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Abstract

The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center School of Health Professions (SHP) is committed to the education of health care professionals, through formal academic programs that award institutional certificates and bachelor of science degrees in health sciences. The following eight programs are part of the SHP: Clinical Laboratory Science (CLS), Cytogenetic Technology (CGT), Cytotechnology, Diagnostic Imaging (DI), Histotechnology (HT), Medical Dosimetry (MD), Molecular Genetic Technology (MGT), and Radiation Therapy (RT).

All SHP students were given a program evaluation survey to assess their educational program, student services, and student programs. The survey was administered at the end of the summer 2012 semester. There were 136 survey respondents, resulting in a response rate of 96.5%. Approximately 18.4% of the respondents were from either the Cytogenetic Technology or Diagnostic Imaging programs, while 17.6% were from the Molecular Genetic Technology program, 12.5% from either Clinical Laboratory Science or Radiation Therapy programs, 8.8% from Medical Dosimetry, 7.4% from Histotechnology, and 4.4% from the Cytotechnology program. The following objectives are addressed in this report: 1) to determine student satisfaction with their school curriculum; 2) to determine student satisfaction with their program/school; 3) to determine student satisfaction with student services and programs; and 4) to determine student demographics.

The first objective of this study was to determine how the students evaluated their school curriculum. Students were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with twelve areas such as the curriculum, faculty advising, school administration, staff, and clinical rotations. Overall, the following five areas had levels of satisfaction at or above 85%: demonstration of quality control in clinical rotations (97.1%); following safety procedures in clinical rotations (94.1%); satisfaction with development with decision making skills (88.2%); quality of the curriculum (87.5%); and satisfaction with support received from program’s staff (86.4%). The following seven areas had satisfaction less than 85%: support from program’s faculty (84.6%); quality of staff (83.6%); quality of teaching (83.0%); support from program’s school administration (82.9%); quality of faculty (81.6%); quality of school administration (77.9%); and quality of student advising (75.6%).

When the results were analyzed by program, 85% or more of the Cytogenetic Technology and Medical Dosimetry students were satisfied with all twelve of the areas listed under school curriculum. Less than 85% of the Diagnostic Imaging and Molecular Genetic Technology students were satisfied with ten of the areas. Over 30% of MGT respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the support received from their program’s school administration (30.4%), over 20% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the quality of school administration (29.2%), staff (29.2%), and faculty (25.0%). Over 20% of the DI students were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the support received from their program’s staff (24.0%) and with the quality of student advising (24.0%). Also, less than 85% of the Radiation Therapy students were satisfied with nine of the areas, while 23.5% were dissatisfied with the quality of staff.

The second objective was to determine student satisfaction with their program/school. Questions focused on how well students were prepared for their certification exam, how well prepared they were to enter the workforce, and if they would advise others to enter their field and to study at the SHP. Overall, 85% or more of the respondents were satisfied that the education they received prepared them to enter the workforce (85.1%), while less than 85% were satisfied that the education they received prepared them for their certification exam (82.6%) and less than 85% would either strongly advise or advise others to obtain their education at MD Anderson’s School of Health Professions (75.1%).

When the responses were analyzed by program, over 85% of the respondents from Clinical Laboratory Science, Cytogenetic Technology, and Medical Dosimetry were satisfied that the education they received prepared them for their certification exam and to enter the workforce, additionally, they would advise others to obtain their education at SHP. Over 85% of the Radiation Therapy respondents were satisfied that their education prepared them to enter the workforce, while 58.9% were satisfied that
they were prepared for their certification exam. Moreover, 64.2% indicated that they would advise others to obtain their degree at SHP. Less than 85% of the Molecular Genetic Technology (81.9%) were satisfied with how well they were prepared for their certification exam, while 69.5% would advise others to obtain their degree at SHP. Furthermore, 66.7% of Diagnostic Imaging students noted that they were prepared for their certification exam and 60.0% would refer others to obtain their degrees at SHP. Also, over 20% of the DI students (24.0%) would discourage others from obtaining their education at SHP.

