

# Department of Radiologic and Medical Laboratory Sciences

#8 Plan cycle - 8
Plan cycle 2022/2023
7/1/22 - 6/30/23

## Introduction

## **Unit Mission:**

The purpose of the Department of Radiologic and Medical Laboratory Science is to provide high school graduates of southwest Louisiana and two-year college transfer students with the knowledge and skills required for employment in their allied health disciplines.

## **Institutional Mission Reference:**

The Department of Radiologic and Medical Laboratory Science supports the institutional mission of offering baccalaureate curricula distinguished by academic excellence by offering two quality baccalaureate allied health degrees (Medical Laboratory Science and Radiologic Sciences).

## Description of services provided to students:

Courses are taught, academic advising is provided, and undergraduate degrees are awarded in medical laboratory science and radiologic sciences. Letters of recommendation are provided either by individual faculty or by committee as requested. Official student organizations are sponsored in each of the degree areas.

# Performance Objective 1 Increase enrollment, persistence, retention, and graduation rates for each program offered by the department.

## 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Increase enrollment by 5% each year in the MLSC program.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was track student enrollments at each level. Maintain or exceed 2015-2016 levels of declared majors for the BS in Medical Laboratory Science (MLSC) program:

- CLSC BS Clinical Laboratory Science (inactive effective 201440)
- MLSC BS Medical Laboratory Science (effective 201440)

## 1.1 Data

## 2018-2019:

Major Conc.	Conc	Summer							Fall			Spring					
	F	S	J	Sr	Т	F	S	J	Sr	Т	F	S	J	Sr	Т		
MLSC	(blank)	2	6	5	14	27	14	16	17	22	69	7	16	16	27	66	

## 2019-2020:

Major	Cono		5	Summ	er				Fall			Spring						
	Conc.	F	S	٦	Sr	Т	F	S	٦	Sr	Т	F	S	J	Sr	Т		
MLSC	(blank)	2	1	2	16	21	7	7	22	31	67	7	7	19	35	68		

## 2020-2021:

Major Conc.	or Conc.	Summer onc.							Fall			Spring						
	F	S	J	Sr	Т	F	S	J	Sr	Т	F	S	J	Sr	Т			
MLSC	(blank)	1	5	3	25	34	5	17	8	38	68	5	18	8	39	70		

## 2021-2022:

Major	Cono		5	Summ	er				Fall			Spring							
Major Conc.		F	S	J	Sr	Т	F	S	J	Sr	Т	F	S	J	Sr	Т			
MLSC	(blank)	2	3	3	18	26	4	6	14	25	49	2	7	13	24	46			

## 2022-2023:

Major Co	Conc.		5	Summ	er				Fall					Spring	g	
	Conc.	F	S	J	Sr	Т	F	S	٦	Sr	Т	F	S	J	Sr	Т
MLSC	(blank)	1	0	2	11	14	8	5	10	21	44	4	7	11	27	49

## Percentage Change between 2018-2019:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
MLSC	2018	69	-2.899%
IVILGO	2019	67	-2.099%
Total	2018	69	-2.899%
Iotai	2019	67	-2.099%

#### Percentage Change between 2019-2020:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change			
MLSC	2019	67	1.492%			
IVILGO	2020	68	1.49270			
Total	2019	67	4 4020/			
Iotai	2020	68	1.492%			

#### Percentage Change between 2020-2021:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
MLSC	2020	68	-27.941%
IVILGO	2021	49	-27.94170
Total	2020	68	-27.941%
Iotai	2021	49	-21.941%

## Percentage Change between 2021-2022:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
MLSC	2021	49	-10.204%
IVILGO	2022	44	-10.204%
Total	2021	49	-10.204%
Iotai	2022	44 -10.204%	-10.204%

## 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

## 2018-2019:

MLS program had an increase of approximately 41% for the 2018-2019 academic year. The department will continue to monitor and trend, as the MLS program has experienced an upward and then a downward trend in enrollment over the past five years. Currently, this makes the third year there is an increase in enrollment in the MLS program.

## 2019-2020:

MLS program experienced a decrease from the Fall of 2018 to the Fall of 2019 of approximately 2.9%, which was lower than the University for this semester which was 4.8%. During the Spring Semester, the MLS program experienced an increase of 3 % While the University had a decrease of -3.7%. Over all the MLS program was the same for the 2019 -2020 academic year as it was for the 2018-2019. Will continue to trend

## 2020-2021:

The MLS program experience an increase of 1.5% from the Fall of 2019 to the Fall of 2020, while the increase was not the 5% planned it was an increase, therefore will continue to trend!

## 2021-2022:

The MLS program experienced a decrease of 27% from Fall 2020 to Fall 2021. While no specific reasons can be given for the drop in MLS students, these are some contributing factors:

- Almost all MLS majors have a previous major before declaring MLS as their major. Most of the
  majors come from the biology department through word of mouth from the biology professors
  referring students to the MLS program. During the past 1.5 years, the biology department was
  teaching online, and therefore the students were not hearing about the MLS program.
- About 1/3 of the MLS student typically are international students, and those individuals are not able
  to come here for education as they were previously because of the COVID restrictions.

- The requirement to be in the healthcare setting was to be fully immunized against COVID-19 and some students have major concerns about this requirement.
- In general, students are not wanting healthcare, as they are hearing about the on-call and overworked individuals working in healthcare.

To address the matter the MLS program typically only offered the orientation course MLS 210 once a year in the spring semester and the department has decided to offer it both semesters in an effort to attract more students.

#### 2022-2023:

The MLS program from 2021 to 2022 experienced a decrease of approximately 10%, which amounts to about 5 students. Although this is still a decrease in enrollment, it is down considerably from the 2020 to 2021 period when the program saw a decrease of 27%. The MLS program offered MLS courses in the Fall Semester this year in an effort to increase enrollment; however, the course was dropped due to low enrollment. The MLS program is continuing to increase recruitment efforts as the MLS faculty travel to most schools in the area, giving lectures and participating in all available career events. The results of this will be evaluated once enrollment data is collected for the Fall 2023 semester.

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: The BS in MLSC program will strive to maintain at least 12 graduates per academic year.

