CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

Diagnostic Medical Imaging
Department of Radiologic Sciences

Outcomes Assessment Plan – AY 2024-2025

Goal 1: Students will demonstrate CLINICAL COMPETENCE

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Tool	Timeframe	Benchmark	AY 2020-2021	AY 2021-2022	AY 2022-2023	AY 2023-2024	AY 2024-2025
1.1: Student will apply positioning skills	1.1.1: DMI 51A Lab, final positioning practical, section 5	2nd Semester (formative)	90%	92.1%	96.2%	91.2%	91.67%	95.03%
	1.1.2: DMI 68, Student Clinical Evaluation, section 2.2	Final Semester (summative)	2.7	2.84	2.89	2.81	2.675	2.73
1.2: Students will practice radiation protection	1.2.1: DMI 51A Lab, final positioning practical, section 9	2nd Semester (formative)	90%	91.2%	96.7%	94.9%	93.94%	91.30%
	1.2.2: DMI 68, Student Clinical Evaluation, section 5	Final Semester (summative)	2.7	2.94	3.00	2.98	2.98	2.955

Analysis

1.1.1: Benchmark met. This year, students exceeded expectations with a class average of 95.03%. The results indicate effective instruction and student engagement throughout the course.

1.1.2: Benchmark met. This year, students achieved an average score of 2.73, indicating a positive outcome and a slight improvement over last year's average of 2.675. This upward trend suggests that the action plan implemented last year has had a measurable impact. The improvement, though modest, reflects increased student competence and confidence in applying positioning techniques in real clinical settings.

1.2.1: Benchmark met. To reinforce student learning, we emphasized the consistent use of lead shielding during all positioning exercises. As a result, students demonstrated routine application of shielding throughout lab sessions.

1.2.2: Benchmark met. Preceptors consistently reinforced and modeled adherence to radiation protection protocols. Despite changes to lead shielding requirements at two clinical sites, they maintained a strong emphasis on safety, ensuring continuity in student learning and compliance with best practices.

Action Plan

1.1.1: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. Continued emphasis on hands-on practice and formative feedback appears to be contributing to this upward trend in performance. As this SLO has been met for three consecutive academic years, the Assessment Committee will consider developing a new SLO for AY 2025-2026.

1.1.2: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. Continued emphasis on actual clinical setting positioning will be essential to sustaining and building on this progress in future cohorts.

1.2.1: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. Continued emphasis on classroom instruction to remind students to practice using shielding all the time. As this SLO has been met for three consecutive academic years, the Assessment Committee will consider developing a new SLO for AY 2025-2026.

1.2.2: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. Continued emphasis on real-world applications of shielding. As this SLO has been met for three consecutive academic years, the Assessment Committee will consider developing a new SLO for AY 2025-2026.

Re-Evaluation Date

At the conclusion of the Spring 2026 semester

Goal 2: Students will demonstrate CRITICAL THINKING

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Tool	Timeframe	Benchmark	AY 2020-2021	AY 2021-2022	AY 2022-2023	AY 2023-2024	AY 2024-2025
2.1: Students will analyze radiographic images	2.1.1: DMI 51B, final exam, image critique questions	2nd Semester (formative)	90%	82.7%	80.5%	84.5%	88.00%	83.00%
	2.1.2: DMI 68, Student Clinical Evaluation, section 2.7	Final Semester (summative)	2.7	2.94	2.83	3	2.635	2.785
2.2: Students will manipulate technical factors	2.2.1: DMI 62, Student Clinical Evaluation, section 2.3	3rd Semester (formative)	2.7	2.105	2.385	2.135	2.045	2.16
	2.2.2: DMI 68, Student Clinical Evaluation, section 2.3	Final Semester (summative)	2.7	2.89	2.76	2.875	2.635	2.895

Analysis

2.1.1: Benchmark not met. The final exam in DMI 51B, which includes image critique questions, remains a challenging component of the course. This year, students achieved an average score of 83%, falling below the established benchmark of 90%. This trend has persisted over the past five academic years. Despite the continued gap, the assessment committee has determined that the current performance level is acceptable, given the rigor and complexity of the course content.

