2021-2022 14 of 14 students scored consistently but not always/ A little above average 2020-2021 (18 of 18 students scored “Consistently, but not always/A little above Average” or above), 2019-2020 (9 consistently but not always, 8 always, 1 consistently);

Student Learning Outcome 4.1

Analysis: The benchmark was met on both measures. All 25 first-year students earned the required points for patient communication on the RAD 112 Spines Lab Test, and all 22 second-year students met or exceeded the expected level for explaining procedures clearly and appropriately to patients. Historical clinical data also demonstrate consistently strong oral communication.

Action Plan based on Analysis: Continue requiring students to practice patient explanations during laboratory simulations and clinical procedures. Reinforce the use of clear, concise, age-appropriate language and provide remediation when communication is incomplete or not appropriate for the patient.

Results/Improvement(s) noted based on the action plans that were implemented: The RAD 112 lab measure provides an early, direct assessment of patient communication before students are evaluated summatively in the clinical setting. Current results establish baseline data for the new formative tool.

Re-evaluation Date: Summer 2027

Student Learning Outcome 4.2

Analysis: The benchmark was met on both measures. All 25 first-year students earned the required points for obtaining patient history and pregnancy status on the RAD 112 Spines Lab Test, and all 22 second-year students met or exceeded the expected clinical communication level when using appropriate terminology to communicate patient and procedural information.

Action Plan based on Analysis: Continue emphasizing complete and accurate patient histories, pregnancy screening when appropriate, and correct medical and radiographic terminology. Incorporate patient-history collection into laboratory scenarios and reinforce documentation and communication expectations during clinical education.

Results/Improvement(s) noted based on the action plans that were implemented: The RAD 112 lab measure provides an early structured assessment of patient-history collection, while the clinical evaluation measures students' ability to communicate accurately in the professional environment. Current results establish baseline data for the revised assessment approach.

Re-evaluation Date: Summer 2027

Updated: September 22, 2025

Program Effectiveness Measures- class of 2025				
OUTCOME	MEASUREMENT TOOL	BENCHMARK	TIMEFRAME/ RESPONSIBLE PARTY	analysis
1. Students will achieve a passing score on the ARRT certification exam.	a. Scoring results from the ARRT	a. graduates will obtain a scaled score of 75 or higher on the ARRT certification examination.	a. within 6 months' post-graduation Program Director	Class of 2025 14/14= 100% 1 student waited a year to test and was unsuccessful. We are not required to report this as a failed attempt
2. Enrolled students will complete the program within 150% of the stated program length. (Program length is 5 semesters).	a. Datatel student records	a. students will complete within 150% of stated program length. Program start date is November 1 st of their first semester.	a. 150% of the stated program length. (Program length is 5 semesters). Program Director	2 students dismissed before 11/1 due to failing a lab test 3 times. 1 student dismissed in their 1 st spring semester for failing a lab test 3 times. 1 student withdrew to go into US 1 student withdrew for personal reasons 17/18= 84.4%
3. Students who are seeking employment will be employed within 12 months of graduation	a. Graduate survey	a. graduates will have at least PRN employment or will continue their education.	a. 12 months' post-graduation Program Director	100% pass rate- see job placement chart
4. Graduates will be satisfied with the quality of their radiography education.	a. Graduate survey	a. graduates will be satisfied with the quality of their education.	a. 6 months' post-graduation Program Director	All graduates report they are satisfied with their education.
5. Employers will be satisfied with the performance of the program's graduates.	a. employer survey	a. employers will be satisfied with the performance of the program's graduates.	a. 12 months after graduation Program Director	Employers who responded all indicated they are satisfied