#### 2.1 Data

Academic Year	# of graduates
2011-2012	19
2012-2013	15
2013-2014	11
2014-2015	13
2015-2016	19
2016-2017	11
2017-2018	13
2018-2019	9
2019-2020	14
2020-2021	17
2021-2022	12
2022-2023	11

# 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

## 2018-2019:

The benchmark for this academic year was not met. Students graduate from the MLS program three times a year. There was one student dismissed from the program and was granted re-entry into the program and this delayed her graduation date into another academic year. The benchmark would still have not been met. The MLS program faculty will are continuing to see an increase in the number of students entering the program and projections are that the benchmark will be met during the 2019-2020 academic year.

## 2019-2020:

The benchmark for the number of MLS graduates is 12. The MLS program surpassed the established benchmark during the academic year of 2019-2020. The graduation rate for the MLS will be trended for two years before changing the established benchmark

## 2020-2021:

The benchmark for the number of MLS graduates is 12. The MLS program surpassed this benchmark in the 2020-2021 year with 17 graduates. If it continues surpassing next year, then will consider raising the benchmark.

## 2021-2022:

The MLS program did meet the benchmark of 12 graduates and the number of graduates did not increase; therefore, the benchmark will be maintained at 12.

## 2022-2023:

The MLS program did not meet the benchmark of 12 graduates. One of the students who intended to graduate in Spring 2023 had to withdraw due to complications related to pregnancy.

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Increase enrollment by 5% each year in the RADS program.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was track student enrollments at each level. Maintain or exceed 2014-2015 levels of declared majors for the BS in Radiologic Sciences (RADS) program.

• RADS - BS Radiologic Sciences

## 3.1 Data

## 2018-2019:

Major Conc.	Summer									ı	Fall			Spring							
	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР			
RADS	(blank)	6	14	21	28	69	0	49	41	35	33	158	0	32	38	29	39	138	19		

#### 2019-2020:

Major	Conc.			Sui	mme	r				ı	Fall					Sp	oring		
Iviajoi	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	
RADS	(blank)	5	12	19	28	64	0	32	33	29	35	129	0	26	26	38	44	134	22

## 2020-2021:

Major	Cono			Su	mme	r				ı	-all								
Major	Conc.	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	٦	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР
RADS	(blank)	6	11	25	32	74	0	50	31	40	39	160	0	37	41	30	48	156	21

## 2021-2022:

Major	Cono	Summer							Fall						Spring					
Major Conc.	Conc.	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	
RADS	(blank)	2	16	13	39	70	0	44	34	28	43	149	2	24	46	26	49	145	22	

## 2022-2023:

Major	Conc.			Su	mme	r				ı	Fall					Sp	oring		
iviajoi	Conc.	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	٦	Sr	Т	СМР	F	S	J	Sr	Т	СМР
RADS	(blank)	2	12	16	21	61	0	54	36	32	38	160	0	40	27	34	45	146	22
RTRS	(blank)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
То	Total 2 12 16 21 61			0	54	36	32	38	161	0	40	27	34	46	147	22			

Percentage Change between 2018-2019:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
RADS	2018	158	-18.354%
KADS	2019	129	-10.304%
Total	2018	158	49.2549/
Total	2019	129	-18.354%

## Percentage Change between 2019-2020:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change			
RADS	2019	129	24.031%			
KADS	2020	160	24.031%			
Total	2019	129	24 0240/			
Total	2020	160	24.031%			

## Percentage Change between 2020-2021:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
RADS	2020	160	-6.875%
RADS	2021	149	-0.075%
Total	2020	160	-6.875%
Iotai	2021	149	-0.0/5%

## Percentage Change between 2021-2022:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
RADS	2021	149	7.382%
KADS	2022	160	7.302/0
RTRS	2021	0	
KIKS	2022	1	1
Total	2021	149	8.053%
Total	2022	161	6.055%

# 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

## 2018-2019:

The RADS program enrollment for the academic year of 2018-2019 saw a decrease of two students, after an increase of 4 students during the 2017-2018 year from the 2016-2017 year, this was encouraging. However, the RADS program did not meet the desired benchmark of increasing 1-5 students during this past academic year, instead, there was a decrease and the program is down 16 students from the 2014-2015 year. The plan for continuous improvement in enrollment is to work with the declared student in the RADS program and enhance the advising efforts to encourage students to keep trying for the RADS professional program rather than advising them to change their majors prematurely. There is a planned meeting of the RADS advisors on 9/5/19 to discuss this matter further.

#### 2019-2020:

The RADS enrollment is down in the Fall Semester 2020. This is not surprising with the COVID -19 and two major hurricanes. The RADS faculty are active in going to recruitment events when they are possible and will have to plan a plan of recruiting students in the Spring Semester 2021 and assess to see if the plan actually increased the number of RADS students in the Fall Semester 2021

#### 2020-2021:

The RADS program did experience an increase of 16.4 % from the Spring Semester of 2020 to the Spring Semester of 2021. Therefore the benchmark was met, will continue to trend, and continues with activities to increase recruitment.

#### 2021-2022:

The RADS program did see a decrease of 6.875%. The total enrollment for Fall 2021 was down by 11.41% University-wide. Therefore, this item will be trended for the next two years and adjustments may need to be made.

## 2022-2023:

The RADS program met the benchmark of increasing enrollment by at least 5%. The program increased enrollment from the Fall of 2021 to the Fall of 2022 by 8%. It will continue to participate in career fairs and all possible events to recruit students to the RADS program.

## 4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 70% of students accepting and enrolling in the program will complete the BS in Radiologic Sciences program.

Assessment tool: Program completion report (comprised of the following):

- Admissions committee report (acceptance vs. graduation);
- · Graduate list corresponding two years later; and
- · Student folders.

#### 4.1 Data

Year	Program completion rate for graduating cohort of students
2010	10.00%
2011	80.00%
2012	60.00%
2013	76.00%
2014	77.00%
2015	81.00%
2016	80.75%
2017	62.50%
2018	75.00%
2019	79%
2020	96%
2021	88%
2022	91.6%
2023	91.6%

## 4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

## 2018-2019:

Continuing to trend as this is the second year of a trending cycle for five years. The plan for continuous improvement will be if the completion rate continues to stay well above 75%, then the RADS program may wish to consider increasing this to a 75% completion rate per year.

## 2019-2020:

This is the third year of trending a 5 year trending cycle. This is the highest completion rate in the last 10 years. If the RADS program continues to follow this trend then the completion rate benchmark will be elevated.

## 2020-2021:

This is the fourth of a 5-year trending cycle, as was determined in 2017. This is the third consecutive year the benchmark was met. Will continue to trend as the past three years there has been an increase with each year until this year and it went down 8% but was still within the benchmark.

