

**Northern New Mexico College  
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT • PEER REVIEW FEEDBACK 2009-10**

Department Health Occupations

Program Radiologic Technology

Date 12/2010

	(6) Commendable	(4) Acceptable	(2) Developing	(0) Under-developed
Mission	<i>The program mission defines the program's primary purpose(s), and is in explicit alignment with the departmental and College mission statements.</i>	<i>The program mission defines the program's primary purpose(s), and aligns in general with the departmental and College mission statements.</i>	<i>The program mission defines the program's primary purpose(s) but alignment to the departmental and/or College mission is either unclear or unstated.</i>	<i>The program mission is non-existent, or not stated in an acceptable format.</i>
<p><b>Score and comments (4/6).</b> The mission meets the acceptable criterion above. Linking it explicitly to the college mission statement might be helpful to Radiologic accreditation evaluators, tying to the program mission statement to employment.</p>				
Outcomes	<i>SLO's indicate knowledge, skills and dispositions; they align clearly to the program mission and mission of the College.</i>	<i>SLO's indicate two of three aspects of student learning; align clearly to program mission and College mission.</i>	<i>SLO's are stated but unclear regarding two or more aspects of student learning and/or connections to program and College missions.</i>	<i>SLO's are non-existent, not stated in an acceptable format, and/or do not align to program mission and/or College mission.</i>
<p><b>Score and comments (4/6).</b> Some of the outcomes clearly describe desired knowledge, skills, and dispositions of RT graduates; others are less clear. Outcome #2 (demonstrate written communication skills), outcome #4 (demonstrate patient examination skills), outcome #5 (demonstrate professionalism), and outcome #6 (demonstrate oral communication skills) are fine. There are opportunities to improve the other outcomes: #1 could be re-written (demonstrate skills relevant to Radiologic Technology that build onto the college's Gen Ed program, say, in science and math); and #3, which isn't really an outcome at all – rather, the ARRT registry exam is a measure. This last outcome could be deleted.</p>				
Measures & achievement targets	<i>Measures promise direct and indirect evidence of student learning; they are related to appropriate SLO's and have clear achievement targets.</i>	<i>Measures promise direct and indirect evidence of student learning; they relate to some but not all of the SLO's.</i>	<i>Measures exist but their relationships to the SLO's is unclear; they are incomplete and vague in addressing the SLO's.</i>	<i>Measures are non-existent or not stated in an acceptable format.</i>
<p><b>Score and comments (5/6).</b> The measures and targets promise direct and indirect evidence of student learning, and connect back to the outcomes in appropriate ways. The presentation of graduate data is excellent. The only measure that is unclear is #1. Perhaps faculty can select an assignment, or set of assignments, that reflect students' general education knowledge and/or skills that are important for academic success in the program.</p>				
Findings	<i>Findings provide compelling student learning data that follow details spelled out in the description of measures.</i>	<i>Findings include references to some (but not all) measures, and indicate extent to which most but not all SLO's were met as well as need for further actions (as appropriate).</i>	<i>Findings are initiated but incomplete; the overall sense of progress attained is hard to ascertain.</i>	<i>Findings are non-existent or not stated in an acceptable format.</i>
<p><b>Score and comments (3/6).</b> For the most part, data are reported as class percentages; they would be more compelling if we had more details (number of students, number who met target, class average). Pass rates would be more compelling if they were more descriptive. Student retention in the program is high, let's see the details.</p>				

Continued below

Action plan tracking	<i>Steps are spelled out with persons responsible and budget amounts as needed for implementing program improvements in ways that related compellingly to assessment findings.</i>	<i>Steps are spelled out for implementing program improvements in ways that address some of the assessment findings.</i>	<i>Steps are spelled out for implementing program improvements in ways that address one or two of the assessment findings.</i>	<i>There are no action steps listed.</i>
<b>Score and comments (1/6).</b> The action plan/improvements tools in WEAVE are under-utilized. There are big opportunities here to improve the overall assessment of the RT program. Licensure pass rates must improve, but how? Who will do what?				
<b>Overall comments</b>				
<b>3.4 overall.</b> Between "developing" and "acceptable." There are opportunities to improve the program's measures, findings, and especially, the action plans for program improvement, which is essential to assessment success.				