

## Assessment, Improvement, Measurement (AIM): 09/20/2013

**Plan Year:** 2012-2013

**Unit:** Nuclear Medicine

**Coordinator(s):** Charles Coulston, Karman Wheeler, Martin Baxter

**Reviewer:** Martin Baxter

---

**Program Health Review:** Use the Annual Program Health Review to evaluate student achievement and, if warranted based upon analysis of the results, make program changes to improve student achievement. Identify expected student learning outcomes, assess the extent to which these outcomes are achieved, and provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results.

**Measure Text:** PROGRAM HEALTH REVIEW - LEVEL 1 1. Program Health Review - Refer to the attached Annual Program Summary for longitudinal information related to enrollment, graduates, employment, employer and alumni satisfaction, and licensure pass rates. 2. Student Learning outcomes Three student learning outcomes – Plan an assessment for each outcome identified, and assess the extent to which these outcomes are achieved, and provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results.

**Achievement Target:** Program Health Review Target - Maintain a level 1 assessment with comments from program coordinator, assistant dean, dean and vice president according to attached time schedule. Student Learning Outcome Target - Student learning outcomes are identified, assessed on level of achievement, and evidence of improvement are provided based on analysis of the results according to the attached time schedule.

**Results:** Program Coordinator: 1. Strengths of the Program - (TEXT) 2. Items Requiring Continued Attention - (TEXT) 3. Document and provide evidence indicating how last year's program review resulted in improvements in the program/department.

**AD Comments:**

**Dean Comments:**

**VP Comments:**

**Target Results:** Partially Met

**Findings:** It is difficult to draw conclusions from a class size of 5 graduates (2012) when 1 individual represents 20% of the results. Beginning in 2011, the Nuclear Medicine Technology Certification Board (NMTCB) changed testing companies and the test format so that each of the 4 sub-sections of the exam can be scored individually in addition to the overall exam score. (Previous to 2011, the examinee and the program director received a relative ranking of the 4 sub-sections so that it was difficult to tell how well or poor students performed on the different parts of the exam.) Weighted scores for each sub-section have been a help to start to look for trends where weaknesses in instruction. For the class of 2012, the sub-section with the lowest average was Radiopharmacy. My plan to try to improve the performance in this area is to add some kind of related calculation (radioactive decay, patient dosages, etc) to the daily quizzes given in the lecture class for the spring semester. This may help the students begin to review the kinds of problems they may encounter on the certification examination following graduation.

Just a few comments on the supporting document attached to this review. (1) The professional licensure reports a 100% pass rate for the first attempt. There were 5 graduates in the class of 2012 that passed; one passed with high distinction (this is a scaled score of 82 or above).

(2) Job Placement - This is for the 2011 graduates. There were 4 graduates: 2 were working part time in Nuclear Medicine, 1 was working PRN (as needed), and 1 did not find a job within 6 months of graduate. This individual continued to work at the job he had while in school.

(3) Unduplicated Head Count - In the academic year 2011-2012 (August to May), there were 4 students that continued from the previous academic year; and 6 students that started in August and continued into January (1 withdrew during the spring semester). This would make a total of 10 continuing students.

---