#### 2021-2022:

The benchmark was met for the 5th straight year, with the highest percentage of program completion being this year. Will continue to trend this data to see if it stabilizes.

#### 2022-2023:

The benchmark was met for the sixth consecutive year; the 2023 cohort was the same as the 2022 cohort. The program will continue to trend, as the percentage of students completing the program has increased every year for the past six years.

## 5 Assessment and Benchmark

#### Benchmarks:

- A persistence rate (students retained from Fall Y1 to Spring Y1) of 85%.
- A retention rate of 70% from Y1 to Y2.
- A retention rate of 55% from Y1 to Y3.
- A retention rate of 45% from Y1 to Y4.
- A 4-year graduation rate of 35%.
- A 5-year graduation rate of 40%.
- A 6-year graduation rate of 45%.

#### Major:

- CLSC Bachelor of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science (inactive effective 201440)
- MLSC Bachelor of Science in Medical Laboratory Science (effective 201440)
- RADS Bachelor of Science in Radiologic Sciences

## 5.1 Data

## Fall 2012 Cohort:

## Major Retention

		Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rate	Э			G	radua	ation Ra	te	
Major	Cohort Size	Rate		Y1	Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		Year	5-	Year	6-	Year
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	10*	10	100	7	70.0	4	40.0	4	40.0	4	40.0	4	40.0	4	40.0
RADS	51**	35	68.6	21	41.2	10	19.6	8	15.7	5	9.8	5	9.8	5	9.8

<sup>\*2</sup> students were undeclared before declaring MLSC.

## Fall 2013 Cohort:

# Major Retention

		Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rate	Э			Gr	radua	tion Ra	te	
Major	Cohort Size	Rate		Y1	to Y2	Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-	Year	5-`	Year	6-`	Year
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	7	5	71.4	3	42.9	2	28.6	2	28.6	2	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
RADS	42*	29	69.0	18	42.9	10	23.8	5	11.9	2	4.8	1	2.4	0	0.0

<sup>\*4</sup> students were undeclared before declaring RADS.

<sup>\*\*2</sup> students were undeclared before declaring RADS.

# Fall 2014 Cohort:

# Major Retention

	Cohort Size	Persi	stence		R	Retent	ion Rat	е			G	radua	ation Ra	te	
Major		Rate		Y1	Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		Year	5-	Year	6-	Year
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	4	3	75.0	3	75.0	3	75.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0
RADS	45	31	68.9	17	37.8	6	13.3	5	11.1	3	6.6	4	8.8	5	11.1

# Fall 2015 Cohort:

# Major Retention

	Cohort Size	Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rat	е			G	iradua	ation Ra	te		
Major		Rate		Y1	Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		Year	5-`	Year	6-`	Year	
		Size	OIZC	Oizo	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	
RADS	53	38	71.7	24	45.3	12	22.6	12	22.6	8	15.1	10	18.9	10	18.9	

# Fall 2016 Cohort:

# Major Retention

		Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rat	е			G	radua	tion Ra	te	
Major	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-`	Year	5-`	Year	6-`	Year
	Size	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
RADS	47	30	63.8	21	44.7	16	34.0	12	25.5	11	23.4	12	25.5	12	25.5

# Departmental Retention

		Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rat	е			G	radua	tion Ra	te	
Dept	Dept Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-`	Year	5-`	Year -	6-`	Year
	0120	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
RMLS	50	30	60.0	22	44.0	17	34.0	13	26.0	12	24.0	13	26.0	13	26.0

# Fall 2017 Cohort:

# Major Retention

		Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rate	Э			G	radua	tion Ra	ate	
Major	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-\	Year	5-`	⁄ear	6-`	Year
	0.20	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	9	7	77.8	7	77.8	5	55.5	3	33.3						
RADS	45	36	80.0	19	42.2	13	28.9	14	31.1						

Departmental Retention

	Cohort	Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rate	Э			G	radua	tion Ra	ite	
Dept	Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-\	⁄ear	5-`	<b>Year</b>	6-\	⁄ear
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
RMLS	54	43	79.6	26	48.1	19	35.2	18	33.3						

# Fall 2018 Cohort:

# Major Retention

		Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rate	Э			G	radua	tion Ra	ate	
Major	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-\	⁄ear	5-\	⁄ear	6-\	⁄ear
	0.20	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	13	7	53.8	5	38.5	4	30.8	3	23.1						
RADS	43	32	74.4	17	39.5	10	23.3	10	23.3						

# Departmental Retention

		Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rate	е			Gı	radua	tion Ra	ite	
Dept	Cohort Size	Size		Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-\	⁄ear	5-`	⁄ear	6-\	⁄ear
	0.20	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
RMLS	56	40	71.4	23	41.1	15	26.8	13	23.2						

# Fall 2019 Cohort:

# Major Retention

		Persi	stence		R	Retent	ion Rate	Э			G	radua	tion Ra	te	
Major	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-\	⁄ear	5-\	⁄ear	6-\	⁄ear
	0.20	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	1	25.0						
RADS	26	18	69.2	12	46.2	9	34.6	9	34.6						

# Departmental Retention

		Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rate	Э			Gı	radua	tion Ra	ıte	
Dept	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-\	⁄ear	5-\	⁄ear	6-\	⁄ear
	0.20	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
RMLS	30	21	70.0	13	43.3	10	33.3	10	33.3						

## Fall 2020 Cohort:

## Major Retention

		Persi	stence		R	etenti	on Rate	!			G	radua	tion Ra	ite	
Major	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-\	⁄ear	5-\	<b>Year</b>	6-\	⁄ear
	0.20	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	5	4	80.0	3	60.0	3	60.0								

R	ADS	41	32	78.0	17	41.5	14	34.1									
---	-----	----	----	------	----	------	----	------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Departmental Retention

		Persi	stence		R	etenti	on Rate	)			Gı	radua	tion Ra	te	
Dept	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1 ·	to Y4	4-\	⁄ear	5-`	⁄ear	6-\	⁄ear
	0.20	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
RMLS	46	36	78.3	20	43.5	17	37.0								

# Fall 2021 Cohort:

# Major Retention

		Persi	stence		R	etenti	on Rate	Э			G	radua	tion Ra	te	
Major	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-\	⁄ear	5-`	<b>Year</b>	6-\	<b>Year</b>
	0.20	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MLSC	4	2	50.0	0	0.0										
RADS	32	20	62.5	13	40.6										

