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**AGENDA**

**DATE** 11/14/18  
**TIME** 11:30-1:30  
**LOCATION:** SHP DEAN'S CONFERENCE ROOM

**MEETING CALLED BY**  
Steering Committee

**TYPE OF MEETING**

**NOTE TAKER**

- Chair Dr. David Ford
- Dr. Jun Gu
- Dr. Bill Mattox
- Mark Bailey
- Dr. Brandy Greenhill
- Melissa Robinson
- Shaun Caldwell
- Dr. Peter Hu
- Mayank Amin
- Dr. Mahsa
- Dr. William Undie
- Catherine Evans
- Dehghanpour
- Clara Fowler
- Aziz Benamar
- Dr. Jamie Baker
- Helene Phu
- Mamie Ilboudo

**AGENDA TOPICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-MINUTES</th>
<th>APPROVAL MEETING MINUTES</th>
<th>MEMBER NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 MINUTES</th>
<th>SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) RESEARCH (INTRODUCTION OF TEAM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 MINUTES</th>
<th>QEP TRENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACSCOC QEP TOPICS</td>
<td>MEDICAL SCHOOL QEP TOPICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCY BASED EDUCATION</td>
<td>INTERPROFESSIONAL EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHICS</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 MINUTES</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 MINUTES</th>
<th>SURVEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50 MINUTES</th>
<th>PROGRAM DIRECTORS- CLOSED DISCUSSION- INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS APPROACH FOR QEP 2021.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Agenda topics

15 MINUTES
INTRODUCTIONS OF MEMBERSHIP

All attendees introduced themselves

15 MINUTES
SACSCOC QEP STANDARD 7.2

SACS has streamlined the accreditation process to our advantage, has significantly reduced standards requiring response, including QEP.

Under new guidelines, QEP falls under Standard 7.2.

The institution has a Quality Enhancement Plan that
a) has a topic identified through its ongoing comprehensive planning and evaluation process.
b) has broad-based support of institutional constituencies
c) focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success
d) commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP
e) includes a plan to assess achievement

As a SACS-certified QEP consultant, Dr. Ford's role is to organize an approach, and to be as efficient as possible within our limited resources.

QEP 2021 Overview booklets, specific to SHP, were distributed to all attendees.

10 MINUTES
QEP RUBRIC

QEP Rubric details SACS site visitors expectations for our QEP:
- Plan is directly related to institutional planning efforts
- Direct and strong relationship of QEP topic to institutional needs such as "student learning outcomes" (i.e. certification exam results)
Clear relationship between activities of the QEP and improvement in student learning  
- Detailed budget information (indicating institution's commitment of funds)  
- Detailed timeline table (example provided in QEP Overview booklet)  
- Benchmark measures established  
- Input from all relevant constituencies (i.e. steering committee members)  
- Clearly stated goals  
- Assessment methods are related to outcomes

Our goal is **compliance and acceptance** of our QEP.

We will need to articulate a strong narrative to distinguish our QEP and our school's focus and activities from the opportunities offered via GSBS group and their QEP and approach.

SACS visitors are expected to arrive in February or March 2021.

Dr. Ford provided a brief summary of the previous SACS site visit and the preparation process.

**10 MINUTES**  
QEP ELEMENTS  

- I. Institutional process – i.e. steering committee  
- II. Focus on learning – true focus on students, not facilities  
- III. Capability – demonstrated via funding and resources  
- IV. Broad-Based Involvement – broad group of participants, including students  
- V. Assessment Plan – ideally utilizing instruments, measures, annual report

**10 MINUTES**  
QEP CONTENTS  

Dr. Ford will be facilitating and writing the QEP report using SACS components as a structural template. Per recommendation from Dr. Belle Wheelan, the report will generate responses to table of contents exactly as listed and required.

**30 MINUTES**  
**QEP PROCESS OVERVIEW**  

Dr. Ford provided a planning document ("road map") that effectively incorporates the table of contents into a 10-step process as required by SACS via the following subcommittees:

- Institutional Effectiveness  
- Research  
- Proposal (must be achievable)  
- Assessment (indicate exact instrument of measure)  
- Implementation (provide timeline chart)

Subcommittees will vary in size. SACS review will evaluate how we analyzed data, how we are using established "best practices".

**10 MINUTES**  
**QEP PRODUCTION GRID**  

Dr. Ford has developed a detailed color-coded QEP 2021 production grid (included in Overview booklet).

**10 MINUTES**  
**QEP AGREEMENT GSBS/UT HEALTH**  

SACS accredits the UT MD Anderson institution, not just a school or a specific program. We must demonstrate how UT MDA complies with SACS requirements.

It was decided that, as in the past, GSBS will continue to join with UT Health to generate a joint QEP report (Memo from VP Dr. Bodurka)

The person writing the SACS report must explain all intricacies and options available to all of the students and faculty at MD Anderson including Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences and the School of Health Professions and acknowledge the existence of the relationship.

**10 MINUTES**  
**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION**

Dr. Ford
## QEP Communications Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Person responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Education Council:</td>
<td>12/17/09</td>
<td>R11.1663</td>
<td>D Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/10/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Resources Committee:</td>
<td>1/19/10</td>
<td>EPB 6</td>
<td>D Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Forum:</td>
<td>2/17/10</td>
<td>R11.4100</td>
<td>S. Tomasevic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic</strong></td>
<td>Employees Notes:</td>
<td>3/3/10</td>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>L. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Headlines stories:</td>
<td>3/3/10</td>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>L. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home page &quot;banner ads&quot;:</td>
<td>3/9/10</td>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>L. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the Record blog:</td>
<td>3/8/10</td>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>L. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eCast:</td>
<td>3/8/10</td>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>L. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action News Team:</td>
<td>3/6/10</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>L. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotions</strong></td>
<td>Newsletter:</td>
<td>2/5/10</td>
<td>Student/Faculty</td>
<td>S Madigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QEP Lanyards:</td>
<td>2/8/10</td>
<td>Student/Faculty</td>
<td>S Madigan, Viki Hopwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QEP Badge Inserts:</td>
<td>2/8/10</td>
<td>Students/Faculty</td>
<td>S Madigan, T Candela, T Candela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posters:</td>
<td>3/11-3/15/10</td>
<td>A2ACC (13) Smithville 1, Bastrop 1</td>
<td>S Madigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Bulletin Boards:</td>
<td>3/1-3/20/10</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>L. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandwich Boards:</td>
<td>3/15/2010</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>V Hopwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QEP Contest</strong></td>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>2/16-2/15/10</td>
<td>Dean's Office</td>
<td>V Hopwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>2/22/10</td>
<td>Student Lounge</td>
<td>V Hopwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>2/25/10</td>
<td>R11.1100</td>
<td>V Hopwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archives</strong></td>
<td>Employees Notes:</td>
<td>7/6/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Notes:</td>
<td>10/8/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletter 2009:</td>
<td>1/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of QEP topic categories – Fall 2013 – Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Themes</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Totals per topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Orientation/First Year Orientation/Career Enhancement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/Global Communities/Community Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning/Student Engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Based/Wellness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interprofessional Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Orientation/First Year Orientation/Career Enhancement

Amarillo College, Amarillo, Texas – June 2013
No Excuses! First-Year Seminar

Davidson County Community College, Lexington, North Carolina – June 2013
Storm Toward Success: A Comprehensive First-Year Experience

Eastfield College, Mesquite, Texas – June 2013
Year One: ENGAGE

Edison State College, Fort Myers, Florida – June 2013
Cornerstone Experience: Building the Foundation for Success

