

Outcomes and Assessments for the Class of 2020

Cohort Group 2018-2020



BLACKHAWK
TECHNICAL COLLEGE

6004 S County Road G, Janesville, WI 53546

(608) 758-6900 • info@blackhawk.edu • blackhawk.edu

BTC is an EO/AA educator/employer. For more information, go to blackhawk.edu.

PROGRAM MISSION

The mission of the Blackhawk Technical College Associate Degree Radiography Program is to prepare the student to practice entry-level diagnostic medical radiography.

PROGRAM GOALS

1. Students will perform competent radiography.
2. Students will communicate effectively.
3. Students will use critical thinking and problem-solving skills.
4. Students will demonstrate professionalism.

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

1. Carryout the production and evaluation of radiographic images.
2. Apply computer skills in the radiographic clinical setting.
3. Practice radiation safety principles.
4. Provide quality patient care.
5. Model professional and ethical behavior consistent with the A.R.R.T. Code of Ethics.
6. Apply critical thinking and problem-solving skills in the practice of diagnostic radiography.

GOAL 1: STUDENTS WILL PERFORM COMPETENT RADIOGRAPHY					
Outcomes	Measurement Tool	Benchmark	Timeframe	Responsible Party	Results
OUTCOME 1: CARRYOUT THE PRODUCTION AND EVALUATION OF RADIOGRAPHIC IMAGES	1. Clinical Competency Form/Unsuccessful Competency Form	1. All students successfully complete 80% in clinical 2 and 85% in clinical 3 & 5 competency attempts on first attempt.	1. Clinical 2, 3 & 5 End of Semester	1. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semester 2: 81.27% • Semester 3: 94.23 • Semester 5: 99%
	2. Lab Rubric	2. All students successfully complete 75% of laboratory competency attempts on first attempt	2. End of Semester Fall Y1 & Spring Y1	2. Course instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall Y1: 93.5% (143 of 153) • Spring Y1: 88.2% (90 of 102)
	3. End of Semester Image Evaluation Tests 4. Random Lab assessment	3. All students pass image evaluation examinations 4. All students will pass this activity with a score of 85%	3. End of Semester Fall & Spring Y1 4. End of Semester Fall Y1 End of Semester Fall Y2	3. Course instructor 4. Course instructor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall: 100% • Spring: 53% • Fall: 100% • Fall Y2: 100%
OUTCOME 3: PRACTICE RADIATION SAFETY PRINCIPLES	1. Clinical Competency Form/Unsuccessful Competency Form	1. Less than 10% of unsuccessful competency attempts due to rad. safety issues for 100% of students.	1. Clinical 2, 3 & 5 End of Semester	1. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clin 2: 17% (8 of 47) • Clin 3: 23% (6 of 26) • Clin 5: 0% (0 of 5)
	2. Clinical radiation safety policy infractions	2. 10% or less students incurring clinical infractions for radiation safety issues.	2. Clinical 2, 4 & 6 End of Semester	2. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clin 2: 17% (3 of 17) • Clin 4: 0% (0 of 16) • Clin 6: 0% (0 of 15)
Exhibits Supporting Goal 1:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical Competency Form • Unsuccessful Competency Form • Procedures Lab Rubric • Procedures 1 & 2 End of Semester Image Evaluation Tests Information • Random Lab checkoff • Clinical Radiation Safety Infraction Information 					
See Next Page for Action Plan for Goal 1					

Action Plan: Goal 1

Outcome 1: Measurement Tool 1 Competency/Unsuccessful Competency Forms

Unsuccessful competency rate calculated by dividing successful competency attempts by total competency attempts:

- Semester 2: 81.27%
- Semester 3: 94.23%
- Semester 5: 99.0%

By continuing to collect data from the unsuccessful competency form, it became apparent that students were seeing examinations performed utilizing positioning criteria that differed from that taught by the program, especially at facilities with large orthopedic clinics. This opened a dialog with the facilities to clarify those differences and allowed the program to better prepare students for these procedures.

Based on this information, the benchmark will remain unchanged at 80% and data will continue to be collect.