# Departmental Retention

		Persistence			Retention Rate					Graduation Rate					
Dept	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1	to Y4	4-\	⁄ear	5-`	<b>Year</b>	6-\	<b>Year</b>
	0.20	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
RMLS	36	22	61.1	13	36.1										

# Fall 2022 Cohort:

# Major Retention

		Cohort	Cohort	Persi	stence		F	Retent	ion Rat	е			G	radua	tion Ra	te	
Major	Cohort Size	R	ate	Y1	to Y2	Y1	to Y3	Y1 ·	to Y4	4-\	Year	5-`	<b>Year</b>	6-`	⁄ear		
	0120	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
MLSC	6	3	50.0														
RADS	48	33	68.8														

# Departmental Retention

Dept Cohort Size		Persistence	stence	Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
	Rate		Y1	′1 to Y2		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year			
	OIZO	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
RMLS	54	37	68.5												

# **Summary of Benchmark Achievement:**

Fall	Cohort	Persistence	Retention Rate			on Rate Graduation Rate			
Cohort	Size	Rate	Y1 to Y2	Y1 to Y3	Y1 to Y4	4-Year	5-Year	6-Year	

2016	50	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
2017	54	N	N	N	N			
2018	56	N	N	N	N			
2019	30	N	N	N	N			
2020	46	N	N	N				
2021	36	N	N					
2022	54	N						
Average	46.6	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

## 5.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2018-2019:

- The persistence rate was met for 2018. In reviewing the persistence rates for the six previous years from 2012 to 2017, the data reveals the department met the persistence rate for every year except the 2014 and the 2016 years. For the two years in which the 85% benchmark was not met, it was still very close to being met with 84% in 2016 and 83.7% in 2014. The department has met the benchmark in five of the past seven years; therefore, there is no need for a plan for continuous improvement.
- The retention rate for Y1 to Y2 has an established benchmark of 70%. The department has met the benchmark for four of the past six years; therefore, there is no need for a plan for continuous improvement.
- The retention rate for Y1 to Y3 has an established benchmark of 55%. The department has met the benchmark for four of the past five years; therefore, there is no need for a plan for continuous improvement.
- The retention rate for Y1 to Y4 has an established benchmark of 45%. The department has met the benchmark for four of the past four years; therefore, there is no need for a plan for continuous improvement.
- The graduation rate data is available for the 2012 cohort of students only.
  - The benchmark for the four-year graduation rate is 35%. The department has a 32.8% four-year graduation rate; thus, the benchmark was not met.
  - The benchmark for the five-year graduation rate is 40%. The department has a 21% five-year graduation rate; thus, the benchmark was met.
  - The benchmark for the six-year graduation rate is 45%. The department has a 44.3% six-year graduation rate; thus, the benchmark was not met, but only by 0.7%.
  - After analyzing the graduation rates, the plan is to trend this with the future graduation rates as they become available and plan accordingly.

#### 2019-2020:

The only data available for review is the persistence rate. The persistence rate for the department in 2019 met the established benchmark.

## 2020-2021:

The only data available for review is the persistence rate. The persistence rate for the department in 2020 met the established benchmark, however was only 80% for the MLS, will continue to trend. The retention rates were added for the Y1 to year two for 2019-20 and the benchmark was met, will continue to trend.

The 2017 retention rate for Y1 - Y2 the benchmark was met for both the RASA and MLS programs.

The 2017 retention rate for Y1 - Y3 the benchmark was met by both the RADS and MLS programs.

The 2017 retention rate for Y1 - Y4 the benchmark was met by both the RADS and MLS programs.

The 4 year graduation rate for the 2014 cohort of students: the benchmark was met for the MLS program, but not for the RADS program. Will continue to trend, however, the RADS program only accepts students once a year and is a lock step program, which causes individuals to have to wait another year for course offerings.

The 5 year graduation rate for the 2014 cohort of students: the benchmark was met for both the MLS program and the RADS program.

The 6 year graduation rate for the 2015 cohort of students: the benchmark was met for both the MLS

program and the RADS program.

#### 2021-2022:

The 2021 persistence rate was not met for the department; both MLS and the RADS program fell approximately 5%. Will continue to trend as it fell for the RADS program the previous year.

The 2018 retention rate for Y1 - Y2 the benchmark was not met by either the RADS or MLS programs. Will continue to trend to see if there is a pattern.

The 2018 retention rate for Y1 - Y3 the benchmark was met by both the RADS and MLS programs.

The 2018 retention rate for Y1 - Y4 the benchmark was met by both the RADS and MLS programs.

The 4 year graduation rate for the 2015 cohort of students: the benchmark was met for the MLS program but not for the RADS program. Will continue to trend, however, the RADS program only accepts students once a year and is a lock step program, which causes individuals to have to wait another year for course offerings.

The 5 year graduation rate for the 2015 cohort of students: the benchmark was met for the MLS program but not for the RADS program; however, this is not typical. Will continue to trend to see if this is going to continue and if it needs to be addressed.

The 6 year graduation rate for the 2015 cohort of students: the benchmark was met for both the MLS program and the RADS program.

#### 2022-2023:

For 2022 persistence rate was not met for the department of RMLS, for the department the persistence rate did increase by 7.7%. Will continue to trend, the MLS stayed the same from 2021 to 2022, and the RADS program increased by 6%.

The 2019 retention Rate for Y1 - Y2 the benchmark was not met by either program continuing to trend to find a pattern.

The 2019 retention Rate for Y1 - Y3 the benchmark was not met by either program continuing to trend.

The 2019 retention Rate for Y1 - Y4 the bench was not met by either program.

The retention rates did stay the same at 25% for the MLS program for all years and stayed the same for RADs at 34.6% from Y1-Y3 and Y1-Y4.

The 4-year graduation rate for the 2016 cohort of students, was not met for either program in the department.

The 5-year graduation rate for the 2016 cohort of students was not met for either program in the department.

The 6-year graduation rate for the 2016 cohort of students was not met for either program in the department.

The RADS program only accepts one group to start the professional phase or clinical phase for the 2016 cohort of students. There were 41 applicants for the professional phase, but eight of the applicants were not eligible for acceptance. We accepted 23 students and 10 other students that met the criteria were listed as alternates and ranked to replace any of the 23 accepted students who decided not to enter the program. Of the 23 students who started the program, 22 graduated from the program.