Gateway Community and Technical College, Florence, Kentucky – June 2013
S.M.A.R.T.: Student Mentoring Through Advising, Retention and Transitions

Greenville Technical College, Greenville, South Carolina – June 2013
Steer Your Career

John Tyler Community College, Chester, Virginia – June 2013
Tyler Connections: Making the First Year Count

Pamlico Community College, Grantsboro, North Carolina – June 2013
Focus on Success: Enhancing the Experience of First Year Students

Developing Accountability and Responsibility Together (DART)

Pitt Community College, Winterville, North Carolina – June 2013
Career and Academic Planning (CAP)

Richland College, Dallas, Texas – June 2013
Learning to Learn: Developing Learning Power

Santa Fe College, Gainesville, Florida – June 2013
Navigating the College Experience (NCE)

South Piedmont Community College, Polkton, North Carolina – June 2013
TRAC: Teaching Responsibility, Readiness, and Resourcefulness through Advising Connections

Southern University at Shreveport, Louisiana – June 2013
Jaguar Pride: Ensuring Student Success through Structured Advisement

Southern University, Georgetown, Texas – June 2013
Transforming Paideia: Interdisciplinary, Integrative, and Intentional Teaching and Learning

Vance Granville Community College, Henderson, North Carolina – June 2013
Advising in 3D: Dream, Design, Discover
Armstrong Atlantic State University, Savannah, Georgia – December 2013
First Class

University of Mary Washington, Fredericksburg, Virginia – December 2013
The First-Year Seminar: Research, Write, Speak

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, North Carolina – December 2013
PROSPECT for SUCCESS

Athens Technical College, Athens, Georgia – June 2014
First-Year Experience Initiative

Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina – June 2014
STAR (Success Through Academic Reporting)

Chattahoochee Technical College, Marietta, Georgia – June 2014
eMAP: educational Mater Advising Plan

Coastal Bend College, Beeville, Texas – June 2014
CBC Smart Start

Daytona State College, Daytona Beach, Florida – June 2014
Learn to SOAR: Students Optimizing Academic Resources

Eastern Florida State College, Cocoa, Florida – June 2014
The Core Scholar Program

Florida State College at Jacksonville, Jacksonville, Florida – June 2014
Make a Plan for Success

Maryville College, Maryville, Tennessee – June 2014
Maryville College Works: Bridging College to Career

Rockingham Community College, Wentworth, North Carolina – June 2014
Student Success through Orientation, Advising, and Relationships

Sampson Community College, Clinton, North Carolina – June 2014
A VOICE (Advising to Value Opportunities In Career and Education)

Snead State Community College, Boaz, Alabama – June 2014
Student Success: College Wide

South Plains College, Levelland, Texas – June 2014
ESP@SPC – Educational Success Plan

Technical College of the Lowcountry, Beaufort, South Carolina – June 2014
Be Advised!

Valencia College, Orlando, Florida – June 2014
The New Student Experience
Virginia Western Community College, Roanoke, Virginia – June 2014
*Navigate: Get THERE through Team Advising*

Brewton-Parker College, Mount Vernon, Georgia – December 2014
*SOAR: Students Obtaining Academic Rewards*

Bryan College, Dayton, Tennessee – December 2014
*College Success – Relational and Academic Skills*

LSU Paul M. Hebert Law School, Baton Rouge, Louisiana – December 2014
*Apprenticeship Week*

The University of Dallas, Irving, Texas – December 2014
*Discern, Experience, Achieve – Preparing for Life and Work in a Changing World*

University of Houston-Victoria, Victoria, Texas – December 2014
*Living and Learning: Teaming Up in Jaguar Village*

Bishop State Community College, Mobile, Alabama – June 2015
*Strong Start*

Blinn College, Brenham, Texas – June 2015
*Destination Success: First-Year Focus*

Central Texas College, Killeen, Texas – June 2015
*FAST: Faculty Advise and Students Thrive*

Clear Creek Baptist Bible College, Pineville, Kentucky – June 2015
*POWER, etc. – Plan – Organize – Work – Evaluate – Rethink. Excellent the Call!*

Cleveland State Community College, Cleveland, Tennessee – June 2015
*Connect to Complete*

Collin College, McKinney, Texas – June 2015
*There’s a Map for That!*

Guilford Technical Community College, Jamestown, North Carolina – June 2015
*Students Providing Alternative Resources for Knowledge (SPARK)*

Lamar Institute of Technology, Beaumont, Texas – June 2015
*Students Taking Education Personally (STEP) Project*

Louisiana State University at Alexandria, Alexandria, Louisiana – June 2015
*The LSUA Experience*

Northeast Alabama Community College, Rainsville, Alabama – June 2015
*MAPS: Mentoring, Advising, and Planning for Success*

State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota, Bradenton, Florida – June 2015
*R3: right place, right time, right person*
Texas State Technical College-West Texas, Sweetwater, Texas – June 2015
*Contextualized Reading, Writing, and Math Skills*

Wallace State Community College, Hanceville, Alabama – June 2015
*GPS (Goals-Planning-Success): Navigate Your Future*

*The Advising PIE: Prepare, Inspire, Engage: A Focus on Advising*

Catawba College, Salisbury, North Carolina – December 2015
*College to Career (C2C)*

Midway University, Midway, Kentucky – December 2015
*Because We Care-Comprehensive Advising Reaches Everyone*

Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida – December 2015
*R-COMPASS: Preparing Students for Lives and Careers After Graduation*

Sullivan University, Louisville, Kentucky – December 2015
*Career Literacies and Competencies: Putting Care Back into Career*

The University of Memphis, Memphis, Tennessee – December 2015
*Academic Coaching for Excellence (ACE)*

Wesleyan College, Macon, Georgia – December 2015
*From Here to Career: Connecting the Liberal Arts and Professional Development*

**Math**

Austin Community College, Austin, Texas – June 2013
*Math PLUS (Practice, Learn, Understand, Succeed)*

Cedar Valley College, Lancaster, Texas – June 2013
*It all begins with ME – Math Empowerment: A Sustainable Plan for Success in Mathematics*

Georgia Northwestern Technical College, Rome, Georgia – June 2013
*Math Matters*

Lane College, Jackson, Tennessee – June 2013
*GEMS: General Education Math Scholars*

North Lake College, Irving, Texas – June 2013
*Math GPS: Goals Promote Success*

Southeastern Technical College, Vidalia, Georgia – June 2013
*“MESH” for Success, (Mathematics Enhancing the Sciences and Health)*

Texas State Technical College Waco, Waco, Texas – June 2013
*We All Add Up!: Student Success in Development Mathematics*

West Georgia Technical College, Waco, Georgia – June 2013
*Reaching the Summit: Conquering Mathematics*
Chattahoochee Valley Community College, Phenix City, Alabama – June 2014
*Factor in Your Future*

Indian River State College, Fort Pierce, Florida – June 2014
*Math At the Root of Success (MARS)*

Jefferson State Community College, Birmingham, Alabama – June 2014
*Methods of Mastering Math*

L.E. Fletcher Technical Community College, Schriever, Louisiana – June 2014
*Soar with Math*

Lenoir Community College, Kinston, North Carolina – June 2014
*It All Adds Up at LCC – Addressing the Needs of Developmental Mathematics Students*

Louisiana State University at Eunice, Eunice, Louisiana – June 2014
*Path 2 Math Success*

Okefenokee Technical College, Waycross, Georgia – June 2014
*Extreme Math Makeover*

Rust College, Holly Springs, Mississippi – June 2014
*Building Communities Academically for Total Student Success: Improving First Year Math Skills*

