

Meeting called by	Rendy Petrin, Program Director
Type of meeting	Radiology Team Meeting
Facilitator	Rendy Petrin, Program Director
Note taker	Rendy Petrin, Program Director

Attendees: Rendy Petrin Program Director, Coleen Kubetschek Clinical Coordinator, Michael McNiskin Program Coordinator
Please read: Agenda

Agenda Items

	Presenter	Time allotted
1. Class of 2025 Program Evaluation	Rendy	5 min
2. Hurricane Readiness	All	5 min
3. Adjunct Faculty	All	5 min
4. Career Day at Phys Reg	Rendy/Coleen	5 min
5. Annual Program Goals and Assessment	Rendy	5 min
6. JRCERT Program Effectiveness	Rendy	5 min
7. SWOT of Program	Rendy	10 min
8. Ribbon Cutting	Rendy	5 min
9. Lab Rules	All	5 min
10. Syllabi Review	All	5 min
11. ARRT Pass Rate	All	5 min
12. Dosimeters for new labs	All	10 min

Discussion

- The class of 2025 program evaluation by graduates was completed (see attached). There were 20 respondents and overall program effectiveness ranked a 4.65 out of 5.0. The lowest scores were "Appropriateness of textbook and other material" at 3.75 and "Helpfulness and ability of staff radiographers" at 3.88. Both items are being reviewed.
 - Follow-up: All staff to update course material to match current information on ARRT exam
- All staff have reviewed the hurricane preparedness information
 - Follow-up: None, all staff are prepared
- New adjunct faculty member Jonelle Cortina is scheduled to begin August 11th. She will be teaching the Radiologic Science Principles class and Mike will help orient her to PowerPoint as well as ordering a book for her.
 - Follow-up: **Mike** to finalize PowerPoints and meet with Jonell prior to August 25th start date.
- Rendy and Coleen will present at Physician Regional Career Day tomorrow July 23rd. They will also take information for the respiratory care program.
 - Follow-up: None, FYI only
- Annual program effectiveness plan and goals for 2024 – 2025 is being reviewed by Rendy who finalize the

results by the end of the August 31st due date. New 2025 – 2026 effectiveness plan will be developed by September 30th due date.

- a. Follow-up: **Rendy** to complete all.
6. JRCERT annual effectiveness plan is also due by October 10th which Rendy is working on
 - a. Team will review the Student Learning Objectives and effectiveness data that was developed prior
 - b. Follow-up: **Rendy** to complete and review with Dean prior to submission
7. A SWOT analysis of the program was developed and shared with staff. Will focus on ways to mitigate weaknesses and ways to optimize strengths and opportunities.
 - a. Follow-up: **Rendy** to review SWOT with Dean at next meeting and staff will use this as a template for improvements throughout the year.
8. Ribbon cutting ceremony for the new energized lab is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday September 3rd. Marketing with FSW and Canon will work together
 - a. Follow-up: Date to be finalized by the Dean and then marketing plan will move forward.
9. Mike has developed some “Rules” for the students utilizing the new energized lab area. No students will be allowed in this area without a staff member present. Rules will be shared with the Dean once finalized.
 - a. Rendy is also working on a safety lock box to surround the exposure switches to prevent accidental exposure of individuals.
 - b. Follow-up: **Mike** to present finalized version to Rendy for review.
10. Syllabi are all being reviewed and corrections made. Rendy will meet with Dr. Harris and curriculum committee later this year to make necessary changes in syllabi and course catalog.
 - a. Follow-up: **Rendy** to meet with Dr. Harris in August.
11. ARRT pass rate shows that so far 18 of the 22 graduates have taken the exam and all have passed.
 - a. Follow-up: FYI only