Performance Objective 2 Provide a comprehensive curriculum that reflects disciplinary foundations and remains responsive to contemporary developments, student and workforce demand, and university needs and aspirations.

## 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: MLSC faculty members are required to stay up-to-date with current developments in the field of laboratory medicine. Faculty members complete 12 hours of continuing education each year and maintain a current Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiner's (LSBME) license in Medical Laboratory Science.

## 1.1 Data

#### 2018-2019:

Both MLSC faculty continue to stay up-to-date and hold current LSBME licenses and have completed more than the minimum of 12 hours of continuing education respective to their discipline during the year and this is reported on each of their annual performance reports.

## 2019-2020:

Both of the MLS faculty have continued to stay up-to-date and hold current LSBME licenses. They continue to

obtain the required hours of continuing education during this difficult time by attending virtual meetings and obtaining online education!

#### 2020-2021:

Both of the MLS faculty have continued to stay up-to-date and hold current LSBME licenses. They continue to obtain the required hours of continuing education during this difficult time by attending virtual meetings and obtaining online education!

#### 2021-2022:

Both of the MLS faculty continue to stay up-to-date and hold current LSBME licenses. They continue to obtain the required hours of continuing education by attending bistate meetings with Mississippi and obtaining online education!

#### 2022-2023:

Both the MLS faculty continue to stay up-to-date and hold current LSBME licenses. They continue to obtain the required hours of continuing education by attending state and bistate meetings with Mississippi.

## 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2018-2019:

All MLS faculty continue to stay current in their discipline, and the benchmark was met. The department initiated an incentive within the Annual Performance report for faculty to receive extra points when they go over the required hours in continuing education to renew their license. The plan for continuous improvement will be to track this over the next few years to see if the MLS faculty continue to exceed the required number of hours for continuing education. If the MLS faculty continue to meet the requirement, we will consider raising the limit or consider changing the requirement.

#### 2019-2020:

Both MLS faculty have met the benchmark established and will continue to observe and maintain records of their documentation of the required continuing education requirements.

## 2020-2021:

Both MLS faculty have met the benchmark established and will continue to observe and maintain records of their documentation of the required continuing education requirements.

## 2021-2022:

Both MLS faculty have met the benchmark established and will continue to observe and maintain records of their documentation of the required continuing education requirements.

## 2022-2023:

Both MLS faculty have met the benchmark established and will continue to observe and maintain records of their documentation of the required continuing education requirements.

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: MLS faculty meets at least once per year to review student progress, curricular offerings, professional contacts, and opportunities. Additional meetings are held, as indicated.

## 2.1 Data

## 2018-2019:

The MLS faculty met every month during the fall and spring semesters during the 2018-2019 academic year. The meeting covered information regarding the upcoming NAACLS accreditation visit for the Spring 2020 and the self-study that is due in October 2019. Also discussed were items such as faculty workloads, clinical issues, and MSL student organization concerns. There are minutes of each meeting on the MLS shared file within the departmental intranet files.

#### 2019-2020:

The MLS faculty met monthly up until March of 2020. Since that time they have met via zoom and have stayed in communication with each other via emails.

## 2020-2021:

The MLS faculty did not meet monthly during the 2020-21 academic year, as was planned, however they did meet at least twice meeting the benchmark.

#### 2021-2022:

The MLS faculty met monthly during the 21-22 academic year, as planned. In addition to routine meetings, the faculty also planned for the construction of a new MLS in Hardtner Hall.

#### 2022-2023:

The MLS faculty have moved into the newly constructed MLS lab in Hardtner Hall. The MLS faculty met monthly during the 2022-2023 academic year.

## 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2018-2019:

The MLS faculty more than met the benchmark during the 2018-2019 academic year. Because of the upcoming on-site evaluation of the program by NAACLS, this is the rationale for meeting monthly. Plans for continuous improvement include evaluating the benchmark during the 2019-2020 academic year to determine if the benchmark needs to state monthly meetings of the faculty or if it should remain just once per year.

#### 2019-2020:

The MLS faculty have met the benchmark during the 2019 - 2020 academic year. The meetings of the MLS faculty will continue to be documented and progress is made as is evident in recent curriculum changes to the MLS program.

## 2020-2021:

The MLS faculty have met the benchmark during the 2020- 2021 academic year. The meetings of the MLS faculty will continue to be documented.

## 2021-2022:

The MLS faculty have met the established benchmark. The minutes of their meeting continued to be documented.

## 2022-2023:

The MLS faculty have met the established benchmark. The minutes of the meetings of MLS faculty are kept on file in the office of the program director for MLS.

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: The MLS Advisory Committee meets annually to review program effectiveness, trending developments, and workforce demand.

General topics include, but are not limited to:

- Graduation rates
- Certification scores
- Employment/placement rates
- Curriculum improvements
- Clinical sites
- Accreditation standards

## 3.1 Data

#### 2018-2019

The MLS Advisory Committee met on November 7, 2018. The minutes from this meeting are attached.

## 2019-2020:

The MLS Advisory Committee was unable to meet during the Fall Semester 2020. Plan to resume meeting for the Fall Semester 2021.

#### 2020-2021:

Currently, the MLS Advisory Committee plans on meeting in October of 2021.

#### 2021-2022:

The MLS Advisory Committee members was unable to come up with meeting dates for all members during October 2021, and had planned to meet in Summer 2022. However, due to an increase in COVID -19 was unable to meet during the Summer of 2022; therefore, will attempt to meet in Fall 2022.

#### 2022-2023:

The MLS Advisory Committee members met on November 10, 2022. The agenda for the meeting included an Accreditation update from NAACLS, the Regional impact of the program, graduate Placement Rates, Graduation/Attrition Rates, jASCP BOC pass rate, local employment rates, Program Surveys, Student Enrollment/Recruitment, and Internship rotations and Curriculum.

## 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2018-2019:

The MLS Advisory Committee discussed the regional impact of the program with regard to graduation rates, placement rates, admission process and poor returns from employer satisfaction. Plans for continuous improvement include considering other clinical site placements including increasing the capacity at some of the sites currently used and to expand to include all of the following old and new clinical sites: West Calcasieu-Cameron Hospital, Moss Memorial Health Clinic, Path lab, Jennings American Legion Hospital, Beauregard Memorial Hospital, Christus Ochsner Lake Area Hospital, Christus St. Patrick Hospital, Lake Charles Memorial Hospital, University Medical Center in Lafayette, and Rapides Medical Center.