St. Johns River State College, Palatka, Florida – June 2014
*Conquer Math*

South College, Knoxville, Tennessee – June 2015
*Quest for Math Improvement (Qmi)*

Texas State Technical College-Harlingen, Harlingen, Texas – June 2015
*Math: It All Adds Up To Success*

Wiregrass Georgia Technical College, Valdosta, Georgia – June 2015
*Engage in Excellence*

Coker College, Hartsville, South Carolina – December 2015
*Go Figure! Connect With Numbers*

**Critical Thinking**

Bladen Community College, Dublin, North Carolina – June 2013
*R U Thinkn? Think Smarter: A Quality Enhancement Plan in Problem Solving*

El Centro College, Dallas, Texas – June 2013
*CT3: Critically Thinking Things Through O A Journey to Develop Student Critical Thinking*

Piedmont Community College, Roxboro, North Carolina – June 2013
*Quantitative Reasoning for you (QR4U)*

Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina – December 2013
*Clemson Thinks2*
Texas Wesleyan University, Fort Worth, Texas – December 2013
Think On!: Thinking Critically

University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama – December 2013
TEAM USA: Team-Based Learning at the University of South Alabama

Broward College, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida – June 2014
Question Every Possibility – Thinking Critically

College of the Albemarle, Elizabeth City, North Carolina – June 2014
I Love Problem Solving

Tarrant County College District, Fort Worth, Texas – June 2014
PowerOn: Critical Thinking

Victoria College, Victoria, Texas – June 2014
Operation: SEAL the DEAL

Alabama Agricultural & Mechanical University, Normal, Alabama – December 2014
Enhancing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills – “Dare to Think!”

Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia – December 2014
The Nature of Evidence

Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida – December 2014
Think FSU: Improving Critical Thinking in the Disciplines

Jacksonville State University, Jacksonville, Alabama – December 2014
Fast Forward: Using 21st Century Tools to Promote Critical Thinking

Newberry College, Newberry, South Carolina – December 2014
Habits of the Heart: Critical Thinking for Personal and Social Responsibility and Vocational Reflection

North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina – December 2014
TH!NK: Higher-order Skills in Critical and Creative Thinking

Judson College, Marion, Alabama – June 2015
Project Curiosity!

Marion Military Institute, Marion, Alabama – June 2015
Thinking Critically About Leadership

Texas A&M University International University, Laredo, Texas – December 2015
ACT on IDEAs

Union College, Barbourville, Kentucky – December 2015
Catch Fire: Higher Order Thinking at Union College

Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky – December 2015
Evidence & Argument
Communication
Bluefield College, Bluefield, Virginia – June 2013
The Confident Communicator

College of the Mainland, Texas City, Texas – June 2013
Find Your Voice at COM: Oral Communication across the Curriculum

LeMoyne-Owen College, Memphis, Tennessee – June 2013
M.A.G.I.C.: Moving a Generation in Communication

Wiley College, Marshall, Texas – June 2013
Communicate through Debate

University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky – December 2013
Presentation U

The University of West Alabama, Livingston, Alabama – December 2013
iCommunicate

Richmond Community College, Hamlet, North Carolina – June 2014
Speaking to Convey, Writing to Display

Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana – December 2015
BLUE FIRE: Igniting Communication Experiences

University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida – December 2015
Communication for Professional Success

Reading
Brookhaven College, Dallas, Texas – June 2013
Reading: The App for Life

Georgia Piedmont Technical College, Clarkston, Georgia – June 2013
iRead...iClick...I'm Ready... Enhancing Reading Comprehension and Digital Literacy

Miles College, Fairfield, Alabama – June 2013
Enhancing Reading Through Metacognition

North Lake College, Irving, Texas – June 2013
iRead – “a world of possibilities”

Enterprise State Community College, Enterprise, Alabama – June 2014
A CASE for Developmental Reading

Lamar State College Port Arthur, Port Arthur, Texas – June 2014
Seahawks SOAR: Students Obtaining Achievement in Reading

Seminole State College of Florida, Sanford, Florida – June 2014
Read to Succeed
Southcentral Kentucky Community & Technical College, Bowling Green, Kentucky – June 2014

Today’s Readers are Tomorrow’s Leaders

Galveston College, Galveston, Texas – June 2015
Read Deeper

Jarvis Students Tackling Reading (JSTAR)

Lamar State College – Orange, Orange, Texas – June 2015
RISE (Reading Is Simply Everything)

Writing

Columbia State Community College, Columbia, Tennessee – June 2013
Writing to Learn Matters (WTLM)

Dalton State College, Dalton, Georgia – June 2013
Improving the Academic Performance of High-risk Students through Learning Support English: Getting on the “Write” Path

Johnston Community College, Smithfield, North Carolina – June 2013
On the Write Path

Mountain View College, Dallas, Texas – June 2013
The Pen Is Our Power

Northeast Texas Community College, Mt. Pleasant, Texas – June 2013
WRITE SMART: Improving Students Writing and Vocabulary

St. Joseph Seminary College, St. Benedict, Louisiana – June 2013
O Sophial Improving Writing Skills in Philosophy

East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina – December 2013
Write Where You Belong

Elon University, Elon, North Carolina – December 2013
The Writing Excellence Initiative

Hodges University, Naples, Florida – December 2013
Writing – Your Path to Success

Lindsey Wilson College, Columbia, Kentucky – December 2013
Lindsey Writes

Saint Thomas University, Miami Gardens, Florida – December 2013
Word Up! Transforming Writing at STU

Shaw University, Raleigh, North Carolina – December 2013
Adventures in Writing: I Came. I WROTE. I Conquered!
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky – December 2013
*Improving Theological Writing*

Alamance Community College, Graham, North Carolina – June 2014
*Write to Succeed*

Dabney S. Lancaster Community College, Clifton Forge, Virginia – June 2014
*Write Now for the Road Ahead*

Surry Community College, Dobson, North Carolina – June 2014
*The Write Choice for Success*

Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Virginia – December 2014
*WE Write for Success*

Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, Mississippi – December 2014
*Maroon and Write*

St. Mary’s University, San Antonio, Texas – December 2014
*Written Communication Excellence*

University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, Belton, Texas – December 2014
*The Writing Cru*

University of Mobili, Mobile, Alabama – December 2014
*Writing Intensive Networks*

University of West Georgia, Carrollton, Georgia – December 2014
*Undergraduate Writing in the Core Curriculum*

Central Virginia Community College, Lynchburg, Virginia – June 2015
*Building Better Writers*

Copiah-Lincoln Community College, Wesson, Mississippi – June 2015
*The Write Path*

Denmark Technical College, Denmark, South Carolina – June 2015
*P.O.W.E.R.S. (Purpose, Organization, WRITING, Evaluation, Reflection, Scaffolding)*

Edward Waters College, Jacksonville, Florida – June 2015
*Mighty Write!*

Lees-McRae College, Banner Elk, North Carolina – June 2015
*Your Writing Elevated*

Miami Dade College, Miami, Florida – June 2015
*Do the Write Thing*

Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky – December 2015
*THE QUILL: Improving Student Academic Writing*
Erskine College, Due West, South Carolina – December 2015
Developing Academic Writing Skills through the Study of Critical Issues within the Disciplines

Everglades University, Boca Raton, Florida – December 2015
Writing for the Major

Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Myers, Florida – December 2015
FGCU Scholars: Think, Write, Discover: Enhancing the Culture of Inquiry from Composition to Capstone
(Three topic areas featured: Writing, Critical Thinking, Information Literacy)

Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, Georgia – December 2015
Georgia Southern! Eagles! Write! Write! Write!