Outcome 1: Measurement Tool 2: Lab Rubric

The benchmark for both semester was met and like the previous year, the first attempt pass rate increased again.

Based on this information, the program has determined that the changes made to laboratory instruction and testing practices are showing the desired results. As such there are no immediate plans to change any of these processes but rather to continue to monitor and evaluate for the class of 2021.

Outcome 1: Measurement Tool 3 End of Semester Image Test

The pass rate for the fall image evaluation test remained at 100% for the 3rd consecutive year. The pass rate for the spring image evaluation examination decreased to 53%, compared to 72% for the class of 2019. Reasons previously identified for poor performance on the spring semester examination included:

- Students performing fewer overhead images for fluoroscopic examinations
- Very little headwork performed
- Decreased GU procedures performed
- Spine imaging are the only procedures in this course still being performed with any frequency

As a result the program changed its competency requirements to better reflect number and variety of procedures being performed. However the spring semester image evaluation test retained the same rigor relative to these procedures performed with diminished frequency. Success at previous levels looks increasingly unlikely.

Consequently the program will:

- Increase the level of rigor of instructional materials for these less frequently performed examinations, at least as long as it is apparent that they are being tested by ARRT.
- Revise the spring semester image evaluation examination to better reflect current practice.

The program will implement these changes prior to considering changing benchmarks.

Outcome 1 : Measurement Tool 4 Random Lab Assessment

This was the first group of students that performed a random laboratory evaluation in their final clinical semester, rather than during the 2nd procedures class to spot check skills as students neared program completion. This exercise proved very positive as 100% of students demonstrated levels of understanding and psychomotor skills at a level that would indicate preparation to enter the workforce. This data was shared with program advisory committee who advocated for its continued use.

Additionally, the program has been building a collection of image evaluation videos to help offset the diminishing amount of time spent at clinical reviewing and critically evaluating images. This process was expedited by the switch to more remote learning in spring semester 2021. The reaction to these videos has been very positive and their use will be continued and expanded.

Outcome 3: Measurement Tool 1 Competency/Unsuccessful Competency Forms

Unsuccessful competency rate calculated by dividing successful attempts divided by total competency attempts.

The data shows that the benchmark was met for 1 of the 3 semesters evaluated. However in all semesters the number of unsuccessful competency attempts for reasons of radiation safety increased. Most of the unsuccessful competency attempts attributed to radiation safety issues were related to shielding. After investigation, it became apparent that students were getting inconsistent information relative to shielding owing to the AAPM report advocating for the discontinuation of gonadal/fetal shielding. The program did not change policy on this topic, instead waiting for organization such as ASRT, ARRT, and JRCERT to make formal positions.

Consequently as students moved between facilities they found themselves subject to differing shielding philosophies and policies. This led to the spike in unsuccessful competency attempts for shielding issues that the program had not previously seen.

Based on this information, the program will continue to use data collected by the unsuccessful competency form for assessment of radiation safety practices during clinical competency attempt, as this tool has shown to provide a wealth of information for program assessment. The program will however continue to look for ways to improve the quality of this data through continued information and training.

Outcome 3: Measurement Tool 2: Radiation Safety Policy Infractions

The benchmark was not met for the first assessment period but met for the remaining two. The program had increased training of clinical staff with respect to JRCERT supervision guidelines, preparing poster for display at clinical affiliates reinforcing these requirements.

It is evident that the increased focus on radiation safety coupled with the program's revised clinical infraction system was instrumental for 0 radiation safety policy infractions for the entire 2nd year of training.

