

Mitchell Technical College

Annual Program Review Report

PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program:	Radiation Therapy
Submitted by:	Paula Freeman
Date of Review:	March 16, 2026
Form ID:	a0f4c36d-2f6f-4725-815d-a761f150aa17

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Explain how program outcomes were reviewed this year (i.e., input from advisory board, instructors, students, etc.) and changes made, if any.

Program outcomes were reviewed and analyzed by the assessment committee during meetings held on September 27, October 15, and October 22, 2025. Data from the 2025 student cohort, including outcome analysis and corresponding action plans, were shared with the advisory board in advance of the December 12, 2025, meeting. The program's five learning goals include competency in the clinical setting, critical thinking, communication, professionalism, and graduate success in the field. One specific outcome area was presented to the advisory board for feedback: 1b. Students demonstrate competency in treatment delivery.

Outcomes are up to date in Courshedog and on the program's web page: Yes

SYLLABI

Course Description:	Yes
Course Title and Number:	Yes
Credit Hours:	Yes
Prerequisites:	Yes
Required Text(s):	Yes
Instructor:	Yes
Office Hours/Contact Information:	Yes
Competencies:	Yes

Grading Criteria:	Yes
Freedom of Expression Statement:	Yes
ADA Statement:	Yes
Academic Integrity Policy:	Yes
Nondiscrimination Statement:	Yes
Syllabi up to date in Courseedog:	Yes

Explain which syllabi were reviewed this year; input received from advisory board, instructors, students, etc. regarding course objectives and textbooks used; and changes made, if any:

RTH 202: Radiation Therapy Physics was reviewed as part of the program’s ongoing systematic assessment process. Advisory board members were provided course materials in advance of the scheduled meeting, and feedback was collected through the advisory board survey. One item of feedback questioned whether all lesson-level learning objectives tied to course competencies need to be listed on the syllabus and noted that the current number of objectives may reduce clarity for students. Program faculty reviewed this feedback and confirmed that Mitchell Technical College’s syllabus template requires the inclusion of course competencies and associated learning objectives. However, faculty determined that RTH 202 would benefit from a comprehensive review of course competencies and learning objectives to ensure the syllabus remains clear, concise, and student-centered while accurately reflecting course expectations. It was also noted that the course has been taught by multiple adjunct faculty, which may have contributed to inconsistencies and expansion of listed objectives over time. The RTH 202 syllabus will be reviewed and revised during the spring term to refine course competencies and streamline learning objectives. Revisions will focus on alignment with program outcomes, professional practice expectations, and JRCERT assessment standards, while maintaining institutional syllabus requirements.

PROGRAM COMPETENCIES

Explain how competencies were reviewed this year (i.e., input from advisory board, instructors, students, etc.) and changes made, if any.

All student learning outcomes were assessed and analyzed in accordance with the program’s established assessment plan. Data from the 2024–2025 student cohort, along with outcome analyses and corresponding action plans, are documented in the 2024–2025 assessment plan and in minutes from the program’s assessment meetings held during the fall term. This information was shared with advisory board members through the advisory board survey prior to the scheduled meeting. Outcome data were reviewed to identify trends, patterns, and opportunities for improvement. Action plans were developed to maintain or enhance student learning as appropriate. All established benchmarks were met with the exception of Student Learning Outcome 1b: Students demonstrate competency in treatment delivery. As part of the analysis for Outcome 1b, a total of 78 treatment machine or linear accelerator competencies were reviewed. All competencies received full point values with the exception of six competencies associated with a single student. Faculty noted that this student experienced significant test anxiety and did not pass three competencies (brain, breast, and skeletal) on the initial attempt. All three competencies were successfully completed on the second attempt. The student also received lower

performance scores on three additional competencies, which impacted the cohort average for this outcome. Faculty determined that the lower scores were attributable to an individual student and did not represent a cohort-wide trend or systemic concern. As a result, no program-level corrective action was identified for this outcome.

Faculty explained to the advisory board that when a student does not successfully complete a competency on the first attempt, the program follows a structured remediation process that includes feedback, guided practice, and a subsequent attempt. Competency failures are treated as part of the learning process, and all students are required to successfully complete required competencies in order to continue in the clinical component of the program.

Competencies are up to date in Coursedog: Yes

COURSE ASSESSMENTS USED IN PROGRAM

Oral examinations/presentation:	Yes
Written essays:	Yes
Written reports:	No
Examinations	Yes
Comprehensive Final Exams:	Yes
Journals	No
Peer Evaluations:	Yes
Self-evaluations:	Yes
Clinical/internship observations:	Yes
Class participation:	No
Portfolio projects:	No
Capstone projects:	No
Other projects:	Yes
Videos of student mastery:	No
Quizzes:	Yes
Lab demonstrations:	Yes
Simulations:	Yes

ALIGNED AND APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENTS

Assessments used in the program are matched to the outcomes/competencies for the program:

Yes

Explain changes in the assessments used in your program since your last review (include input received and rationale).

None reported

Give examples of how assessments used in the program reflect higher-level thinking skills, such as applications, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

None reported

INDUSTRY CERTIFICATIONS

Explain any changes made or planned in the program based on assessment of industry certifications (if applicable) used in the program.