Texas A&M University-Kingsville, Kingsville, Texas – December 2015
Culture of Writing

University of the Incarnate Word, San Antonio, Texas – December 2015
Think, Learn, Share: Writing Matters

University of St. Thomas, Houston, Texas – December 2015
Write Well, Think Well: Toward a Culture of Writing

Information Literacy

Forsyth Technical Community College, Winston-Salem, North Carolina – June 2013
Information Literacy: Because We C.A.R.E.

ECPI University, Virginia Beach, Virginia – December 2013
Students F.I.R.S.T. (Find Information and Resources to Succeed Today)

East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee – December 2013
INtopFORM: Insightful Questions, Informed Answers

Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida – December 2013
Distinction through Discovery: Expanding the Culture of Undergraduate Research and Inquiry

The University of Tennessee at Martin, Martin, Tennessee – December 2013
Maximum Information Literacy Excellence Program (MILE Program)

Darton State College, Albany, Georgia – June 2014
Making Information Click

Howard Payne University, Brownwood, Texas – December 2014
Information Literacy: Navigation for the Information Age

Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia – December 2014
Learning That Matters: Building a Culture of Generalizable Education

Catawba Valley Community College, Hickory, North Carolina – June 2015
It's TIME: Testing Information for Merit & Effectiveness
Tallahassee Community College, Tallahassee, Florida – June 2015

Digital FOCUS

International/Global Communities/Community Service

Angelo State University, Plano, Texas – December 2013
CONNECT! Campus and Community: ASU’s Plan to Enhance Learning through Community Engagement

Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina – December 2013
Global Learning: A World of Opportunities for Appalachian Students

Carson-Newman University, Jefferson City, Tennessee – December 2013

LeGrange College, LaGrange, Georgia – December 2013
Global Engagement

Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas – December 2013
Discovering Global Citizenship: Building the Foundation for Comprehensive Internationalization

El Paso County Community College District, El Paso, Texas – June 2014
Learning about the Community as a Community

Georgia Gwinnett College, Lawrenceville, Georgia – June 2014
Internationalization of the Curriculum: Engaging the World to Develop Global Citizens

Clayton State University, Morrow, Georgia – December 2014
Partnering Academics with Community Engagement (PACE)

Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas – December 2014
The Agape Project: Developing a Habit for the Great Commandments

Delta State University, Cleveland, Mississippi – December 2014
Improving Cultural Competency

Georgia Southwestern State University, Americus, Georgia – December 2014
Windows to the World

Texas A & M University-Commerce, Commerce, Texas – December 2014
Preparing Students for an Interconnected World

University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida – December 2014
Learning without Borders: Internationalizing the Gator Nation

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, North Carolina – December 2014
Global Learning for Global Engagement

Blue Ridge Community College, Weyers Cave, Virginia – June 2015
Cultivating Personal and Social Responsibility for Students Success

Mid-Atlantic Christian University, Elizabeth City, North Carolina – June 2015
Global Awareness – “Connecting Cultures”
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia – December 2015  
Serve-Learn-Sustain

Lee University, Cleveland, Tennessee – December 2015  
Integrative Learning: Faith, Vocation, and Core Values

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas – December 2015  
Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society

University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana – December 2015  
Bringing the World to UNO: Global Learning and Engagement

University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida – December 2015  
QEP: The Global Citizens Project

Building Diversity: Inclusive Excellence across the Curriculum

Technology

Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama – December 2013  
The ePortfolio Project: Learn It, Live It, Create It, Share It

Student Online Success (SOS)

Columbus Technical College, Columbus, Georgia – June 2015  
Computer Literacy Is Critical Knowledge (CLICK)

Leadership

Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia – December 2013  
Educating Imaginative, Resilient Leaders for God’s Changing World

Longwood University, Farmville, Virginia – December 2014  
R.E.A.L. Inquiry: Research Experience for Aspiring Leaders

Ave Maria University, Ave Maria, Florida – December 2015  
Sophomore Success: Preparing Leaders for the Third Millennium

Marine Corps University, Quantico, Virginia – December 2015  
Strengthening Leadership through Enhanced Creative Problem Solving

Experiential Learning/Student Engagement

Jacksonville University, Jacksonville Florida – December 2013  
ECHO: Everything You Do Comes Back to You

Texas Woman’s University, Denton, Texas – December 2013  
Pioneering Pathways: Learn by Doing
The University of North Carolina at Wilmington, Wilmington, North Carolina – December 2013
ETEAL: Experiencing Transformative Education through Applied Learning

Georgia Perimeter College, Decatur, Georgia – June 2014
EDGE – Engagement Drives GPC Education

Southern Crescent Technical College, Griffin, Georgia – June 2014
Engage to Learn, Learn to Engage

Western Piedmont Community College, Morganton, North Carolina – June 2014
Get REAL: Really Engaged in Active Learning – Improving Student Learning by Using Active Learning Strategies

Academy of Oriental Medicine at Austin, Austin, Texas – December 2014
CAMS Success! Enhancing Clinical and Management Skills Proficiency Through Staged Competencies

The Agnes Scott College, Decatur Georgia – December 2014
Preparing Women for a World of Opportunity

Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, Tennessee – December 2014
Explore, Experience, Excel (E³)

Barry University, Miami Shores, Florida – December 2014
Fostering Personal and Social Responsibility through Experiential Learning

Georgia College & State University, Milledgeville, Georgia – December 2014
ENGAGE: Building a Culture of Engaged Learning

Mississippi University for Women, Columbus, Mississippi – December 2014
Think Outside the Books: Cultivating Intellectual Curiosity

Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky – December 2014
Bring Learning to Life

Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Alabama – June 2015
rise3 – research, internship, service, ("Explore, Experience, Excel")

Central Alabama Community College, Alexander City, Alabama – June 2015
Keys to Success

North Florida Community College, Madison, Florida – June 2015
Engage for Success

Southwest Tennessee Community College, Memphis, Tennessee – June 2015
Learning Communities

Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain, Mississippi – December 2015
The CARE Project: Enhancing Student Learning through Collaboration, Active Learning, Course Redesign, and Engagement
Fundación Universidad de las Américas – Puebla, Puebla, Mexico – December 2015
EXPERIENTIAL UDLAP

Interdenominational Theological Center, Atlanta, Georgia – December 2015
_Sankofa: The Interrelatedness of Engaging Orality and Ocularity_

Louisiana State University at Shreveport, Shreveport, Louisiana – December 2015
_Learning Through Engagement_

Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond, Louisiana – December 2015
_Real-World Ready_

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama – December 2015
_Learning in Action: Developing Real-World Problem Solvers through High Quality Experiential Learning_

The University of Tampa, Tampa, Florida – December 2015
_Learning by Doing: Inquiry-Based Experiential Education_

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee – December 2015
_Experience Learning_

**Ethics**

James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia – December 2013
_The Madison Collaborative: Ethical Reasoning in Action_

Campbellsville University, Campbellsville, Kentucky – December 2014
_Find Your Compass: Developing a Basis for Ethical Decision Making_

The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina – December 2014
_Ethics in Action: Since 1842_

**Faith Based/Wellness**

Louisiana College, Pineville, Louisiana - December 2013
_Faith Learning and You_

Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, Texas – December 2014
_Comprehensive Wellness for Ministry_

**Research**

Midwestern State University, Wichita Falls, Texas – December 2013
_Enhancing Undergraduate Research Endeavors and Creative Activities (EURECA)_

Trevecca Nazarene University, Nashville, Tennessee – December 2013
_Undergraduate Research_

Louisiana State University and A & M College, Baton Rouge, Louisiana – December 2014
_LSU Discover – Undergraduate Research_
Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center at Shreveport, Shreveport, Louisiana – December 2014
Translating Research Into Practice (TRIP)

Mercer University, Macon, Georgia – December 2015
Research that Reaches Out-Integrating Research and Service at Mercer University

Distance Learning

Augusta Technical College, Augusta, Georgia – June 2014
ide@ (innovative distance education@) Augusta Tech

Montgomery Community College, Troy, North Carolina – June 2014
Strengthening the Online Student Learning Environment at Montgomery Community College

Ranger College, Ranger, Texas – June 2014
Engage with E-Learning

Sandhills Community College, Pinehurst, North Carolina – June 2014
OASIS: Online Academic Success Initiative at Sandhills

Preparing Students to Learn Online: Are You Ready?