Meeting adjourned at 10:00am

Radiologic Technology Program Student Evaluation Class of 2025

n=20

	5 = Excellent	4 = Good	3 = Fair	2 = Poor	1 = Unacceptable	Average
Didactic (classroom) portion						
1 Amt and practicality of required courses	15	4	1	0	0	4.70
2 Quality and thoroughness of class instruction	14	5	1			4.65
3 Availability of instructors outside of class time	14	4	1.5	0.5		4.58
4 Organization of classes	14	5	1			4.65
5 Appropriateness of textbook and other material	3	10	6	1		3.75
6 Appropriateness of tests and quizzes	12	7	1			4.55
7 Consistency of classroom instruction	14	5	1			4.65
8 Timely and constructive instructor feedback	15	4	1			4.70
9 Quality and quantity of educational resources	15	3	2			4.65
10 Appropriateness and effectiveness of labs	14	3	2	1		4.50
11 Appropriateness and effectiveness of student advising and counseling	11	5	2	2		4.25
12 Overall effectiveness of academic portion of the program	13	6	1			4.60
Clinical Portion						
13 Availability and technical ability of the Clinical Coordinator	14.5	5.5				4.73
14 Availability and technical ability of the Clinical Instructor	12	7	1			4.55
15 Organization of clinical internship	12	7	1			4.55
16 Communication between clinical faculty (CC and CI) and student	10	9	1			4.45
17 Helpfulness and ability of staff radiographers	5	7.5	7.5			3.88
18 Amount of time spent in clinical	13	4	3			4.50
19 Use of rotations outside of diagnostic radiography	12	5	2	1		4.40
20 Length of rotations or room assignments	12	6	2			4.50
21 Variety of clinical experiences	15	4	1			4.70
22 Overall effectiveness of clinical program	16	3	1			4.75
Overall Program						
23 Effectiveness of program policies	13	6	1			4.60
24 Enforcement of program policies	14	4	2			4.60
25 Program's willingness to listen and incorporate student suggestions	10	7	1.5	0.5	1	4.23
26 Effectiveness and leadership of program administration	13	5	2			4.55
27 Availability and communication with Program Director	14	3	2	1		4.50
28 Overall effectiveness of program	14	5	1			4.65

Positive Comments

Mike was a great addition

Program is good, wouldn't change anything

Program faculty and staff has been great

Program faculty always there for questions/concerns, great communication throughout the 2 years and always there for overall support

Amazing program that sets us up for success in the field. I received such a great education from faculty that truly cares

I feel one of the strongest aspects of the program is that the faculty and staff truly want all students to succeed. I hope that never changes

Program well structured and organized. I also appreciated that I was always aware of what was coming up regarding class and tests

Faculty was exceptional. They were knowledgeable and readily available.

Faculty were highly knowledgeable. I appreciated how approachable and supportive the instructors were. Also, they made me feel comfortable asking questions and seeking help

Program is respected in medical community. It's strong reputation sets a high standard, and many employers and co-workers have higher expectation from graduates which speaks volumes about quality of education and training we receive

Great program, staff really do know what they are doing and do it because they love it

Love the program would recommend others to it

Staff is good

FSW staff is wonderful, always willing to help and available when needed

Good program, organized classes

I'm glad the program didn't give too much extra work

I think the program is moving in the right direction with the energized lab.

Love the new staff additions

Negative Comments

Accommodate students closer to clinical sites to allow more studying and less driving

Update information per ARRT

Update certain material that was covered in some classes that is no longer on the registry (rad, rem versus SI)

Check the clinical sites more often for certain sites. I think it helps when faculty personally can see the activity out at the clinical sites

Update exposure PowerPoint presentations to reflect more current content (rem, density). Also suggest reconsidering required textbook as we didn't use it and it added unnecessary cost. Additionally incorporating quizzes or homework in Canvas for all classes would add variety to the learning process

Update some info not needed to be learned if its not needed for ARRT registry

Changing some of the old PowerPoints

Trim the unnecessary information, stuff that is irrelevant to the job or the ARRT

Take A&P 1 and 2 before starting the program as a prereq. Update all info to ARRT requirements (no more film, IVU's, etc.) Terms contrast and density

Update slide shows to more current material

Wish 1st and 2nd years could overlap

Too much clinical time. Lack of different times to go. More updated info, Film versus DR

More labs, different times for clinic

Florida SouthWestern State College
Radiologic Technology Program
Program Assessment Cycle: August 2024 to July 2025

Goal 1: Students will be able to perform as an entry-level radiographer.