GOAL 2: STUDENTS WILL COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY					
Outcomes	Measurement Tool	Benchmark	Timeframe	Responsible Party	Results
OUTCOME 4: PROVIDE QUALITY PATIENT CARE	1. Affective Evaluation #8: <i>Appropriately interacts with patients (courteous, thoughtful, empathetic, displays patience and non-judgmental)</i>	1. Average score of 4 or better: 1-5 scale	1. Clinical 2, 3 & 5 End of Semester	1.All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 2: 3.52% Clinical 3: 4.0% Clinical 5: 4.65
	2. Clinical Competency Form/Unsuccessful Competency Form	2. Less than 10% of unsuccessful competency attempts identified in Patient Preparation and History category for 100% of students	2. Clinical 2, 3 & 5 End of Semester	2.All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 2: 2% (1 of 47) Clinical 3: 11.5% (3 of 26) Clinical 5: 0%
	3. Trauma Lab Rubric: Communication category	3. 100% students attain score 3 or better: 1-5 scale	3. Radiographic Procedures 1 & 2	3. Faculty Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures 1: 100% (17 of 17) Procedures 2: 100% 17 of 17
OUTCOME 5: MODEL PROFESSIONAL AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR CONSISTENT WITH THE A.R.R.T. CODE OF ETHICS	1. Affective Evaluation #10: <i>Communicates effectively within the healthcare setting (communicates appropriate information, applies confidentiality, uses appropriate medical terminology)</i>	1. Average score of 3 or better: 1-5 scale	1. Clinical 2, 3 & 5 End of Semester	1. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 2: 3.47 Clinical 3: 3.88 Clinical 5: 4.51
	2. Professionalism in the Classroom Rubric Statement 3: <i>Communicates effectively within the classroom setting (communicates appropriate information, applies confidentiality, used appropriate medical terminology)</i>	2. 100% of students attain an average score of 4 or better: 1-5 scale	2. Fall Y1 & Spring Y2 (midterm)	3. Course instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fall Y1: 94% (16 of 17) Spring Y2: 93% (14 of 15)
	3. Random Lab evaluation tool/rubric	3. Score of 90% (13 of 14) or higher by all students	4. Procedures 1 5. Clinical 6	6. Course faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures 1: 82.3% (14 of 17) Clinical 6: 100% (15 of 15)
<p style="text-align: center;">Exhibits Supporting Goal 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affective Evaluation through Dataarc (www.dataarc.ws) Clinical Competency Form Unsuccessful Competency Form MHS communication rubric Trauma Lab Rubric Random lab rubric Professionalism in the Classroom Rubric 					
See Next Page for Action Plan for Goal 2					

Action Plan: Goal 2

Outcome 4: Measurement Tool 1: Affective Evaluation Statement # 8

The class of 2020 had a completion rate of 83% (13 of 15) as opposed to the class of 2019 which was 94% (17 of 18). This did to some degree affect the scores for this particular assessment as 2 of 3 that did not successfully complete the program struggled with communication skills that were in no small part a factor in non-completion.

Based on this information the program will:

- Continue to use the BTC derived core ability assessment rubrics & monitor benchmarks.
- Continue to grow the Medical Imaging club, increasing the level of professional and community involvement of the radiography students.
- Increase communication requirements/assessments in classroom & lab settings including requiring students to pose communication issues when acting at patient in lab settings.

Outcome 4 Measurement Tool 2 Competency/Unsuccessful Competency Forms

Less than 10% of unsuccessful competency attempts were attributable to patient preparation and history, however the scores seen on affective behavior evaluation would indicate that this particular category of competency assessment was more problematic for students. This is largely attributed to the fact that more competency examinations are performed by staff technologists rather than CI's, who have a better understanding of the process.

The program is again presenting the CE approved Clinical Instruction and Evaluation presentation and will continue to present to staff in our various clinical affiliates to continue to increase compliance.

Looking at Clinical 3 in particular, the spike to 11% represents 2 points for review.

- In clinical 2, it is observed that technologists play a bigger role in taking the patient history and explanation of the examination as opposed to clinical 3 where more of this responsibility falls to the student.
- This 11% still represents a total of 3 unsuccessful competency attempts for the entire semester by 17 students performing clinical education.

Based on this information, the program will:

- Continue staff training for better use of both competency and unsuccessful competency forms through the CE approved CI/Technologist training.
- Continued emphasis on the importance of completion of the unsuccessful competency form, including training of students and staff.
- Continue to emphasize communication skills as a vital part of clinical competency assessment.