Stanly Community College, Albermarle, North Carolina – June 2015
Engage, Develop, and Grow with eLearning (EDGe)

e-Learning Preparedness Initiative across the College (EPIC)

Amridge University, Montgomery, Alabama – December 2015
Exceptional Programs for Learning Online, Research, and Engagement (EXPLORE)

Interprofessional Education

Baptist College of Health Sciences, Memphis, Tennessee – June 2015
PULSE – Professionals United in Life, Service, and Education

Watkins College of Art, Design and Film, Nashville, Tennessee – June 2015
Visual Arts Foundation

Louisiana State University Health Science Center at New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana – December 2015
IPE: Changing the Course of Health Education

The University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama – December 2015
Learning in a Team Environment
Medical School QEP Themes Fall 2013 to Spring 2015

December 2014

Academy of Oriental Medicine at Austin, Austin, Texas – December 2014

**CAMS Success! Enhancing Clinical and Management Skills Proficiency Through Staged Competencies**

AOMA recognizes that clinical skills, critical thinking, and the ability to work in integrative healthcare settings are crucial in a rapidly changing healthcare environment. The critical issue to be addressed is that beginning clinic interns need greater support to build confidence and skills, while experienced interns benefit from more advanced opportunities in preparation for clinical practice after graduation.

Accordingly, the goals of CAMS Success! are:

- Provide clinical practice that progressively and systematically develops interns through stages competencies
- Provide educational experiences that build learner confidence and competence
- Educate interns to successfully practice in fast-paced, specialty or collaborative integrated settings.

Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center at Shreveport, Shreveport, Louisiana – December 2014

**Translating Research Into Practice (TRIP)**

Translating Research Into Practice (TRIP) will focus on making critical appraisal of research a seamless part of the schools of LSUHSC-Shreveport. It will seek to increase students’ ability to:

- Develop creative hypotheses.
- Determine legitimate research methodology.
- Critically analyze published studies.
- Apply relevant scientific literature to practice.

Student learning outcomes for TRIP include:

1. Students will be able to locate and evaluate appropriate resources for scientific information.
2. Students will demonstrate proper application of methods in research design.
3. Students will be able to critically appraise the scientific literature.
4. Students will be able to identify and investigate a research question.
5. Students will be able to present and defend a research project.

December 2015

Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center at New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana – December 2015

Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center at New Orleans (LSUHSC-NO) is an academic health sciences center offering 20 degree programs across six schools: Allied Health, Dentistry, Graduate Studies, Medicine, Nursing, and Public Health. This institutional structure provides significant potential
for teamwork and collaboration among various students, which in turn has been shown to improve health outcomes. However, a broad review of LSUHSC-NO institutional goals and the ability to meet those goals through interprofessional interactions identified a number of factors hindering interprofessional relationships. This Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is focused on interprofessional education (IPE) in response to this acknowledgement as well as national calls to utilize IPE to improve health outcomes.

June 2015

Baptist Memorial College of Health Sciences, Memphis, Tennessee – June 2015

PULSE – Professionals United in Life, Service, and Education

The focus of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) at Baptist Memorial College of Health Sciences (Baptist College) is interprofessional education (IPE). The title of the QEP is PULSE which represents Professionals United in Life, Service, & Education. Literature review confirms the value of teamwork, communication, and collaboration across professions as mechanisms to improve patient care. Such collaboration demands that the teaching and learning of health professionals bridge their disciplinary domains. PULSE is a concentrated effort to implement interprofessional education through learning communities at Baptist College.
Good Morning David,

It was a pleasure to talk with you this morning about my favorite subject – interprofessional education and practice. I included some resources that I hope will be useful for you. Please feel free to call or email. I will do the same. I forwarded the save the date for the upcoming Texas IPE Consortium meeting. The rest of the resources are located below. My QEP presentation is too large to attach so let me find another way to get that to you.

Take care,
Shelley

IPE Resources:

The Texas IPE Consortium (A wonderful and unique networking opportunity):
https://www.ttuhscc.edu/interprofessional-education/texas-interprofessional-education-consortium.aspx

TeamSTEPPS:

The National Center for Interprofessional Practice and Education (Great for assessment tools):
https://nexusipe.org/

The IPEC Core Competencies (This will be useful to help define program goals and objectives):
https://nebula.wsimg.com/2f68a39520b03336b41038c370497473?AccessKeyId=DC06780E69ED19E2B3A5&disposition=0&alloworigin=1

MUSC’s QEP:
http://ip-v.mdc.musc.edu/qep/appendix.php

Kind regards,
Shelley Smith

Shelley Smith MEd
Director, Interprofessional Education and Practice, QEP
Phone: 409-772-0213
shelsmit@utmb.edu

The University of Texas Medical Branch
301 University Blvd.
Galveston, Texas 77555-1132

Follow us on Facebook
The institution has a Quality Enhancement Plan that (a) has a topic identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes; (b) has broad-based support of institutional constituencies; (c) focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success; (d) commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP; and (e) includes a plan to assess achievement.

(Quality Enhancement Plan)

Rationale and Notes

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is an integral component of the reaffirmation of accreditation process and is derived from an institution’s ongoing comprehensive planning and evaluation processes. It reflects and affirms a commitment to enhance overall institutional quality and effectiveness by focusing on an issue the institution considers important to improving student learning outcomes and/or student success.

By providing details on a specific component or subcomponent for the comprehensive planning and evaluation process, the institution can delve into more detail than would appear in Standard 7.1 (Institutional planning) on a topic the institution itself has identified as a priority. As an ongoing process, the QEP will be reviewed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee, allowing a peer review committee to better understand the institution’s focus on student learning and/or student success. In addition, it will allow the institution to benefit from the insights of the committee to strengthen its efforts as it moves forward. It is important to note that the topic of the QEP may be something that is already underway, or it may represent a new initiative; the focus of the QEP will depend heavily on where the institution is relative to its own comprehensive planning and evaluation process. Put another way, there is not an expectation that an institution will “stop what it is doing” until it finds out the result of the reaffirmation review. In fact, to do so would represent a weakness in the ongoing planning and evaluation process already in place. Instead, the QEP is done in the spirit of an institution seeking continuous improvement.

Because the QEP is more detailed than other elements of the reaffirmation process, it should be a standalone document, not a narrative within the Compliance Certification. That document should address each of the specific components within the standard. Comments on each of those components follow.