Learning Outcome	Benchmark	Measurement Tool and Timeframe	Responsibility	Annual Results	Trends	Corrective Actions
1. Students will produce diagnostic quality images and perform radiographic procedures appropriately.	Students will pass all second-semester skills evals in RTE 1513L with a grade of 75% or higher.	Second semester skills evaluations -- Annually, End of First Spring Semester	Program Coordinator	2024 - 100% (19 of 19) of students passed their second-semester skill evals with a grade of 75% or greater	2024 - 100% (19 of 19), 2023 - 92.3% (24 of 26), 2022 - 100% (14 of 14), 2021 - 100% (18 of 18) met the benchmark.	In fall 2024, the program redesignated labs as separate courses with a single instructor along with an associate. Additionally, the labs were extended from 2 hours per week to 3. These changes have shown that student understanding and retention of positioning and technical skills have improved.
	Students will successfully perform required competencies with a grade of 85% or better by the end of the first summer semester.	Clinical Competency Evaluations -- Annually, End of First Year Summer C	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Preceptors	2024- 63.1% (12 of 19) of enrolled students passed all required competencies by the end of the first summer semester.	Students obtaining a grade of 85% or higher on all required competencies: 2024 = 63.1% (n=19), 2023 =100%, (n = 26), 2022 = 100% (n = 13), 2021 = 91% (n = 20 of 22). In 2024, this benchmark was not met. 7 of 19 students did not attain all required competencies during the given timeframe. These data may not represent a trend as 5 of the 7 students attained 30 competencies, one student attained 29, and one student attained 28.	In 2024, the number of students performing all required competencies was considerably reduced. It is the opinion of the faculty that having three Radiologic Technology programs in the immediate area and multiple programs in all of the clinical sites has greatly reduced the opportunities for showing competency. All required competencies have been completed prior to graduation, however it has taken a greater length of time than in the past. The program has and will continue to monitor the number and variety of exams available to students in the clinical environment.
2. Students will apply age specific variations and competencies in using proper patient care skills and positioning techniques.	90% of second-year students will successfully perform a minimum of 3 radiographic competencies on actual geriatric patients by the end of the fall semester.	Clinical Competency Evaluations --Annually End of Fall semester	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Preceptors	2024 - 100% (17 of 17) of second-year students successfully performed 3 or more radiographic competencies on geriatric patients during fall semester.	Percent of students performing a minimum of 3 geriatric procedures: 2024 - 100% (n=17), 2023 - 100% (n = 12), 2022 - 100% (n = 19), 2021 - 100% (n = 22).	This outcome has been met, however with multiple programs at all clinical sites, the program needs to monitor these data closely.
	90% of second-year students will successfully perform a chest competency on an actual pediatric patient by the end of the spring semester.	Competency Evaluations -- End of Summer semester	Clinical Coordinator	in 2024, 94.1% of second-year students successfully performed a chest competency on an actual pediatric patient.	Percent of students performing a chest competency on an actual pediatric patient: 2024 94.1% (n=17), 2023 - 100% (n = 12), 2022 - 100% (n = 19), 2021 95% (21 or 22).	In 2024, one student needed to complete this competency on a simulated patient due to inability to access a pediatric patient in clinical. In 2022, rotational assignments were altered so that all students would have a greater chance to show competency on an actual pediatric patient. The program has been closely tracking the number of successful pediatric radiographic competencies per student by the end of the spring semester of the second year. It has been determined that pediatric patient exams have become less available due to multiple programs' students at each clinical site.

Goal 2: Students will demonstrate critical thinking through problem solving skills.