Outcome 4 Measurement Tool 4: Trauma Lab Rubric

This tool was implemented for the class of 2019 and used for the first semester trauma lab. However, a new communication evaluation tool had been developed by one of the program's clinical affiliates and the decision was made to pilot this tool for the 2nd semester trauma lab. Unfortunately, this tool did not lend itself well to this type of evaluation and while it was deemed by faculty that 100% of the students successfully completed this exercise, the tool itself did not yield useful data and would not be used again.

While the college did receive funding for cameras in the lab for recording activities such as this, they were not installed until after students had completed these courses. They will be used for the class of 2021.

Based on this information the program will:

- Return to the use of the trauma lab rubric form for both semesters for the class of 2021.
- The cameras in the 2 rad labs will be used to assess the trauma labs for the class of 2021.

Outcome 5 Measurement Tool 1: Affective Evaluation Statement 10

Although the benchmark was met for each semester it was utilized, it has been noted that students struggled somewhat in communicating with patients when medical terminology was necessary. Also the program is evaluating whether a benchmark of 3 might need to be increased as a higher standard may be necessary for items such as confidentiality.

Based on this information, the program will continue to use this tool as a method of assessing professionalism in the clinical setting and consider increasing the benchmark.

Outcome 5 Measurement Tool 2: Professionalism in the Classroom Rubric Statement 3

This tool implemented for the class of 2019 so it has still provided limited data. Performed as a blind assessment at mid-term by multiple faculty in a variety of classroom and laboratory activities, the assessment is rather than a “snapshot” of a particular day in the classroom, each instructor makes a more global assessment of types of activities – group work, lab experiments, open and formal procedures laboratories – to complete the rubric on each student. The completed rubrics for each student are compiled and an average score is identified. This information is shared with the student as part of mid-term counseling.

The benchmark was met for both semesters, however for the class of 2021 the benchmark will be changed to an average score paralleling with how this same tool is used in the clinical setting, making results more comparable.

Based on this information the program will:

- Continue to use this tool in its current form and process.
- Change the benchmark to be better comparable with clinical evaluation of professionalism.

Outcome 5 Measurement Tool 3: Random Lab evaluation tool/rubric

3 students of 17 did not meet the benchmark in the first trauma lab assessment, however it was for reasons not attributed to communications skills. Upon review it has been deemed that a better tool will be implemented for assessment of communication in the random lab setting for the class of 2021.

Based on this information the program will:

- Continue to assess communication skills as part of the random lab activities.
- Replace use of the random laboratory assessment tool and replace with the competency form used for all other laboratory and clinical competency evaluation.

GOAL 3: STUDENTS WILL USE CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS

Outcomes	Measurement Tool	Benchmark	Timeframe	Responsible Party	Results
OUTCOME 6: APPLY CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS IN THE PRACTICE OF DIAGNOSTIC RADIOGRAPHY	1. Affective Evaluation #11: <i>Efficient planning and management of time (prioritizes work, adapts to changing workload and completes assignments on time)</i>	1. Average score of 3 on 1-5 scale for Clinical 2 & 3; Average score of 4 on 1-5 scale for Clinical 5	1. Clinical 2, 3 & 5 End of Semester	1. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 2: 3.23 Clinical 3: 3.53 Clinical 5: 4.55
	2. Clinical Competency Form/Unsuccessful Competency Form	2. Less than 10% of unsuccessful competency attempts due to critical thinking/problem solving issues for 100% of students	2. Clinical 2, 3 & 5 End of Semester	2. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 2: 8.5% (4 of 47) Clinical 3: 0% (0 of 26) Clinical 5: 20% (1 of 5)
	3. BTC Core Ability Rubric: Solve Problems Efficiently.	3. 100% of students score at a level of "introductory" in "Develops Approaches to the Problem".	3. Trauma Lab: spring semester year 1 Clinical 6; end of program	3. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures 2: 88% (15 of 17)
OUTCOME 2: APPLY COMPUTER SKILLS IN THE RADIOGRAPHIC CLINICAL SETTING	1. Imaging 2 Experiments	1. All students participate in group-based imaging experiments as assigned	1. Spring Semester Y1	1. Course instructor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spring Y1: 100%
	2. Clinical Orientation Checklist: <i>Brief Orientation to PACS system</i>	2. Completed by 100% of placed students	2. Clinical Semesters 2, 4, & 6	2. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 2: 100% (17 of 17) Clinical 4: 94% (15 of 16) Clinical 6: 100% (15 of 15)
	3. Digital Imaging Checklist Imaging 1 & 2	3. Fall: 70% "Yes" response rate all categories Spring: 90% "Yes" response rate all categories	3. Fall & Spring Semesters Y1	3. Course Instructor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Imaging 1: 100% (17 of 17) Imaging 2: 100% (17 of 17)
Exhibits Supporting Goal 3					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affective Evaluation through Dataarc (www.dataarc.ws) Clinical Competency Form Unsuccessful Competency Form BTC Core Abilities Rubric: Solve Problems Efficiently Imaging Experiments Information Clinical Orientation Checklist Digital Imaging Checklist 					
See Next Page for Action Plan for Goal 3					