#### 2019-2020:

The MLS Advisory Committee was unable to meet during the Fall Semester 2020. Plan to resume meeting for the Fall Semester 2021.

## 2020-2021:

The MLS Advisory Committee did the benchmark of meeting annually during the 2020-2021 academic year. This was due to the natural disaster that plagued the Lake Charles Area during 2020 and 2021. However, constant communication did exist via email and phone calls to keep everyone informed and up to date and continues to add information for assessment from the previous year to this years' meetings.

## 2021-2022:

The MLS Advisory Committee failed to meet the benchmark of meeting annually again for the academic year 2021-2022. However, constant communication did exist once again via email and phone calls to keep everyone informed and up to date and continues to add information for assessment from the previous year to this year's meetings. They will make arrangements to meet during Fall 2022.

#### 2022-2023:

The MLS Advisory Committee met in conference room 118 in Hardtner Hall on November 10, 2022. The minutes from this meeting are on file with the program director of MLS.

## 4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: RADS program faculty meet eight times during the academic year to review student progress, curricular offerings, and appropriate professional contacts and opportunities.

#### 4.1 Data

## 2018-2019:

The RADS program faculty met on the following dates:

- 6/7/18
- 8/16/18
- 9/7/18
- 10/5/18
- 11/2/19
- 1/10/19

- 2/1/19
- 3/1/19
- 4/5/19

## 2019-2020:

The RADS program faculty met on the following dates:

- 6/6/19
- 8/15/19
- 9/5/19
- 10/3/19
- 10/31/19
- 1/9/20
- 2/6/20
- 3/5/20
- 5/17/20 zoom
- 6/5/20
- 8/13/20

## 2020-2021:

The RADS program Faculty met on the following dates during the 2020 -2021 academic year

- 6/4/20
- 8/17/20
- 2/5/2021
- 3/5/2021
- 4/21/2021

## 2021-2022:

The RADS program Faculty met on the following dates during the 2021 -2022 academic year

- 6/3/2021
- 8/12/2021
- 9/2/2021
- 9/30/2021
- 11/4/2021
- 1/6/2022
- 2/4/2022
- 3/4/2022
- 4/1/2022

## 2022-2023:

The RADS Program Faculty which has Liaisons from the Clinical Settings makes up the RADS p\Program Advisory Committee. The Rads Program met on the following dates during the 2022-2023 academic year.

- 6/2/2022
- 8/11/2022
- 9/2/2022
- 9/30/2022
- 11/4/2022
- 1/5/2023
- 2/3/2023
- 3/3/2023
- 3/31/2023

## 4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2018-2019:

The RADS program did meet the benchmark of meeting at least eight times during the academic year 2018-2019. The meetings are for the purpose of functioning as an advisory committee for the RADS program. Items for discussion were primarily centered around clinical issues and concerns with the students and faculty for the professional phase of the program. Other items of discussion were discussing and planing for continuous programmatic improvement including the assessment plan benchmarks and to analyzing the data collected. The RADS program director maintains all program meeting minutes. The meetings have proven to be an effective method for continuous quality improvement. The following are a highlights of a some changes that were voted upon in these meetings.

- Monitoring more closely the results centered around students applying the principles of radiation protection for the patient, self, and others. The average scores on the RADS 349 Test 2 had dropped slightly from the previous year.
- Declaring that a new benchmark or new tool is needed to assess that students are communicating
  effectively with clinical staff and peers, as the current benchmark had been met consecutively for
  several years.
- Established the completion rate for the RADS program for the previous year.
- Established a Community Service/Involvement policy for students in RADS professional program.
- Performed the annual review of supervision of students with the clinical, stressing the difference between direct and indirect supervision.
- Decided to raise the benchmark for the objective that students will be able to communicate
  effectively from a score of 3.0 to 3.5 on Form F-9 during RADS 356, as the benchmark had been
  meet for five years of trending.
- Reviewed the results for the 2018 national certification results for RADS graduates and determined the established benchmark was met.
- Discussed the exploration of reaching out to clinical facilities out of the Lake Charles area, as the RADS program needs to determine ways to increase the number of students they can select for the professional phase of the program.

## 2019-2020:

The RADS program did meet the benchmark of meeting for a minimum of 8 times during 2019- 2020. The faculty meetings involve meeting with the clinical preceptors for various clinical education settings, and a student representative from the two upper-division levels representing the Junior and Senior classification of students enrolled in the professional phase of the RADS program. At these meetings the programmatic outcomes assessment plans are reviewed, curriculum and admission decisions are discussed!

#### 2020-2021:

The RADS program did not meet the benchmark of meeting a minimum of 8 times during the 2020 - 2021 academic year. This was due to the natural disaster that plagued the Lake Charles Area during 2020 and 2021. However, constant communication did exist via email and phone calls to keep everyone informed and up to date and continues to add information for assessment from the previous year to this years' meetings.

## 2021-2022:

The RADS program did meet the benchmark of meeting over a minimum of eight times a year to discuss programmatic issues as well as assessment plan benchmarks and to analyze data from the outcomes assessment plan for the program. The program director maintains all program meeting minutes. The meetings have proven to be an effective method for continuous quality improvement.

## 2022-2023:

The RADS program did meet the benchmark of meeting at least eight times during the year. At the meetings, discussions centered around programmatic issues as well as assessment plans and benchmarks, and analysis of data from the outcomes assessment plan for the program. The minutes of these meetings are maintained with the RADS program director.

## 5 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: The percentage of graduates who take the ARRT Radiography exam and become certified

radiographers will meet or exceed the national passage rate for first time examinees.

Outcome: Radiologic Sciences Graduates will pass the national certification examination on the first attempt.

Assessment tool: Results of ARRT national certification examination - annual first time pass rates.

#### 5.1 Data

Year	Cohort first-time Passage Rate	National first-time Passage Rate
2013	100%	_
2014	95%	88.5%
2015	100%	88.4%
2016	100%	87.2%
2017	100%	89.3%
2018	95%	89.4%
2019	95%	89%
2020	100%	88.2%
2021	100%	83.2%
2022	68.2%	83.5%

## 5.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

## 2018-2019:

The benchmark was met; however, after achieving a 100% first-time passage rate for three straight years, it was disappointing to only receive a 95% first-time passage rate for the 2018 graduates. A 95% first time passage rate implies one individual did not pass the test the first time. This particular graduate did pass it on the second time about one month later, maintaining the program's 100% passage rate. The plan for continuous improvement is to monitor the passage rate next year, and if the benchmark is not achieved, then develop a plan to review what areas there is remediation needed.