The program's five-year average credentialing examination first-attempt pass rate is 94%, which exceeds the JRCERT benchmark of 75%. For the Class of 2025, the first-attempt pass rate was 60%, with three of five graduates passing on the initial attempt. The remaining two graduates successfully passed the examination on their second attempt. Faculty reviewed the results and discussed potential contributing factors. It was noted that both graduates who did not pass on the first attempt took the examination immediately following program completion with limited preparation time. Faculty identified exam timing and inadequate preparation as significant factors influencing examination performance. As a result, faculty will continue to emphasize the importance of structured exam preparation and appropriate timing when advising students on credentialing examination readiness. Cut score changes implemented during the assessment year were reviewed and were also attributed to lower exam scores. This cohort's scores were lower than the program's past cohorts in all content areas and not in a single area Action Plan: The program will continue to focus on credentialing examination preparation through faculty guidance, new review material resource implementation, and advising related to exam timing. In addition, the review of RTH 202: Radiation Therapy Physics will be used to guide subsequent curriculum review activities, supporting consistency and alignment across the radiation therapy curriculum. Credentialing examination outcomes will continue to be monitored as part of the program's ongoing assessment process.

INTERNSHIPS/ CLINICALS

How do you evaluate program competencies or learning objectives during internship/externship experiences?

All student learning outcomes were assessed and analyzed as specified in the program's assessment plan and presented to the advisory board during the fall 2025 meeting. In the most recent review, all benchmarks were met except for Student Learning Outcome 1b: Students demonstrate competency in treatment delivery. During the analysis for Outcome 1b, faculty reviewed 78 treatment machine competencies, and all received full points except for six competencies associated with a single student. This student initially failed three competencies on the first attempt but successfully passed them on the second attempt. The student also received lower scores on three additional competencies, which affected the class average.

When competency is not passed on the first attempt, the program addresses the deficiency through instructor feedback, additional practice opportunities, and a follow-up evaluation. Students must successfully complete all required competencies to progress in the clinical portion of the program. Because the lower scores were associated with one student and not a cohort-wide trend, the advisory board agreed that this did not indicate a systemic program concern. The board also discussed feedback regarding the Treatment Chart Review implemented with the 2025 cohort as a tool to support student learning during clinical experiences. Overall, the feedback was positive. Board members noted that the chart checklist is working well and helps students become more comfortable with treatment charts, patient care responsibilities, and understanding the overall treatment process.

As you reviewed results of internship/externship evaluations, what curriculum changes were made or are planned in your program?

Trajecsys, a cloud-based, paperless clinical tracking and reporting system, is used to support the collection and monitoring of clinical data. Assessment plan data were analyzed as part of the program's ongoing evaluation process. Because the results indicated that benchmarks and overall program expectations were being met, no changes to the clinical study component were implemented this year. The analysis of Outcome 1b: Students demonstrate competency in treatment delivery showed that the lower score was associated with a single student, as described in the narrative above, and did not represent a cohort-wide trend requiring program modification.

ENROLLMENT

Does the most recent year's data meet this benchmark? If not, explain a single-year anomaly or explain what strategies your program will implement to address a pattern (two or more years) of not reaching this benchmark.

Yes. The benchmark has been achieved. The most recent year's data shows the program reached 90% of its enrollment capacity, which exceeds the required benchmark of 75% of the enrollment cap at the 10-day count. Additionally, the program enrollment for Fall of 2026 is at 100%.

RETENTION

Does the most recent year's data meet this benchmark? If not, explain a single-year anomaly or explain what strategies your program will implement to address a pattern (two or more years) of not reaching this benchmark.

100% of the students completed the program.

GRADUATION

Does the most recent year's data meet this benchmark? If not, explain a single-year anomaly or explain what strategies your program will implement to address a pattern (two or more years) of not reaching this benchmark.

Yes. The benchmark has been achieved. One hundred percent (100%) of exiting students completed the program and were awarded an Associate degree, exceeding the program benchmark that 70% or more of exiting students complete the program with a diploma or degree.

PLACEMENT

Does the most recent year's data meet this benchmark? If not, explain a single-year anomaly or explain what strategies your program will implement to address a pattern (two or more years) of not reaching this benchmark.

Placement for the 2024-2025 cohort was 100%.

STUDENT SATISFACTION

If this benchmark is not met, what strategy or strategies will be implemented to address this measure?

Not assessed this cycle.

ALUMNI SATISFACTION

If this benchmark is not met, what strategy or strategies will be implemented to address this measure?

Not assessed this cycle.

EMPLOYER SATISFACTION

If this benchmark is not met, what strategy or strategies will be implemented to address this measure?

Not assessed this cycle.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

What professional development activities have instructors in this program completed in the last year?

In the past year, the program director completed the required ARRT continuing education (CE) credits necessary to maintain professional credentials and remain current with developments in radiation therapy practice and education.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Do faculty members belong to professional organizations associated with this program? Yes

If no, explain why.

N/A

Are students made aware of the professional organizations for their career field? Yes

ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

What changes were or will be made to this program based on feedback provided at the past year's advisory board meeting(s)?

Refer to sections A, C, and F.

Implementation Date: 3/16/2026

Indicate the personnel responsible for implementing the change(s): Paula Freeman

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND BUDGET

As you review this past year, what changes do you propose for the next school year that will affect the program's budget?

The program would like to again request replacement of classroom furniture, as this request was not approved during the previous budget cycle. Second, the program proposes purchasing student licenses for the RadPro Academy RTT Exam Prep (18 months) bundled with 6 months of ProMatch. This resource provides structured registry review along with image-matching practice designed specifically for radiation therapy students preparing for the ARRT examination. The program would request the bundle option at \$499 per student, which provides both board preparation and imaging recognition practice in a single platform.

Cost: To be determined