2.1.2: Benchmark met. In DMI 68, students demonstrated improved performance in analyzing radiographic images, earning an average score of 2.785 out of 3. This marks a notable increase from last year's average of 2.635 and surpasses the benchmark of 2.7. The improvement suggests that the action plan implemented last year has had a positive impact. These targeted efforts appear to have strengthened students' critical thinking and evaluative skills in clinical settings.

2.2.1: Benchmark not met. To more accurately assess SLO 2.2, the assessment committee revised the assessment tool 2.2.1. Beginning in the 2024–2025 academic year, this outcome is now measured using the Student Clinical Evaluation, section 2.3, from course DMI 62. This change was made to better align the assessment with real-world clinical performance. Although data was collected for academic years 2020–2021 through 2023–2024, it was not formally analyzed. The 2024–2025 cohort earned an average score of 2.16 out of 3, which falls below the benchmark of 2.7. This initial result highlights a potential gap in students' ability to consistently adjust technical factors in clinical settings.

2.2.2: Benchmark met. In DMI 68, students demonstrated significant improvement in their ability to manually select radiographic techniques, earning an average score of 2.895 out of 3, well above the benchmark of 2.7. This represents a substantial increase from the previous year's average of 2.635, suggesting that the targeted interventions implemented last year were effective.

Action Plan

2.1.1: The assessment committee will continue to monitor the data. Beginning in Fall 2025, lab questions in DMI 50B will be redesigned to more directly reinforce learning outcomes related to image critique. These targeted lab activities aim to strengthen students' analytical skills and improve their performance in future assessments.

2.1.2: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. Continued collaboration with clinical partners and reinforcement of image critique practices will be essential to maintaining and building on this progress in future cohorts.

2.2.1: Clinical Coordinators will conduct mid-semester check-ins with students to review their progress on technical factor manipulation and provide individualized coaching as needed. The assessment committee will analyze historical data from 2020–2024 to identify patterns or persistent gaps. Insights from this analysis will inform future curriculum adjustments and support strategies.

2.2.2: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. They will continue working closely with clinical site technologists to ensure students are consistently provided with opportunities to practice manual technique selection. Emphasis will remain on reducing overreliance on AEC during training.

Re-Evaluation Date

At the conclusion of the Spring 2026 semester

Goal 3: Students will demonstrate an understanding of PROFESSIONALISM

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Tool	Timeframe	Benchmark	AY 2020-2021	AY 2021-2022	AY 2022-2023	AY 2023-2024	AY 2024-2025
3.1: Students will demonstrate professional ethics	3.1.1: DMI 52: ethics exam (Chapters 5 & 6)	2nd Semester (formative)	90%	93.5%	90.0%	82.3%	82.50%	91.10%
	3.1.2: DMI 68, Student Clinical Evaluation, section 3	Final Semester (summative)	2.7	2.91	2.855	2.79	2.785	2.875
3.2: Students will demonstrate an appreciation for radiologic sciences	3.2.1: DMI 50A, on-time assignments	1st Semester (formative)	90%	no data	no data	no data	no data	98.45%
	3.2.2: DMI 68, Daily Log Sheet Evaluation	Final Semester (summative)	90%	no data	no data	no data	no data	93.85%

Analysis

3.1.1: Benchmark met. In DMI 52, students achieved an average score of 91.1% on the ethics exam. This upward trend suggests that the instructional changes implemented last year were effective in enhancing student understanding of ethical principles in medical imaging.

3.1.2: Benchmark met. In DMI 68, students earned an average score of 2.875 out of 3 in the area of professional ethics, continuing a strong trend of performance. Faculty and clinical partners have worked collaboratively to reinforce ethical standards through both classroom instruction and real-world application.

3.2.1: Benchmark met. In DMI 50A, 98.45% of assignments were submitted on time, significantly exceeding the benchmark of 90%. This is the first year this metric has been used to assess student engagement and responsibility, replacing the previous tool, which tracked the number of DMI graduates who continued on to a Bachelor's degree program. The shift to this new assessment provides a more immediate and course-specific measure of student appreciation for radiologic sciences.