## 2019-2020:

The benchmark was met; the program continues to score higher than the nation. This 95% reflects only one student did not pass the national certification examination on the first attempt. This student was successful in attempting the national examination on their second attempt.

## 2020-2021:

The results from the national certification examination for the 2021 graduates does not become complete until sometime in October of 21 therefore, actually reporting for the graduates for the 2020 class in which the first time passage rate was 100% and the national average first time passage rate was 88.

## 2021-2022:

The program achieved a 100% passage rate for first-time test takers on ARRT national certification examination in Summer 2021. The ARRT national test continues to add new content material to the examination and the MSU graduates continue to pass the examination on the first attempt. Will continue to monitor knowing new items are being added to the national certification examination. The national first-time passage rate was lower this year at 83.8% compared to the program's first-time passage rate of 100%

#### 2022-2023:

I am devastated to report that the MSU program did not have a first-time passage rate of 100%. The first-time passage rate is 68.2%. To date, all of those who have retaken the examination have passed. Our program has never been here before, making it difficult to counsel those who are in this state. The question was raised, how did this compare with their work in the RADS 465 class which prepares the students for the national certification examination? Mr. Bradley reported for the first test this group scored the lowest in the history of the course. The average score on test one was 52.55%, and below is a comparison of the mock certification raw scores of the tests in RADS 465 for the past three years. As the table reveals, there

was no indicator other than the first test, as the class of 2022 scored higher on all tests.

Year	T1 Average	T2 Average	T3 Average	T4 Average	T5 Average	T6 Average	First-time Passage Rate %	Passage Rate
2020	59.86	69.54	75.82	78.39	85.35	83.12	100%	100%
2021	55.79	65.3	76.79	77.9	81.4	83.12	100%	100%
2022	52.55	71.9	79.4	84.95	87.5	83.2	68.2%	TBD

In summary, this is the class that had the most interruptions in their education. Also, this cohort of students had most of their foundation courses in the professional phase delivered in the online format. This was also the first cohort nationally to take the test under the new content specifications.

The other benchmark the program uses on this program effectiveness data item is the first-time passage rate five-year average should not drop below 75%. For 2022, the first-time passage rate five-year average is 91.26%.

The RADS Curriculum Committee conducted a thorough curriculum review and investigate alternate review methods. Several of the students who retested stated they used the Clover learning boot camp platform and found it very useful. The RADS program plans on purchasing review books for all senior students and the possibility of purchasing the boot camp for students.

## 6 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Regardless of the national percentage passage rate on the ARRT examination, the program passage rate should never drop below 75% over a five-year period.

Outcome: Radiologic Sciences Graduates will pass the national certification examination on the first attempt.

Assessment tool: Results of ARRT national certification examination – annual first time pass rates.

## 6.1 Data

Five-Year Span	Average Passage Rate for First-Time Examinees
2012-2016	96.67%
2013-2017	98.94%
2014-2018	97.87%
2015-2019	97.84%
2016-2020	97.87%
2017-2021	97.92%
2018-2022	91.64%

## 6.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2018-2019:

This benchmark is part of the national accrediting agency, the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) program effectiveness requirements. Therefore this item will continue to be monitored every year.

#### 2019-2020:

This benchmark is part of the national accrediting agency, the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) program effectiveness requirements. Therefore this item will continue to be monitored every year.

This benchmark was met and is part of the national accrediting agency, the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) program effectiveness requirements. Therefore this item will continue to be monitored every year.

## 2021-2022:

This benchmark was met and is part of the national accrediting agency, the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) program effectiveness requirements. Therefore, this item will continue to be monitored every year.

## 2022-2023:

This benchmark was met and is part of the national accrediting agency, the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) program effectiveness requirements. Therefore, this item will continue to be monitored every year.

## 7 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Five-year average job placement rate will not be less than 75% of the graduates actively seeking employment within six months post-graduation.

Outcome: Radiologic Sciences graduates will be employed within six months post graduation.

Assessment tool: Graduate questionnaire and formal and informal discussions with students/graduates.

## 7.1 Data

Year	Total # of Graduates	Graduates actively seeking and gaining employment within 6 months					
		#	%				
2013	19	15/17	88%				
2014	20	19/19	100%				
2015	19	19/19	100%				
2016	19	19/19	100%				
2017	15	15/15	100%				
2018	18	15/17	88%				
2019	19	19/19	100%				
2020	21	21/21	100%				
2021	21	21/21	100%				
2022	22	22/22	100%				

Five-Year Span	Five-Year Average (employed with 6 months)
2009-2013	88%
2010-2014	89.26%
2011-2015	91.25%
2012-2016	97.6%
2013-2017	97.6%
2014-2018	97.6%
2015-2019	97.8%
2016-2020	97.7%
2017-2021	97.8%
2018-2022	98.62%

## 7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2018-2019:

The benchmark was met as the five year average for job placement within six months is 97.6%, and the job placement within 12 months for the same five year period is 100%. There was a total of two students from the class of 2018 who did not have jobs within six months following graduation. One student had an attitude issue and was not desired by local employers because of that reputation. The other student did not actively start seeking employment until about seven months following graduation, as they were waiting on their spouse to gain acceptance into physical therapy school, so they would know where to look for a job. Both were employed by the eighth month following graduation. There does not appear to be a reason to plan for continuous improvement at this time.

#### 2019-2020:

The benchmark was met. The job placement rate within 6 months following graduation was 100% for the class of 2019. The five-year average job placement rate for the period within six months following graduation was 97.8%.

#### 2020-2021:

The benchmark was met. The job placement rate within 6 months following graduation was 100% for the class of 2020. The five-year average job placement rate for the period within six months following graduation was 97.7%.

#### 2021-2022:

The benchmark was met. The job placement rate within 6 months following graduation was 100% for the class of 2021. The five-year average job placement rate for the period within six months following graduation was 97.8%.

#### 2022-2023:

The benchmark was met. The job placement rate within 6 months following graduation was 100% for the class of 2022. The five-year average job placement rate for the period within six months following graduation was 98.6%.

# Performance Objective 3 Provide the surrounding medical community with nationally certified medical laboratory scientists.

## 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 80% of MLS graduates actively seeking employment will be employed within 2-6 months of graduating.