Action Plan: Goal 3

Outcome 6 Measurement Tool 1: Affective Evaluation:

All benchmarks for this assessment was met. The affective behavior evaluation through Dataarc remains a very good method of collecting data related to critical thinking skills and the program will continue to rely on this data as a primary method of assessing these skills.

As was indicated in the assessment document for the class of 2019, the program recognized that the assessment of affective behaviors, primarily those related to communication and critical thinking skills needed to be better incorporated into the clinical grade. The program implemented a process whereby student receiving consistently low scores in this evaluation would complete a plan for success and strategies for improvement would be devised and monitored. Students would additionally be put in contact with student program advising and counseling staff, and if warranted referral to college access and accommodations staff would be considered.

Based on this information the program will develop a better tool to assess specific shortcomings identified by the program related to being self-directed and timely completion of tasks.

Outcome 6 Measurement Tool 2: Clinical Comp Form and Unsuccessful Comp Form:

The benchmark was not met in clinical 5 or 1 of the 3 semesters it is evaluated. However this 20% of unsuccessful competencies represents 1 of a total of 5 unsuccessful competencies in this final semester. The 1 unsuccessful exam was related to issues of beam restriction and being taught differing sizes of IR not transferring that knowledge to the use of a single size IR at clinical.

Based on this information the program will continue to collect and evaluate data from the competency and unsuccessful competency forms as they have shown to provide such a wealth of information for program assessment. However the program must and will be more diligent about making sure that any member of faculty that could be involved with this process be well versed and trained in all aspects of the process.

Outcome 6 Measurement Tool 3: BTC Core Ability Rubric: Solve Problems Efficiently.

With the class of 2019 the program implemented use of the BTC-derived Core Abilities Rubric: Solve Problems Efficiently for this assessment. For 2020, the decision was made to complete this assessment based on a single category of the tool, rather than the tool in its entirety. Additionally, a second assessment during the final semester of the program was planned which could not be completed owing to COVID restrictions. The benchmark was not met for Procedures 2 and can be attributed to difficulties of 2 students that were perceived as apathy/disinterest in activity.

Based on this information the program will:

- Continue to use the tool again as part of the trauma lab exercise with first year students as modified for the class of 2020.
- Perform the 2nd evaluation in the final semester.

Outcome 2 Measurement Tool 1: Exposure Experiments:

The class of 2020 marked the last year that Apply computer skills in the radiographic clinical setting will be identified as a program level outcome for the WTCS aligned radiography curriculum. Although exposure experiments will continue if the 2 radiographic imaging courses held in the fall and spring semesters of the first year, results will not continue to be reported, at least in this form.

Students designed and performed experiments that examined the following aspects of digital imaging:

- Technical factor development and manipulation
- AEC use and technique formation
- Exposure indicator evaluation and implications
- Digital QC

Additionally students checked off on the Konica/Minolta digital imaging system used for both the college's CR and wireless DR systems, as well as the Merge efilm dicom viewer. Students did not interface with the college's PACS network.