A topic identified through ... ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes

The QEP describes a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses an identified element from within the institution’s comprehensive planning process that focuses
SACS QEP
Focus Group Report

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
MD ANDERSON CANCER CENTER
Making Cancer History®
I. Introduction and Purpose of Study

The University of Texas M. D. Anderson Cancer Center School of Health Professions (SHP) (formerly the School of Health Sciences) is pursuing a project to enhance student learning outcomes as part of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation. As a result of several focus groups with students, faculty, and employers, the SHP wanted to evaluate the potential of pursuing critical thinking as the SACS quality enhancement plan (QEP) project. Surveys were sent to employers, student and alumni, and faculty to evaluate the proposed QEP project. The results of the surveys will be used to determine student needs and to continue efforts to improve the quality of student learning outcomes. The following objectives are addressed in this report:

Objective 1: To determine employers' perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project.

Objective 2: To determine the SHP faculty members' perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project.

Objective 3: To determine the SHP student and alumni perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project.

Objective 4: To determine respondent demographics in relation to program affiliation.

II. Background of Evaluation Process

The School of Health Professions had been reviewing the feasibility of implementing a program which would enhance student learning outcomes in all programs. The Quality Enhancement Team was formed in the summer of 2008. Four topics were considered for the project: (1) a capstone project; (2) critical thinking skills project; (3) faculty development project; and (4) a technology project. After reviewing research on these four topics of interest submitted by the QEP Research Subcommittee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee chose to obtain constituency input concerning the four proposed projects through focus groups and report those findings to the QEP Committee for consideration. The outcomes of the focus groups would be used to prepare questionnaires to solicit additional input from School of Health Professions' faculty, alumni and students and employers as well as validate the focus group findings.

The focus groups were conducted with two focus groups per group of employers, faculty and students. There were six focus groups conducted with a total of 52 attendees (92.9% overall attendance). By group, employers had a 100.0% response rate (n = 13); faculty had a 88.2% (n = 15); and students and alumni had 92.3% (n = 24) response rate. The Critical Thinking Skills (CTS) area for the QEP was the most selected topic. The QEP Committee voted to conduct a survey of faculty, students and alumni and employers to review the feasibility of implementing Critical Thinking Skills as a program in all SHP areas which would enhance student learning skills.
III. Methods

There were three separate survey instruments; one for employers, one for faculty members, and another for students and alumni. The employer survey was sent to 50 employers, of which 32 responded, resulting in a response rate of 64.0%. The faculty survey was sent to 86 faculty colleagues, of which 44 responded, resulting in a response rate of 51.2%. The student and alumni survey was sent to 515 students and alumni, of which 154 responded, resulting in a response rate of 29.9%.

The study objectives were analyzed using frequency distributions. All unknown or missing responses were removed from the analysis. The survey did not have any control numbers or features to identify the individual respondents. The data was analyzed using SPSS for Windows, Release 14.0, Standard Version. A time line for the study is shown in Figure 3.1. The survey instruments are presented in Appendix A.

![Figure 3.1](image)

**Figure 3.1**
Time Line for Study

Survey Distribution
First Survey Email
November 5, 2008

Second Survey Email
November 12, 2008

Third Survey Email (to Faculty only)
November 20, 2008

Fourth Survey Email
December 4, 2008

Data Analysis
January 9, 2009

Report Submission
Draft Report
January 14, 2009

Final Report
March 3, 2009

IV. Results

A. Objective 1 Analysis (Refer to Appendix B, Table B.1)

The first objective was to determine employers' perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project. The majority of employers indicated that critical thinking was currently imbedded in their operation through five different avenues (Table 4.1). Over 90% of the employers indicated that the advantages to SHP students of developing a critical thinking project would be more effective and efficient use of skills on the job (96.9%) and increased troubleshooting abilities (90.6%). In addition, 71.9% of respondents indicated an advantage would be students' increased confidence in their knowledge level. When asked about disadvantages, 25% or more of employers indicated that there would be four main disadvantages of developing a critical thinking project for SHP students (Table 4.2).
Table 4.1  
**SHP Quality Enhancement Plan: Employer Survey**  
**Areas Where Critical Thinking is Imbedded**

**1.** How is critical thinking currently imbedded in your operation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applying Knowledge to Troubleshooting</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch Mistakes</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation of Data</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing a Significant Finding</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of Results</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2  
**SHP Quality Enhancement Plan: Employer Survey**  
**Disadvantages of a Critical Thinking Project**

**3.** What are the disadvantages of developing a critical thinking project for the SHP students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Outcomes for the Project Would be Difficult</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to Secure Adequate Resources for the Project</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Time Commitment for the Project</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Confidence of Students in Job Abilities</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked to indicate their priority for areas where a critical thinking skills project could improve a student's chances for success, 70.0% of the respondents indicated as a first priority that a student has better analytical skills, followed by increased ability for entry level professional to work under stress (61.3%), and improved student preparation for job placement (50.0%). The area ranked the highest as a second priority was improved instructional techniques from SHS faculty (77.3%), while improved student preparation for job placement (17.9%) was ranked highest as a third priority. Approximately 87.5% of the employers would propose interactive case studies as a critical thinking project for the SHP students, followed by opportunity to use manual simulations (59.4%).

B. Objective 2 Analysis (Refer to Appendix B, Table B.1)

The second objective was to determine the SHP faculty members' perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project. Over half of the faculty indicated that critical thinking is currently imbedded in their operation in four areas (Table 4.3). Over 80% of the respondents indicated that the advantages of developing a critical thinking project for their program would be increased ability for their students to succeed in future employment (88.6%), increased clinical competence for their students (86.4%), and increased troubleshooting abilities (81.8%). Almost 60% of the respondents indicated that inadequate time to complete the project (59.1%) would be a disadvantage of developing a critical thinking project for their program. In addition, 29.5% of the respondents indicated that diversion of faculty focus from program objectives and inability to secure adequate resources for the project were disadvantages of developing a critical thinking project for their program.

Table 4.3  
**SHP Quality Enhancement Plan: Faculty Survey**  
**Areas Where Critical Thinking is Imbedded**

**1.** How is critical thinking currently imbedded in your operation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Rotations</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams and Quizzes</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for priority areas where a critical thinking skills project could improve a student's chances for success, over 50% of the respondents identified the following areas as a first priority: improved preparation for job performance (66.7%); improved entry level competence (62.5%); and improved training for students in clinical experiences (58.5%). Over 35% of the respondents indicated the following three areas were a second priority: improved preparation for job placement (37.5%); improved instructional techniques from SHS faculty (37.1%); and improved training for students in clinical experiences (36.6%). Over 25% of the respondents indicated improved instructional techniques from SHS faculty (28.6%) and improved preparation for job placement (27.5%) as a third priority. The majority of respondents would propose interactive case studies (77.3%) as a critical thinking project for their program. In addition, 59.1% of the faculty would recommend group class presentations and virtual clinical experience simulations as a critical thinking project for their program.

C. Objective 3 Analysis (Refer to Appendix B, Table B.1)

The third objective was to determine the SHP student and alumni perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project. Over 65% of the students and alumni indicated that critical thinking is currently imbedded in their operation in four areas (Table 4.4). Over 70% of the respondents indicated that the following would be advantages of developing a critical thinking project for their program: increased confidence in ability to work independently in chosen profession (84.4%); increased overall entry skill level upon completion of the program (79.5%); and increased comprehensive understanding of program competencies (74.7%). Over 25% of the respondents indicated that the following would be disadvantages of developing a critical thinking project for SHS students: inadequate time to complete project (43.5%); inability to secure adequate resources for the project (27.9%); and diversion of faculty focus from program objectives (26.6%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas Where Critical Thinking is Imbedded</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How is critical thinking currently imbedded in your SHS program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Rotations</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams and Quizzes</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Projects</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-percent or more of the respondents indicated the following as a first priority area where a critical thinking skills project could improve their chances of success: improved preparation for job performance (71.3%); improved training for students in clinical experiences (67.2%); improved entry level competence (61.8%); and improved preparation for job placement (50.0%). Improved instructional techniques from SHS faculty was ranked highest as a second priority (43.5%), while an area other (35.0%) than what was listed on the survey, such as increased salary, was ranked highest as a third priority. Approximately 71.4% of the respondents would propose interactive case studies as the critical thinking project for their program, while 60.4% would propose virtual clinical experience simulations.