Learning Outcome	Benchmark	Measurement Tool and Timeframe	Responsibility	Annual Results	Trends	Corrective Actions
1. Students will identify the proper corrective actions to create quality images while meeting the individual needs of the patient.	Students will maintain a minimum of 80% on the Image Evaluation (satisfactory for 4 of 5 criterion) portion of all competencies in the spring semester of the second year.	Clinical Competency Evaluations – Annually, End of Spring Semester	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Preceptors	Percentage of students achieving a minimum of 80% for the image evaluation section: 2024 - 95% (n=17), 2023 - 83% (10 of 12), 2022 - 84% (17 of 19), 2021 - 95% (21 of 22).	Benchmark for year over year comparisons was met. It 2023, the benchmarks were determined to be in decline, but have rebounded in 2024.	Beginning in 2023, following data analysis, a greater emphasis was placed on radiographic anatomy and image analysis in the Positioning lab. The results were evident in the increase in the percentage of students that maintained an 80% or higher (from 83% to 95%). Further restructuring of the labs was completed in AY 2024-25. Any additional changes in this benchmark will be monitored in 2025.
	During trauma competencies in the spring semester of the second year, 90% of students will be rated as successful on Properly Evaluates Patient Condition and Alters Patient Position Appropriately (item 8) on the clinical competency evaluation.	Clinical Competency Evaluation Form – Annually, end of spring semester	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Preceptors	2024 - 100% (n=17) were able to properly identify necessary position alterations and recommend appropriate actions.	2024 - 100% (n=17), 2023- 83% (n=12), 2022 - 84% (n=19), 2021 - 95% (n=22). In 2022 and 2023, the student's ability to alter their positioning and recommend corrective actions were noted to be trending downwards. In 2024, the trend increased markedly. The faculty believes that this increase is due, at least in part, to curricular changes and enhancement of the laboratory experience.	The greater emphasis on trauma skills in labs and clinical assignments has demonstrated an increase in the students skills and abilities during trauma exams. With further enrichment of the lab experience and having a single, full-time lab instructor should strengthen these skills further.
2. Students will demonstrate appropriate judgment in the clinical setting.	90% of second-year students will achieve a score of 3.0 (out of 3.0) on item 9 (Good Judgement) of their Final PDA for the spring semester.	Final Personal Development Assessment - Annually, end of spring semester.	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	In 2024, 94.1% (16 of 17) students received a score of 3.0 on item 9 on their spring Final PDA.	Percent of second-year students receiving a score of 3 on item 9 of the spring Final PDA: 2024 = 94.1% (n=17), 2023 = 92.3% (n=13), 2022 = 100% (n=19), 2021 = 100% (n=23)	In fall 2024, the program faculty determined that the previous measurement tool (Weekly Student Evaluations) were not reliable and did not accurately reflect the students' ability to show clinical judgement. It was recommended by the faculty and approved by the Advisory Committee to use the "Good Judgement" criteria on the Final PDA as a measurement tool. The students have consistently demonstrated good judgement in the clinical setting
	Employer respondents will Agree or Strongly Agree to the statement "Exercises independent judgement and discretion in the technical performance of medical imaging procedures" (question 8) on the Employer survey at least 90% of the time.	Employer Survey – every other year 6 months following graduation.	Program Director	In 2024, 100% of employer respondents (n=6) indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that program graduates they employ exercise independent judgement and discretion in performing medical imaging.	Percent of employer respondents that "strongly agree" with question 8: 2024 - 100% (n=6), 2023 - 100% (n=4), 2021 - 100% (n=4), 2019: 100% (n=2).	In the last four survey cycles, the percent of employers that strongly agree with question 8 has remained consistently high. However, the low response rate was noted and employers were asked to provide survey responses during the Advisory Committee meeting or provided the survey in the clinical setting. The response rate increased in 2024, but with many of the program's graduates finding employment at a small number of sites, the number of responses appears low.

Goal 3: Students will effectively communicate with patients and staff.