The third objective was to determine student satisfaction with student services and programs. The questions prompted students to rate services and programs such as classrooms, computer equipment, laboratory facilities, orientation, school catalogs, the Research Medical Library, and their student government organization. Overall, over 85% of the respondents were satisfied with the six aspects related to classrooms and student laboratory facilities. By program, over 85% of the respondents from all programs, except Diagnostic Imaging and Radiation Therapy, were satisfied with all six aspects of the classrooms and student laboratory facilities. Less than 85% of all respondents found the new student orientation (81.3%) and the school catalogs (66.2%) helpful. All programs rated the school catalogs less than 85% helpful, while only students in Cytogenetic Technology and Medical Dosimetry rated new student orientation over 85% helpful.

Respondents were asked to rate six aspects of the MD Anderson Research Medical Library. Overall, over 85% of the respondents were satisfied with the following aspects of the library: study environment (91.7%); ease of access to online resources (90.4%); customer service (88.9%); and computer hardware and software (87.4%). Less than 85% of the respondents were satisfied with print materials needed for study (82.7%), and library classes (76.9%). By program, over 85% of the respondents from the Cytogenetic Technology program were satisfied with all six of the library aspects, while less than 85% of the respondents from the Diagnostic Imaging program were satisfied with all six of the aspects. Overall, less than 85% of the respondents rated the specified student support services as very good or good. There were no programs where 85% or more of the respondents rated all of the areas as either very good or good, however one program (Cytogenetic Technology) did rate four of the five support services over 85% very good or good. Over 40% of the respondents from Medical Dosimetry did not use each of the services, while over 15% of Radiation Therapy respondents indicated they did not use each of the services.

Concerning the school student government organization, less than 85% of all respondents were aware of their school government representatives (71.8%) and of the school government sponsored activities (55.8%), while 53.4% of the respondents were satisfied with their school’s student government. When analyzed by program, over 85% of the Cytogenetic Technology and Medical Dosimetry respondents were aware of their school government representatives, while less than 85% of the respondents from the other programs were aware of their school government representatives. Less than 85% of the respondents from all programs were aware of the school government sponsored activities, while less than 85% of the respondents from all programs were aware of their school government sponsored activities, with the exception of Cytogenetic Technology respondents in which 88.0% were satisfied with their school’s student government.

The fourth objective was to determine respondent demographics. The majority of respondents, 96.8%, indicated their educational objective was to obtain a Bachelor’s degree and 82.4% indicated their goal after leaving SHP was to obtain full-time employment. Over half of the respondents were U.S. citizens/permanent residents (96.0%), over 30 years old (66.9%), single, never married (57.9%), and female (69.1%). Most respondents identified themselves as either Asian (27.2%) or White/Caucasian (23.5%). Significant differences were noted in response patterns by several of the demographic groups. There were 105 significant differences by program (only programs with ten or more respondents were compared), five by gender, seven by marital status, and five by age.

The results from the 2012 survey were not compared to the results from the 2011 survey due to a change in the survey instrument. Although the number of respondents (less than ten) for two of the
programs is not statistically significant, the results for the overall program are useful for program outcomes guidance.

Areas suggested for possible improvement are those with combined ratings of Very Satisfied/Satisfied, Very Helpful/Helpful, Very Good/Good, and Very Aware/Aware less than 85%. Regarding the area of school curriculum, the evaluation results indicate that the quality of student advising should be reviewed along with the quality of teaching. In addition, less than 85% satisfaction levels existed with the quality of faculty, school administration, and staff. Results also indicate that students were less than 85% satisfied that the education they received help them prepare for their certification exams, and less than 85% suggested that they would advise others to obtain their education at MD Anderson’s School of Health Professions. In relation to student services and programs, areas of possible review would include new student orientation and school catalogs, in which there were no programs with more than 85% of respondents suggesting that catalogs were either helpful or very helpful. Within the MD Anderson Research Medical Library, areas such as print materials needed for study and library classes may need to be evaluated. Also, all areas of student support services may need to be reviewed as there were not any areas rated over 70% good or very good. Results also imply that aspects of student government may need to be addressed with less than 85% of respondents being aware of their school government representatives, and school government sponsored activities. Moreover, a slight majority were satisfied with their school's student government.

We recommend that the program evaluation continue to be administered on an annual basis at the end of the summer session to evaluate student programs and services. In doing so, data can then be compared longitudinally to not only help improve student outcomes, but also to improve student experiences doing their careers in the School of Health Professions.