D. Objective 4 Analysis (Refer to Appendix B, Table B.1)

The fourth objective was to determine respondent demographics in relation to program affiliation. Tables 4.5 through 4.7 show the breakdown of demographic questions by each survey.

Approximately 70.0% of the employers indicated they had hired less than five SHS students in the past five years, 16.7% indicated they had hired ten or more students, while 13.3% indicated they had
hired five, but less then ten SHS students in the past five years. Over half of the faculty respondents, 58.1%, indicated they had been a faculty member at SHS for less than five years, while 41.9% indicated they had been an SHS faculty member for five or more years. The majority of students and alumni, 86.8%, indicated they had either completed or were at the SHS to complete a Bachelor of Science degree program, while 13.2% indicated they had either completed or were here to complete a certificate program.

Table 4.5
SHP Quality Enhancement Plan: Employer Survey
Primary Program for Student Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Laboratory Science</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytogenetic Technology</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytotechnology</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Imaging</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histotechnology</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Dosimetry</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Genetic Technology</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6
SHP Quality Enhancement Plan: Faculty Survey
Program Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Laboratory Science</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytogenetic Technology</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytotechnology</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Imaging</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histotechnology</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Dosimetry</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Genetic Technology</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7
SHP Quality Enhancement Plan: Student and Alumni Survey
Program Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Laboratory Science</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytogenetic Technology</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytotechnology</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Imaging</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histotechnology</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Dosimetry</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Genetic Technology</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Conclusions

A. Major Findings

The University of Texas M. D. Anderson Cancer Center School of Health Professions (SHP) is pursuing a project to enhance student learning outcomes as part of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation. As a result of several focus groups with students, faculty, and employers, the SHP wanted to evaluate the potential of pursuing critical thinking as the SACS quality enhancement plan (QEP) project. Surveys were sent to employers, student and alumni, and faculty to evaluate the proposed QEP project. The results of the surveys will be used to determine student needs and to continue efforts to improve the quality of student learning outcomes.

The following objectives are addressed in this report: 1) to determine employers’ perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project; 2) to determine the SHP faculty members’ perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project; 3) to determine the SHP student and alumni perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project; and 4) to determine respondent demographics in relation to program affiliation. The response rate for the employer survey was 64.0%, for the faculty survey it was 51.2%, and for the student and alumni survey the response rate was 29.9%.

The first objective was to determine employers’ perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project. The majority of employers indicated that critical thinking was currently embedded in their operation through the following avenues: applying knowledge to troubleshooting (100.0%); catching mistakes (93.8%); correlation of data (90.6%); recognizing a significant finding (90.6%); and verification of results (87.5%). The majority of employers indicated that the advantages to SHP students of developing a critical thinking project would be more effective and efficient use of skills on the job (96.9%) and increased troubleshooting abilities (90.6%). Approximately 40.6% of employers indicated that a large time commitment for the project would be one of the disadvantages of developing a critical thinking project for SHP students.

When asked to indicate their priority for areas where a critical thinking skills project could improve a student’s chances for success, 70.0% of the respondents indicated a student with better analytical skills as a first priority area, while 77.3% indicated improved instructional techniques from SHS faculty as a second priority area. Approximately 87.5% of the employers would propose interactive case studies as a critical thinking project for the SHP students, followed by an opportunity to use manual simulations (59.4%).

The second objective was to determine the SHP faculty members’ perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project. The majority of faculty indicated that critical thinking is currently imbedded in their operation in clinical rotations (81.8%). The majority of respondents indicated that the advantages of developing a critical thinking project for their program would be increased ability for their students to succeed in future employment (88.6%), increased clinical competence for their students (86.4%), and increased troubleshooting abilities (81.8%). Almost 60% of the respondents indicated that inadequate time to complete the project (59.1%) would be a disadvantage of developing a critical thinking project for their program.

As for priority areas where a critical thinking skills project could improve a student’s chances for success, over 60% of the respondents identified improved preparation for job performance (66.7%) and improved entry level competence (62.5%) as a first priority area. Over 35% of the respondents indicated the following three areas as a second priority area where the project could improve their student’s chances for success: improved preparation for job placement (37.5%); improved instructional techniques from SHS faculty (37.1%); and improved training for students in clinical experiences (36.6%). The majority of respondents would propose interactive case studies (77.3%) as a critical thinking project for their program.
The third objective was to determine the SHP student and alumni perceptions on pursuing critical thinking as the QEP project. The majority of students and alumni indicated that critical thinking is currently imbedded in their operation through exams and quizzes (78.6%). The majority of respondents indicated that advantages of developing a critical thinking project for their program would be increased confidence in ability to work independently in chosen profession (84.4%) and increased overall entry skill level upon completion of the program (79.9%). Approximately 43.5% of the respondents indicated that inadequate time to complete the project would be a disadvantage of developing a critical thinking project for SHS students.

Over 60% of the respondents indicated the following as a first priority for areas where a critical thinking skills project could improve their chances of success: improved preparation for job performance (71.3%); improved training for students in clinical experiences (67.2%); and improved entry level competence (61.8%). Improved instructional techniques from SHS faculty was ranked highest as a second priority (43.5%). Approximately 71.4% of the respondents would propose interactive case studies as the critical thinking project for their program.

The respondents' overall comments and comments by question are presented in Appendix C. A summary of comment by survey is shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1
SHP Quality Enhancement Plan
Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Comments by Question</th>
<th># of Comments</th>
<th>% of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer Survey</strong></td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal, Employer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Survey</strong></td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal, Employer</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student and Alumni</strong> Survey</td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal, Employer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Study Limitations

A response rate closer to 70%, for each survey, would be more representative of the views of the population being evaluated. On the employer survey, there were no respondents from employers of the Cytogenetic Technology, Diagnostic Imaging, and Radiation Therapy program graduates, while on the student and alumni survey there were no respondents from the Histotechnology program. Responses from all programs may be more reflective of views of all programs.

C. Implications for the School of Health Professions

Over 70% of the respondents from all three surveys would propose interactive class studies as the critical thinking project for the program/SHP. Inadequate time to complete the project was the disadvantage selected the most often by faculty, students and alumni. A large time commitment for the project was the disadvantage selected by the most employers. Improved preparation for job performance was selected by faculty, students, and alumni as a first priority area where a critical thinking skills project could improve a student’s chances for success.

D. Suggestions for Future Research

We recommended that additional student learning outcomes research be conducted at SHP annually by alternating programs under evaluation in a two year cycle for the first five years after project implementation. In this way outcomes can be tracked for all programs every two years.
• Employer Groups: One group of employers suggested that SHS faculty rotate through the technologies available so that the faculty will know what technology is being used now; students should do hands-on work before they get to the lab, a lecture is not enough before they being working in the lab; basic lab skills are needed by students; students should know what to do when the equipment breaks; students appear to want to finish the rotation, not learn the technology. The second group all agreed that only MDACC procedures/policies are being taught, leaving students unaware and unprepared for different labs; several suggested that SHS programs use a ‘building block strategy’ to teach technology.