Learning Outcome	Benchmark	Measurement Tool and Timeframe	Responsibility	Results	Trends	Corrective Actions
1. Students will communicate both orally and in writing in a professional manner.	Students will attain an 85% or higher on an oral presentation conducted in the classroom setting during spring semester of second year, RTE 2782.	Oral presentation in RTE 2782 – annually Spring Semester, second year.	RTE 2782 instructor.	2024- 94.1% (n=17) earned 85% or higher on the oral presentation.	Percent of students receiving a grade of 85% or higher on the oral presentation: 2024 = 94.1% (n=17), 2023 = 100% (n=12), 2022 = 94.7% (n=19). In 2024, one student received a grade of 82% (class average was 94%)	In 2022 and 2024, one student in each class did not receive a grade of 85% or higher. The course adjunct instructor has changed over the years and the current full-time instructor has implemented a greater emphasis on verbal communication in the class. He is stressing communication and presentation skills throughout the semester.
	Students will attain an 85% or higher on a written research assignment conducted in the classroom setting during spring semester of first year, RTE 1613	Written research assignment in RTE 1613 – annually spring semester, first year.	RTE 1613 instructor.	2024- 94.1% of students (n=16 of 17) passed the written assignment in RTE 1613.	Percent of students receiving a grade of 85% or higher: 2024 = 94.1% (n=7) 2023 = 96.1% (n=26), 2022 = 100% (n=14), 2021 = 100% (n=18), 2020 = 96% (n=27), 2019 = 81.3 (n=16)%. With the exception of 2019, the students have consistently demonstrated a high skill level in written communication evidenced by assignment scores greater than 85%.	Individual scores for each criterion area will be examined closely beginning in 2025 to determine if any particular criterion areas have average student scores below 85%. Subsequent corrective action will be determined accordingly.
2. Students will effectively communicate with patients and staff in the clinical setting.	Students in the first spring semester will average a rating of 3 (out of 4) or higher on question #1 focused on patient communication on 2 different Weekly Clinical Performance Evaluation and midpoint and end of clinical course.	Weekly Student Performance Evaluation – Annually, end of first Spring Semester	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Preceptors and Clinical Staff.	2024: 94.7% of students averaged a rating of 3 or higher for question #1 (average rating of 3.32) (n = 19).	Percentage of students who averaged a rating of 3 or higher for question #1: 2024 - 94.7% (average: 3.39), 2023 - 100% (average rating: 3.58) (n=26), 2022 - 100% (average rating: 3.50) (n=14), 2021 - 100% (average rating: 3.44) (n=18). The percentage of students achieving a rating of 3 or higher has been consistently high.	In 2024, one student received a rating of 2 on both Weekly Performance Evaluations tabulated. Remediation with this student was attempted for two semesters, but the student eventually failed in Fall 2024.
	Students in the second spring semester will average a rating of 2 (out of 3) or higher on question #2 focused on communication with clinical staff on 2 different Weekly Clinical Performance Evaluation and midpoint and end of clinical course.	Weekly Student Performance Evaluation – Annually, end of second spring Semester	Clinical Coordinator and Clinical Preceptors and Clinical Staff.	2024: 100% of students averaged a rating of 2 or higher for question #2 (average rating of 3.0) (n= 17).	Percentage of students who averaged a rating of 3 or higher for question #2: 2024 - 100% (average rating: 3.0) (n=17), 2023 - 100% (average rating: 2.95) (n=13), 2022 - 100% (average rating: 3.0) (n=19), 2021 - 100% (n=23).	The student's have consistently demonstrated excellent communication skills with the clinical staff. In 2023, one student rated a 2 out of three on question 2 of the Weekly Evaluation. The Clinical Preceptor has worked with this student to more effectively communicate with the clinical staff. Subsequently, there has been a marked improvement in the student's communication skills with the clinical staff.

Goal 4: Students will understand the value of professional development and life-long learning.

Learning Outcome	Benchmark	Measurement Tool and Timeframe	Responsibility	Results	Trends	Corrective Actions
1. Students will understand the value of professional development and life-long learning.	Students will receive a satisfactory "pass" grade on a career plan created in their final semester in RTE 2061 that includes plans for further professional development.	Career Plan in RTE 2061 – summer, second year.	RTE 2061 instructor	2024: 100% of students (n= 17) earned a "pass" grade for the career plan assignment.	Percentage of students who earned a "pass" grade for the career plan assignment: 2023: 100% (n=12). 2022: 100% (n=19), 2021: 100% (n=22).	Ongoing as needed. Beginning in summer 2025, career plans will be reviewed and proposed professional pathways will be categorized to determine the student areas of interest.
	Students will attain a grade of 80% or higher on a written assignment in RTE 2473 on the value of life-long learning.	Written assignment in RTE 2473 – spring semester, second year.	RTE 2473 instructor.	2024: 100% of students (n= 17) earned an 80% or higher grade for the written assignment focused on the value of life-long learning.	Percentage of students who earned an 80% or higher grade for the written assignment focused on the value of life-long learning: 2024: 100% (n=17), 2023: 100% (n=12). 2022: 100%.	Individual scores for each criterion area will be examined closely beginning in 2025 to determine if any particular criterion areas have average student scores below 80%. Subsequent corrective action will be determined accordingly.
2. Students will understand the value of continued professional development and further education following program completion (i.e. further imaging certification or cross training).	50% of graduates will indicate a desire to continue professional development and/or further their education on question 17 of the Graduate Survey.	Graduate Survey, 6 months following graduation.	Program Director	In 2024, 50% (n=8) of respondents indicated a desire to further their education following graduation.	Percent of graduates indicating a desire to further their education: 2024: 50% (n=8), 2023: 38% (n=8), 2022: 50% (n=8), 2021: 50% (n=2). In 2023, 38% of graduates indicated that they are looking to further their education following graduation. Otherwise, the percent of respondents indicating a desire to further their education has remained consistent for the last 4 years. These data may be effected by the small sample sizes.	This benchmark remains fairly constant (with the exception of 2023), however the program does not feel that using this question has a strong link to the graduates value of continuing education. An alternative way to assess the graduates' value of continuing education is being reviewed and discussed.
	50% of graduates within 6 months of program completion will indicate, on the Graduate Survey (question 16), that they are interested in pursuing additional ARRT certifications.	Graduate Survey – 6 months following graduation, annually in February.	Program Director	In 2024, 75% of graduate respondents (n=8) indicated that they are interested in pursuing additional ARRT certification.	Percent of graduate respondents indicating the desire to pursue further ARRT certifications: 2024= 75% (n=8), 2023 = 50% (n = 8), 2022 = 88% (n = 8), 2021 = 100% (n = 2). A decline in 2023 and a corresponding increase in 2024 were noted. The program feels that these numbers are somewhat skewed due to the low survey response rate.	There are continued efforts to secure additional survey responses of graduates during the spring, 2024 semester. Areas of interest for certification or continued education will be compiled and associated areas within the curriculum will be enhanced if needed to align with graduate preference areas that align with industry workforce needs.