Outcome 2 Measurement Tool 2 Clinical Orientation Checklist:

The clinical orientation checklist provides good documentation that students have been provided with minimally an overview of the PACS/RIS systems when they are placed at a new clinical affiliate. As importantly, all clinical affiliates had input into the design and content of this document and are very happy with its completion as part of the clinical orientation process. As such, the program has no immediate plans to change this current assessment.

Outcome 2 Measurement Tool 3 Digital Imaging Checklist

This tool was used in each of the 2 radiographic imaging courses to orient students to the Konica/Minolta digital imaging software used in the laboratory setting as well as the Merge efilm pacs/dicom viewer.

As these software products will be used into the foreseeable future, these evaluations will continue for both imaging courses.

GOAL 4: STUDENTS WILL DEMONSTRATE PROFESSIONALISM					
Outcomes	Measurement Tool	Benchmark	Timeframe	Responsible Party	Results
OUTCOME 4: PROVIDE QUALITY PATIENT CARE	1. DATAARC Affective Behavior Evaluation Tool; used in its entirety.	1. All students will meet and maintain an score of 3 in all categories	1. Mid-Term and End of semester	1. Faculty assigned to specific clinical course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 2: 88% (15 of 17) Clinical 3: 88% (15 of 17) Clinical 5: 100% (15 of 15)
	2. Medical Imaging Club participation	2. 100% membership and participation in all required club activities.	2. All semesters enrolled in the program	2. Club advisor and Medical Imaging Club President (student)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 5: 100% Clinical 6: 100%
OUTCOME 5: MODEL PROFESSIONAL AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR CONSISTENT WITH THE A.R.R.T. CODE OF ETHICS	1. Affective Evaluation #1: <i>Professional appearance (cleanliness, grooming and proper attire)</i>	1. Average score of 3 on 1-5 scale	1. Clinical 2, 3 & 5 End of Semester	1. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 2: 4.63 Clinical 3: 4.72 Clinical 5: 4.86
	2. Affective Evaluation #9: <i>Conducts himself/herself in an ethical and professional manner (displays integrity, sincere and applies discretion.</i>	2. Average score of 3 on 1-5 scale	2. Clinical 2, 3 & 5 End of Semester	2. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical 2: 3.59 Clinical 3: 3.06 Clinical 5: 4.90
	3. Professionalism in the Classroom Rubric	3. All students score of 75% of possible (19 of 25)	3. Mid-term Fall & Spring Y1 & 2	3. All radiography faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fall Y1: 88% (15 of 17) Spring Y1: 65% (11 of 17) Fall Y2: 100% (15 of 15) Spring Y2: 73% (11 of 15)
Exhibits Supporting Goal 4:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibit 1: Clinical Competency Form Exhibit 2: Unsuccessful Competency Form Exhibit 12: Medical Imaging roster Exhibit 7: Affective Evaluation through Dataarc (www.dataarc.ws) Exhibit 13: Professional in the Classroom Rubric 					
See Next Page for Action Plan for Goal 4					

Action Plan: Goal 4**Outcome 4 Measurement Tool 1: DATAARC Affective Behavior Evaluation Tool; used in its entirety.**

The program continued to use of the DATAARC Affective Behavior evaluation in its entirety for the class of 2020 to evaluate professionalism. The benchmark was not met in two of the assessment periods as is attributable to:

- The 2 students that consistently did not meet the score of 3 were ultimately unsuccessful in the program for reasons directly related to those low scores.
- One particular new CI was very literal in her interpretation of these statements and had expectations of students perhaps to lofty for their point in the program. We continue to work with this CI on these skills.

Based on this information the program will leave the benchmark in place as this is the first group of students evaluated by this method. The benchmark will be addressed when sufficient data has been accumulated to suggest that it is not appropriate. The program will also continue to provide training for CIs and staff technologist with the continued goal of more consistent evaluation.