3.2.2: Benchmark met. In DMI 68, students earned an average score of 93.85% on the daily log sheet evaluation. This exceeds the benchmark of 90% and reflects a high level of engagement and professionalism in clinical settings. This is the first year this assessment tool has been used, replacing the previous measure, which tracked the number of current students who were members of a professional radiologic society. The new tool provides a more direct and observable measure of students' day-to-day attitudes, behaviors, and reflections related to the profession.

Action Plan

3.1.1: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. They will continue to use applied learning strategies such as case studies and real-world scenarios.

3.1.2: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. As this SLO has been met for three consecutive academic years, the Assessment Committee will consider developing a new SLO for AY 2025-2026.

3.2.1: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. Faculty will continue to clearly communicate assignment deadlines and expectations at the start of the course and throughout the term.

3.2.2: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. They will continue to maintain the use of the daily log sheet as a reflective tool to assess students' engagement, professionalism, and appreciation for the field. Additionally, they have incorporated a "Plan of Action" as a reflective tool to enhance students' understanding of their clinical experience.

Re-Evaluation Date

At the conclusion of the Spring 2026 semester

Goal 4: Students will demonstrate effective COMMUNICATION skills in the medical environment

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Tool	Timeframe	Benchmark	AY 2020-2021	AY 2021-2022	AY 2022-2023	AY 2023-2024	AY 2024-2025
4.1: Students will demonstrate oral communication skills	4.1.1: DMI 51A Lab, final positioning practical, section 1	2nd Semester (formative)	90%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.45%	100.00%
	4.1.2: DMI 68, Student Clinical Evaluation, section 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3	Final Semester (summative)	2.7	2.85	2.86	2.75	2.775	2.91
4.2: Students will practice written communication skills	4.2.1: DMI 50A, Research paper	1st Semester (formative)	90%	83.0%	88.7%	87.8%	90.50%	92.50%
	4.2.2: DMI 56, Research paper	Rotation Semester (summative)	90%	no data	no data	no data	no data	93.00%

Analysis

4.1.1: Benchmark met. In DMI 51A, students demonstrated strong oral communication skills during their final positioning practical, with 100% of students meeting or exceeding expectations. This performance surpasses the benchmark of 90% and reflects consistent success in this area. Notably, students have met the benchmark for five consecutive academic years, indicating that the current instructional strategies and clinical expectations are effectively supporting the development of professional communication.

4.1.2: Benchmark met. In DMI 68, students earned an average score of 2.91 out of 3 in the clinical evaluation category for oral communication, exceeding the benchmark of 2.7. This marks the fifth consecutive year that students have met or surpassed the benchmark, demonstrating consistent strength in professional communication within clinical environments.

4.2.1: Benchmark met. In DMI 50A, students demonstrated strong written communication skills, earning an average score of 92.5% on their research paper. The results suggest that the current instructional approach, emphasizing research, structure, and revision, is successfully supporting the development of these essential skills.

4.2.2: Benchmark met. In DMI 56, students achieved an average score of 93% on their pathology research paper, exceeding the benchmark of 90%. This is the first year this assignment has been used as the assessment tool for written communication skills, replacing the previous tool in DMI 66. The change was made after faculty reviewed prior assessment data and observed no significant improvement in student writing. They attributed this to students feeling overwhelmed by the number of research papers required across the program.

Action Plan

4.1.1: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. As this SLO has been met for three consecutive academic years, the Assessment Committee will consider developing a new SLO for AY 2025-2026.

4.1.2: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. As this SLO has been met for three consecutive academic years, the Assessment Committee will consider developing a new SLO for AY 2025-2026.

4.2.1: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. Faculty will continue to use a clear, detailed grading rubric that will help the students self-assess their work more effectively.

4.2.2: Faculty will continue to monitor this outcome. The faculty is considering developing a structured draft submission process where students receive formative feedback on their outlines or early drafts. This will help improve organization, clarity, and content before final submission.

Re-Evaluation Date

At the conclusion of the Spring 2026 semester