Program Effectiveness Goals

Program Outcome	Benchmark	Measurement Tool and Timeframe	Responsibility	Results	Trends	Corrective Actions
1. Graduates will pass the ARRT national certifying examination.	Each year, at least 90% of program graduates will pass the ARRT certifying exam on the first attempt.	ARRT results for graduate cohort-- annually in September.	Program Director	2024 - 100% of graduates (n=17) passed the ARRT Certification exam on the first attempt 2023- 92% of graduates (n=12) passed the ARRT Certification Exam on the first attempt. 2022- 100% of graduates (n=19) passed the ARRT Certification Exam on the first attempt. 2021- 95% of graduates (n=22) passed the ARRT Certification Exam on the first attempt. 2020- 100% of graduates (n=13) passed the ARRT Certification Exam on the first attempt.	Trending of pass rates over 5 years reveal a range of 92-100% but are consistently greater than the established benchmark.	None needed at this time. Annual assessment of pass rates will continue and necessity of action determined accordingly based upon established benchmark.
	An average of 90% of graduates will pass the ARRT certifying examination on the first attempt over a five-year period.	ARRT results for graduate cohort-- annually in September.	Program Director	The average graduate pass rate over 5 years (2020 - 2024) was 97.6% (81 of 83 graduates passed the ARRT Certifying Exam on the first attempt).	Two graduates (one in 2021 and one in 2023) have failed the exam over the past five years. The program feels that this is within acceptable limits, but will continue reviewing 5-year data.	None needed at this time. Trending of pass rates over 5 year period will continue and necessity of action determined accordingly based upon established benchmark.
	The scaled score for any section of the ARRT Certification Exam will be within 0.1 points of the nation section average each year.	ARRT results for graduate cohort-- annually in February.	Program Director	In 2023, the graduates received scores that were within 0.1 points of the national average in 7 of 8 sections of the ARRT National Certifying Exam. In the section "Patient Interactions and Management" the graduates averaged a score of 7.9 and the national average was 8.2.	Exam results from 2019 to 2023 were reviewed by section and compared to the national average year over year. 98% (39 of 40) sections across each exam for this review period were within 0.1 points of the national average. National data for the ARRT for 2024 is not yet available.	In 2023, the FSW scaled score for the section " Patient Care and Management (PC)" was 7.9 and the national scaled score was 8.2. These data were analyzed and it was determined that a lack of consistency in instruction was a contributing factor. In 2024, a veteran instructor was hired by the program to teach Patient Care. The program feels that the knowledge and leadership of this instructor will help insure that the FSW section score will meet or exceed the national score. Additionally, the Patient Care and Management section of the Registry Review classes has been strengthened and those skills emphasized.
2. Graduates will find employment in the field.	90% of those graduates seeking employment will find jobs within one year of graduation.	Employer Inquiry and graduate response annually in January and June.	Program Director	100% of the 2024 graduates seeking employment in the field found a job within one year.	Employment rates: 2024 - 100%, 2023 - 100%, 2022 - 100%, 2021 - 100%, 2020 - 100%	This goal has been met. With three Radiologic Technology programs in the immediate area, the program will closely monitor these data to assure that the workforce needs are being met.
	Annual employment rates will not decrease more than 10% year-over-year.	Employer Inquiry and graduate response annually in October.	Program Director	Employment rates: 2024 - 100%, 2023 - 100%, 2022 - 100%, 2021 - 100%, 2020 100%, 2019 - 94%	Employment rates for review period 2019-2024 ranged from 94-100% as reported by current employers of program graduates and/or the graduate themselves.	This goal has been met. For the past five years, the employment rate has not dropped more than 6% year-over-year.