• Alumni/Student Groups: Faculty currently use Blackboard, PowerPoint presentations, microarray and SKY, real time PCR (not enough time for training), Gene Analyzer (not enough time for training), imagine systems;

b. Identification of technologies that should be implemented in the SHS program that would improve student learning

• Faculty Groups: Faculty identified the need for a full time instructional technology position to help faculty; more time to develop technology; a trauma mannequin for more simulation; interactive self-teaching; video/audio roll-up; and

• Employer Groups: Both groups: ability to troubleshoot; students should know what to do when the machine goes down. Other suggestions included teaching with cross-discipline training (e.g., increase exposure to a molecular/cytogenetics lab); SHS faculty should be up-to-date as to what is involved; teach more basic skills;

• Alumni/Student Groups: Areas where technology could be improved include more lab work for students, access to Mosaic, new imagine systems (most M. D. Anderson systems are old); use of Palm pilots for testing; need for a ‘dummy lab’ (simulation lab) which would allow more time for practice; provide students laptops; diversity in use of technology to allow students to use all available equipment; more time for practice before patients arrive.

c. Advantages and Disadvantages of a Technology Project as a QEP

1. Advantages:

• Faculty Groups: Assessment would be easier; engages learners more; enhance communication skills; more comparable to life setting;

• Employer Groups: Students will be better prepared (both groups); shorter learning curve when they start a new position; more time available for a project when the students rotate.
Alumni/Student Groups: More practice on dummies prior to working with real patients; students would be more prepared for clinic; students would be able to check for errors; more varied technology would allow students to make contacts with different hospitals for job purposes as they would have more experience.

2. Disadvantages:

- Faculty Groups: Cost of the project (both groups); time to learn and manage (both groups); reliability of the technology;

- Employer Groups: Tying up equipment from real work; resources needed for the project; patient needs can’t be re-prioritized, lab must report patient reports first; students may give out wrong information and/or incompatible and inconsistent information using the new technology as they lack experience.

- Alumni/Student Groups: The equipment may be too sophisticated and will break down often; reduce student critical thinking skills; selection of students for the new technology as not all students are on the same technology level; technology may be too expensive for students to participate.

E. Review of Group Demographics

There were a total of 24 students/alumni participating in the focus groups; 79.2% (n = 19) were students and 20.8% (n = 5) were alumni. The three programs represented by students in the focus groups were Cytogenetics, Radiation Therapy and Molecular Genetics Technology. The majority of alumni were employed at M. D. Anderson (80.0%). Ten respondents (41.7%) were intending to pursue a Master’s degree; two of the ten were considering a Master’s in another field. All participants were intending to work before seeking additional education.

A total of 13 employers attended the focus groups; 38.5% of the employers (n = 5) were from outside labs and 61.5% (n = 8) were from M. D. Anderson labs. Six of the labs (46.2%) had hired SHS graduates for over 50% of their lab-personnel. The group had nine average years of supervisory experience. There were six lab supervisors that had over ten years experience; of those ten, four had over fifteen years experience. All lab supervisors reported providing annual evaluations to their employees as well as six month interim evaluations for new employees. Areas which were considered the most important to high performance ratings were: technical skills, productivity, communication, teamwork and professionalism.

Fifteen faculty attended the focus groups representing Cytotechnology, Cytogenetics, Radiation Therapy, Molecular Genetics, Diagnostic Imaging, Clinical Laboratory Sciences and Histotechnology. The majority of faculty have been teaching over five years; the majority of faculty had over ten years working experience before becoming faculty and/or adjunct faculty with SHS.
IV. Study Themes

The majority of the employer, faculty and alumni/student groups agreed that the Quality Enhancement Plan should benefit everyone in the School of Health Sciences programs. Assessment was very important to this project and a concern for both faculty groups and at least one group of employers and alumni/students. All employers agreed that the project should be applicable to the programs as did one group of alumni/students.

The most critical issue for success of the project defined by the groups was assessment of the student learning outcomes. All groups mentioned the critical issue of time for the quality enhancement plan. Students were particularly concerned with having adequate time planned for students to complete the project. A third critical issue for the project was adequate training and guidance for faculty, or faculty development, available to assist with preparation of the project, availability of experts to train the faculty and the need for faculty to communicate their expectations to the students clearly. Description of the project was considered a critical issue by both faculty groups and at least one employer and alumni/student group agreed that the project should be a ‘real world’ application that was well planned and allowed students multiple ways to succeed.

The Critical Thinking Skills (CTS) area for the QEP was the most selected topic, with technology as a close second choice. Several groups suggested that any QEP should combine Critical Thinking Skills with a Technology project. It was also suggested by several groups that any QEP selected would require faculty development as part of the implementation strategy to ensure success.

Aside from the QEP theme development, employers consistently mentioned the need for SHS faculty to observe their labs so that students would be better trained and would know the technology in their labs before they arrived. Employers consistently mentioned the need for critical thinking skills for SHS students when interpreting results and/or coping with equipment breakdowns. The need for students to learn basic lab skills before working in various labs appeared consistently among employers and students/alumni.

V. Recommendations

The overall attendance to the focus groups was impressive. However, there were several SHS programs where students/alumni, faculty and employers were not represented in the discussions. A survey will give those groups another opportunity to participate in these efforts. It is recommended that additional input from alumni/students, faculty and employers be solicited through a survey with questions developed from the focus group findings.

There was much discussion in all groups concerning the timing, staffing and budget for the QEP project. Employers expressed hesitation to make suggestions concerning the QEP as they were uncertain as to their level of participation in this effort. Students/alumni were very concerned as to the time commitment for this project. Faculty development issues concerning the project should be addressed so as to assure SHS faculty that adequate development programs will be available to equip them to implement the selected QEP. We recommend that the communication concerning the QEP clarify that the project is an independently funded project which will include requests for staff, faculty, expertise and expenses associated with the project. Communication to students must clarify that the effort is part their educational experience meant
to enhance their student learning outcomes, not an additional "research" project that will not be applicable to future job skills.

The employers appeared to be very interested in hiring SHS graduates. However, there appears to be a disconnect between what employers see the students learning and the "real world." It is recommended that faculty obtain release time for observation of lab experiences with their students be made available at least once per semester. Additionally, better communication between employers and lab preceptors and SHS faculty is recommended. One suggestion would be to sponsor faculty and employers and lab preceptors to a meeting, either once or twice per year, to review aspects of laboratory techniques which could be implemented into the individual program's curriculum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.S. Programs</th>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
<th>Last Review</th>
<th>Renewal Self-Study</th>
<th>Next Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Laboratory Sciences</td>
<td>National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences (NAACLS)</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytogenetic Technology</td>
<td>NAACLS</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytotechnology</td>
<td>Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAHEP)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Imaging</td>
<td>Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT)</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
<td>April 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histotechnology</td>
<td>NAACLS</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
<td>April 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Dosimetry</td>
<td>JRCERT</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>May 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Genetic Technology</td>
<td>NAACLS</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>September 2027</td>
<td>April 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>JRCERT</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>April 2024</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Program</td>
<td>Accrediting Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renewal Self-Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Genetics</td>
<td>NAACLS</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>September 2027</td>
<td>April 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSBS Program</td>
<td>Accrediting Entity</td>
<td>Last Review</td>
<td>Next Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Master in Genetic Counseling</td>
<td>ABGC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS and PhD Program in Physics</td>
<td>CAMPEP</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>