Outcome 4 Measurement Tool 2: Medical Imaging Club participation

With the start of the fall semester 2018 (the penultimate semester for the class of 2019) the BTC Medical Imaging Club was formed. Under the umbrella of the Student Government Association, the club receives funding for attendance at the WSRT/WAERT student educational symposium, and is looking for additional funding for such activities as ASRT student membership and field trip to RSNA. While these monetary benefits allow for better access to these professional activities, the primary goal of the club is to foster a sense of professional and community involvement in its members. During AY 2018-2019 radiography students performed a number of college and community outreach activities such as Beloit community "trunk or treat", BTC winter carnival (holiday activity open to the community with games and prizes for children), assisting with college awards banquet, and spring clean-up at an area historic Site (Beckman Mill).

The formation of the club is showing to have had the desired result. The club is growing and more outreach activities are being planned. There has even been interest in greater involvement with the state level professional society.

For its work at the college and in the community, the BTC Medical Imaging Club was awarded the Student Organization of the Year in 2020.

Based on this information the Medical Imaging club will continue to foster professionalism as well as increase the level of college and community involvement by students of the BTC Radiography program.

Outcome 5 Measurement Tool 1 Affective Evaluation #1; Professional Appearance:

The Benchmark was met for the class of 2020 for all assessment periods. However for the class of 2021, this activity will be replaced with an assessment that better evaluates level of professionalism than appearance.

Based on this information, the program will replace this assessment as described above by looking at dress code/professionalism clinical infractions system currently in place.

Outcome 5 Measurement Tool 2 Affective Evaluation #9; Conducts self in a professional manner.

- This benchmark was met for the class of 2021 for all assessment periods. However as with professional appearance this assessment will be replaced for the class of 2021

Based on this information, the program will replace this assessment as described above.

Outcome 5 Measurement Tool 3: Professionalism in the Classroom Rubric

The benchmark was not met for 2 of the 4 semesters for the class of 2020. This is attributable to:

- For spring of 2019, there were issues of talking and behaviors of small groups that were counterproductive to teaching and learning. This was observed by all instructors. This problem did largely resolve after this semester.
- For spring 2020 some of the same issues returned, but were not as problematic.

For the class of 2021, this process will be replaced by the program's clinical infraction system.

Blackhawk Technical College Associate Degree Radiography Program Graduate Completion Worksheet Class of 2019						
Name	Complete Program 2 Y.	Passed ARRT 1 st Attempt	Passed ARRT Subsequent	Placed in Field Within 1 Year	Placed in Field Subsequent	Not Actively Seeking Employment
1. Lydia Boehm	X	X		X		
2. Brenna Diels	X		X	X		
3. Corinne Dunwiddie	X	X		X		
4. Abigail Doss						
5. Jessica Foslin	X					X
6. Karen Granger	X	X		X		
7. Laura Harper						
8. Nena Heinzelman	X	X		X		
9. Brielle McGuigan	X	X		X		
10. Celia Montero	X	X		X		
11. Cassandra Nottestad	X	X		X		
12. Alyssa Pomerence	X	X				X
13. Kendyl Richards	X	X		X		
14. Hannah Rucker	X	X		X		
15. Evan Schultz	X	X		X		
16. Molly Taylor	X	X		X		
17. Jazmyn Thoman	X	X		X		
18. Brian Villafan						
Summary: Class of 2020 Program Completion: 83% (15 of 18) ARRT Pass Rate 1 st Attempt: 87% (13 of 15) ARRT Pass Rate Subsequent: 100% Placed in Field 1 Year Following Graduation:		Summary: BTC Total & 5 Year Averages Program Completion 5 Year Average: 83%: 75 of 90 ARRT 1 st Attempt 5 year Average: 87%: 66 of 76% ARRT Pass Rate Subsequent 5 year Average: 96% Placed in Field 1 Year Following Graduation 5 Year Average 94% 66 of 70				
Notes Consistent with JRCERT Policy, the BTC Radiography Program Considers a Graduate "Not Actively Seeking Employment" if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to communicate with program officials regarding employment status after multiple attempts, • Is unwilling to seek employment that requires relocation, • Is unwilling to accept employment due to salary or hours, • Is on active military duty, and/or • Is continuing education. 						