Program Effectiveness Goals (continued)

3. Graduates will indicate overall satisfaction with the program.	90% of graduates will rate the overall satisfaction with the program as good or excellent on question 14 of the program graduate survey completed 6 months after graduation.	Question 14 on the 6-month Graduate Survey -- annually in February	Program Director	100% of 2024 responding graduates rated the overall satisfaction and effectiveness of the program as good or excellent (n=8).	2024 - 100% (Average = 4.75) (n=8), 2023 - 100% (Average = 4.87) (n=8), 2022 - 100% (Average = 4.75) (n=8), 2021 - 100% (Average = 5.00) (n=2), 2020 - 100% (Average = 4.67) (n=3)	Benchmark met, however, rewording of the measure of satisfaction Question #14 for clarity is an area of opportunity for improvement identified through this review. On the survey for the 2024 graduates, Question #14 was reworded to read: "How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the overall quality and effectiveness of the program?"
	The number of graduates rating the program's overall satisfaction as excellent will not decrease more than 25% year-over-year.	Question 14 on the 6-month Graduate Survey -- annually in February	Program Director	2024 - Excellent = 75%, Good = 25% (n=8), 2023 - Excellent = 88%, Good = 22% (n = 8), 2022 - Excellent = 75%, Good = 25% (n = 8), 2021 - Excellent = 100% (n = 2), 2020 - Excellent = 67%, Good = 33% (n = 3).	From 2021 to 2022, there was a 25% decrease in the Excellent rating. It was determined that this was mainly due to a very low number of responses in 2021 (n=2) possibly due to COVID. Since 2022, the rating of Excellent has not varied more than 13% year-over-year.	Benchmark met for survey respondents; however, the low survey response rate in 2020 and 2021 was identified as an area to improve. In 2022, graduates accessible to clinical coordinator in local clinical facilities, were hand-delivered the survey and reminded of the importance of survey completion. Since 2022, the survey response rate has improved and the program will endeavor to continue this trend.
4. Students starting the program will complete the program.	The program completion rate will be 70% or greater averaged over a five-year period	Program statistics -- annually in October	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	In 2024, 61% of students (17 of 28) completed the program. The five-year average completion rate is 79.6% (82 of 103).	Completion rates: 2024 - 61% (17 of 28), 2023 - 92% (12 of 13), 2022 - 90% (19 of 21), 2021 - 96.5% (22 of 23), 2020 - 68.4% (13 of 18)	The program meets its goal with a 79.6% completion rate average for five years. In 2024, there was a noticeable decline in the program completion rate. This can be attributed to the failure of 7 students in RTE 1523 (Positioning 3) in the summer 2024 semester. During that semester, the instructor changed from an inexperienced one for Positioning 1 and 2; to an instructor with numerous years of experience. Four of the failing students have returned to the program and are expected to graduate in 2025.
	Completion rates will not decrease more than 10% in two consecutive years within the 5-year cycle.	Program statistics -- annually in October	Program Director and Clinical Coordinator	Completion rates: 2024 - 61% (16 of 28), 2023 - 92% (12 of 13), 2022 - 90% (19 of 21), 2021 - 96.5% (22 of 23), 2020 - 68.4% (13 of 18).	In 2024, the completion rate dropped 31% and the results were analyzed. Seven of the non-completers failed RTE 1523 in their first summer semester.	The instructor for the Positioning classes was changed in the summer 2024 semester from an inexperienced one to an instructor with over 30 years of experience. It is believed that this change will reduce the number of non-completers in the future and the program will not have a decrease of more than 10% in two consecutive years.
5. Employers will indicate satisfaction with graduates.	80% of responding employers will indicate that graduates are competent and perform as expected. (Agree or strongly agree with question 14 on the Employer Survey)	Employer Survey -- Question #14 every other year in spring semester	Program Director	In 2024, 100% of employers rated graduates as "Well Prepared" as an entry-level technologist. (n = 6)	Percent of employers that indicated that they strongly agree with question 14 by year are as follows: 2024: 100% (n=6), 2023: 100% (n = 4), 2021: 100% (n=4), 2019: 100% (n=2). Normally, the program surveys the employers every two years, however, in 2024, the program asked for an out-of-cycle survey. These data again demonstrated a strong indication that the employers are highly satisfied with the performance of the program's graduates.	The program meets this goal. Along with verbal information gathered at the Advisory Committee meeting, data indicated that employers are satisfied with how well the graduates are prepared as an entry-level technologist. However, employer survey response rate was reviewed and the number of graduates currently employed by each employer was compared and it was identified that multiple graduates have historically been employed by the same employers in our region. Thus a low response rate for this particular survey does reflect data for multiple graduates.
6. Graduates will consider themselves clinically competent.	90% of graduates will report 6 months after program completion that they felt the program prepared them clinically for a job as an entry level radiographer. (Measured as a 4 out of 5 or higher on question 12 on the 6-month Graduate Survey)	Graduate Survey Question #12 -- annually in February	Program Director	In 2024, 100% of graduates rated themselves as well or adequately prepared clinically as an entry level radiographer (average = 4.62 out of 5).	Percent of graduates rating their clinical preparation as well or adequate (question 12): 2024 - 100% (average = 4.62) (n=8), 2023- 100% (average = 4.67) (n=8), 2022 - 100% (average = 4.86) (n=8), 2021 - 100% (average = 4.00) (n=2), 2020 - 100% (average = 4.33) (n=3).	The lower average scores in 2020 and 2021 were analyzed. Even though the benchmark was met each year, the lower average rating can be attributed to a low number of returned surveys possibly due to COVID. Since 2022, the program has made a concerted effort to obtain a higher response rate and the response rate has been consistently better. The program will continue to strive for as great an response rate as possible.