## 1.1 Data

Academic Year	Graduates before g	employed raduating	Graduates em 2 months of	nployed within f graduating	Graduates employed within 6 months of graduating		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
2013-2014	_	_	_	100%	_	_	
2014-2015	_	63%	_	36%	_	_	
2015-2016	_	69%	_	31%	_	_	
2016-2017	_	100%	_	_	_	_	
2017-2018	_	67%	_	8%	_	25%	
2018-2019	7/9	78%	2/9	22%	_	_	
2019-2020	7/14	50%	3/14	21%	3/14	21%	
2020-2021	14/17	82%	2/17	12%			
2021-2022+			12/13	92.3%			
2022-2023*							

- +one graduate went to graduate school
- \*Data still being tabulated.

## 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2018-2019:

The MLS program continues to meet the benchmark. For 2018-2019, 100% of graduates were employed within two months following graduation.

#### 2019-2020:

The MLS program continues to meet the benchmark. For 2019-2020, 100% of graduates were employed within six months following graduation.

## 2020-2021:

The MLS program continues to meet the benchmark. For 2020-2021, 100% of graduates were employed within six months following graduation. One individual did not seek employment due to health issues. Due to COVID-19, there is a major shortage of MLS personnel.

#### 2021-2022:

The MLS program is still in the process of calculating this data, as most of it cannot be calculated at this time. Will update once it is calculated.

## 2022-2023:

The MLS program is still processing data for 2022-2023. For 2021-2022, the benchmark was met. All graduates actively seeking employment were employed within two months following graduation.

#### 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 75% of MLS graduates will seek employment within the state of Louisiana.

Prior to 2022-2023, the benchmark was 80% of MLS graduates...

## 2.1 Data

Academic Year	Graduates employed within the state of LA				
	#	%			
2013-2014	_	78%			
2014-2015	_	91%			
2015-2016	_	85% <sup>1</sup>			
2016-2017	_	91%			
2017-2018	_	67%			
2018-2019	_	78% <sup>2</sup>			
2019-2020	6/14	42.8%			
2020-2021	14/17	82.3% <sup>3</sup>			
2021-2022	10/12	85%			
2022-2023					

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The remaining 15% of graduates gained employment in Beaumont, TX.

Data is still being calculated for the 2022-2023 year.

## 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The remaining 22% of graduates gained employment in Houston, TX.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The remaining graduates gained employment in Beaumont, TX.

The benchmark was not met for a second straight year. Again, although there are ample job opportunities for graduates to be employed within Louisiana, graduates are electing to accept employment at facilities outside the state of Louisiana. The advisory committee will consider adjusting the % of graduates employed in Louisiana or to include neighboring states by stating 80% of graduates will accept employment in the region. This will be added to the agenda for the next advisory meeting and for the MLS faculty to consider.

#### 2019-2020:

This was the most diverse graduating class today, with students from 6 different countries of origin. With few local ties these students chose to relocate.

#### 2020-2021:

The benchmark was met, will continue to trend.

#### 2021-2022:

The data is still being calculated and will be updated once it is available.

#### 2022-2023:

For the 2021-2022 year, the benchmark was exceeded with 85% of graduates employed within the state of Louisiana. The data for the 2022-2023 year is still being calculated.

#### 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 80% of MLS graduates will seek employment within a medical laboratory.

#### 3.1 Data

Academic Year	Graduates employed within a medical laboratory		
	#	%	
2013-2014		100%	
2014-2015		100%	
2015-2016		100%	
2016-2017		100%	
2017-2018	13/13	100%	
2018-2019	9/9	100%	
2019-2020	14/14	100%	
2020-2021	17/17	100%	
2021-2022	12/13**	100%	
2022-2023*			

<sup>\*\*</sup>One graduate went to graduate school rather than seeking employment.

## 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

## 2018-2019:

Graduates from the MLS program for the academic year of 2018-2019 all were employed in a medical laboratory. Therefore the benchmark was met and the program plans to continue with the emphasis on the medical laboratory science as this is currently where all graduates are being employed.

# 2019-2020:

Graduates from the MLS program for the academic year of 2019-2020 all were employed in a medical laboratory. Therefore the benchmark was met and the program plans to continue with the emphasis on the medical laboratory science as this is currently where all graduates are being employed.

## 2020-2021:

Graduates from the MLS program for the academic year of 2020-2021 all were employed in a medical

<sup>\*</sup>Data still being calculated.

laboratory. Therefore the benchmark was met and the program plans to continue with the emphasis on the medical laboratory science as this is currently where all graduates are being employed. There was one graduate who did not seek employment due to medical issues.

2021-2022:

Data still being calculated and will be provided once it is available.

2022-2023:

For 2021-2022, the benchmark was met.

#### 4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 75% of MLS graduates will pass the American Society for Clinical Pathology Board of Certification (ASCP BOC) National Exam within 12 months of graduating.

Prior to 2022-2023, the benchmark was 80% of MLS graduates...

#### 4.1 Data

Academic Year	Graduates who passed ASCP BOC within 12 months		Graduate pass rate on the first attempt	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	_	87%	_	_
2014-2015	_	85%		77%
2015-2016	_	94%	_	58%
2016-2017	_	91%	_	73%
2017-2018	_	92%		85%
2018-2019	8/9	88%		63%
2019-2020	11/14	77%		69%
2020-2021	15/17	85%	9/13	69%
2021-2022	12/13	92%		
2022-2023*				

<sup>\*</sup>Results for 2022-2023 are still being calculated.

## 4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

## 2018-2019:

The benchmark was met for the graduates of 2018, and also there was an increase in the first-time passage rate on the certification examination. The MLS program director has purchased the ASCP new edition study guide for the certification examination. The trend is going up and the MLS program will continue to monitor this trend and to see if the study guide purchased and the study sessions that are being offered will increase the passage rate percentages.

## 2019-2020:

The benchmark of an 80% passage rate within 12 months was not met for the graduates of 2019-2020. The MLS faculty will be developing on a national certification review sessions and incorporating special practice questions throughout the curriculum

## 2020-2021:

The data are actually for the graduates from the 2019-20 year as the benchmark is set for passing the test 12 months after they graduate. The benchmark was met.

## 2021-2022:

The data are actually for the graduates from the 2020-21 year as the benchmark is set for passing the test 12 months after they graduate. The benchmark was met.

# 2022-2023:

For 2021-2022, the benchmark was exceeded. The results for 2022-2023 are still being calculated.