FSW Radiography Program SWOT Analysis

INTERNAL FACTORS

STRENGTHS +

- Experienced and dedicated Clinical and Program Coordinators
- Highly competitive program with high student interest
- More affordable tuition than competitors
- Long standing community and employer reputation as a quality program
- ARRT pass rate on first try almost always 100%
- Marketability of graduates

WEAKNESSES –

- Limited clinical sites limit class size
- Unlike some programs, clinical instructors are not FSW staff
- Some class presentations need updating
- Not every student gets the same rotational experience (i.e. trauma and peds)
- Limited opportunities for competency on some exams such as headwork, sternum, calcaneus, AC joints
- High attrition rates at times due to various reasons

EXTERNAL FACTORS

OPPORTUNITIES +

- New energized labs debuting in the fall will enhance student learning
- Attendance at community job/career fairs
- More visibility of program director with clinical facility leadership to build relationships
- Recruitment of more clinical associates to help with clinical site visits and with on-site lab experience

THREATS –

- Other radiography programs taking up student slots at clinical sites (required 1:1 student/tech ratio)
- Program director retired and clinical coordinator will retire in the next 4 years or so which threatens program stability and consistency
- Limited program staff can result in voids during times of absence or illness
- Past JRCERT probation status may result in enhanced inspection during the next few years

ANALYSIS SUMMARY

The FSW Radiography program has a reputation as a very strong program that produces highly qualified graduates with a high ARRT registry exam first-time pass rate. However, the strong desire to maintain the status quo has resulted in some outdated resources and lost opportunities. The goal moving forward should be to maintain excellent program outcomes while adopting teaching methods more in tune with current student teaching methods and practices. The program also needs to do more to show prospective employers how FSW provides them with higher quality employees than competing programs thus ensuring clinicals slots.